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This study examined the job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and attrition (intent to leave their position within the next twelve months) of mid-level managers in student affairs administration using Herzberg’s (1966) Motivation-Hygiene Theory.

A purposive sample of 1943 mid-level managers from the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) was sent an invitation to take a Web-based survey. Four hundred seventy seven responses were received. Statistics were calculated for the demographic variables of age, education, gender, ethnic background, degree level and currently pursuing a degree, functional area(s) of the mid-level manager, supervision, Carnegie classification, student enrollment, institutional type, and career tenure in the student affairs field and tenure in the mid-level manager’s current position, job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction, and attrition. Participants were grouped in functional role categories to calculate regression analyses between the demographic variables and intent to leave their current position. Following the statistics, qualitative comments were also taken from the survey respondents.

It was found that mid-level managers in student affairs were satisfied with their positions; demographic variables accounted for a small extent of the job satisfaction; intrinsic variables and extrinsic variables were moderately significant for job satisfaction.
and job dissatisfaction respectively; and the combination of intrinsic, extrinsic factors with age and race were significant factors in determining attrition of mid-level managers in student affairs. Upon further investigation, it was found that professionals from 20 – 30 years of age and African American and Hispanics/Latinos were more likely to attrite from their positions as mid-level managers in student affairs. Issues of supervision, relationships with colleagues, politics, and work balance were also factors that led to the job dissatisfaction of the sample and attrition of the sample. Finally, a combination of both extrinsic and intrinsic factors led to the job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of study’s sample.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Student affairs professionals have the responsibility of providing the out of classroom learning experiences for students at colleges and universities in the United States and abroad (Garland & Grace, 1993; Komives, et al., 2004). I argue that there are three position levels for the student affairs professional: entry-level positions, mid-level managers, and chief student affairs officers (CSAOs). Entry-level professionals are those staff members who have programmatic and supervisory responsibility over students and report to a mid-level manager (Exum, 1998). Examples of these professionals are residence hall directors and program advisors. Mid-level managers are the professionals who have programmatic and supervisory responsibility of student and professional staff; some also have budgetary responsibility for one or more functional areas or departments in the student affairs division (Kane 1982, as cited in Shermesheim, 2003; Mills, 1993; Young 1991). Depending on the institution, associate directors, directors, and coordinators may be mid-level professionals. These individuals typically report to a chief student affairs officer. Chief student affairs officers report to the president or the provost of the institution and have the responsibility of the overall management and coordination of student services at their college or university (Sandeen, 1991). These student services strive to exemplify the mission, vision and purpose of the institution. In the student affairs organization, these people have titles such as are the dean of students, or the vice president of student affairs.
The purpose of student affairs is to support the institution by creating learning environments and experiences for students that complement traditional classroom academics (Bliming & Whitt, 2000). One of the signature documents of the student affairs field, The Student Learning Imperative, asks professionals to adopt current challenges such as budget constraints, shifting demographics, and accountability as opportunities to encourage our commitment to student development and learning (American College Personnel Association, 1994; American Council of Education, 1994). The need for student affairs professionals to work in collaboration with students, faculty, and academic administrators is ever-present. As higher education is increasingly challenged with issues such as new technology, changing student demographics, demands for greater accountability, concerns about escalating costs, and criticism of the climate (moral and ethical) of our campuses (Bliming & Whitt, 2000; Garland & Grace, 1993; Smith, 2004), the demand for personnel to support students is also increasing, and begs the question: how satisfied are student affairs professionals with the work that they do?

Job satisfaction in student affairs has been studied; however, the focus has been on entry level professionals and chief student affairs officers. Barr (1993) and Exum (1998) stated that an important part of job satisfaction for new professionals was to learn job expectations, understand the environment, and develop collegial relationships. Many new professionals are satisfied with their positions and make the choice to stay. However, a number of new professionals are not satisfied and make the choice to leave their positions and the student affairs profession (Garland & Grace, 1993; Kisner, 1991; Lorden, 1998; Ward, 1995). Tull (2004) found that entry-level professionals experienced a great deal of role ambiguity. According to Berwick (1992), role ambiguity occurs when
a professional faces new situations on the job in which prescribed behavior for task accomplishment was not known or was not clear. Role conflict, role orientation, burnout, and work overload were also factors that influenced job satisfaction for entry-level professionals. The lack of proper information about the nature of student affairs positions was a major cause of job dissatisfaction (Tull, 2004).

Chief student affairs officers (CSAOs) have a different experience in relation to job satisfaction. Holloway (2004) wrote that CSAOs chart unfamiliar territory, work long hours, and respond to a high level of stress and the demands of numerous constituents. Studies have been conducted regarding job satisfaction within this group from multiple perspectives and have focused on the issues of attrition and persistence (Bender, 1980; Burns, 1972; Evans & Kuh, 1983; Holmes, Verrier, & Chisholm, 1983; Lorden, 1998), or the work itself and other aspects of these positions (Bishop, 1996; Studer, 1980; Willis, 1987). Overall, CSAOs were satisfied with their positions and find their jobs rewarding, but some research has reported that CSAOs would like to earn more money (Holloway, 2004). Important factors found to influence CSAO attrition included: limited mobility, unclear career plans, lack of opportunities for personal growth, and lack of opportunities for scholarship (Bender, 1980; Holloway, 2004). Women left these positions more quickly than men did and reported less job satisfaction overall (Blackhurst, Brandt, & Kalinowski, 1998).

The topic of mid-level managers and job satisfaction is intriguing, especially for those who hold or aspire to the CSAO positions. There are few studies that examined aspects of mid-level manager job satisfaction in the larger higher education arena. Middle managers in higher education were, according to Rosser (2000), the unsung heroes of
higher education because their contributions were rarely recognized. Their lack of visibility in the academy has not been investigated. Mid-level managers were defined as “the academic and non-academic support personnel within the structure of higher education organizations” (Rosser, 2000, p. 5). Studies that focused on job satisfaction of mid-level managers in student affairs specifically included groups such as chief housing officers, student activities directors, and directors of recreation and found that there was an awesome responsibility managing the day to day operations of their areas in addition to fulfilling the high expectations of senior-level administrators and students. Job satisfaction for mid-level managers would be enhanced by improving individual and organizational work environments (Bailey, 1997; Connell, 1993; Familiant, 2001; Zhang, DeMichele, & Connaughton, 2004). While overall job satisfaction was found, these professionals were not satisfied with their salary levels and grappled with role conflict and complexity. As a mid-level manager for the past five years, I concurred with the findings of these researchers from the perspective of my own personal experience in Appendix A.

Challenges for the Mid-Level Manager

Due to the role and complexity of mid-level management, student affairs professionals faced many challenges. Javinar (2000) believed two major issues that mid-level managers in student affairs faced were articulating the value and the worth of the manager’s area to the larger student affairs division and working with the changing student demographics. In order to meet the needs of the changing student demographics, technology and student services offered via the Web are new tools expected to be mastered by mid-level managers (Palloff & Pratt, 2003). To add to this complexity,
Johnsrud (1996) identified three sources of frustration for mid-level managers in higher education. The sources of frustration were: (a) a challenge of their voices to being heard because of their advocating for themselves, functional units or departments, and staff members, (b) a lack of recognition of the skills and abilities of the mid-level manager from his or supervisor and colleagues and, (c) the lack of career development and advancement opportunities. In addition to the frustrations with functional responsibilities, students are requesting more and more student-oriented programs and services. These functional requests and the changing demographics of under-prepared students have placed increasing demands on all levels of management in higher education. The demands of accountability also now challenge the mid-level manager and his or her supervisor, the chief student affairs officer (CSAO) (Garland & Grace, 1994).

Statement of the Problem

The research on entry-level professionals in student affairs tells us that that they are satisfied with their positions overall; however, the realities of the position, role ambiguity, role conflict, and work overload cause these professionals to lose satisfaction and attrite within the first five years of being employed in the field (Bender, 1980; Burns, 1972; Evans & Kuh, 1983; Holmes, Verrier, & Chisholm, 1983; Lawing, Moore, & Groseth, 1982; Lorden, 1998). Chief student affairs officers are also satisfied, and seem to embrace the complexity in their roles and positions (Bender, 1980; Holloway, 2004; Nestor, 1988; Perry, 1990). Studies have been completed regarding the job satisfaction of mid-level managers for specific functional areas of higher education and student affairs (Bailey, 1997; Connell, 1993; Familiant, 2001; Zhang, DeMichele, & Connaughton, 2004). However, what we do not know is the extent of job satisfaction and job
dissatisfaction on a comprehensive level for mid-level managers in student affairs. Therefore, this study explores job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of mid-level managers in student affairs across all functional areas.

Research Questions and Methodology

This study examined the following research questions:

RQ1: To what extent are mid-level managers in student affairs satisfied or dissatisfied with their positions?

RQ 2: To what extent is job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction of mid-level managers in student affairs related to demographic variables such as age, gender, race, functional area, institutional type, education level, number of years of administrative experience, number of years in their present position and Carnegie classification?

RQ 3: To what extent is job satisfaction (or lack thereof) of mid-level managers in student affairs related to Herzberg's intrinsic factors (advancement, recognition, work itself, achievement, and responsibility)?

RQ 4: To what extent is job dissatisfaction (or lack thereof) of mid-level managers in student affairs related to Herzberg's extrinsic factors (supervision, relationships with colleagues, administrative policies, working conditions, salary, job status, job security and balance of work and personal life)?

RQ 5: To what extent do mid-level managers in student affairs plan to leave the mid-level manager position or the field? What factors most influence this plan?
This study was conducted using a web-based survey that examined job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction, and intent to leave the mid-level manager position in the student affairs field. The sample population was generated from the membership database of the American College Personnel Association (ACPA). For those members who identified as mid-level managers, I randomized the membership list and sent the survey by e-mail to ACPA members. I conducted data analysis from the completed surveys that fit the criteria of mid-level managers employed at four-year colleges and universities.

**Theoretical Framework**

These research questions were examined through the theoretical framework of job satisfaction as conceptualized by Herzberg (1957; 1959; 1966). Through extensive literature review and empirical work, Herzberg developed a two continuum model of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Herzberg contended that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction need to be considered on two different continua rather than a single continuum since particular factors lead to job satisfaction, and a different set of factors lead to dissatisfaction. The first continuum consisted of factors considered to be intrinsic to the individual worker; felt within them and generated by them. These “satisfiers” or “motivators” included achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement, and growth. This continuum identified “job satisfaction” at one end and “no job satisfaction” at the opposite end. The second continuum consisted of factors outside of or extrinsic to the worker, which were labeled “dissatisfiers” or “hygienes.” Herzberg identified these factors as “hygiene factors” because their presence was necessary for worker “health” (satisfaction) and their absence, in essence, created “unhealthy” workers. These factors included company policy and administration, working conditions,
interpersonal relationships (with peers, subordinates, and superiors), job status, job security, salary, and the effects of the worker's personal life. This continuum identified "job dissatisfaction" at one pole and "no job dissatisfaction" at the opposite pole (Herzberg, 1959, 1966; Lunnenberg & Ornstein, 2004). Herzberg found that: (a) all motivators contribute to job satisfaction rather than to job dissatisfaction, and all hygienes contribute to job dissatisfaction rather than to job satisfaction; and (b) all intrinsic factors combined contributed more to job satisfaction than do all extrinsic factors combined. In effect, intrinsic motivators led to job satisfaction, but a lack of them did not lead to dissatisfaction, but a condition Herzberg labeled "no job satisfaction." Likewise, extrinsic hygienes led to job dissatisfaction. However, a lack these factors did not lead to job satisfaction, but to a condition called "no job dissatisfaction." Therefore, surveys and instruments used to test Herzberg's Two Factor Theory measured the factors separately and reported both a satisfaction rating and a dissatisfaction rating.

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

Limitations

Mid-level managers in student affairs are a subset of a larger population of student affairs and higher education administrators; therefore, it would not be appropriate to generalize results to student affairs administrators. All data in the sample was self reported and assumed to be an honest representation of the questions participants responded. Since respondents choose to participate voluntarily and self-report, the results may have some undeterminable bias. Finally, the study was a sample of mid-level managers in student affairs administration employed at four-year public and private institutions. The study excluded mid-level managers from professional schools (e.g.
community colleges, law, dentistry, podiatry, art, and nursing) and theological and divinity and propriety schools; therefore, the results from this study cannot be assumed to be generalized to professionals employed at these types of schools. Results from this study should be generalizable to mid-level managers in student affairs employed at four-year institutions.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to mid-level managers of student affairs at four-year public and private institutions of higher education in the United States and used Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory as its guiding theoretical framework. This theory was chosen because of its impact on, and widespread use in, job satisfaction research (Locke, 1983). In addition, it provided a solid starting point for: (a) examining the concept of job satisfaction with mid-level managers in student affairs; (b) noting possible exceptions to Herzberg's theory for this group; and (c) formulating explanations to conceptually validate Herzberg's theory or account for non-support of the theory. Finally, a delimitation is that participants in study are members of ACPA and connected to professional development opportunities which is related to job satisfaction

Significance of the Study

This study fills the gap in the literature related to job satisfaction of mid-level managers in student affairs administration. This work provides critical information for those who aspire to the mid-level manager position in student affairs administration, as well as those CSAOs who supervise these professionals. This study provides data that affects the recruitment and selection of mid-level managers in student affairs, and could reduce attrition of these professionals. Finally, this study will benefit students who are
contemplating student affairs administration as a career choice, professionals seeking promotion in the student affairs field, and mid-level managers seeking to increase their upward mobility.

Definition of Terms

American College Personnel Association (ACPA) - This association serves student affairs professionals, graduate students, and faculty in higher education (www.myacpa.org).

Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAO) - This position provides leadership in conjunction with the president to non-academic programs and services in the college and university setting (Komives, et al., 2004; Sandeen, 1991).

Mid-Level Manager - Mid-level managers are defined as the academic or non academic support staff that within the institution (e.g. directors, and coordinators of admissions, placement and counseling services, etc.) (Rosser, 2004).

Job dissatisfaction - The level to which unsuccessful attempts to achieve a set of work related goals that are associated with a negative mind set (Herzberg, 1966).

Job satisfaction - The level to which achievement of a set of work-related goals are associated with a positive mind set (Herzberg, 1966).

Overview of the Dissertation

Chapter 2 is an extended review of the literature concerning factors related to job satisfaction and the area of mid-level managers in higher education and student affairs. Specifically, the areas of research reviewed are job satisfaction theory, Herzberg’s intrinsic and extrinsic factors, environment, relationships with supervisors and colleagues, compensation and personal motivation. Prior research on student affairs
professionals is discussed in detail, and a conceptual framework that applies Herzberg’s and others’ work on job satisfaction to the present student affairs population is presented.

Chapter 3 provides the methodology used in the study, including the sample, the survey instrument, the revision of the instrument and data collection plan, and the procedures that used to analyze data generated by the survey.

Chapter 4 is the results from the quantitative and qualitative sections of the ML-MJSJDS. Descriptive statistics, correlations, analysis of variance (ANOVAs), the examination of job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction related to intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Regression analyses about job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction, and attrition are presented. Finally, the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic factors is explored.

Chapter 5 is the overview of the significant findings, discussion of the study, differences from Herzberg’s findings, implications for the student affairs field and the recommendations for further study are presented in this chapter.

Summary

Mid-level managers in student affairs hold varied positions that often include multiple responsibilities (Mills, 1993). Circumstances such as lowered student enrollments and declining fiscal resources exacerbate the challenges mid-level managers already face (Garland & Grace, 1993). Research examining mid-level managers in student affairs, however, is limited, and we know little about the job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction of this important group of professionals. Herzberg’s (1966) Motivation-Hygiene Theory of job satisfaction lended itself to this study because the factors related to environment and personal motivation fit well with the work in which mid-level student
affairs managers are engaged, and have been previously validated in academic settings (Anuna, 1997; Osueke, 1991).

The study examined mid-level managers at four-year public and private institutions. The significance of the study is that it provides information about job satisfaction, which will assist with hiring and selecting appropriate candidates for mid-level manager positions, and provide information to entry-level professionals who aspire to the mid-level manager position and improve the current work environment for mid-level managers. Finally, this study adds to the limited scholarship about mid-level managers across all functional areas in student affairs and what factors lead to attrition within the next twelve months for this population.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND CONCEPTUAL MODEL

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the literature relevant to job satisfaction and mid-level managers in student affairs administration. Since the literature about this topic was limited, it was necessary to extrapolate literature from vocational psychology and general student affairs administration. The format for this chapter includes the following: (a) information about mid-level administrators in higher education, (b) issues that affected the work lives of mid-level managers in higher education, (c) job satisfaction, which included definitions and historical background, a theoretical analysis of Herzberg’s Two-Factory Theory, (d) justification of Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory, (e) research about job satisfaction for administrators in higher education, (f) analysis of job satisfaction of entry-level student affairs administrators, chief student affairs officers, and what was currently in the literature about mid-level managers and job satisfaction, (g) attrition of mid-level managers in student affairs, (h) factors that related to job satisfaction based on Herzberg’s Two-Factory Theory, (i) demographic variables that related to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, (j) Herzberg’s conceptual framework and (k) the conceptual framework used to assess job satisfaction and intent to leave of mid-level managers in student affairs.

Mid-Level Administrators in Higher Education

According to Rosser (2004; 2000), mid-level managers in higher education are the unsung professionals of higher education because their contributions are rarely recognized. Because relatively little research existed on these professionals, their lack of visibility in the academy appeared to have been of little concern to educational
researchers. Rosser (2000) posited, "Mid-level managers are the academic (e.g. department chairs,) and non-academic staff within the structure of higher education organizations" (p. 5). They report to a senior-level administrator or dean, and usually defined or identified by the department or functional area where they work.

National data on mid-level managers in higher education are limited to demographics. The Fall Staff report on postsecondary institutions (U.S. Department of Education, 2005) produced in 2003, about employees at institutions who receive Title IV (federal funds) gave the most current information to date. A national survey gave the most comprehensive information about occupational activity in higher education. The results from survey indicated that 185,011 people were employed as executive and managerial staff in higher education (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). The breakdown for this figure was by institutional type instead of administrative level. Public institutions had 94,195 professionals at this level. Private for non-profit institutions had 80,167 mid-level managers. Private for profit institutions had 10,649 professionals employed at the mid-manager level. Sixty-eight percent of the staff was employed full-time. Twenty-nine percent of the staff was employed at private not-for-profit institutions, and three percent were employed by private for profit institutions. African Americans had the highest percentage among administrative professionals of color at 11 percent, and were primarily employed in service support positions. Overall, professionals of color represented 23 percent of administrators in higher education. A demographic breakdown for this 23 percent was as follows: (a) African Americans at 11 percent, (b) Hispanics with 6.1 percent, (c) Asian and Pacific Islanders with 6.0 percent, and (d) American Indian with 0.7 percent (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). Rosser (2000), who
looked at the same data set in 1995, asserted that the racial and ethnic makeup of mid-level managers at colleges and universities tended to mirror student and local communities more closely than faculty and administrative groups. Professionals of color in 1995 held 20 percent of administrative positions (Rosser, 2000).

Although not mandatory, it is preferred that mid-level managers in student affairs have a graduate degree in counseling, student affairs, or higher education administration and approximately three to five years of experience in entry-level positions (Mills, 1993). Twombly (1990) identified a number of entrances and exits in mid-level positions with a number of paths between destinations. Vital to the management of the academy, mid-level administrators served higher education institutions as counselors, advisors, analysts and officers who faculty, senior-level administrators, and students came to rely on and trust (Rosser, 2004; 2000).

Mid-level managers are an important part of higher education administration. According to Sangria and Johnsrud (1992), mid-level managers make up approximately 64 percent of administrative staff positions. The significance of this finding according Rosser (2000) was that mid-level managers maintain the balance between their supervisors and the constituencies they serve; their performance determines the quality of the relationships with faculty, students, and the public who utilize the services these professionals provide. This relationship building is important to mid-level managers (Johnsrud & Rosser, 1999). Mid-level managers are also viewed as the “frontline personnel” along with entry-level professionals with whom students initially interact when entering the college or university system. They serve as firing-line managers, who have responsibility for regulating policy and procedures (Rosser, 2000). However, they
have little authority to change or develop the policies they enforced in their positions (Johnsrud, 1996; Johnsrud & Rosser, 1999; Rosser, 2000). While this may cause frustration among mid-level managers, they are a dedicated group of professionals who worked long hours, are highly skilled, and strongly connected to their work (Rosser, 2000). It is clear that mid-level managers contribute significantly to the academic organization by serving and supporting the primary functions of teaching, research, and service of the academy (Rosser, 2000). Since their work is so important, it is essential to understand what issues affect their work lives.

Issues that Affect the Work Lives of Mid-Level Managers in Higher Education

Although the literature is limited, Johnsrud (1996) conducted a study on the morale of mid-level administrators and faculty in the University of Hawaii system to make recommendations to the senior-level administrators to improve the morale of these groups. Her sample consisted of 869 mid-level administrators and 1022 faculty. Using a mixed methodology, she surveyed the administrators and faculty to determine which factors contributed to their morale. She found that institutional dimensions such as hiring practices, opportunities for career advancement and clearer performance criteria affected the participant’s morale. Working conditions such as parking and work environment, discrimination based on age, gender, and ethnic origin, issues such as federal and government mandates, budget reviews also had a negative impact. Finally, bureaucracy, professional issues such as recognition for contribution, and expertise, gender and racial harassment, intra- and inter-department relations, and external relations were the primary reasons for low morale of the mid-level managers in the University of Hawaii system. From her data collection, Johnsrud (1996) identified three issues that were sources of
frustration for mid-level managers in higher education. They were: (a) the mid-level nature of their role, (b) lack of recognition for their contributions, and (c) the lack of career development and advancement opportunities. The first issue was the major source of frustration. Mid-level managers provided information to senior-level administrators, but were rarely involved in decision or policymaking that affected their areas. Although mid-level managers had a great wealth of knowledge of their functional areas, their role in decision-making was minimal even though they were held responsible for outcomes related to this decision. Lack of recognition was a source of frustration because mid-level managers were asked to provide information to decision makers; however, those persons did not appear to recognize the skill level, background, and expertise of those who were providing this information (Rosser, 2004). Because of this lack of recognition, mid-level managers may have wondered if their supervisors trusted them. Mid-level managers were in the position to create and control the information that moved up the ladder in decision-making. Supervisors of mid-level managers needed to inquire about work done by the manager and the manager may have felt that his or her accuracy or integrity was being questioned (Johnsrud, 1996).

Finally, the last source of frustration was the lack of career development and advancement opportunities. Because mobility is complex in higher education (Fey & Carpenter, 1996; Johnsrud, 1996; Johnsrud & Rosser, 1999), it was important to develop professional growth opportunities for mid-level managers within institutions. Some mid-level managers are interested in improving their ability to perform their jobs as well as gain skills necessary to take on new and more challenging positions (Shermehiemi, 2002). Although some institutions did have professional development, opportunities such
as those related to conferences and travel support, workshops and classes, for employees, others did not (Johnsrud, 1996; Shermesheim, 2002). In addition, some mid-level managers did not take advantage of opportunities that exist (Shermesheim, 2002). Because of these frustrations, some mid-level managers left their positions to gain these opportunities. Shermersheim (2002) asserted that time was a reason why some mid-level managers did not participate in these professional development opportunities. The frustration felt from mid-level managers due to lack of opportunity led to separation from the institution (Johnsrud, 1996).

This turnover may have been a reflection of how mid-level managers viewed their work lives. The literature said that turnover was over 60% among mid-level administrators (Blum, 1989; Johnsrud, 2002; Johnsrud & Rosser, 1999; Rosser, 2000; Rosser, 2004; Rosser & Javinar, 2003; Sangria & Johnsrud, 1988; Spangler, 2003). With the attrition of a mid-level manager, this could be an opportunity for the institution. Replacing the mid-level manager with an entry-level person could bring cost savings to the hiring manager as well as savings in benefits and pension plan costs (Johnsrud & Rosser, 1999). This also gives the hiring or senior-level administrator the opportunity to evaluate current organizational structures and determine what best suits the needs of the organization (Johnsrud & Rosser, 1999). As higher education is in tough fiscal times, it is important to make the most of resources and minimize costs. Although this section was an overview of mid-level managers in higher education, student affairs administration has a different set of issues, which is discussed in a later section.
Job Satisfaction

Definition and Historical Background

Since Hoppock's seminal study in 1935, job satisfaction has been one of the most widely studied topics in the organization and industrial psychology fields (Dawis, 1984). Hoppock (1935) defined job satisfaction as "any combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that cause a person to truthfully say, 'I am satisfied with my job'" (p. 47) and that definition holds today. Job satisfaction was defined as an employee's evaluation of the overall quality of his or her position. Evaluations measured the affective orientation towards one's job (Firebaugh & Harley, 1995; Vroom, 1995) or an attitude one held about their position (Spector, 1997). Locke (1976) asserted that job satisfaction could be the "pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (p. 1300). Spector (1997) suggested that job satisfaction was an attitude relating to the extent that people liked or disliked their jobs. It appeared that job satisfaction answered how people felt about their jobs and to what extent they liked their positions. This led to the question of how these conditions combined to produce job satisfaction.

Studies and measures of job satisfaction dated back to the beginning of the twentieth century. The first studies were conducted on worker behavior in 1911 and 1913 by Taylor and Mustenberge, respectively. They specified human requirements of work and factors that contributed to satisfactory work performance. Dating back to 1939, the now famous "Hawthorne experiments" examined worker productivity in different work environments (Owens, 2004). The Great Depression brought studies from the employee's viewpoint. Hoppock (1935) was one of the first researchers to examine job satisfaction.
According to Dawis (1984), over 3,000 studies have been completed on job satisfaction between 1935 and 1970.

Hoppock (1935) found over two-thirds of workers reported being satisfied; and 15% reported dissatisfaction (Dawis, 1984). A nationwide study of the first occupational prestige scale was conducted by the National Opinion Research Center (Dawis, 1984; Powers, 1982). They surveyed 3,000 people asking them to assign a level of prestige to 100 occupations and then asked them if they were satisfied with the positions they held. Respondents confirmed that 80% were satisfied with their positions. Researchers who challenged this study asked, if the percentage of people who were satisfied with their positions was so high, then why was it difficult to explain the increasing number of people who were not satisfied in their positions. The explanation that exists to date could be the way in which the questions were asked of survey participants. The Special Task Force for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (1973) conducted a study in which they surveyed 5,000 people and asked, “If you could go back and to age 18 and start your life over again, would you choose a different career or occupation?” The task force found only 40 percent of the sample said yes, and 39 percent of the sample would choose the same occupation. Another explanation for the level of dissatisfaction could be from what was called facet satisfaction. Facet satisfaction defined by Spector (1997) was satisfaction with certain facets or aspects of work. Some facets would be compensation, relationships with colleagues and supervisors, work environment, and the type of work done by the employee. Facet satisfaction and overall satisfaction could be separated and scales used to measure these concepts correlated moderately (Dawis, Pinto, & Weitzel, 1974).
Weitzel, Pinto, Dawis and Jury (1973) conducted a study, which demonstrated how facet satisfaction could be organized in a hierarchical fashion. This group surveyed 1,909 salaried employees from operating companies of a Midwestern corporation. Twenty-eight variables were examined in a four-item satisfaction self-report developed by the Triple Audit Opinion Survey. The items required a response on a five-point scale from “not satisfied” to “extremely satisfied.” Using the Wherry Wherry Hierarchical Factor Analysis procedure, this procedure used principal factor analysis and minimum residual methods to obtain factors, which are then rotated to a varimax solution. Then the varimax factors were then further analyzed to get second and third order (subgeneral) factors. The hierarchies among the companies were: (a) recognition among superiors, (b) individual identity, (c) overall satisfaction, (d) creditability and confidence in management, and (e) regularity of communication with superiors. When the sub general factors were removed, the top five rankings of the factors were as follows: (a) opportunity for advancement, (b) promotion practices, (c) satisfaction with the progress of their careers, (d) satisfaction with their career choice, and (e) the amount of compensation received. In the third factor analysis process, the hierarchy rankings were: (a) openness of communication, (b) cooperation in the organization, (c) confidence in management, (d) company policies, and practices, and (e) company aims and plans. According to the researchers, the findings of this study were consistent with the factor analysis of previous researchers.

Finally, the second factor analysis produces factors closely related to intrinsic factors and the third factor analysis produced factors similar to extrinsic factors used by Herzberg in his research. The next section is an explanation of Herzberg’s Motivation-
Hygiene theory. Then, I will provide a justification for its use in this study. Following this justification is an explanation of the factors and the literature as they applied to this study.

Theories of Job Satisfaction

Content theories, process theories, and situational theories are the three job satisfaction frameworks conceptualized by Thompson, McNamara, and Hoyle (1997). Content theories are those that label certain needs that must be satisfied, or values attained for job satisfaction to occur for the individual (Locke, 1983). Process theories are those frameworks that attempt to identify the types of factors (e.g. needs, values, perceptions, and expectations) that work together to lead to job satisfaction (Locke, 1983). Situational theories according to Thompson et al. (1997) explain the process in which factors (job tasks, individual, and organizational dynamic) work in partnership to influence job satisfaction (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). This study lies in one of the major content theories (Locke, 1983), the work of Herzberg.

Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction

Frederick Herzberg was recognized for writing three works relating to Job Satisfaction-Job Dissatisfaction Theory. Referred to as the “Herzberg Trilogy” (Hoy & Miskel, 1996), these major works presented a comprehensive review of the job satisfaction literature (Herzberg, 1957), the research studies that created the theory (Herzberg, 1959), called the Two-Factor Theory also referred to as the Motivation-Hygiene Theory, and a series of replications of the study to validate the theory (Herzberg, 1966). Although Herzberg worked with many colleagues to create this theory, he was only person credited for this work in the research literature.
The first major work was an extensive review of the job satisfaction literature that led Herzberg to question the linear one-continuum theory of job satisfaction with job satisfaction at one end and job dissatisfaction at the other end (Herzberg, 1957). The second work in this series was Herzberg’s (1959) study to measure the validity of the one continuum theory of job satisfaction and alternatives to that theory. He used Flanagan’s (1954) critical incident technique as a data collection procedure to examine the one-continuum theory. This approach used a qualitative methodology whereby Herzberg interviewed his subjects, collecting information from the subjects’ direct observations of their own and other’s behavior (Woosley, 1986). Herzberg changed the critical incident technique to a semi-structured interview format. He asked his subjects to recall work incidents in which they felt exceptionally good or bad, and the factors and conditions that led to those feelings.

Herzberg (1959) tested the technique in his first pilot study of clerical and production workers and people in managerial and professional positions. He found that the professional and managerial groups were more verbal and showed a quicker grasp of the “critical incident” technique and related more and more detailed sequences of events or “incidents” than did the clerical and production groups (p. 32). Herzberg, therefore, intentionally focused his second pilot study on professional and managerial staff. The results of the two pilot tests encouraged Herzberg to select a representative sample of 203 engineers and accountants in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania as subjects for his larger study. These groups of professionals were chosen to explore “the job attitudes of two of the most important staff groups in modern industry” (Herzberg, 1959, p. 32). In addition,
Herzberg felt that a sample limited to one profession would present results of doubtful generalizability.

Herzberg and his associates used an inductive content analysis approach to analyze the subjects' job attitudes that permitted categories to emerge from the data. Each description of good incidents and bad incidents were reduced to a "single thought unit" and summarized individually on 3 x 5 index cards for sorting (Herzberg, 1959, p. 32). Based on the categories that came from the data, Herzberg (1959) created two separate distinct continua for job satisfaction. The first continuum consisted of factors intrinsic to the work or "satisfiers"—achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, advancement and growth. This continuum identified "job satisfaction" at one pole and "no job satisfaction" at the opposite pole. The second continuum identified "job dissatisfaction" and consisted of factors extrinsic to the work but found in the work environment or "dissatisfiers"—supervision, company policy and administration, working conditions, interpersonal relations, job status, job security, salary, and effects on the personal lives of the subjects. This continuum identified "job dissatisfaction" at one pole and "no job satisfaction" at the opposite pole (Herzberg, 1959; 1966; Lunnenburg & Orenstein, 2004).

Herzberg's third work (1966) recorded numerous replications of his original study with different populations. Those populations were: (a) lower level supervisors in the utility industry, (b) Finnish supervisors, (c) women in high level professional positions, (d) county agricultural extension employees, (e) pre-retirees from managerial positions, (f) scientists and engineers, (g) manufacturing supervisors, (h) hourly male technicians,
(i) female assembly workers, (j) nurses, (k) skilled hospital employees, (l) unskilled workers, and numerous other groups.

From his own review of the literature (Herzberg, 1957) his original study (Herzberg, 1959) and the following replications (Herzberg, 1966); he created the following theoretical assumptions:

1. Factors or satisfiers involved in creating job satisfaction were separate and distinct from the factors or dissatisfiers that lead to job dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1966, p.75).

2. Satisfier factors were more likely to increase job satisfaction than they would decrease job satisfaction and dissatisfier factors that relate to job dissatisfaction infrequently serve to decrease job satisfaction (Herzberg, 1966, p. 80).

3. Job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction were not the opposite of one another (Herzberg, 1966, p. 76).

4. The opposite of job satisfaction would not be job dissatisfaction, but rather no job satisfaction; similarly, the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction, not satisfaction with one's job (Herzberg, 1966, p. 76).

5. Satisfiers were the factors involved in doing the job, where dissatisfiers were factors that define the context of the job (Herzberg, 1959, p. 82).

6. There are two sets of needs for [man]: his need to avoid pain as an animal and his need to grow psychologically (Herzberg, 1966, p. 71). Dissatisfiers led to dissatisfaction because of the need to avoid pain for situations that caused discomfort; satisfiers led to job satisfaction because
they created a need for growth or self-actualization (Herzberg, 1966, p. 75).

Pinder (1984) described the Two-Factor Theory was groundbreaking at the time because of its suggestion that the opposite of job satisfaction was not job dissatisfaction as was traditionally held, but no job satisfaction. In addition, the opposite of job dissatisfaction was not job satisfaction, but no job dissatisfaction.

Studies that Questioned Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory

A review of the literature indicated intrinsic and extrinsic factors were not independent. Ewen (1964) criticized Herzberg theory by asserting that certain “satisfiers” produced positive, but not negative job attitudes, whereas other variables “dissatisfiers” produce negative, but not positive job attitudes. He found deficiencies in Herzberg’s methodology. The deficiencies were: (a) a narrow range of jobs studied, (b) the use of only one measure of job attitudes, (c) no validity and reliability data, and (d) the absence of an overall definition of job satisfaction. As a result, Ewen (1964) concluded that generalizing Herzberg’s results past the situation where the results of the study generated were not suitable. To further explore the generality of Herzberg’s theory, Ewen (1964) conducted a study where he surveyed 1,021 full-time life insurance agents at two different times (1960 and 1962) using a four-point anonymous scale. Those participants who checked the two middle points on the survey instrument created a neutral group. Ewen (1964) found that six factors emerged. Dissatisfiers in Ewen’s work were manager interest in agents, company training policies, and salary. Satisfiers in this study were the work itself, prestige, and recognition in addition to general morale, and satisfaction.
General satisfaction of the satisfied and dissatisfied groups was compared to the general satisfaction of the neutral group using t-tests of significance.

The results of Ewen’s (1964) study were that managers’ interests in agents and company training were identified as dissatisfiers, but acted like satisfiers in both groups. Salary was a satisfier in the 1960 group, but in the 1962 group, salary caused job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The work itself was satisfier as Herzberg theorized; however, prestige and recognition also caused both job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. This study had the similar limitations to Herzberg’s work and was not conclusive. Ewen recommended that further research was necessary to explore different occupational situations before definite statements about job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction were made. Therefore, no support was could be provided for generalizing Herzberg’s study.

Whitsett and Winslow (1967) conducted a review of various studies that used Herzberg’s Two Factor (Motivator-Hygiene, M-H) Theory to measure facets of job satisfaction. They found that numerous misinterpretations of the M-H theory, the weakness in methodology, and the misinterpretations of results taken as a collective the studies provided little empirical support for the validity of the theory. The studies used in Whitsett and Winslow’s (1967) analysis did support Herzberg’s Motivator-Hygiene in part, although, one consistent finding was evident. That finding was that motivators were more important in rankings of factors in job attitudes than hygiene factors.

Burke (1966) interviewed 187 college students and asked them to rank 10 job characteristics in order of importance. He found that more than one pair of mirror-image preference orders suggested intrinsic and extrinsic factors were not one-dimensional or independent variables. Locke (1976), in his assessment of Herzberg’s work, disagreed
with Herzberg and posited: (a) job satisfaction and dissatisfaction result from different causes, and (b) the two-factor is parallel to the dual theory of [man's] needs which says that physical needs are work in conjunction with hygiene factors and psychological needs work alongside with motivators.

Silver (1987) conducted an analysis of Herzberg's studies. Her purpose was to measure the validity of Herzberg's theory without bias from interviews or rating scales. She conducted three tests where she examined 92 educators who were students at the University of Illinois-Chicago and the University of Tulsa. The first test asked respondents think about a time where the respondents felt especially good and especially bad about their current position and write a brief paragraph about those experiences. The second tests asked respondents to read a list of statements in the past tense and check items that did not occur at the time of the episode written previously. The third test asked respondents to indicate the frequency of the items in test two with the following scale, zero = never, one = seldom, two = occasionally, and three = frequently. She found that her study, and other studies of educators, modifications needed to be made to measure job satisfaction using Herzberg's Two Factory theory. She also concluded that dissatisfaction was a combination of complex collection of feelings separate from feelings that led to satisfaction.

Midiani (1991) conducted a study where he explored the importance of job factors between employees in the public and private sectors. He surveyed 173 accounts and engineers at a private organization and 177 accountants and engineers at a public organization using a survey based on Herzberg's intrinsic and extrinsic classifications. He found that motivators were sources of satisfaction. He found that both public and
private sectors identified intrinsic factors as important, but those who were employed in the public sector rated extrinsic factors more important than those in the private sector were. Overall, the survey indicated that the majority of satisfied employees were employed in the public sector.

Tietjan and Myers (1998) translated Herzberg’s theory by asserting that attitude was an important factor in determining job output and satisfaction. They wanted to understand the basis of Herzberg’s non-bipolar relationship of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Tietjan and Myers (1998) also felt that the basic difference between job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction was the inherent level of satisfaction and dissatisfaction within each factor. Worker attitude and personal values would determine the extent of satisfaction or dissatisfaction an employee felt. They surmised that as workers’ performance declined, it was not because of a lack of benefits or enforcement, but employee tasks should be changed in a way that job satisfaction should happen daily.

As Herzberg’s Two Factory theory has been challenged over time, it still serves a best option to conduct a study of job satisfaction in higher education. Although Silver (1987) asserted that, these studies needed to be modified to measure all the facets of job satisfaction in education. Studies in higher education have indicated that Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory as a viable option to study job satisfaction (Anuna, 1997; Bailey, 1997; Blank, 1993; DeMichele, 1998; Familiant, 2002; Lacewell, 1983; Miskel, DeFrain, & Wilcox 1983; Osueke, 1991) therefore, this study used Herzberg’s Two Factory Theory as a theoretical framework.
Justification of Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory

Careful analysis indicated that Herzberg’s Two-Factor theory was more suitable than other theories for this study. The Two-Factor Theory opposed other theories because it listed specific job context factors, which were related to job dissatisfaction that supported the methodology of this study.

Other theories were not suitable for this study for various reasons. For example, there was a lack of scientific evidence to support Need Fulfillment Theory (Bennis, 1967). McGregor (1960) said that the assumptions of Theories X and Y were intuitive and deductions were not based on research. Vroom’s Expectancy Theory was challenging to research and apply in practice (Koontz, O’Donnel, & Weihrich, 1980). Finally, Job Characteristic Theory only examined characteristics related to job satisfaction and did not look at job dissatisfaction at all (Oldham & Hackman, 1980).

Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory was preferred over other theories because it had become a management tool and had inspired a number of empirical research studies relevant to job satisfaction (Blank, 1993; Bailey, 1997; Groseth, 1978; Lacewell, 1983; Miskel, DeFrain, & Wilcox, 1980). Gaziel (1986) posited that Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory has made a key contribution in understanding job satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction in Higher Education

In examining job satisfaction in higher education numerous of directions could be explored. Because little research existed on the job satisfaction for mid-level managers in student affairs, it was necessary to look at job satisfaction for more generalized administrators in higher education. Boone (1986) conducted a study in which he found that the satisfaction level was the same for higher education administrators as for workers
in other business settings. Glick (1992) and Solomon and Tierney (1977) found that faculty and administrators were less satisfied with their positions than at large.

Administrators

Research on job satisfaction of administrators in higher education has centered on gender and institutional type. These studies have been more encouraging for women than for men (Steward et al., 1995). First, Reeves (1975) said that female administrators, with advanced degrees, reported higher levels of job satisfaction than those with a bachelor’s degree. Her study also said that married female administrators were more satisfied than their single counterparts (Reeves, 1975) were. Schonwetter, Bond, and Perry (1993) asserted that female administrators with their Ph.D. reported the highest level of job satisfaction with their role and occupation regardless of their position. Although this study examined gender and occupational level, it concluded that increased education and experience yielded higher job satisfaction in women.

Next, Solomon and Tierney (1977) reported that upper-level administrators at private higher education institutions were more satisfied with most parts of their positions than those at public higher education institutions. In 1981, Sullivan conducted a study with K-12 administrators, which also has implications for higher education. His study examined the effectiveness of job classification to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Using Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene theory, Sullivan applied this to educational administrators in a large school district. First, he found that the effectiveness of the variables used in identification of job classes of employees was significantly related to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Second, the effectiveness of administration of the different job classes was also significantly related to job satisfaction of the employees.
Third, the effectiveness of variables and administration of the program concurrently contributed to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Finally, organizational and demographic factors like age, nature of organization responsibility, and prior administrative experience were correlated with job dissatisfaction.

Following Solomon and Tierney, Freeman-Garrott (1983) examined female senior-level administrators. Using a qualitative design, she interviewed 20 women who were vice presidents, deans, and faculty members who had dual roles as administrators. Her participants had similar backgrounds; most had doctoral degrees and had worked more than 15 years in higher education. Administrators were satisfied with the most aspects of their positions, such as salary, working conditions, and recognition received from colleagues. Following Freeman-Garrott, Jarrell (1983) examined the relationship of role ambiguity and conflict with job-related tension, job satisfaction, and the desire to leave the institution for upper-level and mid-level administrators. She found that role ambiguity was negatively related to job satisfaction and positively related with job tension. She also found that in role ambiguity among levels of administrators and job satisfaction differed. Those who were senior-level administrators reported a higher level of job satisfaction than those mid-level managers did. Some of the administrators in her sample could be identified as mid-level managers according to the definition used in chapter one. A small difference was found in the relationships with job-related variables, but these variables did not differ between mid-level managers and upper-level administrators who were deans and the senior level administrators in the sample.

Reisser and Zurfluh (1987), Reeves (1975), and Scott and Spooner (1989) in studies found that women reported lower levels of job satisfaction than men did in regard to...
to salary and promotion. Taylor (1989) conducted a study to examine the perceptions of
women in colleges and universities in Ohio. She found that the structure of the
organization, socialization, and male hegemony affected the women in her sample
negatively. This study was weak in that her sample size was small and she made no
comparison to men or other populations in higher education. Glick (1992) conducted a
nationwide survey and found that academic administrators expressed dissatisfaction in
the nature of the work they were required to perform. Using the Job Descriptive Index
(JDI), he found that male and female administrators with the same educational level and
experience reported equally that they were not satisfied with their positions. Anuna
(1997) examined whether academic deans in public universities in Texas were satisfied
with their positions due to a large turnover of the administrators in this position. He also
wanted to identify the factors that contributed to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction to
assist with policy development. Based on Herzberg’s Two-Factor theory, he looked at the
relationship between job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. He found that the deans
were satisfied with their positions, and that demographic variables did not have any
significant relationship with job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction. The study participants
were most satisfied with their responsibility, interpersonal relationships, job status,
administrative policies, and recognition. The participants were least satisfied with
achievement, supervision, working conditions, salary, and personal life.

Volkwein, Malik, and Napierski- Prancl (1998) investigated the extent that
financial, personnel, and academic dimensions influenced managers at state institutions.
This research team also investigated the extent that regulatory climate influenced
satisfaction among managers who are functional areas influenced by state control. Their
expectations were as follows: (a) there was not a direct relationship between regulatory climate and overall job satisfaction, and (b) campus autonomy (administrative flexibility) directly influenced some subcomponents of job satisfaction. Using a two-survey process, Volkwein, Malik, and Napierski-Prancl sent surveys to 144 public Carnegie Research I, II, Doctoral I, and II institutions. The researchers asked presidents and chancellors at the institutions to determine a point person to assist with data collection. One hundred twenty-two institutions responded for a 77% response rate. The first survey had questions about management flexibility, and state regulation. The second survey about administrative satisfaction was sent to 12 managers on each campus who had positions that were affected by regulatory climate.

In their five regression models (overall satisfaction, intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, work conditions, and relationships with others), they found that overall satisfaction, intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, work conditions and relationships with others explained between 14% and 43% of the variance of job satisfaction for the study's sample. Next, the regulatory climate (measured from the data from states and institutions) was significant. Volkwein, Malik, and Napierski-Prancl (1998) also found mild evidence to support campus autonomy (administrative flexibility) and administrative satisfaction. They concluded that the data suggested that regulatory climate may have had an indirect yet small influence on work environment and work stress and further investigation was needed.

Finally, Volkwein and Zhou (2003) developed a model of administrative job satisfaction that embraced the notion that job satisfaction was derived from a combination of organizational/environmental perspectives and individual characteristics. Volkwein
and Zhou believed that the most important facets of job satisfaction were the nature of the work, which is related to Herzberg’s intrinsic factors, rewards received, related to Herzberg’s extrinsic factors, and satisfaction with those one’s work with. Volkwein and Zhou labeled this construct as interpersonal. This concept however, is one of Herzberg’s extrinsic factors. For higher education administrators, Volkwein and Zhou felt that the work environment and its climate, teamwork, interpersonal conflict, job security, work stress and pressure, regulation and control and adequacy of funding and facilities affected satisfaction.

In sum, their hypothesis was that three clusters of factors—state, organizational, and personal characteristics influenced the work environment and the administrator’s perception of it. The work environment and factors shape various forms of administrative job satisfaction. Was there evidence to support this notion? To test their model, Volkwein and Zhou used a two-survey process, where they sent surveys to 122 Research I, II, Doctoral I and II public and private institutions classified in the 1994 Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching. The first survey gathered information on the management and regulatory climate of the institutions. The second survey was given to 12 mid-level and senior-level managers at each institution. This survey was directed to managers in four arenas of the institution: academic affairs, business and finance, planning and institutional research, and student services. The survey had questions about the managers’ backgrounds, assessment of their work climate, and satisfaction with different aspects of their positions. They received 122 institutional surveys and 1,178 surveys from individual managers for an 85% response rate.
Volkwein and Zhou (2003) found a number of things that affected administrative job satisfaction. They were as follows:

1. State, campus and personal variables presented a small, but statistically significant, effect on administrative work climates;
2. State size and state wealth directly impact the extrinsic dimension of job satisfaction; therefore university administrators in states with less regulated and more affluent have higher morale and are more effective;
3. The background traits of the participants had little impact on satisfaction;
4. The impact of personal, health, and financial on individual perceptions of work climate and attitudes of an manager's position was confirmed; thus administrators with personal issues tend to have more negative feelings about their work climate, and these feelings directly affected all three dimensions of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction;
5. Positive work environments and teamwork influenced most job satisfaction measures;
6. Interpersonal conflict diminished job satisfaction for participants;
7. Job insecurity, strongly and directly influenced all three subcomponents satisfaction and overall job satisfaction; consequently, job insecurity decreases administrator satisfaction and increases intent to leave; and
8. Intrinsic factors are the most noteworthy contributors to overall job satisfaction.

Volkweim et al. (1998) and Volkwein and Parmley (2000) supported this notion. The next section discusses student affairs administrators in higher education and job satisfaction.
Student affairs administrators. The student affairs literature has a number of studies that use variables that have correlated with job satisfaction, including career commitment, organization formalization, professional commitment, and job related stress (Tseng, 2002). Studies have found positive relationships between career commitment, job involvement, organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Aryee & Tan, 1992; Chang, 1999; Goulet & Singh, 2001). In relation to the student affairs field, Barnett (1997) explored how organizational culture, work environment, and personal work life affects job satisfaction. Finally, Novack (1999) examined how institutional diversity efforts influences job satisfaction across all levels of administration, and found that a positive relationship exists between career commitment and job satisfaction.

Blank (1993) conducted a study that examined the theoretical base of job satisfaction for student affairs professionals. He examined the utility of Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory and identified the factors associated with job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction based on type of position, education, experience, salary, age, and gender in his instrument called the Professional Satisfaction Scale (PSS). His survey also had two open-ended comment sections for participants to express thoughts not addressed by the survey questions. This instrument was sent to 115 student affairs professionals at three institutions in Colorado and Wyoming. He received 100 surveys for an 87 percent return rate. He categorized the open-ended questions and used the data from the Professional Satisfaction Scale (PSS) to determine the factors that contributed to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction for his sample. Blank (1993) found partial support for Herzberg’s theory. In this survey, he identified recognition and advancement as job dissatisfiers or hygienes instead of job satisfiers or motivators as Herzberg did. In addition, interpersonal
relations were labeled as job satisfiers rather than job dissatisfiers. Participants in this study reported that the work itself, interpersonal relations with students and colleagues, achievement, and responsibility were factors that afforded the most job satisfaction. Salary, advancement, growth, working conditions, and company policy and administration were factors that gave the most job dissatisfaction. He then concluded that Herzberg’s theory was over generalized to all populations and emphasized that positions in educational environments were different from other work environments.

Blank (1993) concluded that student affairs administrators focus on recognition, growth and advancement through professional development opportunities (Herzberg, 1966). He suggested that student affairs revise the organizational policies and structures and continue to evaluate the job satisfaction of student affairs administrators.

Specifically, Blank identified the following limitations to his study: (a) the varying backgrounds of the participants and their responses about job satisfaction, (b) bias from self-reported data, and (c) limited generalizability because of the geographic location of his participants and institutional type of medium size institutions.

Bailey (1997) asserted that most job-satisfaction studies in student affairs have been broad in scope and explore groups and functions at different position levels. She further posited that generalizability had been limited, and many of the studies were narrow in scope geographically or organizationally. In her study, she used a national random sample to measure the job satisfaction of chief housing officers, which is discussed later. As a result of Blank’s and Bailey’s studies, this study will use a national random sample to measure the job satisfaction of mid-level managers across functional areas in student affairs administration. Although Blank’s and Bailey’s studies were
limited in scope, this study is generalizable to mid-levels managers employed at four-year institutions in the field regardless of functional area and geographic location.

Although not directly a student affairs organization, but close in service and design, Petty, Brewer, and Brown (2005) conducted a study where they examined the job satisfaction and attrition of employees of youth development organizations that serve underrepresented and high-risk youth. The sample was 350 employees of a youth development organization located in the Southeast. Three hundred and thirty two surveys were returned for a 95% response rate. The Job Satisfaction Index (JSI) was used to measure participants' satisfaction. The JSI consisted of 18 questions, where eight are negative statements and ten are phrased positively. The scale used a Likert format with one representing strongly disagree to five representing strongly agree. Lower scores meant that respondents were less satisfied, whereas higher scores indicated more satisfaction.

Petty, Brewer, and Brown (2005) found that the sample was moderately satisfied with their positions. Significant relationships using t-tests existed for gender and martial status. The research team believed that participants in this study were influenced by the work itself as in many helping professions. In addition to examining the working conditions of student affairs administrators, another condition is job related stress.

Finally, Loyd (2005) conducted a study on the impact of teamwork on job satisfaction using student affairs administrators as her sample. Through a Web-based survey, she surveyed 276 members of NASPA's 1,175 member institutions who answered questions regarding three components of job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and interpersonal satisfaction) and eight components of teamwork (clear elevating goals,
results-driven structures, competent team members, collaborative culture, shared standards of excellence, external support and recognition, and principled leadership).

Loyd (2005) concluded the following:

1. Administrators who earned higher salaries, have spent more time at their institution, and in the profession were more satisfied than their colleagues were;

2. There was a relationship between administrators who experience greater interpersonal satisfaction (relationships with faculty, staff and students) and higher levels of job satisfaction;

3. The factors of teamwork worked in combination rather than separately;

4. Those administrators who earn higher salary perceive teamwork more than those who learn lower salaries at the office and division level;

5. Participants saw differences in teamwork at the office and division level;

6. There was a relationship between the level of teamwork and job satisfaction for student affairs administrators.

All components of job satisfaction and teamwork were highly correlated. The next section discusses the research about job related stress and its impact on job satisfaction.

*Job related stress.* Numerous factors in the student affairs work environment cause stress. Forney, Wallace-Schultzman, and Wiggers (1982) found that student affairs professionals experienced work overloads, lack of time for family, and lack of opportunities for professional development, which resulted in job dissatisfaction and job stress. Blix and Lee (1991) investigated how occupational stress affected college and
university administrators and discovered that a “misfit” between the employee and the environment led to perceived stress, job strain, and illness. Consequently, these outcomes lead to increased occurrences of tardiness, absenteeism, and attrition of administrators, which contributed to job dissatisfaction. Scott (1992) identified five stressors among chief student affairs officers: (a) an increase in the number of work hours per week, (b) new subordinates and colleagues, (c) conflicts between student affairs and other divisions of the institution, (d) differing perceptions from others about their job and (e) unresolved interpersonal conflict among colleagues. These factors explained other factors that related to job satisfaction among mid-level managers. As a result, these stressors can lead to burnout of the employee. Brewer and Clippard (2002) measured the burnout and job satisfaction of student support services personnel (SSSP). Their research questions for this study were: (a) To what degree are SSSP satisfied with their job? (b) What was the rate of burnout among them? And (c) Were the employee responses on the MBI survey and JSS survey in line with known information about the literature on burnout and satisfaction?

The study used a correlational design to assess the level of burnout and job satisfaction of individuals who administer these SSSP (TRIO and other educational opportunity programs). The sample was drawn from the Directory of TRIO programs. A simple random sample of 250 was pulled from the 1702 member directory. Participants were sent a letter of explanation and the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) and the Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS). One hundred seventy four surveys were received for a 69% return rate. The survey asked questions relating to organization satisfaction, intrinsic satisfaction, total satisfaction, and salary and promotion. The JSS survey used a Likert
scale from one to eleven. The researchers scored the questions in each of the above
categories from the MBI to derive to a total job satisfaction score, which was:

Total job satisfaction = (emotional exhaustion + depersonalization + personal

Brewer and Clippard found: (a) their sample had a lower burnout rate and a higher job
satisfaction score than other professionals in helping professions; and (b) salary and
promotions were lower. Explanations for the lower burnout and higher job satisfaction
score were organizational factors such as work overload, role conflict, and ambiguity,
rigid environments, and lack of decision-making power. Concerning salary and
promotions the participants enjoyed the work with students and staff, but wanted more
compensation for services rendered. The next section addresses studies related to job
satisfaction and attrition of senior-level administrators.

Senior-level administrators. Chief student affairs officers (CSAOs) face
responsibilities that are different from the responsibilities held in previous positions. In
this role, they chart unfamiliar territory as they work with academic administrators,
community agencies, and a higher level of budget responsibility (Hollway, 2004).
Despite this unfamiliarity, job satisfaction for chief student affairs officers was higher
than it was when they were employed in entry level and mid-level manager positions.
The reason for this satisfaction was that CSAOs reported that they enjoyed the level of
responsibility in the chief student affairs position (Holloway, 2004).

Some studies that have been conducted in relation to the job satisfaction of chief
student affairs officers (CSAOs) explored whether chief student affairs officers were
satisfied with their positions once they were reached. Others examined job satisfaction by
exploring attrition and persistence in the student affairs field (Bender, 1980; Burns, 1972; 
Evans & Kuh, 1983; Holmes, Verrier, & Chisholm, 1983; Lawing, Moore, & Groseth, 
1982; Lorden, 1998). In addition, some researchers examined the work itself and other 
aspects of the position (Bishop, 1996; DeCabooter, 1972; Foy, 1969; Grant & Foy, 1972; 
Studer, 1980; Willis, 1987). Although studies of CSAOs employed at four-year 
institutions were limited, studies of CSAOs at community colleges were used to provide 
information about job satisfaction at this administrative level.

Foy (1969) and Grant and Foy (1972) examined the satisfaction of chief student 
arffairs officers and found that 33 percent of CSAOs were loyal to their institutions,
compared with 27 percent of student affairs administrators at other levels. Although the 
CSAOs were currently happy in their positions, they expected to be happier in the future. 
This study was interesting in that data were collected during the Vietnam War while 
unrest was commonplace on many college and university campuses.

Burns (1972) conducted a study of student affairs graduates from two universities 
on the East coast. She found that those who left the field would look for more 
responsibility, variety, and money in future positions. Haraway (1977) found that, at the 
time, most CSAOs viewed themselves on the outside of the leadership team and did not 
receive communication from the president or other senior-level administrators. Bender 
(1980) conducted the groundbreaking study about job satisfaction among student affairs 
administrators. Using a random sample of professionals from various administrative 
levels and institutional types, she found no differences by gender or age in their level of 
job satisfaction, and length of time in their position. She reported that female respondents 
and respondents who were between the ages of 22 and 36 also reported limited 
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opportunities for advancement. Forty-three percent of men said they would stay in field, whereas 28 percent of women said this same thing. Overall, her study concluded that 66% of her sample indicated that they were satisfied with their positions, 16% indicated that they were undecided and 18% indicated that they were not satisfied with their positions.

Holmes (1983) examined persistence in student affairs graduates from 1971 to 1981. The sample was representative of the number of graduates in student affairs programs at the time. Their gender breakdown was 46 percent men and 54 percent women. Out of the sample, 39 percent had remained in the student affairs field. The number of graduates who had secured positions as mid-level managers within 10 years of entering the student affairs field was not known.

Holmes, Verrier, and Chislom (1983) stated that the majority of graduate students in student affairs programs were women and suggested that attrition rates would increase in the student affairs field by the graduate’s sixth year in the field. Eighty-four percent of people in the sample that said they were satisfied with their positions. Reasons for the attrition level included limited promotional opportunities, limited mobility, and the need for the terminal degree to advance; However, further study was recommended to determine why these professionals made the choice to leave their positions.

Studer (1980) examined the job satisfaction of CSAOs and found that seventy-seven percent of CSAOs at four-year colleges and universities were highly satisfied with their jobs or enjoyed their positions most of the time, whereas 19% of the sample found their positions frustrating. Eighty-three percent said that they would become CSAOs if they had to do it over again, whereas 12% were undecided. The survey also found that
88% of the sample was fairly satisfied with their positions over the past three years; 85% were currently satisfied, and 82% felt they would continue to be satisfied in the next three years. The CSAOs in the sample were satisfied with the institution, relationships with the administrative colleagues, relationships with their supervisors, opportunities to practice special abilities, opportunities to innovate, opportunities to learn, and opportunities for personal growth and development. Participants in this study reported that they were not satisfied with their relationships with faculty colleagues and moderately satisfied with their fringe benefits and salary.

Willis (1987) conducted a study similar to Studer’s with community college Chief Student Affairs Officers. She found that CSAOs at community colleges were satisfied with their positions and institutional size seemed to affect job satisfaction for the CSAO. The survey had the participants rate their satisfaction on a five-point Likert scale. The participant’s ratings all ranged from “enjoyed most of the time” to “highly satisfying.” Seventy-eight percent of the CSAOs indicated that they would be CSAOs if they had to do it over again. Eighty-six percent of the CSAOs in schools with 20,000 or more students would become a CSAO again. Sixty-five percent of those in schools with student enrollments of less than 1,000 said that they would become CSAOs again. The CSAOs reported they had been satisfied with their positions for the past three years. CSAOs at larger institutions were more satisfied in all three categories. They were satisfied with their salary levels compared to the CSAOs in the Studer study. However, they were less satisfied with the opportunities to innovate, to practice special abilities, and to learn.

These findings were similar to DeCabooter’s (1972) study of the job satisfaction of community college CSAOs. He found that 86% of his sample were very satisfied and
expected to grow and advance professionally. Of his sample, 86% of the men and 78% of the women were very satisfied with their positions. Foy (1969) and Grant and Foy (1972), and Harway (1977) also found that community college CSAOs were satisfied with their positions. Rickard’s research discussed how job satisfaction was impacted by gender.

Rickard (1985) found that female practitioners were less satisfied with their positions and left the student affairs field at a higher rate then men. Forty-seven percent of the women in his sample indicated they planned to leave the field. Salary and limited opportunities for advancement were mentioned as reasons for leaving the field. Female CSAOs indicated that they were more satisfied than minority women of those in lower level positions were. Although this study addressed gender, Lawing, Moore, and Groesth present research about the intent to leave the field at the CSAO level.

Lawing, Moore, and Groesth (1982) proposed that relationships exist between a person’s plans to remain in the student affairs field and variables that impact career stability such as job satisfaction, length of time in the field, and number of positions held in the field. The combination of job satisfaction, career tenure and number of positions in the field explained 31% of the in people’s plan to remain in the field. Therefore, to use these factors as predictors should be done with caution.

When comparing job satisfaction with positions held, Bishop (1996) found that Chief Student Affairs Officers were significantly more satisfied with their positions than other student affairs professionals were. Variables such as ability utilization, achievement, opportunities for advancement, authority, institutional practices and policies, compensation, recognition, job security, social status, supervisor technical
competence, and working conditions showed significant differences in job satisfaction. Salary, gender, and length of time in one’s position were also good predictors for job satisfaction. Men in this sample tended to be more satisfied with their positions. In addition, the more money CSAOs made, the more satisfied they were with their positions. It was found that the longer CSAOs were in their positions, the less satisfied they were. Student affairs professionals may stay longer in their positions because they perceive upward mobility as not a possibility (Arnold, 1982; Holloway, 2004; Ohanesian, 1974); therefore, staying in a position may not reflect the level of satisfaction with their positions. Bishop’s study was limited to community colleges in Kentucky and a small number of CSAOs. It cannot be taken as representative to larger community colleges or the population of community college CSAOs.

Overall, Chief Student Affairs Officers were satisfied with their positions, and find that the role of the CSAO was rewarding, although they would appreciate an increase in their salaries. Studies have addressed specifically the CSAO job satisfaction; a number of studies concentrated on all student affairs professionals and why they chose to leave the field or reasons, they may be dissatisfied in their positions before they become CSAOs.

According to Evans (1988), factors that lead to attrition of student affairs professionals include limited mobility, limited or unclear career ladders, requirement of and lack of interest in resources for obtaining the doctorate, and lack of opportunities for personal growth, scholarship, and ability utilization. Those who become CSAOs were inclined to be more satisfied and have higher salaries. Women tended to leave the student affairs field quicker before attaining the chief student affairs officer position then men.
and report less job satisfaction. The next section presents the research related to entry-level administrators in student affairs and job satisfaction.

**Entry-level administrators.** Research about the job satisfaction of the entry-level student affairs professional was even more limited than research on mid-level managers; however, some studies have created a profile of the entry-level student affairs professional. Exum (1998) defined a new professional or entry-level professional as an employee in their first full-time position held three or fewer years. In general, entry-level student affairs professionals were satisfied with their positions (Austin & Gamson, 1983; Bender, 1980; Barnett, 1997; Evans, 1988; Solomon & Tierney, 1977; Ward, 1995). The profile says that the entry-level professional is ambitious, limited to geographic area (Jones, 1980), enjoys and feels appreciated by his or her colleagues, believes that work is important, and enjoys working students (Bender, 1980). Rosen, Taube, and Wadsworth (1980), and Trimble, Allen, and Vidoni (1991) stated that new professionals have encountered a number of challenges upon entering the student affairs field. Trimble et al. (1991) then identified personality preconditions that assist entry-level professionals with success in their positions. These preconditions are: (a) ability to function without unanimous support, (b) being political savvy, (c) organization, (d) tolerance for ambiguity, (e) social skills, (f) tolerance for delay of positive outcomes, and (g) openness for negative feedback.

The premiere study that explored job satisfaction and entry-level student affairs professionals directly was Bender's (1980) work about job satisfaction. She found entry-level professionals appeared to be relatively dissatisfied with their positions. Of those new professionals in her sample, 41% indicated that they were undecided about their
future in the student affairs field and 31% reported that they did not plan to remain in the student affairs field. Entry-level respondents in the study reported that they saw little opportunity for advancement, which was a major factor that leads to high attrition in the field (Bender, 1980).

Since Bender, other studies have examined job satisfaction and the entry-level student affairs professional. Job satisfaction was correlated with other factors such as organizational commitment and socialization (Exum, 1998), career choice (Kisner, 1993), synergetic supervision (Tull, 2004), and role stress (Ward, 1995). Exum’s study explored the six dimensions of organizational socialization, which are collective, formal, sequential, fixed, serial, and investiture. The collective dimension takes a group of new hires who were encountering a boundary passage and having them go through a common set of experiences. The sequential dimension is level to which the organization has identified a given series of distinct steps that lead to the goal of the organization for that new professional. The fixed dimension is the level to which process and procedures involved in the socialization process were related with a timeline given by the organization and communicated to the new professional. Finally, the investiture dimension is the level to which the organization approved and documented for new professionals the viability and usefulness of the personal characteristics they bring to the organization. These dimensions were measured to determine the relationship they have with job satisfaction of new professionals in student affairs. Using a survey, Exum found that dimensions of organizational socialization were significantly related to job satisfaction. Five of the six dimensions studied were significantly related to job satisfaction: investiture, serial, sequential, fixed, and collective. Further, these five
dimensions accounted for 31.2% of the variance in job satisfaction of her sample. The organizational commitment can be improved by institutional activities that reflected the fixed dimension and their role orientation that can be determined by activities that reflected the fixed and serial dimensions.

Kisner (1993) examined the experiences of new professionals in student affairs. Through a survey, he asked questions about the job search process, reasons they chose their positions, experiences with institutional policies, and ethical and political situations they faced. Kisner surveyed graduates from the class of 1991 from the student affairs programs at the University of Vermont, Bowling Green State University, Indiana University, Teacher's College of Columbia University, and the University of Maryland College at Park. He distributed 120 surveys and received 50 (42% return rate) to conduct his analysis.

Kisner (1993) reported the following:

1. Twenty-six percent of his sample felt that their titles did not reflect their actual position responsibilities;
2. Forty-four percent said they encountered many surprising things about their jobs related to their expectations;
3. Thirty-eight percent said their budgets were inadequate for performing their job responsibilities such as programming, and operational costs;
4. Thirty percent said that on-campus interviews did not give them a good idea of what the institution was like; and
5. Twenty-six percent said that they did not use student development theory learned in graduate school.
The survey also had a section for respondents to write comments about their experiences. One of the primary themes from the data were related to job satisfaction, and the role of supervision in it. The participants stressed how important their supervisors and their role were to job satisfaction and the intent to leave the field for entry-level professionals.

While Kisner’s work does not directly relate to Herzberg’s concept of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction, it does show that a combination of job context and job environment factors led to the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of entry-level professionals in his study and the importance of supervision for the entry-level professional which was focus of Tull’s work.

Tull (2004) measured job satisfaction and synergetic supervision, which is the discussion of: (a) exemplary performance, (b) long-term career goals, (c) inadequate performance, (d) the frequency of informal performance appraisals and (e) personal attitudes (Winston & Creamer, 1997). This study was conducted by administering a web-based survey to 1,233 members of the American College Personnel Association (ACPA). Of the 1,233 who met Tull’s criteria, 933 or 76% responded. Tull used the Synergetic Supervision Scale developed by Saunders, Cooper, Winston and Chernow (2003), which measured the dimensions of synergetic supervision outlined by Winston and Creamer (1997). Those dimensions are as follows: discussion of exemplary performance, discussions of long-term career goals, discussion of inadequate performance, discussion of the frequency of informal performance and appraisals, and discussions of personal attitudes. Job satisfaction was measured by use of questions taken from the Michigan Organization Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ).
Tull (2004) found a positive significant relationship between the perceived level of synergetic supervision and job satisfaction. He posited that job satisfaction was related to many factors in the organization such as supervisor feedback, social support, and organizational commitment. Tull’s findings suggested that new professionals who viewed their supervisors as low or not synergetic would have higher intentions of turnover. What the study did not measure was whether the intent to leave would involve a job change or leaving the field. Tull’s work examined synergetic supervision and mentions organizational commitment and role stress, whereas Ward’s (1995) work specifically addressed how job satisfaction correlated to role stress and attrition of new professionals.

Ward (1995) studied the relationships among role stress, and (a) the new professional’s graduate program, (b) functional area of employment, (c) satisfaction with job preparation, (d) autonomy, (e) organization formation, (f) job satisfaction, and (g) propensity to leave their position.

The sample used for the study included new professionals who were employed at four-year colleges and universities, and who were employed in student affairs for two years and had a master’s or professional degree. A stratified random sample was created representing all geographic regions and student enrollments to locate institutions to contact for his sample. The chief student affairs officer at the chosen institution was used to identify people who met the study’s criteria. One hundred ninety surveys were distributed, which 158 were returned for an 83% return rate.

Ward (1995) did not find that neither graduate school training, nor the current functional area was related with role stress nor were there any interactions between the variables. He found that, although there was a high level of job satisfaction among new
professionals, many experienced role stress and as a result of that stress, many new professionals left the field. Ward also found that those entry-level professionals who were satisfied with the level of their decision-making ability were less likely to experience role stress and leave the field. The study was limited in scope, in that it did not examine those professionals who have recently left the student affairs field, or the organizational structures that entry-level professionals were employed or what messages they received in their preparation programs about the realities of the entry-level professional. Now that chief student affairs officers and entry-level professionals have been discussed, the following section outlines the research specifically related to mid-level managers in student affairs and job satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction among Mid-Level Managers in Student Affairs

To date there have been seven studies that specifically identified mid-level managers in student affairs as research populations. Two of those studies examined chief housing officers and their satisfaction in their roles (Bailey, 1997; Familiant, 2002; Jones, 2002). Ellis (2001) studied the experiences of mid-level managers at Christian institutions. Connell (1993) examined the job satisfaction of directors of student activities programs at four-year colleges and universities. Finally, DeMichele (1998), and Zhang, DeMichele, and Connaughton (2004) examined the job satisfaction of campus recreation directors.

Connell (1993) conducted a study, where he surveyed 455 student activities directors who were members of the National Association for Campus Activities (NACA). His study related to job satisfaction by articulating which intrinsic factors lead to job satisfaction for his participants. He found that: (a) men may be more inclined than
women to commit to student affairs as a field; (b) student activities mid-level managers perceived advancement opportunities in higher education as limited and narrow; (c) student affairs was a transitory field; and (d) higher education institutions provided minimal encouragement for student activities mid-level managers’ professional growth.

Following Connell’s study was Bailey (1997) work where she examined the job satisfaction of chief housing officers using Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory. She surveyed 185 chief housing officers using an instrument similar to Blank (1993) which: (a) identified factors that contributed to job satisfaction, (b) identified factors that contributed to job dissatisfaction officers, and (c) assessed the applicability of Herzberg’s theory to chief housing officers. She found that chief housing officers were satisfied with their positions, although the sample was not able to distinguish between Herzberg’s satisfiers and dissatisfiers as his theory predicted. Factors leading to job satisfaction for Bailey’s sample were the work itself, relationships with colleagues, students, and subordinates, achievement, and responsibility. She concluded that Herzberg’s theory could not be supported with chief housing officers and occupational generality, and criticism at aimed Herzberg was valid because of the nature of the chief housing officer position.

After Bailey’s dissertation study, DeMichele produced the next work pertaining to mid-level managers in student affairs in 1998. He conducted a study to determine if organizational and job satisfaction factors enhanced or detracted from job satisfaction and organizational climate for mid-level campus recreation program coordinators. A survey was distributed to 545 mid-level campus recreation coordinators listed in the 1997 directory of the National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA). Responses were obtained from 285 surveys for a 52.3% return rate. He used regression
analyses to determine, which, if any, of seven identified organizational climate factors (campus size, political structure, administrative structure, institutional governance, being a public or private institution, and budget source for funding the campus recreation program) or five identified environmental job factors (financial rewards, working conditions, company policies, opportunities for advancement, job security, and content of the job) affected a national population of mid-level campus recreation program coordinators. Although there was no theoretical framework, DeMichele’s work did use some of Herzberg’s extrinsic factors in his environmental job factors.

DeMichele (1998) found 65% of the mid-level campus recreation program coordinators were: (a) employed on a twelve month appointment at a public four year institution; (b) responsible for coordinating multiple components in the campus recreation organization; and (c) employed in an institution serving a student body of 10,000 or more students. The program coordinators reported that they were moderately satisfied with their institutions and their jobs. DeMichele’s results suggested that job satisfaction was influenced by the organizational climate factors such as evaluation, regard for personal concerns, professional development opportunities, and political climate. Additionally, job satisfaction was affected by the environmental factors such as relationship with colleagues, and autonomy, power and control. The analysis further suggested that directors could benefit by examining the relationships between specific environmental factors and specific organizational climate factors. Demographic factors such as region of the country, years of experience, institutional governance, and institutional size were not significantly related to job satisfaction for this population.
Next, Ellis (2001) examined the job satisfaction of mid-level managers employed at religiously affiliated institutions. He surveyed 175 mid-level managers from institutions, which were members of the Council of Christian Colleges. He found that four of his ten variables influenced overall job satisfaction. Those variables were ideological fit, relationships with students, autonomy, and age of the mid-level manager. Ellis asserted that ideological fit or the level of congruence between a professional’s organizational ideology and the organization’s ideology explained the highest percentage (32.5%) of the variance in job satisfaction among his participants.

After Ellis, Familiant (2002) conducted a study where he surveyed 312 members of the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I) to determine which facets lead to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. He found: (a) that lack of promotion opportunities was a facet of job dissatisfaction for his sample; (b) a strong relationship existed between age of the Chief Housing Officer (CHO) and job satisfaction; the older the CHOs, the more satisfied he or she was with their position, and (c) there was no difference between institution type and job satisfaction. There was no overall significant difference between gender and job satisfaction of his sample. The size of the housing operation, total enrollment did have an effect on the job satisfaction of the CHO. For example, CHOs who had more than 20,000 students and over 3,000 students in their housing program rated a higher level of satisfaction than those who had fewer than 3,000 students in their housing program reported high levels of job satisfaction with the exception of promotion and salary.

Following Familiant’s study, Jones (2002) also investigated the job satisfaction of CHOs using a national sample. Jones measured his sample by using the College Housing...
Officer Satisfaction Survey (CHOSS) based on Locke’s Theory V. Theory V proposes that job satisfaction is the result of employees receiving what they want and value from their jobs. Job dissatisfaction is the outcome of the employees receiving what they did not want or value from their jobs (Locke, 1976). Using a Web-based design, one thousand five hundred and sixty housing officers responded to his survey where he received a 39% response rate. The survey was a five-point Likert-scale instrument where one = strongly disagree and five = strongly agree. The instrument measured work achievement, work role clarity, supervision, institution, pay, promotions, facilities, co-workers, intended tenure, general affect, and non-involvement. His demographic variables were gender, age, tenure in current position, salary, student status, institution’s enrollment, chief housing officer status, race and ethnic identity, educational level living situation (on campus or off campus) institution funding type (public or private) and location of the institution.

He found that college housing officers were satisfied with their positions. Of his demographic and institutional variables, his sample reported being slightly satisfied. Among the measures, co-workers ranked highest and institution ranked lowest in determining what led to job satisfaction. His sample reported that the categories who reported satisfaction were: (a) White, (b) older, (c) living off campus, (d) chief housing officers, (e) highly educated (Master’s or terminal degree), (f) working at larger public institutions, and (g) living in the Southwest. The least satisfied were in the following categories: (a) women, (b) African American, (c) younger, (d) living on campus, (e) less educated, (f) less experiences, (g) working at small private institutions, (h) living in the Northeast, and (i) responsible for residence education.
Finally, Zhang, DeMichele, and Connaughton (2004) examined the job satisfaction of mid-level campus recreation administrators. This research team surveyed 285 professionals and examined job satisfaction with three employment background variables. Those variables were: (a) institutional size, (b) institutional classification, and (c) years of service. They found: (a) mid-level campus recreation managers were highly satisfied with their current job settings; (b) campus recreation administrators needed to focus on higher needs (Maslow, 1970) such as esteem and self direction; and (c) there was a challenge for senior-level professionals to identify ways to maintain the high level of satisfaction. In relation to the employment background variables, Zhang, DeMichele, and Connaughton also found that respondents who had been employed more than five years in their roles were satisfied with intrinsic factors such as recognition, and involvement in decision making, but were not satisfied with extrinsic factors such as salary and working conditions. These findings were consistent with Herzberg’s (1959) findings from his Two Factor Theory. These factors did relate to attrition. When mid-level managers were not satisfied in their roles, one of the options exercised by this group was to leave their position or institution to find one that was a better fit for their needs, which may be working conditions, salary, or the work itself.

Mid-Level Managers’ Intent to Leave

Intent to leave in student affairs has been studied on a number of levels. According to Bender (1980) and Lorden (1998), issues such as burnout, job position, opportunities for goal attainment, professional development opportunities, and career advancement are reasons for mid-level managers to leave their positions. Burns (1982) investigated why professionals left the field. She surveyed 372 professionals who
received their degrees in 1970s. She found that 62% remained in the field and 39% left the field. Reasons for leaving the students affairs field were relocation, going back to school, and not enough professional challenge in their positions. Johnsrud and Sangria (1988), and Blum (1989), both asserted that intent to leave was over 70% for mid-level managers. Ward (1995) in his study of role stress and intent to leave found that those new professionals experienced high levels of job satisfaction even though they experienced role ambiguity and conflict. Ward (1995) also found that entry-level professionals reported a high tendency to leave the field.

Lorden (1998) asserted that there was a relationship between job satisfaction and a professional’s decision to leave the field. Job satisfaction was connected to intent to leave in the student affairs organization (Bender, 1980; Harned & Murphy, 1998; Lorden, 1998). However, studies about entry-level professionals found that supervision was a factor that leads to these professionals leaving their positions (Creamer & Winston, 2002). Wood, Winston and Polkosnik (1985) found that entry-level professionals were more rigid than mid-level managers and CSAOs. Reasons for this rigidity were administrative realities of the field (e.g. uncertainty with administration), political climate, and relationships with supervisors. These reasons resulted in entry-level professionals to leaving the field sooner than they planned. As entry-level professionals in the student affairs field advance, they have less contact with students; this role conflict also fueled entry-level professionals to leave the field (Carpenter, DiBrito, & Kelly, 1987; Tull, 2004). Hamel and Mathiru (1990) also found that job conflict was less consistent, across employee level, as a predictor in attrition for their study sample. This finding was true for female student affairs administrators. Blackhurst, Brandt, and
Kalinowski (1998) asserted that women in associate or assistant director positions had low levels of organizational commitment and low levels of life satisfaction. This leads to the premise that organizational commitment indicated the participants' dissatisfaction with their position, which can be a reason for attrition of women in the field. Finally, in Johnsrud and Rosser's (2003) study of mid-level managers in higher education, they found that the decision to stay or leave the institution was based on the mid-level manager's perceptions of the institution and themselves. Conducting a national study in 2002, they received 1,166 surveys for a 54% response rate; they examined the extent that work life characteristics and demographics affected morale and intent to leave. They found that tenure in the participant's current position and salary were the demographic variables that were significant in morale and intent to leave for mid-level managers. Johnsrud and Rosser (2003) discovered that the longer a mid-level manager was employed at an institution, the lower their morale; however, years of service and commitment to the student affairs field, were reasons why these mid-level managers chose not leave. In addition, administrators with higher salaries, also reported low morale as well; yet they did not leave the field. Relationships within the work unit and amongst colleagues emerged as the most important work life issue. Specifically, the positive relationships with colleagues improved job satisfaction and the likelihood to stay in the field (Johnsrud & Rosser, 2003).

Toward A Study of Job Satisfaction among Mid-Level Managers in Student Affairs

Factors from Herzberg's Framework that Relate to Job Satisfaction

The review of the related literature is divided into two sections. The first section has current studies on intrinsic factors of achievement, recognition, the work itself,
advancement, responsibility and growth. The second section addresses extrinsic factors of supervision, relationships with colleagues, company policies, working conditions, salary, job status, job security, and the balance of work life and personal life. Company policies was changed to institutional policies and balance of work life and personal life was changed to work balance. These changes were made for the purposes of this study to remain consistent with the higher education job context.

**Intrinsic Factors**

Intrinsic factors are job content factors that related to job satisfaction and not job dissatisfaction. Herzberg (1959) labeled achievement, recognition, work itself, advancement, and responsibility as intrinsic factors because they emanated from the position a person holds. A review of the literature on each of these factors and the literature in student affairs follows.

**Achievement.** Achievement is a relative term. People who are not in student affairs equate achievement with criteria such as money and status, whereas a person’s perception of his or her achievement is based on more on a subjective level (Jaksola, Beyer, & Trice, 1985). For administrators, the level and amount of administrative responsibilities can also serve as a marker of achievement. Distribution of tasks such as committee work and other responsibilities send a message of the worth and value of a professional in one’s environment (Dipboye, 1987). Peitchinis (1989) reported that more men than women are assigned tasks that were important to the organization. Moreover, Denton and Zeytingolu (1993) asserted that women were given less important tasks because they tended to see themselves as second-class citizens in the academy.
Recognition. Timpe (1986) said that most employees reported that praise and recognition were things that were effective in motivating and increasing institutional commitment. Flynn (1994) conducted a study in which she surveyed 150 executives; she found that 34% of the respondents reported that lack of praise and recognition were the major reasons why professionals choose to leave the organization. Andrea (1992) asserted that individuals who were not recognized lose job satisfaction due feelings of resentment and rejection by the organization. Groseth (1978) said that recognition was one of the top four motivators among student affairs professionals. Praise, credit, and criticism were the others.

The work itself. The research has found that this variable is highly correlated with job satisfaction (Cranny, Smith, and Stone, 1992). Job satisfaction was measured in terms of job characteristics such as autonomy, tasks significance, and skill variety. Studies of autonomy suggested that when employees were given total responsibility for outcomes of their jobs, including scheduling, communication about workplace concerns, and personal issues, job satisfaction increased (Beltzhoover, 1994; Warner, 1995).

In addition to autonomy, task variety also positively correlated with job satisfaction (Warner, 1995). Timpe (1986) said that the ideal work environment was one that encouraged employees, supported innovation in the workplace, examined procedures and practices, and experimented with new behaviors. In this environment, employees were able to develop creative ways to solve problems, take on challenging standards of excellence, and try new approaches to work.

A study by Glisson and Durick (1988) established that skill variety was the best predictor of job satisfaction in human service organization employees. In another study,
nurses who were permitted to expand their opportunities felt more personal autonomy in their work environments (Shoham-Yakubovich, Carmel, Zwanga, & Zaltman, 1989).

In student affairs, researchers have found the work itself to be a positive facet of job satisfaction. Work was satisfying when it is interesting to, and meaningful for the individual (Locke, 1976). Bowling (1973) found that student affairs mid-level managers were satisfied with the level of responsibility and creativity needed in their positions.

Advancement. People want more out of a position than money. They want an opportunity to grow and gain new experiences. Timpe (1986) and Harned and Murphy (1998) asserted that employees should be able to see what they must do to advance in the organization. A number of studies in the workplace report that women and professionals of color are underrepresented in leadership in the organization (Allison, Long, & Mc Ginnis, 1993; Igbaria & Wormley, 1995). Reasons for this assertion are that women were stereotyped as second-class citizens and professionals of color did not have the skills to be in decision-making roles and were viewed as not promotable to those positions (Sandler & Hall, 1986; Spencer & Podmore, 1987).

Boensich (1983) posited that half of student affairs professionals are not satisfied with their opportunities for advancement and career development. Sangaria and Johnsrud (1988) reported that professionals did want to advance, but do not advance because of the lack of availability of positions. Cranny, Smith and Stone (1992) proposed the following four recommendations about promotions in the workplace.

First, employees who saw few opportunities for advancement have negative attitudes toward work and the organization. Second, opportunities at hierarchical levels accounted for the way people saw themselves in the organization. Third, a person’s
satisfaction was influenced by more than the next promotion opportunity. Finally, fourth, opportunities for promotion throughout an employee's tenure in an organization contribute to the employee's satisfaction with promotion.

Following this study, Feyerham and Vick (2005) conducted a study on the type of environment female Generation Xers (born between 1965 and 1980) needed to advance in their careers. Using a qualitative approach, they interviewed 16 women who had high potential in technology and industry, to explore the relationships with work. The research team defined environment as the interaction with superiors, colleagues, and the corporate culture defined this.

Feyerham and Vick (2005) found that for this sample, personal fulfillment was connected to professional success. Participants also wanted support from their organization in terms of mentors for guidance, development, opportunities to excel, recognition, relationships, and room to achieve work and personal life balance. The study was limited to its small sample size and participants' being employed in one work area; therefore, caution should be exercised if these findings are applied to professionals in other areas. These studies should serve as a call for organizations to review their promotion practices to ensure that they are fair. Chappell (1994) asserted that when hard work is not noticed in the organization, dissatisfaction was the result.

Responsibility. Research on responsibility and administrators in higher education goes back to Tucker and Bryan's (1988) study of college deans. They found that planning, ensuring quality (academic) and creating a community of scholars, directing the operations of the unit, compiling departmental budgets, resolving personnel conflicts, and supervising and developing support staff were the major responsibilities for the dean.
These responsibilities also hold true for the mid-level manager in student affairs. Garland and Grace (1993) asserted that the increasing changes in contexts and clienteles would call for a differing level of responsibility for the student affairs administrator. Issues such as changes in society or an increase in underrepresented students being admitted to institutions, new accountability due to decreasing resources, and changes in federal and state statutes will add to this dynamic. Mid-level managers were being asked to double enrollments while retaining students to graduation, employing quality management, changing programs and services to meet changing student needs, seeking new funding sources while searching to contain cost, creating partnerships, and focusing efforts to improve student involvement on campus (Garland & Grace, 1993). However, Hirt, et al. (2003) agreed with Tucker and Bryan, saying that responsibility and time commitments varied based on institutional type for the student affairs administrator.

These responsibilities added to the complaints of mid-level managers regarding role ambiguity. Ehrie and Bennett (1994), in work that focused on deans, and Hardy and Conway (1978) who focused on health care professionals, concluded that role ambiguity came from the discomfort administrators felt when they were expected to represent varying interests (student, faculty, staff, and community) that competed with one another. This ambiguity or conflict caused stress (Green & McDade, 1994). As such, mid-level managers need support while they serve in their roles.

Extrinsic Factors

Extrinsic factors are related to the job context rather than its content and are also known as “dissatisfiers” or hygiene factors. Herzberg (1966) identified factors such as supervision, relationships with colleagues, administrative policies, working conditions,
salary, job status, job security, and the balance between work life and personal life as extrinsic. The existence of these factors in the workplace did not satisfy or motivate employees, but the absence of these factors did not result in job satisfaction.

**Supervision.** The perception of supervision is an important characteristic in job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Winston and Creamer (1997) defined supervision as the overseeing of people, activities, and facilities. When supervision was perceived as poor, job dissatisfaction was the likely result. When supervision was viewed as good, the employee is less likely to be dissatisfied. Herzberg (1987) labeled this concept a hygiene factor. Lack of satisfaction was dependent upon whether the person supervised agreed with the style of supervision (Locke, 1976; Vroom, 1964).

Thomas and D’Annunzio (2005) analyzed the challenges to matrix organizations on mid-level and top-level managers. They used surveys, interviews, and workshops of seven multinational organizations in six industries to identify these challenges. They found that the challenges in these organizations were misaligned goals, unclear roles, and responsibility, ambiguous authority, lack of a matrix guardian, and silo focused employees. As they analyzed the role of supervision by mid-level managers and top-level managers in matrix organizations, Thomas and D’Annunzio suggested that: (a) mid-level managers and top-level managers faced different challenges in matrix organizations; (b) misaligned goals were a challenge of the organization, with a higher frequency; (c) the matrix guardian was the key to success for optimal organizational performance. In contrast, mid-level managers reported ambiguous roles and responsibilities as a challenge, and managers and both levels agree that ambiguous and silo focused employees were major challenges to the organization. While matrix organization and
student affairs division differ, there is a similarity in job context for managers, which has a strong impact for student affairs organizations.

Chief student affairs officers appeared to be satisfied with their level of supervision for college and university executive officers (Biggs, Barnhart, & Bakkenist, 1975). The student affairs research suggested that professionals were moderately to very dissatisfied with the level of supervision they receive (Bender, 1980; Bowling, 1973; Clements, 1982; Hutmaker, 2000).

**Relationships with colleagues.** Interaction with superiors and colleagues is an important aspect of daily work life. Roper (2002) asserted, “The quality of our relationships with colleagues has a powerful impact on our ability to get things done in our institutions” (p. 11). Roper (2002) also reported that student affairs professionals need to give complete care or work to maintain relationship with colleagues. Repetti and Cosmas (1991) found that 43 percent of their survey respondents reported that interpersonal relationships were an important source of job satisfaction. They found that relationships with colleagues and supervisors and observations of the quality of those relationships influenced job satisfaction. Cosmas findings contradict Herzberg’s (1966) findings in that relationship with colleagues according to Herzberg, as a dissatisfer because these relationships impede work productivity. Cosmas (1991) said that these relationships were influential in satisfaction according to 43% of his sample.

Another element of interpersonal relationships with colleagues is politics. Politics are considered a fundamental activity in organizations because they are closely related to power, authority, and influence. Politics may also lead to the misuse of resources, conflict, and create an environment of tension and frustration (Kumar & Ghadially,
Kumar and Ghadially (1989) asserted that power and politics in organizations are related to uncertainty, suspiciousness, distrust, jealousy, and alienation. Senior-level managers need to realize that organizations can be hurt by excessive politics (Miner, 1986). Roper (2002) said that ways to improve relationships among colleagues consist of the following: (a) do not start conversations unless you can be committed to the other person, (b) listen generously, (c) be on each other’s side, (d) speak the truth, (e) take care of the other person, (f) stay focused on the conversation and stay in the conversation until it complete, (g) treat the conversation and each person as important (h) be clear about the value that you are producing, and (i) manage each other’s reputation.

*Institutional policies.* Employees are likely to respond positively when they feel that the employer is committed to their well-being and career advancement (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Organizations that embrace diversity, empowerment, cooperation, and ethics are likely to encourage honesty and high work performance by employees (Martin & Boye, 1998). According to Moran (1993), the most evident complaints that a majority of employees had about management included: (a) inability to follow through with proposed change, (b) lack of adequate resources to accomplish tasks, (c) unwillingness to accept suggestions, (d) lack of performance measures that have a important relationship to their job, (d) being secretive and dishonest with employees, and (e) inability to motivate employees.

Researchers have reported that administrative policy was related to job satisfaction (Ellis 2004; London, 2003). In studies where corporate culture was examined London found through interviews of mid-level managers that based on the intent of the policy, job satisfaction, or dissatisfaction achieved. According to London (2003),
administrative polices lead to dissatisfaction because they restricted employees. Ellis, in her study, found that administrative policies did not lead to short-term job satisfaction, but led to dissatisfaction over time. Resnick (1991) explored the connection between job satisfaction among higher education administrators and their position in the informal organization established by communication patterns within the organization. She found that administrators included in the president’s cabinet were highly satisfied with their responsibility level, economy, influence, and challenge and they were “mildly” satisfied with their salary. Those who were not in the president’s circle were significantly less satisfied with salary, responsibility and the challenge of their positions.

Osueke (1991) asserted that communication is an important management tool. He cautioned supervisors that if they did not listen to their staff then communication within the organization itself would deteriorate. Lack of communication can be improved through participatory management in the workplace. Denton and Zeytingolu (1993) reported that participation in decision-making is important; however, not simply as an index of actual participation, but as an effort to improve morale and work performance.

*Working conditions.* Studies of working conditions explored the extent to which the employee was influenced by the environment in which he or she was employed. A number of characteristics have been explored in these studies; the most often explored was job demand (Loscocco & Spitze, 1990).

Studies have shown that excessive workloads, pressure to produce, role ambiguity, and conflict took away from various factors of job satisfaction (Loscocco & Spitze, 1990). In a study of job-related threats to control older workers, they found that limited control over workload was associated with increased job stress, depression,
injury, on-the-job absenteeism, and disruptive performance (Remondet & Hanson, 1991; Whittaker, 1983).

Organizational research has demonstrated that objective characteristics of the physical work environment such as openness and accessibility, have an impact on satisfaction, motivation, behavior, and performance (Carlopio, 1991; Wineman, 1986). Oldham (1988) found that workers prefer architecturally private offices to open offices, and that lack of privacy in the work environment affects job satisfaction.

Groseth (1978) and Holloway (2004) asserted that chief student affairs officers identify working conditions as a facet that negatively impacted their job satisfaction. Locke (1976) found that conditions such as temperature, lighting, facility issues, noise, and cleanliness made a short list of concerns that affect job satisfaction. Understanding mid-level managers' perceptions in this area measured extrinsic factors related to job dissatisfaction (Nestor, 1988).

**Salary and benefits.** Satisfaction with compensation can be an important facet in job dissatisfaction, and can be related to many other facets such as supervision, and work itself (Henneman, 1985). Adams (2004) in a Web-based survey of 19,935 subscribers to Quality management magazine in the U.S., employed in manufacturing and engineering fields, asked survey participants about their salary and job satisfaction levels. Of his sample, he found that 68% of his sample indicated that they were increasing, 1.6% said they were decreasing, and 30.8% of his sample said there was no change in the compensation level. When he asked about job satisfaction, his sample reported that 35% were highly satisfied, 58% were moderately satisfied, and seven percent were not satisfied with their salary levels. In academe, salaries have become an important issue
because academic incomes have not kept pace with increases with the cost of living compared to other professional areas (Olsen, 1993). Researchers have found that pay rate satisfaction/dissatisfaction was connected to employee's behavior including absenteeism, turnover, and extra role behavior (Cotton & Turtle, 1986; Deckop, 1992).

Research from the social sciences suggested that being underpaid led to job dissatisfaction (Mirowsky, 1987). Dornstein (1989) also found people may not be satisfied with the salaries depending on their position in the salary distribution relative to others. Davis-Blake (1992) asserted that organizational salary distribution and employee's position in the organization predicts intent to leave.

Fringe benefits, as a part of the salary package, are also important to employees. Cohen (1993) posited that some employees were resistant to leaving their higher-pressure position because they did not want to give up their benefits. Employees who received participative benefits programs, in which they chose which benefits they want, were happier than those who receive direct static benefits. Heshizer (1994) contended that more research was needed on employee attitudes toward flexible fringe benefits programs and their impact on job satisfaction. In his exploratory study, he mailed questionnaires to two samples. Sample one was taken from a large financial institution of 500 salaried professionals from two organizations in the Midwest and received 217 for a 53% return rate. Sample two had 142 surveys from 400 salaried hospital employees excluding doctors and executives returned 142 surveys for a 36% response rate. Using a survey with a Likert-scale format that measured the attitudes of the participant (strongly agree to disagree) job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover were the dependent variables, and benefit variables were satisfaction, human resources staff assistance,
employee knowledge of benefits and need benefits/reimbursement information. Job attitude variables for this study were supervision satisfaction and pay equity satisfaction. Based on Heshizer's review of the literature, he expected that age, tenure, education, family responsibility, and salary level to be directly related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and inversely with turnover intent (p. 87). First, he found that flexible benefits plans predicted only organizational commitment for bank and hospital employees. Next, he discovered that the job attitude variables with management and pay contributed more to the prediction of outcome variables than benefits or demographic variables. Lastly, Heshizer found that the demographic variables added modestly in predicting turnover intent and job satisfaction, but not organizational commitment. He concluded that mixed results existed for the dimensionality of flexible benefit program satisfaction and the impact of these programs did not have a strong effect on the dependent variables for his study. He suggested that more theoretical works needs to be done to further our understanding of benefit programs and their impact on organizational behavior. Moreover, good fringe benefits packages with comparable salaries assisted in promoting job satisfaction (Earls, 1994). This facet was an element that lead to job dissatisfaction and caused good employees to leave organizations (Friedman & Lobel, 2003).

The research on satisfaction concerning compensation among student affairs professionals was mixed. Bowling (1973) reported that mid-level managers in student affairs were satisfied with their compensation. Shaw, Duffy, Jenkins, and Gupta (1999) reported that the higher the pay, the higher the level of job satisfaction. Bishop (1996) and Blank (1993) supported this claim. The amount of pay received, mode of payment,
and its equity are connected to job satisfaction (Locke, 1976). Finkelstein (1984) asserted that salary has a negative impact on job satisfaction for student affairs administrators. Studer (1980) reported that student affairs professionals were not satisfied with their fringe benefits. Ellis (2001) posited that the same is true for professionals at religiously affiliated institutions. Although there had been a shift to increase salary for administrators, this shift did not solve all problems in student affairs (Anderson, 1998; Baumgartner, 1991; Clements, 1982; Hutmaker, 2000; Norman, 1975; Ward, 1995). Loyd (2005) in her study focused on the impact of teamwork environments on job satisfaction asserted that those student affairs professionals who made more than $60,000 indicated more satisfaction than those professionals who earned $10,000 - $39,999 and $40,000 - $59,999. She also asserted that those professionals, who made more than $60,000, were more satisfied with relationships with colleagues than those participants making $10,000 - $39,999.

*Job status.* Prestige is the degree to which status is differently distributed in the organization (Price & Mueller, 1993). If professionals were recognized and status was given to them, then they will be satisfied in their position. For mid-level managers in student affairs, opportunities for status are sought through work and service to the institution and student affairs field. Higher education institutions have established a clear hierarchy with different levels of prestige and rank (Lange, 1985).

Cassidy and Warren (1996) conducted a study to determine how job status influenced job satisfaction. They found that consistency was strongly associated with job satisfaction and female employees in male-dominated positions had higher levels of job satisfaction than females in female dominated positions. Flowers and Howard-Hamilton
(2002) asserted that females and professionals of color are located in the lower ranks in administration, which does not lead to status in the student affairs organization.

Items in the environment served as embedded signs of the status of the employee. Examples such as private workspaces, personal computers and ergonomic furniture, artwork, and certificates and diplomas on the wall determine status (Bitner, 1992). Bitner's study on faculty office design proved that desk size and placement and cleanliness of the office strengthened students' perceptions about the person in the office. Gaithiker and Larwood (1990) reported that job satisfaction and status depended on the agreement between the employee's personality and prestige of the environment in which he or she worked.

Job security. Miller and Wheeler (1993) surveyed 595 executives in different fields about their job security and its influence on intentions to leave their positions. They found that: (a) women were twice as likely as men to admit they would leave their organizations in two years, (b) female employees were less content than their male counterparts with the opportunity for advancement and the meaning of their responsibilities, and (c) the longer women were in their positions the more they wanted to leave those positions. Miller and Wheeler theorized that concerns such as discrimination, issues with performance, and differential treatment in the appraisal process might be reasons for female administrators' dissatisfaction in their positions. Hardin (1995) described the results of a nationwide survey of 350,000 employees, which showed that 44 percent of people were concerned about being laid off work. Manski and Straub (2000) conducted a survey to measure worker perceptions in the mid-1990s. From 1994 to 1998, they interviewed 3,561 participants and the results show that workers do vary in
perceptions about job security. The results are as follows: (a) composite job security decreased with age, (b) job security decreased with educational level, hence the more education a person has, the more secure they are with their position, (c) gender caused little variance in job security, (d) race showed little variance as well, (however, African Americans across all levels, age, educational level, and gender did show lower rates of job security than other racial groups in the study), (e) self-employed workers and workers in family owned business felt less job security than those who worked for others, (f) job insecurity was perceived higher in 1995 than in 1994 and 1996, and (g) the differences in the groups were heterogeneous. Therefore, the groups explained only a small part of the variation in employee perceptions.

Probst (2003) developed and validated two scales that measured job security. These scales were the Job Security Index (JSI) and the Job Security Satisfaction (JSS). With a sample of 283 health and human services employees, she administered a survey that asked about antecedents, perceptions, moderators of job security, job attitudes and consequences. She found that both scales were strongly correlated. According to Probst’s (2002) conceptual model, if a worker is dissatisfied with their level of job security, he or she would experience stress as a result. For this study, stress level significantly predicted job security satisfaction, but stress level was not predicted by job security perceptions. She found that both the JSS and JSI scales measured unique components of the antecedents and consequences of job security and future researchers should conduct further factor analyses to the scales to confirm their validity.

In student affairs, the literature related to job security construct is sparse. As institutions work to address job security, unions and collective bargaining units have been
established. In New York, the State University of New York (SUNY) conducted a study and found that while working conditions improved, issues such as salary increases were difficult to manage (Stein, 1981). In a time of numerous layoffs and budget cuts in the general economy, higher education professionals are also concerned about job security. For mid-level managers in student affairs, pressures such as changing enrollments and programs, retaining students, diminishing resources, seeking revenues, and keeping students involved on campus lead to them to question their job security (Garland & Grace, 1994). While committed professionals will remain to serve students and the campus community, these pressures created concern about job security.

**Work balance.** Conflict between work and home life has become an issue in the United States (Boles, Howard, & Donoforio, 2001). Satisfaction with life is defined as the level to which individuals measure the quality of their lives positively, and it can be associated with happiness (Veenhoven, 1991). Job satisfaction and life satisfaction are correlated with one another because for many people work is an important part of their lives.

Lewis and Binders (1995) explored the relationship between a number of demographic, personal, and work-related variables and the life satisfaction of 152 single professional women employed in higher education. The results showed that job satisfaction was correlated with life satisfaction. The participants also articulated concerns with life circumstances, locus of control, and spare time for activities.

Boles, Howard, and Donoforio (2001) conducted a study to measure how work family conflict and family work conflict affected job satisfaction. The purpose of the study was to explain organizational behavior issues among employees. Using a sample of
144 probation and parole officers in the southeast, the research team surveyed the study's population using a 7-point Likert-scale instrument. The facets for this study were: family work conflict, satisfaction with the work itself, satisfaction with promotion, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with supervision, satisfaction with co-workers, and satisfaction with the job in general.

Boles, Howard and Donoforio found that work family conflict negatively correlated to a number of facets of the employee satisfaction. Those facets were satisfaction with the work itself, satisfaction with promotion, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with supervision, satisfaction with co-workers, and satisfaction with the job in general. Regression analyses on theses variables found that work family conflict was significant for satisfaction with the job in general, satisfaction with promotion, satisfaction with the work itself, and satisfaction with coworkers. Family work conflict was significant for satisfaction with the work itself and satisfaction with coworkers. The study’s conclusion was that this conflict needed to be considered in addressing organizational issues.

Robert Burke (2002) also conducted a study that explored work balance. He measured the relationship of male and female managers in Canada and their perceptions of organizational values support for work and personal life balance, work and non-work satisfaction and psychological well-being. These were categorized into four independent variable categories, which were job experiences, work satisfaction, organizational values, and psychological well-being. Using a five point Likert scale where surveys were mailed to 1000 male and 1000 female Master of Business Administration graduates, he then explored the organizational values, job experiences, extra work satisfactions, and
psychological well being of his participants. Each variable had factors in it. For job experiences, hours worked, extra hours worked, job involvement, joy in work, time to job, job stress, were in this factor. Career satisfaction, career prospects, job satisfaction, intent to quit, family satisfaction, friends’ satisfaction, and community satisfaction were in the work satisfaction factor. Finally, psychosomatic symptoms, emotional health, and physical health were in the psychological well-being factor. He received a 35% response rate of 530 surveys in total. Thirty-seven percent of his sample was mid-level managers. Overall, Burke found that women scored slightly lower than men on his satisfaction and organizational value scales did. For organizational values, men scored higher than women did. However, intent to leave their current organizations was similar for men and women. In the other independent variable categories: job experiences, work involvement, and psychological well-being, women scored higher than the male participants.

The regression analyses for this study showed that for women in the job experiences category, joy in work and job stress were significant. For work satisfaction, career satisfaction, job satisfaction, intent to quit, and family satisfaction were significant. For psychological well being, psychosomatic symptoms were significant. For men, all the factors in the job experiences variable were significant. In the work satisfaction factor, all variables were significant except family satisfaction. For psychological well-being factor all variable were significant here as well. Further examination of his variables for work and well-being explained for women psychosomatic symptoms and intent to quit were significant which explained 8 and 11 percent of variance respectively. For men significance was shown for job satisfaction, psychosomatic symptoms, and intent to quit. These variables explained 10, 12, and 16 percent of the variance respectively. For job
experiences in women, job stress was significant which explained 10% of the variance. For men, job stress, joy in work, hours worked, feeling driven by work were significant which explain 16, 19, 23 and 25 percent of the variance for this outcome. Burke’s study supported two conclusions: (a) women and men indicated the benefits in working in organizations having values, supportive of work-personal life balance; and (b) men appeared to benefit more from organizational values supportive of work-personal life balance than women did.

Demographic Variables and Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction

Demographic variables such as age, gender, race and educational level, have been investigated in the research relating to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. The following section reviews these concepts as relates to job satisfaction. Finally, the section concludes with the research relating to Carnegie classification and student affairs functional area in student as this study uses these variables as demographic factors in determining the job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction and intent to leave for mid-level managers in student affairs administration.

Age. Brush, Moch, and Pooyan (1987) posited that job satisfaction increased with age. This was supported with studies from Siu, Lu, Cooper (1999) in their analysis of workers in Hong Kong and Taiwan. Brush et. al. (1987) found a weak correlation in their meta-analysis of 21 studies measuring age and job satisfaction. Although a curvilinear relationship exists, job satisfaction decreased early in age and equalized during middle age and increased after age 45 (Zietz, 1990). Wright and Hamilton (1978) reported that worker expectations were values that changed over time. Older employees tended to have a higher level of job satisfaction than younger employees did because they were willing
to be more compliant toward authority figures and assume less from their jobs (Wright & Hamilton, 1978). In addition, older employers had superior or senior-level positions and more skills than younger employees did.

Lee and Wilber (1985) examined the relationship between age and job satisfaction; in particular, they looked at the extent to which job satisfaction was influenced by variables such as length of time on the job, educational level, salary, and job characteristics. Using the Triple Audit Opinion survey (an adaptation of the Minnesota Satisfaction Survey), they found that job satisfaction increased with age. Salary, tenure on the job, and educational level did not change the relationship of job satisfaction and age significantly. The combination of job characteristics, job tenure, education, and salary did have a significant impact on job satisfaction. However, Warr (2001) suggested from a study that older employees were not dissatisfied, but valued different things in their work settings.

In the student affairs literature, Anderson (1998) studied age and marital status in relation to job satisfaction. Using CSAOs, she found that the older the respondent was, the more satisfied they were with their positions. In addition, male CSAOs were more satisfied than female CSAOs and married CSAOs were more satisfied than unmarried CSAOs. Tarver, Canada and Lim (1999) examined the relationship between locus of control among student affairs and academic affairs administrators. Through a survey, they found that there was a positive relationship between job satisfaction and locus of control for all institutional type except community colleges. A negative relationship existed there. Moreover, older student affairs administrators had higher levels of locus of
control and job satisfaction than younger student affairs and academic affairs administrators.

Race/ethnic background. Studies show us that Caucasian workers were more satisfied with their positions than African American workers (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Womberly, 1990; Tuch & Marin, 1991) based on extrinsic factors such as salary, relationships with colleagues and work environment. However, Brush, Moch, and Pooyan (1987) used a meta-analysis to demonstrate that race was not significant in 15 studies. A number of African American employees were limited to lower-level positions that have minimal compensation and little opportunity for advancement (Tuch & Martin, 1991). Weaver (1998), in a meta-analysis of surveys, conducted from 1972-1996 provided support that African Americans were less than satisfied with their jobs than European Americans. This difference existed for gender and age across educational levels and occupations.

Educational level. Studies on educational level and job satisfaction were also sparse. According to available research, female administrators with advanced degrees reported higher levels of job satisfaction than those with a bachelor’s degree (Reeves, 1975). Schonwetter, Bond, and Perry (1993) asserted that female administrators with their Ph.D. report the highest level of job satisfaction with their role and occupation. Although this study examined gender and occupational level, it concluded that increased education and experience yielded higher job satisfaction in women (Lee & Wilber, 1985).

Gender. Results on job satisfaction between men and women were relatively inconsistent. Meta-analysis found correlations close to zero across multiple studies and thousands of participants (Brush, Moch, & Pooyan, 1987; Witt & Nye, 1992). Therefore,
men and women were similar in their levels of job satisfaction. One study showed no difference in job satisfaction. It did, however, show that women are less likely than men to have professional jobs were and are more likely to have low wage clerical positions (Greenhaus, Parasuraman & Womberly, 1990). Men and women do have different values and expectations of their work. For example, men do not expect much interaction from colleagues while women do (Brush, Moch, & Pooyan, 1987; Witt & Nye, 1992). However, this has changed since Brush, Moch, and Pooyan's work. Burke (2002a; 2002b) found that men were more satisfied with their work roles than women were.

Finally, Opkara, Squillace, and Erondu (2005) in their study of university faculty found the opposite. The discovered that female faculty were more satisfied with their work and colleagues than men were.

In student affairs, although indirectly related to job satisfaction, Blackhurst, Brandt, and Kalinowski (1998) examined the relationship between career development, organizational commitment, and life satisfaction of women student affairs professionals. Through a survey instrument, they surveyed 200 women selected from the NASPA Member Handbook. Blackhurst et al. (1998) found that there was a significant relationship between career development factors with organizational commitment and life satisfaction. Moreover, they found that younger, entry-level professionals were less satisfied with their positions and the student affairs field, which is consistent with data found in Bender's (1980) study.

Following, Blackhurst, Brandt, and Kalinowski's work, Okpara, Squillance, and Erondu (2005) conducted a study where they measured the job satisfaction of university teachers. The study's sample was taken from the Brain Track University Index Directory,
where they sent 1,100 questionnaires to participants from 80 institutions. They received 560 useable surveys for a 51% return rate. Two hundred fifty eight (46%) were from assistant professors. One hundred eight five (33%) were from associate professors, and 117 (21%) were from full professors. The instrument used for this study was modified from the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) created by Smith et al. (1965, 1985). The questions used eight scales to measure satisfaction in relation to different pieces of the professors’ job satisfaction, which entailed satisfaction with pay, promotion, supervision, colleagues, and overall job satisfaction. Items on the instrument were measured on a range with one being extremely dissatisfied to seven being extremely satisfied. Demographic questions covered age, gender, educational level, experience. Using t-tests, for the mean comparisons, Okpara, Squillance, and Erondu (2005) found that women were less satisfied with pay than men were. Statistics showed that female instructors were also less satisfied with promotion and supervision than men were. Women were more satisfied with their colleagues than men were. This was true across instructor levels as well. Regression analyses for this study proved that age, gender, income, and educational level were predictors of the sample’s job satisfaction. They explained 56% of the total variance in job satisfaction. Overall, age, gender, and rank were significant in job satisfaction for this sample.

Carnegie classification. The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education is the leading typology of American colleges and universities. It is the framework in which institutional diversity in U.S. higher education is commonly described. Most of the Carnegie Foundation's higher education projects rely on the Classification to ensure a representative selection of participating individuals and

The highest degree awarded from the institution created the classification of institutions. In 1994, this classification was based on federal funding. In 2000, there were two Carnegie classifications, Doctoral Research-Extensive, that awarded more than 50 doctorates in at least 15 disciplines; and Doctoral Research-Intensive, that awarded at least 20 doctorates in three of more disciplines. In 2005, the classification has broadened based on research activity. The classifications are Research universities (very high research activity), Research universities (high research activity), and Doctoral/Research Universities. The classifications for Master’s degree granting institutions are now based on the amount of degree production. In 2000, there were two categories, Master I— institutions that awarded 40 or more degree in at least three or disciplines; and Master’s II— institutions that awarded 20 of more Master’s degrees. Today, there are three categories. Those categories are Master’s College and Universities (larger programs, medium programs and smaller programs). Baccalaureate degree granting institutions in 2000 were identified as Baccalaureate-Liberal Arts, General, and Associates. Baccalaureate Liberal Arts institutions awarded at least 50% of the degrees in liberal arts disciplines. Baccalaureate—General institutions awarded less than 50% of their degrees in liberal arts fields. Baccalaureate— institutions were colleges and universities that awarded the majority of their degrees below the Baccalaureate degree. (e.g. associates degrees and certificates) In 2005, the terms have changed for names that are more
favorable. Now, their categories are: Baccalaureate Arts and Sciences, Baccalaureate-Diverse Fields and Baccalaureate-Associates, which did not change.

Volkwein and Parmley’s (2000) study of job satisfaction of administrators at public and private colleges and universities by comparing the national data on university characteristics and state characteristics used Carnegie classification as a variable, which was the first of this type. This study was also influenced by Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene theory. They collected 1200 survey responses from administrators from 120 colleges and universities, which 1191 were usable for a 99 % return rate. They also added data from the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS). Wolkwein and Parmley developed five satisfaction measures for their study which were: overall satisfaction, intrinsic factors, extrinsic factors, work conditions, and relationships with others. The independent variables used for this study were categorized into campus characteristics, administrator characteristics, and perceived work climate. Using a five-point Likert-scale instrument, they found that administrators at private institutions reported a slightly higher rate of overall job satisfaction than those at public institutions Intrinsic and extrinsic variables also had the same outcome for the sample. Regression analyses were conducted on these measures of job satisfaction and they found that 27% of the variance was explained by the independent variable classes for public institutions. For private institutions, 39% of the overall job satisfaction variance was explained. Intrinsic and extrinsic variables explained 31% and 17 % for public institutions and 45% and 23% for private institutions respectively. Work conditions explained the 42% of the variance for public institutions and for 54% private institutions. Relationships with others explained 22 % of the variance for public school and 26% for private colleges and universities.
Both groups reported being more satisfied with rewards received from the intrinsic factors and less satisfied with extrinsic rewards and work conditions. As Carnegie classification was used in this study and others (Volkwein, Malik & Napierski-Prancl, 1998; Volkwein & Zhou, 2003) as a demographic variable, it was also used in this study. For the purposes of this study, the 2000 Carnegie classifications are used to determine how this institutional type would impact the job satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the mid-level manager.

*Functional area.* Studies of job satisfaction among the various functional areas of student affairs indicated that professionals in those related areas were satisfied with their roles. The primary study conducted by Whittaker (1983) reported there was little work about job satisfaction in student affairs and chose to investigate specific functional areas in the field. She used Herzberg’s (1959) Two-factor theory as a framework to survey 208 administrators in the Midwest, who were employed in the counseling, residence life, and student activities functional areas. She found that 60% of her sample was satisfied with nine out of ten job factors in instrument. She discovered that lack of advancement was the greatest predictor of job dissatisfaction among her respondents. Whittaker (1983) also discovered that age, tenure at an institution, tenure in the respondent’s current position is related to job satisfaction. Other studies include the following: admissions and registrars (Simpson, 1996), academic advisors (Hull, 1997; Reed, 1999), counselors (Acree, 1998; Baird, 1995; Call, 1989), financial aid officers (Marcus, 1988), multicultural affairs officers (Novak, 1999), recreation and athletics (Lawrence, 2003; Zhang, DeMichele, & Connaughton, 2004), student activities and leadership development programs (Connell, 1993; Coll, 1989; Kirkland, 1989), student union (Kirkland, 1989), study abroad
programs (O'Connell, 1987), and TRIO and Educational Opportunity programs (Jones, 1995). These studies however, used different instruments, and even taken together present an incomplete portrait of factors that influence job satisfaction in student affairs. In addition, they do not necessarily address the mid-level manager.

As there are 28 different functional areas in student affairs administration (Council for the Advancement of Standards, 2003), it is important to determine which areas specifically influenced job satisfaction for mid-level managers in student affairs. As each of the functional areas, have different job contexts, job satisfaction may be viewed differently based on the functional area. The use of functional areas as a variable in this study provides more information to student affairs literature about how satisfaction or dissatisfaction is perceived by mid-level managers in each of functional areas, to which extent, and reasons these conditions exist. These studies say that overall, professionals say that the work itself is the factor that leads to the most satisfaction and factors such as salary, supervision, and institutional policies lead to job dissatisfaction for these professionals.

**Conceptual Framework**

According to Herzberg (1957; 1959; 1966), job satisfaction is achieved by combining intrinsic factors and demographic variables. Job dissatisfaction, the inverse is achieved by combining extrinsic factors along with demographic variables. These concepts are to be investigated on two separate continua (Herzberg, 1966). According to Rosser and Janivar (2003), little explained how demographics impacted to the job satisfaction of the mid-level manager in student affairs. The study will explore to what extent demographic variables impact job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction.
Figure 1 shows how extrinsic and intrinsic factors combined along with demographics lead to satisfaction or dissatisfaction while an abundance of extrinsic factors related the positions may cause a mid-level manager to feel dissatisfaction and leave their position.

Figure 1: Conceptual Model

Summary

Mid-level managers in student affairs are the unsung heroes of higher education. These professionals are the ones responsible for the administration and management of the functional units in a student affairs division. Although, mid-level managers report directly to the CSAO, their voice was often not heard when it came to the development of policy. This population represented 23 percent of the administrators employed in higher education and they served as the frontline personnel who interacted with students, faculty, and the external community.
While mid-level managers work hard in serving the institution by serving students, and implementing co-curricular programs, many frustrations exist for them. The nature of being a mid-level manager, lack of recognition for contributions made to the institution, and lack of opportunities for advancement are reasons that lead to the attrition of mid-level managers in student affairs. Because the research that specifically addressed the job satisfaction of mid-level managers in student affairs was limited, it became necessary to look to the research in generalities and by position level. Generally, the research said that faculty and administrators were less satisfied than the general population of workers. Student affairs professionals reported high levels of job satisfaction and women in student affairs roles have reported higher level of satisfaction depending on their administrative level.

Industrial psychology has kept an interest in job satisfaction and what makes employees happy. Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory (Job Satisfaction Job Dissatisfaction) was created in the 1950 and 1960s and postulated that job satisfaction was comprised of two different continua with one continuum having job satisfiers or motivators and the other continuum having job dissatisfiers or hygienes. The theory listed two sets of work related factors labeled as intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Intrinsic factors are related to the job content and viewed as positive and satisfying to the employee. Extrinsic factors are related to the job context and are viewed as dissatisfying to the employee. There have been a number of studies that have used Herzberg as a theoretical framework even though his work was criticized by his colleagues.

Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory is a good fit for the purposes of this study. This is due to the specificity of job content and job context factors that are related to job
satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. These factors were reviewed generally and as they relate to student affairs administrators. The review established that intrinsic factors contribute to satisfying or positive experiences, while extrinsic factors contribute to dissatisfying or negative experiences.

Dissatisfiers and negative experiences can lead to attrition. The student affairs literature says that issues such as supervision, political climate and administrative decision making can lead to attrition. The chapter labeled attrition as a financial setback to organization which can lead to low morale, and continued attrition of other mid-level managers.

Job satisfaction in student affairs has been in the research literature for the past 35 years. Studies have examined job satisfaction as a single construct as well as comparing it to other variables. Most studies have been broad in scope and explored collective groups of functional areas and positions. These studies have been limited in their generalizability due to their narrow focus. There have only been a few studies that used a national sample to examine job satisfaction, and those studies still examined the professionals employed in one functional area. The focus of this explored job satisfaction and intent to leave for mid-level managers across functional areas using a national sample.

The conceptual model is a framework that postulates that the combination demographics and intrinsic factors and extrinsic factors can lead to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction respectively. However, job satisfaction occurs when intrinsic factors exist for the mid-level manager and they outweigh extrinsic factors. The inverse, job dissatisfaction, is the occurrence of extrinsic factors that outweigh intrinsic factors for the
mid-level manager. If employees are satisfied with their positions, they are likely to persist or stay with the organization. However, if they dissatisfied, they are more likely to consider leaving their position, the institution and the student affairs field.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The aim of this study was to examine job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of mid-level managers in student affairs administration using Herzberg's (1957; 1959) concepts of intrinsic and extrinsic factors. This chapter discusses the research design, sample population and participants, survey instrument, procedural pilot study, changes of the Faculty Job Satisfaction Job Dissatisfaction Instrument (F-JSJD-I) and the Administrator Job Satisfaction Job Dissatisfaction Instrument (A-JSJD-I) toward the creation of the Mid-Level Manager Job Satisfaction Job Dissatisfaction Survey (M-LMJSJD), revised instrument, data, collection procedure, and finally, data analysis.

Research Design

Quantitative methods are suitable when a researcher wants to discover the factors that may influence a specific outcome (Creswell, 2003). Dillman (2000) and Fink and Kosecoff (1998) asserted that surveys can be used to conduct research when the information needed comes directly from individuals. Fink and Kosecoff (1998) also posited that data provided by quantitative study could be any of the following: (a) descriptions, (b) attitudes, (c) values, and (d) habits. Qualitative studies are best used when the researcher is attempting to discover concepts or when he or she may not be able to quantify variables. Because factors related to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are well defined and identified in the literature, I have chosen to use a quantitative methodology for this study. It is a survey of a non random sample of student affairs mid-level managers across the United States who are members of the American College Personnel Association (ACPA).
Sample Population and Participants

The participants are members of the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) who self-identified as mid-level managers and work at four-year colleges and universities in the United States. An initial e-mail sent directly to the members of the Commissions and Standing Committees from their chairs on my behalf was used to recruit the study’s participants. Once invitations were sent and participants chose to respond, I reviewed the responses to determine whether they as a participant were eligible to be used in the sample. The process to determining a potential participant’s eligibility was to evaluate the responses from the demographic sections particularly, budget responsibility, Carnegie classification, institutional type, and supervision. The responses to these factors according to Mills (1993) and Young (1991) indicate that the participants were indeed mid-level managers in student affairs by their responses to questions three, four, and responding affirmatively to question five. Survey responses that indicated that participants supervised other professional staff members and had budgetary responsibility were used.

Survey Instrument. Osueke (1991) developed the Faculty Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction Instrument (F-JSJD1). The instrument’s primary focus was to measure the job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction of faculty in the state of South Dakota. Anuna (1997) revised the instrument to measure the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction of academic administrators (deans) at public universities in Texas. Permission was received from Anuna because his instrument measured the job satisfaction of the academic administrators.
The A-JSJD-I had two parts. Part 1 included 48 items on a six-point Likert scale (1=very dissatisfied to 6=very satisfied with no neutral point) was intended to measure job satisfaction and dissatisfaction with questions to gauge both intrinsic and extrinsic factors. The intrinsic factors measured were: (a) achievement, (b) advancement, (c) recognition, (d) responsibility, and (e) work itself. The extrinsic factors were: (a) administrative policies, (b) the balance between work life and personal life, (c) job security, (d) relationships with colleagues, (e) salary, (f) supervision, and (g) working conditions. Respondents were also required to answer whether they “Agree” or “Disagree” to each of the questionnaire items. Part 2 consisted of 19 demographic-related items that were used to describe the population sample.

Anuna’s survey instrument was the most appropriate for adaptation for this study for a number of reasons. First, it directly addresses the level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction that senior-level managers experience in their positions. Second, it was designed to test Herzberg’s postulations that intrinsic factors relate to job satisfaction and not to job dissatisfaction whereas extrinsic factors are related to job dissatisfaction and not job satisfaction. Third, it can show gradations or magnitudes of job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction of the respondents. Fourth, it is evident that the Anuna explored Herzberg’s hypothesis that job dissatisfaction, but “no job satisfaction” and job satisfaction and “no job dissatisfaction”.

Finally, Anuna’s survey instrument is also a very reliable instrument. A 0.95 Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha (α) was generated from Osueke’s (1991) and Anuna’s (1997) factor analyses of intrinsic and extrinsic factors of their instruments. Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha (α) is the best measure for the constructs of reliability because it is a
more general measure compared to tests composed of items with a number of responses and categories, and it also provides a more general test of variance (Kinnear & Colin, 2004). Permission and approval to use Anuna’s instrument can be found in Appendices B and C.

Pilot Study

The intent of the pilot study was to test and examine the survey instrument to be used in this study measuring the level of job satisfaction of mid-level managers as identified by the American College Personnel Association (ACPA). Data collected from the pilot study was withheld from the final study because it was used to test the instrument.

The instrument was pilot-tested by using a non random sample of 35 colleagues who self-identified as mid-level managers in student affairs administration. Surveys were sent to respondents who were asked to complete the instrument and judge its suitability for the proposed study, and modifications were made based on that feedback. The modifications made to the instruments were as follows: (a) remove the agree and disagree response before the question, (b) change the rating scale from one to seven to one to six, (c) shorten the questions from sixty to under fifty, and (d) phrase all the questions in the affirmative. The e-mail sent to colleagues asking them to participate in the study is in Appendix D, and the instrument they completed and provided on is in Appendices E and F. These participants were not a part of the study’s sample, as they asked not to respond to the final instrument if sent to them to comply with Western Michigan University’s Human Subject Review (HSIRB) policies. Appendix G is the approval form from Western Michigan University’s Human Subjects Institutional Review Board.
Changes to the F-JSJDI and A-JSJDI toward the Creation of the M-LMJSJDS

Since the F-JSJDI was designed to study faculty job satisfaction in the state of South Dakota, and the A-JSJDI was designed to study the job satisfaction of deans in the state of Texas, I modified the survey to meet the purpose of this study in the following ways:

1. The name of the instrument was changed from the “Faculty Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction Instrument” to “Mid-Level Manager Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction Survey” (M-LMJSJDS) to reflect the present study.

2. Items that reflected “teaching” were changed or removed to reflect “administration” for either the senior level, such as Chief Student Affairs Officer (CSAO), or the mid-level manager. For example, an item such as “I control my teaching responsibilities was changed to “I have discretion in regards to procedures and practices used in performing my job.”

3. Items were added to the demographic portion (Part 1) of the instrument to reflect the revised Carnegie Classification, to address supervision, and the type and scope of supervision practiced by the participants in the study.

4. Based on feedback from the pilot implementation of the survey, the “Agree” and “Disagree” items of the F-JSJD-I and A-JSJD-I were removed. Respondents felt that the forced dichotomous responses did not add clarity to the Likert scale already requested, and in fact confused their response process. Because the dichotomous response was also very difficult to
calculate statistically in conjunction with a scale, that element of the survey was eliminated.

5. All survey statements regarding job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction were worded in the affirmative as a way to prevent bias their responses.

6. Since there are 28 functional areas of student affairs according to the Council for the Advancement of Standards (2003), I separated the functional areas into five domains: enrollment management, co-curricular programs, health education and promotion programs, learning assistance, and student development. Breakdowns of the areas within each domain are as follows:
Table 1
*Domains and Functional Areas of Mid-Level Managers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Functional Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Enrollment Management | Admissions  
Campus Information and Visitation Services  
Financial Aid  
New Student Orientation  
Registrar’s Office |
| 2. Co-Curricular | Greek Affairs  
Student Leadership  
Student Activities  
Student Union |
| 3. Health Education and Promotion | Alcohol and Other Drugs  
Counseling  
Health Services |
| 4. Learning Assistance | Academic Advising  
Distance Education  
TRIO and other Educational Opportunity Programs |
| 5. Student Development | Assessment and Evaluation Outcomes  
Campus Ministry Programs  
Disabled Student Services  
International Student Services  
Judicial Affairs  
Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Student Services  
Multicultural Affairs  
Recreation and Athletics  
Residence Life  
Women’s Center Programs |

Revised Instrument

The resultant M-LMJSJDS was divided into two parts, and consisted of 66 items. Part 1 consists of 15 demographic variables and three institutional variables. The demographic variables include age, education, gender, ethnic background, degree level and current enrollment, current position, functional work area(s), supervision responsibilities, and length of time in the student affairs field. The three institutional variables include institution type (public or private), Carnegie Classification, and student enrollment. Eight of the questions are placed at the beginning of the survey and seven questions will be placed at the end of the instrument. This was done to make participants...
more at ease answering personal questions. These variables are used to describe the sample and determine if any demographic or institutional variables are related to the overall job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction of the participants.

Part 2 of the M-LMJSJDS consists of 51 items on a six-point Likert scale adapted as discussed earlier from Osueke's (1991) instrument. These items measure satisfaction or dissatisfaction using intrinsic factors such as recognition, advancement or the work itself, and extrinsic factors such as supervision, relationships with colleagues, and compensation. Thus, intrinsic and extrinsic factors are translated into work-related situations associated with happy or unhappy feelings for the mid-level manager's work, environment, and resultant job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction.

The survey questions asked for the level of agreement or disagreement with statements of job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction with various factors. A forced-choice six-point Likert-type scale will be offered, where 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=mildly disagree, 4=mildly agree, 5=agree, and 6=strongly agree. The questions were worded in a manner that required participants to choose one of the responses, and therefore, not remain neutral. Osueke (1991) established the following satisfaction/dissatisfaction range a priori, and his results indicated that its use was appropriate. A mean score of 3.5 and higher indicated agreement with the statement, and a score lower than 3.5 indicated disagreement with the statement.

The satisfaction range developed by Osueke (1991) was maintained in this study. Respondents were asked to provide voluntarily additional comments about their roles as mid-level managers and job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction after each section of questions and at the conclusion of this part of the instrument.
Instrument items were stated in the affirmative to avoid potential confusion in the respondent's interpretation (Dillman, 2000; Fowler, 2002). Fowler (2002) said that negatively phrased statements were difficult to interpret. The final M-LMJSJDS instrument can be found in Appendix H.

Data Collection Procedure

The study population consisted of the 1,943 mid-level managers in student affairs who are members of the American College Personnel Association (ACPA). ACPA Commission and Standing Committee Chairs sent the messages to the participants. Participants were contacted three times. The first contact was via e-mail inviting participants to complete the survey. An e-mail explaining the survey and the purpose of the study (Appendix J) was sent to the participants to solicit their participation. Because I was not able to identify non-responding addresses for follow-up purposes, emails were sent to all participants. A second e-mail (Appendix K) was sent to non-responders after five days with another link to the survey. A third message (Appendix L) was sent after an additional five days to encourage any late responders to reply. As soon as the surveys were collected through Zoomerang a Web-based survey tool, responses were downloaded into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Program (SPSS) for analysis. Incomplete surveys were examined and a determination on their use was made depending on the number of surveys and degree of completeness. My intended response was rate was 65 percent. This was based on research conducted by Dillman and his use of web based surveys (Dillman, 2000). Dillman, Tortora, Condrat, and Bower (as cited in Dillman, 2000) conducted a study to determine the effects of simple and advanced construction techniques on completion rates. His research team received a 71 percent
return rate from subjects who were contacted by telephone, and completed the screening interview. Of those who qualified after the screen interview, the research team received an 82 percent return rate. Nichols and Sedivi (1998) as cited in Dillman (2000) also conducted an experiment. They tested businesses to determine the feasibility of survey access. Nichols and Sedivi (1998) found that 84 percent of their sample completed a paper and pencil version of their instrument and 68 percent completed their web based version. After following up with survey respondents, they found that respondents' browsers were not compatible with the technology used to create the survey.

While these researchers received high rates, Cook, Heath and Thompson (2002) through a meta-analysis of survey research methodologies found that the use of electronic surveys averaged approximately 40 percent. A factor in the success of these surveys is the use of the Internet (Shannon & Bradshaw, 2002). They also found that electronic surveys are successful when participants are selected from organizational listserv. In student affairs, two success studies of this type were Tull’s (2004) work on synergetic supervision and Loyd’s (2005) investigation of the impact of a teamwork environment on job satisfaction.

Referring to these studies and from my own frame of reference as a mid-level manager, my intention was to obtain a 65 percent return rate. If this percentage was not received, my plan was conduct the data analysis with the data I did receive, which was 25 percent (n = 477). The power for this sample size was .9943 (Lenth, 2006). The effect that power had on the sample size was indicated that the M-LMJSJDS was likely to yield useful information (Lenth, 2001).
Data Analysis

This study was conducted in three phases. The first phase was to determine whether mid-level managers are satisfied or dissatisfied with their jobs. Job satisfaction was characterized by the averages calculated for each item, which was also conceptualization of the Faculty Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction Instrument (F-JSJD-I). Prior to conducting the analyses, reliability and validity tests were conducted to assure that the M-LMJSJDS had properly operationalized the constructs in the study. These results were compared to those found by Osueke and Anuna and presented in their studies.

Osueke (1991) asserted that the sum of work was related to influences that result in feelings of satisfaction; however, when the cumulative results were feelings of dissatisfaction, the worker is dissatisfied. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, means, and percentages ANOVAs and regression models were for this condition.

The second phase of this study examined the extent that job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction of mid-level managers is related to Herzberg’s intrinsic factors (advancement, recognition, work itself achievement, and responsibility) or extrinsic factors (supervision, relationships with colleagues, salary, and personal life). This phase addressed the five research questions posed in this study. These hypotheses were analyzed using descriptive statistics, canonical correlations and simple regression models. This approach tested for linear relationships of independent variables to dependent variables and allowed me to explore predictive relationships. Two tests were conducted for this analysis. The first test was for those who report satisfaction; and a second test was for those who reported dissatisfaction.
The tests were conducted in four stages. The first stage was to examine the relationship between the mid-level manager’s job satisfaction and each of the intrinsic factors. The second stage was then to explore the relationship between the mid-level manager’s job dissatisfaction and each of the extrinsic factors. The level of significance was set at .05 to determine whether the relationship was found to be significant. The Coefficient of Determination, $R^2$, will determine the strength of the relationship. The Coefficient of Determination, $R^2$ is a proportion of the variance of the outcome variable that is determined by an independent variable (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). High $R^2$ indicated a strong relationship, influence, and vice versa. Regressions were set up by taking the values from the individual intrinsic and extrinsic factors and aggregating those values to generate an overall job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction measure. The aggregate value calculated for job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction served as the dependent variable in the equation while, then a second regression was completed using the demographic variables as the independent variables and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction as the dependent variables. Because the questions were formatted to be used as an aggregate measure of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction, this procedure was best in determining the values in the regression analysis.

The third stage of this study was to address the participants’ level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Based on Osucke’s (1991) scale, respondents indicated their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with work related situations by checking the number below each item. A “0” indicates that the item does not apply to the respondent. A “1” indicates that the respondent “strongly disagrees”, while a “6” indicates they “strongly agree” with the statement. These responses will be analyzed using descriptive statistical methods such
as frequencies, means, and percentages. Job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction will be an aggregate of the means of both the intrinsic and extrinsic factors divided by two. Therefore, according to Osueke’s (1991), scale of satisfaction, if the aggregate average is above 3.5, then the participant is satisfied with his or her position and if the aggregate average falls below 3.5, then the participant is dissatisfied with their position.

The fourth stage of this study was to determine the relationship between the demographic variables, and the respondent’s overall job satisfaction and/or job dissatisfaction. Demographic variables are age, education, gender, ethnic background, degree level, and current enrollment in a degree-granting program, functional area of the mid-level manager, supervision, Carnegie classification, student enrollment, institutional type, and length of time in the student affairs field and in the mid-level manager’s current position. Using Glick’s (1992) approach, the demographic variables served as the predictor variables, and the overall job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction were treated as dependent variables. The relationship between the predictor and dependent variables were determined by running a multiple regression test that included all of the demographic variables as predictors and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction as the dependent variables. The Coefficient of Determination, $R^2$ was used to measure the variation in the dependent variables explained for the predictor variables. A high $R^2$ indicated a strong relationship between the demographic variables and overall job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.

After these phases, attrition of mid-level managers was assessed. This was done by conducting a simple regression procedure of “intent to leave” as the dependent variable (the response from question 15K, I intend to look for another position elsewhere.
during the next academic year), with the intrinsic and extrinsic variables as the independent variables: (a) institutional policies, (b) work balance, (c) job security, (d) relationships with colleagues, (e) salary, (f) supervision, and (g) working conditions. Significance levels were the same in this phase as in the previous portions of the study. Two tests were conducted for this procedure. The first test was for those who reported satisfaction and the second test was for those who reported dissatisfaction.

**Summary**

This study was delimited to mid-level managers who are members of the American College Personnel Association (ACPA). The study’s instrument was a modified version of the Faculty Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction Instrument (F-JSJDI) by Osueke (1997) and the Administrator Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction Instrument (A-JSJDI) by Anuna (1997). The instrument is comprised of two parts. Part 1 consists of 15 demographic items of age, education, gender, race/ethnic background, educational level, and currently pursuing a degree, functional area(s) of the mid-level manager, supervision, Carnegie classification, student enrollment, institutional type, and length of time in the student affairs field and in the mid-level manager’s current position, which are likely to be related to job satisfaction. Part 2 consists of 51 items designed to measure respondent’s satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction with various intrinsic and extrinsic factors (Nagle, 1986; Osueke, 1991). Data were collected through a Web-based survey and analyzed using SPSS. Descriptive and predictive statistics were used to explore the levels of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction among mid-level managers, and the factors that most influenced their feelings regarding their work.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The focus of this study was to examine the job satisfaction of mid-level managers in student affairs organizations in higher education. The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the statistical analyses of the Mid-Level Manager Job Satisfaction Job Dissatisfaction Survey (ML-MJSJDS) developed for this study. Descriptive statistics of the study’s sample are stated and examined. Responses to survey questions were coded; bracketed and major themes were presented. Mean values were measured to determine the level of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction for the functional area domains and the entire study’s sample. Analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were computed to show any differences in job satisfaction and intent to leave for the study’s population. Regressions were calculated to determine what variables would predict job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction, and intent to leave for mid-level managers in student affairs. Finally, cluster analysis and canonical correlations were performed to explore the independent variables’ relationships with each other and the outcomes. Alpha levels for statistical significance were set at .05 where suitable.

Sample Population

Participants for this study were recruited from the Commissions and Standing Committee listservs of the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) by an e-mail invitation to respond to a web based survey. Reminders five and seven business days respectively were sent to all potential respondents to encourage participation in the study and to increase the study’s sample size. A total of 773 responses were received. Once
received, I determined whether the participants were mid-level managers based on their responses to question 4 (job title), an affirmative response to question 5 (budgetary responsibility) and question 8 (Carnegie classification) the number of participants decreased to 535. Then, surveys were removed due to significant amounts of missing data. After these processes, 477 useable surveys with minor missing data were received out of 1943 invitations, which yielded a 25% response rate. While that percentage is small, the participants in the sample are representative of the national population of mid-level managers in student affairs as determined by the data collected by the American College Personnel Association (ACPA). Table 2 shows the number of mid-level managers in each functional area domain along with their corresponding percentages in the sample. Twenty seven participants did not respond to this question, representing 5.67% of the total study's population.

Table 2
Number of Participants by Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Curricular</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Education and Promotion</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Assistance</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic Information

This section presents information on the categorical and continuous demographic variables for this study. It provides frequencies, percentages, and means and standard deviations (where applicable) for the following variables: age, race and ethnicity, gender, educational level, highest degree in student affairs administration, career tenure, tenure in current position, number of full-time professionals supervised, institutional type, and
Carnegie classification. Table 3 shows these statistics for age, race and ethnicity and gender.

Table 3
Demographics of Study Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Enrollment Management N (%)</th>
<th>Co-Curricular N (%)</th>
<th>Health Education and Promotion N (%)</th>
<th>Learning Assistance N (%)</th>
<th>Student Development N (%)</th>
<th>Total N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>4 (33)</td>
<td>19 (30)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>10 (9)</td>
<td>46 (23)</td>
<td>83 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>5 (42)</td>
<td>25 (40)</td>
<td>9 (21)</td>
<td>24 (22)</td>
<td>94 (47)</td>
<td>157 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>9 (14)</td>
<td>11 (26)</td>
<td>28 (27)</td>
<td>40 (20)</td>
<td>89 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>6 (10)</td>
<td>20 (48)</td>
<td>41 (38)</td>
<td>15 (8)</td>
<td>83 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 60</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>12 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4 (33)</td>
<td>4 (6)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>21 (19)</td>
<td>27 (14)</td>
<td>57 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>7 (59)</td>
<td>47 (75)</td>
<td>41 (98)</td>
<td>73 (65)</td>
<td>141 (71)</td>
<td>309 (72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 (11)</td>
<td>10 (5)</td>
<td>26 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>12 (6)</td>
<td>14 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>7 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6 (50)</td>
<td>26 (42)</td>
<td>9 (21)</td>
<td>23 (20)</td>
<td>87 (43)</td>
<td>151 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6 (50)</td>
<td>36 (58)</td>
<td>33 (79)</td>
<td>93 (80)</td>
<td>113 (56)</td>
<td>281 (65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants ranged in age from 22 to 64 years of age. Overall, the sample age averaged 40 with a standard deviation of 10. The largest percentage (37) of the sample was 31 to 40 years old. The sample had a large number of Caucasian participants (n = 309), followed by African Americans (n = 57), and Hispanics and Latinos (n = 26) respectively. Finally, the sample had more female respondents (n = 281) than male respondents (n = 151).
The next set of demographic data is for educational level and career tenure in the student affairs field and in their current position. Table 4 depicts these statistics. Across all the functional domains, the majority of the participants held a Master’s degree, followed by a terminal degree. Tenure in the participants’ current positions decreased as their Career tenure years increased. Table 5 shows the institutional information for the sample. Most participants who participated in this study were employed at worked Doctoral Research-Extensive according to Carnegie Classification (www.carnegiefoundation.org).

Sample Comparison to National Data

The demographic characteristics of the response sample were compared to demographic data received from the ACPA’s national office. Overall, the sample reflected the national population of mid-level managers in ethnicity and career tenure. Major differences in the sample population when compared with the national data were found for work setting/institutional type; the sample population had more than a 10% difference from the national data. Table 6 shows the descriptive statistics, percentages and differences in percentages for the sample population when compared with the national data. Appendices M – Q show the demographic data by functional area domain category.

Reliability Testing for Constructed Variables

This study relies on several variables constructed from multiple items in the survey instrument (factors). Prior to proceeding with the planned analysis, reliability statistics were used to confirm that the proposed constructed variables did indeed behave in the way predicted when the survey was created.
Table 4  
Descriptive Statistics for Educational Level and Career Tenure  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Enrollment Management N (%)</th>
<th>Co-Curricular N (%)</th>
<th>Health Education and Promotion N (%)</th>
<th>Learning Assistance N (%)</th>
<th>Student Development N (%)</th>
<th>Total N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Degree</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juris Doctorate</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdD or PhD</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12 (62)</td>
<td>63 (38)</td>
<td>42 (24)</td>
<td>116 (66)</td>
<td>200 (100)</td>
<td>433 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree in Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 (83)</td>
<td>51 (81)</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>32 (28)</td>
<td>118 (59)</td>
<td>214 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 (17)</td>
<td>12 (19)</td>
<td>39 (93)</td>
<td>83 (72)</td>
<td>82 (41)</td>
<td>218 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12 (62)</td>
<td>63 (38)</td>
<td>42 (24)</td>
<td>115 (66)</td>
<td>200 (100)</td>
<td>432 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Tenure in Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>6 (54)</td>
<td>46 (69)</td>
<td>19 (45)</td>
<td>63 (51)</td>
<td>131 (64)</td>
<td>265 (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>3 (27)</td>
<td>14 (21)</td>
<td>14 (33)</td>
<td>43 (35)</td>
<td>56 (27)</td>
<td>130 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>6 (9)</td>
<td>9 (21)</td>
<td>14 (11)</td>
<td>14 (7)</td>
<td>43 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td>10 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 26</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11 (62)</td>
<td>67 (38)</td>
<td>42 (24)</td>
<td>124 (66)</td>
<td>205 (100)</td>
<td>449 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in Current Position in Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5 Years</td>
<td>12 (100)</td>
<td>62 (93)</td>
<td>30 (73)</td>
<td>101 (81)</td>
<td>188 (92)</td>
<td>393 (88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (4)</td>
<td>10 (24)</td>
<td>20 (16)</td>
<td>13 (6)</td>
<td>46 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>2 (2.2)</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td>9 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (.8)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 26</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12 (62)</td>
<td>67 (38)</td>
<td>41 (24)</td>
<td>124 (66)</td>
<td>205 (100)</td>
<td>449 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Descriptive Statistics for Institutional Type and Carnegie Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Enrollment Management</th>
<th>Co-Curricular</th>
<th>Health Education and Promotion</th>
<th>Learning Assistance</th>
<th>Student Development</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4 (33)</td>
<td>33 (49)</td>
<td>19 (45)</td>
<td>21 (17)</td>
<td>81 (40)</td>
<td>158 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>8 (67)</td>
<td>34 (51)</td>
<td>23 (55)</td>
<td>103 (83)</td>
<td>123 (60)</td>
<td>291 (65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral-Extensive</td>
<td>4 (33)</td>
<td>19 (30)</td>
<td>8 (23)</td>
<td>17 (17)</td>
<td>54 (29)</td>
<td>102 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Intensive</td>
<td>4 (33)</td>
<td>8 (13)</td>
<td>6 (17)</td>
<td>10 (10)</td>
<td>33 (18)</td>
<td>61 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s I</td>
<td>2 (17)</td>
<td>12 (19)</td>
<td>5 (14)</td>
<td>25 (26)</td>
<td>35 (19)</td>
<td>79 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s II</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>6 (9)</td>
<td>6 (17)</td>
<td>11 (11)</td>
<td>12 (6)</td>
<td>36 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate-Lib</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13 (20)</td>
<td>8 (23)</td>
<td>15 (15)</td>
<td>42 (23)</td>
<td>78 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Baccalaureate-General</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (5)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>8 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baccalaureate-Associates</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>3 (5)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>19 (19)</td>
<td>1 (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specifically, the mean scores for each item in the intrinsic and extrinsic factors of the M-LMJSJDS were tested for reliability using Cronbach’s alpha (Nunnally & Berstein, 1994). The following variables were measured and the individual questions were averaged together to create the variables within each factor:

**Intrinsic Factors**

*Advancement.* The mean score of questions 9A and 9B was used to determine the advancement value.

*Recognition.* The mean score from questions 9C and 9D was used to determine the recognition value.

*Work itself.* The mean score from questions 9E, 9F, 9G, and 9H was used to determine the work itself value.
### Table 6
Descriptive Statistics of the Sample Data Compared with ACPA Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Category</th>
<th>ACPA Sample (December 2005)</th>
<th>Grant Sample Data</th>
<th>Difference (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>207(11)</td>
<td>60(13)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>593.</td>
<td>14(3)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>1392(72)</td>
<td>327(69)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>96(5)</td>
<td>26(6)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>32(2)</td>
<td>15(3)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>4(1)</td>
<td>8(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>36(2)</td>
<td>4(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Setting/Institutional Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>729(38)</td>
<td>167(35)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>980(50)</td>
<td>309(65)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree/Educational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>107(6)</td>
<td>24(5)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>1490(77)</td>
<td>353(74)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>212(111)</td>
<td>66(14)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist</td>
<td>9(1)</td>
<td>5(1)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12(1)</td>
<td>21(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Tenure</th>
<th>0-5 years</th>
<th>612(32)</th>
<th>123(26)</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>661(34)</td>
<td>148(31)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>338(17)</td>
<td>79(17)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>126(21)</td>
<td>58(12)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>76(4)</td>
<td>35(7)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 plus years</td>
<td>35(2)</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain/Functional Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management</td>
<td>377(19)</td>
<td>12(3)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co Curricular</td>
<td>1065(55)</td>
<td>67(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Education and Promotion**</td>
<td>284(15)</td>
<td>42(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Assistance</td>
<td>232(12)</td>
<td>124(26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td>1646(85)</td>
<td>205(43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**This group had the health services and drug and alcohol functional areas combined. Values in parentheses in the difference column are in favor of the national data.**

**Achievement.** The mean score from questions 11A, 11B, 11C and 11D was used to determine the achievement value.

**Responsibility.** The mean score from questions 11E, 11F, 11G, and 11H was used to determine the responsibility value.
Extrinsic Factors

_Supervision._ The mean score for questions 13A, 13B, 13C, and 13D was used to determine the supervision value.

_Relationships with colleagues._ The mean score for questions 13E, 13F, 13G, and 13H was used to determine the relationship with colleagues' value.

_Institutional policies._ The mean score for questions 13I, 13J, 13K, 13L, and 13M was used to determine the institutional policies value.

_Worlding conditions._ The mean score for questions 13N, 13O, 13P, 13Q, and 13R was used to determine the working conditions value.

_Salary._ The mean score for questions 15A, 15B, 15C, and 15D was used to determine the salary value.

_Job status._ The mean score for questions 15E, 15F, and 15G was used to determine the job status value.

_Job security._ The mean score for questions 15H, 15I, 15J, 15K, and 15L was used to determine the job status value.

_Work balance._ The mean score for questions 15M, 15N, 15O, and 15P was used to determine the work balance value.

Table 7 shows the Cronbach's alpha coefficients for each factor. As seen in Table 7, Cronbach's alpha for most factors exceeded .70, the commonly used threshold for accepting a constructed factor (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Santos, 1999). Three factors were removed from constructs because of low alpha scores. It seemed statistically appropriate to remove these questions from the variable constructs due to the
improvement in the alpha coefficient without the specific variables included (Santos, 1999).

The first question removed was 11E (Working to develop entry-level professionals is rewarding) in the responsibility variable. When it was removed, the alpha coefficient increased from .58 to .63. The second question was 130 (I am satisfied with my workload) in the working conditions variable. Removing question 130 increased this variable’s alpha from .69 to .70. Finally, the third question removed was 15K in the job security variable. Removing it from the scale increased the alpha from -.25 to .63. The reason this question was removed was because the wording of the item was changed to sound affirmative. As a result of this change, the alpha was lowered significantly and it had to be removed to adjust for that change.

Table 7
Factor Analysis for Job Satisfaction Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with Colleagues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Policies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Status</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Balance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As not all variables had over .70 Cronbach alpha scores, the scores presented in Table 7 are the highest levels achieved after the removing questions 11E, 130, and 15K from the responsibility, working conditions and job security variables respectively. The instrument’s overall reliability was .94, which is consistent with the reliability scores of the Osueke (.95) and Anuna (.95) instruments.
Examination of Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction

This study examined five questions in relation to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction based on Herzberg’s Motivation Hygiene Theory (1966). The first research question was: to what extent are mid level managers in student affairs satisfied or dissatisfied with their positions? To respond to this question, means and standard deviations were evaluated for the functional area domains and the entire sample. Descriptive statistics for these variables for the functional area domains and the entire sample population are found in Table 8. The criterion established job satisfaction if the job satisfaction score was above 3.50 (Chapter 3; Osueke, 1991). If a participant’s average among the extrinsic variables was below 3.50, that person was deemed dissatisfied (Chapter, 3; Osueke, 1991). Job satisfaction was calculated by adding the intrinsic factor mean scores, while job dissatisfaction was calculated by adding the extrinsic factors mean scores.

While all mean scores were above the 3.5 criterion to determine job satisfaction, professionals in the enrollment management domain scored highest and mid-level managers in student development domain scored lowest among the five functional area domains. For the study sample, the job satisfaction mean value was 4.37 with a standard deviation of .87 and the job dissatisfaction mean value was 4.35 with a standard deviation of 76. The range for the sample was four for both the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction variables.
Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for Overall Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction by Functional Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Management</th>
<th>Co-Curricular</th>
<th>Health Education and Promotion</th>
<th>Learning Assistance</th>
<th>Student Development</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M SD</td>
<td>M SD</td>
<td>M SD</td>
<td>M SD</td>
<td>M SD</td>
<td>M SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.57 .87</td>
<td>.68 .86</td>
<td>.86 .90</td>
<td>.76 .87</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>4.69 4.46</td>
<td>4.59 4.50</td>
<td>4.27 4.37</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>.54 .79</td>
<td>.65 .78</td>
<td>.76 .76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

Overall Descriptive Statistics of Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>364 (83)</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>59 (17)</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows that the overall satisfaction score for those who reported satisfaction was 4.68 with a standard deviation of .59. The overall mean dissatisfaction score for those participants who reported dissatisfaction was 2.92, with a standard deviation of .37. Of those participants who reported satisfaction, 60% (n = 225) reported extreme satisfaction or strongly agreed with the intrinsic factor questions. Of those who reported dissatisfaction, less than 1% (n = 5) reported extreme dissatisfaction indicating that they strongly disagreed with the extrinsic factor questions. Therefore, to answer research question one, to what extent mid-level managers in student affairs are satisfied with their positions; the answer is that they are mildly satisfied with some areas of dissatisfaction which will be discussed later in this chapter.

Relationship between Demographic Variables and Job Satisfaction

Research question two asked to what extent job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction of mid-level managers in student affairs is related to demographic variables such as age,
gender, race, domain, institutional type, educational level, career tenure, and tenure in their current position and Carnegie classification. To respond to this question, correlations were calculated. Table 10 shows these statistics.

Table 10
Correlations for Job Satisfaction and Categorical Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Career Tenure</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Tenure in Current Position</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>- .009</td>
<td>- .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- .007</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>- .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in Current Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p<.05; **p<.01

Table 10 depicts the Pearson r correlations for each of the categorical demographic variables and job satisfaction. As seen in Table 10, there was a weak significant relationship at the .01 level for age (r = .16). Since Carnegie classification, educational level, functional area domain, and race are categorical variables, Chi square analyses were conducted with these variables and the job satisfaction categorical variable. Table 11 shows these analyses. As seen in Table 11, all the variables are significant.

Table 11
Chi Square Analyses for Carnegie Classification, Educational Level, Functional Area Domain, Race and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X²-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Classification</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>107.14</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>1038.25</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Area Domain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>184.74</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnic Background</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1090.10</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Correlations and chi square analyses were repeated for those who reported dissatisfaction.

Table 12 shows the correlations for age, career tenure, gender, institutional type and tenure in the participants’ current positions.

Table 12
Correlations for Job Dissatisfaction and Categorical Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Career Tenure</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Tenure in Current Position</th>
<th>Job Dissatisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Tenure</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Type</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in Current Position</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 12, there was a weak significant relationship at the .05 level for tenure in the participant’s current position (r =.30). Following the ratio and dichotomous variables, chi square analyses were conducted for the categorical variables. Table 12 shows these statistics. As seen in Table 13, all categorical demographic variables are significant. However, caution should be used in determining the generalizability for those who reported dissatisfaction (n = 83) because the sample size is small (Glass & Hopkins, 1996).

Following the correlation and chi square analyses, correlations coefficients for each of the demographic variables and job satisfaction were calculated. Table 14 shows the percentages of variance for each of the demographic variables in relationship to job satisfaction.
Table 13

Chi Square Analyses for Carnegie Classification, Educational Level, Functional Area Domain, Race and Job Dissatisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X²-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Classification</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>25.87</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>206.92</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Area Domain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>55.94</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnic Background</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>183.19</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the coefficient of determination, the percentage of the variance explained for job satisfaction by the demographic variables is presented. Collectively, these variables accounted for less than one percent of the variance in job satisfaction for mid-level managers in student affairs administration.

Table 14

Correlation Coefficients of Demographic Variables and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Percent of Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.135**</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Tenure</td>
<td>.102**</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Classification(^d)</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain(^d)</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level(^e)</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender(^f)</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Type(^e)</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race(^h)</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in Current Position(^i)</td>
<td>.143**</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) n=446. \(^b\) n=475. \(^c\) n=417. \(^d\) n=449. \(^e\) n=455. \(^f\) n=454. \(^g\) n=474. \(^h\) n=452. \(^i\) n=474.
\(*p<.05. \**p<.01.

Examination of Job Satisfaction with Intrinsic Factors

Research question three asked to what extent job satisfaction (or lack thereof) of mid-level managers in student affairs is related to Herzberg's intrinsic factors (advancement, recognition, work itself, achievement, and responsibility). To respond to this question a correlation analysis was also used. Table 15 shows the descriptive
statistics for the variables in the intrinsic factor by the functional area domains and the entire sample.

Table 15
Descriptive Statistics for Intrinsic Factor Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Enrollment Management</th>
<th>Co-Curricular</th>
<th>Health Education and Promotion</th>
<th>Learning Assistance</th>
<th>Student Development</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 12 Mean 12 SD</td>
<td>N = 67 Mean 67 SD</td>
<td>N = 42 Mean 42 SD</td>
<td>N = 122 Mean 122 SD</td>
<td>N = 265 Mean 265 SD</td>
<td>N = 477 Mean 477 SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>4.20 1.00</td>
<td>4.06 1.36</td>
<td>4.41 1.46</td>
<td>3.57 1.61</td>
<td>3.71 1.44</td>
<td>4.12 1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>4.75 .89</td>
<td>4.33 1.17</td>
<td>4.37 1.11</td>
<td>4.04 1.30</td>
<td>4.01 1.32</td>
<td>3.83 1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>4.25 1.22</td>
<td>4.33 1.16</td>
<td>4.43 1.08</td>
<td>4.54 1.27</td>
<td>4.18 1.29</td>
<td>5.00 .81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>5.25 .62</td>
<td>5.03 .69</td>
<td>5.34 .66</td>
<td>5.14 .83</td>
<td>4.82 .88</td>
<td>4.32 1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>5.13 .58</td>
<td>4.85 .95</td>
<td>4.76 .66</td>
<td>4.98 .73</td>
<td>4.72 .79</td>
<td>4.68 .91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 15, advancement was the variable that had the lowest mean score among the job satisfaction variables for the learning assistance (M = 3.57, SD = 1.61) and student development (M = 3.71, SD = 1.44) domains. While these scores do not result in job dissatisfaction for these domains, they imply that lack of advancement leads to no job satisfaction (Herzberg, 1966). The variable that led to most job satisfaction among the intrinsic factors was work itself. The enrollment management (M = 5.25, SD = .62) and health education and promotion (M = 5.34, SD = .66) domains reflected that the professionals in these groups really enjoy the varied responsibilities of their positions. For the entire sample, low recognition (M = 3.83, SD = 1.47) was the variable that led to no job satisfaction, while achievement (M = 5.00, SD = .81) lead to the most job satisfaction among mid-level managers in student affairs.
Table 16 shows the correlation analysis among the intrinsic variables and jobs satisfaction. Work itself, achievement, and responsibility showed moderate positive relationships, while advancement and recognition showed strong relationships with job satisfaction. Finally, all the relationships were significant at the .01 level. Caution must be used in responding to this question because in correlation analysis, correlations do not establish a direct linear relationship between the variables and job satisfaction. Therefore, the extent that intrinsic factors have on the job satisfaction of mid-level managers in student affairs is significant and strong.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations for Intrinsic Factors and Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 375

Examination of Job Dissatisfaction with Extrinsic Factors

Research question four explored the extent to which job dissatisfaction (or lack thereof) of mid-level managers in student affairs is related to Herzberg’s extrinsic factors (supervision, relationships with colleagues, institutional policies, working conditions, salary, job status, job security, and work balance). The question was addressed through correlations. Table 17 contains the descriptive statistics for each of the functional area
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domains and the entire sample. As seen in Table 17, salary had the lowest mean score among the variables in job dissatisfaction.

Table 17  
Descriptive Statistics for Extrinsic Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enrollment Management</th>
<th>Co-Curricular</th>
<th>Health Education and Promotion</th>
<th>Learning Assistance</th>
<th>Student Development</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 42</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N = 67</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with Colleagues</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Policies</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Status</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Balance</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest ranking job dissatisfaction variables among the functional area domains were as follows: job security (M = 5.46, SD = .92) for enrollment management, co-curricular (M = 4.90, SD = .88) and student development (M = 4.69, SD = .93). For the health education and promotion, supervision (M = 5.00, SD = 1.00), while relationships with colleagues (M = 4.77, SD = .77) ranked highest in these domains. For the entire sample job security was the variable that led to job dissatisfaction (M = 4.71, SD = .94). This was followed by supervision (M = 4.70, SD = 1.18) and relationships with colleagues (M = 4.69, SD = .82). Salary was the variable with the lowest mean score (M = 3.69, SD = 1.28).
Table 18 is the Pearson Correlation table examining the relationships existing between extrinsic factor variables and job dissatisfaction. As seen in Table 18, all the relationships were significant at the .01 level. The highest correlation existed for working conditions (r = .74, p<.01). The lowest relationship among the extrinsic factors was for salary (r = .27, p<.01). Therefore, the extent that job dissatisfaction (or lack thereof) of mid-level managers in student affairs related to Herzberg’s extrinsic factors (supervision, relationships with colleagues, institutional policies, working conditions, salary, job status, job security, and work balance) is also significant and moderate.
Table 18
Correlation Analysis for Extrinsic Variables and Job Dissatisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Relationship with Colleagues</th>
<th>Institutional Policies</th>
<th>Working Conditions</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Job Status</th>
<th>Job Security</th>
<th>Work Balance</th>
<th>Job Dissatisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Dissatisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intent to Leave and Job Satisfaction of Mid-Level Managers

This section addresses the level that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction influences the intent to leave for mid-level managers in this sample. Job satisfaction is presented first followed by job dissatisfaction completing the section with intent to leave.

*Job Satisfaction*

To determine which factors predicted job satisfaction for the study's participants, separate regression models were conducted for the participants who reported satisfaction and for those who reported dissatisfaction. For intent to leave, regression models were calculated for those who reported satisfaction, those who reported dissatisfaction, and the full sample. Tables 20 and 21 show the descriptive statistics for the demographic variables separated by those who reported job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.

It was found for those who reported satisfaction as the participants got older, job satisfaction increased until they were 60, then job satisfaction decreased. For those who reported job dissatisfaction, those participants from 51 - 60 years old scored the highest (M = 3.11, SD = .26). Caucasians reported the highest level of job satisfaction, while Hispanic/Latinos reported the highest level of job dissatisfaction.
Table 19

Descriptive Statistics of Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction for Age, Race and Ethnicity, Gender and Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean Satisfied</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Mean Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N =364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N =59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 60</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race or Ethnic Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Degree</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdD or PhD</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juris Doctorate (JD)</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next set of demographic variables tabulated with those who reported job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are Carnegie classification, institutional type, career tenure and tenure the participant’s current position. The statistics are reported in Table 20.

For Carnegie classification, mid-level managers employed at Baccalaureate-Associates institutions reported the highest mean satisfaction with 4.79 and a standard deviation of .90. Mid-level managers at Baccalaureate – Liberal Arts institutions reported the highest level of job dissatisfaction (M = 3.13, SD = .35) Finally, it was found that as time in the participants’ career and at their current institution increased, so did the level of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.
Table 20

Descriptive Statistics for Job Satisfaction and Carnegie Classification, Institutional Type, Career Tenure and Tenure in the Current Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfied N =364</td>
<td>Dissatisfied N =59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Research – Extensive</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Research – Intensive</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s I</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s II</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate – Liberal Arts</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate – General</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate – Associates</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Tenure (in years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 5</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in Current Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 5</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To examine the potential relationships between job satisfaction and the demographic variables correlations were run to determine these relationships. Table 21 shows these relationships for those who reported job satisfaction and Table 22 shows the relationships for those who reported job dissatisfaction.
Table 21
Correlations for Demographic Variables for Those Who Reported Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carnegie Classification</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Career Tenure</th>
<th>Tenure in Current Position</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in Current Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 364

* significant at .05 level; ** significant at .01 level.
Table 22

*Correlations for Demographic Variables for Those Who Reported Job Dissatisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Carnegie Classification</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Career Tenure</th>
<th>Tenure in Current Position</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Classification</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Type</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Tenure</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in Current Position</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 59

* significant at .05 level; ** significant at .01 level.
As seen in Table 22, for those who reported job satisfaction there was a small significant relationship between job satisfaction and age ($r = .16, p < .01$). For those participants who reported job dissatisfaction, no significant relationships were found with the demographic variables.

*Model Development for Job Satisfaction*

The first phase of this model was to determine which intrinsic factors were significant. The second phase was to determine which demographic variables were significant. Finally, the last phase of this procedure was to combine the intrinsic variables with the demographic variables to create the final model. Table 24 shows descriptive statistics for the sample of job satisfaction score.

**Intrinsic variables.** In this phase of the model, all the intrinsic variables were regressed on job satisfaction to determine which were significant. When placed in the model, it was found that these variables overlapped. As a result, correlations were rerun to determine which variable or variables interfered with one another. It was found that responsibility was the intrinsic factor that overlapped most with other intrinsic variables, so it was removed.

The linear combination of advancement, work itself, achievement, and responsibility explained approximately 96% of the variance for job satisfaction for those who reported job satisfaction ($R^2 = .96$). The ANOVA for this combination was $F(4, 370) = 2493.72, p < .01$. Table 23 shows the regression analysis for the intrinsic variables.

**Relationships among demographic variables.** Job satisfaction was measured with the demographic variables (age, Carnegie classification, career tenure, educational level,
functional domain, gender, institutional type, race and tenure in the participant's current position) in the study. ANOVAs were performed to determine if any predictive relationships existed, and for which categories within the demographic variables. Those specific categories could then be entered into the regression model with the intrinsic factors. For age, it was ran as a ratio and found not to be significant. Then dummy variables were created for age into 10 year categories and it was found that the age dummy variables that the 51-60 age group was found significant. For race, the same procedure was conducted and African Americans Whites and the others (Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic/Latino, Multiracial and others) placed into a variable due to their small numbers in those categories. When the all the dummy race and age category variables were placed in the regression analysis, the African American dummy variable was found significant. Therefore, race, is a significant factor in determining job satisfaction for mid-level managers in student affairs employed at four-year institutions. This linear combination of variables explained approximately five percent of the variance in job satisfaction ($R^2 = .048$). The ANOVA for this combination was $F_{6(357)} = 3.011$, $p = .007$. Table 24 shows the regression analysis for these demographic variables. As a result of this significance, the 51-60 age group and the African American dummy variables were used in the final regression model for job satisfaction.

Table 23
*Regression Analysis for Intrinsic Variables for Those Who Reported Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>29.47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>39.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>30.44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>39.19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24
Regression Analysis for Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.637</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>86.61</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age dummy 21-30</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age dummy 41-50</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age dummy 51-60</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age dummy Above 61</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race dummy African American</td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>-2.20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race dummy Other races</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 24, the African American dummy variable has a negative coefficient meaning that the African Americans less likely to be satisfied in their positions.

**Final model for job satisfaction.** The final model consisted of the significant intrinsic variables and all the dummy variables for age and race. The linear combination of the intrinsic factors and age accounted for approximately 93% of the variance in job satisfaction ($R^2 = .928$). The ANOVA for job satisfaction was $F_{10(353)} = 452.93$, $p<.01$.

Table 25 is the final model of job satisfaction.

Table 25
Regression Analysis for Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>36.20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>15.32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>25.79</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age dummy 21-30</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age dummy 41-50</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age dummy 51-60</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age dummy Above 61</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race dummy African American</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race dummy Other races</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 25, all the intrinsic variables predicted job satisfaction for those the participants who reported job satisfaction. However, age and race were not significant, yielding that only the combination of intrinsic factors led to job satisfaction for mid-level
managers in this study, which is consistent with Herzberg's (1959; 1966) Two-Factor Theory.

**Model Development for Job Dissatisfaction**

Similar to the procedure used to develop the model for job satisfaction, a model to identify the variables that predicted job dissatisfaction was also created. The difference for this model is that extrinsic factors and job dissatisfaction are used with those participants who reported job dissatisfaction. Table 26 displays the details.

**Extrinsic factors.** For this phase of the model the extrinsic factors of supervision, relationships with colleagues, institutional policies, working conditions, salary, job status, job security, and work balance were used. Due to the closeness of the extrinsic factors with job dissatisfaction, overlapping was assumed. To address this issue, similar to the process used for the intrinsic factors, correlations were examined to determine which factors might interfere with the other extrinsic variables. Upon review of the correlations, it was found that institutional policies, working conditions, and job status were the variables that interfered with the other extrinsic factors, therefore they were removed.

Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>1.554</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>5.346</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with Colleagues</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>4.619</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>5.283</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>5.883</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Balance</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>2.837</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The linear combination of extrinsic factors explained approximately 66% of the variance for job dissatisfaction ($R^2 = .660$). The ANOVA for this combination is $F(5)_{48} = 18.66$, $p<.01$. Table 26 shows the regression analysis for the extrinsic variables.
Demographic variables and job dissatisfaction. Age, Carnegie classification, career tenure, educational level, functional domain, gender, institutional type, race and tenure in the participant’s current position were measured with job dissatisfaction to determine which variables were significant. Again, ANOVAs were used to account for the groups within the categorical demographic variables. None of the demographic variables were found to be significant.

Final model for job dissatisfaction. The final model for job dissatisfaction (Table 27) included all the extrinsic variables to determine which variables predicted job dissatisfaction. The linear combination of supervision, relationships with colleagues, working conditions, salary, job status, job security, and work balance explained 90% of the variance for job dissatisfaction (R^2 = .902). The ANOVA for this model \( F(5, 66) = 121.07, p < .01 \). Table 29 shows the final regression model for job dissatisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>-.1576</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>8.235</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with Colleagues</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>7.394</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>10.368</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>8.830</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Balance</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>3.307</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 27, all the variables were significant in predicting job dissatisfaction. Therefore, the combination of extrinsic variables predicts job dissatisfaction as stated in Herzberg’s Two Factor theory (1966).

Intent to Leave

For intent to leave, separate initial tests were run to predict the factors influencing intent to leave for those participants who reported satisfaction and those who reported dissatisfaction. There were no significant differences between the two groups. As a result,
the analysis to predict intent to leave is conducted on the full sample. Using the same procedure as for job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction, models were created with the intrinsic variables, the extrinsic variables, the demographic variables and the combination of the models above to make the final regression model.

**Intrinsic variables.** The intrinsic variables of advancement, work itself, achievement, and responsibility were used as the independent variables with intent to leave as the dependent variable. Table 28 contains the results. This linear combination accounted for approximately 22% of the variance for intent to leave ($R^2 = .215$). The ANOVA for the intrinsic variables $F(4)_{434} = 29.64, p<.01$. Table 30 shows the analysis for the intrinsic factors.

**Table 28**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent to Leave</td>
<td>8.315</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>15.72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>-.262</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-4.10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>-.562</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>-3.98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 28, advancement, and work itself were the variables that elicited significance, so they were moved to the final regression model. The next phase is to determine which variables from the extrinsic factors will predict intent to leave.

**Extrinsic variables.** Supervision, relationships with colleagues, salary, job security, and work balance were placed in a model as the independent variables with intent to leave as the dependent variable. This combination of extrinsic factors explained 23% of the variance for intent to leave ($R^2 = .234$). The ANOVA $F(5)_{424} = 25.98, p<.01$. Table 29 shows the regression analysis for the extrinsic factors for intent to leave.
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Table 29 shows that only job security and work balance are significant predictors of intent to leave and therefore will be used in the final regression model. Next, the ANOVA model for the demographic variables was calculated.

Table 29
Regression Analysis for Extrinsic Variables and Intent to Leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent to Leave</td>
<td>9.045</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with Colleagues</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>-.602</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Balance</td>
<td>-.297</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic variables. Age, Carnegie classification, career tenure, educational level, functional domain, gender, institutional type, race, and tenure in the participant’s current position are used as the independent variables for this model with intent to leave as the dependent variable, as in the previous models. Since these variables had categories within them, ANOVAs for each of the variables were conducted and it was found that age, race, and tenure in the participant’s current position were significant. Table 30 shows the ANOVAs for these variables.

Table 30
ANOVA for Demographic Variables and Intent to Leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>2.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>4.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in Current Position</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>2.582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tukey post hoc analyses were then performed on these variables to determine which classifications were significant within each of the demographic categories. Table 31 illustrates the significant mean differences for the demographic variables.
As seen in Table 31, those mid-level managers between 31 and 40 and 51 to 60 years of age and those who are African American present a higher intent to leave their positions as mid-level managers in student affairs. Tenure in the participant’s current position variable did elicit significant differences among categories when the post hoc analysis was conducted. In addition, tenure in their position was significant; however, there were no significant differences between those categories. As a result of this analysis, all the dummy variables for age and race were placed in a regression analysis (Table 32). This combination of variables explained approximately eight percent of the variance for intent to leave ($R^2 = .081$). The ANOVA for these demographic variables was $F(6, 445) = 6.51$, $p<.01$. Table 32 is the regression analysis for the demographic variables.

As seen in Table 32, the 51-60, above 61 and the African American dummy variables elicited significance. It is important to note that coefficients for the 51-60 and above 61 age groups are negative which means that this age group is less likely to leave their
positions. Resultant of this analysis, these variables along with the significant intrinsic and extrinsic factors were used in the final regression model for intent to leave.

**Final regression model for intent to leave.** The final model for intent to leave for the full sample has the following variables: advancement and work itself from the intrinsic variables, job status and job security from the extrinsic variables, and all the dummy variables for age and race as the independent variables with intent to leave as the dependent variable. The linear combination of these variables explained approximately 30% of the variance for intent to leave for the full sample ($R^2 = .301$). The ANOVA for this combination of variable is $F(10)427 = 27.73$, $p < .01$. Table 33 shows the regression analysis for the final model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent to Leave</td>
<td>9.106</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-2.82</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>-.406</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-3.43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>-.527</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-5.17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Balance</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age dummy 21-30</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age dummy 41-50</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>-.94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age dummy 51-60</td>
<td>-.566</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>-2.45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age dummy above 61</td>
<td>-1.343</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>-2.63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race dummy African American</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race dummy others</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33 shows us that the factors that predicted intent to leave for the full sample in this study are advancement, work itself and job security age and race. It should be noted that advancement, work itself, job security, the 51-60, above 61 age categories variable had negative coefficient values. Therefore, intent to leave would increase if mid-level managers are not advancing in their positions, not enjoying the work itself, experiencing lower levels of job security. For participants in the above 51 years of age, these mid-level managers are less likely to leave their positions.
Upon review of the data, questions arose regarding the extent to which the intrinsic and extrinsic factors really represented parallel continua and measured two different functions for this sample. While this was a preliminary research question, the applicability of the response could explain potential differences in the sample. The measures used in the analyses were a cluster analysis and canonical correlations of the intrinsic and extrinsic factors.

*Cluster Analysis*

As part of the analysis of the data, a cluster analysis was conducted to determine if there were combinations of intrinsic and extrinsic factors that led to job satisfaction for the sample. Three groups emerged from this process. Cluster one had work itself and responsibility with relationships with colleagues, job security, work balance and supervision. Cluster two had working conditions, job status, institutional policies, recognition and achievement. Finally, in cluster three, there was salary and advancement. Figure 2 illustrates this analysis.
Figure 2: Cluster Analysis of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Variables
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This implies that there are combinations of intrinsic and extrinsic variables that lead to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction for this sample. This is supported by Bailey’s (1997), and Blank’s (1993) studies that concluded that was not a direct relationship with intrinsic and extrinsic variables for job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction respectively.

**Canonical Analysis**

A canonical correlation analysis was conducted using the five intrinsic variables as predictors of the eight extrinsic variables to measure the shared relationship between the two variable sets (job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction). The analysis yielded three functions with squared canonical correlations of .858, .254, and .229 for each function. Collectively the complete model across all the functions was statistically significant using Wilk’s $\lambda = .227$ criterion, $F_{40}(1663.59) = 16.82$, $p < .01$. Consequently, for the set of three canonical correlations the $r^2$ type effect size was .851, which illustrates that the full model explains approximately 85% of the variance shared between the variable sets.

In the full model (Functions one to five) not all functions were statistically significant. Functions one to five, two to five and three to five were statistically significant, $F_{40}(1663.59) = 16.82$, $p < .01$, $F_{28}(1378.74) = 2.10$, $p = .001$, $F_{18}(1083.77) = 1.82$, $p = .019$ respectively. Functions four and five did not explain a statistically significant amount of the shared variance between the intrinsic and extrinsic factors, $F_{10}(768) = 1.18$, $p = .298$ and $F_{4}(385) = .760$, $p = .552$ respectively.

Knowing that the squared canonical correlations influenced each function, only the first three functions were considered notable for this study, explaining 73.5%, 6.4% and 5.2% of the shared variance respectively. The last two functions explained 2.2% and
.8% respectively of the remaining variance in the variable sets after the extraction of the previous functions.

Table 34 shows the standardized canonical function coefficients and structure coefficients for all five functions. As seen in Table 35, for Function 1 between variables, recognition and responsibility are the primary contributors with the combination of work itself, advancement and achievement as the secondary contributors. For the extrinsic variables, the primary contributors to the function are job status and institutional policies with the combination of working conditions, relationships with colleagues and job security as the secondary contributors. Meaning for Function 1, all the intrinsic variables contributed to job satisfaction, while institutional policies and job status also contributed to satisfaction.

Table 34
Correlations Between Intrinsic Variables and their Canonical Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>.8569</td>
<td>-0.0037</td>
<td>.0347</td>
<td>-0.4173</td>
<td>.0033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.6475</td>
<td>-0.0163</td>
<td>.3389</td>
<td>.0376</td>
<td>.6813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>.7768</td>
<td>-0.3277</td>
<td>.1582</td>
<td>.6813</td>
<td>-0.1423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>.6406</td>
<td>.5025</td>
<td>.4254</td>
<td>-1.225</td>
<td>-0.3757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>.8416</td>
<td>.2301</td>
<td>-0.3840</td>
<td>.3008</td>
<td>.0282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With Variables</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.6955</td>
<td>-0.5382</td>
<td>-0.164</td>
<td>-1.383</td>
<td>-0.3067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with Colleagues</td>
<td>.7480</td>
<td>.1506</td>
<td>-0.3768</td>
<td>-0.2709</td>
<td>.3498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Policies</td>
<td>.8234</td>
<td>.2404</td>
<td>.1208</td>
<td>.1923</td>
<td>.1024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>.7999</td>
<td>.2899</td>
<td>.1708</td>
<td>-0.3813</td>
<td>-0.1703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.5947</td>
<td>.0141</td>
<td>.3355</td>
<td>-1.047</td>
<td>.1415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Status</td>
<td>.8541</td>
<td>.0046</td>
<td>.0508</td>
<td>.1071</td>
<td>.1739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>.7168</td>
<td>.0023</td>
<td>.2145</td>
<td>.2844</td>
<td>.2366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Balance</td>
<td>.5962</td>
<td>.3842</td>
<td>.3654</td>
<td>.2031</td>
<td>-0.4277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Function 2, achievement is the primary contributor, with the combination of recognition and work itself as secondary contributors. Among the extrinsic variables, work balance and working conditions were the primary contributors with the inverse of
supervision as the secondary contributor. This can be interpreted such that a professional who has work balance and good working conditions with the absence of supervision issues would have job satisfaction.

Advancement and achievement were the primary contributors with the inverse of responsibility for Function 3. For the extrinsic variables, working conditions and salary were the primary contributors with the inverse of relationships with colleagues lead to job satisfaction. Therefore, professionals in this sample reported if they had good working conditions and salary with bad relationships with colleagues they would still be satisfied as mid-level managers in student affairs. This contradicts Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory in that intrinsic factors lead to job satisfaction and extrinsic factors lead to job dissatisfaction. Among the three functions, combinations of intrinsic and extrinsic factors led to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction for the study’s population.

Table 35 explains the correlations between the intrinsic variables and the canonical variables of the extrinsic variables. These correlations determine to what extent the intrinsic factors capture the extrinsic factors. Table 35 shows that for Function 1, recognition and responsibility are the major contributors, with work itself, achievement and advancement leading to dissatisfaction. While all the extrinsic factors lead to dissatisfaction, institutional policies and job status were the primary contributors. Therefore, a professionals who had low job status and unsupportive institutional polices would be dissatisfied in their positions. This interaction of intrinsic and extrinsic variables also contradicts Herzberg’s Two Factory theory.

Function 2 indicates that achievement with recognition and work itself lead to satisfaction while the inverse of supervision with a small contribution of the other factors
lead to satisfaction. So a mid-level manager who has a bad supervisor or the absence of supervision would be dissatisfied in their position.

Table 35
_Correlations Between the Intrinsic Variables and the Canonical Variables with the Extrinsic Variables_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Between Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>.7349</td>
<td>-.0762</td>
<td>.0079</td>
<td>-.0625</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.5553</td>
<td>-.0041</td>
<td>.0775</td>
<td>-.0056</td>
<td>.0603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>.6679</td>
<td>-.0831</td>
<td>.0362</td>
<td>.0736</td>
<td>-.0126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>.5493</td>
<td>.1274</td>
<td>.0973</td>
<td>-.0184</td>
<td>-.0333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>.7217</td>
<td>.0583</td>
<td>-.0878</td>
<td>.0451</td>
<td>-.0025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.5964</td>
<td>-.1364</td>
<td>-.0037</td>
<td>-.0207</td>
<td>-.0271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with Colleagues</td>
<td>.6414</td>
<td>.0382</td>
<td>-.0866</td>
<td>-.0406</td>
<td>.0310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Policies</td>
<td>.7062</td>
<td>.0609</td>
<td>.0276</td>
<td>.0288</td>
<td>.0091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>.6860</td>
<td>.0735</td>
<td>.0391</td>
<td>-.0572</td>
<td>-.0151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.5100</td>
<td>.0036</td>
<td>.0767</td>
<td>-.0157</td>
<td>.0125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Status</td>
<td>.7324</td>
<td>.0012</td>
<td>.0116</td>
<td>.0161</td>
<td>.0154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>.6148</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>.0490</td>
<td>.0426</td>
<td>.0209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Balance</td>
<td>.5113</td>
<td>.0974</td>
<td>-.0835</td>
<td>.0304</td>
<td>-.0379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Function 3 illustrates that achievement is the sole primary contributor to job dissatisfaction, while advancement and work itself are secondary contributors to the job dissatisfaction. For the extrinsic variables in Function 3, salary and the inverse of relationships with colleagues and work balance were contributors for this function. This can be interpreted such that a mid-level manager with bad working conditions and relationships with colleagues but a good salary being satisfied.

A note that needs to be made with this canonical analysis is that in this model, Function 1 explains approximately 73% of the shared variance, while Functions 2 and 3 of the model explain six and five percent respectively. Thus, it is suggested that model 3 was not stable in determining the shared variance although statistically significant. Since Function 1 explains approximately 73% of the shared variance and Functions 2 and 3
explained low amounts, the overall model was not strong in separating all variance among the factors. This could be due to overlapping of questions in the survey instrument.

Summary

This study measured the job satisfaction of mid-level managers in student affairs. The sample used was closely representative of the national data provided by ACPA. The primary difference in this sample was the number of professionals employed in TRIO and other educational opportunity programs. The sample had been employed in the student affairs field approximately five years and was in their current position for at least two years.

During this study, the M-MJSIDS was measured for reliability and it was found be strongly reliable and consistent with the studies (Osueke, 1997; Anuna, 1997) from which was adapted. However, three questions were removed to increase the level of reliability. Further analysis of the data found that there were combinations of intrinsic and extrinsic factors that formed cluster grouping among the variables. Canonical correlation analysis determined that combinations of intrinsic and extrinsic variables influenced both job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. While this was not consistent with Herzberg’s studies (1966), it does support Bailey’s (1997) notion that Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory did not have occupational generality to mid-level managers in student affairs and Blank’s (1993) assertion that Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory was applicable to the job satisfaction of student affairs professionals in Wyoming and Colorado.

Research question one asked to what extent were mid-level managers satisfied with their positions. Based on the survey data, there were mildly satisfied (M = 4.37, SD
Although, some levels of dissatisfaction were reported among the study’s participants. Question two asked to what extent were demographic variables related to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. It was found that among all the variables, age and race were significant for job satisfaction. Further investigation presented that professional between 51 and 60 years of age, with African Americans specifically impacted job satisfaction. For job dissatisfaction, no demographic variables impacted this relationship. The third research question was the extent that job satisfaction was related to intrinsic factors, it was found to be moderately significant. Question four in relation to the extent the job dissatisfaction was related to extrinsic factors was found to be strongly significant.

The remaining research question about the extent that mid-level managers intended to leave their positions and what factors led to that decision was answered in a four part process. The first part this process examined the intrinsic factors that led to intent to leave. Using a simple regression model with the intrinsic variables (advancement, work itself, achievement, and responsibility) as the dependent variables and intent to leave as the dependent variable, it was found that only advancement and the work itself were significant. Part two, was similar to part one, in that it used the extrinsic variables (supervision, relationships with colleagues, salary, job security, and work balance) as the independent variables with intent to leave as the dependent variable. It was found that only job security and work balance were significant in this model.

Part three involved a similar process with the demographic variables. ANOVAs were then conducted for each demographic variable. The results of the ANOVA procedure demonstrated that age and race were the only variables that proved significant.
Then post hoc analyses were conducted for age and race and it found that African Americans and those participants above 51 (51-60, above 61) were significant. Finally, part four was to conduct a regression procedure that used the significant intrinsic variables, extrinsic and all the dummy variables. Thus, the final model had advancement, work itself, job security, work balance with all the dummy variables for age and race as the independent variables with intent to leave as the dependent variable. This linear model accounted for 30% of the variance for intent to leave. Advancement, work itself, job security, African American dummy variable, and the 51-60 and above 61 age dummy variables were significant. All variables expect African American dummy variable had negative coefficients. This means that participants in the study above 51 years of age were less likely to leave their positions. For advancement, work itself if intent to leave would increase if these conditions decreased. For job security, intent to leave would decrease if job security increased.

In conclusion, Herzberg (1966) reported that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction should be measured on two separate continua. The data from this study reports that mid-level managers in student affairs are satisfied with their positions. Achievement and work itself are the factors that most influence this satisfaction. However, the sample also reported some factors that led to dissatisfaction such as salary, job status and work balance. Further analysis of the M-LMJSJDS and its data discovered that a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic factors better explained the job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction and intent to leave. While this finding is not directly consistent with Herzberg’s findings, there are studies that support this assertion (Bailey, 1997; Blank, 1993). Therefore, Herzberg’s Two-Factor theory is a good model to determine job
satisfaction, and job dissatisfaction, the population used for this study is not a complete fit for his theory.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the job satisfaction and job
dissatisfaction of mid-level managers in student affairs administration. The focus of this
chapter is to discuss the results of the study. I made the choice to study mid-level
managers based on my own experiences as a mid-level manager in student affairs and the
questions that arose from my own self-reflection and discussions with colleagues. This
study was the first to measure the job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction, and attrition of
mid-level managers in student affairs across functional areas. The format of this chapter
includes the following: (a) review of the effects of the demographic variables in the
study, (b) an overview of the study’s findings, (c) an examination intent to leave, (d)
differences from Herzberg’s findings, (e) revision of Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory, (f)
implications of use of Herzberg’s Theory in job satisfaction, (g) implications of the
study’s findings, and (h) recommendations for future research.

Effects of Demographic Variables within the Study

Demographics were used to describe to the study’s population and also used in
the regression analysis for the attrition of mid-level managers.

Age

The mean age of the sample was 40 years of age, as expected, but ranged from 21
to over 60. Job satisfaction increased as the participants got older. This finding was
similar to the findings of Brush, Moch, and Pooyan, 1987; Clark, Oswald, and Warr,
1996; Siu, Lu, and Cooper, 1999; and Wright and Hamilton 1978. Stronger job
satisfaction scores were shown for participants above 51 years of age (51-60, above 61).
In addition, the highest intent to leave the mid-level manager position was found by those professionals who were less than 35 years of age, which was also supported by Kisner, (1991) and Ward (1995).

**Race**

Racially, the sample had a large representation of Caucasian professionals (74%), as expected. When further analysis was completed, it was found that African Americans and Hispanic/Latinos were less satisfied with their positions, and African Africans were most likely to attrite from the mid-level manager position. This was also supported by the studies conducted by Brush et al. (1987) and Greenhaus et al (1990). However, this study differed from a recent study by Somers and Birnbaum (2001), in which they found no difference between African Americans and white employees when they controlled for type of work.

**Gender**

Men in this study were slightly more satisfied with their roles as mid-level managers in student affairs than women. Further, female study participants were more likely to agree with the statement, “I would make an effort to look for another position elsewhere (institution) during the next academic year.” This is the inverse from Blackhurst, Brandt, Kalinowski (1998), who found that women were satisfied with their positions in student affairs. Gender differences also come into play with certain aspects of the position, such as pay (Okpara, Squillance, & Erond, 2005), and expectations from colleagues (Brush, Moch & Pooyan, 1987; Witt & Nye, 1992).
Educational Level

The study showed that as participants’ educational level increased, job satisfaction also increased. A note about this applies to those professionals with the Specialists and others degrees. This was supported by Schonwetter’s (1975) findings that female administrators with the Ph.D. were most satisfied. Lee and Wilbur (1985) supported this notion. For attrition, as the education level of the participants increased, attrition decreased. Information for job satisfaction and attrition for men by educational level was limited in the general job satisfaction literature.

Carnegie Classification

For each Carnegie classification level, between degree granting level, job satisfaction decreased. The highest degree of job satisfaction was for mid-level managers employed at Baccalaureate degree granting institutions. This was followed by those at Doctoral Research Extensive. For attrition, a different pattern existed. Professionals employed at Doctoral Research Intensive institutions were more likely to attrite from their position than those employed at Doctoral Research Extensive institutions. This was supported by Volkwein and Parmley’s study (2000) that mentioned Carnegie classification as a variable in measuring the job satisfaction of administrators at public and private institutions.

Overview of the Study’s Significant Findings

A representative sample of mid-level managers in student affairs was used for this study. Percentages of participants across demographic and functional areas were within ten percent of the national population except for those employed in residence life and TRIO and other educational opportunity programs. Those percentage differences were
19 and 22 respectively. The study’s sample had more professionals in these two functional areas.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction was defined as the degree to which a professional was happy with his or her position. The combination of intrinsic variables (advancement, recognition, work itself, achievement, and responsibility) was used to measure job satisfaction. According to the scale used to determine job satisfaction (job satisfaction score > 3.5), eighty three percent (n = 375) of the mid-level managers in the study were satisfied. This held across all functional area domains (enrollment management, co-curricular, health education and promotion, learning assistance, and student development). This finding is consistent with prior studies, which found that faculty (Osueke, 1991) and deans (Anuna, 1997) were satisfied with their positions.

Among the functional area domains, a ranking of the satisfaction levels was as follows: enrollment management, health education and promotion, learning assistance, co-curricular, and student development. While each domain area rated the intrinsic variables differently, it was consistent across all the domains that work itself was the highest rated intrinsic variable. Therefore, the participants in the study identified work itself as the most salient factor in their job satisfaction.

The open ended responses demonstrated that the intrinsic variables were connected to the relationships that the participants had with their colleagues (supervisors, co-workers, faculty and students). While relationships with colleagues is an extrinsic factor, the comments received mentioned how the relationship with the respondent’s supervisor impacted these factors. One participant said, “I really appreciate my direct
supervisor...” Positions having demanding and varied responsibilities were also
satisfying for survey respondents. Another respondent shared, “It is not about title to me,
it is about what I do. I am well compensated and have been given huge areas of
responsibility and frequently complete special assignments.” The statistical analysis, as
well as the open-ended comments offered by participants, support that the extent of job
satisfaction (or lack thereof) of mid-level managers in student affairs is strongly related to
Herzberg’s intrinsic factors (advancement, recognition, work itself, achievement, and
responsibility). In particular, the work itself and the responsibility participants felt
contributed to job satisfaction.

Job Dissatisfaction

Job dissatisfaction was described as the level or extent to which a participant did
not like his or her position. Extrinsic factors were used to determine the level of job
dissatisfaction. The variables used to create the extrinsic factor category were:
supervision, relationships with colleagues, institutional policies, working conditions,
salary, job status, job security, and work balance. Across the functional area domains,
supervision was the variable that scored the lowest and led to the most job dissatisfaction.
Salary and working conditions followed. The scale used to determine job satisfaction
was also used to determine job dissatisfaction (job satisfaction score < 3.5). This was
consistent across functional area domains. The lowest mean score by variable and domain
was salary for the student development domain. The other variables in the extrinsic factor
all scored as if they were factors that led to job satisfaction (> 3.5). Seventeen percent (n
= 59) reported dissatisfaction with their positions as mid-level managers.
The open-ended comments indicated that supervision, relationships with colleagues, and work balance were the variables that lead to job dissatisfaction. Those participants who did report dissatisfaction reported frustration with supervision received. A participant commented:

There have been numerous unethical actions taken by supervisors/upper administrators that have created tension among certain staff members; therefore increase low employee morale. I have not been empowered in my position to make critical decisions and have not been given clear directions as to how my position fits into the overall mission of the Division. My direct supervisor has not handled conflict very well and, in most cases, avoids it, which has led to many problems in our division.

Another said, “…Negatives--lack of support from my supervisor; working with a few colleagues that do not carry their weight or do not treat their students and other co-workers with the respect that they deserve.” For these respondents, relationships with colleagues and disparities that exist among colleagues lead to their job dissatisfaction. Therefore, the extent of job dissatisfaction (or lack thereof) of mid-level managers in student affairs is strongly related to Herzberg’s extrinsic factors (supervision, relationships with colleagues, institutional policies, working conditions, salary, job status, job security, and work balance).

Intent to Leave

Overall, 26% of the sample (n = 126) reported they agreed or strongly agreed with the question, “I will look for a new position in the next academic year.” Examination of the factors that predicted intent to leave for the study’s sample was therefore supported. The regression analysis indicated that African Americans, younger professionals (under 40) and those employed in TRIO and other educational programs specifically were more likely to consider leaving the student affairs field. The open-ended comments indicate
that salary, personal reasons, and unresolved issues are the common themes among mid-level managers considering leaving their positions. While unresolved issues most often related to supervision, personal reasons ranged from family relationships, to values that have become inconsistent with the goals of the institution. Therefore, the question regarding to what extent mid-level managers in student affairs are likely to leave their positions can be answered in general “not likely.” However, those who reported intent to leave had specific issues that should be further explored. In addition, the experiences of African American mid-level managers warrant further exploration, since this group was significantly more likely to consider leaving than their White colleagues. Since this group of professionals is also more likely to be employed in TRIO and other educational support programs, it is not entirely clear from this study whether the demographic characteristic or the functional area contributes to intent to leave.

Differences from Herzberg’s Findings

This study found differences from Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory. Herzberg (1966) posited that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction should be measured on two separate continua (Herzberg, 1966). Next, satisfiers or “motivators” were more likely to increase satisfaction, whereas, dissatisfiers or “hygienes” lead to dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1966). Finally, motivators were the factors involved in doing the job; hygienes were factors that define the context of the job (Herzberg, 1959).

While this study supported the Motivation-Hygiene Theory in part, there were also results that did not support the theory. The study supported the theory in that all the intrinsic factors of advancement, recognition, work itself, achievement, and responsibility did lead to job satisfaction. The part that was not supported by Herzberg’s Two Factor
theory was that the extrinsic factors (supervision, relationships with colleagues, institutional policies, working conditions, salary, job status, job security, and work balance) exclusively lead to job dissatisfaction. The nature of the mid-level manager position in student affairs is highly relationship orientated, and factors such as supervision and relationships with colleagues are essential to the career success of these individuals. It therefore makes sense that these factors would also contribute to their job satisfaction. The open ended comments demonstrated that combinations of intrinsic and extrinsic factors led to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. To determine the extent this was supported, I conducted canonical correlations and found that 85 percent of the variance for job satisfaction was explained by the two variable sets. This analysis elicited three significant functions. Function 1, which explained over 74 percent of the variance, indicated that job satisfaction was the result of all the intrinsic variables and the addition of institutional policies and job status, two extrinsic variables. Thus, professionals who had high amounts of recognition and responsibility with advancement, who enjoyed work itself, achievement along with a high level of job status, supportive institutional policies and good working conditions, would have job satisfaction. Function 2 reported that professionals with a high level of achievement who enjoyed the work itself, received recognition, and reported good working conditions and work balance, but who reported bad supervision would also still be satisfied in their positions. To interpret this is to say that a professional who has work balance and good working conditions with the absence of quality supervision issues would have job satisfaction provided that there was high level of achievement with a moderate amount of recognition and the professional enjoyed the work he or she did. This function accounted for five percent of the variance.
Finally, Function 3, which explained only four percent of the variance, indicated that professionals with a high level of work balance and good working conditions with the absence of supervision issues would have job satisfaction provided the mid-level manager had achievement and advancement opportunities. A participant said, “I really enjoy my colleagues in my office and my work with students. I wish I could be paid more... I do feel that I am valued by my supervisor.” Another respondent said, “My job, as outlined in a job description, is very rewarding and satisfying, however it is the red tape, politics, and other issues dealing with the campus culture that make the job stressful.” These conditions are challenging for participants in this study the implications are even more challenging.

Revision of Herzberg’s Two Factor Model

Based on the study’s findings, intrinsic factors did not exclusively lead to job satisfaction and extrinsic factors did not exclusively lead to job dissatisfaction for mid-level managers in student affairs. This study found that combination of intrinsic and extrinsic factors led to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction for the study’s sample. These findings were supported by Bailey (1997) and Blank (1993) in their work which also examined the job satisfaction of student affairs professionals and Colorado and Wyoming and chief housing officer respectively using Herzberg’s Two Factory Theory as a theoretical framework. Resultant of this study’s findings, I suggest that Herzberg’s Model be revised to fit the work context of administrators in student affairs, which is quite different than the accountants and engineers used in his work from 1957-1966.

The cluster analysis (Figure 2) shows that combinations of intrinsic and extrinsic factors work in tandem to lead to the overall job satisfaction for mid-level managers in
student affairs employed at four-year institutions. The first cluster showed that work itself, responsibility, relationships with colleagues, job security, work balance and supervision lead to the highest percentage (74) of job satisfaction within the two sets. Supported by the canonical correlations and open-ended comments, this combination of intrinsic and extrinsic variables shows that work context of mid-level managers in student affairs is highly collegial, which was stated earlier, and supervision does influence the work itself for this sample of administrators. The second cluster shows us that working conditions, job status, institutional policies, recognition, and achievement work as a group that leads to job satisfaction. While this combination explained approximately five percent of the variance in job satisfaction, it tells that work environment does influence achievement and job satisfaction for some of this study’s sample. The last combination indicates that advancement and salary leads to job satisfaction. Although this combination explained four percent of the variance, it tells us that salary does influence advancement for some mid-level managers in student affairs administration.

In addition to the combination of intrinsic and extrinsic variables, demographic variables such as race and age should also be placed in this model because they were found significant in predicating job satisfaction and intent to leave for the study’s sample. The study showed that participants over the age of 50 were satisfied and less likely to leave their positions. This is also related to the tenure mid-level managers have in their positions. While this was not significant, it does demonstrate that the longer a person in their position, the more satisfied they become.
Implication for Use of Herzberg’s Theory in Job Satisfaction

To apply Herzberg’s Two-Factor theory to real-world practice for mid-level managers in student affairs, I will address these issues based on the combinations and intrinsic and extrinsic variables from the cluster analysis produced from the study.

Cluster 1

The combination of intrinsic and extrinsic factor explained over 75% of variance between the two variable sets. The following paragraphs are practical ways CSAOs can address job satisfaction based on the open-ended comments provided from study participants.

Work itself. Most important to mid-level managers is that the work they are doing is important and that their tasks are meaningful. Stories of success about how mid-level managers’ actions made a real difference to the division or made a process better. The process of work is made more resonant with mid-level managers when they are made to feel by the CSAO that their actions made a significant difference to the division. When CSAOs praise meaningful tasks that may have become ordinary, such as the development of student programs, mid-level managers are made to feel as valued members of the student affairs division. An effective CSAO should show the mid-level manager how these seemingly mundane tasks are important to the overall management of the division/institution and help the division succeed.

Responsibility. Mid-level managers will be more motivated to do their work well if they feel a sense of ownership of the work and its results. When mid-level managers grow in their expertise, CSAOs can provide opportunities for added responsibility. CSAOs should ensure that they are not simply adding more work, rather CSAOs and
supervisors of mid-level should discover ways to add challenging and meaningful work, perhaps giving the mid-level manager greater freedom and authority as well.

*Relationships with colleagues.* The mid-level manager position is highly relational, thus, mid-level managers need to have a fair amount of time for socialization. This serves two purposes: (a) networking, and (b) building relationships. These relationships will assist mid-level managers in creating a sense of camaraderie and teamwork. Since mid-level managers are highly collegial in their work, organizational dynamics and strategies for improving relationships need to be addressed from a divisional perspective to achieve both the goals of the institution and afford the mid-level manager the ability to be effective in the position.

*Job security.* No person is completely secure in his or her position, due to shrinking budgets and changing contexts in universities. That said, mid-level managers need to know where both they as professionals and their departments they stand in regards to importance in the organization. Ensuring their importance and providing the necessary assistance if positions are lost is the best way to address this issue.

*Work balance.* Work balance is important because mid-level managers play a variety of roles professionally and personally. CSAOs can work within their institutions to provide perks such as time off, flexible schedules and telecommuting options if available. Issues such as family and other relationships are important, and attention must be given to them to help mid-level managers balance their multiple roles.
Cluster 2

This combination of variables explained approximately five percent of the variance in job satisfaction. However, it does also show a combination of variables that also lead to the satisfaction of mid-level managers in this study.

Supervision. To decrease dissatisfaction in supervision, CSAOs need to make wise decisions when hiring mid-level managers with supervisory responsibility in their divisions. It is important to note that good employees do not always make good supervisors. The role of supervisor is extremely challenging as it involves the use of leadership skills and the ability to treat all employees fairly. Mid-level manager supervisors need to be taught to use positive feedback when possible and to establish fair procedures for employee evaluation and feedback. The supervisory relationship between the CSAO and the mid-level manager needs to become one that is more goal oriented and reflects a mutually agreed performance appraisal of the mid-level manager. Open discussion of professional development opportunities and organizational politics as it relates to the mid-level manager's position also need be a part of this relationship.

Working conditions. Mid-level managers take pride in the environment in which they work with their staffs. Keeping equipment and facilities up to date assists this sense of pride. Efforts such as providing new office furniture can make a huge difference to a mid-level manager's psyche. Also, when possible, it is important to avoid overcrowding by allowing mid-level managers to have offices where they have their own personal space. Placing mid-level managers in close quarters with little or no personal space increases the possibility of creating tensions between staff that lead to dissatisfaction and attrition.
Job status. While the mid-level manager is not the most important position in the academy, the role function does provide a valuable service to the institution. Recognition for mid-level managers' work needs to be a priority to the division/institution. CSAOs, in communication can refer to the contributions of their mid-level managers when speaking with their colleagues so that respect for the mid-level is created.

Institutional policies. A student affairs division can be a great source of frustration for mid-level managers if the policies are unclear, not necessary or if not everyone is required to follow them. Dissatisfaction can be decreased by making sure the institution's policies are just and applied equally to all employees in the division/institution. Printed copies of the division's policies and procedure manual must be made available and easily accessible to all members of their staff.

If this document does not exist, one must be created, with input from the mid-level managers during the process. If the division already has a manual, consider updating it. The CASO might also compare the institution’s policies with benchmark institutions evaluate themselves whether particular policies are unreasonable or whether some consequences are too harsh.

Recognition. Mid-level managers want to be recognized for their achievements. When CSAOs see their mid-level managers doing something well they should, take the time to acknowledge their good work immediately, publicly thank them for handling a situation effectively. The CASO or the institution may even want to establish a formal recognition program, such as "employee of the month." or give them a bonus, if resources are available.
Achievement. One idea essential in Herzberg’s theory is that most individuals sincerely want to do a good job. In order to assist them, the CSAO should place them in positions that utilize the full scope of their talents and are not set up for failure. Therefore, clear, achievable goals and standards for each position need to be established. In addition, employees need to know what those goals and standards are. Mid-level managers should receive regular, timely feedback on how they are doing and should feel they are being adequately challenged in their positions. It is important to note that CSAOs should not to overload mid-level managers with challenges that are too difficult or impossible, as that can be frustrating.

Cluster 3

The intrinsic and extrinsic variable combination in Cluster 3 explains approximately four percent of the variance between the variable sets. However, it is the set that appears most common in examining job dissatisfaction for mid-level managers in student affairs administration.

Salary. Salary is not a major motivator for mid-level managers, but mid-level managers in student affairs do want to be compensated fairly. If individuals perceive they are not compensated well, they will not be happy in their positions. CSAOs can consult salary surveys to determine whether the salaries and benefit packages that their institutions offer are comparable to those with benchmarking or similar institutions. In addition, CSAOs should make sure that policies are clear policies related to salaries, raises and bonuses.

Advancement. Loyalty and performance should be rewarded with advancement when possible. If positions are not open to promote a valuable mid-level manager,
CSAOs can consider giving their mid-level managers new titles that reflect the increased level of work the mid-level manager has achieved. This is what Herzberg (1987) calls job enrichment. When feasible, support mid-level managers by allowing them to pursue further education, which will make them more valuable to the division and more fulfilled professionally.

Implications of the Study's Findings

So, what does all this mean? This study can be used for a number of purposes in student affairs. Due to the research on mid-level managers in student affairs increases, this study can be used to mark job satisfaction in the new millennium. It should be a catalyst to ACPA and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and other student affairs organizations develop programs to increase the number of mid-level managers in student affairs. This study should be used a guide to determine which areas of the mid-level manager position need attention to improve the work performance of those mid-level managers who come behind the current generation of mid-level managers in student affairs.

This study should also be cause for concern. Study participants clearly indicated that relationships with colleagues were a factor that led to job dissatisfaction and politics was a part of that relationship. Relationships among senior-level administration, and between them and their subordinates, need to be addressed to decrease the level of attrition among mid-level managers in student affairs. Next, all functional area under the student affairs should be embraced. While there was no representation in some of the functional areas due to the data collection procedure, their voices should be heard. In addition to the professionals who work on the periphery of the student affairs
organization (i.e. professionals who work with TRIO and other educational opportunity programs). These professionals add a breadth and depth of experience and knowledge about students that needs to be acknowledged by the student affairs organization. Since funding has become an area of concern, the goal of assisting students to graduation is paramount. Finally, as professionals are leaving the field there are a number of questions for us who chose to remain in the student affairs field. Questions such as how can we recoup from these losses? What can we do to make sure that others do not leave the field? And, what can we do as a profession to improve our own satisfaction and decrease the intent to leave among us?

**Further Research**

Because this study focused on mid-level managers in student affairs administration at four year institutions, there were a number of limitations associated with the results. The small percentage of African Americans in the study made interpreting their experiences difficult. Organizational politics emerged as an important factor, both in quantitative findings and open-ended comments, but was not well defined. Relationships with supervisors also emerged as an important finding but needs further definition and exploration. Professionals at two-year or community colleges were not a part of the sample for comparison. Likewise, mid-level managers from professional schools (e.g. law, dentistry, medicine, art, and nursing) were excluded from the sample. Finally, some of questions in the instrument overlapped for this study population in ways they did not for other populations (Anuna, 1997; Osueke, 1991). To address these and other concerns while conducting this study, I offer the following recommendations for further study.
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First, the impact of race on the mid-level manager position should be measured. The demographic information from the study elicited that African Americans reported the highest level of dissatisfaction and intent to leave the mid-level manager position. Higher education has a commitment to diversity, and maintaining and supporting professionals of color is a part of that commitment. Understanding the experiences of African American professionals in student affairs across all functional areas is critical to fostering a diverse educational community. Factors that lead to the attrition beyond intrinsic and extrinsic factors need to be a part of this investigation.

Second, as mentioned earlier, the political nature of the student affairs organization related to mid-level manager position needs to be investigated. Since a number of professionals in this study mentioned that organizational politics lead to job dissatisfaction, a study that inquired about the impact of politics among mid-level managers is warranted. Roper (2002) asserted that relationships are important to all student affairs professionals and Amey (1998) posited that organizational politics are important. This concept, then, needs to be examined to determine the impact of organizational politics on mid-level managers. An open ended comment supports this notion, “The institution where I am employed has experienced changes at the Vice President's level for the past year which account for the majority of the dissatisfaction that I am experiencing. ...Our leadership is weak and micromanages. With the changes at the Vice President's level there is a lack of emphasis on student development and much power brokering and politics.”

Third, the supervisory practices of senior-level administrators and their impact on mid-level managers need to be studied. Several comments from the open ended section of
the M-LMJSJDS mentioned supervision as a primary factor of dissatisfaction. A replication of Tull’s (2004) work with mid-level managers may show that synergetic supervision will lead to job satisfaction mid-level managers. In addition to this, an assessment of the rationale for attrition of professionals at the mid-level manager level should also be investigated with above mentioned supervision study. Since professionals who reach mid-level manager status have been employed in the field for more than five years, what factors lead to the decision for these professionals to leave the field?

Fourth, a study should be conducted examining the job satisfaction of mid-level managers in student affairs employed at community colleges, proprietary, and technical schools. This study only examined professional at four-year institutions. Student affairs mid-level managers employed at community colleges, professional and technical schools should also be examined to determine if their satisfaction differs from those employed at four-year institutions and what factors lead to those differences.

Fifth, this study should be replicated in five years to determine whether the study’s findings still hold or if other factors lead to the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of mid-level managers in student affairs. If the factors that lead to job satisfaction for the mid-level manager have changed, then we need to know what is needed for mid-level managers to be successful in their positions and the impact of those factors.

Finally, the questions on the M-LMJSJDS should be revised to address the potential overlapping of questions in its original design. The factors in the Herzberg’s intrinsic and extrinsic variables had elements that were common among variables. Questions should be rephrased to ensure that variables address what it intends to address.
Many of the recommendations for further study involve areas of the data that could not be interpreted as deeply as needed. The combination of intrinsic and extrinsic factors was supported by the canonical correlations and open ended comments provided by the survey’s participants. Additional studies on the impact of synergetic supervision and impact of organizational politics is also warranted because participants commented that supervision, politics, and the bureaucracy of higher prevent the participants from working with students. Finally, a study on race and job satisfaction is called for because the African American participants in the study reported the highest level of dissatisfaction and intent to leave. This needs to be measured due to its inconsistency with higher education’s commitment to diversity. The next section discusses the practical implications of this study.

Summary

This study was a quantitative analysis of the job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction and attrition of mid-level managers in student affairs administration employed at four-year colleges and universities. The study found that: (a) mid-level managers in student affairs administration are satisfied with their positions; (b) demographic variables such as age, gender, functional area, institutional type, educational level, career tenure, and tenure in a mid-level manager’s current position accounted for only a small percent of the variance in job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction of mid-level managers in student affairs (2.2%); (c) job satisfaction related to Herzberg’s intrinsic factors (advancement, recognition, work itself, achievement, and responsibility) was moderately significant; (d) job dissatisfaction related to Herzberg’s extrinsic factors (supervision, relationships with colleagues, institutional policies, working conditions, salary, job status, job security and
work balance) was also moderately significant; and (e) a small percentage (26%) of mid-
level managers in student affairs were considering leaving their positions within the next
12 months. The factors that related to intent to leave were advancement, work itself, job
security, work balance, age and race. Once age and race were further explored, it was
found that younger mid-level managers (21-30) were most likely to attrite from their
positions and African American Americans were the ethnic groups most likely to attrite
from their positions.

The open-ended responses in the survey indicated that job satisfaction, job
dissatisfaction, and attrition were influenced by a combination of complex factors related
to Herzberg’s intrinsic and extrinsic factors used in this study. Responses indicated that
job satisfaction was most related to challenging work or levels of responsibility.
Relationships with colleagues, especially supervisors, were the leading cause of job
dissatisfaction. Supervision and work balance were also related to attrition of the mid-
level managers who participated in this study. Further analysis indicated that as
participants got older, thoughts of attrition deceased. While other factors may exist in the
current state of higher education, these themes were present in the data.

Conclusion

Mid-level managers in student affairs administration are satisfied in their
positions as this study indicates. While there are many factors that lead to job
dissatisfaction and job satisfaction, this study concludes that combinations of both
intrinsic and extrinsic factors lead to it. Since the mid-level manager position in student
affairs is complex, job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are also complex. From my
perspective, I feel that job satisfaction is a question that will never change and be
impacted by factors related to the position as well as personal factors. When professionals move into different positions, reasons for job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction, and intent to leave will also change. This was supported by the open-ended comments in the survey. The question then becomes at what level are we willing to leave our organizations for factors that were influenced by job dissatisfaction? For participants in this study, it was a combination of salary and supervision. For me, I am not sure I will leave.
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APPENDIX A
Personal Reflection of My Experiences as a Mid-Level Manager
Personal Reflection of My Experiences as a Mid-Level Manager

As I think back to my own career and job satisfaction, I too was frustrated in my role as a mid-level manager. I found that the role was very challenging because I reported to multiple supervisors and stakeholders, and numerous, often undefined, responsibilities.

In two previous positions, the Assistant Director of Student Activities at Edinboro University of Pennsylvania and the Director of Campus Life at Aquinas College, I reported to the Dean of Student Development; however, I answered to, students, and community members. It seemed that any personal interaction with stakeholders undoubtedly led to the assignment or acceptance of additional tasks, joining another committee, and an increase in the number of projects to complete. Moreover, I had multiple budgetary, supervisory, and programmatic responsibilities. The challenges of these responsibilities included managing several multi-line budgets, and also collaborating with colleagues to implement programs with limited resources. In supervising entry-level and seasoned professionals at the same time, I monitored work projects and provide enough support to encourage my staff, while granting them autonomy. I provided mediation services to colleagues as conflicts arose with professionals and their job responsibilities. As a supervisor, I often served as an advocate for members of my staff. As in any management position, there was the expectation to help my direct reports develop professionally through professional development activities that included, but not limited to, weekly meetings, retreats and conferences, and allowing them to present information to the larger student affairs division.

The functional areas I worked in were student activities, leadership development, multicultural affairs, new student orientation, and Greek life. These functional areas had
many responsibilities, in which I wore different and often conflicting hats. I was, at times, a counselor, an administrator, a mediator, and a parent.

In addition to these conflicting demands, there was also external competition from other institutions of higher education in the region for student enrollment. In order to maintain our student enrollment, we needed to provide out of classroom experiences that students would enjoy, and continue to provide opportunities for leadership development, dialoguing about diversity, and securing resources for these initiatives with community-funding agencies. There were times when I felt these responsibilities were simply too much to handle, but somehow, I continued working. There were times when I was in meetings from 7:30 AM to 11:00 PM with only an occasional break. I would be in transit from one meeting to the next, while a student or a colleague walked with me and asked me two or three questions regarding items that needed my attention. I was expected to respond promptly and accurately, sometimes without notes of previous conversations. It seemed like I was the circus performer spinning eight plates on bamboo shoots making sure that none of the plates fell to the floor. Although I enjoyed my work, it seemed that my job was my life. There was not a healthy balance between quality of my personal life and my professional life; it felt that they were often one in the same.

I enjoyed the impact I had on my campuses as a mid-level manager. I felt satisfied with what was happening in my department and my division. I was content with my career, but I was not happy with my personal life. There were a number of relationships I put “on hold” to cultivate my career. My contentment was challenged when a colleague asked me if I felt a sense of balance, I had to say “no.” I began to question if it was worth it to do everything I was doing. I was not sure. I asked a number of my colleagues in the
field who were mid-level managers if they felt the same way. Many of my colleagues echoed my sentiments. As a result, I began to question whether I was pleased in my role as a mid-level manager in student affairs. I worked hard to get to this level, and felt I was making a difference at the institutions that I worked, and in the lives of students, but I was not satisfied with the imbalances between my personal life and my professional life.

My frustrations with my role as a mid-level manager were not unique to me, I later discovered. In fact, much of the literature on job satisfaction in student affairs revealed that many of my colleagues suffered from the same overloaded schedules and little recognition for the multiple roles we filled.
July 25, 2005

Dr. Melford Anuna
Adjunct Professor
University of Houston Downtown
One Main Street
Houston, TX 77002

Per your e-mail request to me on July 25, 2005, I am writing to formally request your permission to use the Administrator Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction Instrument you developed for your dissertation.

My study, "An Examination of Job Satisfaction of Mid-Level Managers in Student Affairs Administration at Four Year Colleges and Universities" will be a national study focused on the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction of 4-year college and university administrators and will use members of the American College Personnel Association who identify as mid-level managers. My goal is to conduct the survey in the fall of 2005.

In addition if you could provide any background information on the study, including reliability, validity, and factor analyses it would be appreciated. I would be more than willing to share my findings with you for allowing me to use your instrument. I am supplying two letters for your use. If you could send the second letter back with your signature allowing me to use the instrument, it would also be appreciated.

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today. I look forward to receiving your written response to my written request. Please send the reply at your earliest convenience to the following address:

Jessie Grant
2000 Goldsworth Valley # U2
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-1051

I can be reached by phone (work: 269-387-1725; home 269-387-5421; cell: 616-706-4512) or email jessie.grant@wmich.edu.

I will keep you apprised of my progress.

Sincerely,

Jessie L. Grant
Jessie L. Grant, Ph.D. Candidate
Western Michigan University
APPENDIX C
Approval to Use the AJSJDI
Dr. Melford Anuna  
10124 Weatherstone  
Houston, TX 77042  
November 13, 2005

Mr. Jessie Grant  
2000 Goldsworth Valley U2  
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-1051

Dear Jessie:

This letter is to advise you have permission to use the Administrator Job Satisfaction Job Dissatisfaction Instrument (AJSJDI) by Melford Anuna (1997) for purposes of your dissertation research at Western Michigan University. I understand that you will adapt the instrument to collect data in the Fall 2005.

I would appreciate receiving a copy of the results and interpretation used in your dissertation when available I wish you the best as you proceed with your study.

Sincerely,

Melford Anuna, Ed.D.  
University of Houston-Downtown
APPENDIX D
Pilot Study Cover Letter
Participation Request for Pilot Study

May 25, 2005

Dear Colleague:

I am in need of your help. I am piloting my survey instrument for my dissertation. It is attached. I was wondering if you could take a few minutes and complete it. Since I am looking to put it on line and send it to respondents via e-mail, I would appreciate it if you could bold your responses and send it back to me. Also, if you could provide any candid feedback about questions, wording, order, I would really appreciate it.

Sincerely,

Jessie L Grant

Jessie Grant, Ph.D. Candidate
Western Michigan University
APPENDIX E
Demographics Sheet of Pilot Study
SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHICS

1. GENDER (Please check one)
   - Male
   - Female

2. ETHNIC BACKGROUND
   - African American
   - Asian/Pacific Islanders
   - Caucasian
   - Hispanic/Latino
   - Multiracial
   - Native American
   - Other: Please list: ____________________________

3. What is your age? ____________________________

4. What is the highest degree you have obtained?
   - Bachelor's degree or equivalent
   - Master's degree or equivalent
   - Specialist degree
   - Juris Doctorate (JD, LLM)
   - Doctorate (Ed.D or Ph.D.)

5. Are you currently pursuing a degree?
   - Yes (please specify) __________
   - No

SECTION II: EMPLOYMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

6. What is the major functional area of responsibility of your current position? (please check one)
   - Academic Advising
   - Admissions
   - Alcohol and other Drug Programs
   - Campus Information and Visitation Services
   - Career Planning/Placement
   - Counseling
   - Distance Education (Educational Services for the Distance Learner)
   - Disability
   - Financial Aid
   - Greek Affairs (Fraternity or Sorority Life)
6. What is your current position? _____________________

7. How many full-time professionals do you directly supervise?
   i. Professional staff: __________
   ii. Graduate students (GA): __________
   iii. Paraprofessional staff members (students): __________

8. How many full-time students are enrolled at your institution (as of Spring 2005)?
   o Under 2,999
   o 3,000-5,400
   o 5,500-9,999
   o 10,000-14,999
   o 15,000-20,000
   o over 20,000

9. What is your institutional type?
   o Private
   o Public

10. How many years have you been employed in your current position?
    ___________________

11. How many years have you been employed in full-time student affairs positions?
    ________
There are 45 statements about being a mid-level managers in student affairs. Each statement asks for two responses. The first asks for disagreement or agreement relating to the statement and the second response asks for the degree of dissatisfaction or satisfaction with your work situation.

Please circle (check) your response on the scales to the left and to the right of each statement. If you disagree with the statement circle/check "D" or "A" to the left. Indicate you level of dissatisfaction or satisfaction by circling/checking a number to the right of the statement, "1" (very satisfied) though "5" (very satisfied). Please respond to all items.

Check 1 if you are very dissatisfied
Check 2 if you are mildly satisfied
Check 3 if you are mildly satisfied
Check 4 if you are satisfied
Check 5 if you are very satisfied

Disagree  Agree
D A

Example 1  1  2  3  4  5
Parents are interested in education of their children.

Explanation: This individual agrees with the statement (circled/checked "A") and feels satisfied with the level of interest that parents have about their children's education (circled/checked "4").

Or

This individual disagrees with the statement (circled/checked "D") and feels dissatisfied with the level of interest that parents have toward their children's education (circled/checked "1")
Circle 1 if you are very dissatisfied

Circle 2 if you are mildly dissatisfied
Circle 3 if you are mildly satisfied
Circle 4 if you are satisfied
Circle 5 if you very satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th></th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Mildly dissatisfied</th>
<th>Mildly satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A 1.</td>
<td>I am recognized for my</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>accomplishments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A 2.</td>
<td>I have autonomy over my work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A 3.</td>
<td>Promotions are handled fairly.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A 4.</td>
<td>My workload is adequate</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A 5.</td>
<td>My position is influential.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A 6.</td>
<td>My position is secure.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A 7.</td>
<td>My position matches my abilities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A 8.</td>
<td>My responsibilities are well</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>defined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A 9.</td>
<td>My institution makes an effort</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to demonstrate its value of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A 10.</td>
<td>My chances for promotion in the</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>future are good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A 11.</td>
<td>Working on committees is</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rewarding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A 12.</td>
<td>Institutional administrative</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>policies meet my needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A 13.</td>
<td>I am involved in decision-</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Circle 1 if you are very dissatisfied
Circle 2 if you are mildly dissatisfied
Circle 3 if you are mildly satisfied
Circle 4 if you are satisfied
Circle 5 if you very satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Moderately dissatisfied</th>
<th>Moderately satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>14. I am concerned about the physical condition of my work environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>15. My job gives me the opportunity to do various things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>16. Advising students is rewarding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>17. I believe the administration is fair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>18. My office is a good working environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>19. Given a second chance, I would work at my present institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20. The administration is responsive to my needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>21. Student at my institution respect administrators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>22. Administrative procedures and procedures are effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>23. My salary is adequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>24. Compared with others with similar training and in similar positions my salary is adequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25.</td>
<td>My fringe benefits offered by institution are adequate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>26.</td>
<td>My present salary is comparable with my status.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>27.</td>
<td>My supervisor is helpful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td>My supervisor(s) are competent.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>My supervisor(s) act(s) as a mentor for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30.</td>
<td>My supervisor provides support for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>31.</td>
<td>My supervisor supports my development as a mid-level manager.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I am able to share information freely with my supervisor(s).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I feel relaxed with my colleagues.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>34.</td>
<td>My colleagues recognize my accomplishments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I have a good relationship with my colleagues.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Circle 1 if you are very dissatisfied
Circle 2 if you are mildly dissatisfied
Circle 3 if you are mildly satisfied
Circle 4 if you are satisfied
Circle 5 if you very satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Mildly dissatisfied</th>
<th>Mildly satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D A</td>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Good fellowship exists among senior-level and mid-level managers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D A</td>
<td>37.</td>
<td>The people I work are friendly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D A</td>
<td>38.</td>
<td>My present assignments match my personal objectives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D A</td>
<td>39.</td>
<td>My social life is exciting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D A</td>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Release time from work is available to pursue developmental needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D A</td>
<td>41.</td>
<td>My work conflicts with my personal life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D A</td>
<td>42.</td>
<td>My job meets my needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D A</td>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Being a mid-level manager is exciting.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D A</td>
<td>44.</td>
<td>I will encourage entry-level professionals to become mid-level managers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D A</td>
<td>45.</td>
<td>My institution encourages me to be involved with professional associations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: October 12, 2005

To: Andrea Beach, Principal Investigator
    Jesse Grant, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Mary Lagerwey, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number: 05-10-10

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "An Examination of Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Mid-Level Managers in Student Affairs Administration" has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you may only conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: October 12, 2006
Using the Zoomerang Online Survey program, the survey will be laid out in the following fashion.

Thank you for participating in this survey project. Your feedback is important. This survey should take no more than 15 minutes to complete. Your completion and submission of this survey will indicate your consent to use the data.

Demographic Questions:
1. How long have you been employed in full-time student affairs positions?
2. How long have you been employed in your current position?
3. What is your job title?
4. How many full-time professionals do you supervise?
5. Do you have budgetary responsibility?
6. What is the major functional area of responsibility of your current position? Choose from the following list based from Council for the Advancement of Standards (2003).

   Academic Advising
   o Admissions
   o Alcohol and other Drug Programs
   o Campus Information and Visitation Services
   o Career Planning/ Placement
   o Counseling
   o Distance Education (Educational Services for the Distance Learner)
   o Disability (Differently Abled Student Services)
   o Financial Aid
   o Greek Affairs (Fraternity or Sorority Life)
   o Health Services
   o International Student Services
   o Judicial Affairs/Advocacy/Ombudsperson
   o Leadership Development Programs
   o Learning Assistance (Academic Support Services/Developmental Education)
   o Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Student Services
   o Multicultural Affairs (Minority Student Services)
   o New Student Orientation
   o Outcomes Assessment And Program Evaluation Services
   o Recreation/Athletics
   o Registrar's Office
   o Residence Life
   o Religious (Campus Ministry Programs)
   o Student Activities
   o Student Union
   o Study Abroad Programs
   o TRIO and other Educational Opportunity Programs
   o Women's Center
   o Other; Please list: ___________________
7. What is your institutional type?
   o Public
   o Private

8. What is your Carnegie Classification?

Choose from the list based on Carnegie (2000)
   o Doctoral-Research-Extensive
   o Doctoral-Research-Intensive
   o Master's I
   o Master's II
   o Baccalaureate- Liberal Arts
   o Baccalaureate - General
   o Baccalaureate - Associates

Survey Questions

Intrinsic Factors

Advancement
1. I am satisfied with how promotions are handled.
2. I am satisfied with my chances for promotion in the future at my current institution.

Recognition
3. I am satisfied with the recognition I receive for my accomplishments.
4. I am happy with the level of professional recognition I receive from my colleagues.

Work Itself
5. I am satisfied with the autonomy I have over my work procedures.
6. I am satisfied that my job meets my professional needs.
7. I am challenged by my work.
8. I find advising students rewarding.

Comments Box

Achievement
9. I am satisfied with the emphasis of involvement in the profession (professional organizations) as an indicator of professional achievement.
10. I am satisfied with the amount of release time from administrative responsibilities to pursue professional development needs.
11. I am satisfied with opportunities to conduct research on my campus.
12. My institution encourages me to get involved in professional organization.
Responsibility
13. Working to develop entry-level professionals is rewarding.
14. I am satisfied with the variety of tasks that my job enables me to do.
15. My responsibilities are well defined.
16. Students at my institution respect mid-level managers in student affairs.

Comments Box

Extrinsic Factors

Supervision
18. I am satisfied with the level of assistance my supervisor gives me.
19. I am satisfied with my relationship with my supervisor(s).
20. I am respected by my supervisors.
21. I feel my direct supervisor(s) is/are competent.

Relationships with Colleagues
22. I am satisfied with my current relationship with my colleagues.
23. I am satisfied with my colleagues in my department.
24. I am respected by my colleagues in the division.
25. I feel that senior level administrators respond to my needs.

Administrative Policies
26. I am satisfied with the institutional policies regarding carrying out my job responsibilities.
27. I am satisfied with my level of involvement in decision-making regarding policies for my area.
28. I feel that my administrative is fair in the decisions they make about policy.
29. I feel administrative policies and procedures in relation to my position are effective.
30. I am satisfied that administrative policies are consistent with my values.

Working conditions
31. I am satisfied with my workload.
32. I enjoy and value committee work.
33. I am happy with the physical condition of my work space.
34. I feel my office is a good working environment.
35. My work environment is enjoyable.
36. I am satisfied with the rapport among senior-level administrators and mid-level managers.

Comments Box

Salary
37. I am satisfied with my salary level.
38. I am satisfied with the fringe benefits my institution offers.
39. I am satisfied with my salary when compared with others of similar education background and position.
40. My salary is compatible with my job responsibilities.

Status
41. I am satisfied with the privileges my position gives me.
42. I am satisfied with the level of influence my position has within the institution.
43. I find being a mid-level manager in student affairs rewarding.

Job Security
44. I feel my position is secure.
45. If given a second chance, I would choose to work at my institution.
46. I will encourage entry-level professionals to become mid-level managers.
47. I will make an effort to look for another position elsewhere during the next academic year.

Balance with Personal Life
48. I am satisfied that my assignments are aligned my personal objectives.
49. I achieve balance between the various aspects of my personal life and professional life.
50. My work does not conflict with my personal life.
51. I am proud of my work.

Comments Box

Comments Box: This box will address over job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction and the respondent's role as a mid-level manager in student affairs administration.

Demographics

1. What is your gender?
   o Male
   o Female
   o Transgender
2. What is your ethnic background?
   - African American
   - Asian/Pacific Islanders
   - Caucasian
   - Hispanic/Latino
   - Multiracial
   - Native American
   - Other: Please list: __________________________

3. What is the highest degree you have attained?
   - Bachelor's Degree or equivalent
   - Master's Degree or equivalent
   - Specialist or equivalent
   - Doctorate (Ed.D or Ph.D)
   - Juris Doctor (JD)
   - Other, please specify: __________________________

4. Is your degree in student development, student affairs administration, or higher education administration?
   - Yes
   - No

5. If no, what is your degree in? Please list.
   - Bachelor's Degree or equivalent
   - Master's Degree or equivalent
   - Specialist or equivalent
   - Doctorate (Ed.D or Ph.D)
   - Juris Doctor (JD)
   - Other, please specify

6. Are you pursuing a degree?
   - Yes
   - No

7. If yes, what degree are you pursuing?
   - Bachelor's Degree or equivalent
   - Master's Degree or equivalent
   - Specialist or equivalent
   - Doctorate (Ed.D or Ph.D)
   - Juris Doctor (JD)
   - Other, please specify
APPENDIX I
Coding System
The survey will be coded using Herzberg's intrinsic and extrinsic factors as follows: Code number for Dissatisfaction-Satisfaction Response:

0. Not Applicable
1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Mildly Disagree
4. Mildly Agree
5. Agree
6. Strongly Agree

Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic Factors

Intrinsic Factors

Advancement
1. I am satisfied with how promotions are handled.
2. I am satisfied with my chances for promotion in the future at my current institution.

Recognition
3. I am satisfied with the recognition I receive for my accomplishments.
4. I am happy with the level of professional recognition I receive from my colleagues.

Work Itself
5. I am satisfied with the autonomy I have over my work procedures.
6. I am satisfied that my job meets my professional needs.
7. I am challenged by my work.
8. I find advising students rewarding.

Achievement
9. I am satisfied with the emphasis of involvement in the profession (professional organizations) as an indicator of professional achievement.
10. I am satisfied with the amount of release time from administrative responsibilities to pursue professional development needs.
11. I am satisfied with opportunities to conduct research on my campus.
12. My institution encourages me to get involved in professional organization.

Responsibility
13. Working to develop entry-level professionals is rewarding.
14. I am satisfied with the variety of tasks that my job enables me to do.
15. My responsibilities are well defined.
16. Students at my institution respect mid-level managers in student affairs.
Extrinsic Factors

Supervision
17. I am satisfied with the level of assistance my supervisor gives me.
18. I am satisfied with my relationship with my supervisor(s).
19. I am respected by my supervisors.
20. I feel my direct supervisor(s) is/are competent.

Relationships with Colleagues
21. I am satisfied with my current relationship with my colleagues.
22. I am satisfied with my colleagues in my department.
23. I am respected by my colleagues in the division.
24. I feel that senior level administrators respond to my needs.

Administrative Policies
24. I am satisfied with the institutional policies regarding carrying out my job responsibilities.
25. I am satisfied with my level of involvement in decision-making regarding policies for my area.
26. I feel that my administrative is fair in the decisions they make about policy.
27. I feel administrative policies and procedures in relation to my position are effective.
28. I am satisfied that administrative policies are consistent with my values.

Working conditions
29. I am satisfied with my workload.
30. I enjoy and value committee work.
31. I am happy with the physical condition of my work space.
32. I feel my office is a good working environment.
33. My work environment is enjoyable.
34. I am satisfied with the rapport among senior-level administrators and mid-level managers.

Salary
35. I am satisfied with my salary level.
36. I am satisfied with the fringe benefits my institution offers.
37. I am satisfied with my salary when compared with others of similar education background and position.
38. My salary is compatible with my job responsibilities.

Status
39. I am satisfied with the privileges my position gives me.
40. I am satisfied with the level of influence my position has within the institution.
41. I find being a mid-level manager in student affairs rewarding.

Job Security
42. I feel my position is secure.
43. If given a second chance, I would choose to work at my institution.
44. I will encourage entry-level professionals to become mid-level managers.
45. I will make an effort to look for another position elsewhere during the next academic year.

Balance with Personal Life
46. I am satisfied that my assignments are aligned with my personal objectives.
47. I achieve balance between the various aspects of my personal life and professional life.
48. My work does not conflict with my personal life.
49. I am proud of my work
APPENDIX J
Study Participation E-mail
June 2, 2005
FROM: Jessie Grant
TO: Jessie Grant
CC: 
SUBJECT: Study regarding the Job Satisfaction of Mid-level Managers in Student Affairs

Dear Student Affairs Colleague:

My name is Jessie Grant and I am Doctoral Candidate in the Higher Education Leadership Program at Western Michigan University and a member of the ACPA. I am conducting my dissertation research study to explore job satisfaction among mid-level managers. Your name was given to me by Jacqueline Skinner, Deputy Executive Director, and Ex-Officio member of the Commission for the Dissemination of Knowledge of ACPA.

You are cordially invited to participate in this study. Participation will involve completing an online survey located at http://www.zoomerang.com. The survey consists of 66 questions on intrinsic extrinsic factors, demographic information, and intent to leave the field. This survey should take no longer than 15 minutes to complete, and will be completely confidential.

Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary. You may answer some questions and not others, or skip the survey altogether. Once on the web survey site, only the final submission will record your responses. You can choose the leave the survey at any time. Your final submission will indicate your permission to use your responses. The survey data will be used in the final data analysis of my dissertation.

If you have any questions about this survey and its content, please contact Jessie Grant at 269-387-5421 or jessie.grant@wmich.edu or my dissertation advisor Andrea beach at 269-387-1725 or andrea.beach@wmich.edu. The HSIRB at Western Michigan University has approved this protocol from October 12, 2006 to October 11, 2007. If you receive this communication outside those dates, please do not take the survey. If you have questions or concerns with the process of the study please contact the Chair of the HSIRB (269-387-8293) or the Vice President of Research (269-387-8298).

To complete the survey, just click on the link http://www.zoomerang.com XXXX.

Thank you for your participation.
Jessie L. Grant
Doctoral Candidate
Western Michigan University
APPENDIX K
Reminder letter (E-mail)
June 2, 2005

Dear Colleague:

On (date of first e-mail) an e-mail was sent to you seeking your cooperation with participating in a research study designed to explain the job satisfaction and among mid-level managers in student affairs administration.

If you have completed and returned the survey, thank you for doing so. If you have not, please consider doing so by clicking on the link below. The total time for completion of this survey will be between 15 and 20 minutes.

Once again, thank you for supporting my academic pursuits.

Sincerely,

Jessie L. Grant

Jessie L. Grant, Ph.D. Candidate
Western Michigan University

[link to survey]
APPENDIX L
Reminder E-mail 2
June 2, 2005

Dear Colleague:

On October 26 and November 1 an e-mail was sent to you seeking your cooperation with participating in a research study designed to explain the job satisfaction and among mid-level managers in student affairs administration.

If you have completed and returned the survey, thank you for doing so. If you have not, please consider doing so by clicking on the link below. The total time for completion of this survey will be between 15 and 20 minutes.

Once again, thank you for supporting my academic pursuits.

Sincerely,

Jessie L. Grant

Jessie L. Grant, Ph.D. Candidate
Western Michigan University

[link to survey]
APPENDIX M
Demographics for the Enrollment Management Domain
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Score/Range</th>
<th>Percentage of Participant Total</th>
<th>ACPA Percentages (if applicable)</th>
<th>Difference (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Information and Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>14.62</td>
<td>-12.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar’s Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree of Equivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree of Equivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juris Doctorate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D. or Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrollment Management Domain
APPENDIX N
Demographics for the Co-Curricular Domain
### Co-Curricular Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Score /Range</th>
<th>Percentage of Participant Total N =477</th>
<th>ACPA Percentages (if applicable)</th>
<th>Difference (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Affairs (Fraternity and Sorority Life)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>-4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>22.39</td>
<td>-21.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>-9.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Union</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree of Equivalent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree of Equivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juris Doctorate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D. or Ph.D.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX O
Demographics for the Health Education and Promotion Domain
### Health Education and Promotion Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Score /Range</th>
<th>Percentage of Participant Total N = 477</th>
<th>ACPA Percentages (if applicable)</th>
<th>Difference (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and Other Drug</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services/Health*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>-8.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree of</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree of</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juris Doctorate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D. or Ph.D.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX P
Demographic Information for the Learning Assistance Domain
## Learning Assistance Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Score /Range</th>
<th>Percentage of Participant Total N=477</th>
<th>ACPA Percentages (if applicable)</th>
<th>Difference (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>11.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Assistance (Developmental Education)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIO and other Educational Opportunity Programs</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>25.58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree of Equivalent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree of Equivalent</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>18.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juris Doctorate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D. or Ph.D.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX Q
Demographic Information for the Student Development Domain
### Student Development Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Score /Range</th>
<th>Percentage of Participant Total N = 477</th>
<th>ACPA Percentages (if applicable)</th>
<th>Difference (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>29.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>23.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>25.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and Outcomes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>-5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Planning and Placement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>-7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Placement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>-4.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Affairs</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>-5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Affairs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>-5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Athletics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Life</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>31.55</td>
<td>-12.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Ministry Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Center Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>-3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree of Equivalent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree of Equivalent</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>33.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juris Doctorate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D. or Ph.D.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These areas may be placed together depending on the study participant
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