

References and additional methodology for “Differences in U.S. Medical School Faculty Job Satisfaction by Gender”

References:

- Blackburn, R.T. & Lawrence, J.H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, satisfaction*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bland, C.J., Seaquist, E., Pacala, J.T., Center, B., & Finstad, D. (2002). One school's strategy to assess and improve the vitality of its faculty. *Academic Medicine*, 77, 368-376
- Carsten, J.M. & Spector, P.E. (1987). Unemployment, job satisfaction, and employee turnover: A meta-analytic test of the Muchinsky model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 8, 374-381.
- Coyle, Y.M., Aday, L.A., Battles, J.B., & Hynan, L.S. (1999). Measuring and predicting academic generalists' work satisfaction: implications for retaining faculty. *Academic Medicine*, 74, 1021-1027.
- Haignere, L. (2002). *Paychecks: A guide to conducting salary-equity studies for higher education faculty*, second edition. Washington DC: AAUP.
- Krefting, L.A. (2003). Intertwined discourses of merit and gender: Evidence from academic employment in the USA. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 10(2), 260-278.
- Leigh, J.P., Kravitz, R.L., Schembri, M., Samuels, S.J., & Mobley, S. (2008). Physician career satisfaction across specialties. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 162, 1577-1584.
- McGuire, L.K., Bergen, M.R., & Polan, M.L. (2004). Career advancement for women faculty in a U.S. school of medicine: Perceived needs. *Academic Medicine*, 79(4), 319-325,
- McMurray, J.E., Williams, E., Schwartz, M.D., Douglas, J., Van Kirk, J., Konrad, T.R., et al. (1997). Physician job satisfaction: Developing a model using qualitative data. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 12, 711-714.
- Mukamal, K.J., Smetana, G.W., & Delbanco, T. (2002). Clinicians, educators, and investigators in general internal medicine. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 17, 565-71.
- Nonnemaker, L. (2000). Women physicians in academic medicine: New insights from cohort studies. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 342(6), 399-405.
- Nyquist, J.G., Hitchcock, M.A., & Teharani, A. (2000). Faculty satisfaction in academic medicine. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 105, 33-43.
- Pathman, D.E., Konrad, T.R., Williams, E.S., Scheckler, W.E., Linzer, M., & Douglas, J. (2002). Physician job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction, and physician turnover. *Journal of Family Practice*, 51(7), 593-597.
- 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.
- Settles, I.H., Cortina, L.M., Malley, J., & Stewart, A.J. (2006). The climate for women in academic science: The good, the bad, and the changeable. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30, 47-58.
- Waldman J.D., Kelly F., Arora S., & Smith H.L. (2004). The shocking cost of turnover in health care. *Health Care Management Review*, 29, 2-7.
- Wetterneck, T.B., Linzer, M., McMurray, J.E., Douglas, J., Schwartz, M.D., Bigby, J.A., et al. (2002). Worklife and satisfaction of general internists. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 162, 649-56.

Methodology:

Data come from a 51-item web-based survey administered in spring 2007 to full-time basic science and clinical faculty at the following ten medical schools:

- Stanford University School of Medicine
- University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences College of Medicine
- University of California San Diego School of Medicine
- University of California, San Francisco, School of Medicine
- University of Kansas School of Medicine
- University of Louisville School of Medicine
- University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine
- University of South Florida College of Medicine
- University of Texas Medical School at Houston
- University of Texas School of Medicine at San Antonio

These participating schools were selected from a pool of 24 that expressed interest in participating in the pilot study and were selected to reflect a range of institution types (public and private, research intensive and non-research intensive, etc.). Faculty members from these schools voluntarily participated in the survey and their identities remained confidential. While several of the significant differences by gender found are presented in this AIB, not all significant differences are reported due to space limitations.

Chi-square statistics for Figures 1 and 2:

Percentage of Agreement with Statements about Aspects of Faculty Promotion, by Gender (from Figure 1)

<i>Survey item:</i>	% Male who agree/strongly agree	% Female who agree/strongly agree	% who don't know (male and female)	<i>significance</i>
At my medical school, minority and non-minority faculty members have equal opportunities to be promoted in rank.	64	42	23	$\chi = 141.0, p < .001$ (<i>df</i> 3, <i>n</i> =2989)
At my medical school, female and male faculty members have equal opportunities to be promoted in rank.	66	39	19	$\chi = 303.8, p < .001$ (<i>df</i> 3, <i>n</i> =2992)
At my medical school, the criteria for promotion are consistently applied to faculty across comparable positions.	38	26	23	$\chi = 61.9, p < .001$ (<i>df</i> 3, <i>n</i> =2993)

Percentage of those Satisfied or Very Satisfied with Aspects of Pay and Compensation, by Gender (from Figure 2)

<i>Survey item:</i>	% Male who are satisfied/ very satisfied	% Female who are satisfied/ very satisfied	% who don't know (male and female)	<i>significance</i>
Your overall compensation.	48	42	n/a	$\chi = 19.6, p < .001$ (<i>df</i> 2, <i>n</i> =2990)
Your salary compared to colleagues in your department.	42	30	18	$\chi = 77.3, p < .001$ (<i>df</i> 3, <i>n</i> =2994)
Your salary compared to colleagues in other departments.	30	20	25	$\chi = 36.6, p < .001$ (<i>df</i> 3, <i>n</i> =2991)