

CORRELATION BETWEEN FACULTY SATISFACTION
AND STUDENT SATISFACTION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

A Thesis

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Bachelor of Science in Business Administration in the
Fisher College of Business at The Ohio State University

By

Kristin Ann Kroncke

* * * * *

The Ohio State University
2006

Thesis Examination Committee:

Dr. H. Rao Unnava, Advisor

Dr. Venkat Bendapudi

Nancy Lahmers, JD

Approved by

Advisor
Department of Marketing & Logistics

ABSTRACT

In an effort to stay competitive in the increasingly more challenging business world, companies are constantly trying to develop new ways in which to improve their organizations. One way to accomplish this is by improving overall employee satisfaction, which has been found to be correlated with increased customer satisfaction, and increased profits. Thus, by gaining a greater understanding of their employees' perceived level of satisfaction, and by working toward enhancing it, organizations should be able to better serve their customers.

While the evidence on higher employee satisfaction being correlated with greater customer satisfaction is presented in the literature, it is mostly anecdotal. Further, research has not looked into various facets of employee satisfaction and how they relate to various facets of customer satisfaction. Finally, while employee satisfaction issues have been discussed in various organizational settings, I have not been able to locate research on faculty satisfaction and its relationship to various aspects of student satisfaction in a university setting.

My research seeks to examine the correlations between several aspects of faculty satisfaction and student satisfaction within a university setting. In this environment, faculty members are employees of the organization and students may be viewed as its customers. Each group derives satisfaction from different aspects of what occurs at the university, yet the satisfaction experienced by one group is expected to affect their

performance, and thus the satisfaction experienced by the other group. For example, a faculty member who is happy with his or her colleagues may be motivated to do more team-teaching and enhance the learning experience (and thus satisfaction) of students.

This project requires data to be gathered from two groups – faculty and students. Data on faculty satisfaction with various aspects of their job are available by department through an organization that conducts such surveys at various universities every three years. To understand student satisfaction, a survey of current undergraduate students will also be undertaken. The survey will examine student satisfaction with various aspects of their academic experience at the university. Based on the data obtained from the two surveys, we plan to compute correlations between facets of faculty satisfaction that are hypothesized to have the greatest impact on student satisfaction.

I believe that this research will not only help The Ohio State University and its various departments, but also any other university that is interested in enhancing the satisfaction levels of its various constituents. University administrators can use this information to understand which aspects of their work experience faculty members of a certain department are more satisfied with and whether this has an effect on student satisfaction. This research model may be applied for further study by analyzing universities that are different than the large, urban, public university that has been surveyed in this study. The concept of correlating facets of employee satisfaction to customer satisfaction could also be applied to any organizational setting. This additional research will advance the understanding of employee and customer satisfaction and the correlations discovered through this study.

Dedicated to my loving family and Andrew

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Rao Unnava, my advisor, for his encouragement, effort, and enthusiasm for my project. None of this would have been possible without Rao's belief in undergraduate students and passion for seeing us succeed.

I am also grateful for Nancy Lahmers and Dr. Venkat Bendapudi for agreeing to participate on the examination committee and listen to my project's defense. I also wish to thank Drs. Wayne Hoy and Heather Davis from the College of Education for their insights into the relevant correlations that can be recognized through this study. I also greatly appreciate Amy Biesenthal's advice and resources from her past research experience and the encouragement and support of Nicole Votolato.

I am also indebted to the 750 respondents to the student survey. Over 70% of these participants answered less than a week after my original email, and I am incredibly grateful for their assistance. I would also like to thank the dozens of individuals who sent the survey to a variety of list serves before I was able to obtain students' email addresses.

Finally, I am eternally grateful for the continued loving support of my family and close friends in this and all of my academic and extracurricular pursuits. Thank you to my mother for instilling in me a passion for education and to my father for encouraging my interest in business. I also thank Andrew Schrader for inspiring me to pursue research and supporting me every step of the way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract.....	ii
Dedication.....	iv
Acknowledgments.....	v
List of Tables.....	viii
List of Figures.....	ix
 Chapters:	
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Literature Review.....	5
2.1 Faculty Satisfaction.....	5
2.2 Student Satisfaction.....	12
2.3 Relationship Between Faculty Satisfaction and Student Satisfaction.....	17
3. Research Methods.....	19
4. Analysis of Survey Results.....	24
4.1 Why Students Decided to Attend Ohio State.....	24
4.2 Students’ Satisfaction with Faculty Teaching.....	25
4.3 Students’ Perceptions of Academic Effectiveness.....	27
4.4 Faculty Satisfaction.....	29
4.5 Correlations.....	30
5. Conclusions.....	34
5.1 Summary.....	34
5.1.1 Analysis of Why Students Decided to Attend Ohio State.....	34
5.1.2 Analysis of Students’ Satisfaction with Faculty Teaching.....	35
5.1.3 Analysis of Students’ Perception of Academic Effectiveness.....	36
5.1.4 Analysis of Faculty Satisfaction.....	37
5.1.5 Analysis of Correlations.....	38
5.2 Contributions.....	40
5.3 Related Future Research.....	43
5.4 Research Conclusion.....	44

Bibliography.....	46
Appendices.....	53
1. The Student Survey.....	54
2. The Faculty Survey.....	58

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
4.1 Major Faculty Qualities Contributing to Students' Overall Satisfaction.....	26
4.2 Major Contributors to Faculty's Overall Job Satisfaction.....	29
4.3 Correlations Related to Overall Faculty Satisfaction.....	31
4.4 Correlations Related to Overall Student Satisfaction.....	31
4.5 Additional Correlations between Faculty Social Relationships and Facets of Student Satisfaction.....	32

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
4.1 Why Students Decided to Attend Ohio State.....	24
4.2 Students' Satisfaction with Facets of Faculty Teaching in Major Area of Study.....	27
4.3 Students' Perception of Academic Effectiveness.....	28
4.4 Facets of Faculty's Job Satisfaction.....	30

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The university experience has long been thought of as a time of change and excitement. Students eagerly embark on their adventure towards independence and personal growth while collegiate faculty annually prepare for a new year of cognitive challenge in the three areas in which they serve: research, teaching, and service (Middaugh 2001). While pursuing these various endeavors, it is possible to forget that a university is in fact a business, one that competes for the best students and faculty. Satisfying these stakeholders, therefore, is critical to the overall prosperity of the university, but evaluating student and faculty satisfaction is a complicated task. The purpose of this analysis is to gain an understanding of faculty satisfaction, conduct an assessment of student satisfaction, and to determine useful correlations between these two components that will be useful in improving higher education.

Unlike the many businesses that develop concrete, reproducible items, a university encompasses the characteristics related to a service industry. Shank *et al.* (1995) states that:

Educational services are intangible, heterogeneous, inseparable from the person delivering it, variable, perishable, and the customer (student) participates in the process. Additionally, colleges and universities are increasingly finding

themselves in an environment that is conducive to understanding the role and importance of service quality; this environment is a fiercely competitive one.

As is evident from this final statement, competition in higher education is just as prevalent as in any other organization, so it makes the understanding of student satisfaction all the more critical to the university's success.

Since faculty member play a vital role in contributing to student satisfaction, many hypothesize that one of the best ways to affect student satisfaction is to increase job satisfaction among the university's faculty members. In 1992, it was estimated that over 5,000 articles and dissertations have been performed on the topic of job satisfaction (Cranny *et al.*, 1992). In the years that have passed since then, this number has naturally increased even more. The obvious interest in the subject illustrates the belief in the significance that employee satisfaction can have on an organization. Staples *et al.* (1998) suggest that the reason for this overwhelming interest is that work takes up such a significant amount of a person's life, so increasing an individual's overall satisfaction with his or her employment will improve the overall well-being of society.

Before a study of any type of satisfaction may be performed, it is essential to gain an understanding of this vague concept. Locke (1976), one of the most well-known researchers in job satisfaction, defines the concept as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences." Locke differentiates the concept of "satisfaction" from other similar concepts like "morale" and "job involvement" by clarifying his belief that satisfaction is based on a past or present assessment. It is also different because it is based on the opinion of one individual rather than a group appraisal.

One key component of satisfaction is the individuals' perception of what they will receive from their experience with the organization (Staples 1998). This component can apply to both employee and customer satisfaction. Many models have been developed to illustrate this phenomenon. These satisfaction models have found that individuals' perceived levels of satisfaction are based on their expectations of the service's quality. If the service meets the individuals' predictions, then they will be satisfied. If the service is below or above the preconceived expectations, then satisfaction levels will decrease or increase, respectively (Joseph *et al.*, 2005).

Another satisfaction model defines a "zone of tolerance" where individuals will be satisfied. Like the previous models, this, too, relies on a preconceived expectation of anticipated performance, but it develops these theories into the idea that as long as the service quality is within this predetermined range of acceptability, the individuals will basically be satisfied. This is a more flexible way of assessing satisfaction than the previous models (Berry *et al.*, 1991).

In addition to what the individual perceives as getting, another key component of satisfaction is the importance of what is desired (Staples 1998). Locke (1976) divides this into two categories: needs and values. The concept of a need is further divided into physical needs and psychological needs which make up his broad definition for the term: "objective requirements of an organism's survival and well-being." Needs are essentially objective in nature, but values are subjective opinions of what the individual wants and seeks to obtain. Both must be satisfied in order for the individual to feel the fullest level of satisfaction.

In this analysis, the concept of faculty satisfaction has been analyzed by reviewing studies related to job satisfaction. The opinions of students, who are the recipients of their faculty experts' services, will be studied by looking at customer satisfaction research. Facets of employee and customer satisfaction will be analyzed and compared to determine if one particular facet of faculty satisfaction correlates to the improvement in a facet of student satisfaction. The implications of these results and recommendations for further research will conclude this analysis.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Faculty Satisfaction

When analyzing the notion of job satisfaction, many researchers make the assumption that the more satisfied employees are, the more productive they will be, which will result in increased profits for their companies. Many studies have been conducted that validate this seemingly logical assumption beginning with Brayfield and Crockett in 1955. Countless analyses have been conducted on this subject, and this research still continues to this day (Katzell *et al.* 1992).

The majority of these early studies came to the conclusion that although the two variables of job satisfaction and job performance are related, the relationship was weak with the central tendency being low with large variation among the correlations. One such study by Iaffaldano *et al.* (1985) stated not only that the relationship between these two was slight, but also that the results that stated that the correlation was stronger was due to small sample sizes thus causing unreliable results. Indeed, further research into the subject throughout the 1960's until the early 1990's resulted in inconsistent and conflicting evidence on this relationship (Katzell *et al.* 1992).

Fisher (1980) hypothesized that the difficulty in understanding this relationship was due to the complexities involved in relating an attitude (satisfaction) to a behavior (performance). She argues that analysis of a single behavior, a common way that job satisfaction researchers approach the subject, is not an effective way to predict a general attitude.

There is no reason to expect a single measure of performance to be related to overall job satisfaction. What should be strongly related to job satisfaction is a multiple-act, multiple-observation measure of a variety of work behaviors.

Fisher further contends that satisfaction should be measured on the basis of an analysis of several job facets that relate to the specific situation being examined. The questionnaires used for this research have been designed and analyzed with this consideration in mind.

As is evident from these studies, job satisfaction is a complex condition to understand. This is complicated further when considering that job satisfaction is one of the interrelated parts that make up one's aggregate level of satisfaction with life. Such components that effect employee satisfaction include aspects of one's job satisfaction such as contentment with pay, supervisors, coworkers, and the work itself. Yet satisfaction is also affected by one's satisfaction at home including satisfaction with family life, social activities, and marriage. Recent work by Judge *et al.* (2004) confirms the positive relationship between moods and satisfaction at work and home. Smith (1992) uses an image of a river to illustrate this complex system. The main river itself represents one's total life satisfaction which is fed by numerous tributaries and streams that represent the various facets that effect one's aggregate satisfaction. These offshoots would include job satisfaction as well as marriage, family and leisure satisfaction.

Additional branches off of the streams of job satisfaction would include components like satisfaction with workers, superiors, pay and workload.

The image of overall life satisfaction being illustrated like a complex river is useful for a number of reasons. For one, it shows the interrelation between the different facets of one's job satisfaction and satisfaction outside of work. By placing the facets of these images as offshoots to the main body of water, this image illustrates that the process of changing a major facet of life satisfaction like job satisfaction would take time and cannot be completely satisfied by changing only one of the total number of facets. Unfortunately, the illustration fails to show that the dissatisfaction with one facet, like an undesirable relationship with one's supervisor, can result in troublesome behaviors like absenteeism or poor performance. This should be visualized as a hindrance to the river's flow. These results can stem from a number of different causes, though, and Smith (1992) suggests that further research should still be performed on relating these results to their causes.

Dozens of studies have been conducted to analyze the various facets that specifically affect employee satisfaction. Participation in organizational decision making has been proven to impact both satisfaction and productivity in a positive way with a greater effect on satisfaction than productivity (Miller *et al.* 1986). One exception to this latter finding has been when employees participate in goal setting as this interestingly appears to have a negative effect on productivity. An employee's relationship with his or her supervisor has also been found to be related to overall satisfaction. Schmit *et al.* (1995) found that positive attitudes resulting from this relationship will result in

improved customer service as long as this relationship is not hindered by corporate-level policies and procedures that do not support this bond.

Many other studies contribute to the vast amount of analysis on the various facets of job satisfaction. Loher *et al.* (1985) studied the importance of job enrichment by attempting to discover correlations in job characteristics and job satisfaction. Their study identified individuals as having either a high or low “growth need strength,” and this appeared to impact these individuals’ desire for a more enriched profession as a stronger growth need strength indicated that the employee desired more challenging job responsibilities. Similarly, Miller *et al.* (1986) discovered that the more employees are able to participate in the decision making process at their jobs, the more satisfied these workers become.

As can be expected, wages play a major role in determining an employee’s level of satisfaction. In the March and Simon model, expected rewards have a positive relationship on performance (Schwab *et al.* 1970). Additionally, satisfaction with benefits has been found to have an impact on job satisfaction as well as customer perceptions of service quality (Snipes *et al.* 2005). Lawler found that dissatisfaction with pay often causes higher employee absenteeism and turnover. The critical determinant of whether employees are satisfied with their pay is if there is a sense of fairness in their compensation compared to fellow employees performing similar jobs (Sweeney *et al.* 2005). Of particular note is the study by Curall *et al.* (2005) who surveyed over 6,000 public school teachers’ satisfaction with their pay and discovered that the higher their satisfaction, the better their performance. This study is especially relevant considering

the similarity in professions between public school teachers and a public university's faculty.

Researchers have discovered that another major impact on the job satisfaction yielding better job performance relationship includes situational variables. Whenever employees lack such items as financial and managerial support, time, or information, the employee's performance potential will be constrained (Peters *et al.* 1980). Many researchers have studied the impact of organizational pressure to be productive and its impact on performance. In 1959, Triandis discovered that additional organizational pressure would increase performance because managerial pressure for performance would illustrate the importance the organization placed on being productive.

Unfortunately, this researcher also discovered that this increased focus on performance lowered employees' satisfaction. As can be expected, then, in situations of extreme performance pressure, both job performance and employee satisfaction would eventually decrease. One way that managers may apply pressure on their employees is by placing immediate deadlines on projects. Bhagat's research (1982) indicates that this time pressure may affect satisfaction levels because employees will do the work because of the pressure they are under, but not because they enjoy the job. The latter feeling indicates a low feeling of satisfaction, and this would also cause concern of a lack of quality in the work. Herman (1973) suggests that removing these situational constraints will cause the employees' attitudes, knowledge, skills, and behaviors to be the significant variables that will affect performance. These studies again illustrate the complexities of the satisfaction-performance relationship.

In addition to these organization-related effects on satisfaction, a number of facets that are internalized within the individual employee are just as important in determining job satisfaction as any other variable. These include the employee's mood and life interests. Ilies *et al.* (2002) found that these internal variables caused 36% of the variance in employees' satisfaction. The employees' mood accounted for 29% of this variance. In other words, employees whose moods varied more across time rated their level of job satisfaction more variably when surveyed on different occasions than those whose moods were more consistent. An employee's mood and satisfaction level were always positively related in this study. Butler *et al.* (1999) take this idea one step further by stating that no matter how committed an employee is to the job and no matter the individual's skills, background, or excellence in completing the work, an employee will still not be completely satisfied unless the individual is doing work that the author says addresses his or her "deeply embedded life interests." This research argues that although skills can be trained into an employee, the individual will not stay satisfied for the long-term unless the job is fulfilling one of these passions. The importance of these intrinsic factors was studied by Snipes *et al.* (2005) who discovered that these facets were significant in impacting customer perspectives of service quality.

Other researchers have analyzed the idea that performing well on the job has a greater impact on one's satisfaction than the opposite hypothesized relationship (Schwab *et al.* 1970). Although many studies have been conducted and models have been developed to illustrate the validity of this assumption, for the purposes of this study, this hypothesis will be ignored. This is due to the difficulty in assessing this relationship with the variables that will be tested. Gauging a student's performance would require a

number of separate studies in and of itself, and it still would be difficult to determine whether the student's success is directly related to one particular faculty member's influence. The same complications arise in assessing faculty satisfaction as there are so many components that make up this contract. The decision to ignore this hypothesis is justified by Fisher (1980) who states that even if performance caused satisfaction, the same recommendations for action will still apply, and these applications are the primary purpose of this study.

According to a recent poll from the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), the top five "important" job components to employees differed slightly to the ones human resource professionals believed that employees valued (Podolske 2003). Among these differences is employees' apparent desire for flexibility in balancing work and life issues. More and more, companies are adding additional benefits to their workplace to make employees' lives easier. Employers that are frequently ranked on *Fortune* magazine's "100 Best Companies to Work for" are often the leaders in creating these benefits. Clearly, increasing employees' satisfaction is a priority for many companies as they all believe that this will improve their overall performance.

It is clear from the results of these studies that a vast amount of research has been conducted in the complex area of job satisfaction. There are numerous elements that contribute to an employee's satisfaction with his or her job, and this satisfaction has the potential to influence the organization's success. A candid measure of the success of a business is by understanding the company's customers' satisfaction. A great amount of research accompanies this concept as well, and this will be the next topic before the correlations between faculty and student satisfaction will be analyzed.

2.2 Student Satisfaction

Previously, it was stated that members of a university's faculty have three primary purposes in which they serve: research, teaching, and service (Middaugh 2001).

Although the existence and nature of these three components will not be analyzed in this discussion, the fact of their existence is mentioned for the purpose of acknowledging that professors are called to be versatile in their roles. How well they balance these three could potentially differ a great deal in the eyes of those whom they serve. For example, many students are primarily concerned with only the teaching portion of professors' responsibilities and largely ignore the other two components that are often equally or perhaps more important to both the university administration and faculty. A student's perception of this single facet of the professor's abilities is therefore a narrow one.

Acknowledging this, it is the belief of the researcher that students' opinions of their faculty experience still carry a great deal of weight as they are a key benefactor of a university experience and can greatly impact a university's future well-being.

Understanding, therefore, that although students' perspectives are limited, student satisfaction will still be analyzed in this study under the context of understanding the general concept of customer satisfaction.

The idea of treating students as a school's customers is easy to debate, particularly in a university setting. Students will often choose their university or specific academic department based on its reputation, and universities and even the same school's academic departments will often compete in attracting the best students. Like any other business, a university exists in a highly competitive environment. Unfortunately, many would argue that what pleases students is often not the most beneficial for their understanding of the

different courses' concepts. Students are often characterized as being prone to laziness and the desire to complete assignments in the simplest way possible not realizing that education often requires an abundance of hard work and self-discipline. Although this stereotype is not necessarily true, due to these opinions and other reasons, many protest the idea of placing a great deal of importance on students' evaluation of their instructors as students will sometimes choose to give a professor a lower rating solely for the reason that the professor's course was difficult. Those who feel that students' evaluation is not a useful measurement for assessing the quality of the faculty members support their opinion by arguing that employers are often dissatisfied with students' performance saying that new graduates are not ready for work, so they feel that the expectations of students should continue to be more challenging than what students' desire. Balancing the satisfaction of students with the opinions of these external parties is a challenge for administrators and professors, but this equilibrium must be found (Winer 1999).

Despite the difficulties in basing this assessment solely on the perspectives of students, many believe that their satisfaction is extremely important to the vitality of the university. These individuals point to the increasing competition between universities and that students are becoming more discriminatory in their selection of where to go for their higher education and more demanding of their chosen institution. "It is important then for institutions to understand what incoming students desire (and increasingly expect) from the institution of their choice," states Joseph *et al.* (2005). Indeed, Dominowski writes, "Students are...the consumers of instructional programs, so their evaluations of courses provide a kind of index of customer satisfaction" (2002). This researcher also notes the importance of students' evaluation of professors as it can be an

excellent way to assess the effectiveness of faculty's teaching. Research has even found a positive relationship between students' assessments of faculty effectiveness and the self-assessments of professors themselves (Howard *et al.* 1985).

Additionally, the opinions of students in formal assessments have been found to be very useful in several ways. For administrative reasons, student assessments can often influence a faculty member's salary, tenure, and hierarchical rank in the university. The faculty members also often use these assessments to improve their teaching style. Another reason is that these evaluations can provide a breadth of knowledge to contribute to research on education topics. Finally, these surveys have even been used by academic advisors to aid students in knowing, when they select their courses, which professors would best suit their educational needs (Doyle 1975).

Like job satisfaction, the concept of customer satisfaction is also challenging to understand due to the variety of components that affect it. Even the definitions of customer satisfaction differ significantly (Babin *et al.* 1998). Hunt (1977) says "[c]onsumer satisfaction with a product refers to the favorableness of the individual's subjective evaluation of the various outcomes and experiences associated with buying it or using it." Another definition states that satisfaction is "an evaluation of the surprise inherent in a product acquisition and/or consumption experience" (Oliver 1981). Clearly, the concept is broad and one that requires some clarification, but both of these descriptions are helpful in understanding the complexity of this idea.

There are many difficulties involved in managing a customer's satisfaction, and these are particularly complicated in the education sector. Because education is a service, it is often challenging to increase both customer satisfaction and productivity

concurrently (Anderson *et al.* 1997). One of the contributors to this fact is that customer satisfaction is more dependent on customization, yet increased productivity often requires more standardization. In an education-related context, this can best be described by understanding that students generally prefer smaller classes where they can contribute more to course discussion and receive personal attention from the professor, but this is significantly more costly and less efficient than educating students in a large-classroom setting.

Another element that contributes to the complexity of this understanding is a customer's perception of quality, which has been found to have a direct relationship with the individual's level of satisfaction (Cronin *et al.* 1992). A customer's satisfaction with a service is often an essential method used to evaluate its quality. Although it is typically not the case in a higher education setting that students' satisfaction would be the only method for judging a school's quality, this measure can greatly impact external perceptions of a university who are interested in statistics like student retention (Athiyaman 1997). Other important stakeholders in this process who are involved in gauging its quality include the financial providers of the student's education, employers, current professionals in the field of study, and the community at large (Lagrosen *et al.* 2004). Although these parties' opinions will not be sought during this study, it is the opinion of the researcher that they are still important to mention due to the potential impact that they could have on the student's satisfaction with the university experience.

Since quality has already been stated to play an important role in determining a student's level of satisfaction, it is now relevant to discuss a few of the various dimensions of quality. Some of the more widely used criteria include reliability,

responsiveness, competence, access, courtesy, communication, credibility, security, understanding the customer, and tangibles (Lagrosen *et al.* 2004). The student survey used in this research addresses many of these facets.

Research has found that quality can be measured in a variety of different ways. “Quality as exceptional” describes quality as exceeding high expectations. Quality measured in a manufacturing setting would often be described as “Quality as perfection or consistency” since these organizations place a high value on eliminating the number of defects in its operations. Quality that meets customer requirements would be described as “Quality as fitness for purpose.” This definition is one of the more appropriate measures in a higher education setting as it helps to describe why students are coming to a university. Quality that is related to costs is “Quality as value for money.” Finally, “Quality as transformation” describes processes that bring about a qualitative change which in a university setting might be skill or knowledge enhancement or increased confidence for students (Lagrosen *et al.* 2004).

Hill *et al.* (2003) discovered that the two most influential factors that contribute to a student’s perception of quality in higher education are the quality of the lecturer and the quality of the students’ support systems. The latter group of individuals is composed of peers, families, university services, and any environment where students could be surrounding “by a positive atmosphere that valued learning.” This will not be studied in this research. The quality of the lecturer, though, was the most important facet to a student’s perception of quality. The student survey used in this study will assess a variety of elements that will gauge the students’ overall perception of the quality of educators in their academic major.

2.3 Relationship between Faculty Satisfaction and Student Satisfaction

It is clear from the previous analyses that the concept of satisfaction for both employees and customers is quite complex. The question that remains, then, is if there is a relationship between these two variables? Instinctively, one would likely assert that one would affect the other. Unfortunately, there are no studies that correlate these two variables, but several that have been performed contribute to justifying this intuitive hypothesis.

Since students' perception of educational quality has been found to being positively correlated with their satisfaction, it is logical to try to understand if there is a relationship between employee satisfaction causing a higher quality educational experience. One recent article directly challenged the idea that there was not an adequate amount of research on this correlation. Wilson *et al.* (2004) concentrated their study on service organizations to determine if employee satisfaction impacts the quality of service performance. They stated in their conclusion that the most important outcome of their research is that service organizations, like educational institutions, "cannot ignore employee satisfaction in their attempt to deliver quality services." In an educational setting, Ostroff had similar results where schools with satisfied teachers were found to be more "effective" than schools with less satisfied educators (1992).

Both studies stressed the need for increased understanding of the various facets that cause this relationship. Ostroff (1992) questioned whether satisfied educators can hire fellow teachers who are more apt to be satisfied, or if this satisfaction can be nurtured into the individual person. This is important from a managerial standpoint of

understanding whether administrative support can cause increased satisfaction in educators or if this character trait is related solely to intrinsic factors beyond administration's control. Wilson *et al.* (2004) concluded their report by conceding that more research needs to be in place to understand the various dimensions that will cause either employees or customers to be more satisfied. The analyses performed for this project will seek to understand these various facets.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODS

The results of this study were primarily derived from the results of two main groups of surveys. Surveys were used because of their ability to be administered to a large number of people and because they allow for consistent responses that can be easily quantified. The faculty questionnaire was conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at the University of California at Los Angeles and is administered every three years to all regular faculty members at The Ohio State University. The data utilized for analysis was collected in 2005. In this survey, 1,061 regular faculty members responded representing a variety of academic departments. Although the survey administered by HERI collects a vast amount of information from its respondents, only those questions that deal with facets of faculty satisfaction were utilized in this analysis.

The HERI survey was chosen for a variety of reasons. One of the main reasons was that it is administered by a third-party which by nature minimizes researcher bias and confidentiality concerns. The survey's numerous respondents come from a diverse array of Ohio State's academic departments, and this reduces bias from participants. An added benefit of this survey was its ready availability by contacting Ohio State's Institutional Research and Planning Office. The last main advantage of this survey was that it was

conducted in the recent past, and this guarantees that the students surveyed would be reflecting on their interactions with virtually the same professors as those who answered the HERI questionnaire, a situation necessary for the validity of the hypotheses made in this study.

The faculty satisfaction data were factor analyzed and categorized into three separate groups to simplify the analysis process. The categories are job-related issues (which included the questions: opportunity for scholarly pursuits, autonomy in job, and competency of colleagues), extraneous variables (quality of students, visibility, and relationship with administration), and one based on relationships with colleagues (professional and social). Mean scores were computed for variables representing each factor and these means were then correlated with overall student satisfaction and overall faculty satisfaction.

The researcher developed the second survey. This involved a multi-step process which began when 150 students from a wide variety of academic majors were asked to name three words that they would use to describe an ideal professor in their academic department. This request generated sixty-nine responses, which represents a 46% response rate. The students answered with words like “Knowledge,” “Teaching,” “Fairness,” and “Clarity.” These results were used to determine the order and content of the student questionnaire. Those characteristics that students repeatedly found to be important were placed higher on the questionnaire so that the survey respondents would be more likely to answer that part of the survey even if they did not finish the bottom portion. The student survey was also based on the questions asked in the HERI faculty questionnaire.

In total, the student survey involved four parts. The first asked participants to assess the importance of a variety of characteristics in determining their decision to attend The Ohio State University. These included items like “Perceived value of degree,” “Geographic location,” and “Institutional emphasis on research.” Next, students were asked to state how satisfied they were with a variety of facets of faculty teaching as applied to those educators in their major area of study. Facets like “Knowledge of subject matter,” “Accessibility,” and “Ability to clearly communicate the subject matter” were all included.

Similar to the second portion of the survey, in the third part, students were asked to describe their belief of how effective faculty members in their major area of study are in instilling a variety of characteristics into their students. Such items like “Instilling an appreciation for liberal arts,” “Developing creativity,” and “Preparing students for graduate school” were included, and these items were based on the HERI faculty survey. All of these questions were evaluated on a 7-point Likert-type scale. Of the four portions of the students’ survey, this portion is the most controversial as researchers have argued about the difficulty in measuring effectiveness in an educational setting for several decades. Of the many reasons cited in these articles, one that is especially interesting is that most evaluations of academic effectiveness have focused on efficiency rather than a true evaluation of how effective the university actually is in serving its students (Cameron 1978). To measure effectiveness, then, it is logical to ask the students their opinions, and this portion of the survey seeks to understand these students’ perceptions.

The final portion of the survey asks for demographic information like gender, academic rank, and academic department. 40.4% of the survey’s respondents were male,

and 73.1% of respondents were fourth-year students. Dozens of majors are offered by Ohio State which could easily translate into that many academic departments, but this survey generalized several of these categories into fifty-one different departments based on the academic departments given by faculty members who participated in the HERI survey. Finally, students were asked if they qualify for honors or scholars designation by the university. 33.5% of respondents are honors students, 6.6% are scholars students (which has admissions criteria that is slightly less competitive than the university's honors students), and 45.8% of students said that none of these distinctions applied to them. 14% of students chose not to respond to this question.

The survey was created using the Internet-based survey creator Survey Monkey. This program was chosen due to its ability to easily distribute surveys and its ability to ensure participant confidentiality. All participants were given the option of not answering a question by selecting the "No Response" option which was available for each question. Every undergraduate student who will be graduating in June of 2006 (4,576 students) received the survey. This particular group of students was selected because of their upcoming graduation in the very near future, which ensures that they will have taken a vast majority of their major coursework. This means that they would have had more interaction with professors in their field than those who have several more quarters of coursework to take. Students who are not close to graduation would be only basing their opinions on a few professors, and so the researcher felt that they would not be as unbiased as these graduating seniors. Of the students who received the survey, 750 responded, and 703 of these responses were considered valid for study. This represents a 15.36% response rate. The students who were eliminated from participating were those

who somehow received and answered the survey even though they are not a graduating senior and those who chose not to provide their academic department when answering the demographic portion of the survey as this was how students were primarily categorized. Both the student survey and the faculty survey can be found in the Appendices.


One final resource was utilized to conduct this analysis, and this involved the input of experts' opinions. Two professors from The Ohio State University College of Education were asked to identify correlations between the various factors of faculty satisfaction that would contribute to increased student satisfaction. These experts were used due to the lack of research into these relationships. The correlations discovered in the following analysis are those that these professors agreed are related to one another.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF SURVEY RESULTS

4.1 Why Students Decided to Attend Ohio State

The first portion of the student survey asked participants to reflect on their motivations for choosing to attend The Ohio State University. Ten different reasons were evaluated on an individual basis. These possible reasons can be found in Figure 4.1.



As is evident from this illustration, students' perception of their Ohio State degree, the university's geographic location and the academic services that it offers were the main reasons why students remember choosing to attend The Ohio State University. The figure also shows that the emphasis on and facilities for research were the least important reasons of those surveyed for students' decision to attend. The bar graph portion of the illustration indicates the range of data when students were classified according to their academic college. The yellow line illustrates the mean of all students' opinions. Clearly, several facets such as students' perception of the value of their degree and the institution's emphasis on research varied significantly by college in contributing to students' desire to attend Ohio State.

4.2 Students' Satisfaction with Faculty Teaching

The second portion of the student survey asked students to assess how satisfied they are with various aspects of faculty teaching. The questionnaire specified that students should respond based on their experiences with faculty in their major area of study. These facets can be viewed in Table 4.1. This table also shows the correlations between the facets studied and their statistical significance to contributing to students' overall satisfaction. As is evident from this table, almost all of the thirteen components analyzed contributed to students' overall satisfaction. The two exceptions were if faculty members were "being unbiased in evaluation" and "creating research opportunities." The first statement was attempting to assess students' satisfaction with faculty members' fairness in evaluating their performance. The researcher hypothesized that this would affect students' overall satisfaction, so it is possible that survey participants


misinterpreted the meaning of this question. The second statement's lack of correlation to overall student satisfaction is not a surprise especially considering the results from the previous set of questions asking why students chose to attend Ohio State. Research was clearly not a major contributor to their decision, and it appears from the analysis in Table 4.1 that it is also not a contributor to their overall satisfaction.

Factor	Significance
Ability to Clearly Communicate Subject Matter	0.000
Ability to Relate Theory to Real World	0.000
Accessibility	0.000
Addressing Students' Concerns	0.000
Creativity in Teaching	0.000
Engaging Students in Interactive Discussions	0.000
Enthusiasm for Teaching	0.000
Reputation in Field of Study	0.000
Using Humor When Teaching	0.000
Knowledge of Subject Matter	0.001
Challenging Coursework	0.007
Being Unbiased in Evaluation	0.253
Creating Research Opportunities	0.259

Table 4.1: Major Faculty Qualities Contributing to Students' Overall Satisfaction

Figure 4.2 depicts the elements that students were most satisfied with down to those questioned that satisfied them the least. As in Figure 4.1, the bar graphs illustrate the range of the data based on academic college, and the line graph illustrates the grand mean of all responses. The trait that clearly satisfied students the most was faculty members' knowledge of the subject matter. Not only did this have the greatest overall mean, but this mean also had a smaller range than any other component surveyed. The rest of the elements had means that were very close to one another although the ranges differed on several of the elements (engaging students in interactive discussions is one


example). The means decrease more significantly when students evaluated their satisfaction with faculty creativity when teaching and their ability to create research opportunities for their students. Students were least satisfied with these elements.



4.3 Students' Perceptions of Academic Effectiveness

The third portion of the survey asked students to assess their perception of how effective faculty members in their major area of study are in instilling a variety of characteristics into their students. The characteristics analyzed are listed in Figure 4.3. Students felt that faculty members were most effective at instilling the ability for students to become critical thinkers and to master knowledge in their major area of study.

Instilling a spirit of community service and spiritual development were the characteristics that faculty members were least effective at providing for their students.



These results are both predictable and reassuring when one assumes that developing critical thinking skills and mastering knowledge in a students' chosen field of study should be a primary aim for any institution of higher learning. Similarly, the facets that placed lower on the students' analysis are logical due to the lack of classes emphasizing community service and the fact that the survey was administered on a public university's campus where there is naturally a lack of emphasis on spiritual development.

None of these components were correlated with faculty satisfaction measurements, although they certainly contribute to understanding the variance between academic departments' priorities. As in the similar graphs above, this figure illustrates the ranges in data based on academic departments, but unlike the previous graphs, the ranges vary a great deal in several factors considered in this analysis. Appreciation for

community service, diversity, and the liberal arts were three factors that had particularly large ranges of data. Understanding students’ and faculty priorities is a constant challenge for administrators, and this figure illustrates this fact.


4.4 Faculty Satisfaction

When assessing faculty satisfaction, only a portion of the HERI survey was utilized in this study, and these components are listed in Table 4.2. Unlike the assessment of student satisfaction where the vast majority of components analyzed contributed to students’ overall satisfaction, few elements listed in the faculty survey contributed to these professors’ overall satisfaction in a statistically significant way. Those elements highlighted in dark yellow in Table 4.2 are those that are significant due to their p-value of less than 0.05. The facet shaded in a lighter yellow color is moderately significant as the p-value was less than 0.10. Only these highlighted elements contribute to faculty members’ overall satisfaction.

Factor	Significance
Opportunity for Scholarly Pursuits	0.001
Teaching Load	0.001
Competency of Colleagues	0.043
Salary and Fringe Benefits	0.067
Autonomy and Independence	0.146
Social Relationships with Other Faculty	0.174
Professional Relationships with Other Faculty	0.248
Visibility for Jobs at Other Institutions/Organizations	0.333
Relationship with Administration	0.494
Quality of Students	0.817

Table 4.2: Major Contributors to Faculty’s Overall Job Satisfaction

Additionally, analyzing faculty members' satisfaction with these components helps to illustrate the range of responses when categorized by academic colleges. Figure 4.4 illustrates this range as well as the aggregate mean of all responses. Overall, faculty members appear to be most satisfied with their level of autonomy and the competency of their colleagues. By and large, these workers seem to be generally satisfied as their overall job satisfaction was the third highest favorable response. Of the components analyzed, faculty members were least satisfied with the quality of their students and their relationship with the university's administration. These candid results have major implications when correlations between the two surveys are analyzed.



4.5 Correlations

Based on the results of the faculty satisfaction survey and the relevant correlations found between it and the student satisfaction survey, three relationships were discovered.

When assessing factors contributing to overall faculty satisfaction, the relationship described in Table 4.3 has been made.

<u>Correlations</u>		<u>Significance?</u>
Faculty compensation	➔ Overall faculty satisfaction	Moderately Significant (p=.067)
Faculty satisfaction with colleagues	➔ Overall faculty satisfaction	Significant (p=.043)
Social relationships with other faculty	➔ Overall faculty satisfaction	NOT Significant

Table 4.3: Correlations Related to Overall Faculty Satisfaction

The importance of this analysis is not fully realized until the correlations of these same facets of faculty satisfaction are compared to students' overall satisfaction as is illustrated in Table 4.4.

<u>Correlations</u>		<u>Significance?</u>
Faculty compensation	➔ Overall student satisfaction	NOT Significant (p=.848)
Faculty satisfaction with colleagues	➔ Overall student satisfaction	NOT Significant (p=.372)
Social relationships with other faculty	➔ Overall student satisfaction	Moderately Significant (p=.052)

Table 4.4: Correlations Related to Overall Student Satisfaction

Clearly, opposite factors contribute to overall faculty satisfaction than those that contribute to overall student satisfaction.

The factor correlation analysis also reveals these results. Here, faculty satisfaction was significantly correlated with their satisfaction with job-related issues like compensation and autonomy ($r = 0.614, p < 0.05$). The other two factors were not

correlated with faculty job satisfaction ($p > 0.05$). Interestingly, the factor that was significantly correlated with faculty satisfaction was *not* correlated with student satisfaction ($r = 0.35, p > 0.1$). Interestingly, though, the last factor, one representing the satisfaction of faculty members with their professional and social relationships, was the only factor that was related to student satisfaction ($r = 0.47, p < 0.05$). Clearly, the job parameters that drive faculty satisfaction are not the same as those that drive student satisfaction.

Other factors of student satisfaction also correlate with faculty members having social relationships with one another in a statistically significant way. These can be found in Table 4.5 and include faculty members' ability to clearly communicate the subject matter and their ability to relate theory to the real world. These social relationships also appear to effect students' perceptions of faculty members' ability to address the students' concerns and helping them master their knowledge of the subject matter.

<u>Correlations</u>		<u>Significance?</u>
Social relationships with other faculty	➔ Relate Theory to Real World	Moderately Significant (p=.094)
Social relationships with other faculty	➔ Faculty Clearly Communicates	Significant (p=.043)
Social relationships with other faculty	➔ Address Concerns	Significant (p=.042)

Table 4.5: Additional Correlations between Faculty Social Relationships and Facets of Student Satisfaction

The data for these results is based on an analysis of twenty different departments having at least 8 faculty respondents and 10 student respondents. This assessment was

limited in this way so as to correlate a fairly large sample of data for students and faculty members of the same academic departments.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Summary

The results of these surveys and the correlations developed from their analysis result in a number of conclusions that are relevant for Ohio State faculty members and administrators alike. These results highlight the effectiveness of marketing and human resources decisions made by these individuals and their impact on students.

5.1.1 Analysis of Why Students Decided to Attend Ohio State

The first portion of the student survey asks students why they decided to attend Ohio State. The reasons that they chose this university differed, sometimes a great deal, by academic department, but in general, most students chose Ohio State because of their perception of the value of their degree, the geographic location of the university and the academic service it offers. This university offers numerous degrees in programs that are often highly ranked and respected among the academic community, and students' recognition of this appears to be a major cause for their decision to attend. Students also appreciate the academic services that Ohio State offers which they probably feel contributes to the value of their degree. All of this is conveniently located in Columbus,

Ohio, the capital and most centralized major city in the state. It is not surprising, then, that over 82% of all students who attend the Columbus campus of Ohio State are from Ohio (“Enrollment” 2005). It is clear that the vast majority of students choose to attend Ohio State because they view it is an affordable place to earn a valuable degree.

This portion of the survey also highlighted reasons that were less important for students’ decision. Emphasis on and facilities for research ranked the lowest of all students’ responses when they reflected upon their choice to attend. As a Research I institution, the university has made an institutional decision to emphasize research as a major priority for its strategic plan. These institutions “offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate, and give high priority to research” and by so doing, obtain a large amount of federal support for their research initiatives every year (Middaugh 2001). Unfortunately, though, these efforts do not appear to impact students’ decision to attend in comparison to other reasons.

Naturally, even though students don’t appear to appreciate research in their decision to attend, the fact that Ohio State is dedicated to research means that its faculty are usually more up-to-date on the latest information in their fields and often make major contributions to leading these research efforts. When asked, undergraduates may not appreciate this specifically, but this certainly contributes to the value of their degree.

5.1.2 Analysis of Students’ Satisfaction with Faculty Teaching

The second portion of the survey asked students to assess their level of satisfaction with various aspects of faculty teaching, and virtually all of these components contributed to students’ overall satisfaction with their faculty in a statistically significant

way. Students were most satisfied with faculty members' knowledge of the subject matter and were least satisfied with their creativity in teaching and ability to create research opportunities for their students. The rest of the components tested all satisfied students about the same although the ranges of the data often differed extensively based on a students' academic department.

There are several implications for understanding this data. As is evident from Table 4.1, most of the facets tested greatly contribute to students' overall satisfaction with their professors and this includes students' desire for faculty members to be creative in their teaching. That this trait ranked the second lowest of all of those tested indicates that faculty members should attempt to be more creative in their teaching in order to better satisfy their students. Table 4.1 shows that students like professors who engage them in active conversation and who use humor when teaching, and increasing characteristics like this can aid in increasing students' perception of faculty creativity. The facet that ranked the lowest of those tested, faculty's ability to create research opportunities for students, does not contribute to students' overall satisfaction in a significant way, so increasing these opportunities would likely not impact students' overall satisfaction with their faculty.

5.1.3 Analysis of Students' Perception of Academic Effectiveness

The third portion of the survey asked students to assess their perception of how effective faculty members are in instilling in them a variety of characteristics. These results were rather predictable as those elements that students ranked more highly (developing critical thinking skills and mastering knowledge of subject matter) are

primary purposes of an institution of higher education. Similarly, those that students did not rank as high, instilling an appreciation for community service and spiritual development, are not institutional priorities of Ohio State. The university encourages community service and sponsors a variety of annual events to involve students in giving back to their community, but these are typically sponsored by student affairs administrators and have little if any faculty participation. The few courses that do emphasize community service are taken by a limited number of students who usually are a part of a specific academic program. This is the cause of the wide range of the data as illustrated in Figure 4.3. The item that students placed lowest of all, fostering spiritual development, is also a result that is easy to rationalize considering that Ohio State is a public institution, so it naturally does not place much emphasis on spiritually developing its students. It does offer comparative religion courses and student organizations for individuals with a variety of beliefs, but there is no institutional emphasis on this development.

5.1.4 Analysis of Faculty Satisfaction

Although the components of the faculty satisfaction survey analyzed were much more brief and specific than the student survey, the results of this analysis are quite candid. Table 4.2 lists those components that contribute to faculty members' overall satisfaction, and only four of these make a significant impact on these educators' assessment. By combining the results from this table and Figure 4.4, one learns that faculty members enjoy having their independent scholarly pursuits and prefer to have a teaching load that will allow them to pursue these projects. They appreciate the

competency of their colleagues, but having social relationships with them is less important to their overall satisfaction. In other words, faculty members appear to like their independent, individual pursuits. Salary is another factor that contributes to their overall satisfaction in a moderately significant way, yet overall, it was one of the lowest ranked factors compared to the others assessed in the survey.

In general, though, one can infer that faculty members at Ohio State are satisfied with their jobs as their assessment of their overall job satisfaction ranked the third highest of all other components analyzed. The survey points out to facets that could be improved that might increase their satisfaction (components like their salary and benefits and teaching load), and this result is useful for administrators responsible for making these kinds of decisions.

5.1.5 Analysis of Correlations

To assess the correlations between faculty and student satisfaction, a recap of certain components of faculty satisfaction and how it correlates to overall faculty satisfaction should be discussed. As is evident from Table 4.3, contributors to overall faculty satisfaction included their satisfaction with their colleagues' competency, their teaching load, and their pay. These motivators illustrate faculty members' apparent appreciation for their personal projects and a teaching load that best suits these academic pursuits. They appreciate their colleagues' competency, which again reflects their focus on their research initiatives because they are able to utilize their colleagues as reliable resources. The other factor discussed in Table 4.3 was faculty's appreciation for their

social relationships with one another, which did not appear to impact their overall satisfaction.

These relationships are opposite to those that impact student satisfaction. Table 4.4 illustrates the impact that the faculty satisfaction components previously discussed makes on students' overall satisfaction. Unlike for overall faculty satisfaction, though, competency of colleagues and compensation do not impact students' overall satisfaction, but social relationships amongst faculty members do. Faculty relationships with their coworkers in a professional context do not appear to have the same impact on students' satisfaction based on this statistical assessment.

The logic behind these findings is quite understandable from a human resources context. The reason why contributors to overall faculty satisfaction do not appear to impact overall students' satisfaction could be due to the way that Ohio State has chosen to compensate its faculty members. Due to the institution's emphasis on research, faculty members are compensated according to their academic pursuits. Faculty members who are more interested in teaching, then, and who do not choose to pursue research to as great of an extent often experience a delay in gaining tenure and a lower level of compensation. This is not necessarily a good decision or a bad decision for the institution, but it is important for Ohio State to recognize that its students are noticing a difference in faculty members who are focused on research and those who are more interested in teaching, and this does contribute to their overall satisfaction.

On the other hand, this study also has determined that students appreciate faculty members' social interactions with one another. This is also a fascinating finding for the university's human resources administrators. If faculty members are interacting with one

another in a social setting, away from work and not meeting to discuss work-related issues, they can be assumed to be much more likely to come to work more relaxed and happy since they are better able to interact with their colleagues. This translates into better relationships with students as well. Interestingly enough, though, these social relationships that faculty educators have with one another also correlated with various components of students' satisfaction as is illustrated in Table 4.5. Therefore, these social relationships not only improve the working relationships professors have with their colleagues, but it also impacts the relationships that they have with their customers, their students, as well.

This divide between the variables that drive faculty satisfaction and student satisfaction has significant implications. University administrators, relying on faculty satisfaction surveys, might be spending time and effort to enhance faculty satisfaction by improving drivers such as salaries, autonomy in research and teaching, and opportunities for scholarly pursuits. Unfortunately these efforts, while enhancing faculty satisfaction, will not translate into student satisfaction. Conversely, university's efforts in developing social and professional relationships among faculty may not contribute to faculty members' overall satisfaction, but success in this endeavor would translate into students being happier with their educational experience at Ohio State.

5.2 Contributions

The results of this analysis will be useful for a number of parties both at the university analyzed as well as others with similar institutional priorities. Because a correlation like this has never been conducted, this analysis is, of course, quite useful to

Ohio State and the field of higher education research, but even the survey results that were not correlated greatly contribute to the institution's knowledge of two of its stakeholders. Two of the primary benefactors of this research include the university's undergraduate admissions offices and the academic administrators assisting this institution in various roles but who all work to enhance students' educational experience.

Some of the more candid results of the student survey were the students' reflection of why they decided to attend this institution. Understanding these motivations can greatly assist the university in drafting its future recruitment materials to market the school to its future students. The ranges illustrated in Figure 4.1 note the disparity of how students from the various academic colleges felt about the motivation in question. Many colleges have their own recruitment events, and understanding that students' decisions can vary based on their chosen field of study will help these colleges more appropriately draft their future marketing materials.

This study contributes to the work of higher education administrators of undergraduate academics in a number of relevant ways. In assessing student satisfaction, this survey illustrated that a variety of components are extremely important to students' overall satisfaction. This is a logical conclusion because it is hard to imagine that a student would not want a faculty member who would engage them in conversation, make the subject matter relevant and useful for their future careers, and accomplish this in a clearly communicated way. Clearly, though, research was not as important to students as it statistically did not correlate with their overall satisfaction. Additionally, this survey was helpful in assessing students' opinion of how effective their faculty members were in instilling in them certain knowledge. The ranges between the means respondents from

the various academic colleges on both the students' satisfaction and the students' academic effectiveness portions of the survey were also quite enlightening. Similar to understanding that students from the various academic departments choose to attend a university for a variety of reasons, it is equally important to understand that students will be satisfied with facets of their faculty members' contribution to their education based on their choice of study as well.

This study also focused on developing an increased understanding of the contributors to faculty satisfaction. The fact that faculty members generally prefer to pursue their personal academic pursuits rather than engaging in a more interactive and social environment with students and their colleagues is a fascinating result for academic administrators at this institution. It is also interesting to note that salary contributes to faculty members' overall satisfaction because if they felt like they were being unfairly paid, then their performance would surely be affected, and this, of course, would be of interest for compensation administrators at this institution.

Although all of these results are fascinating, perhaps the most enlightening result of this research and the one that would be the most useful for all interested parties results from the analysis of correlations between the satisfaction levels of these two stakeholders. That students appear to be more satisfied when faculty members engage in social interactions with one another is a fascinating and helpful finding for all those who engage in motivation and morale building efforts at Ohio State. These efforts apparently do not affect faculty members' overall satisfaction, but if this institution chooses to place an even greater emphasis on undergraduate education, then encouraging these social relationships could be one way for students' satisfaction to be improved.

5.3 Future Research

The faculty and student surveys used in this study would easily apply to other universities throughout the country. Although the correlations found in this study demonstrate some interesting and applicable findings, it would be fascinating to determine if they also are found if applied to other institutions. If this was performed, it might be possible to find similarities amongst universities who typically value one aspect of a faculty member's responsibility over the other two, and one could hypothesize that this would have an effect on the satisfaction correlations that could be found at those institutions. Other similarities might be found amongst additional large, public universities located in urban areas like Ohio State. One would theorize that these institutions would differ greatly from those with opposite characteristics.

It would also be beneficial for colleges and universities to conduct the first part of the student survey which deals with their decision process for choosing to attend the university. Admissions offices can always benefit from understanding this information so that they can appropriately prepare their marketing materials and recruitment presentations that would cater to what the students are looking for in their institution. In this study, this portion of the survey also illustrated what is *not* as well received by Ohio State students. The survey indicated that these graduating seniors did not place as much emphasis on their chosen institution's commitment to research or the research facilities available to them as they did on other characteristics.

Another possibility for further research would involve assessing the origins of faculty and student satisfaction that goes beyond their relationship with one another. Both parties interact extensively with administrators and other university staff who all

contribute to their opinions of the institution and can play a major role in determining the overall satisfaction of these groups with the university. Perhaps one contributor to faculty and student satisfaction with the university would be the strength of the program as identified by its national ranking. A fascinating study would involve determining if individuals from an academic department perform better if the department is more highly ranked and this results in both the faculty and the students' increased satisfaction. University departments are frequently ranked by a number of external parties which can be the source of both pride and frustration for university administrators and academics alike, yet it would be fascinating to determine their impact on its stakeholders' satisfaction. Now that the basic procedure for determining correlations between faculty and student satisfaction have been developed through this study, there are numerous opportunities to understanding the affects of these relationships that can be performed in the future.

5.4 Research Conclusion

It was stated in the beginning of this analysis that the concepts of customer and employee satisfaction are the well-researched subjects of literally thousands of studies. Although the relevant correlations discovered in this analysis are few, the conservatism of these results illustrates the complexity of these relationships. Indeed, Ostroff (1992) writes that the majority of surveys on the subject have found relatively few correlations between facets of satisfaction and performance in a job satisfaction context, and if faculty performance is measured by the overall satisfaction of its students, then this study is consistent with these other analyses.

The most groundbreaking finding of the correlations made in this study is the apparent impact that social relationships amongst faculty members can have on students' overall satisfaction. Equally candid is the lack of correlations between student satisfaction and factors that satisfy faculty members. Faculty members at this institution, as was stated previously, are primarily compensated based on their research contributions, but this does not translate into more satisfied students. It is not the purpose of this analysis to editorialize on the quality of this decision. The conclusion is simply this: students at Ohio State recognize the institution's decision to emphasize research and not teaching, and this appears to affect their overall satisfaction. The administrative implications of these findings remain to be seen.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, E. W., Fornell, C., Rust, R. T., 1997. "Customer satisfaction, productivity, and profitability: Differences between goods and services." *Marketing Science* 16, 129-145.
- Athiyaman, A., 1997. "Linking student satisfaction and service quality perceptions: the case of university education." *European Journal of Marketing* 31, 528-540.
- Babin, B. J., Griffin, M., 1998. "The nature of satisfaction: An updated examination and analysis." *Journal of Business Research* 41, 127-236.
- Berry, L., Parasuraman, A. *Marketing Services: Competing through Quality*. New York: Free Press, 1991.
- Bhagat, R. S., 1982. "Conditions under which stronger job performance-job satisfaction relationships may be observed: A closer look at two situational contingencies." *The Academy of Management Journal* 25, 772-789.

- Brayfield, A. H., Crockett, W. H., 1955. "Employee attitudes and employee performance." *Psychological Bulletin* 52, 396-424.
- Butler, T., Waldroop, J. 1999. "Job Sculpting." *Harvard Business Review* 77, 144-152.
- Cameron, K., 1978. "Measuring organizational effectiveness in institutions of higher education." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 23, 604-632.
- Cameron, K. S., 1981. "Domains of organizational effectiveness in colleges and universities." *The Academy of Management Journal* 24, 25-47.
- Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., Stone, E. F., 1992. "The Construct of Job Satisfaction." In C. J. Cranny, P. C. Smith, and E. F. Stone (Ed.), *Job Satisfaction*. New York: Lexington Books, 1-3.
- Cronin Jr., J. J., Taylor, S. A., 2001. "Measuring service quality: A reexamination and extension." *Journal of Marketing* 56, 55-68.
- Currall, S. C., Towler, A. J., Judge, T. A., Kohn, L., 2005. "Pay Satisfaction and organizational outcomes." *Personnel Psychology* 58, 613-640.
- Dominowski, R. L. *Teaching Undergraduates*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2002.

Doyle Jr., K. O. *Student Evaluation of Instruction*. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Company, 1975.

“Enrollment.” *Statistical Summary*. 2005. The Ohio State University Institutional Research and Planning. 25 May 2006 < <http://www.osu.edu/osutoday/stuinfo.php>>.

Fisher, C. D., 1980. “On the dubious wisdom of expecting job satisfaction to correlate with performance.” *The Academy of Management Review* 5, 607-612.

Fisher, C. D., Locke, E. A., 1992. “The new look in job satisfaction research and theory.” In C. J. Cranny, P. C. Smith, and E. F. Stone (Ed.), *Job Satisfaction*. New York: Lexington Books, 165-194.

Herman, J. B., 1973. “Are situational contingencies limiting job attitude-job performance relationships.” *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 10, 208-224.

Hill, Y., Lomas, L., MacGregor, J., 2003. “Students’ perceptions of quality in higher education.” *Quality Assurance in Education* 11, 15-20.

Howard, G. S., Conway, C. G., Maxwell, S. E., 1985. “Construct validity of measures of college teaching effectiveness.” *Journal of Educational Psychology* 77, 187-196.

- Hunt, K. H. 1977. "CS/D-Overview and future directions." In K. H. Hunt (Ed.), *Conceptualization and Measurement of Consumer Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction*. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute, 49.
- Iaffaldano, M. T., Muchinsky, P. M., 1985. "Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis." *Psychological Bulletin* 97, 251-273.
- Ilies, R., Judge, T. A., 2002. "Understanding the dynamic relationships among personality, mood, and job satisfaction: A field experience sampling study." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 89, 1119-1139.
- Joseph, M., Yakhou, M., Stone, G., 2005. "An educational institution's quest for service quality: customers' perspective." *Quality Assurance in Education* 13, 66-82.
- Judge, T. A., Ilies, R., 2004. "Affect and job satisfaction: A study of their relationship at work and at home." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89, 661-673.
- Katzell, R. A., Thompson, D. E., Guzzo, R. A., 1992. "How job satisfaction and job performance are and are not linked." In C. J. Cranny, P. C. Smith, and E. F. Stone (Ed.), *Job Satisfaction*. New York: Lexington Books, 195-217.
- Lagrosen, S., Seyyed-Hashemi, R., Leitner, M., 2004. "Examination of the dimensions of quality in higher education." *Quality Assurance in Education* 12, 61-69.

- Lawler, E. E. III. *Pay and Organizational Effectiveness: A Psychological View*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1971.
- Locke, E. A., 1976. "The nature and causes of job satisfaction." In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1297-1349.
- Loher, B. T., Noe, R. A., Moeller, N. L., Fitzgerald, M. P., 1985. "A meta-analysis of the relation of job characteristics to job satisfaction." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 70, 280-289.
- Middaugh, M. F. *Understanding Faculty Productivity: Standards and Benchmarks for Colleges and Universities*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 2001.
- Miller, K. I., Monge, P. R., 1986. "Participation, satisfaction, and productivity: A meta-analytic review." *The Academy of Management Journal* 29, 727-753.
- Oliver, R. L., 1981. "Measurement and evaluation of satisfaction processes in retail settings." *Journal of Retailing* 57, 25-48.
- Ostroff, C., 1992. "The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: An organizational level analysis." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 77, 963-974.

- Peters, W. S., Champoux, J. E. 1980. "The use of moderated regression in job redesign decisions." *Decision Sciences* 10, 95-95.
- Podolske, A., ed., 2003. "What motivates frontline staff—and how the 'best' companies deliver it." *IOMA's Report on Customer Relationship Management*, 2-4.
- Saari, L. M., Judge, T. A., 2004. "Employee Attitudes and Job Satisfaction." *Human Resource Management* 43, 395-407.
- Schmit, M. J., Allscheid, S. P., 1995. "Employee attitudes and customer satisfaction: Making theoretical and empirical connections." *Personnel Psychology* 48, 521-536.
- Schwab, D. P., Cummings, L. L., 1970. "Theories of performance and satisfaction: A review." *Industrial Relations* 9, 408-430.
- Shank, M. D., Walker, M., Hayes, T., 1995, "Understanding professional service expectations: do we know what our students expect in a quality education?" *Journal of Professional Services Marketing* 13, 71-83.
- Smith, P. C., 1992. "In pursuit of happiness: why study general job satisfaction?" In C. J. Cranny, P. C. Smith, and E. F. Stone (Ed.), *Job Satisfaction*. New York: Lexington Books, 5-19.

- Snipes, R. L., Oswald, S. L., LaTour, M., Armenakis, A. A., 2005. "The effects of specific job satisfaction facets on customer perceptions of service quality: An employee-level analysis." *Journal of Business Research* 58, 1330-1339.
- Staples, D. S., Higgins, C. A., 1998. "A study of the impact of factor importance weightings on job satisfaction measures." *Journal of Business and Psychology* 13, 211-232.
- Sweeney, P. D., McFarlin, D. B., 2005. "Wage comparisons with similar and dissimilar others." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 78, 113-131.
- Triandis, H. C., 1959. "A critique and experimental design for the study of the relationship between productivity and job satisfaction." *Psychological Bulletin* 56, 309-312.
- Wilson, A., Frimpong, J., 2004. "A reconceptualisation of the satisfaction-service performance thesis." *Journal of Services Marketing* 18, 471-481.
- Winer, L., 1999. "Pursuit of customer satisfaction ruins schools." *Marketing News* 33, 11.

APPENDICES

1. The Student Survey

PAGE 1 OF 4

When thinking of your college decision, please indicate the importance of the following in your decision to attend Ohio State:

	Very important	Important	Moderately important	Neither	Moderately unimportant	Unimportant	Very unimportant	No Response
Institutional emphasis on research								
Institutional emphasis on teaching								
Reputation of faculty								
Academic services								
Facilities for research								
Prestige of my department								
Geographic location								
Scholarships/ financial aid options								
Perceived value of degree								
Other family/ personal considerations								

If you were to choose a university again, would you still choose the Ohio State University?

Yes No Maybe No Response

Continued

Indicate how satisfied you are with faculty in your major area of study on each of the following dimensions:

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither	Somewhat dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No Response
Knowledge of the subject matter								
Being unbiased in evaluation								
Ability to clearly communicate subject matter								
Ability to relate theory to real world								
Engaging students in interactive discussions								
Enthusiasm for teaching								
Addressing students' concerns								
Creativity in teaching								
Creating research opportunities								
Accessibility (ability to meet when needed)								
Challenging coursework								
Using humor when teaching								
Reputation in field of study								
Overall Satisfaction								

Continued

Indicate how well the faculty in your major area of study have helped you achieve the following:

	Very effective	Effective	Somewhat effective	Neither	Somewhat ineffective	Ineffective	Very ineffective	No Response
Ability to think critically								
Prepare for employment								
Prepare for graduate school								
Develop moral character								
Provide for emotional development								
Develop my own personal values								
Enhance my self-understanding								
Instill spirit of community service								
Prepare for responsible citizenship								
Enhance appreciation for diversity								
Help master knowledge in my major area								
Help develop creativity								
Instill appreciation of liberal arts								
Enhance spiritual development								
Promote ability to speak effectively								
Promote ability to write effectively								

Continued

We will now ask for some basic demographic information:

1. Gender Male Female No Response
2. Academic Rank 1 2 3 4 5+ No Response
3. Academic Department (Pull down list of all departments in the data set including an “other” category)
4. Please indicate if you qualify for one of the following distinctions:
 Honors Scholars Not Applicable No Response

THANK YOU ONCE AGAIN FOR HELPING US WITH OUR RESEARCH.

2. The Faculty Survey

NOTE: The following dimensions were the only ones analyzed in this survey. The complete HERI survey contains additional components, but ones that are unrelated to faculty members' interaction with students.

How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job?

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Marginally satisfied	Not satisfied	Not applicable
Salary and fringe benefits					
Opportunity for scholarly pursuits					
Teaching load					
Quality of students					
Autonomy and independence					
Professional relationships with other faculty					
Social relationships with other faculty					
Competency of colleagues					
Visibility for jobs at other institutions/ organizations					
Relationship with administration					
Overall job satisfaction					