Georgia Journal of College Student Affairs

Volume 30 | Issue 1

2014

An Assessment of Faculty Job Satisfaction in Georgia's Technical College System Using Bolman and Deal's Four Organizational Frameworks

Bee S. Hart
Southeastern Technical College

Brenda L.H. Marina
Georgia Southern University, bmarina@georgiasouthern.edu

Recommended Citation

Hart, B. S., & Marina, B. L. (2014). An assessment of faculty job satisfaction in Georgia's technical college system using Bolman and Deal's four organizational frameworks. *Georgia Journal of College Student Affairs, 30*(1), https://doi.org/10.20429/gcpa.2014.300104

An Assessment of Faculty Job Satisfaction in Georgia's Technical College System Using Bolman and Deal's Four Organizational Frameworks

Bee S. Hart
Brenda L. H. Marina

Abstract

This study examined the extent to which elements within Bolman and Deal's (2003) four organizational frameworks impacted the job satisfaction of full-time faculty working within the Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG). A factor analysis coupled with a linear regression analysis found that elements within Bolman and Deal's structural framework had the greatest impact.

In an age of increasing professorial job dissatisfaction, high mobility rates within the teaching profession, and public accountability demands for quantifiable work performance, educational administrators must develop organizations that are not only highly effective but also promote worker morale (Sanderson, Phua, & Herda, 2000; Syptak, Marsland, & Ulmer, 1999; Kelly, 1989). By having a greater understanding of what forces within an institution have the greatest impact on faculty job satisfaction (or dissatisfaction), administrators can be better positioned to create such an environment.

Job satisfaction is a topic of interest to leaders in a variety of fields because of its ability to impact an assortment of work attributes. Previous literature has shown that an employee's level of job satisfaction can impact worker motivation, absenteeism, commitment, productivity, and even illness (Bozeman, B. & Gaughan, M., 2011; HMRS, 2005; Kelly, 1989; Syptak, Marsland, & Ulmer, 1999). This is of particular interest within the realm of higher education. There has been a growing level of dissatisfaction among college faculty (Levin, 2006), with 41.3% of nationally polled faculty indicating they have considered leaving the field for a different career (Sanderson, Phua, & Herda, 2000). With a better understanding of the factors contributing to satisfaction, or lack thereof, educational leaders can devise more effective strategies to promote recruitment and retention (Johnsrud & Heck, 1994; Seifert & Umbach, 2008; Smart, 1990; Weiler, 1985). Chen, S. H., Yang, C. C., Shiau, J.Y. and Wang, H. H. (2006) also note that institutions can only improve quality in teaching and learning if they identify mechanisms that improve faculty job satisfaction and contentment.

Faculty job satisfaction studies have been carried out in traditional two-year and four-year settings (e.g. Kessler, 2007; Levin, 2006; Sanderson, Phua, & Herda, 2000; and Jackson 2000); however, faculty job satisfaction studies within the technical college environment have been largely neglected (Brewer & McMahan-Landers, 2003) . Technical colleges provide a unique setting in which to consider faculty job satisfaction because they are inherently different than other educational settings in which faculty job satisfaction studies have been conducted. Cohen and Brawer (2003) note that technical colleges provide a unique educational work environment because their purpose is to prepare students for employment and provide industry with trained workers. Palmer (1987) also asserts that some view the technical college environment as being innately different than other branches of education for three reasons: an emphasis on workforce development; terminal program offerings that provide services to students that are seen as being less prepared academically than those pursuing baccalaureate degrees; and the social service perspective of providing economic improvements to communities.

In this study, a multidimensional approach was used to assess organizational elements impacting job satisfaction of full-time faculty members within the Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG). The following provides a review of the fundamental constructs discussed within each of Bolman and Deal's (2003) organizational frameworks. These constructs provide the theoretical foundation upon which this study was developed.

Literature Related to Bolman and Deal's Four Organizational Frameworks

Bolman and Deal (2003) have divided organizations into four broad frames: the structural frame, the human resources frame, the political frame, and the symbolic frame. They define an organizational frame to be a set of ideas that enables one to better understand daily occurrences. These frames were chosen for this study to better understand how each facet of the work environment impacts faculty job satisfaction. By identifying major contributors to job satisfaction, organizational leaders may be better able to strengthen those aspects of the work environment to promote morale and limit turnover as well as improve the quality of services provided. A brief overview of each of the four frames is provided below along with representative job satisfaction studies (Zabriskie, Dey, and Riegle 2002; Truell, Price, and Joyner, 1998; Chatman, 1991) discussed within the context of the given frame.

The Structural Frame. The structural frame posed by Bolman and Deal (2003) relates to the administrative hierarchy of an organization. They contend that the structural framework of an organization can accommodate institutional goals while allowing for individual differences and have outlined six foundational assumptions of this frame:

1. Organizations exist to achieve established goals and objectives.
2. Organizations increase efficiency and enhance performance through specialization a clear division of labor.
3. Appropriate forms of coordination and control ensure that diverse efforts of individuals and units.
4. Organizations work best when rationality prevails over personal preferences and extraneous influences.
5. Structures must be designed to fit an organization's circumstances (including its goals, technology, workforce, and environment).

6). Problems and performance gaps arise from structural deficiencies and can be remedied through analysis and restructuring. (p. 45)

Zabriskie, Dey, and Riegle (2002) found a supportive environment allowing faculty to focus on teaching without having to divert their available time and energy towards being defensive to be positively correlated with job satisfaction.

The Human Resources Frame. The human resources frame considers the relationship between individual and organizational needs. Steers and Porter (1991) define a human need as an internal state of imbalance that causes an individual to pursue a set of actions by which to regain balance. Hoy and Miskel (2005) note that the ultimate objective of an individual's action is to fulfill a need or otherwise reduce an existing imbalance and it is within the context of needs that human behavior can be explained. Bolman and Deal (2003) note that the alignment between the needs of an employee and the needs of the organization is critical in providing meaningful and satisfying work for the employee and have outlined the following four core assumptions:

1. Organizations exist to serve human needs rather than the reverse.
2. People and organizations need each other. Organizations need ideas, energy, and talent; people need careers, salaries, and opportunities.
3. When the fit between individual and system is poor, one or both will suffer. Individuals are exploited or exploit the organization – or both become victims.
4. A good fit benefits both. Individuals find meaningful and satisfying work, and organizations get the talent and energy they need to succeed (p. 115)

In a study of job satisfaction among community college occupational and technical faculty, Truell, Price, and Joyner (1998) found that full-time faculty members were most satisfied with the nature of the work being performed. Waltman, J., Bergom, I., Hollenshead, C., Miller, J., and August, L. (2012) found similar outcomes when studying the job satisfaction of non-tenure track faculty. The work of Bozeman and Gaughan (2011) regarding university faculty also led to similar findings, showing that these individuals were satisfied overall, but felt a need for their work to be considered important and appreciated.

The Political Frame. The political frame posed by Bolman and Deal (2003) considers the interactions that impact individual and group interests within an organization. Mintzberg (1983) defines politics to be influence stemming from informal individual or group behaviors that are not sanctioned by formal authority and notes that these actions often serve the interests of a particular group at the expense of the organization as a whole. Bolman and Deal (2003) note, however, that politics can be used to benefit an organization and they have outlined five underlying assumptions regarding this frame:

1. Organizations are composed of coalitions of diverse individuals and interest groups.
2. There are enduring differences among coalition members in values, beliefs, information, interests, and perceptions of reality.
3. Important decisions involve allocating scarce resources-who gets what.
4. Scarce resources and enduring differences make conflict central to organizational dynamics and underline power as the most important asset
5. Goals and decisions emerge from bargaining, negotiation, and jockeying for position among competing stakeholders (p. 186).

The Symbolic Frame. Bolman and Deal's (2003) symbolic frame considers how people give meaning to symbols and how such meanings help shape an organization's culture. They contend that symbols embody culture and culture defines for members of the organization "who they are and how they are to do things" (pg. 243). Chatman (1991) recommends that organizations desiring close employee-organization value relationships spend time developing selection and socialization strategies. Specifically, Chatman (1991) recommends that organizations seek out those individuals that possess values similar to those of the organization at entry and that organizations also develop socialization opportunities that will allow the continued development of employee-organization fit. Bolman and Deal (2003) draw on existing literature (e.g.Selznick, 1957; Dittmer, 1977; Hofstede, 1984) within the field of institutional theory to develop assumptions regarding their symbolic frame:

1. What is most important is not what happens but what it means.
2. Activity and meaning are loosely coupled; events have multiple meanings because people interpret experience differently.
3. In the face of widespread uncertainty and ambiguity, people create symbols to resolve confusion, increase predictability, find direction, and anchor hope and faith.

4. Many events and processes are more important for what is expressed than what is produced. They form a cultural tapestry of secular myths, heroes and heroines, rituals, ceremonies and stories that help people find purpose and passion in their personal and work lives.
5. Culture is the glue that holds an organization together and unites people around shared values and beliefs. (p. 243).

Ultimately, Bolman and Deal (2003) state, "the symbolic frame seeks to interpret and illuminate basic issues of meaning and belief that make meanings so powerful" (pg. 242).

Methodology

This research study focused on the following overarching question: To what extent do elements within Bolman and Deal's (2003) four organizational frameworks impact faculty job satisfaction the Technical College System of Georgia? The following subquestions were used to seek answers to the overarching question:

- Subquestion 1: To what extent does faculty job satisfaction vary among technical colleges?
- Subquestion 2: To what extent do perceptions regarding elements within Bolman and Deal's (2003) four organizational frameworks vary among technical colleges?
- Subquestion 3: To what extent do elements within Bolman and Deal's (2003) four organizational frameworks impact faculty job satisfaction?

Each stated research question has one dependent variable and multiple categorical independent variables relating to the specific research question. The independent variables for research question one are: demographic groupings; for research questions two and three: elements within organizational frameworks.

Instrument Development

For this study, a question pool was developed using information provided within each of the four frameworks proposed by Bolman and Deal (2003). Three veteran administrators within the field of technical education, consisting of a Vice President for Academic Affairs and two college Deans, agreed to participate in the instrument development phase of the study. These administrators were provided with a brief summary of Bolman and Deal's (2003) four organizational frameworks and were asked to review the question pool to provide initial feedback regarding question clarity and the degree to which questions fit the intended frameworks. Additionally, the group was asked to review four open-ended questions, one pertaining to each of the four organizational frameworks, for clarity and fit. One question directly asking participants how satisfied they are with their jobs was also included.

After revisions were made to the initial question pool based on group feedback, the group was asked to complete the survey to obtain initial consistency data. Two of the three participants returned completed surveys for a preliminary data review. Internal consistency values were obtained for groups of questions within each framework by calculating Chronbach's alpha. DeVaus (2002) states that Chronbach's alpha values can range from 0 to 1 and that the higher the value of alpha the greater degree of reliability between items. DeVaus (2002) asserts that an instrument should have a reliability coefficient of 0.7 to be considered reliable, and that items should be removed from the instrument until an acceptable value is achieved. The Chronbach's

alpha values for question groups were calculated using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software program. Questions were grouped together by framework and individual questions were removed until an acceptable value of Chronbach's alpha was found for each framework grouping. An additional Likert scale item asking participants to rank their overall level of job satisfaction was also included to make comparisons between groups of items within a given framework and the overall level of satisfaction stated.

The final survey instrument, reflecting modifications based on expert feedback and internal consistency calculations contained 32 Likert scale survey items, four open-ended questions, and six demographic questions. The Likert scale used allowed participants to respond to a given question by choosing one of the following numeric values: 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (undecided), 4 (agree), or 5 (strongly agree). Using this construction, higher valued responses corresponded to higher levels of agreement with the stated survey item. The four open-ended questions were presented so that one question relating to each organizational framework was included. Demographic groupings (see Appendix A) included the following: gender, race/ethnicity, years of employment, college size classification, type of instructor (program or general education), and type of previous employment experience (k-12 education, post secondary education, business and industry, or other). A summary of item sets and corresponding consistency values for each framework in the final survey instrument can be seen in Table 1.

Framework	Items	Chronbach's Alpha
Structural	1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, and 28	0.778
Symbolic	4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 27, and 31	0.959
Human Resources	2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 25, and 29	0.857
Political	7, 11, 15, 23, and 30	0.938

Table 1. Internal consistency values for each organizational framework.

Respondents

Participants were full-time faculty members employed within the Technical College System of Georgia. There were 2,219 full-time faculty members working in the technical college system at the time the survey was administered, however 278 faculty (see Table 1) completed the survey to yield a response rate of 12.5%. The majority of the respondents, 59%, were female and 39% of all respondents had 2-5 years of experience at their current place of employment. Approximately 48% of the respondents work in large technical colleges and roughly 32% work in medium size technical colleges. Most respondents, 68%, came to their positions from business and industry backgrounds.

Instrument Delivery

An electronic link to the final survey was sent to the TCSG state-level Research Manager for distribution to all Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs and Deans of Instruction via organizational listserves. In turn, the link along with a letter of invitation to participate in the study and a letter of support from the state-level Research Manager's Office, was then be forwarded by the Vice President to all full-time faculty within each college.

By emailing the survey to faculty email addresses, unauthorized access of the survey instrument could be reduced. DeVauss (2002) purports that using the internet to deploy research

questionnaires is both viable and popular. He encourages inclusion of an invitation letter to participate in the study containing directions for the instrument and the social value of taking part in the study along with the URL where the survey instrument can be found in order to gain participant cooperation. Additionally, DeVauss (2002) recommends using an internet survey software package to ensure anonymity and smooth implementation. For this study, the internet survey software package, eListen, was utilized to deploy the survey instrument and store participant responses. This software package allowed participants to respond to survey items anonymously. The data obtained was uploaded into SPSS for statistical analysis.

Data Analysis

Data for each of the three subquestions were collected and organized using eListen software. The numeric data were then uploaded into SPSS for further analysis while responses to open-ended questions were coded to provide additional insight into respondent perceptions of elements impacting their job satisfaction. The coding method consisted of organizing responses into general themes and recording the frequency of occurrences. The following paragraphs discuss the statistical approach and outcomes for each of the three research subquestions.

The first subquestion considered how job satisfaction varies within TCSG for full-time faculty. To determine the variation in job satisfaction, descriptive statistics and t-tests were calculated for each demographic grouping in the study. No statistically significant difference was found in the mean level of job satisfaction within the gender, years of experience, college size, and type of instructor demographic variables. It was found that a statistically significant difference exists at the 0.05 level of alpha in job satisfaction for the racial demographic variable between black respondents and respondents not identifying with any of the race choices listed on the survey instrument. Also, a statistically significant difference was found at the 0.05 level of alpha between respondents coming from K-12 institutions and business and industry as well as K-12 institutions and those coming from backgrounds other than the choices listed on the survey instrument. A statistically significant difference was found at the 0.01 level of alpha between K-12 respondents and post-secondary respondents, with the mean response value for K-12 respondents being higher.

The second subquestion examined how perceptions of elements within each of Bolman and Deal's four organizational frameworks vary. To determine how perceptions differ within each of the four frameworks, descriptive statistics were calculated for all respondents for survey items within each framework, responses to open-ended questions were coded and presented, and t-tests were calculated between demographic groupings for each survey item within a given framework.

Within the structural framework, t-test analyses showed a statistically significant difference between some groups for some of the survey items relating to that framework. After coding open-ended responses, it was found that "limited institutional communication" influenced full-time faculty job satisfaction the most. Within the symbolic framework, t-test analyses again show a statistically significant difference for some of the survey items for each demographic grouping and coding data reveals that having a supportive institutional culture impacted their job satisfaction the most. For the human resources framework, a statistically significant difference was found between some items within each demographic grouping except for the college size demographic variable. The most frequent open-ended response impacting job satisfaction was interaction with students. Similarly to t-test outcomes for the human resources framework, t-test

analyses within the political framework showed statistically significant differences between group perceptions of some survey items except for comparisons within the college size demographic variable. Coded responses within this framework revealed that overall organizational politics have a negative impact on full-time faculty job satisfaction.

Finally, the third subquestion considered the extent to which elements within Bolman and Deal's (2003) four organizational frameworks impact faculty job satisfaction. To better understand this relationship, a linear regression analysis and factor analysis were conducted. An initial linear regression analysis was conducted for each of the four organizational frameworks utilizing the question groupings outlined for each framework. For this regression analysis, each question within a framework grouping served as an independent variable and was compared to the job satisfaction dependent variable, survey item 32. The Pearson correlation coefficient, r, for each grouping is provided in Table 2 below:

Table 2

Organizational Framework	**r-value**
Structural Framework	0.847
Human Resources Framework	0.776
Political Framework	0.681
Symbolic Framework	0.682

The result of this linear regression suggests that elements within the structural framework are the strongest predictors of job satisfaction. An r-value of 0.847 was obtained, which suggests a strong positive correlation between the two. The human resources framework had the second highest correlation value, 0.776, which also suggests a strong positive correlation to job satisfaction. The correlation values for the political framework and symbolic framework were very similar at 0.681 and 0.682 respectively, suggesting that elements within each of these frameworks have roughly the same impact on job satisfaction and are less important to overall job satisfaction than elements found in the previous two frameworks.

To better understand the extent to which individual survey items within a given framework impact overall job satisfaction, a factor analysis was performed for each framework grouping. Component coefficients were calculated and used to create four new weighted factor variables in SPSS. These four new factor variables were used to perform a second linear regression analysis to determine the relationship between each of the weighted factor variables and survey item 32.

Structural Framework analysis. The factor analysis for the structural framework returned one factor variable. This factor analysis demonstrated that survey item 1, "feeling valued as an employee", is the best indicator of how the structural framework impacts job satisfaction. Survey item 5, "enjoying the work environment", was the second most important aspect of the structural framework. Survey item 28, "taking part in important decision making", was third. Items 17 and 21, "feedback from supervisors and autonomy", were of similar importance. And finally, items 13 and 9, "feeling that work is significant" and "compensation", were least important. Ultimately, all factor coefficients within this variable demonstrated a positive correlation to job satisfaction, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Structural Framework Item		Factor Coefficient
Survey item 1	I feel valued as an employee of my organization	0.858
Survey item 5	I enjoy my work environment.	0.794
Survey item 9	I am satisfied with my compensation	0.470
Survey item 13	I feel that my work is significant	0.531
Survey item 17	My supervisor does a good job of providing feedback	0.651
Survey item 21	I have autonomy within my job	0.641
Survey item 28	I get to take part in making important decisions within my organization	0.673

Human Resources Framework analysis. A factor analysis of the human resources framework survey items returned two factor variables. After creating each new factor variable and including it in a linear regression analysis of survey item 32, it was found that factor variable 1 had a Pearson's correlation value of 0.768 as compared to a value of 0.064 for variable 2; therefore, variable one was included in the analysis (see Table 4). The two strongest indicators of job satisfaction within the human resources framework were survey items 2 and 10. Item 2 considers "goal alignment between an employee and institution" while item 10 considers the "impact that full-time faculty employment has on an individual's self-esteem". Other elements within the framework carried r-values of less than 0.7. Again, all items within the human resources framework had a positive correlation with job satisfaction, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Human Resources Framework Item		Variable 1 Coefficients	Variable 2 Coefficients
Survey item 2	My personal goals align with the goals of my organization	0.763	-.005
Survey item 6	My work behavior is consistent with my supervisor's expectations	0.643	0.300
Survey item 10	My job helps build my self-esteem	0.751	0.059
Survey item 14	My relationships at work impact my level of job satisfaction.	0.201	0.671
Survey item 18	I feel that my job is secure	0.693	0.252
Survey item 22	My organization tries to promote from within	0.456	-0.390
Survey item 25	I am offered training for my job	0.460	-0.442
Survey item 29	My work is intellectually stimulating	0.627	-0.259

Political Framework analysis. The factor analysis for the political framework returned one factor variable. This analysis indicated that survey item 30, the "distribution of power within an organization" was the best indicator of job satisfaction within this framework; however, the "potential for expert knowledge to surpass formal authority" returned a similar value. All of the elements within this grouping were positively correlated to job satisfaction, except the feeling that "a technical college is very political." This item was negatively correlated with job satisfaction (see Table 5). This suggests that politics reduced job satisfaction for faculty.

Table 5

Political Framework Item		Factor Coefficient
Survey item 7	I feel that there are groups of people in my organization that I can relate to	0.536
Survey item 11	Expert knowledge is more powerful than formal authority in my organization	0.776
Survey item 15	My supervisor uses rewards to motivate me	0.535
Survey item 23	I feel that my organization is very political	-0.680
Survey item 30	I am satisfied with the distribution of power between groups in my organization	0.792

Symbolic Framework analysis. A factor analysis of the symbolic framework survey items returned two factor variables. After creating each new factor variable and including it in a linear regression analysis of survey item 32, it was found that factor variable one had a Pearson correlation value of 0.653 as compared to a value of 0.068 for variable two; therefore, variable one (1) is included in the analysis (see Table 6). Survey item 16, "creating a sense of community between diverse groups", was the strongest indicator of job satisfaction within this framework. Survey item 8, "alignment between individual and organizational values and priorities", was also a strong indicator of job satisfaction within this framework. Other items were found to less influential.

Table 6

Symbolic Framework Item		Variable 1 Coefficients	Variable 2 Coefficients
Survey item 4	The culture of my organization impacts my job satisfaction.	-.173	0.781
Survey item 8	My values and priorities match my organization's values and priorities.	0.748	-0.057
Survey item 12	Understanding the culture of my organization impacts my level of success.	0.191	0.752
Survey item 16	My organization develops a sense of community between diverse groups	0.797	-0.102
Survey item 20	My organization uses an orientation process	0.669	-0.064
Survey item 24	I spent time with members of my organization before beginning work	0.493	-0.191
Survey item 27	I regularly participate in organizational ceremonies	0.384	0.311
Survey item 31	Becoming part of the group is important in my organization	0.365	0.364

The four weighted factor variables were used to generate a linear regression analysis between each factor variable and question 32. The values of this regression can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7
Pearson coefficient with Factor Variables

Organizational Framework	r-value
Structural Framework	0.810
Human Resources Framework Variable 1	0.768
Human Resources Framework Variable 2	0.064
Political Framework	0.641
Symbolic Framework Variable 1	0.653
Symbolic Framework Variable 2	0.068

The result of this regression analysis suggests that full-time faculty job satisfaction is most influenced by elements found within the structural framework. Elements within the human resources framework have the second greatest impact on job satisfaction followed by elements within the symbolic and political frameworks respectively.

Limitations

Before we discuss our conclusions, it must be noted that this study has three important limitations that constrain the generalizability of the findings. First, while there were 2,219 full-time faculty members working in the technical college system at the time the survey was administered, only 278 full-time faculty completed the survey. Given that there is very little research regarding faculty job satisfaction within the technical college environment, we believe that this study is a step towards unveiling what institutions can do to facilitate job satisfaction. We suggest that this study be replicated to further substantiate our conclusions. A second limitation involves the demographic data. Given the limited demographic data for full-time faculty within the Technical College System of Georgia, differences between respondents and the total full-time faculty population are somewhat ambiguous. Future studies could expand upon this work to account for this difference. A third consideration must be given to the limitations surrounding the research design itself. While participant responses were anonymous, some may have believed their responses could be tracked and were, thereby, influenced to answer positively. This concern arises based on feedback given within open-ended questions.

Discussion and Conclusions

Full-time faculty members are typically satisfied with their jobs although there is variability in the perception of how satisfied members are within demographic groupings (see Appendix A). The only statistically significant differences in satisfaction were found between Black respondents and "Other" respondents and also within the previous employment variable between the K-12 group and all other groups. This difference suggests that Black and K-12 respondents have a higher level of association with elements presented within the study that are positively correlated with job satisfaction, are less likely to be impacted by elements that limit job satisfaction, or typically find a balance between those groups of elements which allows them to be significantly more satisfied than other respondents. For example, Black and K-12

respondents are likely to be more satisfied with the level of autonomy provided within their respective institutions, take part in organizational ceremonies, find their work rewarding, feel that they are supported by others within the organization, and are less impacted by the political power struggles that exist among various groups within the organization. The fact that there is not a significant difference in the perceived level of job satisfaction among the other demographic groups suggests that elements presented within the four frameworks have comparable influences among these groups. According to this study, gender, years of experience, type of instructor, and the size of the technical college are not the best predictors of potential job satisfaction. This supports and advances the work of Bozeman and Gaughen (2011) by expanding their findings to the unique environment of technical education.

Respondent feedback for subgroups of questions within each organizational framework supports the belief that there is variability among faculty perceptions of elements comprising each framework. Variability was found within most demographic groupings within each framework suggesting that faculty have different fundamental reactions to organizational elements. This also suggests that organizations have variability in the degree to which organizational attributes are expressed. For example, some technical colleges may foster work environments that are more mechanistic in nature whereas others may promote a more organic setting. Some colleges may be more politically oriented than others or some colleges may promote better unity among groups than others. We conclude that differences within the work environments of technical colleges coupled with innate differences in individual perceptions lead to variability in how faculty perceive and react to elements within each of the four organizational frameworks. Such perceptions and reactions ultimately shape the level of job satisfaction held by full-time faculty members within the TCSG.

It was found that elements within the structural framework have the greatest impact on full-time faculty job satisfaction within the TCSG. Full-time faculty members were most impacted by "how they perceive the administration" of the technical college in which they work. It became clear that faculty value autonomy, clear communication, feedback, support from administrators, and being treated as academic authorities within their respective disciplines. Our study suggests that faculty job satisfaction is limited by administrators that give assignments that are perceived as being menial, by administrators that micro-manage, do not provide a sufficient level of support, or do not provide regular feedback. The positive correlation between faculty job satisfaction and a supportive work environment is consistent with the findings of Zabriskie, Dey, and Riegle (2002). We found that full-time faculty within the TCSG primarily derived satisfaction from intrinsic aspects of their work environments with "the need to feel valued" having the single greatest impact on full-time faculty job satisfaction overall.

Elements within the human resources framework were the second largest contributors to full-time faculty job satisfaction. The most significant component within this group was found to be "employee and institutional goal alignment". Individuals would most like to feel their efforts are contributing to a cause they perceive to be worthwhile and are thus satisfying basic intrinsic needs as well. Another strong contributor within the human resources framework was the "desire to do work that builds self-esteem". This suggests that individuals chose the technical school system because they felt that they would be successful. Responses to an open-ended question relating to the human resources framework suggest that "interactions with students" and "the nature of the work being performed" are the greatest contributors to satisfying these intrinsic needs. Our conclusions regarding this framework further confirm and expand the findings of Truell, Price, and Joyner (1998) and Waltman, Bergom, et.al. (2012).

Within the political framework, "power distributions" among groups impacted faculty job satisfaction more than other aspects of this framework. For example, one respondent directly stated "yes, group politics has had a negative impact on job satisfaction" and another remarked that "[politics] creates an environment of distrust, resentment and professional dishonesty." While there is variability in the perception of organizational politics within the TCSG, some faculty felt their job satisfaction was limited by favoritism within their organizations. This, in turn, led to feelings of isolation for some faculty. Overall, faculty felt that organizational politics had a negative impact on their job satisfaction and felt that their educational contributions were undermined by affiliations between groups.

Finally, within the symbolic framework, "developing a sense of community between diverse groups" had the most influence on full-time faculty job satisfaction within the TCSG. This outcome confirms and expands the findings of Chatman (1991) and suggests that a sense of unity within the organization is important. This supports the conclusion that faculty members desire support within their respective organizational roles. Based on feedback to an open-ended question related to the structural framework, the "diverse groups" were not necessarily limited to gender, race, or instructor type groupings. Faculty and administration were considered diverse groups within the organization, which again supports the conclusion that full-time faculty job satisfaction is most impacted by administrators within the organization. Ultimately, faculty typically desired to have a supportive, community-oriented relationship with their supervisors as well as with one another.

Implications

The implications for this study are far reaching in the technical college community. We suggest and urge administrators working within the Technical College System of Georgia to use the outcomes of this project to consider the creation of environments that foster higher levels of job satisfaction. Outcomes of the study may be used to enhance the efficiency of current hiring and retention practices within the system in an effort to limit the expenses associated with employee turnover. Namely, financial costs associated with advertising vacant positions can be limited, lower levels of morale among existing employees can be reduced, organizational cultures can be developed more fully with increased retention, and services provided to students may be improved given that the acclimation periods for new employees would be less of an issue.

The study's findings may be particularly important to educational policymakers. Local and state level policies may be reviewed within the context of this study to ensure that factors leading to improved levels of job satisfaction are maximized while those elements limiting full-time faculty job satisfaction are minimized. Namely, policies and procedures should be developed in a way that allows for faculty input, that enhance levels of autonomy, that encourage communication between faculty and various levels of administration, and that provide regular feedback from supervisors to faculty members.

Educational administrators within the Technical College System of Georgia should continue to work towards creating environments that are supportive in nature. Administrators must also diligently strive to be cognizant of the impact that clear and open communication has on faculty morale and should request faculty input in organizational decision-making when appropriate. A recurring response to one open-ended question was that faculty did not feel they were respected for their levels of experience and education, which led to lower levels of job

satisfaction. As such, we suggest that administrators re-examine measures that ensure that faculty are treated as academic professionals. We concur with Chatman (1991), that administrators should develop and schedule organizational events that allow diverse groups of faculty the opportunity to interact in order to promote communication among faculty members as well as between faculty and administration. Such interactions will allow faculty the opportunity to find other faculty members that share similar core values, which has been shown to improve job satisfaction and retention (Kelchtermans, G. & Vandenberghe, R.1996; Meir and Hasson, 1982; Marcus, 1998). By having a greater understanding of how various aspects of the technical organization impact full-time faculty, we believe there is a greater potential for educational administrators to develop and sustain environments that promote faculty job satisfaction.

References

Bolman, L.G., and Deal, T. (2003). *Reframing Organizations (3rd ed.).* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bozeman, B. and Gaughan, M. (2011). Job satisfaction among university faculty: individual, work, and institutional determinants. *Journal of Higher Education,* 82, p. 154-186.

Brewer, E.W., and McMahan-Landers, J. (2003). Job satisfaction among industrial and technical teacher educators. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education,* 40 (2). Retrieved February 20, 2008, http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JITE/v40n2/brewer.html#sanderson

Chatman, Jennifer A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 333-349.

Chen, S. H., Yang, C. C., Shiau, J.Y. and Wang, H. H. (2006), "The Development of an Employee satisfaction model for higher education", *The TQM Magazine*, Vol.18 No. 5, pp. 484-500.

Cohen, A., and Brawer, F.B. (2003). *The American Community College.* San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Dittmer, L. (1977). Political culture and political symbolism: Toward a theoretical synthesis. *World Politic, 29,* 552-583.

DeVaus, D. (2002). *Surveys in Social Research (5th ed.).* London: Routledge.

Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values.* Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Hoy, W., & Miskel, C. (2005). *Educational Administration* (7th ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.

HRMS Inc. 2005. *U.S. job satisfaction* keeps falling, the conference board reports today. NetAssets. Retrieved January 27, 2008, from www.hrms-netassets.net/templates/template.asp?articleid=832%26zoneid=29.

Jackson, Sonja Peters (2000) An environmental assessment of community college faculty satisfaction. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Central Florida, United States -- Florida. Retrieved February 6, 2008, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 9977815).

Johnsrud, L. K., & Heck, R. H. (1994). A university's faculty: Predicting those who will stay and those who leave. *Journal for Higher Education Management, 10,* 71–84.

Kelly, J.D. (1989). Gender, pay, and job satisfaction in journalism. *Journalism Quarterly,* 66, 446-452.

Kelchtermans, G., Vandenberghe, R. (1996). Becoming political: A dimension in teacher's professional development. A micropolitical analysis of teacher's professional biographies. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New York, April 8-12, 1996.

Kessler, Stacey R. (2007) The effects of organizational structure on faculty job performance, job satisfaction, and counterproductive work behavior. Ph.D. dissertation, University of South Florida, United States -- Florida. Retrieved January 31, 2008, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3260070).

Levin, J.S., Kater, S., & Wagoner, R.L. (2006). *Community college faculty at work in the new economy.* New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Marcus, Laurence R. (1998). Threats to staff diversity: A case study. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Meir and Hasson (1982). Congruence between personality type and environment type as a predictor of stay in an environment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 21, 309-317.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and around organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Palmer, J. (1987). The Characteristics and Educational Objectives of Students Serviced by Community College Vocational Curricula. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles.

Sanderson, A., Phua, V. C., & Herda, D. (2000). *The American faculty poll*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 442527)

Seifert, T. A., & Umbach, P. D. (2008). The effects of faculty demographic characteristicsand disciplinary context on dimensions of job satisfaction. *Research in HigherEducation, 49,* 357–381.

Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership and Administration*. New York: Harper Collins.

Smart, J. C. (1990). A causal model of faculty turnover intentions. *Research in Higher Education*, *31*, 405–424.

Steers, R.M., and Porter, L.W. (1991). *Motivation and Work Behavior* (5th edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Syptak J.M., Marsland D.W., & D. Ulmer (1999). Job satisfaction: Putting theory into practice. *Family Practice Management,* 6(9).

Truell, A. D., Price, W. T., & Joyner, R. L. (1998). Job satisfaction among community college occupational technical faculty. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 22, 111-122.

Waltman, J., Bergom, I., Hollenshead, C., Miller, J. & August, L. (2012). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among non-tenure-track faculty. *Journal of Higher Education,* 83, 411-434.

Weiler,W. C. (1985).Why do faculty members leave the university? *Research in Higher Education*, *23*, 270–277.

Zabriskie, M.S., Dey, E.L, and Riegle, S.G. (2002). Job satisfaction in teaching: An examination of personal and environmental influences on faculty. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Institutional Research. Toronto, June 2-5.

Appendix A

Participant Demographic Data

Gender	n	Relative Percent
Female	165	59.35%
Male	104	37.41%
No Response	9	3.24%
Race/Ethnicity	n	Relative Percent
White	218	78.42%
Black	29	10.43%
Hispanic	6	2.16%
Asian	5	1.80%
Other	11	3.96%
No Response	9	3.24%
Years of Employment	n	Relative Percent
0-1	33	11.87%
2-5	110	39.57%
6-9	46	16.55%
10 or more	77	27.70%
No Response	12	4.32%
Size of College	n	Relative Percent
Small	40	14.39%
Medium	89	32.01%
Large	135	48.56%
No Response	14	5.04%
Previous Employment	n	Relative Percent
K-12	38	13.67%
Post Secondary	41	14.75%
Business/Industry	127	45.68%
Other	61	21.94%
No Response	11	3.96%

Bee Hart is a Math Instructor in the General Education Department at Southeastern Technical College in Vidalia, Georgia.

Brenda Marina is an Associate Professor in Educational Leadership/Higher Education Administration at Georgia Southern University in Statesboro, Georgia.