



Office of Institutional Research
October 2010

From the Quality of Work Life survey, conducted in Spring 2007 [baseline year] and Spring 2010. These comparisons are based on all survey results, when grouped as specified, and analyzed with the appropriate parametric/distribution-based or non-parametric test(s); significance at the 0.05 level is indicated with an asterisk (*).

Section I: Compare all survey items from baseline year [2007] to current year [2010]

Section II: Pierpont Community & Technical College - Survey Items of Significance

Section III: Fairmont State University - Survey Items of Significance

Section IV: Compare the Institutions by current year 2010

Section V: Descriptive Statistics of all survey items by Institution for Current Year 2010

Section VI: Spring 2010 Survey Items by mean order

Section VII: Spearman Rank Correlation of Importance vs. Satisfaction and relative differences in rank positions

Section I: Compare all survey items from baseline year [2007] to current year [2010]

Items of **Importance** by rank [1-Highest to 17-Lowest] comparison from 2007 to 2010:

Item No.	Items	2010 Rank	2007 Rank	Change in Relative Position from 2007 to 2010
1	Relationship with co-workers. Importance	5	5	0
2	Job security. Importance	1	4	+3
3	Working conditions (comfort, safety). Importance	7	7	0
4	Flexibility of work hours. Importance	9	12	+3
5	Clearly defined job expectations. Importance	11	10	-1
6	Salary. Importance	8	9	+1
7	Health care benefits. Importance	2	6	+4
8	Retirement benefits. Importance	4	2	-2
9	Fair and equitable work performance evaluations. Importance	10	8	-2
10	Opportunities to develop new skills. Importance	12	11	+1
11	Sense that your work is meaningful. Importance	6	1	-5
12	Relationship with your immediate supervisor. Importance	3	3	0
13	Special recognition for achievements and milestones. Importance	14	15	+1
14	Access to cultural events and/or sporting events. Importance	16	16	0
15	Availability of on-campus child care. Importance	17	17	0
16	Access to and the cost of recreational/fitness facilities. Importance	15	14	-1
17	Productivity of work-related meetings. Importance	13	13	0

Items of **Satisfaction** by rank [1-Highest to 17-Lowest] comparison from 2007 to 2010:

Item No.	Items	2010 Rank	2007 Rank	Change in Relative Position from 2007 to 2010
1	Relationship with co-workers. Satisfaction	2	1	-1
2	Job security. Satisfaction	4	4	0
3	Working conditions (comfort, safety). Satisfaction	6	8	+2
4	Flexibility of work hours. Satisfaction	1	2	+1
5	Clearly defined job expectations. Satisfaction	10	9	-1
6	Salary. Satisfaction	15	14	-1
7	Health care benefits. Satisfaction	11	13	+2
8	Retirement benefits. Satisfaction	8	10	+2
9	Fair and equitable work performance evaluations. Satisfaction	12	11	-1
10	Opportunities to develop new skills. Satisfaction	7	7	0
11	Sense that your work is meaningful. Satisfaction	9	5	-4
12	Relationship with your immediate supervisor. Satisfaction	3	3	0
13	Special recognition for achievements and milestones. Satisfaction	13	12	-1
14	Access to cultural events and/or sporting events. Satisfaction	5	6	+1
15	Availability of on-campus child care. Satisfaction	17	16	-1
16	Access to and the cost of recreational/fitness facilities. Satisfaction	16	17	+1
17	Productivity of work-related meetings. Satisfaction	14	15	-1

Items of **Importance and Satisfaction** comparison by mean score from 2007 to 2010:

Importance: 1 – Not Important at all to 5 – Very Important

Satisfaction: 1- Very Dissatisfied to 5 – Very Satisfied

Items	2010 Mean	2007 Mean	Mean Difference: 2010 - 2007
Relationship with co-workers. Importance	4.64	4.61	+0.03
Relationship with co-workers. Satisfaction	3.92	4.16	-0.24*
Job security. Importance	4.69	4.61	+0.08
Job security. Satisfaction	3.77	3.84	-0.07
Working conditions (comfort, safety). Importance	4.55	4.57	-0.03
Working conditions (comfort, safety). Satisfaction	3.65	3.73	-0.09
Flexibility of work hours. Importance	4.51	4.43	+0.07
Flexibility of work hours. Satisfaction	4.00	4.13	-0.14
Clearly defined job expectations. Importance	4.48	4.50	-0.02
Clearly defined job expectations. Satisfaction	3.60	3.71	-0.11
Salary. Importance	4.55	4.51	+0.04
Salary. Satisfaction	2.99	3.10	-0.11
Health care benefits. Importance	4.68	4.59	+0.09
Health care benefits. Satisfaction	3.45	3.36	+0.09
Retirement benefits. Importance	4.65	4.67	-0.02
Retirement benefits. Satisfaction	3.60	3.51	+0.09
Fair and equitable work performance evaluations. Importance	4.50	4.53	-0.04
Fair and equitable work performance evaluations. Satisfaction	3.36	3.45	-0.09
Opportunities to develop new skills. Importance	4.43	4.48	-0.05
Opportunities to develop new skills. Satisfaction	3.64	3.74	-0.11
Sense that your work is meaningful. Importance	4.63	4.77	-0.14*
Sense that your work is meaningful. Satisfaction	3.60	3.82	-0.22*
Relationship with your immediate supervisor. Importance	4.65	4.63	+0.02
Relationship with your immediate supervisor. Satisfaction	3.79	4.12	-0.34*

Special recognition for achievements and milestones. Importance	3.87	3.74	+0.13
Special recognition for achievements and milestones. Satisfaction	3.12	3.41	-0.30*
Access to cultural events and/or sporting events. Importance	3.55	3.63	-0.08
Access to cultural events and/or sporting events. Satisfaction	3.66	3.78	-0.13*
Availability of on-campus child care. Importance	2.99	3.24	-0.26
Availability of on-campus child care. Satisfaction	2.55	2.62	-0.07
Access to and the cost of recreational/fitness facilities. Importance	3.81	3.83	-0.02
Access to and the cost of recreational/fitness facilities. Satisfaction	2.94	2.40	+0.54*
Productivity of work-related meetings. Importance	4.27	4.21	+0.05
Productivity of work-related meetings. Satisfaction	3.07	3.10	-0.03

(* indicates significance difference at the 0.05 level and a negative difference indicates a lower importance/satisfaction from 2007 to 2010)

Level of Stress item comparison by mean score [1 – Not a source of stress to 5 – Extreme Stress] from 2007 to 2010:

Item No.	Level of Stress Items	2010 Mean	2007 Mean	Mean Difference: 2010 - 2007
1	Keeping up with technology.	2.55	2.828	-0.28*
2	Rapid pace of workplace change.	2.79	2.962	-0.17
3	Availability and cost of child care.	1.83	2.088	-0.25
4	Personal finances.	3.37	3.127	+0.25*
5	Care of elderly parent.	2.36	2.364	-0.01
6	Availability of promotion opportunities.	2.93	2.718	+0.22*
7	Availability and cost of food services.	2.22	1.943	+0.27*
8	Inefficient use of technology on campus.	2.69	2.653	+0.04
9	Discrimination (e.g. prejudice, racism, sexism)	1.90	1.766	+0.13
10	Marital friction.	1.53	1.584	-0.06
11	Managing household responsibilities.	2.62	2.604	+0.02
12	Insufficient available information for decision-making.	2.56	2.359	+0.20
13	Frequency of work-related meetings.	2.46	2.423	+0.04
14	Conflict among co-workers in the work place.	2.69	2.234	+0.45*
15	Work load.	3.10	3.130	-0.03
16	Availability of parking.	1.94	1.957	-0.02
17	Commuting.	1.75	1.772	-0.02
18	Ineffective communication methods.	2.85	2.575	+0.27*
19	Difficulties with other work units.	2.38	2.152	+0.23*
20	Rude or inconsiderate students.	2.46	2.211	+0.25*
21	Illness or death of a family member.	2.27	2.327	-0.05
22	Institutional procedures and "red tape".	3.08	3.131	-0.05
23	Cost of parking.	2.62	2.593	+0.03
24	Top-down decisions contrasting with departmental expertise/knowledge.	3.23	3.069	+0.16
25	Difficult relationship with immediate supervisor.	2.08	1.636	+0.45*

26	Physical health.	2.18	1.982	+0.20*
27	Review / promotion process.	2.61	2.500	+0.11
28	Departmental budget concerns.	2.84	2.881	-0.04
29	Unproductive committee work.	2.49	2.410	+0.08
30	Difficult relationship with subordinate.	1.75	1.697	+0.05

(* indicates significance difference at the 0.05 level and a positive difference indicates an increase in stress from 2007 to 2010)

Level of Agreement item comparison by mean score [1 – Strongly Disagree to 5 – Strongly Agree] from 2007 to 2010:

Item No.	Level of Agreement Items	2010 Mean	2007 Mean	Mean Difference: 2010 - 2007
1	The institution really cares about my well-being.	2.79	2.953	-0.16
2	Management strongly considers my goals and values.	2.75	2.782	-0.03
3	The college/university community operates from a strong sense of shared mission and goals.	2.76	3.043	-0.28*
4	Help is available when I have a problem.	3.40	3.629	-0.23*
5	The organization cares about and values my opinions.	2.67	2.971	-0.30*
6	I feel a strong sense of belonging to this institution.	3.11	3.371	-0.26*
7	In general, managers in this institution are quite accommodating of family-related needs.	3.65	3.946	-0.29*
8	Colleagues and supervisors support my work endeavors.	3.59	3.926	-0.34*
9	The amount of time required to perform the responsibilities of my position has increased beyond the normal work day.	3.60	3.664	-0.06
10	I enjoy discussing this institution with people outside it.	3.40	3.741	-0.34*
11	I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization.	2.73	2.543	+0.18
12	The institution would forgive an honest mistake on my part.	3.51	3.615	-0.11
13	My organization shows very little concern for me.	2.63	2.376	+0.25*
14	I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this institution.	3.43	3.760	-0.33*
15	Considering everything, the quality of my work life is very good.	3.54	3.854	-0.31*
16	The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life.	2.66	2.772	-0.12
17	The demands of my family or spouse/partner interfere with work-related activities.	2.02	1.972	+0.05

(* significance at the 0.05 level and a negative difference indicates a lowering level of agreement from 2007 to 2010)

Section II: Pierpont Community & Technical College - Survey Items of Significance

The following survey items showed a significant difference (0.05 level) from 2007 to 2010 when grouped by institution = Pierpont C&TC:

Working conditions (comfort, safety) – Importance
Special recognition for achievements and milestones – Satisfaction
Access to and the cost of recreational/fitness facilities – Satisfaction
Conflict among co-workers in the work place
Difficulties with other work units
The College/University community operates from a strong sense of shared mission and goals
Help is available when I have a problem
The organization cares about and values my opinion
I enjoy discussing this institution with people outside it
The institution would forgive an honest mistake on my part
My organization shows very little concern for me
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this institution
Considering everything, the quality of my work life is very good
What is your age [in years]?
Are you a full-time employee?
How long have you worked at FSU and/or PC&TC?

Descriptive Statistics of all survey items by survey year when grouped by institution = Pierpont C&TC:

	Survey Year	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Relationship with co-workers. Importance	2007	97	4.57	.749	.076
	2010	58	4.59	.702	.092
Relationship with co-workers. Satisfaction	2007	97	4.19	.870	.088
	2010	60	4.18	.892	.115
Job security. Importance	2007	94	4.54	.876	.090
	2010	56	4.57	.783	.105
Job security. Satisfaction	2007	94	3.93	1.029	.106
	2010	58	3.91	.996	.131
Working conditions (comfort, safety). Importance	2007	97	4.65	.708	.072
	2010	60	4.50	.676	.087
Working conditions (comfort, safety). Satisfaction	2007	97	4.03	1.035	.105
	2010	60	3.97	.938	.121
Flexibility of work hours. Importance	2007	94	4.43	.810	.084
	2010	60	4.53	.700	.090
Flexibility of work hours. Satisfaction	2007	94	4.11	.861	.089
	2010	60	4.08	1.046	.135
Clearly defined job expectations. Importance	2007	96	4.59	.674	.069
	2010	60	4.45	.832	.107
Clearly defined job expectations. Satisfaction	2007	96	3.90	.989	.101
	2010	60	3.78	1.166	.151
Salary. Importance	2007	97	4.56	.829	.084
	2010	60	4.40	.807	.104
Salary. Satisfaction	2007	97	3.29	1.136	.115
	2010	59	3.29	1.035	.135

Health care benefits. Importance	2007	78	4.56	.920	.104
	2010	54	4.74	.589	.080
Health care benefits. Satisfaction	2007	72	3.50	1.343	.158
	2010	52	3.63	1.138	.158
Retirement benefits. Importance	2007	79	4.68	.708	.080
	2010	54	4.61	.763	.104
Retirement benefits. Satisfaction	2007	74	3.50	1.327	.154
	2010	52	3.71	.915	.127
Fair and equitable work performance evaluations. Importance	2007	90	4.43	.912	.096
	2010	56	4.50	.739	.099
Fair and equitable work performance evaluations. Satisfaction	2007	87	3.69	1.124	.120
	2010	56	3.57	1.158	.155
Opportunities to develop new skills. Importance	2007	94	4.41	.848	.087
	2010	57	4.44	.627	.083
Opportunities to develop new skills. Satisfaction	2007	94	3.83	1.064	.110
	2010	57	3.79	1.081	.143
Sense that your work is meaningful. Importance	2007	96	4.74	.637	.065
	2010	59	4.63	.740	.096
Sense that your work is meaningful. Satisfaction	2007	95	3.98	1.101	.113
	2010	59	3.69	1.277	.166
Relationship with your immediate supervisor. Importance	2007	94	4.63	.733	.076
	2010	60	4.62	.666	.086
Relationship with your immediate supervisor. Satisfaction	2007	94	4.18	1.047	.108
	2010	60	3.93	1.300	.168
Special recognition for achievements and milestones. Importance	2007	91	3.68	1.173	.123
	2010	55	3.76	1.247	.168

Special recognition for achievements and milestones. Satisfaction	2007	89	3.65	.955	.101
	2010	51	3.18	1.228	.172
Access to cultural events and/or sporting events. Importance	2007	89	3.57	1.096	.116
	2010	54	3.41	1.190	.162
Access to cultural events and/or sporting events. Satisfaction	2007	87	3.79	1.013	.109
	2010	53	3.77	.912	.125
Availability of on-campus child care. Importance	2007	53	3.51	1.502	.206
	2010	34	3.03	1.714	.294
Availability of on-campus child care. Satisfaction	2007	44	2.55	1.109	.167
	2010	28	2.68	1.362	.257
Access to and the cost of recreational/fitness facilities. Importance	2007	79	3.90	1.172	.132
	2010	51	3.80	1.077	.151
Access to and the cost of recreational/fitness facilities. Satisfaction	2007	77	2.62	1.159	.132
	2010	49	3.10	1.212	.173
Productivity of work-related meetings. Importance	2007	84	4.25	.820	.089
	2010	55	4.24	.693	.093
Productivity of work-related meetings. Satisfaction	2007	80	3.29	1.150	.129
	2010	54	3.22	1.058	.144
Keeping up with technology.	2007	96	2.76	1.176	.120
	2010	62	2.50	1.184	.150
Rapid pace of workplace change.	2007	93	2.75	1.357	.141
	2010	62	2.42	1.195	.152
Availability and cost of child care.	2007	48	2.02	1.451	.209
	2010	33	1.88	1.364	.237
Personal finances.	2007	90	3.21	1.362	.144
	2010	61	3.18	1.432	.183

Care of elderly parent.	2007	65	2.40	1.579	.196
	2010	38	2.21	1.455	.236
Availability of promotion opportunities.	2007	89	2.72	1.279	.136
	2010	60	2.65	1.260	.163
Availability and cost of food services.	2007	80	2.06	1.256	.140
	2010	53	2.08	1.190	.164
Inefficient use of technology on campus.	2007	89	2.39	1.249	.132
	2010	56	2.75	1.311	.175
Discrimination (e.g. prejudice, racism, sexism)	2007	88	1.73	1.152	.123
	2010	58	1.83	1.201	.158
Marital friction.	2007	83	1.53	.954	.105
	2010	52	1.52	.918	.127
Managing household responsibilities.	2007	90	2.47	1.359	.143
	2010	60	2.50	1.295	.167
Insufficient available information for decision-making.	2007	91	2.25	1.207	.127
	2010	61	2.21	1.213	.155
Frequency of work-related meetings.	2007	86	2.33	1.306	.141
	2010	57	2.26	1.247	.165
Conflict among co-workers in the work place.	2007	90	1.93	1.197	.126
	2010	60	2.32	1.269	.164
Work load.	2007	93	2.90	1.407	.146
	2010	62	2.95	1.408	.179
Availability of parking.	2007	92	1.89	1.227	.128
	2010	58	1.76	1.129	.148
Commuting.	2007	89	2.00	1.270	.135
	2010	59	1.83	1.101	.143

Ineffective communication methods.	2007	95	2.33	1.284	.132
	2010	61	2.57	1.284	.164
Difficulties with other work units.	2007	91	1.86	1.216	.128
	2010	60	2.18	1.282	.166
Rude or inconsiderate students.	2007	92	2.17	1.314	.137
	2010	59	2.32	1.210	.157
Illness or death of a family member.	2007	72	2.29	1.569	.185
	2010	54	2.11	1.369	.186
Institutional procedures and "red tape".	2007	93	2.98	1.383	.143
	2010	59	2.93	1.230	.160
Cost of parking.	2007	89	2.58	1.421	.151
	2010	60	2.58	1.441	.186
Top-down decisions contrasting with departmental expertise/knowledge.	2007	86	2.74	1.374	.148
	2010	60	2.85	1.459	.188
Difficult relationship with immediate supervisor.	2007	89	1.62	1.113	.118
	2010	60	1.87	1.321	.171
Physical health.	2007	93	1.96	1.169	.121
	2010	60	1.95	1.096	.141
Review / promotion process.	2007	86	2.50	1.361	.147
	2010	56	2.25	1.254	.168
Departmental budget concerns.	2007	89	2.58	1.372	.145
	2010	57	2.86	1.274	.169
Unproductive committee work.	2007	85	2.24	1.333	.145
	2010	55	2.35	1.174	.158
Difficult relationship with subordinate.	2007	78	1.73	1.113	.126
	2010	52	1.87	1.121	.155

The institution really cares about my well-being.	2007	96	3.32	1.021	.104
	2010	62	3.06	1.038	.132
Management strongly considers my goals and values.	2007	93	3.14	1.079	.112
	2010	61	3.05	1.117	.143
The college/university community operates from a strong sense of shared mission and goals.	2007	97	3.55	.979	.099
	2010	61	3.13	1.162	.149
Help is available when I have a problem.	2007	97	3.95	.917	.093
	2010	61	3.51	.906	.116
The organization cares about and values my opinions.	2007	94	3.34	1.053	.109
	2010	61	3.00	1.111	.142
I feel a strong sense of belonging to this institution.	2007	95	3.53	1.050	.108
	2010	59	3.31	1.163	.151
In general, managers in this institution are quite accommodating of family-related needs.	2007	87	4.01	.814	.087
	2010	60	3.73	1.103	.142
Colleagues and supervisors support my work endeavors.	2007	94	4.03	.848	.087
	2010	61	3.74	1.109	.142
The amount of time required to perform the responsibilities of my position has increased beyond the normal work day.	2007	93	3.55	1.273	.132
	2010	59	3.71	1.160	.151
I enjoy discussing this institution with people outside it.	2007	94	3.97	.933	.096
	2010	60	3.40	1.167	.151
I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization.	2007	92	2.57	1.269	.132
	2010	61	2.48	1.120	.143
The institution would forgive an honest mistake on my part.	2007	93	3.77	.910	.094
	2010	62	3.50	.937	.119
My organization shows very little concern for me.	2007	95	2.21	1.061	.109
	2010	62	2.61	1.219	.155

I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this institution.	2007	92	4.07	.899	.094
	2010	59	3.68	1.025	.133
Considering everything, the quality of my work life is very good.	2007	96	4.15	.781	.080
	2010	60	3.68	.948	.122
The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life.	2007	94	2.57	1.222	.126
	2010	59	2.46	1.222	.159
The demands of my family or spouse/partner interfere with work-related activities.	2007	90	2.19	1.170	.123
	2010	57	1.95	.934	.124

Section III: Fairmont State University - Survey Items of Significance

The following survey items showed a significant difference (0.05 level) from 2007 to 2010 when grouped by institution = FSU respondents:

Relationship with co-workers – Satisfaction
Sense that your work is meaningful – Importance
Sense that your work is meaningful – Satisfaction
Relationship with your immediate supervisor – Satisfaction
Special recognition for achievements and milestones – Satisfaction
Access to and the cost of recreational/fitness facilities – Satisfaction
Keeping up with technology
Personal finances
Availability of promotion opportunities
Availability and cost of food services
Insufficient available information for decision making
Conflict among co-workers in the work place
Difficulties with other work units
Rude or inconsiderate students
Difficult relationship with immediate supervisor
Physical health
The organization cares about and values my opinion
I feel a strong sense of belonging to this institution
In general, managers in the institution are quite accommodating of family related needs
Colleagues and supervisors support my work endeavors
I enjoy discussing this institution with people outside it
I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this institution
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this institution
Considering everything, the quality of my work life is very good
What is your marital status?
How long have you worked in your current position?

Descriptive Statistics of all survey items by survey year for Fairmont State University:

	Survey Year	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Relationship with co-workers. Importance	2007	246	4.63	.727	.046
	2010	202	4.65	.639	.045
Relationship with co-workers. Satisfaction	2007	244	4.15	.922	.059
	2010	201	3.86	1.022	.072
Job security. Importance	2007	244	4.64	.754	.048
	2010	197	4.72	.587	.042
Job security. Satisfaction	2007	244	3.82	1.108	.071
	2010	201	3.70	1.123	.079
Working conditions (comfort, safety). Importance	2007	244	4.54	.710	.045
	2010	202	4.54	.684	.048
Working conditions (comfort, safety). Satisfaction	2007	243	3.63	1.104	.071
	2010	203	3.56	1.135	.080
Flexibility of work hours. Importance	2007	241	4.44	.879	.057
	2010	201	4.49	.782	.055
Flexibility of work hours. Satisfaction	2007	239	4.15	1.046	.068
	2010	202	3.96	1.180	.083
Clearly defined job expectations. Importance	2007	246	4.48	.797	.051
	2010	201	4.47	.825	.058
Clearly defined job expectations. Satisfaction	2007	245	3.63	1.147	.073
	2010	201	3.51	1.213	.086
Salary. Importance	2007	247	4.49	.759	.048
	2010	202	4.59	.672	.047
Salary. Satisfaction	2007	245	3.04	1.123	.072
	2010	202	2.87	1.237	.087

Health care benefits. Importance	2007	214	4.60	.854	.058
	2010	182	4.66	.745	.055
Health care benefits. Satisfaction	2007	207	3.30	1.210	.084
	2010	175	3.39	1.227	.093
Retirement benefits. Importance	2007	225	4.66	.758	.051
	2010	183	4.64	.679	.050
Retirement benefits. Satisfaction	2007	215	3.51	1.199	.082
	2010	176	3.56	1.150	.087
Fair and equitable work performance evaluations. Importance	2007	234	4.56	.806	.053
	2010	195	4.49	.887	.064
Fair and equitable work performance evaluations. Satisfaction	2007	228	3.34	1.243	.082
	2010	194	3.27	1.328	.095
Opportunities to develop new skills. Importance	2007	239	4.51	.727	.047
	2010	199	4.42	.799	.057
Opportunities to develop new skills. Satisfaction	2007	239	3.70	1.069	.069
	2010	200	3.55	1.079	.076
Sense that your work is meaningful. Importance	2007	247	4.78	.587	.037
	2010	201	4.62	.653	.046
Sense that your work is meaningful. Satisfaction	2007	246	3.75	1.158	.074
	2010	202	3.55	1.154	.081
Relationship with your immediate supervisor. Importance	2007	245	4.64	.660	.042
	2010	202	4.66	.619	.044
Relationship with your immediate supervisor. Satisfaction	2007	243	4.10	1.136	.073
	2010	203	3.72	1.377	.097
Special recognition for achievements and milestones. Importance	2007	237	3.76	1.031	.067
	2010	197	3.89	.952	.068

Special recognition for achievements and milestones. Satisfaction	2007	232	3.32	1.021	.067
	2010	196	3.09	1.113	.079
Access to cultural events and/or sporting events. Importance	2007	237	3.65	1.164	.076
	2010	196	3.56	1.034	.074
Access to cultural events and/or sporting events. Satisfaction	2007	232	3.78	.968	.064
	2010	194	3.62	.986	.071
Availability of on-campus child care. Importance	2007	129	3.12	1.579	.139
	2010	99	2.98	1.591	.160
Availability of on-campus child care. Satisfaction	2007	108	2.67	1.207	.116
	2010	81	2.41	1.191	.132
Access to and the cost of recreational/fitness facilities. Importance	2007	220	3.82	1.116	.075
	2010	186	3.80	1.181	.087
Access to and the cost of recreational/fitness facilities. Satisfaction	2007	212	2.31	1.218	.084
	2010	182	2.89	1.317	.098
Productivity of work-related meetings. Importance	2007	225	4.20	.924	.062
	2010	192	4.27	.830	.060
Productivity of work-related meetings. Satisfaction	2007	223	3.03	1.090	.073
	2010	192	3.01	.992	.072
Keeping up with technology.	2007	243	2.83	1.303	.084
	2010	204	2.58	1.231	.086
Rapid pace of workplace change.	2007	241	3.03	1.297	.084
	2010	200	2.91	1.249	.088
Availability and cost of child care.	2007	122	2.10	1.550	.140
	2010	101	1.83	1.312	.131
Personal finances.	2007	237	3.10	1.418	.092
	2010	196	3.44	1.309	.094

Care of elderly parent.	2007	158	2.34	1.504	.120
	2010	121	2.38	1.523	.138
Availability of promotion opportunities.	2007	223	2.72	1.351	.090
	2010	186	3.03	1.373	.101
Availability and cost of food services.	2007	213	1.91	1.190	.082
	2010	190	2.23	1.341	.097
Inefficient use of technology on campus.	2007	235	2.73	1.365	.089
	2010	197	2.70	1.317	.094
Discrimination (e.g. prejudice, racism, sexism)	2007	223	1.77	1.203	.081
	2010	196	1.90	1.207	.086
Marital friction.	2007	204	1.62	1.162	.081
	2010	156	1.52	1.038	.083
Managing household responsibilities.	2007	233	2.65	1.422	.093
	2010	194	2.66	1.428	.103
Insufficient available information for decision-making.	2007	239	2.40	1.318	.085
	2010	198	2.69	1.345	.096
Frequency of work-related meetings.	2007	236	2.46	1.403	.091
	2010	195	2.55	1.297	.093
Conflict among co-workers in the work place.	2007	234	2.33	1.405	.092
	2010	201	2.78	1.404	.099
Work load.	2007	241	3.21	1.402	.090
	2010	201	3.16	1.363	.096
Availability of parking.	2007	232	2.00	1.324	.087
	2010	194	1.99	1.232	.088
Commuting.	2007	219	1.69	1.098	.074
	2010	187	1.74	1.063	.078

Ineffective communication methods.	2007	241	2.68	1.417	.091
	2010	201	2.93	1.412	.100
Difficulties with other work units.	2007	239	2.25	1.342	.087
	2010	194	2.46	1.328	.095
Rude or inconsiderate students.	2007	230	2.20	1.327	.088
	2010	193	2.50	1.351	.097
Illness or death of a family member.	2007	184	2.35	1.592	.117
	2010	144	2.32	1.590	.132
Institutional procedures and "red tape".	2007	237	3.19	1.409	.092
	2010	198	3.13	1.385	.098
Cost of parking.	2007	233	2.61	1.465	.096
	2010	195	2.64	1.494	.107
Top-down decisions contrasting with departmental expertise/knowledge.	2007	240	3.17	1.498	.097
	2010	194	3.36	1.332	.096
Difficult relationship with immediate supervisor.	2007	231	1.65	1.140	.075
	2010	196	2.15	1.430	.102
Physical health.	2007	235	2.00	1.288	.084
	2010	193	2.24	1.361	.098
Review / promotion process.	2007	231	2.51	1.414	.093
	2010	189	2.67	1.410	.103
Departmental budget concerns.	2007	233	3.00	1.470	.096
	2010	194	2.86	1.398	.100
Unproductive committee work.	2007	218	2.47	1.431	.097
	2010	180	2.54	1.330	.099
Difficult relationship with subordinate.	2007	202	1.69	1.170	.082
	2010	164	1.73	1.110	.087

The institution really cares about my well-being.	2007	245	2.80	1.072	.069
	2010	206	2.73	1.066	.074
Management strongly considers my goals and values.	2007	244	2.65	1.073	.069
	2010	203	2.68	1.151	.081
The college/university community operates from a strong sense of shared mission and goals.	2007	246	2.85	1.050	.067
	2010	202	2.66	.960	.068
Help is available when I have a problem.	2007	240	3.50	.994	.064
	2010	202	3.36	1.028	.072
The organization cares about and values my opinions.	2007	244	2.83	1.120	.072
	2010	204	2.60	1.108	.078
I feel a strong sense of belonging to this institution.	2007	244	3.32	1.123	.072
	2010	205	3.09	1.193	.083
In general, managers in this institution are quite accommodating of family-related needs.	2007	222	3.92	.938	.063
	2010	191	3.63	.975	.071
Colleagues and supervisors support my work endeavors.	2007	243	3.88	.945	.061
	2010	202	3.58	1.063	.075
The amount of time required to perform the responsibilities of my position has increased beyond the normal work day.	2007	240	3.70	1.261	.081
	2010	201	3.57	1.325	.093
I enjoy discussing this institution with people outside it.	2007	243	3.66	1.158	.074
	2010	199	3.41	1.115	.079
I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization.	2007	244	2.52	1.288	.082
	2010	206	2.81	1.318	.092
The institution would forgive an honest mistake on my part.	2007	242	3.55	.915	.059
	2010	203	3.52	.972	.068
My organization shows very little concern for me.	2007	242	2.45	1.070	.069
	2010	202	2.61	1.163	.082

I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this institution.	2007	239	3.65	1.134	.073
	2010	200	3.36	1.227	.087
Considering everything, the quality of my work life is very good.	2007	244	3.74	.996	.064
	2010	204	3.51	1.053	.074
The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life.	2007	237	2.84	1.386	.090
	2010	198	2.71	1.256	.089
The demands of my family or spouse/partner interfere with work-related activities.	2007	232	1.89	1.026	.067
	2010	189	2.02	.994	.072

Section IV: Compare the Institutions by current year 2010

The following survey items showed a significant difference (0.05 level) when comparing the 2010 results of FSU to the 2010 results of Pierpont C&TC:

Relationship with co-workers – Satisfaction
Working conditions (comfort, safety) – Satisfaction
Salary – Satisfaction
Opportunities to develop new skills – Satisfaction
Rapid pace of workplace change
Availability of promotion opportunities
Insufficient available information for decision making
Conflict among co-workers in the work place
Top-down decision contrasting with departmental expertise/knowledge
Review/promotion process
Management strongly considers my goals and values
The College/University community operates from a strong sense of shared mission and goals
The organization cares about and values my opinion
What is your age [in years]?
How would you classify your position?

Section V: Descriptive Statistics of all survey items by Institution for Current Year 2010

Item	You are employed with:	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Relationship with co-workers. Importance	FSU	202	4.65	.639	.045
	PC&TC	58	4.59	.702	.092
Relationship with co-workers. Satisfaction	FSU	201	3.86	1.022	.072
	PC&TC	60	4.18	.892	.115
Job security. Importance	FSU	197	4.72	.587	.042
	PC&TC	56	4.57	.783	.105
Job security. Satisfaction	FSU	201	3.70	1.123	.079
	PC&TC	58	3.91	.996	.131
Working conditions (comfort, safety). Importance	FSU	202	4.54	.684	.048
	PC&TC	60	4.50	.676	.087
Working conditions (comfort, safety). Satisfaction	FSU	203	3.56	1.135	.080
	PC&TC	60	3.97	.938	.121
Flexibility of work hours. Importance	FSU	201	4.49	.782	.055
	PC&TC	60	4.53	.700	.090
Flexibility of work hours. Satisfaction	FSU	202	3.96	1.180	.083
	PC&TC	60	4.08	1.046	.135
Clearly defined job expectations. Importance	FSU	201	4.47	.825	.058
	PC&TC	60	4.45	.832	.107
Clearly defined job expectations. Satisfaction	FSU	201	3.51	1.213	.086
	PC&TC	60	3.78	1.166	.151
Salary. Importance	FSU	202	4.59	.672	.047
	PC&TC	60	4.40	.807	.104

Salary. Satisfaction	FSU	202	2.87	1.237	.087
	PC&TC	59	3.29	1.035	.135
Health care benefits. Importance	FSU	182	4.66	.745	.055
	PC&TC	54	4.74	.589	.080
Health care benefits. Satisfaction	FSU	175	3.39	1.227	.093
	PC&TC	52	3.63	1.138	.158
Retirement benefits. Importance	FSU	183	4.64	.679	.050
	PC&TC	54	4.61	.763	.104
Retirement benefits. Satisfaction	FSU	176	3.56	1.150	.087
	PC&TC	52	3.71	.915	.127
Fair and equitable work performance evaluations. Importance	FSU	195	4.49	.887	.064
	PC&TC	56	4.50	.739	.099
Fair and equitable work performance evaluations. Satisfaction	FSU	194	3.27	1.328	.095
	PC&TC	56	3.57	1.158	.155
Opportunities to develop new skills. Importance	FSU	199	4.42	.799	.057
	PC&TC	57	4.44	.627	.083
Opportunities to develop new skills. Satisfaction	FSU	200	3.55	1.079	.076
	PC&TC	57	3.79	1.081	.143
Sense that your work is meaningful. Importance	FSU	201	4.62	.653	.046
	PC&TC	59	4.63	.740	.096
Sense that your work is meaningful. Satisfaction	FSU	202	3.55	1.154	.081
	PC&TC	59	3.69	1.277	.166
Relationship with your immediate supervisor. Importance	FSU	202	4.66	.619	.044
	PC&TC	60	4.62	.666	.086
Relationship with your immediate supervisor. Satisfaction	FSU	203	3.72	1.377	.097
	PC&TC	60	3.93	1.300	.168

Special recognition for achievements and milestones. Importance	FSU	197	3.89	.952	.068
	PC&TC	55	3.76	1.247	.168
Special recognition for achievements and milestones. Satisfaction	FSU	196	3.09	1.113	.079
	PC&TC	51	3.18	1.228	.172
Access to cultural events and/or sporting events. Importance	FSU	196	3.56	1.034	.074
	PC&TC	54	3.41	1.190	.162
Access to cultural events and/or sporting events. Satisfaction	FSU	194	3.62	.986	.071
	PC&TC	53	3.77	.912	.125
Availability of on-campus child care. Importance	FSU	99	2.98	1.591	.160
	PC&TC	34	3.03	1.714	.294
Availability of on-campus child care. Satisfaction	FSU	81	2.41	1.191	.132
	PC&TC	28	2.68	1.362	.257
Access to and the cost of recreational/fitness facilities. Importance	FSU	186	3.80	1.181	.087
	PC&TC	51	3.80	1.077	.151
Access to and the cost of recreational/fitness facilities. Satisfaction	FSU	182	2.89	1.317	.098
	PC&TC	49	3.10	1.212	.173
Productivity of work-related meetings. Importance	FSU	192	4.27	.830	.060
	PC&TC	55	4.24	.693	.093
Productivity of work-related meetings. Satisfaction	FSU	192	3.01	.992	.072
	PC&TC	54	3.22	1.058	.144
Keeping up with technology.	FSU	204	2.58	1.231	.086
	PC&TC	62	2.50	1.184	.150
Rapid pace of workplace change.	FSU	200	2.91	1.249	.088
	PC&TC	62	2.42	1.195	.152
Availability and cost of child care.	FSU	101	1.83	1.312	.131
	PC&TC	33	1.88	1.364	.237

Personal finances.	FSU	196	3.44	1.309	.094
	PC&TC	61	3.18	1.432	.183
Care of elderly parent.	FSU	121	2.38	1.523	.138
	PC&TC	38	2.21	1.455	.236
Availability of promotion opportunities.	FSU	186	3.03	1.373	.101
	PC&TC	60	2.65	1.260	.163
Availability and cost of food services.	FSU	190	2.23	1.341	.097
	PC&TC	53	2.08	1.190	.164
Inefficient use of technology on campus.	FSU	197	2.70	1.317	.094
	PC&TC	56	2.75	1.311	.175
Discrimination (e.g. prejudice, racism, sexism)	FSU	196	1.90	1.207	.086
	PC&TC	58	1.83	1.201	.158
Marital friction.	FSU	156	1.52	1.038	.083
	PC&TC	52	1.52	.918	.127
Managing household responsibilities.	FSU	194	2.66	1.428	.103
	PC&TC	60	2.50	1.295	.167
Insufficient available information for decision-making.	FSU	198	2.69	1.345	.096
	PC&TC	61	2.21	1.213	.155
Frequency of work-related meetings.	FSU	195	2.55	1.297	.093
	PC&TC	57	2.26	1.247	.165
Conflict among co-workers in the work place.	FSU	201	2.78	1.404	.099
	PC&TC	60	2.32	1.269	.164
Work load.	FSU	201	3.16	1.363	.096
	PC&TC	62	2.95	1.408	.179
Availability of parking.	FSU	194	1.99	1.232	.088
	PC&TC	58	1.76	1.129	.148

Commuting.	FSU	187	1.74	1.063	.078
	PC&TC	59	1.83	1.101	.143
Ineffective communication methods.	FSU	201	2.93	1.412	.100
	PC&TC	61	2.57	1.284	.164
Difficulties with other work units.	FSU	194	2.46	1.328	.095
	PC&TC	60	2.18	1.282	.166
Rude or inconsiderate students.	FSU	193	2.50	1.351	.097
	PC&TC	59	2.32	1.210	.157
Illness or death of a family member.	FSU	144	2.32	1.590	.132
	PC&TC	54	2.11	1.369	.186
Institutional procedures and "red tape".	FSU	198	3.13	1.385	.098
	PC&TC	59	2.93	1.230	.160
Cost of parking.	FSU	195	2.64	1.494	.107
	PC&TC	60	2.58	1.441	.186
Top-down decisions contrasting with departmental expertise/knowledge.	FSU	194	3.36	1.332	.096
	PC&TC	60	2.85	1.459	.188
Difficult relationship with immediate supervisor.	FSU	196	2.15	1.430	.102
	PC&TC	60	1.87	1.321	.171
Physical health.	FSU	193	2.24	1.361	.098
	PC&TC	60	1.95	1.096	.141
Review / promotion process.	FSU	189	2.67	1.410	.103
	PC&TC	56	2.25	1.254	.168
Departmental budget concerns.	FSU	194	2.86	1.398	.100
	PC&TC	57	2.86	1.274	.169
Unproductive committee work.	FSU	180	2.54	1.330	.099
	PC&TC	55	2.35	1.174	.158

Difficult relationship with subordinate.	FSU	164	1.73	1.110	.087
	PC&TC	52	1.87	1.121	.155
The institution really cares about my well-being.	FSU	206	2.73	1.066	.074
	PC&TC	62	3.06	1.038	.132
Management strongly considers my goals and values.	FSU	203	2.68	1.151	.081
	PC&TC	61	3.05	1.117	.143
The college/university community operates from a strong sense of shared mission and goals.	FSU	202	2.66	.960	.068
	PC&TC	61	3.13	1.162	.149
Help is available when I have a problem.	FSU	202	3.36	1.028	.072
	PC&TC	61	3.51	.906	.116
The organization cares about and values my opinions.	FSU	204	2.60	1.108	.078
	PC&TC	61	3.00	1.111	.142
I feel a strong sense of belonging to this institution.	FSU	205	3.09	1.193	.083
	PC&TC	59	3.31	1.163	.151
In general, managers in this institution are quite accommodating of family-related needs.	FSU	191	3.63	.975	.071
	PC&TC	60	3.73	1.103	.142
Colleagues and supervisors support my work endeavors.	FSU	202	3.58	1.063	.075
	PC&TC	61	3.74	1.109	.142
The amount of time required to perform the responsibilities of my position has increased beyond the normal work day.	FSU	201	3.57	1.325	.093
	PC&TC	59	3.71	1.160	.151
I enjoy discussing this institution with people outside it.	FSU	199	3.41	1.115	.079
	PC&TC	60	3.40	1.167	.151
I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization.	FSU	206	2.81	1.318	.092
	PC&TC	61	2.48	1.120	.143
The institution would forgive an honest mistake on my part.	FSU	203	3.52	.972	.068
	PC&TC	62	3.50	.937	.119

My organization shows very little concern for me.	FSU	202	2.61	1.163	.082
	PC&TC	62	2.61	1.219	.155
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this institution.	FSU	200	3.36	1.227	.087
	PC&TC	59	3.68	1.025	.133
Considering everything, the quality of my work life is very good.	FSU	204	3.51	1.053	.074
	PC&TC	60	3.68	.948	.122
The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life.	FSU	198	2.71	1.256	.089
	PC&TC	59	2.46	1.222	.159
The demands of my family or spouse/partner interfere with work-related activities.	FSU	189	2.02	.994	.072
	PC&TC	57	1.95	.934	.124
What is your age [in years]?	FSU	206	3.61	1.297	.090
	PC&TC	62	4.16	1.011	.128
What is your gender?	FSU	205	1.36	.481	.034
	PC&TC	62	1.32	.471	.060
Are you a full-time employee?	FSU	205	1.19	.393	.027
	PC&TC	62	1.21	.410	.052
How long have you worked at Fairmont State University and/or Pierpont C&TC?	FSU	205	3.24	1.568	.110
	PC&TC	62	3.34	1.482	.188
How long have you worked in your current position?	FSU	204	2.75	1.538	.108
	PC&TC	62	2.74	1.342	.170
How would you classify your position?	FSU	206	4.37	1.832	.128
	PC&TC	62	3.84	1.484	.189
What is your marital status?	FSU	205	1.55	.865	.060
	PC&TC	62	1.35	.749	.095
What is the highest educational level you have attained?	FSU	205	4.50	1.381	.096
	PC&TC	62	4.53	1.097	.139

What is your racial or ethnic group?	FSU	206	1.07	.503	.035
	PC&TC	62	1.08	.454	.058

Section VI: Spring 2010 Survey Items by mean order

Ranking of “Importance” Items (by decreasing means) for 2010:

Item No.	Items	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
2	Job security. Importance	271	1	5	4.69	.632
7	Health care benefits. Importance	254	1	5	4.68	.731
12	Relationship with your immediate supervisor. Importance	280	1	5	4.65	.626
8	Retirement benefits. Importance	253	1	5	4.65	.683
1	Relationship with co-workers. Importance	278	1	5	4.64	.648
11	Sense that your work is meaningful. Importance	278	1	5	4.63	.665
3	Working conditions (comfort, safety). Importance	281	1	5	4.55	.669
6	Salary. Importance	280	1	5	4.55	.696
4	Flexibility of work hours. Importance	279	1	5	4.51	.753
9	Fair and equitable work performance evaluations. Importance	269	1	5	4.50	.845
5	Clearly defined job expectations. Importance	279	1	5	4.48	.808
10	Opportunities to develop new skills. Importance	274	1	5	4.43	.759
17	Productivity of work-related meetings. Importance	264	1	5	4.27	.794
13	Special recognition for achievements and milestones. Importance	269	1	5	3.87	1.019
16	Access to and the cost of recreational/fitness facilities. Importance	254	1	5	3.81	1.139
14	Access to cultural events and/or sporting events. Importance	266	1	5	3.55	1.053
15	Availability of on-campus child care. Importance	146	1	5	2.99	1.597

Ranking of “Satisfaction” Items (decreasing means) for 2010:

Item No.	Items	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
4	Flexibility of work hours. Satisfaction	280	1	5	4.00	1.144
1	Relationship with co-workers. Satisfaction	279	1	5	3.92	1.010
12	Relationship with your immediate supervisor. Satisfaction	281	1	5	3.79	1.356
2	Job security. Satisfaction	277	1	5	3.77	1.099
14	Access to cultural events and/or sporting events. Satisfaction	261	1	5	3.66	.975
3	Working conditions (comfort, safety). Satisfaction	282	1	5	3.65	1.113
10	Opportunities to develop new skills. Satisfaction	275	1	5	3.64	1.090
8	Retirement benefits. Satisfaction	245	1	5	3.60	1.114
11	Sense that your work is meaningful. Satisfaction	279	1	5	3.60	1.183
5	Clearly defined job expectations. Satisfaction	279	1	5	3.60	1.201
7	Health care benefits. Satisfaction	245	1	5	3.45	1.229
9	Fair and equitable work performance evaluations. Satisfaction	268	1	5	3.36	1.292
13	Special recognition for achievements and milestones. Satisfaction	263	1	5	3.12	1.131
17	Productivity of work-related meetings. Satisfaction	263	1	5	3.07	1.018
6	Salary. Satisfaction	279	1	5	2.99	1.204
16	Access to and the cost of recreational/fitness facilities. Satisfaction	247	1	5	2.94	1.293
15	Availability of on-campus child care. Satisfaction	119	1	5	2.55	1.233

Ranking of “Stressor” items (decreasing means) for 2010:

Item No.	Items	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
4	Personal finances.	268	1	5	3.37	1.328
24	Top-down decisions contrasting with departmental expertise/knowledge.	264	1	5	3.23	1.386
15	Work load.	274	1	5	3.10	1.374
22	Institutional procedures and "red tape".	268	1	5	3.08	1.352
6	Availability of promotion opportunities.	257	1	5	2.93	1.361
18	Ineffective communication methods.	272	1	5	2.85	1.390
28	Departmental budget concerns.	262	1	5	2.84	1.354
2	Rapid pace of workplace change.	273	1	5	2.79	1.247
8	Inefficient use of technology on campus.	264	1	5	2.69	1.311
14	Conflict among co-workers in the work place.	272	1	5	2.69	1.394
23	Cost of parking.	266	1	5	2.62	1.470
11	Managing household responsibilities.	263	1	5	2.62	1.390
27	Review / promotion process.	256	1	5	2.61	1.402
12	Insufficient available information for decision-making.	269	1	5	2.56	1.330
1	Keeping up with technology.	277	1	5	2.55	1.214
29	Unproductive committee work.	245	1	5	2.49	1.301
20	Rude or inconsiderate students.	263	1	5	2.46	1.318
13	Frequency of work-related meetings.	263	1	5	2.46	1.280
19	Difficulties with other work units.	263	1	5	2.38	1.317
5	Care of elderly parent.	165	1	5	2.36	1.522
21	Illness or death of a family member.	208	1	5	2.27	1.534
7	Availability and cost of food services.	254	1	5	2.22	1.320
26	Physical health.	264	1	5	2.18	1.316
25	Difficult relationship with immediate supervisor.	267	1	5	2.08	1.417
16	Availability of parking.	263	1	5	1.94	1.226

9	Discrimination (e.g. prejudice, racism, sexism)	265	1	5	1.90	1.216
3	Availability and cost of child care.	139	1	5	1.83	1.317
17	Commuting.	256	1	5	1.75	1.066
30	Difficult relationship with subordinate.	226	1	5	1.75	1.117
10	Marital friction.	215	1	5	1.53	.999

Ranking of “Agreement” items (decreasing means) for 2010:

Item No.	Items	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
7	In general, managers in this institution are quite accommodating of family-related needs.	258	1	5	3.65	1.015
9	The amount of time required to perform the responsibilities of my position has increased beyond the normal work day.	268	1	5	3.60	1.284
8	Colleagues and supervisors support my work endeavors.	271	1	5	3.59	1.091
15	Considering everything, the quality of my work life is very good.	272	1	5	3.54	1.037
12	The institution would forgive an honest mistake on my part.	273	1	5	3.51	.967
14	I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this institution.	267	1	5	3.43	1.191
4	Help is available when I have a problem.	271	1	5	3.40	1.002
10	I enjoy discussing this institution with people outside it.	267	1	5	3.40	1.124
6	I feel a strong sense of belonging to this institution.	272	1	5	3.11	1.193
1	The institution really cares about my well-being.	276	1	5	2.79	1.071
3	The college/university community operates from a strong sense of shared mission and goals.	271	1	5	2.76	1.028
2	Management strongly considers my goals and values.	272	1	5	2.75	1.150
11	I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization.	275	1	5	2.73	1.288
5	The organization cares about and values my opinions.	273	1	5	2.67	1.121
16	The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life.	265	1	5	2.66	1.243
13	My organization shows very little concern for me.	271	1	5	2.63	1.176
17	The demands of my family or spouse/partner interfere with work-related activities.	253	1	5	2.02	.998

Section VII: Spearman Rank Correlation of Importance vs. Satisfaction and relative differences in rank positions

Correlations				
			Importance Position Ranks	Satisfaction Position Ranks
Spearman's rho	Importance Position Ranks	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.520*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.033
		N	17	17
	Satisfaction Position Ranks	Correlation Coefficient	.520*	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.033	.
		N	17	17
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).				

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Absolute Difference in 2010 of Importance and Satisfaction Ranks	17	0	11	3.53	3.356
Absolute Difference in 2007 of Importance and Satisfaction Ranks	17	0	10	3.88	3.199
Valid N (listwise)	17				