

SSSP Report on the 2014 Membership Survey

Keith R. Johnson, Ph.D.

Background

The SSSP leaders have a long standing interest in how successful the organization is in serving its membership. In 2007 a survey was used to obtain general information on membership satisfaction with the organization. The strategy was to survey and interview members, and to focus especially on the Society's ability to serve the unique needs of different groups that make up the organization's membership. A number of suggestions and specific critical areas were uncovered through this method. However, the result was a very long questionnaire that included few members of certain groups, including members of historically underrepresented racial and ethnic groups.

By 2014 the Board agreed to authorize a new membership survey, building on the experience of 2007. This new survey asked more detailed questions about member participation and opinions, and followed with questions identifying different groups, areas of concern, and interests. The difference in method from 2007 apparently produced different results. While members answering the 2014 survey responded in terms of their personal experiences and opinions, not as representatives of a group, the hope was that the survey would give us insights on how well the Society was serving the needs of different groups. The result was less difference among groups in member satisfaction, compared with the 2007 survey.

Table 1 in the Appendix shows the comparison between the two surveys on the demographics of the responding members.

In planning for the 2014 survey, some thought was given to the development of a database for all SSSP members, which would allow a complete management of member participation and opinion. This could be done by routinely requesting basic data at the time of registering for the annual meeting and membership renewal, and would produce results similar to those found from the 2014 survey. The method of asking many questions about specific services and benefits produces a lot of data. The Initial Report of October 1, 2014 providing the raw data consists of 61 pages. Targeted tables reporting all subpopulations would be many times that

length. As a result, this Report only gives an overview of how the 2014 survey data can be used, and a limited number of selected findings. I am available to answer questions that any Board member might have concerning further information from the survey.

The Main Question: Member Satisfaction

Both membership surveys were motivated by leadership concerns about satisfaction, including satisfaction by group that raised concerns about inclusion. These types focused on gender, race, and sexual orientation with some attention to such traits as US citizenship and disability status.

In 2014 general questions about satisfaction and inclusion applied to all as individual members, as presented in the output of the Initial Report of 10/01/14. Table 2 [Appendix] displays all satisfaction and evaluation items from the survey in rank order. The journal is the most highly ranked, while the SSSP's presence on Social Media ranks last. However, while this may be a useful example of information, these data can change their meaning when taken in context. For example, student members report significantly greater satisfaction with the social media than others ($p < .05$). This Report is designed to provide an outline of that context.

One context comes from separating results by member group. The 2014 survey method makes it possible to compare each member group with the remainder on a variety of opinions and evaluations. The advantage is that any other member group of interest can be included (such as students, non-academics, age categories, etc.). In addition, the degree of participation in the Divisions and other SSSP activities could be evaluated and compared with member satisfaction. Here is an overview of this kind of analysis.

First, the use of satisfaction as an outcome measure has limitations. It is useful insofar as the expectations and needs of the respondents are similar for different items. There is a significant relation between reported satisfaction and the importance given to seven of the nine areas of SSSPs operations reported in Table 3. In each of these seven cases, the more important the service/benefit, the greater the satisfaction. This is a highly favorable outcome. It appears to show that the services/benefits that the SSSP offers generally are reaching the people who

want them. It also demonstrates that the overall ranking of a service/benefit may suffer merely because it is wanted or needed by a smaller proportion of respondents.

Table 4 begins an examination of the Divisions, as seen through the responses of those who identify as their members. There is only minor overall difference in general satisfaction with the SSSP among the divisions, save for one case. The respondents who “don’t recall” their division are significantly less satisfied with the SSSP in general than those who do identify their Division(s). The other cases which approach significance are all positive, more satisfied than the average. But Table 5 shows seven significant differences among the Divisions, when the general question is agreement with this statement, “SSSP provides adequate opportunity to participate in divisions.” More directly, we have the question about satisfaction with the division newsletter (Table 6). The more the survey question can be targeted at a specific service and its users, the more useful the information.

SSSP’s Homes for Members

The divisions form the homes for members to meet and participate with their peers according to interests and specialties. It may take some time for a new member to find a home and then become an active participant in it. This is the “career” of the SSSP member. I note that questions about satisfaction are more meaningful when analyzed at the level of the divisions, and for individual members, where they are located at steps along their SSSP career. These social processes are displayed in Table 7. Beginning with the first column, gender, we find a substantial variation in percentage of female members among the divisions. The divisions appear to have different profiles, with different homes for members with different demographics. The disabled are significantly more likely to be found in the Disabilities Division, as females are in Educational Problems, Institutional Ethnography, and Family. LGBT respondents are high in proportion in Sport, Leisure, and the Body Division, as well as the Sexual Behavior, Politics, and Communities. Racial and Ethnic minority members are the large majority in Racial and Ethnic Minorities.

It looks like the SSSP is diverse and varied enough to provide a satisfactory experience for all. The problem for leadership and member retention may be to facilitate the connection between

the potential home and a new or intermittent participant. Table 8 demonstrates that member judgments of importance of the general services/benefits do not vary much among the divisions, while their member demographics do. So we turn away from the divisions to look more closely at those demographics. Table 9 allows this examination. The original thinking when designing the survey was that the demographics of race, gender, sexual orientation, and possibly disability, would be the grounds for dissatisfaction with exclusion and lack of opportunity. But Table 9 shows otherwise. Among 22 different evaluations with six demographics, only 20 of 132 measures are statistically significant. Of these twenty, a majority (11) are from a single demographic, the respondent's age, not one usually thought to be a matter for exclusion or lack of opportunity. On the other hand, race and ethnicity was not found to be significantly different on any of the measures. This appears to be positive news. In addition, some of the measures show that the minority was significantly more satisfied, as were the disabled members' evaluations of their member benefits. It also changes some of the thinking we share about barriers to participation in social systems. The SSSP is not a rigid hierarchy, but rather a loose confederation of divisions, interest groups, and informal activities which should offer something for everyone, and in most cases, it does.

The Integration of Demographic Groups into the SSSP

In order to clarify the matter of how to tap the needs and interests of members, I crossed the demographic categories with the perceived importance of the SSSP's services/benefits. The results are shown in Table 10. Here we can see that Age is the most significant variable. In fact, it may underlie some of the other results, for women and racial/ethnic minorities are predominant among the newer, younger members, as shown in Table 11. What may appear to be a matter of race or gender may well be simply a result of the inclusion of young people who differ from the traditional academic model of the older, white male professor.

I close with an examination of the changing demographics of the membership and comment on the implications for the organization. Table 12 demonstrates that several services/benefits vary in importance by years of membership. This supports the conclusion that there is a "career" within the SSSP leading from the student member more interested in mentoring to the senior

members who are more integrated into a place within the SSSP. Those who are least involved in a career are those who report their membership to be intermittent, and they are generally those who report the features of the SSSP as less important to them. Table 13 follows with the levels of satisfaction reported with the SSSP's opportunities, by years of membership. If years of membership indicate a career within the SSSP, they are associated with increasing satisfaction. The SSSP career appears to involve more satisfaction with peers, divisions, the annual meeting, awards and scholarships, and volunteering. Professional opportunities and Mentoring do not follow this pattern. Finally, Table 14 shows the relationship (if any) between demographic background and reported participation in services to the SSSP. We see that there are only a few cases of lower participation among the different demographic groups, except for Age. This suggests that there indeed is an SSSP career, and the potential lesser participation by demographics is mainly due to the younger populations within those demographic groups.

Going Forward

These results are quite different from the results of the 2007 survey, where members of underrepresented groups were identified and asked for complaints and suggestions about how to improve the SSSP. I suspect that the difference mainly comes from the different methodology employed in 2014. When asked their personal experience, orientations, and opinions, we find SSSP members generally do not differ according to their backgrounds. Instead, the 2014 survey database can be used to inquire into other sources of differences and satisfaction than those originally thought to be problematic.

In 2014 we find that member satisfaction is most related to variables of participation in the SSSP and marginality. I found three direct measures of marginality: (1) failure to recall their division membership; (2) an intermittent renewal of their SSSP membership and/or indication of nonrenewal for the coming year; and (3) Department membership faculty. There are other possible measures of marginality which relate to the "career" of the SSSP member. One example is the proportion of members who have never served on a committee or in other capacity. For new members, not serving could be considered normal, while with the passage of years, it becomes an indicator of marginality.

The survey results suggest that we may want to change the way we think about member satisfaction. While gender, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation are key indicators of member diversity, in this survey they don't seem to serve as indicators of dissatisfaction within SSSP. They may carry other meaning, such as newer demographic groups also representing lower seniority and/or commitment and participation. It is the lower participation and experience, not the demographic characteristic that seems to be the source of dissatisfaction in these cases. The method used in the 2014 survey is most useful when it is applied to specific questions about targeted services/benefits and subpopulations. To maximize the benefits of the survey to the SSSP, there needs to be a feedback between the results of questions and the leaders who are responsible for maintaining and improving the member experience. One aspect of this feedback process is for individual leaders to apply the survey data to better understand their subpopulation and improve our services/benefits. A second, long-term benefit comes from use of more targeted questions and measuring the results of improvements.

The survey process would be maximized by including basic questions on the membership renewal and annual meeting registration forms, to link member behavior with survey results. For example, we have survey data on a small number of respondents who indicate they do not intend to renew their membership for the coming year. But we can find out more if we have a data bank on SSSP members, and then know who actually has not renewed.

In conclusion, I recommend that the SSSP Board members make use of the present data from the 2014 survey by formulating specific questions and presenting them for analysis using the available data. For those questions which cannot be answered with the present data, planning for future data capture can incorporate these queries.

Disclaimer: This Report represents the opinions and analysis of the author, and not the SSSP leadership. Any errors or misinterpretations are the responsibility of the author alone.

Keith R. Johnson, Ph.D. Independent Scholar

Keithjohnson101@gmail.com

1856 Sherman Avenue, Evanston, IL 60201

847 864 7559 (Home)

Table 1: Respondent Characteristics for 2007 and 2014 Surveys

Characteristic	2007	2014
Number of respondents	567	311
Response rate	27.1%	
Gender: Female	62.4%	60.4%
Male	35.2%	37.7%
Other	1.9%	2.3%
Race/Ethnicity: White	74.1%	69.2%
African-American	8.4%	7.6%
Hispanic/Latino	5.3%	9.5%
Asian	2.9%	6.6%
East Asian	—	3.9%
South Asian	—	2.6%
Other or Mixed	9.1%	7.2%
Middle Eastern/Arab	—	1.0%
Employer Affiliation: Academic	88.3%	87.4%
Students/Post Docs	—	30.0%
Academic Faculty	—	50.0%
Academic Administration	—	4.5%
Adjunct Faculty	—	2.9%
Non Profit	5.0%	2.9%
Government/Other	6.7%	2.6%
Retired	—	5.8%
Membership: Joined in last 8 years	53%	57%
Intermittent/On and Off Joining	—	9%

Table 1 Continued: Respondent Characteristics for 2007 and 2014 Surveys

Characteristic	2007	2014
Attend Annual Meetings Regularly	62.4%	65.8%
Never attend	—	15.5%
Presented paper: at least once in 3 years	62.3%	—
Session participant at last meeting?	—	42.3%
(Participant among those attending)	—	78.0%
Served on a committee:	31.3%	37.9%
Served in some capacity	—	58.1%
Have/had an elected position:	15.8%	26.5%

Table 2: Rank Order of Satisfaction with Various Aspects of SSSP

Survey Question	Mean Agreement/Satisfaction	(N)
Social Problems is a high quality publication	4.36	(306)
SSSP is committed to promoting diversity and inclusion	4.31	(307)
Opportunities to participate in Annual Meeting	4.20	(306)
Diverse points of view are invited and respected	4.19	(307)
Provides a welcoming environment for underrepresented groups	4.08	(308)
Opportunities to participate in Divisions	4.03	(306)
Satisfaction with SSSP in general	4.03	(301)
Opportunities to interact with peers	3.99	(306)
Opportunities to volunteer for a committee or elected position	3.86	(305)
Opportunities for Meaningful Dialogues	3.86	(303)
Engages in social justice research and action	3.85	(304)
With your SSSP Membership Benefits	3.81	(298)
Opportunities to give Administrative Office/Officers Feedback	3.77	(303)
Satisfied with Website	3.74	(303)
Satisfied with E-mail Blasts	3.73	(306)
Satisfied with Divisional Newsletters	3.70	(306)
Opportunities for awards and scholarships	3.68	(303)
Professional opportunities	3.57	(303)
Opportunities to receive mentoring in field of interest	3.38	(305)
Satisfied with Social Media	3.35	(302)

Note: All survey questions involving an evaluation of SSSP are included, ranked by degree of satisfaction on a scale from 1 to 5. General satisfaction items were posed on a scale with 1 = Very Dissatisfied to 5 = Very Satisfied. Items beginning with "Satisfied" were phrased on agreement with satisfaction, from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5).

Table 3: Satisfaction with the SSSP's Actions/Benefits by their Importance to Members

Action/Benefit	Not at All	2	Neutral	4	Very Important	Significance
Participating Annual Meeting	3.58 (12)	3.41 (17)	4.04 (57)	4.18 (110)	4.52 (106)	p = .000 (302)
Receiving the Journal	3.25 (12)	4.00 (20)	4.19 (67)	4.42 (110)	4.62 (92)	p = .000 (301)
Engaging in social justice research and action	3.00 (9)	3.13 (8)	3.58 (26)	3.71 (85)	4.03 (172)	p = .000 (300)
Opportunities to interact with peers	3.25 (4)	3.00 (1)	3.73 (26)	3.82 (108)	4.15 (163)	p = .001 (302)
Participating in Divisions	3.71 (14)	3.55 (11)	3.86 (85)	4.06 (121)	4.27 (70)	p < .01 (301)
Volunteering for a committee or elected post	3.81 (31)	3.66 (41)	3.94 (98)	4.22 (91)	4.05 (40)	p = .01 (301)
Professional opportunities	3.29 (14)	3.41 (17)	3.40 (81)	3.69 (95)	3.67 (92)	p < .05 (299)
Awards and Scholarship	3.52 (33)	3.29 (17)	3.64 (67)	3.82 (91)	3.71 (92)	Ns
Receiving Mentoring	3.28 (54)	3.17 (36)	3.34 (71)	3.35 (74)	3.63 (62)	Ns

Note: Table presents the level of satisfaction reported for the indicated Action/Benefit, distributed among the levels of importance given to that SSSP activity by the respondents. Thus, the first row should be read as: Among the members who report that "Participating [in] Annual Meeting" is not important, their level of satisfaction with how the SSSP is doing in that area is 3.58, while those who report that it is Very Important, report a level of satisfaction of 4.52. The ANOVA of satisfaction with the annual meeting across levels of importance of attending the annual meeting is significant at the .000 level (from SPSS)

Table 4: Satisfaction with SSSP by Division Membership

Division	Mean SSSP Satisfaction	N	Significant
Community Research and Development	2.17	30	No
Conflict, Social Action, and Change	1.98	40	No
Crime and Juvenile Delinquency	2.22	45	No
Disabilities	2.33	15	No
Drinking and Drugs	2.14	21	No
Educational Problems	2.50	16	.010
Environment and Technology	1.88	17	No
Family	1.82	17	No
Global	1.81	16	No
Health, Health Policy, and Health Services	2.27	30	.090
Institutional Ethnography	2.10	20	No
Labor Studies	1.90	29	No
Law and Society	2.15	27	No
Poverty, Class, and Inequality	2.21	58	.077
Racial and Ethnic Minorities	2.20	64	.067
Sexual Behavior, Politics, and Communities	2.00	34	No
Social Problems Theory	1.97	36	No
Society and Mental Health	1.94	17	No
Sociology and Social Welfare	2.28	18	No
Sport, Leisure, and the Body	2.29	7	No
Teaching Social Problems	1.86	22	No
Youth, Aging, and the Life Course	2.08	13	No
"Don't Recall"	1.70	36	.002

Note: Mean Satisfaction is on a scale of 1 = Very dissatisfied to Neutral, 2 = Satisfied, and 3 = Very satisfied. Respondents could be members of multiple divisions. The "N" is the number who indicated membership in the division indicated when evaluating the Division Newsletter. Main finding: Those who couldn't remember their division were significantly less satisfied. Second finding: No Division was less satisfied, while members of the Health, Health Policy, and Health Services Division, The Poverty, Class, and Inequality Division, and the Racial and Ethnic Minorities Division tended to be more satisfied. Significantly more satisfied were members of the Educational Problems Division.

Table 5: Satisfaction with Opportunity to Participate in Division by Division Membership

Division	Mean Division Participation Satisfaction	N	Significant
Community Research and Development	4.03	31	No
Conflict, Social Action, and Change	3.76	41	.031 -
Crime and Juvenile Delinquency	4.22	45	No
Disabilities	4.27	15	No
Drinking and Drugs	4.50	20	.011
Educational Problems	4.24	17	No
Environment and Technology	3.83	18	No
Family	4.06	18	No
Global	4.17	18	No
Health, Health Policy, and Health Services	4.45	29	.006
Institutional Ethnography	4.40	20	.045
Labor Studies	4.00	31	No
Law and Society	4.04	27	No
Poverty, Class, and Inequality	3.90	60	No
Racial and Ethnic Minorities	4.18	65	No
Sexual Behavior, Politics, and Communities	4.08	36	.045
Social Problems Theory	4.22	36	No
Society and Mental Health	4.29	17	No
Sociology and Social Welfare	3.83	18	No
Sport, Leisure, and the Body	4.38	8	No
Teaching Social Problems	3.64	22	.028 -
Youth, Aging, and the Life Course	4.23	13	No
"Don't Recall"	3.58	36	.001 -

Note: Mean Satisfaction is on a scale of 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). Respondents could be members of multiple divisions. The "N" is the number who indicated membership in the division indicated when evaluating the Division Newsletter. Main finding: Those who couldn't remember their division were significantly less satisfied. Second finding: Those from a Division reporting significantly less satisfaction were from the Conflict, Social Action and Change Division and the Teaching Social Problems Division, while members of the Drinking and Drugs Division, the Health, Health Policy, and Health Services Division, the Institutional Ethnography Division, and the Sexual Behavior, Politics, and Communities Division reported significantly more satisfaction.

Table 6: Satisfaction with Division Newsletter by Division Membership

Division	Mean Division Newsletter Satisfaction	N	Significant
Community Research and Development	3.87	30	No
Conflict, Social Action, and Change	3.51	41	No
Crime and Juvenile Delinquency	3.87	45	No
Disabilities	3.93	15	No
Drinking and Drugs	3.86	21	No
Educational Problems	3.65	17	No
Environment and Technology	3.50	18	No
Family	3.72	18	No
Global	3.89	18	No
Health, Health Policy, and Health Services	3.97	29	.064
Institutional Ethnography	4.00	20	.088
Labor Studies	3.70	30	No
Law and Society	3.81	27	No
Poverty, Class, and Inequality	3.62	61	No
Racial and Ethnic Minorities	3.77	66	No
Sexual Behavior, Politics, and Communities	3.44	36	.045
Social Problems Theory	3.72	36	No
Society and Mental Health	3.65	17	No
Sociology and Social Welfare	3.89	18	No
Sport, Leisure, and the Body	3.25	8	No
Teaching Social Problems	3.82	22	No
Youth, Aging, and the Life Course	3.92	13	No
"Don't Recall"	3.33	36	.004

Note: Mean Satisfaction is on a scale of 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). Respondents could be members of multiple divisions. The "N" is the number who indicated membership in the division indicated when evaluating the Division Newsletter. Main finding: Those who couldn't remember their division were significantly less satisfied. Second finding: Those from a Division less satisfied were from the Sexual Behavior, Politics, and Communities Division, while members of the Health, Health Policy, and Health Services Division and the Institutional Ethnography Division tended to be more satisfied.

Table 7: Percentage of Various Respondent Traits by Division Membership

Division	Female	NonCitizen	White	LGBT	NoServe	Disabled	MemYears	Age
Community Research and Develop	54.8	15.6	64.5	22.6	22.6 (.010)	6.5	Ns	Ns
Conflict, Social Action, and Change	71.8	10.0	78.1	35.1	48.8	0.0	Ns	Ns
Crime and Juvenile Delinquency	43.2 (.007)	11.1	80.0	30.8	42.2	4.4	(.021)+	Ns
Disabilities	78.6	28.6	80.0	23.1	40.0	20.0 (.000)	Ns	Ns
Drinking and Drugs	33.3 (.006)	5.0	81.0	21.1	23.8 (.050)	4.8	(.007)+	(.004)+
Educational Problems	94.1 (.004)	23.5	58.8	6.3 (.071)	35.3	5.8	Ns	Ns
Environment and Technology	44.4	11.1	77.8	23.5	55.6	0.0	Ns	Ns
Family	82.4 (.066)	11.1	88.9 (.049)	33.3	33.3	0.0	Ns	Ns
Global	64.7	23.5	66.7	26.7	27.8	5.6	Ns	Ns
Health, Health Policy/Services	60.0	6.9	73.3	21.4	33.3	3.3	Ns	Ns
Institutional Ethnography	85.0 (.025)	31.6 (.016)	75.0	10.5	30.0	5.0	Ns	(.049)+
Labor Studies	51.7	22.6	67.7	20.7	29.0	0.0	Ns	(.045)+
Law and Society	51.9	3.8	70.4	9.1	29.6	3.7	Ns	(.017)+
Poverty, Class, and Inequality	66.7	6.5	63.9	26.3	57.4 (.023)	1.6	Ns	Ns
Racial and Ethnic Minorities	72.3	9.0	37.3 (.000)	14.1 (.018)	47.8	3.0	Ns	Ns
Sexual Behavior, Politics/Com	67.6	11.1	83.3 (.034)	76.5 (.000)	38.9	5.6	Ns	(.053)-
Social Problems Theory	41.7 (.009)	24.3 (.037)	72.2	15.2	44.4	8.3	Ns	(.055)+
Society and Mental Health	58.8	12.5	94.1 (.017)	33.3	58.8	0.0	Ns	Ns
Sociology and Social Welfare	72.2	0.0	61.1	23.5	44.4	5.6	Ns	Ns
Sport, Leisure, and the Body	62.5	12.5	100 (.049)	87.5 (.000)	25.0	0.0	(.031)+	Ns
Teaching Social Problems	52.4	4.3	81.8	30.0	50.0	0.0	Ns	Ns
Youth, Aging, Life Course	63.6	0.0	92.3 (.054)	33.3	15.4 (.032)	0.0	Ns	Ns
"Don't Recall"	55.6	19.4	64.9	21.9	48.7	0.0	(.030) -	Ns

Note: Percentage means are given for the first six member traits. The last two traits, Member years and Age, were measured by categories, not absolute numbers in the Survey. So only significance levels are reported, together with a + or - sign. "+" indicates significantly higher in Member Years or Age, "-" is significantly lower.

Table 8: Importance of Selected SSSP Goals by Division Membership

Division	Awards	Social Justice	Peers	Mentoring	Participation
Community Research and Development	3.84	4.65	4.55	3.10	3.71
Conflict, Social Action, and Change	3.85	4.56	4.40	3.15	3.78
Crime and Juvenile Delinquency	3.51	4.49	4.26	3.00	3.81
Disabilities	3.63	4.31	4.41	3.17	3.71*
Drinking and Drugs	3.43	4.33	4.29	2.71	3.75
Educational Problems	3.76	4.47	4.29	3.65	3.65
Environment and Technology	3.06*	4.67	4.28	2.89	3.78
Family	4.00	4.17	4.67	3.50	3.78
Global	4.00	4.78*	4.53	3.00	3.94
Health, Health Policy, and Health Services	3.66	4.43	4.73*	3.32	4.14*
Institutional Ethnography	3.40	4.60	4.75*	3.26	4.20*
Labor Studies	3.65	4.33	4.07*	2.87	3.87
Law and Society	3.56	4.37	4.04**	2.52**	3.56
Poverty, Class, and Inequality	3.75	4.53	4.53	3.42	3.85
Racial and Ethnic Minorities	3.86	4.56*	4.43	3.55*	3.90
Sexual Behavior, Politics, and Communities	3.61	4.19	4.50	3.44	4.08*
Social Problems Theory	3.28	3.69***	4.42	2.72*	3.89
Society and Mental Health	3.00*	4.06	4.47	3.06	3.87
Sociology and Social Welfare	3.83	4.44	4.72	3.39	4.00
Sport, Leisure, and the Body	3.88	4.00	4.50	3.50	4.13
Teaching Social Problems	3.18	4.14	4.50	3.29	3.73
Youth, Aging, and the Life Course	4.08	4.31	4.85*	3.00	3.69
"Don't Recall"	3.73	4.33	4.17*	2.97	3.11***

Note: Mean Satisfaction is on a scale of 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). Respondents could be members of multiple divisions. Significance indicated as follows: * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$

Table 9: Types of Satisfaction with Selected SSSP Services and Operations by Different SSSP Subpopulations

Types of Satisfaction	Gender	Race	Age	LGBT	Citizen	Disability
Opportunities to participate	Ns	Ns	.000	Ns	Ns	Ns
Opportunities to Volunteer	Ns	Ns	.013	Ns	Ns	Ns
Participate in Divisions	Ns	Ns	.001	Ns	Ns	Ns
Divisional Newsletters	Ns	Ns	.007	Ns	Ns	Ns
Participate in Annual Meeting	Ns	Ns	.005	Ns	Ns	Ns
Adequate Award/Scholarship	.016	Ns	.002	Ns	.003	Ns
Adequate Prof. Opportunities	.012	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns
Adequate Mentoring Opport.	Ns	Ns	.022	Ns	Ns	Ns
Effective in Social Justice	.032	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns
SSSP in General	Ns	Ns	.045	Ns	Ns	Ns
Member benefits	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	.002
Will renew next year	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	.048	Ns
Would Recommend SSSP	Ns	Ns	.008	Ns	.049	Ns
Annual Meetings Important	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns
Promotes Diversity	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns
Welcoming Environment	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns
Diverse POVs Invited	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns
Communication with Adm.	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns
Social Problems Journal	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns
E-Mail Blasts	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns
Social Media	.002	Ns	.008	.021	Ns	Ns
Website	Ns	Ns	.031	Ns	Ns	Ns

Note: The data are described as levels of statistical significance. The numbers shown are levels of significance (from ANOVA). As displayed, most of the satisfaction questions did not discriminate among the different SSSP membership demographics, except for age. Also, non-US citizens were significantly less likely to indicate they will renew their membership or recommend SSSP to their colleagues.

Table 10: Importance of Selected Aspects of SSSP by Different SSSP Subpopulations

Type of Awareness/Use	Gender	Race	Age	LGBT	Citizen	Disability
Volunteer opportunities	Ns	.000	.000	Ns	Ns	Ns
Engaging in Social Justice	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns
Network of Peers	.005	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	.015
Participating in Divisions	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns
Participating in Annual Meeting	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns
Receiving Journal	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns
Receiving Mentoring	.015	.006	.000	Ns	Ns	Ns
Volunteering for Post	Ns	.034	.000	Ns	Ns	Ns
Professional Opportunities	.004	.004	.000	Ns	.014	Ns

Note: The data are described as levels of statistical significance, as in Table 9.

Table 11: Selected Background Characteristics by Years of Membership

Years	N	Male***	White**	Straight	Faculty***
Less than 1	(52-58)	33%	50%	81%	26%
1-2	(47-49)	40%	55%	84%	29%
3-5	(40-44)	16%	64%	63%	50%
6-10	(44-49)	31%	78%	68%	80%
11-20	(25-26)	40%	81%	68%	69%
21+	(52-56)	53%	82%	81%	57%
Intermittent	(27-28)	67%	79%	71%	61%

Note: * (p. < .05); ** (p. < .01); *** (p. = .000) Results of ANOVA from SPSS program. "Straight" is defined by selection of "heterosexual" on sexual orientation. "Faculty" are derived from combining different categories of academics.

Table 12: Importance of Selected SSSP Features by Years of Membership

Years	N	Volunteer**	Mentoring***	Journal*	Meeting**	Divisions	Peers	SJustice
Less than 1	(52-58)	3.65	4.13	4.05	4.14	3.86	4.56	4.52
1-2	(47-49)	3.16	3.77	3.62	3.77	3.60	4.20	4.53
3-5	(40-44)	3.14	3.50	3.79	3.86	3.77	4.50	4.14
6-10	(44-49)	3.38	3.08	3.94	4.15	3.80	4.45	4.16
11-20	(25-26)	3.48	2.52	3.81	4.16	4.08	4.48	4.36
21+	(52-56)	3.00	2.16	4.00	3.95	3.63	4.42	4.36
Intermittent	(27-28)	2.59	2.57	3.32	3.29	3.50	4.18	4.14

Note: * (p. < .05); ** (p. < .01); *** (p. = .000). Survey questions ask the importance of availability or opportunity for participating in these items, using a five point scale from 1 = "Not at all important" to 5 = "Very important." From left to right, they are, Volunteering for a committee or elected position, Receiving mentoring in field of interest, Receiving the journal, Participating in the annual meeting, Participating in the divisions, Interacting with a network of peers, and Engaging in social justice research and action.

Table 13: Agreement/Satisfaction of Selected SSSP Opportunities by Years of Membership

Years	N	Peers**	Divisions***	Meeting***	Award**	Prof.	Ment.	Vol.***
Less than 1	(52-58)	3.85	3.67	4.00	3.47	3.47	3.35	3.55
1-2	(47-49)	3.94	3.98	3.98	3.38	3.57	3.40	3.63
3-5	(40-44)	3.75	3.82	4.02	3.68	3.47	3.27	3.63
6-10	(44-49)	4.12	4.16	4.37	3.80	3.67	3.41	3.96
11-20	(25-26)	4.15	4.38	4.42	3.81	3.85	3.42	4.27
21+	(52-56)	4.32	4.36	4.63	4.00	3.67	3.58	4.32
Intermittent	(27-28)	3.64	3.89	3.89	3.68	3.29	3.07	3.75

Note: * (p. < .05); ** (p. < .01); *** (p. = .000). Survey questions ask the agreement that these items are available or provide opportunity for participating in these items, using a five point scale from 1 = "Strongly disagree" to 5 = "Strongly agree." First survey question for "Peers" item column: "SSSP provides adequate opportunities to interact with peers." Divisions, [annual] Meeting, Ment[oring], and Vol[unteering] follow, as in Table 12. Added are Award, for "Awards and scholarship opportunities," and Prof, for "Professional opportunities."

Table 14: SSSP Service by Member Characteristics

Service	Gender	Race	Age	LGBT	Citizen	Disability
Elected Posts/Committees	Ns	.002-	.000-	Ns	.001-	Ns
Appointed Posts/Committees	Ns	Ns	.000-	Ns	.007-	Ns
Ad Hoc Posts/Committees	Ns	Ns	.000-	Ns	Ns	Ns
Social Problems (editor, etc.)	.044-	Ns	.000-	Ns	Ns	Ns
Division Newsletter Editor	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns
Other Service	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	.001+
Agree, Adequate Opportunities to Volunteer for a...Post	Ns	Ns	.016-	Ns	Ns	Ns

Note: Minorities were assumed to be Female, Non-White, Younger, Non-Straight, Non-Citizen, and Disabled. Signs indicate the direction of the difference; nine of 10 demonstrated a lower score for the minority (-), while one (+) was a higher score for the minority. Half of the differences were found to be from age.