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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

It would be difficult to find a college or university in the United States that is not seeking new and innovative methods of recruiting and retaining minority faculty. As higher education experiences a transformation in the demographics of its student body, institutions are finding it increasingly important to enhance their abilities to retain minority educators. Ira Swartz, the provost of Temple University stated, “I think it encourages students to see faculty who have similar backgrounds and cultural beliefs, and these faculty members can serve as role models for these students” (Gater, 2005). Nonetheless, there is a growing amount of skepticism about the success of diversity initiatives, especially as they relate to African American faculty. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2003), African Americans were 12% of the population in the United States but only 5% of the total faculty. In addition, there is a growing amount of literature reflecting issues in the retention, satisfaction levels and tenure rate of this faculty group. Though assumptions about these issues are rampant, a prevailing truth is that solutions are needed. A starting point to gathering these solutions may be in gaining a better understanding of job satisfaction as it relates to African American faculty.
African American Faculty

The percentage of African American faculty members in higher education have remained stagnant for over thirty years. As previously stated, African Americans are currently about 5% of the total faculty in the United States. However, according to Trower and Chait (2002), Black faculty was approximately 4.4% in 1975. These figures represent very little progress in the recruitment and retention of this faculty demographic. African Americans constitute 58% of the faculty at historically Black colleges and universities and 4% of the faculty at all other higher education institutions in the United States (Hubbard, 2006). This number is more alarming when viewed in the context of the low level of Ph.D. attainment among this ethnic group. According to the *Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac*, during the academic year of 2004-2005 only 5.8% of all doctoral degrees were granted to African Americans (p. 20).

Retention of this faculty group has also been an issue. Trower and Chait (2002) found that Black faculty were more likely than white faculty to leave their institution within a seven year period. Despite this attrition, the hiring rate of Black faculty has been minimal at best. A study of institutions in the Irvine Foundation project in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* found African Americans constituted only 4.8% of the new hires between 2000-2004 (Smith & Moreno, 2006).

African American Faculty at Predominantly White Institutions

The literature has consistently found African American faculty to be more satisfied at historically Black colleges and universities than at predominantly white
institutions despite findings suggesting those employed at the latter tend to have lower teaching loads, higher pay, and higher publication rates (Logan, 1990; Tack & Patitu, 1992, McNeal, 2003, Berrian, 2006). This finding naturally leads to questions about the experiences of this faculty group at these institutions. Research of African Americans at predominantly white institutions has noted frustrations with tenure, teaching experiences, and the work environment.

Tenure

According to the Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac (2007), African Americans were only 4% of the professors and associate professors in the United States. While there are various reason for this low percentage, African Americans often cite issues in regards to the acceptance of their research and the type of journals they pursue for publishing. Stanley (2006) noted that the research agendas of faculty of color are often not rewarded in the tenure process.

Many faculty of color engage in research that benefits their communities of color. Affirmative action, diversity and student outcomes, institutional climate, and culture and ethnicity are just a few areas that, without a doubt, benefit most higher education institutions, but research over these topics is not always rewarded in the academy. (p. 705)

This issue leads to a paradox for Black faculty. African Americans often pursue research that will enhance the conditions of Blacks and other oppressed groups. However, this type of research often leads to the questioning of their comprehensive research abilities. Thompson and Dey (1998) reported in a study over sources of faculty stress that, “for those who concentrate their research on African Americans, this focus is often
the vehicle through which others reinforce marginality of the African American faculty” (p 338). A study by the Ford Foundation (1997) noted an assumption that African Americans scholars “excel only in their subjects.”

In addition, the types of journals African Americans pursue for publishing are often viewed as inferior publications (Ruffins, 1997). A qualitative study of junior African American faculty noted that there was a general belief among those interviewed that the top tier journals would not accept their minority-based research since the topics were not considered “mainstream”. The middle tier journals, who they believed were just as rigorous, were much more willing to accept their research (Williams & Williams, 2006).

**Teaching**

There is research suggesting that African Americans value teaching over research (Ruffins, 1997; Thorton, 2003). However, the issues noted by Black faculty at predominantly white institutions have little to do with the concept of teaching; they are in regards to student perceptions and an interesting paradox of either facing resistance to teaching minority-based concepts or being expected to be multicultural experts.

Many African American faculty believe that the students at predominantly white institutions have different perceptions of them and the Caucasian faculty. Studies have found that minority faculty often report challenges to their authority, negative attitudes in and outside of the classroom, and complaints about their inclusion of minority
perspectives in their teachings (Bower, 2002; Stanley, 2006). An article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* noted one African American faculty member’s perception that students expect entertainment from him but rigor from his Caucasian colleagues (Bonner II, 2004).

Curriculum issues tend to fall within two extremes. Either the faculty are met with resistance to the inclusion of minority based courses or they are expected to be multicultural experts. Much of the resistance is from students. Many faculty of color at predominantly white institutions feel they are negatively impacted by student evaluations. A study focusing upon the narratives of faculty of color included the following statement from a white student in the university newspaper:

> As an undergraduate I was less interested in what my professors thought about social topics and more interested in learning something about the course described in my catalog. I am fascinated that not only do professors have the extra class time to insert these ancillary topics, they seem to be the primary focus for the semester. Perhaps a fair approach would be creation of a department for these professors and be open and honest about their intent. This way students would not be ambushed. I realized this sounds terribly insensitive, but grant me [the] latitude of diversity of thought you expect for yourselves. (Stanley, 2006, p. 710)

The profile of the faculty member described by the student above was not given, but this same author also found complaints like this to be common about faculty of color that considered themselves inclusive of all cultures in their teaching.

This narrowness of curriculum has also been considered a contributing factor to the low diversity numbers present among faculty at predominantly white institutions. According to a study by the Ford Foundation, many of the administrators and existing
faculty members were unfamiliar with minority scholars and their academic programs contained very little multicultural literature. This article noted that one English department at a university increased its diversity once it widened its range of world literatures offered in the curriculum (Knowles and Harleston, 1997).

The broadening of the curriculum has also been a source of stress for minority faculty. A more multicultural curriculum is very appealing until the brunt of the responsibility is given to the few faculty of color. The Ford Foundation provided an example of this point.

At one institution, we were told that the members of a religion department decided they could recruit yet another expert in Western religions, secure in the knowledge that their one minority junior faculty member could cover all the other stuff. (Knowles and Harleston, 1997, p. 12)

Work Environment

African American faculty at predominantly white institutions reported unwelcoming work environments. This faculty group has noted a lack of mentors and discriminatory practices. Bonner II (2004) noted that many feel there is a constant need to prove their competence as intellectuals.

In addition, many minority faculty feel they have to create different persona when amongst colleagues. This concept of “code switching”, a sociolinguistic term, is the idea that one has to navigate between the identities of two disparate worlds in order to succeed. Their ability to be successful in this navigation has been linked to their satisfaction and success in higher education. A study noted that faculty of color fare
better when “they have internalized a bicultural way of thinking and behaving rather than experiencing marginality from the dominant culture or assimilation with the resulting loss of their ethnic culture” (Sadao, 2003, p. 415).

This dissatisfaction with the work environment tends to be even more complex when gender is accounted for. Simply being a female faculty member represents several challenges with one being the decision to have children. Mason and Goulden (2004) concluded that becoming a parent was beneficial to the status of males but not nearly as beneficial to the careers of females. This challenge tends to be more complicated when considering race and gender. Research has found that Black female faculty are more likely to be single (49%) and without dependents than white female faculty (29%) (Glover, 2006). In addition, Myers (2002) in attempting to explain the low tenure rates of this group, found that faculty of color (both female and male) had little to no mentoring outside of their shared connectedness with each other. These findings are consistent with others stating that Black female faculty often report isolation, a lack of departmental support, and a need to sacrifice their personal lives (Ruffins, 1997 Stanley, 2006).

African American Faculty at Historically Black Colleges and Universities

The literature discussing African American faculty at historically Black colleges and universities is relatively limited when compared to the research of this same faculty group at predominantly white institutions. As previously noted, there has been research noting that Black faculty tend to be more satisfied at historically Black colleges and
universities than at predominantly white institutions. Nonetheless, according to Johnson (2001) the research focusing solely on the experiences of African American faculty is minimal with much of it being dated to the middle part of the 20th century—-a time most notably known for the civil rights movement.

Currently, we know that 58% of the fulltime faculty at historically Black colleges and universities are African Americans (Collison & Fields, 1999; Johnson, 2001). A study by Perna (2001) noted that many of the faculty members at historically Black colleges and universities attended those institutions as undergraduates. Approximately 75% of all African American Ph.D’s earned their degrees from a historically Black college and/or university (Jackson, 2002).

African American faculty also find tenure to be a challenge at these institutions. Fields (1997) found that historically Black colleges and universities approve and deny tenure to more African Americans than any other institution. Nonetheless, the reasons cited are different. Faculty at historically Black colleges and universities reference a heavier teaching load and an emphasis on service that causes time constraints when trying to research (Collison & Fields, 1999; Thorton, 2003). However, according to Fields (1997) finances may be the reason. Due to budget restraints, many historically Black colleges and universities feel they do not have the funding to attract and maintain tenured faculty. Nonetheless, faculty members at historically Black colleges and universities make significantly less than those at predominantly white institutions. Fields (1997) noted that in 1994, the average salary for male instructor at a historically Black
colleges and university was $40,217 compared to $51,228 for those employed at a predominantly white institution. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2002) the average salaries of full-time instructional faculty at historically Black colleges and universities were 81% of what they were in all institutions in 2001-2002. The average salary has been around 80% since 1976.

Despite the lower salary and increased teaching loads, many African American faculty tend to favor historically Black colleges and universities. Studies have found that faculty chose historically Black colleges and universities to avoid racial conflict, to work more closely with African American students, and to be part of what was referred to as an “extended-family academic group” (Billingsley, 1982; Roebuck and Murty, 1993). In addition, several faculty stated that they feel the mission of historically Black colleges and universities, especially as it relates to service to the community, is more aligned with their purposes for entering higher education.

Though the faculty seem to be satisfied, it would be interesting to know how they feel about the growing amount of critics of these institutions. Two economists from Harvard University and Massachusetts Institute of Technology concluded from a study that historically Black colleges and universities no longer provide a wage advantage for African American students in comparison to those in the same demographic graduating from predominantly white institutions (Ashley, 2007). In addition, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) have expressed disapproval with what they feel are violations of the standards for shared governance at historically Black colleges
and universities (Minor, 2005). Ward Connerly, a chairman of a civil rights institute, expressed his criticism of these institutions by stating they “oppose the diversity ideal” (Jost, 2003). He noted that they were once needed, but no longer. In a report published in CQ Researcher, Gerald Foster of Virginia Union, expressed his support for top tier historically Black colleges and universities, but felt the lower tier had “outgrown their usefulness” (Jost, 2003). In addition, several are facing financial and academic issues causing many to struggle for accreditation. These criticisms undoubtedly must affect the perceptions toward the faculty at these institutions. Though these faculty members are unquestionably highly qualified, these criticisms of historically Black colleges and universities may cause them to consider a jump to a top-tier predominantly white institution a good career move; especially when considering the well documented wage differences.

The aforementioned discussions of African American faculty at predominantly white institutions and historically Black colleges and universities show why solutions to satisfaction and retention problems are so elusive. There are several factors that affect job satisfaction among this group and these factors appear to vary depending upon the institutional type. Black faculty at predominantly white institutions complain of marginalization issues in relation to their teaching, research, and overall work environment. This same faculty group at historically Black colleges and universities expresses a higher level of satisfaction, but often have heavy work loads, lower wages, and must address the growing amount of criticisms facing their institutions. There is a
need for the current understanding of job satisfaction among this group to move beyond what they may be content with to also include the factors that will most likely cause these faculty members to stay with an institution.

Problem Statement

In order for institutions to improve retention of African American faculty, they must examine the complexity of job satisfaction as it relates to this group must be examined. Much of the literature has focused on sources of dissatisfaction for African American faculty. However, it is important for discussions pertaining to possible reasons these faculty members may leave an institution be coupled with discussions of why they may stay with one. Discovering sources of dissatisfaction alone do not provide insight into the factors that may lead to African American faculty feeling motivated, or for more experience faculty, a renewed sense of excitement. In addition, the minimal discussions of factors that lead to job satisfaction are often very narrow making no distinction between factors African American faculty find fulfilling or those they simply find tolerable. Therefore, this study is designed to explore the complexity of African American faculty job satisfaction by seeking to discover what factors they perceive to be dissatisfying about their jobs and those they feel give them a sense of fulfillment.

Theoretical Framework

Frederick Herzberg’s motivational hygiene theory, often referred to as the Two-Factor theory, categorized job satisfaction into intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Intrinsic factors, which serve to motivate workers, include achievement, recognition, the work
itself, responsibility, and advancement. Extrinsic factors, which serve as demotivators or sources of dissatisfaction, include salary, supervision, interpersonal relations, policy and administration, and working conditions. According to the theory, extrinsic factors, often referred to as hygiene factors, do not serve to motivate but employees will be dissatisfied without them.

Researchers in education have found that this dichotomy does not cleanly apply when investigating the job satisfaction of teachers. Linda Evans (2002) found that teachers often noted hygiene factors as motivators. Therefore, she re-conceptualized motivational hygiene theory to create a dichotomy among motivational factors. She made a distinction between factors the teachers were satisfied with and those they were satisfied by. Being satisfied with some aspect of a job means that one finds that particular factor as satisfactory. Being satisfied by something means that one finds that factor to be fulfilling (Evans, 2002).

This conceptualization of motivational hygiene theory may provide a more relevant framework for examining the job satisfaction among African American faculty. By making a distinction between those factors this faculty group finds satisfactory and those they find fulfilling, institutions in higher education may have more accurate ideas about what they can do to possibly increase African American faculty retention.

Research Questions

RQ 1: What are African American faculty at a historically Black university satisfied by?
RQ 2: What are African American faculty at a historically Black university satisfied with?
RQ 3: What are African American faculty at a historically Black university *dissatisfied with*

RQ 4: What are African American faculty at a predominantly white institution *satisfied by*

RQ 5: What are African American faculty at a predominantly white institution *satisfied with*

RQ 6: What are African American faculty at a predominantly white institution *dissatisfied with*

Research Design Conceptual Framework

This descriptive qualitative study follows the phenomenological approach. This method of inquiry seeks to “investigate the meaning of the lived experience of a small group of people from the standpoint of a concept or phenomenon” (Schram, 2006, p. 98). The primary data collection technique of phenomenology is through the use of individual, group, and life history interviews. The relevant assumptions of this method of inquiry include:

1. Perceptions present us with evidence of the world, not as the world is thought to be, but as it is lived.

2. [One] cannot develop an understanding of a phenomenon apart from understanding people’s experience of or with that phenomenon.

3. It is possible to understand and convey the essence, or central underlying meaning, or a particular concept or phenomenon as experienced by a number of individuals. (Schram, 2006, p. 99)

Significance of the Study

This study was conducted to provide insight into factors that contribute to the job satisfaction of African American faculty members. Specifically, this research served
three purposes. The first purpose was to distinguish between factors that satisfy and dissatisfy this faculty group. Secondly, the concept of “job satisfaction” among African American faculty was examined for the purpose of determining those factors they find fulfilling as opposed to simply expressing contentment with. Finally, the findings from this study provided a basis for comparing the job satisfaction factors at a historically Black colleges and universities and predominantly White institutions to see if they differ.

Limitations

The relevant limitations to this study were the following:

1. The study was limited to faculty members willing to participate thus limiting purposeful examination of variables, such as tenure, that may impact African American job satisfaction.

2. The interviewees’ comfort level with the researcher may have served as a limitation. As noted by Schram (2006), over-identification with the researcher could cause participants to “act or respond in ways they think the researcher wants them to act or respond.”

3. Due to the nature of qualitative studies, generalizability to the entire population of African American faculty at historically Black colleges and universities and predominantly white institutions is limited.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to two institutions within the same university system. One is Public University, a predominantly White institution, and the other is Mid-South University a historically Black university.

Definitions

- **Historically Black college or university (HBCU)**: The U.S. Department of Education (2007) defines HBCUs as “[an institution] established prior to 1964, whose principal
mission was, and is, the education of Black Americans” (para. 7).

- **Predominantly white institution (PWI):** Any college or university whose majority demographic of students, faculty, and staff is of European decent.

- **Satisfied by:** As reported by participants, this concept is the state of finding an aspect of a job fulfilling and/or motivating.

- **Satisfied with:** As reported by participants, this concept is the state of finding an aspect of a job acceptable. This concept does not refer to the factors for fulfillment or motivation but for those factors needed in order to keep a faculty member from feeling dissatisfied.

- **Dissatisfied with:** As reported by participants, this concept is the state of finding an aspect of a job unfulfilling or unsatisfactory.

**Organization of the Study**

This study is organized into five chapters with the information thus far serving as the first. The second chapter discusses the relevant literature in the field with a specific focus on the theoretical framework and studies relating to African American faculty job satisfaction. The third is a description of the qualitative methods used to conduct the study. Chapter 3 includes a description of the universities examined in the study, the questions asked, and the process used to analyze the data. The fourth chapter includes all findings and results. The findings are categorized according the six research questions mentioned in this chapter and then followed by additional unexpected themes that emerged. The final chapter is a discussion of the findings including a comparison of the
faculty responses from the two universities, an examination of the applicability of Linda Evan’s reconceptualization of Herzberg’s motivational hygiene theory, a discussion of implications for policy and practice and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature is organized into two sections. First, there is a discussion of studies relevant to the theoretical framework used in this study. The second section focuses upon research conducted about Black faculty job satisfaction. This section includes comparative studies of Black job satisfaction at differing types of institutions. Through this review, the author intends to examine the research relevant to the topic of Black faculty job satisfaction as well as further clarify the need for a study to discover the factors that contribute to this faculty state.

Theoretical Framework Conceptualization

The theoretical framework is based upon Frederick Herzberg’s two factor theory. In 1959, Herzberg published *Motivating to Work*, a book in which he introduced this theory of job satisfaction. Herzberg used a critical incident approach by conducting semi-structured interviews with 203 engineers and accountants employed at nine manufacturing firms in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. He asked the subjects to recall times in which they felt good about their jobs and then to describe the conditions that corresponded with those feelings. The interviews were analyzed through a qualitative version of content analysis in which the categories emerged from the information collected in the interviews.

Herzberg found that the good feelings were commonly associated with
psychological, or intrinsic, factors within the job. These factors included achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility and advancement and/or growth. He referred to these factors as *job satisfiers* for they contribute to psychological growth. The negative feelings were commonly associated with physical, or extrinsic, factors with the job. These factors included company policies, supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions and salary. Herzberg referred to these as *job dissatisfiers* or hygiene factors. One of the main conclusions drawn from this study was that while the hygiene factors can lead to dissatisfaction if they are removed (i.e. salary, good working conditions), they do not motivate employees. In a later publication (1968) Herzberg used an analogy of an uncharged battery to further clarify this point. He stated, “..I can charge a man’s battery, recharge it and then recharge it again. But it is only when he has his own generator can we talk about motivation. He then needs no outside stimulation. He wants to do it” (p 55).

Applicability of this theory outside of an industrial setting has been questioned. Jennifer Nias (1981) tested the applicability of Herzberg’s two-factor theory in education. She discounted Herzberg’s notion that teachers could distinguish between the work itself and contextual (extrinsic) factors affecting it stating, “For teachers, ‘work itself’ includes their involvement in the school as a social system, and thus their interactions with their colleagues as well as their pupils” (p 236).

She interviewed and observed 93 primary school teachers that were divided into two groups. Approximately two-thirds of the total participants were in the first group.
These subjects had attended an education course for at least five years in which the investigator served as a tutor. The second group, chosen as a control for subjectivity, had attended a similar course at one of seven universities, polytechnics, or colleges of education. All participants had taught between two and nine years.

Nias collected data through observing teachers at the schools they taught (with the exception of 20 in the first group that were no longer employed as teachers) and from three interview questions. The questions were; what do you like about your job? What do you dislike about your job? What plans do you have for the future and why? Overall, Nias tabulated 259 responses describing what the participants enjoyed about teaching and 312 responses pertaining to sources of dissatisfaction. Nias concluded that her findings only partially supported Herzberg’s theory. She noted significant consistency with Herzberg’s notion of satisfiers. “Being with children” and “helping pupils learn” were the top sources of satisfaction with 77 and 69 responses respectively. This is consistent with Herzberg’s notion of “the job itself” being a satisfier. However, nearly one-fourth of the respondents noted extrinsic factors as satisfiers. Ten stated they enjoyed the holidays and physical settings and twelve stated they derived satisfaction from the comradeship with the colleagues. These responses are inconsistent with Herzberg’s conclusion that workers are not satisfied by extrinsic factors.

All of Herzberg’s job dissatisfiers were mentioned by the teachers in the study. However, Nias (1981) noted that “factors which may in other occupations relate to job-context appear in education to be intimately bound with the nature of the work itself”
(p. 244). She noted that many of the extrinsic factors of job dissatisfaction stressed teachers due their direct impact upon the students or their abilities to teach them. For example, there were 100 responses referencing institutional factors such as weak leadership, inefficient administration, and poor communication and coordination. The participants described these factors as direct obstacles to good teaching. Over half of the teachers referenced being forced by their schools to teach in manners they found personally or ideologically offensive. Therefore, Nias concluded that Herzberg’s theory could only be supported in an educational setting if many of the factors previously identified as extrinsic to the work of a teacher be considered intrinsic. For clarification, she suggested that many of these factors conceptualized as dissatisfiers be considered, instead, as negative satisfiers. She asserted that the improvement of these factors would facilitate good teaching and thus raise the level of job satisfaction among teachers.

Linda Evans (1998) questioned Nias’s conclusion that the participants in her study only partially corroborated Herzberg’s motivational hygiene theory. Evan’s noted that the extrinsic factors Nias concluded were satisfiers were actually factors the teachers found satisfactory, the lowest level of job satisfaction. She noted that the teachers in Nias’s study were more likely satisfied with those factors but not satisfied by them. Evans noted that Nias may have confused how Herzberg defined job satisfaction since he used the terms “motivation” and “satisfaction” interchangeably. Therefore, while the teachers in Nias’s study may have been content (satisfied) with what Herzberg
considered to be extrinsic factors, they were not motivated by them. This conceptualization also explains Nias’s notion of negative satisfiers. In developing this conceptualization of job satisfaction, Evans referred to this satisfied with/satisfied by bifurcation of satisfaction as job comfort and job fulfillment in other published literature (1998). Nias’s negative satisfiers, according to Evans, are factors that contributed to the teachers’ job comfort, but not job fulfillment.

Linda Evans (1998) tested this conceptualization in a study designed to assess teacher morale and job satisfaction. She conducted four batches of interviews with the first two focusing upon her reconceptualization of Herzberg’s motivational hygiene theory. In the first batch, she conducted semi-structured interviews with 19 English teachers employed in four different primary schools. She asked the teachers to identify factors within their jobs that were sources of satisfaction. Several responses referenced factors considered to be “intrinsic” such as working with children, organizing in-service training days for colleagues, and feeling that they accommodated children’s needs. “Hygiene” factors such as décor of school, room size, and proximity to home was also mentioned in the responses. After analyzing the responses, she noticed a discrepancy with Herzberg’s theory, therefore, she decided to conduct a second batch of interviews approximately one year later. For these interviews, she decided to ask the two questions relating to job satisfaction and one relating to job dissatisfaction. The questions were designed to first identify sources of fulfillment, and then secondly, identify factors the teachers found satisfactory but not fulfilling. The second question
was phrased as: “Tell me about the things that you are satisfied with but not satisfied by.” Lastly, she asked the teachers to focus upon unfulfilling and unsatisfactory aspects of their jobs (Evans, 1998).

The second batch of interviews resulted in what Evans (1998) referred to as “the identification of two separate distinct categories of factors, broadly consistent with Herzberg’s two factors...” (p 10). There was no exception to her conclusion found in the responses.

The theoretical framework for the current study is based upon Herzberg’s two factor theory as refined by Linda Evan’s research. Evan’s conceptualization provides insight into the complexity of job satisfaction and thus provides an ideal theoretical framework for this study examining the factors contributing to African American job satisfaction at a predominantly White institution and a predominantly Black institution. The research goal for the current study is to discover if the African American faculty at these two institutions are consistent in distinguishing between the factors they are satisfied by and those they are satisfied with.

Black Faculty Satisfaction

Thomas Diener conducted a study of faculty at two predominantly Black institutions in a southeastern state. One institution was a public community college and the other was a four-year liberal arts institution. The participants were 72 faculty members. Of these participants, 53% were from the community college, 68% were African American, and 17% were Caucasian.
Each participant filled out a 167 item questionnaire of mostly closed-ended questions. The questionnaire assessed their attitudes toward their work, marriage and family, and their overall self concept. Demographic information was also included.

The findings indicated that the faculty members were overwhelmingly satisfied with their jobs. Eighty-eight percent viewed their work as a career, not simply as a job. Ninety-one percent “loved” or “liked” their job and 86% were satisfied with their jobs “most of the time.” Nonetheless, not all of responses were positive. At least 20% of the respondents identified 12 of 25 items as “quite a problem” or a “major problem.” These top five negative items included adequacy of facilities, time for personal study, lack of opportunities to attend professional events, salaries and red tape, research and promotional opportunities. Despite these problem items, the overall results suggested that the faculty were content with their institutions. Further research is needed to discover why these faculty members were so overwhelmingly satisfied with their institutions despite having a significant amount of areas of concern.

In 1990, Carol Logan examined African American faculty satisfaction at 28 state-assisted predominantly White institutions and 13 predominantly Black state-assisted institutions located in the South. Logan used a demographic questionnaire to determine age, tenure status, salary, faculty rank, number of years of experience, gender, and size of institution. Faculty satisfaction was measured using the job descriptive index, an instrument that consists of five subscales: (a) Work on the Present Job, (b) Present Duties, (c) Opportunities for Promotion, (d) Supervision, and (e) Coworkers. This
instrument lists several one-word descriptors in each of the five subscale areas and asks respondents to choose those that best describe their feelings toward the subscale topic.

Of the 355 surveys mailed, 245 (69%) were deemed usable and thus included in the study. One hundred twenty-nine of the participants were from the predominantly Black institutions and 116 were from the predominantly white institutions. Due to the low amount of African American faculty at the predominantly White institutions, surveys were sent to all 147 African American faculty members while a sample was taken from predominantly Black institutions which employed 1,987 African American faculty. The quantitative technique of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the differences between the respondents at the two different types of institutions.

The findings indicated no significant differences between the faculty groups on three of the five subscales (Work on Present Job, Present Duties, and Coworkers). There were significant differences on the subscales of Opportunities for Promotion ($p = .0005$) and Supervision ($p = .0102$) with the faculty at the predominantly White institutions reporting higher mean scores. The subscale of Opportunities for Promotion was an intriguing finding since approximately 64% of the faculty at the predominantly Black institutions were tenured compared to 29% of the faculty at the predominantly White institutions suggesting greater opportunity for promotion at the former. There was also a significant difference in the co-worker subscale ($p = .0136$) among the tenured faculty with the higher mean scores being among the faculty at the predominantly Black
institutions. In addition, the tenured faculty at both institutions were more satisfied overall than the non-tenured faculty ($p = .0268$).

It is important to note one point about the job descriptive index. It was originally developed for industrial settings though it has been used in higher education. While this instrument provides a general idea of job satisfaction, it is not designed to discover factors that may lead to job satisfaction. In addition, it does not provide insight into areas of higher education such as tenure, research, student attitudes, or other aspects of faculty responsibilities. This point is corroborated by the recommendation section of Logan’s study. She noted the need for an instrument specifically designed for higher education. She supported this point by reporting the responses of several of the participants in a comments section that expressed a need for an instrument designed to assess faculty attitudes toward tenure.

Alyce Eason (1996) conducted a comparative study of African American faculty job satisfaction at a historically Black university and a predominantly white university. The basic concern and purpose for this study was to address the small percentage of tenured African American faculty. A total of 82 African American faculty participated in the study with 41 coming from each university. The instrument used in this study was a three part questionnaire. The first part contained demographic information, the second was a modified scale developed by W.W. Charters, Jr. (1979) in a previous study to determine faculty satisfaction, and the third part was a job satisfaction scale developed by Olsen (1991) that contained items representing professional role interests,
satisfaction, and perceived control over their careers. Parts II and III contained a total of 18 items.

The investigator used the quantitative technique of chi-square tests to analyze the data. One-third of the items in Parts II and III were statistically significant with the faculty at the historically Black university being more satisfied with their achievements being recognized, their personal relationships, their present job in light of their career expectations, and overall job security. The faculty at this institution were less satisfied than their counterparts at the predominantly White university in their attitudes concerning instructional material and aids at their institution and their direction and focus on research.

Gloria McNeal (2003) conducted a study examining faculty satisfaction and productivity of African American women nursing faculty at predominantly White institutions and a predominantly Black institutions. Thirty different states were represented in the study. A total of 147 nursing faculty participated in the study with 119 from the predominantly White institutions and 28 from the predominantly Black institutions. As noted by the author, the low response rate from the latter institutions was somewhat surprising when considering predominantly Black institutions tend to have a higher number of African American faculty.

The instrument used was a two-part questionnaire developed by the author of the study. The first part of the survey contained demographic information relating to salary, tenure, and productivity. The second part consisted of six subscales relating to
Tierney’s (1988) dimensions of organizational culture: information, socialization, environment, strategy, mission, and leadership. Each subscale consisted of 5 to 12 items.

The variables of authorship, grantmanship, and leadership were used to measure productivity. The mean scores for each of these variables were calculated in order to compare the productivity among the institutions. The relationships of faculty levels of satisfaction and the extent of productivity of African American women nurse faculty teaching at predominantly Black institutions and predominantly White institutions was examined using a correlational study design.

The findings indicated that the faculty at the predominantly white institutions reported higher salaries and were more likely to be tenured. Among the productivity variables, the faculty at the predominantly White institutions nearly doubled the level of productivity \( (M = 5.16, SD = 9.48) \) than their counterparts at the predominantly Black institutions \( (M = 2.92, SD = 6.90) \). However, the faculty at the historically Black colleges and universities reported slightly higher funded grant rewards \( (M = .86, SD = 1.18) \) in comparison to the faculty at the predominantly White institutions \( (M = .77, SD = 1.26) \). They also held twice and many leadership positions \( (M = 1.39, SD = 1.87) \) than the faculty at the predominantly White institutions \( (M = .63, SD = 1.38) \).

Among the six dimensions of organizational culture, the faculty at the predominantly Black institutions expressed higher satisfaction on five. These faculty members were moderately more satisfied with the institutional processes of cultural
interaction among students, faculty and alumni; and significantly more satisfied among the dimensions of information resources, environment, leadership, and mission. The only dimension the faculty at the predominantly White institutions expressed higher satisfaction on was strategy, a dimension measuring satisfaction with the decision-making approaches at departmental and institutional levels.

There was a positive relationship between satisfaction and productivity on three of the six dimensions among the African American faculty at the historically Black colleges and universities. Satisfaction was positively correlated with productivity among the dimensions of information, socialization, and strategy. There was no relationship among the six dimensions and the faculty at the predominantly White institutions.

April Berrian (2006) examined job satisfaction of Black and White faculty at a predominantly White institution and a predominantly Black institution. The study also examined how the faculty perceived fairness and departmental support since these are factors considered to lead to job dissatisfaction. The two institutions chosen for the study was Texas Southern University (TSU), the predominantly Black institution, and Vanderbilt University, the predominantly White institution. There were 170 participants in the study. Of the participants, 96 were White and 74 were Black. Each institution had faculty participants of both ethnicities. The instruments for this study included a demographic questionnaire and three different scales. Job satisfaction was measured using the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), a scale previously discussed in this literature review. Perceptions of departmental support were measured through the Department
Support Scale (DSS), a 22-item scale created by the author of the study. Perceptions of fairness, was measured using the Distributed Justice Index (DJI), a 5-item instrument that measures the degree respondents feel they have been fairly rewarded based upon some given comparison (comparison to tenure status, performance, etc.).

The data was analyzed using the quantitative technique of between subject multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). There were several significant findings. The faculty at Vanderbilt, the predominantly White institution, was more satisfied than the faculty at Texas Southern University, the predominantly Black institution. When comparing university and ethnicity, it was found that the White faculty at Vanderbilt were more satisfied than the Black faculty at the institution. Conversely, the Black faculty at Texas Southern University were more satisfied than the White. The estimated mean for perceived fairness and departmental support was higher for the faculty at Texas Southern University. However when comparing university and ethnicity, the white faculty had higher estimated means than the Black faculty at Vanderbilt University. The reverse was true for the faculty at Texas Southern University. The Black faculty had higher estimated means than the White at this predominantly Black institution.

Deandra Holmes (2006) examined African American faculty satisfaction at Doctoral/Research-Extensive Universities. The faculty came from one of 34 possible universities in the public Association of American Universities (AAU). There were a total of 128 Black faculty who participated in this study. The instruments included a demographic questionnaire and four different scales. The first was the Satisfaction with
Life Scale (SWLS), a five item scale used to measure an individual’s judgment of global life satisfaction. This scale is theoretically designed to compare life circumstances to one’s personal standards. The second was the Self Determination Scale (SDS), a ten item instrument with five item subscales. This scale was used to examine the participants’ tendencies to function in a self-determined manner. The third was the Texas A&M Faculty Work Life Satisfaction Survey (FWLSS), a two scale instrument. The first scale consists of 39 items used to measure faculty work life satisfaction. The second, consisting of 16 items, measured the faculty’s intent to stay or leave an institution. The fourth scale was the Collective Self-Esteem Scale-Racial (CSES) which measured aspects of collective self esteem: Membership Esteem, Private collective self esteem, Public collective self esteem, and Importance of identity. This scale is based upon one’s membership with a given group.

The researcher had three research questions that each used a different method of analysis. The first research question “What are the factors relating to job satisfaction Black faculty?” was addressed by analyzing data through the quantitative techniques of analysis of variance (ANOVA), paired t-tests, and bivariate correlations. The second research question, “What specific areas of academic work life are Black faculty most satisfied with?” was addressed through the use of multiple correlations. Multiple regressions were used to analyze the data relating to Research Question 3: “Does gender, tenure status, rank, or collective self esteem predict faculty satisfaction?”
There were several significant findings in this study with the vast majority related to tenure. Tenured faculty reported higher job satisfaction than non-tenured faculty. Specifically, this group reported higher job satisfaction with the respect minority and female faculty have received, campus resources, and perceived fairness. Tenure was also the most significant predictor of job satisfaction across all subscales for the FWLSS. Another significant finding was that the faculty reported higher levels of global life satisfaction than work life satisfaction suggesting that these individuals were happier when outside of their institutions.

Summary

Gaining an understanding of African American faculty satisfaction is a complex process. Herzberg suggests that when extrinsic factors are removed, employees will become dissatisfied. However, the overwhelming majority of the literature suggests that African Americans have a tendency to be more satisfied at predominantly Black institutions than predominantly White institutions despite higher salaries, better working conditions and more research productivity at the latter (Eason, 1996; McNeal, 2003; Berrian, 2006). Despite these findings appearing to support Nias’s notion that Herzberg’s theory does not cleanly apply in an educational setting, Evans suggest that it is a possibility that the theory does apply if job satisfaction is conceptualized in a manner that distinguishes between factors the faculty are satisfied by and those they are satisfied with. The literature relating to African American faculty falls short of providing a distinction between these factors representing a gap this study addresses.
This review provided insight into factors African Americans have expressed satisfaction and dissatisfaction with. However, each of these studies in the second section (Denier, 1985; Logan, 1990; Eason, 1996; McNeal, 2003; Berrian, 2006; Holmes, 2006) of this review used quantitative techniques that served to gain an idea of faculty satisfaction with predetermined factors. The instruments used in these quantitative studies limited the participants to focusing upon factors that may or may not contribute to their overall sense of fulfillment on their jobs. Therefore, the investigator of this study chose to use a qualitative research tradition instead of these quantitative instruments for two reasons. First, the qualitative techniques chosen for this study are consistent with the methods used by Evans in her reconceptualization of Herzberg’s two-factor theory. Secondly, qualitative research has the potential to provide participants with the freedom to express any and all factors that contribute to their fulfillment and/or contentment in higher education.

There were themes that emerged within this review such as African American faculty being more satisfied with personal and collegial relationships, perceiving fairer treatment, and having more leadership positions at the predominantly Black institutions. In addition, as noted earlier, the African American faculty at the predominantly White institutions tended to have higher salaries, were more satisfied with the working conditions, and contained higher research productivity. Tenure also seemed to be a significant factor in determining job satisfaction of this faculty group. Other themes were not as clear.
The results of these studies suggest a need to gain a better understanding of the complexity of African American faculty job satisfaction as well as a need to determine if there are other significant factors that have not yet been discovered. With the well noted retention issues among this group, it is important for research to move beyond the general idea of whether this faculty group is satisfied or dissatisfied to understanding the significance of certain factors in determining overall job satisfaction.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter is organized into three parts. The first section discusses the research design and participants in the study. The next focuses upon the data collection methods. The final section describes the procedures for analyzing the data.

Research Design

This study was designed using qualitative methods. According to Gall, Gall and Borg (2003), the qualitative research traditions are generally organized into three categories: the investigation of the lived experience, investigation of society and culture, and investigation of language and communication. In addition, these authors noted that “some researchers believe that qualitative research is best used to discover themes and relationships at the case level” (p 24).

For this study, qualitative research provides a framework for understanding the perspectives of African American faculty members. Through examining their lived experiences at their institutions, it was my intent to understand the complexity of African American faculty job satisfaction by discovering those factors they find fulfilling, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. As Schram (2006) noted, qualitative researchers “rely on depth, richness, and details” in order to uncover the complexity sought in a qualitative design.
When examining lived experiences, Gall, Gall and Borg (2003) noted four primary research traditions: cognitive psychology, life history, phenomenography, and phenomenology. The latter of the four was used as the research design conceptual framework for this study. Phenomenology is designed to study the world as it appears to an individual (Gall et al., 2003). In addition, Schram (2006) noted that phenomenology is based upon the standpoint of some phenomena, which for this study is job satisfaction. As with other forms of qualitative research, this tradition emphasizes the importance of understanding how individuals construct their social realities.

Phenomenology originated in the early 1900s as a philosophical movement by Edward Husserl. He questioned the notion that all areas of science could be examined using quantitative methods. He believed human consciousness could best be understood through understanding the sensories and perceptions of individuals’ lived experiences of phenomena. Today, this concept has influenced the research approaches in the areas of sociology, psychology, health sciences and education (Schram, 2006).

Interviews are the primary method of the phenomenological approach. The participants are generally information rich with the main criteria being they have experienced the phenomena and are interested in understanding its nature and meaning (Gall et al., 2003). The number of participants is determined through theoretical rather than traditional sampling. According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), this form of sampling is complete once the categories have been saturated and themes have emerged.
Participants

The participants for this study were eleven African American faculty members employed at a historically Black institution and a predominantly white institution in the southern region of the United States. Both institutions are within a well known university system. The participants at each university were a mixture of tenured and nontenured faculty. The participants were identified through institutional contacts within the administrations of both institutions.

The historically Black university, Mid-South University (MSU), is a comprehensive public institution that offers baccalaureate degrees in 50 academic majors, 37 masters degrees and four doctoral degree programs through nine colleges and schools. In fall 2006, this institution enrolled approximately 8,000 students with the largest percentage being of African American descent (88.5 %). In this same year, there were 389 full-time faculty members with 60% being African Americans.

The predominantly white university, Public University (PU) is a comprehensive public institution that offers twelve baccalaureate degrees within 84 majors, seven masters degrees within 68 majors, and two doctoral degrees within 6 majors. In fall 2006, this institution enrolled approximately 8,500 students with the largest percentage being of Caucasian descent (65 %). African Americans were approximately 12% of the student population. In 2004, there were 557 faculty members with 91% being of Caucasian descent. African Americans represented 3.5% of the total faculty.
Data Collection

Data were collected for each research question through a semi-structured interview process. Participants at each type of institution were interviewed in a face-to-face setting. They were asked the same questions and the interviewer only probed for clarification of ambiguous answers. There were two sets of questions. One set of questions were closed-ended and designed to seek demographic information such as teaching area, rank, and experience. The second set consisted of open-ended questions designed to elicit free flowing responses. This set focused upon why the participants entered higher education as well as the job duties they find fulfilling, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. A second interview was conducted as needed through alternative mediums of phone and email. The purpose of this second interview was to gain further clarifications or added information that allowed for a more accurate comparison of African American faculty employed at the historically Black university and those employed at the predominantly white institutions.

Interview Questions

The interview consisted of thirteen questions. The first four were closed-ended seeking the previously discussed demographic information (see Appendix A). Interview Questions 5 (Why did you enter higher education?) and 6 (Why did you choose this particular institution?) sought background information that may contribute to the analysis of the responses to the research questions. These questions are based upon the notion that the missions of historically Black colleges and universities vary from that of
the predominantly White institutions and therefore the faculty may have purposely chosen the institution they felt was aligned with their personal educational philosophy and/or interest.

Questions 7 through 11 are based specifically upon Linda Evans’ conceptualization of motivational hygiene theory as it relates to teacher satisfaction. Interview Questions 7 (What is it about your current position that fulfills you?) and 8 (Think back to two different times when you felt fulfilled as an educator? Take a moment to reflect upon those situations.) sought answers for Research Questions 1 and 4. Interview Question 9 (What aspects of your job do not necessarily fulfill you, but are needed in order for you to feel content with your institution?) sought answers to Research Questions 2 and 5. Interview Questions 10 (What are factors that would lead you to feel dissatisfied with your institution?) and 11 (Think back to a time you were dissatisfied with some aspect of your job and/or the college/university in which you were/are employed? Take a moment to reflect upon that situation.) are for Research Questions 3 and 6. The final two interview questions were asked to seek out sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction that the participants may not have an opportunity to discuss in their answers to the previous interview questions. Question 12 was When considering your multiple job duties and requirements: (a) which do you find the most rewarding, (b) which do you find the least rewarding? The final question asked was When considering your multiple job duties and requirements: (a) which do your institution reward the most, (b) which do your institution reward the least?
Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted according to three concurrent flows of activity consisting of data reduction, data display, and conclusion/verification (Miles & Huberman, 1994). This analysis focused upon the open-ended questions. The demographic information was only used to describe of the professional profiles of the participants. This information included faculty position and years of employment at their present university. Other demographic questions focused on their total number of years in higher education and any other colleges and/or universities that they may have worked at.

For the data reduction and display process, a case-level display matrix was created to display the participants’ answers to the interview questions. A matrix was created for each institution. Miles and Huberman (1994) described this type of matrix as “a master chart assembling descriptive data from each of several cases in a standard format.”

The transcribed interviews were then coded in search of relevant themes to each of the six research questions and for any other additional themes that emerged. The coding process was performed through the use of frequency counts. The frequency counts were based upon keywords or phrases such as “interaction with students” or “job flexibility.” There were times in which a participant described a term used by other participants and was therefore included in the specified category. For example, the term “micromanagement” was used by some faculty members where another discussed not
having to constantly report to a supervisor. A theme was only considered consistent when three or more faculty members from one of the two institutions mentioned the factor. Two more matrices (one for each institution) were then created that organized keyword summaries of the participants’ responses conceptually according to the six research questions and additional themes that were emerging. This conceptual organization included the answers to the interview questions specifically asked for a specified research question.

For instance, the concept of satisfied by, which represents Research Questions 1 and 4, was determined based by three interview questions in which the participants were asked about factors of fulfillment, to recall a time when they were fulfilled and the duties they found to be the most rewarding. There were rare occurrences when a faculty member would mention fulfillment in the answer to another question. These answers would only be considered if it was clear the faculty member meant fulfillment and not contentment or dissatisfaction. Nonetheless, the first category of this matrix, satisfied by, consisted mainly of the answers to the three aforementioned research questions.

The themes relating to the concept of satisfied with for both institutions, which represents Research Questions 2 and 5, came from only one question in which the faculty members were asked about factors they were satisfied with but not necessarily by. This question often needed clarification during the interview and was often asked multiple times using the term “contentment.”
The themes related to factors of dissatisfaction, which represented Research Questions 3 and 6, were determined based upon three questions asking the participants for factors of dissatisfaction, to recall a time when they were dissatisfied and the duties they found the least rewarding. The latter question proved to not always consistently fit within the dissatisfaction category, therefore, the responses to that question were only used if they showed consistency with the participant’s responses to the previous two questions seeking factors of dissatisfaction.

The final question, asking the faculty to state the factors their institution rewarded the most and least, did lead to the emergence of additional themes that are described in the next chapter of this study. Examples of the two types of matrices used to summarize the data are in Appendix B though the data is not included.

There were several follow up questions asked throughout the course of the interviews for clarification purposes or if the participant’s situation was significant enough to be noted in the study. For example, there was one participant at the historically Black university that previously worked at the predominantly white institution. She was asked to distinguish between the dissatisfaction factors that pertained to the historically Black institution and those that referenced the predominantly white institution.

Clear themes emerged for each of the six research questions. There were clear distinctions between the factors the faculty at each institution were satisfied by and what they were satisfied with as well as the dissatisfaction factors. These themes are
discussed in great detail over the next two chapters. It is important to note that a judgment was not made on whether or not the faculty participants were satisfied or dissatisfied with their institutions. The analysis was instead an inductive process of seeking information to determine the factors that contribute to the African American faculty’s satisfaction and dissatisfaction at both institutions.

Ethical Considerations

It is my objective to conduct quality research without endangering the well being or careers of the participants. Therefore, several steps were taken to protect the faculty involved and to insure integrity of the study. First, the universities within this study were identified only by region and an alias name. Mid-South University is the name given to the historically Black institution and Public University is the name of the predominantly white institution. Secondly, each participant is also given an alias name since there is a possibility that identification could be revealed when discussing their position and accomplishments. Thirdly, each participant signed and received a consent form and with the option of dropping out of the study. The faculty were fully aware of the purpose of the study and how their responses would be used. Appendix B contains a copy of the consent form signed by the participants.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS AND RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore the complexity of job satisfaction of African American faculty by making a distinction between factors they find fulfilling, those they find satisfactory, and those they describe as dissatisfactory. There were six research questions addressed in this study. These questions were based on Linda Evans reconceptualization of Herzberg’s motivational hygiene theory. The questions were:

RQ 1: What are African American faculty at a historically Black university satisfied by?

RQ 2: What are African American faculty at a historically Black university satisfied with?

RQ 3: What are African American faculty at a historically Black university dissatisfied with?

RQ 4: What are African American faculty at a predominantly white institution satisfied by?

RQ 5: What are African American faculty at a predominantly white institution satisfied with?

RQ 6: What are African American faculty at a predominantly white institution dissatisfied with?

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section contains brief descriptions of each of the participants including their job titles, years of experience at their current institutions, and their reasoning for choosing their current institution. The second section includes the themes that emerged when analyzing the data from the
historically Black university (HBCU). This section will first include themes related to Research Questions 1, 2, and 3 and then other themes that emerged that may be beneficial to understanding job satisfaction of African American faculty at a historically Black institution. The final section contains themes that emerged when analyzing data at the predominantly White institution. This section will include themes relating to Research Questions 4, 5, and 6 as well other themes that emerged that may be beneficial to understanding job satisfaction of African American faculty at a predominantly white institution.

Participants

Eleven faculty chose to participate in the study. Five were from the predominantly white institution (Public University) and six were from the historically Black university (Mid-South University). Six of the faculty members, three at each institution, were in department head or program coordinator positions. At the predominantly white institution, one was a department head, one an interim department head, and the other was a program coordinator. At the historically Black university, one was department head, one was acting department head and the third was a program coordinator.

The faculty at the predominantly Black institution held positions as lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor and professor. They varied in discipline and their experience at the institution ranged from 2 to 36 years. Table 1 provides an overview of their position and years at the institution.
Table 1

Participants from Mid-South University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Years at Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Professor and Department Head</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>36 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayla</td>
<td>Assistant Professor and Program Coordinator</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brenda is a faculty lecturer of developmental English and curriculum instruction. She is an alumnus of Mid-South University (MSU) and returned to her alma mater upon completing her doctoral degree. She has worked at Mid-South for six years. She has also been employed at a Community College and another online university. Her undergraduate degree is in broadcast communications; she discovered through an internship that she would be happier in another field. She was encouraged through friends to enter higher education. She notes that, “I think I realized my reason for coming to higher education after being here was to impact students. I really love the students.”

James is a faculty lecturer in math. He is an alumnus of Mid-South University. While attending graduate school at MSU, he worked as a coach and a graduate assistant.
teaching developmental math. Upon receiving his degree, he was offered a full-time faculty position. James considered working in public school, but decided against it after talking to his sister who is a teacher in the public school system. He likes higher education because of the freedom he has with his classes.

Mary is a professor and department head of health and human performance. She has been at MSU for approximately four years. Prior to that, she worked at two predominantly white institutions, one of which she would not identify due to negative experiences. She stated that she always wanted to work at a historically Black college or university but worried about the pay. She initially decided against applying for an open position at MSU but eventually did so when the same position opened up a second time. Mary was drawn to higher education when she was in an internship and one of her professors revealed how much she was getting paid. Mary was in awe, stating, “It was just that you can make this amount of money while having this amount of peace.” Her interest further increased once she was in a class taught by her first African American professor. Her main objective since being at MSU has been to improve the infrastructure of the department.

Stacy is a professor of sociology and has been at MSU for thirty-six years. She initially had no intentions of working in higher education. Her plans were to go to Chicago and work as a social worker. However, her father told her that he could get her a job at MSU if she chose to stay in the area. Therefore, to please her father, she applied and received a faculty position making $800 per month. Though she expressed strong
concern for the direction MSU is going in, she noted that her reason for staying has been that the students keep her young.

Doug is an associate professor and acting department head of curriculum and instruction. He has been at MSU for fourteen years. He is a licensed counselor and was interested in having a full-time practice before working in higher education. He decided to look for open positions in higher education in areas that he would be interested in living. When a position opened up, he applied and received it. Doug noted that any university would not have been sufficient for him. He wanted to work at a place that he felt needed him. He noted that MSU was of interest because it provides a platform to address issues affecting people of color in the actual coursework.

Kayla is an assistant professor and coordinator of the early childhood education program. She has been at MSU for approximately two years. Prior to that, she worked for several years as a teacher in the public school system. She became disenchanted with the direction of public education and decided to attend graduate school to earn her master’s and eventually her doctoral degree. Her first faculty position was at a predominantly white institution that she would not identify due to negative experiences. While she was at that institution, she was working on a scholarship committee when she met two faculty members from MSU. They encouraged her to apply for an open position stating that she would be nurtured and supported. Since she was already seeking a new position, she applied. Kayla had attended another historical Black university as an undergraduate and enjoyed the experience.
There was a limited pool of African American faculty at the predominantly white institution. They held positions of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. They varied in disciplines and their experience at the institution ranged from two to thirty-two years. Table 2 provides an overview of their position and years at the institution. Note that the participants were given aliases in order to protect their identity.

Table 2

*Participants from Public University*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Years at Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>Instructor and Interim Department Head</td>
<td>24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>Associate Professor and Program Chair</td>
<td>32 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>Professor and Department Head</td>
<td>17 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendra is an assistant professor in the field of psychology. Before entering the institution, she had conducted a significant amount of research and had a few publications. This background led her graduate advisor to encourage her to enter higher education. Being in education was not initially one of her career goals. “It was not something that was an intention of mine. I actually wanted to be a practitioner. Things just worked out.”
Kendra is not originally from the state where Public University (PU) is located. Her decision to come to the area was based on there being a significant job market that could mutually benefit the careers of both her and her husband. Therefore, she applied for academic jobs in the area and Public University offered her a position. One of her job duties includes working at an on-campus psychological clinic that is open to students and the community.

Harold is an instructor and was the interim department head of health and human performance at the time he was interviewed for this study. He has been at Public University since 1985. He worked at a predominantly Black institution before entering PU as a football coach and instructor. Upon completing his coaching career, the institution encouraged him to stay as a faculty member. He used what he refers to as “extra free time” to earn his doctoral degree in curriculum and instruction.

Harold grew up in the southeastern part of the United States where his family, including his wife, is still located. He entered higher education is because it gives him, “the opportunity to give back to individuals whose skin color looks much like mine.”

Janice is a tenured associate professor in curriculum and instruction and a program chair. She has thirty-two years of experience at the university. She worked in the public school system prior to entering higher education. She felt that higher education would provide her the “greatest opportunity to change education.” Upon earning her doctorate degree, she applied to several places and Public University offered her a position. Janice does a significant amount of work in the community and
she expressed a keen interest in erasing the African American youth achievement gap. She currently does most of her work at a satellite campus.

Maggie is a professor and department head of educational leadership. She has been at the university for seventeen years. She received her undergraduate degree at Public University. Prior to working in higher education, she was in the public school system working her way into administration. Her reason for returning as a faculty member to Public University was due to the university’s President at the time encouraging department heads to recruit former graduates. In addition to her work at Public University, she has also been employed at a local community college.

Janet is an assistant professor in curriculum and instruction. She has been at the university for approximately eight years. She always wanted to be a teacher but was discouraged by her parents due to the low salaries that teachers make. She worked as a copy editor for a while and then decided that education is where she wanted to be. She received her teaching certification post baccalaureate at Public University. She became very close to a professor at the university who encouraged her to earn her doctorate degree and then return to the university. When asked about her reasoning for entering higher education, she stated, “I felt that I could touch more children, particularly more African American children’s lives by teaching their teachers.”

Themes from the Historical Black University

*What African American Faculty at a Historically Black University are Satisfied By*

Linda Evans described the concept of *satisfied by* as the highest level of job
satisfaction. In later publications, she referred to this concept as job fulfillment. To
discover this factor, three questions were asked. First, the participants were asked what
factors fulfill them in their current position. This question was followed by the request
for an example of a time in which they felt fulfilled. Later in the interview, they were
asked what job duties they found to be the most rewarding.

All six of the participants stressed their love for the students. They further
clarified this theme through the various examples that they gave. James, the faculty
lecturer in math, discussed an experience he had with a student in a developmental
math course. The student had aspirations to be an engineer but failed the math portion
of the Texas Higher Education Assessment (THEA). According to James, “if you want to
be an engineering major and do not pass the THEA, then it is probably unlikely.” The
student started in the lowest of four developmental math courses and worked through
each of them. He is now nearing graduation and taking upper level calculus courses.
James described him as the one exception.

The joy expressed by the faculty members from interacting with students did not
appear to be limited to teaching in the classroom. For instance, Mary, the professor and
department head of health and human performance, stressed how she saw herself in
many of the students. She told a story about how she gave a female student $80 to take
a teacher certification test. The significance of this story is that she was once given
exactly $80 when she was an undergraduate student and at risk of leaving school due to
financial difficulties. Since that time the female student that she gave the money to has been nominated for a teacher of the year award.

Kayla, the assistant professor and coordinator of early childhood education, discussed the fact that the faculty advise students at MSU, which was a new experience in comparison to her former duties at the predominantly white institution where she previously worked. She noted that she enjoyed getting to know them and even started working with a student organization.

The clear theme to this research question is that African American faculty at the historically Black university are satisfied by their interactions with students whether they are in the classroom or around the campus.

**What African American Faculty at a Historically Black University are Satisfied With**

Evans described the concept of satisfied with as a lower level of job satisfaction. She later referred to this concept as job contentment, meaning factors that do not fulfill individuals but would cause them to feel dissatisfied if they were removed. Participants were asked for the factors they were satisfied with but not necessarily by. Unlike the theme mentioned for the satisfied by concept, there was not a factor shared by all participants for this concept. The main theme that emerged was job flexibility as it relates to their schedules. Stacy, the professor of sociology, stated, “I raised my children here and I was always able to go to their games, band concerts, or just take off and do whatever it is I wanted to do.” James, who is a proud new father, stated, “It [The flexibility in scheduling] makes me content because it allows me to do other things and
spend time with family.” The majority of the participants were satisfied with their ability to schedule their classes and office hours to meet their personal needs. In addition, they were also content with their ability to leave campus to take care of unexpected demands.

What African American Faculty at a Historically Black University are Dissatisfied With.

Participants were asked three questions for the purpose of discovering factors of job dissatisfaction though answers to the last did not always fit into the dissatisfaction category. They were asked for factors that would cause them to be dissatisfied, an example of a time in which they were dissatisfied, and which of their job duties they found to be the least rewarding. An answer to the latter question was only considered for the dissatisfaction category if it showed consistency with the participant’s responses to the previous two questions.

There were several themes that emerged in reference to dissatisfaction. Despite the faculty expressing contentment with their job flexibility, all six participants from this institution felt as if they were overworked. Kayla stated, “I have never worked this hard in my life,” noting that there was a lack of professional support to help with many of the clerical and labor-intensive duties. She stated there were things that she felt would be a given such as “getting your texts in the bookstore or having technology for instruction.” She also noted that despite her dissatisfaction with her previous institution, there were administrative assistants to take care of many of duties she is now responsible for. James further substantiated this point by describing the professional support that he
needs by stating, “what I really do not like the most is when we are not given what we need to do our jobs. For instance, we use a lot of online programs. Those things ought to be set in place for us so we do not have to do as much leg work.” Brenda, a faculty lecturer of English and curriculum instruction, who was quick to note that she enjoys all her duties, stated that she feels as if she “is stretched too thinly at times.”

Related to this theme are issues regarding faculty pay. While this was not a universal theme among the participants, many felt as if they are not paid for what all they do. Doug, the associate professor and acting department head of curriculum and instruction, who noted that pay is getting better, pointed out that they teach more classes than people at other universities and their workload tends to continually increase while their pay seems to “lag behind.” James mentioned pay and noted incidents in which he was not paid for teaching an extra class. He stated:

[I] feel the university should compensate us for teaching more than a full load. At times they do and at times they do not. There have been times in which I had six classes and there were times when they paid and when they did not. I do not know how the decision is made. I just do not think they look at things from somebody else’s standpoint.

Stacy, who strongly expressed her dissatisfaction with the direction the administration is taking the university, noted that the pay is not even “sufficient” when considering the number of classes they teach and how large the classes are.

The final theme that emerged was the participants’ perception of political-based favoritism by the upper administration. Several of the faculty members felt as if only certain people were given promotion or opportunities for advancements. Brenda noted
that there is not much opportunity for growth stating, “If there are new projects it is the same two or three people working on them.” Stacy noted that only “yes” people or those that follow party lines are rewarded. Though Mary stated that things have changed, she mentioned that there were formerly “incestuous relationships” at the university in which only certain people or cliques were rewarded or given opportunities to advance.

The analysis of the data found that the faculty at the historically Black university were dissatisfied with their workload, pay, and favoritism by the upper administration with the former being the clearest theme.

Additional Theme

There was one additional theme and a notable point that may be beneficial in understanding African American job satisfaction. First, the vast majority of the faculty members struggled to answer the question pertaining to job duties the institution rewards the most. Brenda’s answer was very indicative of what several of the participants noted. She stated, “I do not know. To me that says a lot that I cannot come up with anything. I guess I cannot say I feel rewarded. I honestly do not feel appreciated a lot of times.” James shared this feeling of not being appreciating stating, “You know when people go above and beyond I feel they need to be recognized. I know they cannot always give compensation, but I feel they should at least be recognized.” Doug could not mention anything from the institution and instead noted that he gets recognition from the students. However, there was one faculty member, Kayla, who felt
she has been rewarded through the opportunities she has been given to take leadership positions on various projects or work on the executive dean’s council. She feels this recognition is based upon her always being around and sometimes working “50-60 hours a week.”

A notable point is that the viewpoints of job satisfaction of Mary and Kayla seemed to be impacted by their previous work at predominantly white institutions. For example, when asked about job dissatisfaction, Mary mentioned an experience she had at one of her previous institutions. While Kayla did mention factors at Mid-South such as the lack of professional support or being overworked, she would only use terms such as “unhappy” or “dissatisfied” when discussing her experience at her previous institution of employment.

Themes from the Predominantly White Institution

*What African American Faculty at a Predominantly White Institution are Satisfied By*

The participants were asked the same three questions as with the faculty at the Mid-South University about what factors they find fulfilling, an example of a time when they felt fulfilled, and what job duties they find the most rewarding. There were two main themes that emerged. The first is the faculty’s enjoyment of teaching and working with students. Maggie, the professor and department head of educational leadership, expressed a strong desire to produce successful students. She stated, “I want to make sure that when I move on that the students that enter here, that we produce, are the
kind of people that we want here in the United States.” Harold pointed out how he enjoys the working with students from various background noting:

It provides the opportunity for those with diverse backgrounds to experience those things that I bring to the classroom and it provides me the opportunity to experience the other dynamics, for example, what the other multicultural groups bring to the classroom.

The enjoyment of working with students by faculty at the Public University (PU) was described in a more specified manner in comparison to the similar theme that emerged from the faculty at MSU, leading to the second main theme. The faculty at the PU expressed fulfillment in program and/or course development. When asked to recall a time when she felt fulfilled as an educator, Kendra, the assistant professor of psychology stated, “The day that we received news that we actually achieved the program’s accreditation. That felt really fulfilling. That was a lot of hard work. Almost a year’s work went into that.”

Janice, the associate professor and program chair in curriculum instruction, had a similar answer to the same question. She stated, “I guess I could probably think of several. One is that I developed a program here at [Public University]. It is a program that involves teachers, educators, and high school students, and middle school students.”

Janet expressed fulfillment in a specific course she teaches. When asked what fulfills her, she stated, “You know, it is that I love working with students; but more specifically the diversity course that I teach.” Janet further stated the course is a ten in
importance to her overall job satisfaction and that “if they took it tomorrow, I would find a hard time staying.”

The theme that emerged from this research question is that the African American faculty at the PU are satisfied by the students, and more specifically, the creation of programs that will benefit students as well as others within the community.

What African American Faculty at a Predominantly White Institution are Satisfied With

The faculty were asked about factors they are satisfied with but not necessarily by. The theme was the same as with the faculty at Mid-South but much more representative of the participants. The faculty are content with the flexibility and freedom that they have. Kendra, who lives an hour away from the main campus, expressed contentment with being able to work several days a week from home. She stated, “I am only in the office two to three days a week depending on the week. That makes me very happy. I am happy with the flexibility.” Janet, who also lives nearly an hour from the main campus, stated “Sometimes I work twenty hours a week and sometimes I work 60 to 70 hours a week. You do not have to clock in. I can go to the doctor tomorrow at 9:30 in the morning and nobody knows. I do not have to report to anyone.” Maggie also discussed the idea of freedom stating that she is content with the teaching situation noting that she only teaches two courses. “It provides me with the opportunity to further advise doctoral students on their dissertations and projects.”

The theme that emerged from this research question is that the faculty are satisfied by the flexibility of their schedules and the freedom they have to do their jobs
in the manner that they desire.

What African American Faculty at a Predominantly White Institution are Dissatisfied With

The factors of dissatisfaction were discussed more from a hypothetical point of view rather than from actual experiences. Despite this study not being designed to gauge the faculty’s satisfaction with their institutions, the participants appeared to be content with their work situations. However, they did have clear ideas of what would cause them to be dissatisfied and expressed factors that emerged into three clear themes. The themes were discovered through three inquiries: What are factors that would cause you to become dissatisfied? Could you recall a time when you were dissatisfied? And, what job duties do you find the least rewarding? Answers to the latter question were only considered if consistent with the participants’ responses to the previous two questions.

There were three main themes that emerged. The first was the idea of being micromanaged. Much of the discussion of micromanagement seemed to be more of a reiteration of enjoying their freedom. For example, when asked about what factors she would find dissatisfying, Kendra stated, “Being micromanaged” and further stated that she is fairly satisfied “as long as someone is not breathing down my neck with this to-do list. The whole micromanagement thing I could not do at all.”

The second theme that emerged was based upon the responses of the two department heads, Maggie and Harold, and the program chair, Janice. They all seemed
to describe personal behaviors that are contrary to the type of leaders that they personally desire to be. For instance, Harold, when recalling an incident that he was not satisfied with, began a discussion of how the incident has shaped him as a leader. He stated,

I believe that when people come to you with concerns, you have to be open and honest. That is the only way I know how to be. I believe there may be things said that the person does not want to hear, but if you are open and honest, they will have much more respect for you, even though they may not agree with everything that you say.

Janice, who spoke more from a hypothetical standpoint, stated, “I like people who are upfront and open. If I am heading down the wrong track, tell me. Don’t talk behind my back or not tell me the things that I need to do.” Maggie, who also spoke from a hypothetical standpoint, noted that she is dissatisfied with people that will not change to meet the needs of the incoming generation and expressed her interest in doing so.

Another theme, though it appeared not to be considered a heavy factor in dissatisfaction, is the location of the university’s main campus. Only one of the five participants lived in the city of the main campus. They all lived at least an hour away in a metropolitan area. Three of the faculty members did a significant amount of their work away from the main campus. One member noted that she would be dissatisfied if she had to work on the main campus everyday due to the long drive. Another noted a negative experience with a white male faculty member that led her to believe that there could possibly be a significant amount of racism at the main campus. She stated, “I do
not think it was because I was Black; it was just a lack of exposure to any kind of culture. Because we do have Asian faculty members and I can see the ignorance in how they interact with them as well.”

Harold, the only person that lived in [location] expressed dissatisfaction with faculty not living in the community in which they worked but showed understanding of their reasoning. He stated,

It is also unfortunate that many people that work at this university do not live in location. I always think it is a disservice to the community. If you are working in a community, I feel you should live in that community. They want to live in larger areas or in areas in which they can get to larger areas very quickly and I greatly appreciate that too.

He further stated,

There is still a lot of overt racism in the city of location. While some people may say no, I have experienced some of it firsthand. But being a person that grew up in Birmingham, Alabama, born in 1956, you can imagine the era that I lived through. I know how to effectively deal with it. But for some of the younger Black folks that have not had those experiences, it may be more difficult for them to overcome.

An examination of the responses produced three clear themes in reference to research question six. The African American faculty at Public University are dissatisfied with the idea of being micromanaged and leadership qualities such as not being open, honest or willing to change. To a lesser degree, the location of the university was also a dissatisfaction factor.

Additional Themes

There were two additional themes that emerged that could be beneficial to
understanding African American job satisfaction at predominantly white institution and they are related to research and service. When asked what the institution rewarded the most, they all stated research and writing noting that merit pay is tied to one’s productivity in those areas. Only two faculty members expressed dissatisfaction with research but this was only due to the lack of support and/or opportunities they had with their research. For instance, Kendra, who came to the university for the purpose of researching expressed disappointment that she did not have graduate students that could help her with the process. She stated:

I do not like the research. Let me tell you why. It is not because I do not like research. I just do not like research at location. It is because of the non-traditional students. Almost everybody is commuting and if they are not commuting they have families and full-time jobs so they can not participate in the way that I need them to [in order to] make a study work. Therefore, I end up doing everything. It makes the task quite difficult.

Janet expressed a desire to research but a lack of time to do so. She stated, “I enjoy research but it is always pushed to the back because so much teaching and service is needed.” She noted that she has a heavier course load at PU than her colleagues at other institutions.

However, none of the faculty expressed dissatisfaction with the idea of researching, they simply felt that either too much importance is placed upon it or that they are not given the opportunity or resources to conduct quality research. For example, Janice described research as contentment, something she is satisfied with but not by. She stated,
I enjoy the research and writing but I am really more of a development type person. I know that the research and writing is a part of what I am suppose to do, but I guess to this point, I have found it less fulfilling then some of the program type of things. I like program development. I like to do it and to implement it and see the fruits of it. However, when I do the writing, I like the product and I like the process also. But in thinking in terms of teaching, research and service. I really like the teaching. I really like the service. And if you look at overall what I have accomplished over the years. I have a huge amount of service to the community and to others as far as the education community is concerned.

Harold, who is non-tenure track, expressed concern over how the new emphasis on research is affecting younger faculty members. He stated,

I understand it but not pleased with the pressure that is put on younger faculty because then it becomes more of, and I mentioned earlier, it is all about me. There is a very selfish mentality because there is no collegiality. Unless you can help me then I do not need to have anything to do with you. There is no collegiality and no collaboration because these individuals want the credit and the credit comes through research.

It appeared that part of the reason the faculty felt too much importance is placed upon research is because of their desire to engage in service leading to the second additional theme. When the faculty members were asked what job duties does the institution reward the least, they all mentioned some form of service with the vast majority referencing service within the community. Kendra stated that she felt fulfilled by her work in the clinic, but also stated that it was not rewarded the same type of merit as research and publications are given. Harold discussed the need for the Public University to work more closely with the local high school to improve its Texas Educational Agency (TEA) rating. Maggie described her rewarding experiences of meeting with community leaders, community college administrators and
superintendents to aid them in the improvement of programs. However, that type of service is not as highly rewarded by the university. There is a discrepancy between what the university rewards and what the faculty members find to personally be the most rewarding and/or fulfilling. This point is further addressed in the next chapter.

Chapter Summary

This chapter examined the themes that emerged in reference to the job factors African American faculty are satisfied by, satisfied with, and dissatisfied with. The African American faculty at the historically Black university were satisfied by their interactions with students, satisfied with their job flexibility, and dissatisfied with institutional factors such as workload, pay, and political favoritism. The African American faculty at the predominantly white institution were satisfied by their work with students with a more specific focus on program and course development. The main theme that emerged in reference to the concept of satisfied with was job flexibility and freedom. The dissatisfaction factors were mainly hypothetical such as the idea of being micromanaged and certain personal qualities in people. The location of the university was also a factor of dissatisfaction. Additional themes emerged from both universities that may be relevant to understanding job satisfaction as it pertains to this faculty group. The faculty at the historically Black university seemed unclear on what duties the institution rewarded and felt unrewarded and/or unappreciated for the most part. The faculty at the predominantly white institution all agreed that research was the most rewarded by their institution, but personally found teaching and service duties more
rewarding. This represents a discrepancy between their purpose for entering and staying in higher education and the direction the university appears to be going.

Nonetheless, though this study was not designed to gauge if the faculty were satisfied with their institution, none of the faculty appeared to be dissatisfied with any factors enough to leave their place of employment.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

This study discovered the job satisfaction factors of African American faculty at a historically Black university and a predominantly white institution. It has been well documented that African American faculty have a tendency to be more satisfied at the predominantly Black institutions despite receiving lower pay, lower publication rates, and higher teaching loads (Logan, 1990; Tack & Patitu, 1992, McNeal, 2003, Berrian, 2006). In order to understand this complexity of African American job satisfaction, this study used Linda Evans’ (1998) reconceptualization of Herzberg’s motivational hygiene theory as the theoretical framework. Evans’ reconceptualization is in response to a study by Nias (1981) that asserted that Herzberg’s theory was only partially applicable to education. In a study designed to test the applicability of Herzberg’s theory in an educational setting, Nias discovered that teachers often found factors as satisfiers and/or intrinsic that Herzberg defined as hygiene factors and/or extrinsic. However, Evans found that the factors the teachers in Nias’s study described as satisfiers were actually factors they were satisfied with, not by. Therefore Evans reconceptualized Herzberg’s theory by creating a dichotomy of job satisfaction by making a distinction between factors individuals may be satisfied by, which she later referred to as job fulfillment, and factors that are satisfied with, which she later referred to as job
contentment. Using this framework, this study examined the factors African American faculty are *satisfied by, satisfied with*, and *dissatisfied with*.

This chapter includes four sections. The first section compares the themes that emerged between the African American faculty at the historically Black university and the predominantly white institution and examines the consistency of these themes with Linda Evan’s reconceptualization of Herzberg’s motivational hygiene theory. The second section is a discussion of the findings as they compare to the literature within the field of African American job satisfaction. This section will focus upon those findings not discussed in the first section of this chapter. The third section is a recommendation for policy implications and the final will be suggestions for future research.

**Comparison of Faculty at Both Institutions**

*Factors the Faculty were Satisfied By*

This section compares the themes that emerged from research questions one and four that sought to discover the factors African American faculty at a historically Black university and a predominantly white institution are *satisfied by*. The faculty at the historically Black university, Mid-South University (MSU), were satisfied by their interactions with students. These interactions were through teaching, official and unofficial advisement, and other service related responsibilities such as working with student organizations. This finding corroborated the literature that suggested African American faculty chose to attend historically Black colleges and universities so that they
could work more closely with students and be part of “an extended academic group” (Billingsley, 1982; Roebuck and Murty, 1993).

The faculty at the predominantly white institution, Public University (PU), also expressed a similar level of satisfaction from working with students. However, the faculty at PU were more specific in how they enjoyed working with students expressing a fulfillment in program and course development. There appeared to be two reasons for this focus upon program and course development. The first is that it validated their significance to the university. Public university is in the midst of changing its mission from being primarily a teaching university to becoming a research institution. Therefore, the faculty would often explain their relatively minor focus upon research by discussing what they have accomplished in other areas. For instance, one faculty member noted “I can do the research, I can do the writing. I have done the research and I have done the writing. But if you look at the actual things that I produce, tangible, you will probably see that I place less emphasis on research and writing.” One of the “tangible” items she discussed was the development of a program for public school teachers.

A second reason is based upon their desire to improve the community, and more specifically, students’ lives. For example, Janice, when discussing contentment, described program planning and community involvement as her major accomplishments. She stated:

I know that the research and writing is a part of what I am supposed to do, but it is probably something I have found less fulfilling then some of the program type
of things. I like program development. I like to do it and to implement it and see the fruits of it.

In addition, she stated, “I really like the service. And if you look at overall what I have accomplished over the years. I have a huge amount of service to the community and to others as far as the education community is concerned.”

Janet’s interest in course development appeared to be based upon how a diversity course would eventually affect African American students. For example, she stated, “I felt that I could touch more children, particularly more African American children’s lives by teaching their teachers.”

The faculty at both institutions appeared to have a strong interest in helping African American students and the African American community in general. For example, Kayla from MSU, expressed a high level of satisfaction in being able to connect with African American students stating, “I consider the students to be a real reflection of me and my worldview. It means a lot to me to be able to step into situations and have a real understanding [of the students].” Doug expressed an interest in working with issues relating to students of color with a special emphasis on Black males. When talking about what she found to be the most rewarding, Mary discussed a specific example of how an African American female student matured during her time at MSU. Similarly, the faculty at PU often expressed an interest in dealing with faculty of color. Janice discussed how the university could aid in the closing of the African American achievement gap. Harold felt that the field of education provided him an opportunity to “give back to individuals
whose skin color looks much like mine.” Overall, there did not seem to be any major divergence between the MSU and the PU faculty. Faculty from both institutions expressed a strong sense of satisfaction when working with students. They seem to have embraced a common purpose in improving the lives of students, and more specifically, the academic abilities of minority students.

These findings showed consistency with what Herzberg defined as intrinsic factors thus providing credence to Evan’s interpretation of the model. Work with students and program planning are examples of what Herzberg called the work itself, responsibility, and advancement and growth.

Factors the Faculty were Satisfied With

The theme that emerged from the satisfied with category did not possess the level of clarity as the theme from the satisfied by category. Nonetheless, the most representative theme from both institutions was based upon the faculty’s feelings of contentment with the flexibility and freedom they had in their positions. The faculty from both institutions enjoyed the opportunities to spend time with their families. Stacy and James from MSU were pleased that they could spend time with their families. Stacy, who had been at MSU for 36 years discussed how she was able to raise her children and attend all of their events. James, who had only been at MSU for six years similarly showed excitement in being able to enjoy his time as a new father. This was a similar source of satisfaction by the faculty at PU. Kendra, an expectant mother, was very content with not having to drive an hour and ten minutes everyday to the main campus.
Janet, the mother of a two-and-a-half year old daughter, similarly enjoyed the freedom of being able to attend various appointments as they come up. This finding is broadly consistent with the study by Thompson and Dey (1998) which concluded that time constraints as they relate to family obligations can be a source of stress for African American faculty.

The faculty also enjoyed the flexibility and freedom to do those aspects of their jobs that they enjoy. For example Maggie expressed contentment with the freedom she received from her schedule because it allowed her more time to work with doctoral students. This finding is also consistent with Herzberg’s notion of extrinsic factors which he defines as “factors related to the work itself” (Herzberg, 1959). Thus, this finding also corroborates Evans reconceptualization of motivational hygiene theory.

**Factors the Faculty were Dissatisfied With**

The faculty from the two institutions differed in these factors. The faculty at MSU described institutional based factors such as their workload, pay, and political favoritism. These finding were consistent with the literature that suggested African American faculty at historically Black colleges and universities receive less pay and teach more classes than their counterparts at predominantly white institutions (Logan, 1990; Tack & Patitu, 1992, McNeal, 2003, Berrian, 2006) and findings that these factors are sources of dissatisfaction for this faculty group (Denier, 1985). The idea of political favoritism is not supported in the research and may be institution specific. The research also suggests that African American faculty at historically Black colleges and universities
may not have the time to research due to other service and teaching responsibilities (Collison & Fields, 1999; Thorton, 2003). This point was corroborated by one faculty member, a tenure-track assistant professor who noted that her service responsibilities kept her from being able to work on her writing. However, research was a non-factor at MSU in reference to job satisfaction and only mentioned by the two faculty members who had formerly worked at predominantly white institutions. Their former institutions may have been more focused on research causing them to discuss the topic. In addition, two of the faculty were full professors and two were faculty lecturers, thus making research less important to their career advancement.

The factors of dissatisfaction at the predominantly white institution were only partially consistent with the literature that suggested the faculty are negatively impacted by student evaluations, unhappy with their work environments, and that research was a major source of dissatisfaction (Ruffins, 1997; Bonner II, 2004; Stanley, 2004). The faculty at PU focused more on hypothetical situations such as being micromanaged or working with people that were not upfront and honest. Location seemed to also be a factor but that is most likely institution specific. PU is located in a rural community that is not very diverse and lacks many of the entertainment attractions that a more urban area may have. Only one faculty member lived in the location of the university. The others lived in a metropolitan area approximately an hour’s drive away. Only two of the faculty members noted any form of racial hostility in the community, the others just seemed to be more content living in a more urban area.
The research suggests that African American faculty at predominantly white institutions often feel as if they are negatively impacted by student evaluations. This was not reported by the faculty at PU. They were more likely to note that they had received high evaluations. For instance, Harold stated, “I hope that I have been an excellent instructor. My evaluations indicate that I have done a very good job in the classroom.” Janet did note a few antagonizing questions she had received toward the content in her diversity course, but noted that they are isolated and did not affect her student evaluations.

In addition, the faculty appeared to be pleased, for the most part, with their work environments. Many factors could explain this point. Only two faculty members spent a majority of their working time on the campus. In addition, one faculty member did note a single race-based incident she experienced that led her not to want to work with certain people on the main campus. However, the faculty appeared to enjoy their work environments. Maggie noted, “I like the people that I work with. Our department is a very friendly department.”

Research is also noted in the literature as a factor of dissatisfaction because minority faculty often feel as if their research is not accepted during tenure decisions, that their comprehensive research abilities are often questioned, and that they often do not have time to conduct quality research (Knowles and Harleston, 1997; Thompson and Dey, 1998; Stanley, 2006; Williams & Williams, 2006). The findings in this study only partially corroborated the literature. Two of the faculty at PU, both tenure track
assistant professors, expressed a desire to research but noted either a lack of time or a lack of support from the graduate students within the academic program. One of the faculty members described research as a source of contentment or something she is satisfied with, meaning something she has done but a duty that she prefers less than program development and service. Another, non-tenure track faculty member noted that he had researched in the past, but had no desire to continue to do so.

There did appear to be some concern with the Public University’s shift from being a teaching university to seeking to become a research-based institution. There were three main concerns. First, there was a concern that the shift could cause younger faculty members to focus less on students and collegiality and more on writing and those colleagues that can help them achieve tenure. Secondly, there was a concern that programs could suffer. One faculty felt as if they were faced with a difficult paradox stating:

They want higher levels of students in the university. Students will not come to the university unless the program is of a certain quality. You can not get the program to be of a certain quality unless you do some program development. Then you are not rewarded for these increases in the number of students. But it takes all of the program development to have these increases in the number of students. Then once you get these students, you have a higher likelihood to have students that will help you with your research; which is what the university wants to see.

A third concern is that the university is disproportionately rewarding those that research and publish while giving less attention to work done in the classroom or with
service. Janice, in response to a follow-up question asking her if she would like more emphasis placed on service stated,

Yes, I definitely would. I think this whole business of the achievement gap if there is such. …we have lots of resources we could use to improve the academic achievements of students in schools. We do not always, because like I said, the rewards come to those that do research and writing and so forth.

The responses from the faculty at PU only partially corroborated the literature; however, the two faculty members at MSU who formerly worked at predominantly white institutions discussed experiences at their former universities that were consistent with the findings in the literature. Kayla noted that African American faculty at her former institution would get negative feedback on their evaluations such as “She rolls her eyes” or “She has an attitude.” She also noted a lack of support by her colleagues and supervisor which created a negative work environment. Mary, also spoke of her experience as the first Black department head at her former university describing an experience in which she felt as if her supervisor circumvented her to benefit a student athlete. She noted the lack of support she felt at the institution.

The factors of dissatisfaction from both institutions do corroborate Herzberg’s notion of dissatisfiers. Workload, pay, working conditions, behaviors of colleagues, and micromanagement are all part of Herzberg’s category of dissatisfiers. The findings of this study also supports Linda Evans’ reconceptualization of Herzberg’s motivational hygiene theory by providing evidence of its applicability in higher education. However, Herzberg’s theory, as with its reconceptualization by Evans, falls short of fully providing
insight into the factors that could lead to the retention of African American faculty. While the factors do fill a gap in the literature by making a distinction between what African American faculty are satisfied by and what they are satisfied with, there appears to be a gap between the factors that the faculty members are dissatisfied by and those that would cause them to leave an institution. Studies have found that dissatisfaction can lead to a person leaving a job (Fritzsche & Parrish, 2004). This finding gives credence to the notion that faculty retention is linked to job dissatisfaction. However, it does not equate to a cause and effect relationship between factors of job dissatisfaction and faculty retention.

In analyzing the findings of this study, it was clear that there is a distinction between dissatisfaction factors the faculty are willing to endure and those that they are not. Throughout the interviews, there were statements such as “I am unhappy with______, but it is not enough to cause me to want to leave.” For example, James when discussing his dissatisfaction with pay stated, “faculty members should make more money but it does not bother me to the point that I would want to change jobs.” However, there were also factors stated that could lead to a person leaving the institution. For example, Janet, when discussing a diversity course she teaches, stated, “If they took it tomorrow, I would find a hard time staying.”

This point is further clarified by Kayla, an assistant professor at MSU who formerly worked at a predominantly white institution. She noted several factors she was dissatisfied with at MSU such as lack of resources, professional support, and her
workload but was quick to point out her satisfaction with the institution. However, she noted that she left her former institution once she began to feel that the institution did not value diversity. Harold, from PU, noted a similar point. When asked about factors of dissatisfaction, he noted the low amount of minority faculty members on the campus but viewed that as an opportunity to make PU more known to qualified faculty of color. However, he also mentioned two hiring committees he was on in which he was able to bring two faculty of color that he felt were qualified. He noted that, “If they had not gotten the positions, I think I would have been highly upset perhaps causing me to do some other things because they were highly qualified.” Harold expressed a willingness to stay at an institution that did not have a significant amount of faculty of color if the institution was willing to hire qualified minorities. However, he was not willing to stay if he felt that the institution was not willing to increase diversity.

These examples represent two distinct categories of dissatisfaction. Both faculty members shared factors they were dissatisfied with but willing to endure at their institutions. However, they also shared factors that would cause them to be dissatisfied to the point of searching for employment at another institution.

Evans’ concepts of satisfied by and satisfied with are valuable in understanding the complexity of African American job satisfaction. This dichotomy provides insight into why faculty may choose to stay with an institution. For example, the interactions with students, a factor of fulfillment of the faculty at MSU, is obviously a much greater factor than pay, workload, and other factors of job dissatisfaction. However, in order to fully
understand African American retention, there needs to be a clear idea of what factors will most likely cause a faculty member to leave an institution. Therefore, there needs to be a dichotomy of dissatisfaction factors in addition to Evans dichotomy of satisfaction factors. There needs to be a distinction between those factors faculty members may find dissatisfactory, but willing to endure, and those terminal factors the faculty are dissatisfied by enough to want to leave the institution.

Additional Findings

The examination of the participants’ responses yielded additional findings and/or insights that will be discussed in this section. The first is a reference to one of the main findings in the literature about African American faculty that led to the creation of this current study. It is the notion that African American faculty at historically Black colleges and universities are more satisfied than their counterparts at predominantly white institutions despite having lower teaching loads, higher pay, and higher publications at the latter. While this study was not designed to gauge the job satisfaction of the faculty at their respective institutions, one finding that emerged could at least partially explain this phenomenon. The faculty at Mid-South seemed to have more of a purpose of choosing their institution of employment. For example, two of the faculty were non-recruited alumni that decided they wanted to return to their alma mater to start their higher education careers. Two more of the faculty formerly worked at predominantly white institutions and were unhappy, thus causing one to seek out a predominantly Black institution and another to take advantage of the opportunity to
work at one. One other of the faculty members was interested in issues relating to students of color with a special emphasis on Black males. Therefore, his purpose for entering higher education shared a consistency with the overall mission of the university.

The faculty at Public University did not have as clear of a purpose for choosing their institution. One person was from out of state and looking for a job in the area where PU is located. Another applied to several places and Public University was among the first to offer her a position. One of the faculty members was originally hired to coach. Two faculty at PU were alumni at the institution, but one was heavily recruited out of another career and the other was closely mentored by a faculty member at Public University in her career decisions.

This unintended finding focusing upon the reasons the faculty chose their institution is significant because it could suggest that people are much more willing to endure certain factors of job dissatisfaction if the institution is their first choice or they have a specific reason for choosing it. As previously mentioned, the vast majority of the participants from both institutions expressed a strong desire to improve the lives of African American students and the African American community in general. Traditionally, that has been the mission of historically Black colleges and universities therefore possibly validating their faculty members’ sense of purpose for entering higher education. Future research studies should examine the impact of faculty choice upon job satisfaction to see if it is a significant factor.
An additional insight is that tenure appeared to be significant when considering African American job satisfaction at the predominantly white institution but only in the area of research. This study was not specifically designed to examine that impact of tenure but there were responses that suggest it should be considered when considering African American faculty job satisfaction. All of the participants at PU mentioned research, but the only two that showed any significant concern were the two tenure track professors. The others only expressed concern that the institution may be placing too much emphasis upon research. However, they were more likely to either describe research as a source of contentment or a non-factor in reference to their job satisfaction.

Tenure did not seem to have much of an impact upon the job satisfaction factors at MSU. There seemed to be a commonality in the responses no matter if they were lecturers, tenure track or tenured professors. The discrepancy between the two institutions is perhaps based upon PU’s focus of becoming a research institution. The basis for PU’s reward system was fairly clear to the faculty participants in that publications weighed heavily upon merit pay and future promotions. However, the reward system was not clear to the faculty of MSU and their five-course workload suggests that research may not be focused on as heavily there as it is at PU. Therefore, the participants at MSU most likely focused upon the job duties that they engage in the most when describing their factors of job satisfaction.
Conclusions

This study was designed to provide insight into the complexity of African American job satisfaction. Formerly, research of African American job satisfaction has been quantitative, focusing only upon factors given in a questionnaire or survey. This study provided African American faculty members with the opportunity of providing a more complete picture of factors that contribute to their job satisfaction. Based upon the findings of this study, five conclusions have been drawn and discussed in this section of the chapter.

The most salient theme in this study is that African American faculty are satisfied by their work with students. Previous quantitative studies using instruments such as the job descriptive index found “the work itself” to be a factor in the job satisfaction of African American faculty members. The design of this study supported and clarified these previous findings in that the participants described in great detail what it is about their work that satisfies them most. For the faculty participants in this study, it was their interactions and work with students. This was true for faculty at both institutions though the participants at the predominantly white institutions were more specific when describing their work with students. They noted being satisfied by how the programs and courses they developed impacted students.

Secondly, the faculty are satisfied with the freedom and flexibility of their jobs. Family time as well as having a life outside of their universities tends to be a strong contentment factor. In addition, the faculty want the freedom to be able to do their jobs
as they see fit. This flexibility and freedom are not factors of fulfillment, but the lack of it would appear to lead to job dissatisfaction.

A third conclusion is that the institutional context only seems to be significant when considering factors of job dissatisfaction. Institutional factors such as pay, workload and lack of recognition tend to be the main factors of job dissatisfaction among faculty at the historically Black institution. The faculty at the predominantly white institution focused more on human factors such as a person’s leadership style or specific behaviors such as being dishonest or not being forthcoming with pertinent information. However, none of the participants in this study appeared to be dissatisfied enough to leave their institution.

The fourth conclusion is that this study further proved the applicability of Linda Evan’s reconceptualization of Herzberg’s motivational hygiene theory to education, and more specifically higher education. The findings showed that there is a clear difference between job satisfaction factors African American faculty are satisfied by and those they are satisfied with. As previously noted, these factors were fairly consistent for the faculty in both institutions involved in this study (See Table 3).
### Table 3

**Linda Evans’ Conceptualization of Herzberg’s Theory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linda Evans’ Conceptualization</th>
<th>Herzberg’s Motivational Hygiene Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrinsic Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied By</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interaction with students</td>
<td>- Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Program Development</td>
<td>- Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The work itself</td>
<td>- Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Responsibility</td>
<td>- Advancement and/or growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied With</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flexibility</td>
<td>- Company policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Freedom</td>
<td>- Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The work itself</td>
<td>- Interpersonal relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Responsibility</td>
<td>- Working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Advancement and/or growth</td>
<td>- Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied With</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Workload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Being micromanaged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Personal qualities/Work environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This framework filled a gap in the literature about African American job satisfaction by providing insight into those satisfaction factors that potentially lead to job retention. Previous studies either grouped job satisfaction of this faculty group into one category or measured their degree of satisfaction with certain criteria (Denier, 1985; Logan, 1990, Eason, 1993, Berrian, 2006). The approaches in these studies made it difficult to identify those factors they were satisfied or fulfilled by to the point of wanting to stay with their institution. Using Evan's framework, the findings of this study proved that working with students is a significant retention factor for this faculty group.
This framework should be applied to the study of job satisfaction of other faculty groups in higher education though I suggest one modification that is explained in the following discussion of the final conclusion.

The last conclusion is that there appears to be difference between factors a person is dissatisfied with but willing to endure and factors that will cause a person to leave an institution. This was an unintended finding that needs to be examined when considering faculty job satisfaction and retention. It was not clear whether institutional context is significant when determining the differences between these two dissatisfaction concepts, but faculty from both institutions did express factors that would cause them to leave their institutions. Future research of job satisfaction should modify Evan’s model by creating a dichotomy of job dissatisfaction that is similar to the dichotomy she constructed of job satisfaction.

As with most qualitative studies, the ability to generalize to other universities is limited. However, the findings of this study provide a basis for understanding and examining the job satisfaction of African American faculty.

Implications for Policy and Practice

The findings of this study have the potential for numerous policy and practice implications for both historically Black colleges and universities and predominantly white institutions. Four are discussed in this section of the study. These implications are designed to provide a work environment that will address many of the concerns faculty of color expressed in this study. These are fairly cost effective implications with two
focused specifically on historically Black colleges and universities, one focused on predominantly white institutions and one on for all institutions.

Historically Black colleges and universities should develop a reward and/or recognition system that acknowledges their faculty’s contributions to students in and out of the classroom and also to the community. The faculty participants in this study from MSU expressed interest in simply being appreciated with an understanding that it may not come through pay. When asked about what the MSU appreciated the least, James stated, “Probably the least appreciated is the extra time that we spend. You know when people go above and beyond; I feel they need to be recognized. I know they can not always do compensation, but I feel they should at least be recognized.” The institution did create a teaching award that was mentioned by two of the participants. However this reward alone may not be enough when considering several faculty at predominantly white institutions are receiving merit pay each year for the research they produce.

Historically Black colleges and universities should implement a reward system that recognizes several faculty members even if only one receives the teacher of the year award or the service project of the year award. The only person that stated they were dissatisfied with their institution was Stacy, a faculty member that had been at MSU for 36 years. Her factors of dissatisfaction were not much different than the other five faculty members from the institution. However, her dissatisfaction does present the question of how long will the faculty members remain fulfilled by their love for students
if they do not feel appreciated by their institution. Based upon the participant’s responses, the reward system does not have to be an increase in rank or an ongoing form of compensation such as a pay raise. The faculty seemed to simply desire to be recognized for the specific efforts they make to educate students. This recognition should be publicized with some form of tangible reward that will serve as a symbol of their accomplishments and an incentive to others. One possible suggestion is a plaque given at an annual ceremony with some form of a meager one-time monetary reward attached to the teacher of the year but with other minor recognitions given to other faculty members. These rewards could serve as validation to those faculty members that often feel that their efforts go unnoticed.

Secondly, historically Black colleges and universities should consider cost-effective ways to improve the working conditions for their faculty members. For instance, if it is not possible to hire more professional support staff, then perhaps there can be more student assistants. The faculty at Mid-South mentioned various clerical or labor intensive duties such as inputting their own textbook orders, having to seek out and order needed software packages and having to carry their computers and projectors to class. These duties being performed by student workers could at least partially decrease the workload of faculty members that are teaching five and six classes, advising students, and participating in various service activities.

The third implication for practice is for predominantly white institutions to provide their faculty of color with a sense of ownership in their departments whether it
is through, for example, a specific course, program, or community project. The faculty at Public University expressed fulfillment with their various accomplishments in building programs, being in charge of a clinic, or the creation of a unique course. In addition, they enjoyed the freedom they had to take the programs/course in the direction that they saw fit. This is consistent with Herzberg’s assertion that employees are intrinsically motivated by a sense of accomplishment, responsibility and an opportunity for growth (Herzberg, 1959). Providing this form of ownership could give the faculty of color a sense of belonging in the institution’s culture thus remedying the feelings of isolation expressed in the literature by African American faculty at predominantly white institutions (Ruffins, 1997; Sadao, 2003; Stanley, 2006).

The fourth policy implication is for institutions to consider creating more professors of practice positions as they are defined by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). A subcommittee of the AAUP (2005) defined this faculty position as being “principally engaged in teaching and are not expected to be significantly involved in research activities, but they can be distinguished from the large majority of other full-time non-tenure-track teaching faculty in a number of ways.” These differences include five year renewable appoints, salaries that approach but do not match those of probationary and tenured faculty and more opportunities to participate in institutional and departmental structures of faculty governance (Benjamin, Hollinger, Knight, 2005). The academic performance of these faculty
members is evaluated on a regular basis according to an agreed upon criteria appropriate for their position.

Based upon the perceptions of African American faculty members in the literature as well as those that participated in this study, the professors of practice positions may potentially be better aligned with the academic goals of this faculty group. Institutions should consider creating these positions with teaching and/or service expectations that rival the research requirements of tenure-track faculty members. For example the teaching requirements may include the creation of new methods of delivery or courses not formally offered at the university. The service requirements could include projects that are unique, meet criteria agreed upon by the university, and have quantifiable impacts. For instance, the faculty members in this study expressed interest in finding ways to decrease the African American achievement gap of children in the community, improving the local high school, and implementing a program in the community to increase the literacy rate of adults. These positions could potentially provide a level of prestige that is not often given to non-tenure track faculty while also being stringent enough to keep the research option attractive.

Recommendations for Future Research

The findings of this study produced implications for future research which are discussed in this section. A few of these implications have been discussed previously within this document but five are explored more thoroughly here.
Future researchers should examine the differences between the job satisfaction factors of African American faculty that are tenured, those that are not tenured but on a tenure track, and those that are on a non-tenured track. This study was not designed to examine the impact of tenure though there were isolated findings that suggested tenure could affect how African American faculty view job satisfaction in reference to fulfillment, contentment, and dissatisfaction.

Secondly, a study is needed to test the assertion that job dissatisfaction factors should be separated into two different categories; those a faculty member is dissatisfied with but willing to endure, and those that would dissatisfy them to the point of leaving their institution. This finding could be beneficial in understanding African American faculty retention.

Thirdly, a similar qualitative study should be conducted to compare the job satisfaction factors of Black and White faculty at predominantly white institutions to see if they differ. This finding could aid institutions in understanding the retention discrepancy between White and Black faculty at predominantly white institutions.

The fourth recommendation is for a study examining the reasons faculty choose to apply and/or accept positions at a particular institution and the impact this choice has on their overall job satisfaction. For example, faculty who enter higher education due to their strong research background may not be satisfied at a service-oriented university. The findings of this study could impact how institutions write job descriptions and recruit incoming faculty.
Finally, a quantitative study is needed to determine if the findings of this study can be generalized to African American faculty employed at other historically Black colleges and universities and predominantly white institutions.
APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
(Demographic Information)

1. What is your current title and/or position?
2. How long have you worked at this institution?
3. Have you worked at any other institutions? If so, where?
4. How long have you worked in higher education?

(Questions Relating to Study)

5. Why did you enter higher education?
6. Why did you choose this particular institution?
7. What is it about your current position that fulfills you?
8. Think back to a time when you felt fulfilled as an educator? Take a moment to reflect upon that situation.
9. What aspects of your job do not necessarily fulfill you, but are needed in order for you to feel content with your institution? In other words, what are you satisfied with but not necessarily by?
10. What are factors that would lead you to feel dissatisfied with your institution?
11. Think back to a time you were dissatisfied with some aspect of your job and/or the college/university in which you were/are employed? Take a moment to reflect upon that situation.
12. When considering your multiple job duties and requirements: (a) which do you find the most rewarding, (b) which do you find the least rewarding?

13. Of all of your job duties and contributions: (a) which do you feel are the most appreciated and/or rewarded by your institution, and (b) which do you feel are the least appreciated and/or rewarded?
APPENDIX B

CASE LEVEL DISPLAY MATRICES
Sample Case Level Display Matrix 1 used for the Predominantly White Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PWI</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>IQ6</th>
<th>IQ7</th>
<th>IQ8</th>
<th>IQ9</th>
<th>IQ10</th>
<th>IQ11</th>
<th>IQ12</th>
<th>IQ13</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summaries/Themes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: IQ is short for Interview Questions

Sample Case Level Display Matrix 1 used for the Historically Black University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HBCU</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>IQ6</th>
<th>IQ7</th>
<th>IQ8</th>
<th>IQ9</th>
<th>IQ10</th>
<th>IQ11</th>
<th>IQ12</th>
<th>IQ13</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summaries/Themes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Case Level Display Matrix 2 used for the Predominantly White Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Research Question 4</th>
<th>Research Question 5</th>
<th>Research Question 6</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Additional Theme 1</th>
<th>Additional Theme 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 7, 8, 12a</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQ 9</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 10, 11, 12b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 7, 8, 12a</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQ 9</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 10, 11, 12b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 7, 8, 12a</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQ 9</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 10, 11, 12b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 7, 8, 12a</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQ 9</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 10, 11, 12b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 7, 8, 12a</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQ 9</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 10, 11, 12b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Case Level Display Matrix 2 used for the Historically Black University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Research Question 4</th>
<th>Research Question 5</th>
<th>Research Question 6</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Additional Theme 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 7, 8, 12a</td>
<td>Summary of response to IQ 9</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 10, 11, 12b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 7, 8, 12a</td>
<td>Summary of response to IQ 9</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 10, 11, 12b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 7, 8, 12a</td>
<td>Summary of response to IQ 9</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 10, 11, 12b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 7, 8, 12a</td>
<td>Summary of response to IQ 9</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 10, 11, 12b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 7, 8, 12a</td>
<td>Summary of response to IQ 9</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 10, 11, 12b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayla</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 7, 8, 12a</td>
<td>Summary of response to IQ 9</td>
<td>Summary of responses to IQs 10, 11, 12b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER, CONSENT FORM AND TELEPHONE SCRIPT
Dear Colleague,

I request your participation in a research study focusing upon the job satisfaction of African American faculty. The intent of this study is to discover factors that contribute to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. You are an ideal candidate for this study.

Your participation will entail a face-to-face interview that will last approximately 30-40 minutes. The interview will take place either on your campus or at a neutral location of your convenience. A follow-up interview may be needed, but the second interview can be conducted via email, phone, or some other medium.

Before your responses will be used in the study, a transcript of the interview will be sent to you via mail or email to insure that your responses are accurately recorded. This study is completely voluntary and you can choose to decline at any time. At that point, any information collected will be immediately destroyed.

Your identity will be protected throughout the process of completing and disseminating the findings of this study. All notes and transcribed interviews will be kept safely on an external hard drive and locked within a cabinet in my home office. Within the study, you will only be identified by demographic and rank. Your institution will be identified by the student/faculty demographics and region within the United States.

I will contact you via telephone and/or email to request your participation once I have confirmation from the post office that this letter has been received. If you have any questions about the study, its design, or the procedure used, you may contact the principle investigator at the contact information listed below. In addition, your will be given an opportunity to view the completed results of this study. You will receive a $15 gift certificate for participating in the interview.

I appreciate your consideration for inclusion within this study.

Quentin Wright (Principle Investigator)

Doctoral Student, University of North Texas
Telephone Script

Hello, Dr. ____________. My name is Quentin Wright. I am a doctoral student at the University of North Texas. I recently sent a letter to you requesting your participation in a study focusing on African American job satisfaction. Did you receive my letter?

Your participation will entail a face-to-face interview that will last approximately 30-40 minutes. The interview will take place either on your campus or at a neutral location of your convenience. A follow-up interview may be needed, but the second interview can be conducted via email, phone, or some other medium. Before your responses will be used in the study, a transcript of the interview will be sent to you via mail or email to insure that your responses were accurately recorded.

Would you be interested in participating in this study? You will receive a $15 Pizza Hut gift certificate for participating. Would you like to be interviewed on your campus or at a neutral location?

Thank you for participating in the interview and I will talk to you soon.

If they decline.....

Thanks for your time. I wish you well in your future endeavors.
University of North Texas Institutional Review Board

Informed Consent Form

Before agreeing to participate in this research study, it is important that you read and understand the following explanation of the purpose and benefits of the study and how it will be conducted.

Title of Study: Factors Affecting African American Faculty Satisfaction at a Historically Black University and a Predominantly White Institution.

Principal Investigator: Quentin Wright, University of North Texas (UNT) Department of Counseling, Development and Higher Education.

Purpose of the Study: You are invited to participate in a research study designed to discover factors that contribute to the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of African American faculty. With the well documented retention issues of African American faculty as well as the studies linking job satisfaction to retention, it is important that institutions of higher education use accurate measures to capture the unique characteristics of job satisfaction. Therefore, this study is designed to explore the complexity of African American faculty job satisfaction by seeking to discover what factors they perceive to be dissatisfying about their jobs and those they feel give them a sense of fulfillment.

Study Procedures: As a participant, you will take part in a face-to-face interview in which you will be asked to disclose factors of satisfaction and dissatisfaction in reference to your faculty career. This interview will last no longer than one hour. You may also be asked to take part in a second interview via phone, email, or any other medium available if the investigator finds a need for additional information. Following the interview, you will be sent the transcribed interviews to insure that your responses are accurately written.

Foreseeable Risks: The potential risks are social and economical. Responses could result in a detrimental change in your relationship with employees at your institution and/or their perception of you. There will be several steps taken to insure confidentiality of all responses and to protect the identity of all participants.

Procedures for Maintaining Confidentiality of Research Records: The nature of the study is not to determine if the participants are satisfied with their institutions but to discover factors of job satisfaction. Therefore, no judgment will be made by the researcher to determine overall job satisfaction. Secondly, neither the participants nor the institutions will be specifically identified within the study. The institutions will be
identified by region and all participants will be identified by faculty rank and general demographic information. The confidentiality of your individual information will be maintained in any publications or presentations regarding this study.

Benefits to the Subjects or Others: This study will not directly benefit you but the information collected could possibly lead to more accurate measures of job satisfaction among African American faculty. These measures could inform innovative retention strategies of this faculty group.

Compensation for Participants: You will receive a $10 gift card to Starbucks for participating in this study.

Questions about the Study: If you have any questions about the study, you may contact Quentin Wright at telephone number xxx.xxx.xxxx.

Review for the Protection of Participants: This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB can be contacted at (940) 565-3940 with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects.

Research Participants’ Rights:

Your signature below indicates that you have read or have had read to you all of the above and that you confirm all of the following:

• Quentin Wright has explained the study to you and answered all of your questions. You have been told the possible benefits and the potential risks and/or discomforts of the study.
• You understand that you do not have to take part in this study, and your refusal to participate or your decision to withdraw will involve no penalty or loss of rights or benefits. The study personnel may choose to stop your participation at any time.
• You understand why the study is being conducted and how it will be performed.
• You understand your rights as a research participant and you voluntarily consent to participate in this study.
• You have been told you will receive a copy of this form.

________________________________________
Printed Name of Participant
Signature of Participant  Date

For the Principal Investigator or Designee:

I certify that I have reviewed the contents of this form with the subject signing above. I have explained the possible benefits and the potential risks and/or discomforts of the study. It is my opinion that the participant understood the explanation.

Signature of Principal Investigator or Designee  Date
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