Factors Contributing to Faculty Satisfaction and Its Relationship to Faculty Retention in Tertiary Religious Institutions

Fanny Helda Rantung

Abstract

This study aimed to identify factors contributing to faculty satisfaction and their relationship to faculty retention. The research design was a cross-sectional survey. Furthermore, it looked at correlative relations by using factor analysis and ANOVA. Purposive sampling was used to identify a total of 185 respondents from 4 religious universities in Manado, Indonesia. The sample responded to a 2-part questionnaire. Results showed that faculty satisfaction affected faculty retention $F(2, 177) = 3.05$, $p = .05$, significantly and positively. However, institutional value ($M = 4.27$, $SD = .66$), which was one of the 3 satisfaction factors, affected faculty retention more than the other two factors, which were institutional support ($M = 3.90$, $SD = .68$) and working conditions ($M = 3.94$, $SD = .68$). For faculty members to be highly satisfied and remain in service, administrators should provide support in terms of working conditions, institutional value, and institutional support.

Key words: satisfaction, retention, religious institutions

Introduction

With the growing number of institutions of higher education, retaining faculty has become a challenge. Ultimately, faculty retention is dependent upon faculty job satisfaction (Tack & Patitu, 2000). Universities or colleges strive to employ highly qualified faculty but they are not always successful at retaining them. Moreover, faculty members who remain may not function as engaging colleagues who encourage others to stay (Block, 2008). Faculty members may either face satisfaction or dissatisfaction while at work, and the issue of satisfaction and dissatisfaction is crucial for the success of the institution. Satisfied faculty members are those who are more prone to remain in their profession (Latham, 1998; Perrachione, Petersen, & Rosser, 2008).

The teaching profession is the largest human capital resources of an educational system (Hutton & Jobe, 1995), since understanding the factors that contribute to faculty satisfaction is essential information that is needed to support a successful educational system (see also Hutton & Jobe, 1995). This study aims to discover the factors that contribute to faculty satisfaction at the tertiary level and whether those factors relate to faculty retention. Specifically, this study will answer the following questions:

1. What are the factors that contribute to faculty satisfaction of tertiary religious institutions?
2. How strongly do the identified factors contribute to faculty satisfaction?
3. Do factors related to faculty satisfaction affect faculty retention?

The following null hypothesis guided this study:

$H_{1:}$ There is no significant effect of faculty satisfaction toward faculty retention.

Literature Review and Related Studies

Faculty Satisfaction

Faculty satisfaction is an integral facet in understanding faculty retention. Faculty satisfaction implies the extent to which faculty members like or dislike their job (Balungay, 1990). Studies (Bowen & Radhakrishna, 1991; Castillo, 1999; Conklin, 1999) have examined the levels of job satisfaction and compared them with demographic information such as age, gender, seniority, rank, and tenure-status. The results indicated that there was a low relationship between selected demographics and the level of job satisfaction. Conversely, Seifert and Umbach (2008) reported certain demographic characteristics which were good predictors of faculty job satisfaction at universities in the United States.

Aside from demographic information, faculty members have also identified factors which may contribute to their workplace satisfaction. For instance, Flores' (1991) study showed how faculty members (n=147) at a Seventh-day Adventist tertiary institution reported factors for job satisfaction as the following: (1) high salary, (2) social relations, (3) achievement, and (4) security. In another context, (Gaton, 1976) reported that achievement, advancement, and recognition are factors which influence job satisfaction and encourage faculty members to remain, even when offered jobs elsewhere. Aside from faculty members' value placed on institutional acknowledgement, studies have also indicated that monetary compensation is an important factor. Faculty members in Nuqui's (2000) study reported that (1) a thirteenth month pay, Christmas bonus; (2) regular and prompt payment of salary, and (3) giving of compensation during official holidays in compliance with the provisions of the labor code contributes to greater faculty satisfaction. A more in-depth discussion will follow in the next section.

Besides knowing possible factors which can be attributed to faculty satisfaction, it is worth knowing factors which may cause dissatisfaction as well. Source of these factors include listed instances such as administrators exerting dominance, lack of mutual respect, poor working conditions, boredom, stress, burnout, and stress (Nuqui (2000).

It is worth taking note that faculty satisfaction does not necessarily equate to a satisfaction across different facets involved in working for a university. There are reports which showed how faculty members may have a general satisfied disposition towards their work, but still maintain a certain degree of dissatisfaction towards certain aspects, as exemplified in Acacio's study (1983). This is affirmed by Gualdo's study (1989) where faculty members reported a moderate satisfaction towards their working conditions, but dissatisfaction towards the financial and promotional incentives.

Faculty Retention

Closely linked with faculty satisfaction is faculty retention, which refers to the act or process of keeping a worker in his/her job (Braham, 2002). In this study, faculty retention refers to the faculty members who are willing to stay in their respective universities. College and university faculty members' function is important in the instructional, governance, and academic leadership arenas at higher education institutions (Whetsel-Ribeau, 2007). Having faculty members completing short tenures at a tertiary institution will hamper long-range academic planning, and in turn affect ongoing academic advancement of an institution. This is evidenced in Dee's (2004) study, where faculty members who report a high level of support for innovative works were less likely to leave.

In studies investigating faculty retention, it is found that faculty members who are satisfied with the social climate at their place of employment are more willing to remain (Whetsel-Ribeau, 2007). Furthermore, having a mentoring program in place also contributes to prolonged faculty retention (Whitaker, 2001). However, some factors which may lead to loss of faculty members include issues with salary, institutional climate, faculty workload, technology impact, and stress (Ruhland, 2001).

Factors Contributing to Faculty Satisfaction

In relation with educational institutions, researchers (Acacio, 1983; Bowen & Radhakrishna, 1991; Castillo & Cano, 2004; Conklin, 1999; Garcia, 1983; Gualdo, 1989; Long & Swortzel, 2007; Platsidou & Diamantopoulou, 2009; Schmiesing, 2002) have recognized some factors that may contribute to faculty satisfaction. These consist of age, gender, civil status, educational attainment, teaching experience (years), working condition,

institutional value, and institutional support.

Working Conditions

The working conditions of a tertiary institution describe the situation of the job and the place of assignment. It includes the atmosphere of the place, opportunities for advancement, and the nature of work (Balungay, 1990). Factors that contribute to working condition are campus conditions, salary, research funds, recognition, and upgrading program.

Job satisfaction of the teaching staff of a university can be determined by the conditions of their workplace (Bauer, 2000). Limbong (2000) reported that faculty members expect a healthy and safe workplace, which corresponds with Sein's (2003) study. Aside from the physical aspect of the work environment, salary is also a determinant for faculty retention (Nelson, 2003). Another aspect of working condition include benefits that faculty members receive, as observed in Gappa's (2000) study. Furthermore, a properly implemented upgrading program also leads to an increase in satisfaction level. Upgradingzz program may come in the form of further graduate studies, research works, professional appointments and international conferences (Nelsen, 2003). In addition, institutions that recognize their employee's academic and professional milestones also encourage faculty satisfaction as well as faculty retention (Whetsel-Ribeau, 2007).

Institutional Value

Institutional value relates to how faculty members value and commit to their job. Enhancing work commitment does not only lie within the faculty members themselves. University administrators are also accountable in instilling in faculty members a desire to serve and influence faculty to be committed to their work (Bairagee, 2008). High morale may exist in a situation where many job dissatisfactions exist and are being overcome (Guba as cited in Evans, 1998; Smith, 1976). Mostafa (2006) explains morale as a "supportive feeling and attitudes of a teacher and relation to the accomplishment of his duties, responsibilities and goals while he works with his supervisors, associates workers" (p. 15). Mostafa (2006) further elaborates that the level of morale is determined by the amount of job satisfaction realized by each individual. The greater his/her job satisfaction, the higher his/her morale; as a result, the more he or she is willing to remain. This idea is supported by Bairagee (2008), "Greater job satisfaction manifests higher morale" (p. 133).

Institutional Support

Institutional support is one of the factors that contribute to faculty satisfaction (Malone, 1989). Institutional support in this study encompasses as professional book allowance, freedom to choose instructional devices, and appreciation given to the faculty members. Bauer (2000) reported that satisfaction increased when people perceived themselves as a good working team involved in decision making. Moreover, faculty members are satisfied being knowledgeable about policies and practices, and posessing academic freedom. Freedom to choose instructional devices is one of the practices of academic freedom (Bauer, 2000).

Methodology

A cross-sectional survey was used in this study since this survey was to collect information from a sample that had been drawn from a predetermined population, and the information was collected at just one point in time or at once (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2007). This study is a correlative study with the use of factor analysis. The purpose was to determine whether a relationship existed between various independent variables.

Procedure for Constructing the Questionnaire

Items construction started with an interview conducted with a focus group. This was to find ideas of what made faculty members happy, satisfied, and willing to be retained in their respective universities. The focus group was composed of at least three or four people (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh,2002). This study utilized three focus groups which had 3, 4, and 3 members respectively. The questions asked to the groups were (1) "What are the things that make you happy and satisfied teaching in your university?" (2) "What are the things that make you want to stay in your respective university and teach?" From those answers 35 items were developed .

Next, information was gathered from the review of books, journals, and unpublished materials on faculty satisfaction. Those faculty satisfaction items from the journal, books, and unpublished materials were gathered to confirm the items found from the focus groups' interviews. Moreover, information from the literature served as a basis for categorizing the 35 items and formulating a list of factors for factuly satisfaction (see Appendix).

Population and Sample

The target population for this study was all full-time and part-time faculty members in religious institutions of higher education institutions run by organized religious bodies. Four of such institutions in Manado, East Indonesia, were selected. They are: (1) a Seventh-day Adventist university, (2) a Catholic university, (3) a Protestant university, and (4) a Moslem university. These institutions are given the pseudonyms Universities A, B, C, and D, respectively. Purposive sampling method was used to select the university under study.

Table 1 *The Sample of Faculty Distribution*

University	Male	Female	Total
A	30	30	60
B	16	24	40
C	16	20	36
D	32	17	49
Total	94	91	185

Table 2 *Profile of Faculty Members (N = 185)*

Demographic Variable	Category	N	%
Age	24-33	53	28.6
	34-45	87	47.1
	46-54	25	13.5
	Over 55	20	10.8
Gender	Male	94	50.8
	Female	91	49.2
Civil Status	Single	32	18.9
	Married	151	80.0
	Widow/er	2	1.1
	Divorced	0	0.0
Educational attainment	Bachelor's	53	28.1
	Master's	118	63.8
	Doctoral	14	8.1
Teaching experience (years)	1-6	78	42.2
	7-13	62	33.5
	14-20	18	9.8
	Over 21	27	14.5
Universities	A	60	32.4
	B	40	21.6
	C	36	19.5
	D	49	26.5

Factors That Contribute to Faculty Satisfaction

The first research question aimed to know factors that contributed to faculty satisfaction of the sample institutions. To answer the question "What are the factors that contribute to faculty satisfaction of tertiary religious institutions?", Exploratory Factor Analysis with Cronbach Alpha .05 using SPSS and Confirmatory Factor Analysis with AMOS for Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) were used. Exploratory Factor Analysis in SPSS was used to investigate the factors that contribute to faculty satisfaction. This was used to explore the interrelationships among the set of variables. The result showed that there were seven factors that contribute to faculty satisfaction, and they were noted as recognition (Question No. 28, 32, 44, 27, 43, 26, 36, 37, 29, 18, 25, 38, and 45); working condition (Question No. 5, 1, 46, 20, 7, 40, 33, 12, and 13); institutional value (Question No. 30, 35, and 41); communication (Question No. 8, 21, 17, and 34); freedom and empowerment (Question No. 14, 16, 19, 23, and 9); work itself (Question No. 31, 4, 3, 24, 42, 2, 6, and 22); and institutional support (Question No. 11, 10, 15, and 39).

Pallant (2005) suggested the minimum value for a good factor analysis should be at least 60%. However, after careful analysis of the data as shown in Table 3, the cumulative result for the factors is only 51.026%. It is assumed then that one question from the questionnaire might have belonged to several groups of factors. Thus, analysis of data using Exploratory Factor Analysis of SPSS was not applicable in the present study.

To ensure a firm relationship among the factors, Kountur (2000) explained that measurement error from Exploratory Factor Analysis can be eliminated by using Confirmatory Factor Analysis of AMOS in SEM approach. Hence, the Confirmatory Factor Analysis was used in the analysis of data for the present study. Result showed that there were only three factors that contribute to faculty satisfaction. They were working condition, institutional value, and institutional support (see Table 4). For simplicity, the weighted average of each indicator was assumed to be equal.

Table 3 *The Seven Factors That Contribute to Faculty Satisfaction*

| Component | Total | Initial Eigenvalues | | Rotation | Sum of Loadings | Squared |
		% of cariance	Cumulative %	Total	% of variance	Cumulative %
1	11.25	24.472	24.472	6.935	15.076	15.076
2	3.236	7.035	31.508	3.988	8.669	23.745
3	2.070	4.500	36.008	3.091	6.720	30.464
4	1.854	4.031	40.038	2.592	5.634	36.099
5	1.770	3.847	43.885	2.336	5.078	41.177
6	1.700	3.695	47.581	2.282	4.960	46.137
7	1.585	3.445	51.026	2.249	4.889	51.026

Table 4 *Faculty Satisfaction Indicators*

Indicators	Factor 1 Working condition	Factor 2 Institutional value	Factor 3 Institutional support
Item #05	.64		
Item #12	.67		
Item #13	.51		
Item #20	.63		
Item #33	.61		
Item #30		.79	
Item #35		.69	
Item #41		.51	
Item #10			.62

Item #15			.60
Item #39			.59

Strength of the Factors that Contribute to Faculty Satisfaction

Research question 2 aimed to know how strong the identified factors contribute to faculty satisfaction. There are three factors contributing to faculty satisfaction when Confirmatory Factor Analysis was used. The result showed that institutional value contributed 66% to the faculty satisfaction while working conditions contributed 61%, and institutional support contributed 60%. The strengths of the three factors contributing to faculty satisfaction imply that administrators need to pay more attention to the institutional value of the universities by making objectives, goals, mission, and vision of the institution clearer, well-understood and achievable. Administrators should also consider working conditions such as campus condition, recognition, upgrading program, research fund, and salary. Furthermore, administrators should be further develop institutional support such as professional book allowances, freedom to choose instructional devices, and to give appreciation in order to maintain and improve faculty satisfaction.

Effect of Faculty Satisfaction on Faculty Retention

Research question 3 aimed to know whether factors related to faculty satisfaction affect faculty retention. To answer this question, a two-way ANOVA with Cronbach Alpha .05 or a confidence level of 95% using SPSS was used. The corresponding null hypothesis to this question stated that "there is no significant effect of faculty satisfaction toward faculty retention."

The p-value appeared to be .05 which indicated that there is a significant effect in faculty satisfaction toward faculty retention where the main effect for satisfaction was $F(2,177) = 3.05$, $p = .05$. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for institutional value ($M = 4.27$, $SD = .66$) was significantly different from working condition ($M = 3.94$, $SD = .68$) and institutional support ($M = 3.90$, $SD = .68$). Hence, faculty members were valued institutional value were more willing to remain. Based on this result, the null hypothesis was rejected.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to test the difference in the degree of retention of the faculty members among different religious institutions. There was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ degree in faculty retention scores for the four religious universities groups $F = (3,181) = 6.17$, $p = .001$. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test presented the mean score for the different religious universities: University A ($M = 4.33$, $SD = .62$), University B ($M = 3.67$, $SD = .85$), University C ($M = 4.16$, $SD = .87$), and D ($M = 4.04$, $SD = .73$). It shows that the mean score for University D is not significantly different from University A, University B, and University C. On the other hand, the mean scores for university A ($M = 4.33$, $SD = .62$) and University C ($M = 4.16$, $SD = .87$) were significantly different from the mean score of University B ($M = 3.67$, $SD = .85$). This indicates that the faculty members from University A, C, and University D may be more willing to remain in their respective universities in comparison to faculty members from University B. Perhaps this is due to the fact that University A, C, and D are progressively more developed in terms of years of establishment, location, financial capabilities, qualified faculty members, number of enrolled students, curriculum adequacy, and library and physical/equipment facilities. These are some possible reasons why faculty members from University A, C, and D are more willing remain.

Implications

For faculty members to be highly satisfied and more willing to remain in service, administrators need to provide working conditions which are conducive that faculty members may feel happy working in the institutions. Furthermore, the administrators need to instill institutional value, practice better institutional support by considering faculty members' needs in terms of financial considerations, career growth, recognition, and motivation. Furthermore, administrators need to maintain the institution's stability and good reputation of the institution, and continuously provide and improve working conditions, institutional value and institutional support in order for the faculty members to feel much more satisfied and more willing to be retained.

Conclusion

This study found that faculty members from tertiary religious institutions in Manado, East Indonesia are satisfied with their current employment. Furthermore, they indicate a high degree of willingness to remain with their current employment. Nonetheless, there are several factors which tertiary religious institutions need to consider in order to maintain or to improve faculty satisfaction. These factors include institutional value, working conditions, and institution support. These factors have been linked with faculty satisfaction, which in turn affects the retention of faculty members.

Faculty retention is vital for the operations of a tertiary institution, particularly in the private sector. There is a plethora of tertiary institutions world-wide, and this may attract faculty members to scout for institutions which may offer better incentives for their personal and professional growth. In light of the results of this study, school administrators need to bear in mind factors that may improve faculty's satisfaction and consequently lead to better retention.

References

Acacio, J. (1983). *Job satisfaction of the faculty of Saint Dominic College, Basco, Batangas*. (Unpublished master's thesis). De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (2002). *Introduction to research in education* (6[th]ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.

Bairagee, P. P. (2008). *School health in relation to teachers' performance and commitment: A basis for enhanced teachers' development program.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Adventist University of the Philippines, Puting Kahoy, Silang, Cavite.

Balungay, W. A. (1990). *Factors affecting job satisfaction and loyalty of teachers in selected school district of Ifugao.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Baguio Central University, Philippines.

Bauer, K. W. (2000). The front line: Satisfaction of classified employees. In L. S. Hagedorn, (Ed.), *What contributes to job satisfaction among faculty and staff* (pp.   87-97). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bowen, B. E., & Radhakrishna, R. B. (1991). Job satisfaction of agricultural education faculty: A constant phenomena. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, *32*(2), 16-22.

Braham, C.G. (2002). *Random house/webster's school and office dictionary*. New York: Random   House.

Block, A. A. (2008). Why should I be a college teacher? *Journal of Education, 59*(9), 9-19.

Camilli, K. (2004). *Teacher job satisfaction and teacher burnout as a product of years of experience in teaching.* Retrieved from http://www.Rowan.edu/library/rowan_theses/RU2004/0022TEAC.pdf.

Castillo, J. X. (1999). *The level of job satisfaction among agriculture teacher educators* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://etd.ohiolink.edu/etd/view.cgi?acc_num=osu1247848470.

Castillo, J. X., & Cano, J. (2004). Factors explaining job satisfaction among faculty. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, *3*(45), 65-71. doi: 10.5032/jae.2004.03065.

Conklin, E. A. (1999). *Job satisfaction of faculty in the college of food, agricultural, and environmental sciences on the columbus campus*. (Unpublished honor's thesis). Ohio State University, Columbus. Retrieved from http://etd.ohiolink.edu/ view.cgi?acc_num=osu1235501317.

Dee, J. R. (2004). Turnover intent in an urban community college: Strategies for faculty retention. *Journal of Research & Practice*, *28*(7), 593-607.

Evans, L. (1998). *Teacher morale, job satisfaction, and motivation*. London, England: Paul Chapman.

Flores, G. O. (1991). The correlation of teacher's personal values, and the leadership styles of administrators to job satisfaction of college teachers in Seventh-day Adventist tertiary educational institution in the Philippines: Basis for a proposed management program school year 1990-1991. (Unpublished dissertation). Southern University, Cebu City, Philippines.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2007). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (6th ed.).New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Gappa, J. M. (2000). The new faculty majority: Somewhat satisfied but not eligible for tenure. In L.S.Hagedorn,(Ed.), *What contributes to job satisfaction among faculty and staff* (pp. 77-86). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Garcia, L. S. (1983). *Job satisfaction of college instructors in seven stage colleges in region 111 in relation to selected individual variables*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Baguio Central University, Philippines.

Gaton, H.D. (1976*). Factors affecting job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among teachers at the West Visayas State College*. (Unpublished master's thesis). West Visayas State, College, Iloilo City, Philippines.

Gualdo, R. S. (1989). *Factors affecting job satisfaction of college faculty members of state college and universities in the Cordillera Administrative region*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Baguio Central University, Philippines.

Hutton, J. B., & Jobe, M. E. (1995). *Job satisfaction among community college faculty*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service NO.ED296765).

Kountur, R. (2000). *Structural equation modeling of student Performance, attitude, and anxiety in computerized testing.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.

Latham, A. S. (1998*).* Teacher satisfaction. *Educational Leadership, 55*(5), 82-83.

Limbong, N. (2000)*.Job satisfiers and dissatisfiers among the employees of the Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies (AIIAS): An analysis*. (Unpublished master's thesis) Silang, Philippines.

Long, J. L., & Swortzel, K. A. (2007). Factors influencing job satisfaction of extension agents in the Mississippi State University Extension Service. *Proceedings of the 2007 AAAE Research Conference, 34*, 41-53. Retrieved from http://etd.ohiolink.edu/view.cgi? acc_num=ossu1235501317.

Malone, T. L. (1989). *The relationship between community college faculty job satisfaction and selected intrinsic and extrinsic factors*. (Ed.D. dissertation). Memphis State University, United States—Tennessee. Retrieved from Dissertation & These: A&I. (Publication No. AAT9004350).

Mostafa, L. T. (2006). *Effect of job rotation on work performance and morale*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Adventist University of the Philippines, Puting Kahoy, Silang, Cavite.

Nelsen, R. S. (2003). *Faculty advisory council initial report to the university of Texas system board of agents*. Retrieved from http://www.utsystem.edu/news/2003/BORAug2003-Presentations.

Nuqui, S. C. (2000). *Correlates of job satisfaction among teachers of private tertiary schools in Tarlac City, School year 199-2000.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Osias College, Tarlac City, Philippines.

Pallant, J. (2005). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows* (Version 12). Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Perrachione, B. A., Petersen, G. J., & Rosser, V. J. (2008). Why do they stay? Elementary teachers' perceptions of job satisfaction and retention. *Professional Educator, 32*(2), 25-41. Retrieved from Academic Source Premier database.

Platsidou, M., & Diamantopoulou, G. (2009). Job *satisfaction of Greek university professor: Is it affected by demographic factors, academic rank and problems of higher education?* Retrieved from http://users. uom.gr~platsidu/Job%20satisfaction%20of%20Greek%20 university%20professors.pdf.

Ruhland, S. K. (2001). Factors that influence the turnover and retention of Minnesota's technical college teachers. *Journal of Vocational Educational Research, 26*(1), 56-76.

Schmiesing, R. J. (2002). *Factors related to Ohio State University extension agents perceptions of organizational justice and job satisfaction.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).The Ohio State University-Columbus. Retrieved from http://etd.ohiolink.edu/view.cgi?acc_num=osu123550131.

Seifert, T. A., & Umbach, P. D. (2008), The effects of faculty demographic characteristics and disciplinary context on dimensions of job satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 49*, 357-381. Retrieved from http://etd.ohiolink.edu/view.cg?acc_num=osu1235501317.

Sein, S. (2003). *Motivating high school teachers for higher performance in the Myanmar UnionMission* Unpublished master's thesis, Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies, Silang, Cavite, Philippines.

Smith, K. R. (1976). Morale: a refinement of stogfill's model. *Journal of Educational Administration, 14*(1), 87-93.

Tack, M. W., & Patitu, C. L. (2000). *Faculty satisfaction:Women and minorities in Peril*. Retrieved from http://etd.ohiolink.edu/send-pdf.cgi /WhetselRibeauPaula.pdf?bgsu1182282915.

Whetsel-Ribeau, P. (2007). *Retention of faculty of color as it relates to their perceptions of the academic climate at four-year predominantly while public universities in Ohio*. Retrieved from http://etd.ohiolink.edu/send-pdf.cgi/WhetselRibeau%20Paula.pdf?bgsu1182282945.

Whitaker, S. D. (2001). Mentoring beginning special education teachers and the relationship to attrition. *Exceptional Children, 66*(4), 546-566. Retrieved from http://etd.ohiolink.edu/send-pdf.cgi WhetselRibeau%20Paula.pdf?bgsu1182282915.

About the Author

Fanny Helda Rantung, PhD, is lecturer in the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education at Universitas Klabat, Manado, Indonesia.

Appendix

FACULTY SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Part I.   DEMOGRAPHICS – Please provide the information below by writing or checking [√].

Age: _____ years

Gender: _____ Male   ____Female

Civil Status: ____Single   _____ Married   _____ Widow/Widower   _____ Divorce

Educational Attainment: _____ Bachelor _____   Master   _____   Doctor

Teaching Experience: _____ years in College/University

Part II.   FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO FACULTY SATISFACTION

Directions: Please show your level of AGREEMENT on items related to your college/university by **circling** one number beside each statement, using the following key:

    1 = Strongly Disagree (SD)
    2 = Disagree (D)
    3 = Uncertain (U)
    4 = Agree (A)
    5 = Strongly Agree (SA)

		AGREEMENT RESPONSES				
		SD	D	U	A	SA
1.	This college/university provides adequate instructional materials	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Faculty lounge room is not provided	1	2	3	4	5
3.	My teaching load is reasonable	1	2	3	4	5
4.	I am not confident with the subjects I teach	1	2	3	4	5
5.	I am satisfied with my salary	1	2	3	4	5
6.	I am dissatisfied with the retirement packages	1	2	3	4	5
7.	This college/university ignores my research interest	1	2	3	4	5
8.	The medical allowance given to faculty is unreasonable	1	2	3	4	5
9.	My college/university has an excellent reputation	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Professional book allowance is sufficient	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Having uniforms for faculty is unnecessary	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Faculty upgrading program is properly planned	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Recognition is given to faculty for their performance	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Respecting each other is present in this college/university	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Faculty has the freedom to choose instructional devices	1	2	3	4	5
16.	It is an obligation for every faculty to do research	1	2	3	4	5
17.	The president always practices open communication	1	2	3	4	5
18.	The supervisory program is rarely practiced	1	2	3	4	5

		AGREEMENT RESPONSES				
		SD	D	U	A	SA
19.	Participation in in-service education is encouraged	1	2	3	4	5
20.	The campus is a good place to raise a family	1	2	3	4	5
21.	I establish mutual communication with the business manager	1	2	3	4	5
22.	The vice president of academic affair has good relationship with the faculty	1	2	3	4	5
23.	I have good relationship with my college/university dean	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Faculty-student relationship is weak	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Faculty are uninvolved in college/university decision making	1	2	3	4	5
26.	The president shows competence in managing college/university activities	1	2	3	4	5
27.	The president encourages the faculty	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Faculty attendance of seminars/workshops is encouraged	1	2	3	4	5
29.	I am satisfied with the procedures used to select faculty for promotion	1	2	3	4	5
30.	Faculty evaluation is important	1	2	3	4	5
31.	Faculty accomplishments are ignored	1	2	3	4	5
32.	Motivating faculty to grow professionally is valued	1	2	3	4	5
33.	Research fund is provided	1	2	3	4	5
34.	Written communication like memoranda, e-mail, and bulletins are used in this college/university	1	2	3	4	5
35.	Moral values are important	1	2	3	4	5
36.	This college/university has a qualified faculty	1	2	3	4	5
37.	The president practices democratic leadership	1	2	3	4	5
38.	My college/university collaborates with other colleges/universities	1	2	3	4	5
39.	The faculty feel they are appreciated	1	2	3	4	5
40.	The president is seldom available when needed	1	2	3	4	5
41.	Commitment is crucial	1	2	3	4	5
42.	Faculty opinions or ideas are valued	1	2	3	4	5
43.	Leadership development program is offered	1	2	3	4	5
44.	The faculty are encouraged/inspired in this college/university	1	2	3	4	5
45.	I am satisfied with the present leadership	1	2	3	4	5
46.	Teaching in this college/university makes me happy	1	2	3	4	5
47.	I wish to remain teaching in this college/university	1	2	3	4	5