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Chief student conduct administrators within higher education are responsible for administering and enforcing standards of student conduct, and navigating the vast legal, political and developmental components to fortify the ethical climate and academic integrity of institutions. Although some previous research regarding these individuals and their role does exist, no research to date could be found regarding their job satisfaction at four year public institutions in the United States. This study serves as the first research to examine overall job satisfaction, the level of satisfaction on stated intrinsic and extrinsic variables within the framework of Herzberg’s (1966) dual-factor theory, and the intent of chief student conduct administrators to stay or leave their positions.

A national on-line survey was sent to 358 members of the Association of Student Conduct Administrators, and 137(38%) completed the detailed survey. Results revealed that chief student conduct administrators were satisfied to some degree (86.4%) with their jobs. There were significant differences by gender in that male respondents were significantly more satisfied than females. Findings related to intrinsic variables showed that a majority of the variation in job satisfaction can be explained by the variables of responsibility, recognition, advancement, and work itself. Outcomes related to extrinsic variables showed
much of the variation in job satisfaction can be explained by the variables of work conditions, personal life, job status, and relationship with colleagues.

The majority of chief student conduct administrators intend to remain in their current positions for at least the next year. Further investigation revealed that advancement opportunities, when combined with age and gender, can be used to predict whether or not a chief student conduct administrator will stay or leave their position. Moreover, the extrinsic variable of balance of work and personal life, combined with age and gender, can also be used to predict whether or not a chief student conduct administrator will stay or leave their position.

Overall, this research study offers an initial look at the role and job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators at four year public institutions across the United States, and provides a foundation for future studies.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Student conduct has been an issue since the early days of higher education in the United States. Thomas Jefferson, founder of the University of Virginia, wrote a letter to Thomas Cooper, president of South Carolina College in 1822 in which he described the pervasive struggles with student conduct:

The article of discipline is the most difficult in American education. Premature ideas of independence, too little repressed by parents, beget a spirit of insubordination, which is the greatest obstacle to science with us, and a principal cause of its decay since the revolution. I look to it with dismay in our institution, as a breaker ahead, which I am far from being confident we shall be able to weather. (Jefferson, 1822, as cited in Stoner & Lowery, 2004, p. 1)

Jefferson’s letter is evidence of the historic challenges of student behavior and an accurate depiction of the tenor of what chief student conduct administrators face in their work today (Lancaster & Waryold, 2008).

The position of the chief student conduct administrator is most critical within academe. Chief student conduct administrators at institutions of higher education are responsible for administering and enforcing standards of student conduct to sustain and fortify the ethical climate and academic integrity of institutions. Within academe, transparent and consistently administered standards of conduct form the foundation for the behavioral expectations of the community (Association for Student Judicial Affairs, 1993). It is incumbent upon such administrators to clearly articulate, navigate and apply institutional policies, constitutional, statutory, and regulatory case law, and requirements...
from federal, state and local governments. Chief student conduct administrators are expected to limit the liability exposure of the institution, its officers, employees and agents (Council for the Advancement of Standards, 2006), as well as address an increasingly complex landscape that includes addressing all levels of student behavior and successfully navigating the vast legal, political and developmental components.

Effectively supporting faculty with the resolution of disruptive student behavior in the classroom, and being facile in policy development, implementation and the protection of due process rights for students with psychological conditions, are also central to the position (Amada, 2001; Lancaster & Waryold, 2008; Patterson & Kibler, 1998). In the wake of the tragedies at Virginia Polytechnic Institute in 2007 and Northern Illinois University in 2008, chief student conduct administrators often play an integral role in campus and university threat assessment teams (Sokolow, 2008). The chief student conduct administrator position on college campuses is clearly an essential role.

The efficacy of colleges and universities is tied in part to the job satisfaction of individuals in administrative positions (Volkwein & Zhou, 2003), including chief student conduct administrators. As noted by Fife (1992), the majority of satisfied workers perform at their maximum level for the good of the institution, whereas those who are dissatisfied work to increase their satisfaction for their own advantage. Within the job satisfaction literature, the two-factor theory/framework of job satisfaction developed by Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959; 1966) is often referred to as the most extensively researched and widely applied theory in areas including education. Developed through research in which people were asked to describe critical incidents in their work lives, Herzberg posited that intrinsic (motivational) factors and extrinsic
(hygiene) factors serve as foundational factors for job satisfaction (Owens, 2004).

Intrinsic factors include achievement/growth, advancement, recognition, responsibility, and work itself. Extrinsic factors include administrative policies, balance of work and personal life, compensation, job security, job status, relationship with colleagues, supervision and working conditions. Moreover, the literature states that the job satisfaction of college and university administrators is influenced by demographics (e.g., gender) and organization variables (e.g., enrollment) (Hagedorn, 1996; Volkwein, Malik, & Napierski-Prancl, 1998).

As professionals, chief student conduct administrators are considered to be mid-level administrators within student affairs. Through the development and implementation of core programs and services, mid-level administrators in student affairs have a direct impact on an institution’s success in realizing their stated purposes. Student affairs mid-level administrators are described as dedicated, loyal and hardworking (Grant, 2006). These professionals are “committed to a profession that contributes to the multiple missions and goals of the academy……these leaders are charged with a variety of goals to enhance the quality of student life, support services, and learning experiences in colleges and universities” (Rosser & Javinar, 2003, p. 813).

Based on the complexity of the position and purposes they serve, mid-level professionals in student affairs have often found their positions to be frustrating (Grant, 2006). This is due to several factors including the difficulty they have being heard when advocating for themselves and their departments, a minimal amount of recognition for the skills they bring to the table, and limited opportunities for career development and advancement opportunities (Johnsrud, 1996). In addition, these professionals work within
a challenging environment. "The work culture in many student affairs organizations is one that demands long hours of hard work for levels of compensation that are not competitive with the private sector" (Nobbe & Manning, 1997, p. 108). As a result, some professionals may be dissatisfied with their positions.

Statement of Problem and Research Questions

Some previous research regarding chief student conduct administrators and their role does exist. Several studies profiled the evolution of the position (Dannells, 1997; Dannells & Lowery, 2004; Gehring, 2006; Lancaster & Waryold, 2008; Rudolph, 1962; Smith, 1994). Others examined various administrative aspects or ways to accomplish student conduct work, such as models of adjudication (Ardaiolo & Walker, 1987; Dannells), elements of codes of conduct (Ardaiolo & Walker; Caruso, 1987; Stoner, 1998), differences between criminal and campus processes (Carletta, 1998) and the management of student conduct records (Ardaiolo & Walker; Caruso; Dannells, 1988, 1996; Dannells & Lowery). Although such research findings are most valuable, no research to date was found regarding the job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators. To this end, this study examined the following research questions:

1. To what extent are chief student conduct administrators at four-year public institutions of higher education satisfied with their jobs?

2. To what extent is job satisfaction of such chief student conduct administrators related to demographic characteristics (age, education level, institutional enrollment, ethnicity/race, gender, geographic region, and years of experience in student conduct)?
3. To what extent is job satisfaction of such chief student conduct administrators related to Herzberg’s intrinsic motivation factors (i.e., achievement/growth, advancement, recognition, responsibility, and work itself)?

4. To what extent is job satisfaction of such chief student conduct administrators related to Herzberg’s extrinsic hygiene factors (i.e., administrative policies, balance of work and personal life, compensation, job security, job status, relationship with colleagues, supervision, and working conditions)?

5. To what extent is the intent of the chief student conduct administrator to stay or leave the position related to job satisfaction?

The research questions for this study will be examined through Herzberg’s job satisfaction-dissatisfaction model.

Theoretical Framework

Job satisfaction was traditionally thought of as one continuum, with one end being job satisfaction and the other job dissatisfaction. Points in between the two marked various degrees of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction (Owens, 2004). Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1957; 1959; 1993) and Herzberg’s (1966) theoretical framework departed from this traditional belief suggesting that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction operated on dual continuums (Blank, 1993; Owens). Herzberg’s premise was that clear-cut factors exist that promote job satisfaction and clear-cut factors exist that promote job dissatisfaction. Given this distinction, job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction were examined on separate continuums (Herzberg; Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman. [Note: It is important to note that although Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman co-authored the 1957, 1959 and 1993 works, the dual or two factor theory of job satisfaction has been
most closely associated with Herzberg and solely named as such within the literature. Therefore, future reference to these works within this study will be solely attributed to Herzberg.]

As depicted in figure 1, the first continuum includes intrinsic factors distinguished by Herzberg as "satisfiers" or "motivators" created by and sensed within workers themselves. Such satisfiers or motivators provided by Herzberg and the definitions adopted from Herzberg include: (1) achievement and growth (opportunity to advance one's skills/knowledge in a profession); (2) advancement (change in status or position within the institution); (3) recognition (the act of recognition (praise, notice) by another individual within or external to the institution); (4) responsibility (responsibility for one's own work, for the work of others, or being given new work); and (5) work itself (doing
one’s job or the tasks of the job that generate the intended outcomes associated with the position as determined by the institution).

Extrinsic factors (those outside the individual) are distinguished by Herzberg as maintenance or “hygiene” factors. Hygiene factors are synonymous with the medical application of the term because these factors must be present and maintained for worker’s health (satisfaction). The hygiene factors provided by Herzberg and the definitions adopted from Herzberg include: (1) administrative policies (institutional management and position authority); (2) balance of work and personal life (position offers ample support for professional and personal growth); (3) compensation (pay, benefits); (4) job security (institution and position stability); (5) job status (privileges and influence that accompany one’s position); (6) relationships with colleagues (persons at the same level, lower level, or higher level within the organization); (7) supervision (supervisor’s qualifications and support of one’s position); and (8) working conditions (environmental characteristics and amount of work).

In addition to identifying intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction factors, Herzberg assigned a continuum of outcomes associated with these factors. Specifically, intrinsic motivating factors were associated with the satisfaction continuum. At one extreme was satisfaction and at the other was no satisfaction. This meant that intrinsic motivators added to job satisfaction, but a lack of them did not lead to dissatisfaction. Instead it led to what Herzberg called no satisfaction (Herzberg, 1959; Lunnenberg & Ornstein, 2004).

Herzberg posited that extrinsic hygiene factors were associated with the dissatisfaction continuum. No dissatisfaction was at one end of the continuum and dissatisfaction at the other. This meant extrinsic hygiene factors led to job dissatisfaction,
but a lack of them did not lead to job satisfaction. Instead, it led to what Herzberg called no job dissatisfaction.

These notions departed from the traditional job satisfaction framework by stating that the opposite of job satisfaction is no job satisfaction, and the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no dissatisfaction. Herzberg argued that the continuums were separate because factors associated with job satisfaction were different than those associated with job dissatisfaction (Blank, 1993; May & Decker, 1988). As a result, instruments used to examine Herzberg’s dual-factor theory measure the factors separately and determine both a satisfaction rating and a dissatisfaction rating (Grant, 2006).

A final component of this study regarding job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators is an examination of their intent to leave or stay in their position. Previous research (Bender, 1980; Creamer & Winston, 2002; Harned & Murphy 1998; Lorden, 1998; Rosser & Janivar 2003) indicated that job satisfaction in student affairs is connected to the intent to leave a position. Although administrators’ desires to leave are multi-faceted, these researchers note that dissatisfaction with institutional factors, work-life characteristics, collegial relationships, supervision, and morale impact the intent to leave. Overall, as employers, it is critical for senior student affairs officers and others to understand job satisfaction issues and intent to leave for their employees, including chief conduct administrators (Volkwein & Zhou, 2003).

Methodology Overview

Based on the topic and content of this study, a quantitative approach was used. This study examined the job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators at four-year public institutions of higher education in the United States, and their intent to stay or
leave that position. A quantitative approach is appropriate when specific, pre-determined variables (e.g., size of student population), and a strategy such as a survey is used to collect data (McMillan, 2008). This study therefore employed a national web-based survey structured to examine specific, pre-determined job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction variables, and the employees’ intent to stay or leave. The sample population was drawn from the membership of the Association of Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA), specifically, those who identify as a chief student conduct administrator.

Significance of the Study

This study is an initial step to help fill gap in the literature regarding job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators at four-year public institutions of higher education in the United States. This study provides important information for professionals interested in becoming chief student conduct administrators and those who supervise these professionals. This study also provides data that can impact the recruitment of chief student conduct administrators and offers critical insight into their intent to stay or leave.

Chapter I Summary

Student misbehavior has been a factor at colleges and universities since their inception. Today at four-year public institutions in the United states, those that serve as chief student conduct administrators are typically charged with the responsibility to coordinate the student conduct process and administer the institution’s code of conduct. This position is fraught with pressure from internal and external constituents who expect the chief student conduct administrator to resolve behavior problems quickly with their
expected outcomes in mind. Based on the challenging type of work, demanding climates and critical role in which chief student conduct administrators operate, it is essential to understand their level of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction and the factors that influence these outcomes.

Chapter two provides a review of the literature regarding the history of student behavior, challenges faced by chief student conduct administrators, Herzberg’s dual-factor theory of job satisfaction, an overview of the literature that pertains to each factor in Herzberg’s model and decision to stay or leave the position. Chapter three specifies the methods to be used in this study. Chapter four contains the survey results and chapter five explains conclusions and current and future implications.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter provides an overview of relevant literature about chief student conduct administrators and job satisfaction. The format of the chapter includes the following: (a) an historical account of the evolution of student conduct in higher education in the United States; (b) challenges faced by chief student conduct administrators; (c) a brief history and definition of job satisfaction; (d) overview of job satisfaction theory including Herzberg’s dual-factor theory used in this study; (e) description of intrinsic, extrinsic, and demographic variables related to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction; and (f) intent to stay or leave the position.

Governance of Student Behavior in American Higher Education

In order to fully comprehend the current governance of student behavior by chief student conduct administrators, it is essential to understand the origins of student discipline and the critical factors in its development that follow in this section.

Discipline of Students in Colonial Colleges Through the Civil War

Since the early colonial days, students have demonstrated behavior that is the antithesis of the expressed mores of their institutions (Gehring, 2006). During the colonial period, students (the majority of whom were males) attended college to ensure that as future religious and civic leaders, they were “piously educated in good letters and manners” (Rudolph, 1962, p. 7). All colonial colleges (with the exception of Dartmouth) were founded by religious denominations. Precise and narrowly defined codes of conduct anchored in religious and moral beliefs covered all aspects of students’ lives (Gehring). Behavior was closely governed by the president, faculty, and tutors. In cases involving
serious misconduct, the president informed the board, who in turn decided the appropriate punishment (Dannells, 1997). Outcomes ranged from public confessions (degradations), fines, and loss of privileges to flogging, boxing, and expulsion (Rudolph; Smith, 1994). The colleges at this time acted in loco parentis, or “in place of parent,” in governance of behavior as well as all other aspects related to the education and guidance of the students in their care (Dannells; Lancaster, & Waryold, 2008). Students, however, did not always accept the rigid discipline applied to them, as evidenced by student riots which occurred at a number of institutions (Dannells & Lowery, 2004).

By the end of the 18th century and early into the 19th century, governance of student behavior became less oppressive. An increasingly democratic society, together with the development of public institutions, expansion of the mission of universities, increase in enrollment, and the proliferation of secularism and pluralism in higher education itself, set the stage for a more lenient approach to discipline (Dannells & Lowery, 2004). Also, counseling was determined to be an acceptable response to lesser violations (Dannells, 1997). In 1825 at the University of Virginia, then university president Thomas Jefferson tried to establish a student self-governance model in an effort to repose the strict rules of governance instituted by the colonial colleges (Gehring, 2006). Although it failed, this step provided a glimpse of a participatory type of student governance congruent with the democratic society that would be applied in later years (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997, Dannells).

Post Civil War

During the late 1800's, the German university model, focused purely on the intellectual growth of students, was brought to the academy in the United States. This
model, combined with the necessity for faculty to further the growth in their academic areas due to the Industrial Revolution, shifted the emphasis to student self-discipline and self-governance. Techniques used to enforce rules, and the outcomes students faced, became humane and individualized. Student governments and honor systems were developed at the same time democratic systems of student behavior (with increased student participation) were enacted (Dannells & Lowery, 2004). Disciplinary enlightenment (Smith, 1994) is a phrase often applied to this era. Charles Eliot, president of Harvard from 1869 to 1909, characterized a true university as one that provided students with three critical elements: “freedom of choice in studies; an opportunity to win distinction in special lines of study; and finally a system of discipline which imposes on the individual himself the main responsibility for guiding his conduct” (as cited in Brubacher & Rudy, 1976, p. 112). In addition, with more women making their way to college, student discipline was stretched in a new direction. This included but was not limited to “supervising such daring activities as unmarried young men and women dining together in a campus dining hall” (Fenske, 1989, p. 30).

Although student self-governance experienced some success, it was evident that behavior problems still existed. In order to attend to these concerns, and to experiences of students outside of the classroom, the Dean of Men and Dean of Women positions were created. Specifically, in 1891, LeBaron Russell Briggs was chosen as the first Dean of Men at Harvard College. A few years later, Alice Freeman Palmer became the Dean of Women at the University of Chicago (Gehring, 2006; Lancaster & Waryold, 2008). Deans of Men/Women became standard positions on campuses by the early 1900’s. These individuals brought greater breadth and depth to the philosophical and
programmatic aspects of student discipline. The notion of the whole student was launched and counseling was established as a way to assist those found responsible for misbehavior (Fenske, 1989; Fley, 1964).

**Governance of Student Behavior in the Early 20th Century Through the 1960s**

As noted earlier, the Deans were the customary disciplinarians functioning from the *in loco parentis* perspective as they provided discipline. This approach to the governance of student behavior put a strain on the relationship between the Deans and the new student personnel administrators trained in guidance and counseling. The new administrators viewed the deans' version of discipline as punishment. Brady and Snoxell (1965) characterized the stress between the two parties in the following way:

*Student discipline was something defiled, if it touched the student personnel staff. They would admit, grudgingly, that sometimes someone had to exercise a bit of discipline. But this should be done by teachers or administrators who had not been trained for personnel work. It was crude and unsanitary, and many of these people would have liked to believe that it did not or need not exist at all. (p. 1)*

Upon review of meeting notes from early deans, it is evident they believed their mission was to assist students with "character formation," "citizenship training" and "moral and ethical development," not punishment or control (Dannells, 1997).

After World War II, the GI Bill afforded a vast number of non-traditional aged students with significant life experience the opportunity to obtain a college education. Because these students were considered to be adults who already mastered basic
behavioral expectations, it became difficult for the Dean to justify the use of strict student conduct regulations and discipline (Smith & Kirk, 1971). Therefore, re-education instead of punishment became the focus when handling the behavior of student violators. Professionals with a counseling background took more of a role in the discipline of students (Sims, 1971). Although students, faculty and staff comprised the membership of conduct hearing boards, there was continued dialogue about the capabilities of students in this arena (Smith, 1994).

In 1937, those with counseling and guidance influence came together with administrators upon the release of the American Council on Education's (ACE) Student Personnel Point of View (SPPV). This seminal statement provided an understanding of the whole student, and for the organization of student services to meet the needs of students and support and benefit the distinct mission of every college and university (ACE, 1937). In 1949 the National Association for Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) authored a revised version of the SPPV to include “the treatment of discipline as an educational function designed to modify personal behavior patterns and to substitute socially acceptable attitudes for those which have precipitated unacceptable behavior” (NASPA, 1949 p. 28).

1960's to the Present

“The most portentous upheaval in the whole history of American student life” (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976, p. 349) captures the student revolution of the 1960’s and 70’s. The Civil Rights and anti-Vietnam war movements, combined with the student rights movement and greater toleration of moral issues by the courts had a powerful impact on society and institutions of higher education (Dannells, 1997). Sit-ins, demonstrations and
violence were fairly common occurrences as students demonstrated, often for peace and increased freedoms. Among the freedoms they sought, college students wanted greater participation in campus governance (Dannells).

Heretofore, the courts likened the relationship between students and the university to that of children and parents (Hoekema, 1994; Smith, 1994). In the 1960's, however, litigation increased and the court's movement toward a view of the relationship between students and the university as constitutional. For example, in 1961, *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education*, a landmark court case in student conduct, was heard. The case involved several black students at Alabama State College who had been expelled for their participation in a non-violent civil rights protest (Kaplin & Lee, 1995). The students, supported by legal counsel from the National Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), sued the state board. On appeal, the court set the stage for student discipline at tax-supported institutions of higher education. Specifically, the court rejected the idea of *in loco parentis*, “under which the law had bestowed upon schools all the powers over students that parents had over minor children” (Kaplin & Lee, p. 371). In addition, the court determined that students at public colleges and universities were guaranteed, under the 14th amendment, notice and a hearing prior to expulsion for misconduct (Kaplin & Lee). This was a dramatic shift from the practice where administrators made decisions absent any type of formal proceedings.

Passage of the twenty-sixth Amendment in 1971, which lowered the voting age to 18, was also a catalyst for many states to lower the age of majority to 18. This served as a final blow to *in loco parentis*. Institutions of higher education now interfaced with legal adults and had to give them the rights equivalent with their status (Gehring, 2006). In
order to deal with the legal interest expressed by the courts and based on a true desire to ensure students' constitutional rights, a plethora of institutions in American higher education at this time initiated “formal, legalistic judicial systems for the adjudication of misconduct and the determinant of sanctions” (Dannells & Lowery, 2004, p. 181). This type of governance of student behavior was deemed troubling by some due to its roots in the criminal justice system and narrow focus on the operations of the process which was a disservice to the educational process (Dannells & Lowery).

Ironically, around this same time period, The General Order on Judicial Standards of Procedure and Substance in Review of Student Discipline in Tax-Supported Institutions of Higher Education (1969) was authored by the courts. It provided wisdom to those working with student behavior. Specifically, it highlighted the need for a university discipline system to hold in tension the use of legal-like mechanisms coupled with learning opportunities in order to provide appropriate governance of student behavior:

The attempted analogy of student discipline to criminal proceedings against adults and juveniles is not sound. In the lesser disciplinary procedures, including but not limited to guidance counseling, reprimand, suspension of social or academic privileges, probation, restriction to campus and dismissal with leave to apply for readmission, the lawful aim of discipline may be teaching in performance of a lawful mission of the institution. The nature and procedures of the disciplinary process in such cases should not be required to conform to the federal processes of criminal law, which are far from perfect, and designed for circumstances and ends unrelated to the academic community. By judicial mandate, to impose upon
the academic community in student discipline the intricate time consuming,
sophisticated procedures, rules and safeguards of criminal law would frustrate the
teaching process and render institutional control impotent. (p. 142)

This tension still exists today. However, chief student conduct administrators' at large
institutions or Deans of students at smaller schools that deal directly with student
behavior, strive to strike a balance. They are very mindful of the necessity to do so now
more than ever, American institutions of higher education (including four-year public
colleges and universities) are looking at how student behavior is governed (Dannells &
Lowery, 2004).

Challenges Faced by Student Conduct Administrators

Although the need to deal with student behavior has been in existence as long as
higher education has existed, chief student conduct administrators today encounter a
plethora of challenges (Lancaster & Waryold, 2008). It is important to understand these
issues relative to this study because of the potential impact these factors can have on the
work lives of chief student conduct administrators.

"Besieged clan" is a phrase used by Don Gehring (Patterson & Kibler, 1998, p.
xi), first president of the Association of Student Judicial Affairs, to describe student
conduct administrators. Time and again chief student conduct administrators encounter a
lack of understanding about and an appreciation for their work and its value within
academe and the lives of students. Almost daily, chief student conduct administrators find
themselves bombarded by students, parents, presidents, legal counsel and the media
demanding answers to questions, quick resolutions to problems and assurance of fair
treatment (Patterson & Kibler). Many staff and faculty think the student conduct process
is excessively legalistic. Although they want the inappropriate behavior addressed, they would rather not be involved, except to provide input about the outcome. A lack of understanding about and value for the educational nature of student conduct work often causes a deep schism between student conduct and other areas within an institution. A similar schism also can exist with external constituents based on comparable issues (Lancaster & Waryold, 2008). In addition, students regularly lay responsibility for their actions at the feet of the “system” which may include a fraternity or residence hall environment, lack of adult supervision, the idea that “everyone is doing it” and/or a lack of explicit directions telling them not to do something.

Concerns for liability risk and other problems continue to be real and difficult for chief student conduct administrators (Lancaster & Waryold, 2008). These factors are the most recurrent sources of immediate risk for an institution (including chief student conduct administrators) and cause what many fear most: a subpoena to testify in a civil or criminal court as defendant in a wrongful action or tort case. Chief student conduct administrators must also navigate and appropriately resolve issues related to violent behavior, classroom disruptions, academic misconduct, speech that is hateful, consumerism, racial tensions, a proliferation of government mandates, regulation of technology concerns such as pictures and language on student homepages, use of cell phones, free speech and deference to student conduct by law enforcement to handle possible campus criminal activities through the campus conduct process. These are coupled with growing and pressing concerns about students with multiple disabilities and/or mental health issues, stress, stress-related illnesses and behaviors, helicopter parents, emergency and crisis response and constructing appropriate educational
outcomes/assessment for conduct processes. This array of substantive, complex and potentially volatile realities set the context for the work of chief student conduct administrators now and in the future (Lancaster & Waryold). Job satisfaction within this realm of uncertainty and potential divisiveness certainly seems to be a plausible question.

Brief History and Definition of Job Satisfaction

For purposes of this study, it is also important to understand job satisfaction, its meaning, and beginnings. Studies of job satisfaction date back to the early 1900’s (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). The initial examination of worker behavior by Taylor (1911) and Mustenberg (1913) centered on the factors of productivity and efficiency of job performance. From 1928-1932, Mayo and his team conducted the renowned “Hawthorne experiments” that studied factors impacting worker productivity within the context of various work environments (Dawis; 1984, Owens, 2004). These experiments revealed worker behavior directed by group norms instead of management productivity expectations (Hoy & Miskel).

With the onset of the Great Depression came the earliest studies of work from the employee’s perspective. Both the consequences of unemployment for an employee (Bakke, 1934) and the opposite, job satisfaction (Hoppock, 1935), became new areas of research (Dawis, 1984). Hoppock’s foremost research offered the definition of 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). The results of Hoppock’s (1935) study of the residents of New Hope, Pennsylvania, showed more than two thirds of those surveyed self-reported they were satisfied with their jobs.
During the 1980’s, a national study was conducted by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC). Housed at the University of Chicago, the NORC was established in 1941 with a focus on social science and public opinion research (NORC, 2009). As one of their projects, the NORC conducted a study with 3,000 participants who were asked to designate a level of prestige to 100 occupations using the first occupational prestige scale. Participants were also asked if they were satisfied with their jobs. Eighty percent answered in the affirmative (Dawis, 1984, Powers, 1982). Although these were positive outcomes, some critics wanted to know why there was also a growing perception that more American workers were becoming dissatisfied with their jobs. One rationale was rooted in the way the survey questions were phrased. For example, in the studies cited above, the typical survey question asked, “All in all, are you satisfied with your job?”

In 1973, the Special Task Force for the Secretary of Health and Welfare surveyed 5,000 individuals. The participants were asked to indicate if they would choose a different career or occupation if they could start their lives over again. Forty percent of those surveyed said yes, while 39 percent indicated they would pick the same occupation (Dawis, 1984). A rationale for the level of dissatisfaction was rooted in the difference between overall satisfaction and facet satisfaction. Facet satisfaction, originally defined by Locke (1969, 1976) and later discussed by Spector (1997), examined worker satisfaction with various segments or facets of their work. Examples included: pay, relationships with supervisors and co-workers, and the work itself. Facet satisfaction was
a key element in the theory devised by Herzberg (1959), which serves as the theoretical basis for this study.

Bender (1980) launched one of the first studies to examine job satisfaction within student affairs. A stratified random sample of 200 entry level members from Region II of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) was selected to participate. The sample was identified to include representation from various job functions that mirrored the professional responsibilities within the organization, as well as the demographics of the group. A questionnaire along with an explanatory cover letter was mailed to each participant. Sixty-six percent of those sampled said they were satisfied with their positions, sixteen percent were undecided, and eighteen percent were dissatisfied. No statistical differences were found by gender or age in the level of job satisfaction. The author offered several strategies to chief student affairs officers (CSAOs) to improve employee satisfaction. These included: increased involvement between CSAOs and mid-level managers, professional exchange programs with other institutions, and internal reassignments.

A more recent study by Volkwein and Parmley (2000) compared satisfaction among administrators at public and private institutions. Survey responses were collected from 120 doctoral institutions regarding administrative work environments, organizational highlights, and individual characteristics of the study participants from 1,191 respondents. Institutional type served as the independent variable and overall satisfaction, intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, work conditions and relationships with others were the dependent variables. Independent t tests showed the only significant difference between public and private institutions were extrinsic rewards including benefits,
promotion, and salary. Participants at private institutions were therefore more satisfied with these components than their counterparts at public institutions.

The next section provides an overview of job satisfaction theory in order to give the reader a theoretical context which is part of this study. In addition, a brief description of Maslow’s process theory is shared as it served as the precursor to Herzberg’s theory. Finally, a detailed description of Herzberg’s dual-factor theory is discussed.

**Overview of Job Satisfaction Theory**

Process theories, situational theories and content theories are distinct job satisfaction frameworks developed by Thompson, McNamara, and Hoyle (1997). According to Locke (1984), process theories explore categories of variables (e.g., needs, values, expectations and perceptions) to determine how they interact to effectuate job satisfaction. Situational theories illustrate the way various aspects (e.g., individual, job and organizational characteristics) converge to effect job satisfaction (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Content theories focus on need fulfillment and value attainment to achieve job satisfaction (Locke).

**Maslow as a Theoretical Stepping Stone for Herzberg**

Maslow’s (1943) content theory of a needs hierarchy examined five layers of human needs that materialize in a hierarchy of importance. Once a need has been satisfied, another kicks in and needs to be addressed. The five needs in ascending order are physiological needs such as food and shelter, safety needs such as protection against danger and threat, social needs such as affection and affiliation, esteem needs such as self-respect and respect from others, and self-actualization needs which encompasses reaching one’s full potential for continued self-development (Lunnenberg & Ornstein,
Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory is practical and readily applicable. This has resulted in a wide application of the theory by practitioners.

**Critiques of Maslow’s Hierarchical Theory**

In addition to the strengths of a theory, it is also important to understand the criticisms of the work in order to attain comprehensive insight into all aspects of the research.

Neher (1991) reviewed the whole of Maslow’s theory and offered the following within his critique: Maslow downgraded the effect of an individual’s environment on the formation of the human psyche, the needs put forth by Maslow neglect the necessity to learn cultural traits that comprise our humanness and socially tie us together, Maslow’s theory was less than satisfactory in its explanation of the autonomous nature necessary for self-actualization, and questions exist around the idea that self-actualization can be attained as a result of the process Maslow put forth.

Rowan (1998) argued that three major revisions must be made to Maslow’s work. First, Rowan stipulated that two disparate sets of needs on two distinct levels represent “esteem needs;” esteem from others and self-esteem. Esteem from others has to be in place before an individual can rise to the next level of attaining self-esteem. Second, Rowan stipulated that without cause, Maslow left out actual and perceived competence within one’s own environment as a level between the need for safety and need for love and belongingness. The insertion of this level is critical and supported by the subsequent research of Loevinger (1976). Third, the triangle purported by Maslow depicts finality to personal growth (self-actualization) that is within reach. Rowan’s contention was that this
implied there is nothing beyond this level which is not really known or been substantiated.

Despite the criticisms cited above, Maslow’s theory remains an inviting analysis of human needs. As one of the most widely talked about theories, Maslow’s work continues to be a very influential perspective of human motivation (Hoy & Miskel, 2001).

*Herzberg’s Dual-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction*

Frederick Herzberg was able to build upon Maslow’s needs hierarchy theory by advancing research about the psychological person and how the job affects basic needs through development of the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction theory. The theory has also been identified as the motivation-hygiene theory, the two-factor theory and the dual factor theory, often cited as the “Herzberg Trilogy” (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

The first work included a thorough review of job satisfaction literature (Herzberg, 1957) which posited that job satisfaction existed on a single continuum with satisfaction at one extreme and dissatisfaction at the other (Lunnenberg & Ornstein, 2004). Herzberg’s second work Herzberg (1959) studied the validity of the single continuum theory of job satisfaction. To collect data, Herzberg used the critical incident technique developed by Flanagan (1954). Herzberg later modified this method of data collection to a semi-structured interview. This qualitative approach guided researchers to ask participants to recount instances when they felt positively about their jobs and to describe what conditions precipitated these feelings (Lunnenberg & Ornstein).

Herzberg (1959) utilized the critical incident technique in his first pilot study. Clerical workers, managerial, and professional teams served as participants. The
managerial and professional teams demonstrated a ready grasp of the technique (critical incident), were more verbal and provided more explicit sequences of incidents than the production and clerical teams. As a result, Herzberg (1959) purposefully centered his second pilot study on the managerial and professional teams. The outcome of these studies prompted Herzberg to conduct his larger study with 203 accountants and engineers employed at nine manufacturing companies in the Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, area. Herzberg selected these professionals because they represented “the job attitudes of two of the most important staff groups in modern industry” (Herzberg, 1959, p. 32). Herzberg noted that the ability to generalize the outcomes would have been doubtful had the sample been limited to one profession.

To analyze the data, Herzberg (1959) used an inductive content analysis approach of the participants’ job attitudes from categories or “thought units” that arose from the data. Thought unit was defined as “a statement about a single event that resulted in a feeling, a single characterization of a feeling, or a description of a single effect” (Herzberg, p. 38). Herzberg (1966) later created two continua from the categories that emerged from the data. The first listed “job satisfaction” at one end and “no job satisfaction” at the other end. This continuum included intrinsic factors also known as “satisfiers” (i.e., achievement/growth, advancement, recognition, responsibility and work itself) that were separate and distinct factors from those in the second continuum. The second listed “job dissatisfaction” at one end and “no job satisfaction” at the other. This continuum included extrinsic factors or “dissatisfiers” in the work environment (i.e., administrative policies, balance of work and personal life, compensation, job security, job
status, relationship with colleagues, supervision and working conditions (Herzberg, 1966).

The third work of Herzberg (1966) documented multiple replications of his initial study but with different populations. These populations included but were not limited to: (a) professional nurses, skilled workers and unskilled workers employed at two Veterans Administration Hospitals in Utah and Cleveland, Ohio, (b) women at a high professional level employed by the United States government, (c) scientists, engineers, manufacturing supervisors, male technicians and female hourly assemblers at the Texas Instruments Company installations in Dallas, Texas, (d) lower level supervisors in the utility industry, (e) lower level supervisors from a wide range of industries in Finland, (f) county administrators in the cooperative agricultural extension service at the University of Nebraska, (g) pre-retirees from managerial positions in various industries in Cleveland, Ohio.

Herzberg (1966) developed six theoretical assumptions based on his review of the literature (Herzberg, 1957), his initial study (Herzberg, 1959) and numerous replications of the study. The assumptions are as follows:

1. “Factors involved in producing job satisfaction were separate and distinct from the factors that led to job dissatisfaction” (Herzberg, 1966, pp. 75 - 76).
2. “Satisfiers are much more likely to increase job satisfaction than they would be to decrease job satisfaction but that the factors that relate to job dissatisfaction very infrequently act to increase job satisfaction” (Herzberg 1959, p. 80).
3. “Job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are not the obverse of each other” (Herzberg, 1966, p. 76).

4. “The opposite of job satisfaction would not be job dissatisfaction, but rather would be no job satisfaction. Similarly, the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction, not satisfaction with one’s job” (Herzberg, 1966, p. 76).

5. “Job satisfiers deal with the factors involved in doing the job, whereas the job dissatisfiers deal with the factors that define the job context” (Herzberg, 1959, p. 82).

6. “Man has two sets of needs: his need as an animal to avoid pain and his need as a human 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 of a need for growth or self-actualization” (Herzberg, 1966, p. 75).

Herzberg’s theory has been broadly influential and often appears in the education, business and industry literature (Owens, 2004). Herzberg’s work has had a powerful influence on the field of work and is especially valued because the theory is easy to understand, based on empirical data and offers explicit recommendations for administrators (Steers & Porter, 1991).

**Critiques of Herzberg’s Dual-Factor Theory**

As a researcher, it is also important to understand concerns about the theoretical base of the study in order to minimize the impact of any previously identified concerns. Although there are multiple criticisms of Herzberg’s work, for the purposes of this literature review, those most germane to the application of this study will be discussed.
Solimon (1970) posited that Herzberg’s theory is methodologically bound; meaning that the method implemented to measure the dual factors (intrinsic and extrinsic) determined the results. The participants in Herzberg’s studies received the following directions by the researcher:

Think of a time when you felt exceptionally good or exceptionally bad about your job, either your present job or any other job you have had. This can be either the “long-range or the short-range” kind of situation, as I have just described it. Tell me what happened. (Herzberg, 1993, p. 141)

In response to this question, individuals often provide what they think are socially acceptable responses or what the researcher expects to hear rather than their honest response.

In addition to Solimon’s critique, Ewen (1964) also questioned Herzberg’s work. Ewen stated that intrinsic and extrinsic factors were not independent, stating that some satisfiers produce positive, but not negative job attitudes and dissatisfiers produce negative but not positive attitudes. Ewen called Herzberg’s methodology into question. Specifically, he criticized Herzberg for the following: offering no evidence of validity and reliable data, the absence of a measure of overall job satisfaction, investigating a limited scope of jobs, and the application of only one measure of job attitudes. Therefore, Ewen stated that applying the outcome’s of Herzberg’s research beyond the study in which they occurred was not acceptable.

Locke (1976) also authored research in contrast to Herzberg. Locke believed job satisfaction and dissatisfaction result from different causes. He stated that the dual-factor
is parallel to the dual factor of man’s needs, indicating that psychological needs work with intrinsic factors and physical needs work with extrinsic factors.

In addition, Tietjan and Myers (1998) indicated that a critical factor in job satisfaction and output was attitude. They posited that the level of satisfaction and dissatisfaction within each factor was determined by the variation between job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Personal values and attitude decided the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction realized by a worker.

Despite the criticism, Herzberg’s dual-factor theory has been greatly accepted by administrators and policy makers (Hoy & Miskel, 2001). Focused primarily on the intrinsic and extrinsic factors as they relate to job satisfaction, Herzberg’s theory allows for the connection of these factors to important outcomes such as turnover and productivity instead of the dimensions and levels of satisfaction that serve as the basis for many other theories (Blix & Lee, 1991; Glick, 1992; Solomon & Tierney, 1977; Volkwein & Zhou, 2003).

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Factors Related to Job Satisfaction

Based on the significant role intrinsic and extrinsic factors have within Herzberg’s theory, it is essential to take a closer look at each factor as discussed in the related literature. Moreover, demographic variables including age, education level, ethnicity/race and gender as they relate to job satisfaction are also examined. Although an extensive literature review was conducted, studies pertaining to institutional enrollment, geographic region and number of years in current position as they relate to job satisfaction were not obtainable. Please note that this section is not intended to be an exhaustive review of each factor but to provide a sense of the literature related to Herzberg’s variables.
**Intrinsic Factors**

Herzberg (1959) posited that intrinsic factors correlated with job satisfaction and no job dissatisfaction. Achievement, advancement, recognition, responsibility and work itself were identified as intrinsic factors because they linked to an individual’s position.

**Achievement.** Jaksola, Beyer, and Trice (1985), and Grant (2006) commented that achievement outside of student affairs is often associated with prestige and pay while the source of an employee’s perception of achievement is more subjective. Denton and Zeytinoglu (1993) indicated that the literature within higher education shows the distribution of tasks, including committee work and responsibilities associated with administrative positions, communicates a strong message about the value and achievement of faculty members within an organization. Denton and Zeytinoglu reported on a study conducted at a medium-sized university in central Canada. The Status of Women Committee of the Faculty Association distributed a questionnaire to 78 full-time female faculty members and a random sample of 195 male full-time faculty members. A lower response rate by men was expected due to the nature of the group conducting the survey; therefore, men were over-sampled to insure an estimated equal number of respondents by gender. One outcome of the study indicated women received less significant assignments due to their own perceptions of being less than within the organizational context. As a result, some women have found achievement more elusive than men.

Sharp (2008) used Herzberg’s theory as a framework to investigate achievement as it related to job satisfaction. 161 registered psychiatric nurses from three New England states completed the short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. This 20-
item, five-point, Likert-type survey measured in part, the relationship between achievement and job satisfaction. The findings showed that 83% of the participants reported satisfaction with their level of achievement, which supported Herzberg's theory.

**Advancement.** Commitment to the life-long personal success of all individuals in colleges and universities, depth of character, efficiency, hard work, integrity, mutual respect, open communications, personal responsibility, a positive environment, responsibility, and risk taking are critical components in the success and advancement of student affairs professionals in entry-level positions (Harned & Murphy, 1998). While these factors are known, Boenisch (1983) conducted a study of 221 community/junior college student affairs professionals in Colorado and Wyoming. A four section, 80 item subjective assessment of leadership styles, job stress, job satisfaction and job types was utilized. An outcome of the study revealed that half of the participants acknowledged limited career development options. Moreover, Sangaria and Johnsrud (1988) conducted a study of position changes of student affairs administrators in six consecutive time periods between 1969 and 1980. Researchers administered a standardized questionnaire to a stratified (by position type) random sample of 474 line administrators at 4-year co-educational institutions in the United States. Findings showed that the longer incumbents remain in their positions, the fewer the number of new positions that are for those who wish to move up in the organization. Women showed a greater propensity to move internally than to another institution.

Based on their research, Cranny, Smith and Stone (1992) shared their observations regarding upward mobility in an organization.
A continual opportunity for promotion within a workplace throughout an employee's career enhances their satisfaction; satisfaction is influenced by promotion but not by this aspect only; a person's view of themselves in an organization is attributed to opportunities at hierarchical levels, and employees with limited chances for advancement often display poor attitudes toward their work and work place. (p. 15)

Recognition. Within student affairs, recognition was reported as one of the major motivators for professionals in conjunction with credit, criticism and praise (Groseth, 1978). Belch and Strange (1995) conducted a study about the importance of middle management in student affairs. Purposeful sampling was used to identify six middle managers from four year institutions in the Midwest to participate in semi-structured interviews. These professionals held the title of Dean or director. Outcomes showed that mid-level managers are important, although the roles they serve are often unclear or unrecognized. As a result, it was recommended that supervisors pay attention to the skills and contributions of middle managers on a consistent basis. This in part, is an important component in creating a satisfying work environment for these professionals.

Responsibility. A fairly recent study located about student affairs professionals and their responsibilities/where they spend their time, was conducted by Hirt, Kirk, McGuire, Mount and Nelson-Hensley (2003). The sample population was drawn from a large research university, two comprehensive public institutions and two private liberal arts colleges. The comprehensive and liberal arts institutions had similar enrollments and the schools in each pair employed a similar number of administrators. This specific combination of institutions was selected to allow the researchers to broadly generalize the
results, yet the number was small enough to depict the uniqueness of the individual institutions. 112 administrators were chosen from an original pool of 431 based on the following criteria: administrators were full-time employees; were willing to share their October 2001 calendar (omitting confidential information) with the researchers; and complete a short demographic survey. Calendars were subsequently collected from the 112 administrators to provide the researchers with the data to calculate the number of activities and hours spent per day. Activities were grouped into like categories, such as communication or service to students. Results revealed eight activity categories including the following: administration, management, strategic planning, professional development, personal communication, teaching, service to students. Overall, the researchers found that participants worked hard and that professionals in a variety of functional areas (e.g., career services, conduct, and housing) all had similar responsibilities within the eight categories.

Wisdom (2007) also conducted a study regarding the demands placed on department heads in higher education. Deans, faculty and department heads from three Midwestern AACBS-accredited Colleges of Business’ in two states served as participants. Data was gathered through participant interviews with deans, faculty, and department heads, document reviews and on-site observations by the researcher. Three broad categories including faculty/student, financial-resource and administrative/leadership demands on and responsibilities of department heads emerged with sub categories within each area. A major outcome of the research showed that a lack of training and guidance regarding procedures and policies is common place for department heads. Job satisfaction could be impacted collaterally.
Work itself. Rousseau (1978) posited that job characteristics are major factors that influence job experiences and, therefore, employee job satisfaction. In addition, autonomy, task significance and skill variety are included in the measure of job satisfaction which, according to Cranny, Smith and Stone (1992), has a strong correlation to work itself. In addition, Caldwell and O'Reilly (1982) investigated the impact of employee perceptions of job task characteristics on job satisfaction based on a lab experiment and a field study. The lab experiment included 77 part-time students enrolled in an evening Master of Business Administration program. Members were randomly assigned to role play a satisfied or dissatisfied employee. The satisfied group reported greater satisfaction with the work itself than the dissatisfied group. Task identity, skill variety, task feedback and autonomy were specifically identified. For the field study, 88 representatives having the same position within the western region of a national retail organization were surveyed. Satisfaction with the work itself was strongly correlated with all measures of task perception.

Glisson and Durick (1988) conducted a study in which they examined, in part, the idea that job tasks performed by workers would be excellent predictors of job satisfaction. The sample population included 319 individuals from 47 work groups in 22 different human service organizations. Researchers contacted the CEO of each organization by letter and phone to explain the research and gain their permission for employees to participate. Based on a 91% return rate, approximately 60 percent of all members of all workgroups were sampled. Participants completed a 30 minute questionnaire which included questions about job tasks. Findings confirmed that job tasks are the best predictors of job satisfaction in this study.
Within student affairs, Bowling (1973) conducted a study of eleven public institutions of higher education in the Southeast, each with an enrollment exceeding 10,000 students. A four page questionnaire booklet containing three survey instruments and a personal data sheet were mailed to a total of 106 department heads between the eleven institutions. A key finding applicable to “work itself” is that department heads were satisfied with the inherent aspects of their work.

**Extrinsic Factors**

Extrinsic factors are connected to the context of the job instead of its content. These are also referred to as dissatisfiers. Herzberg (1966) listed administrative policies; balance of work and personal life; compensation; job security; job status; relationship with colleagues; supervision; and working conditions as extrinsic factors. The presence or absence of extrinsic factors does not lead to satisfaction or motivation. (Herzberg; Grant, 2006).

**Administrative policies.** A study was conducted regarding work-life policies for faculty at 10 leading medical schools (as determined by U.S. News and World Report) in the United States (Bristol, Abbuhl, Cappola, & Sonnad, 2008). Researchers collected seven work-life policies on the following: maternity leave, paternity leave, adoption leave, extension of the probationary period for family responsibilities, part-time faculty appointments, job sharing, and child care. Researchers reviewed policy information on each institution’s web site and gained additional information through follow-up phone calls or e-mail. A rating of 0-3 (low to high flexibility) created by the researchers was applied to the policies. The rating was illustrative of the flexibility and existing views within the published literature. The researchers concluded that institutions with well
promoted, flexible, monitored and regularly reassessed work-life policies were at an advantage for attracting and retaining faculty.

Within higher education, Resnick (1991) examined the relationship between job satisfaction of higher education administrators and their place in the informal organization as determined by communication routines. Administrators at the president's cabinet level were very satisfied with the challenges they faced, influence they exerted and their given level of responsibility. Pay elicited a mild level of satisfaction. Administrators in positions outside of the president's cabinet were considerably less satisfied with the challenge of their work, level of responsibility and pay (Grant, 2006).

**Balance of work and personal life.** Work and personal life conflict exists when the demands of an individual's personal life and demands of work interfere with one another. This can have a direct impact on job satisfaction (Spector, 1997). Workers who experience high levels of conflict often report low levels of job satisfaction (Bedeian, Burke, & Moffett, 1988; Holahan & Gilbert, 1979; Lewis & Cooper, 1987; Rice, Frone, & McFarlin, 1992). Work hours and personal life are two important factors that influence job satisfaction (Volkwein & Zhou, 2003; Herzberg, 1959).

In addition, the issue of inter-domain conflict between work and home domains has become an immense concern for employers. Today, more dual-career families exist than ever before and a large number of households have single-parents at the helm. Management of work-family responsibilities becomes a daily juggling act with the work-family conflict often at the center (Boles, Howard, & Donofrio, 2001).

Boles, Howard and Donofrio (2001) also examined the impact of work-family conflict on facets of job satisfaction including: satisfaction with pay, promotion, work
itself, colleagues, co-workers and overall job satisfaction. One hundred and forty four parole officers in a large southeastern state served as participants and completed The Job Description Inventory (Smith et al. 1969). Regression analyses on the facets listed above revealed that work-family conflict was significant to overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with colleagues, work itself and promotion. Researchers determined that work place responsibilities and responsibilities at home cannot be seen as mutually exclusive entities. Recommendations to address these issues included workplace changes coupled with employee training on intra-personal and interpersonal conflict resolution.

Compensation. Salary and the inability of higher education to often offer comparable adjustments, such as the cost of living offered by other professions, is problematic (Olsen, 1993). An additional layer of research shows that pay fairness is critical to job satisfaction. For example, employees have a heightened concern if workers in the same job earn more than they do. People are likely to compare themselves to one another and experience great dissatisfaction if their salary is lower than others in the same job (Spector, 1997).

Loyd (2005) conducted a national web-based study of four year institutions in the United States to explore the relationship between teamwork and job satisfaction among student affairs administrators. Four hundred and forty five participants from 765 colleges and universities were accessed through the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). Correlational data analyses, ANOVAs, and measures of central tendency were used to determine relationships among the variables. Results showed that student affairs administrators, who in part, earn a higher salary, were more satisfied in their jobs than colleagues who earned less. Specifically, administrators making more than
$60,000 demonstrated increased satisfaction than did employees within the $10,000-$39,000 range and $40,000 - $59,999 range.

Job security. The Job Security Index (JSI) and Job Security Satisfaction (JSS) scales were developed by Probst (2002). Probst surveyed 283 health and human service workers regarding the following factors: antecedents, job attitudes and consequences, moderators of job security and perceptions. A strong correlation existed between the two scales. Moreover, Probst (2002) developed a conceptual model that indicated employee dissatisfaction with the level of job security he or she would feel stress. In this research study, stress level significantly predicted job security satisfaction, however, stress level was not predicted by job security perceptions. Probst determined that the JSI and JSS measured distinctive parts of the antecedents and consequences of job security. She recommended that further factor analyses be conducted in the future to confirm the validity of the JSI and JSS.

Within the field of economics, research was completed in 2010 by Aguilar and Vlosky on gender and determinants of job satisfaction. Several explanatory variables of job satisfaction were examined including job stability/security. An on-line, web-based survey was completed by 1147 female and 1280 male employed at Land Grant University Cooperative Extension Services in 48 states within the United States. The F-statistic was equal to 14.06 with an associated p-value of <0.001. Specific interaction suggested that females attained higher levels of satisfaction than males when offered higher levels of job stability and security. The authors suggested that prior working conditions for women were worse than those for men, leading women to place a higher value on job stability/security as a determinant of overall job satisfaction.
There is a dearth in the research about job security in student affairs. In 2006, Grant commented that during the recent economic downturn, budget cuts and layoffs are definitely a concern for student affairs professionals. In 1993, Garland and Grace reported that mid-level professionals in student affairs were apprehensive about job security due to budget constraints, diminishing revenue and enrollment fluctuations.

*Job status.* Robinson and McIlwee (1991) conducted a study on male and female electrical and mechanical engineering graduates of two southern California public universities. A random sample from both schools totaling 1,985 graduates, were sent an 8 page questionnaire about their training and subsequent job attainment. Four hundred and seven responses were received (328 male and 79 female). Follow-up interviews were conducted with a random subsample. Although respondents received the same education, men in high-tech companies obtained positions that carried greater status than women. Researchers spoke with men and women at one high tech company and found that highest level of job status was typically awarded to those who were facile with the technical and hands on aspects of projects. Most often, these were male employees believed to be proficient with technical issues and experts in the "hands on" aspects of projects. Women, on the other hand, were often considered sub-par by their male supervisors. Women also indicated a feeling of insecurity around their male counterparts due to the differences in their interactional styles and lack of opportunities to achieve high status positions afforded to them by their male colleagues.

Another study, by Denton and Zeytinoglu (1993), examined the role of faculty in university decision-making at a medium sized university in central Canada. Having a defined role in this process is often equated with job status and influence in the
environment. A self-completion questionnaire was mailed to all 78 female faculty members and a random sample was conducted of 195 male faculty members. The study showed a strong negative relationship between female faculty and their perceived participation in decision-making. Faculty rank had a very significant impact. The higher the rank, the more likely faculty members were to perceive themselves as participating in the university’s decision-making processes. Because women were more likely to be found in the lower ranks, they often did not perceive themselves as players within the decision-making arena.

*Relationships with colleagues.* Work relationships are important. On one hand, they can be used as a strategic component for upward mobility. On the other hand, they can be a career defining end (Gersick, Bartunek, & Dutton, 2000). A study conducted by these authors looked at the collegial relationship experiences of 37 faculty members from six management schools located in the Western, Eastern and Midwest regions of the United States. This exploratory research included interviews and one to one discussions between researchers and participants. During part one of the interviews, participants provided background information and shared information about the central relationships in their lives and the reasons participant’s felt they were central. During part two of the interview, participants were asked to indicate the two relationships in their professional lives that made the most difference. The most prevalent reasons for a relationship’s importance were collegiality (working side-by side with identified partners), power and control over the participant, and negative influences. Within the relationship spectrum, it is evident that employees understand the importance of various types of work relationships in their professional lives.
Roper (2002) found that student affairs professionals must work hard to maintain positive relationships and be intentional in their efforts. Roper reported that interaction with supervisors and colleagues is usually a part of everyday work life. As a result, the ability to get work accomplished is, in part, dependent on the quality of collegial relationships.

Supervision. Supervision and the perception of supervision have a significant role in job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction (Grant, 2006). O’Driscoll and Beeher (1994) conducted a study about supervisor behaviors and the impact on subordinates. The sample consisted of one hundred and thirteen personnel in accounting organizations in three Midwestern cities, and 123 employees from an accounting organization in New Zealand. These populations were of comparable size and function. Participants were given a questionnaire booklet to complete that included the following variables: demographic information, scales measuring supervisory behavior, role stressors, uncertainties and outcomes. To determine aspects of supervisory behavior that could impact role stressors and uncertainty in the work context, respondents were asked to rate, in part, behavioral items regarding supervisory style and leadership. The study showed that supervisory behavior had some direct impact on job satisfaction. Subordinates that perceived their supervisors to initiate structure, set goals, assist with problem solving, provide social and material support, and give feedback on job performance experienced less ambiguity and uncertainty in their jobs. This led to greater employee satisfaction. A practical inference from this finding is that supervisors need to make themselves aware of their potential capacity to affect employee levels of ambiguity and uncertainty in their place of employment which in turn, is connected to employee satisfaction levels.
Within student affairs, Biggs, Barnhart and Bakkenist (1975) reported that chief student affairs officers were satisfied with their opportunity to supervise executive officials within the university setting. In addition, studies by Bowling (1973) and Bender (1980) described earlier in this review, also lend insight into supervision. The research indicated that the satisfaction level of supervision for student affairs professionals ranged from somewhat to very dissatisfied.

*Working conditions.* Locke (1976) observed that noise, temperature, lighting, location, cleanliness, adequate equipment, and supplies are primary working conditions that impact job satisfaction.

In 2008, a study of teacher working conditions was distributed by the North Carolina Professional Teaching Commission and State Board of Education to 104,248 educators in North Carolina at every traditional public school. This bi-annual survey launched in 2002, describes conditions teachers experience in classrooms and schools that are essential to student success and teacher retention (Hirsch & Church, 2009). For example, statistical models show that supportive school leadership, appropriate facilities, and sufficient resources are important to student achievement. Approximately nine out of ten teachers at the highest-performing schools indicated their school is a positive place to work and learn in comparison to two thirds of the lowest performing schools. Individual planning time, chances to collaborative and the opportunity to work with students minus interruptions and additional workload significantly enhanced student achievement for elementary and high schools students. Eight out of 10 teachers in the highest performing elementary schools described an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect along with safe working conditions, effective school leadership and strong School Improvement Teams.
Growth at the elementary, middle and high school levels were also favorably impacted by one or a combination of the positive working conditions described above.

Moreover, working conditions have a strong impact on teachers' future employment plans. At the elementary level, school leadership and the proportion of licensed educators and those with advanced degrees were significant to teacher retention. At the middle school level, the ability of teachers to be actively involved in decision-making was significant in their decision to stay. At the high school level, facilities, resources, school size and the proportion of fully licensed teachers were significant to the teachers' decisions to remain in their capacities. Overall, positive working conditions are critical to student achievement, teacher productivity and retention (Hirsch & Church 2009).

**Demographic Variables**

The demographic variables in this study include age, education level, institutional enrollment, ethnicity/race, gender, geographic region, and years in current position.

*Age.* In the late 1980s and mid 1990s two meta-analyses regarding age and job satisfaction were completed. First, Brush, Moch and Pooyan (1987) conducted a meta-analysis with data obtained from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Package databank collected by the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan. Twenty-one independent samples were obtained. Ten thousand one hundred and ninety two subjects from service-oriented organizations, manufacturing corporations, and governmental organizations were included. The average age of the respondents was 36.8 years. The mean correlation coefficient between age and job satisfaction was .22. Additional analysis subsequently showed a moderated association between age and job
satisfaction depending on the type of organization studied. This served as an indication that the relationship between age and job satisfaction may differ depending on the organization type. The second meta-analysis by Stems, Marsh and McDaniel (1995) included a larger number of studies and concluded that the age-job satisfaction relationship was positive and occupation type moderated the relationship between age and job satisfaction (Bernal, Snyder & McDaniel (1998).

Within student affairs, Tarver, Canada and Limm (1999) studied the relationship between job satisfaction and locus of control among student affairs administrators and academic administrators at various ages. A systematically chosen random sample of 327 student affairs administrators at the director level or above were selected from the membership directory of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). Three instruments were used including the following: the Job in General Scale (JIG) of the job Description Index (JDI) by Smith, Kendall and Hulin, (1969); the Internal-External Scale [I-E] by Rotter (1954; 1966) and an information sheet used to gather demographic data from the respondents. The JIG measured global satisfaction and the I-E measured locus of control. Significant negative correlations (p < .05), indicating a positive relationship between job satisfaction and internal locus of control orientation were determined in the sample of student affairs administrators as a whole. Overall, seasoned student affairs administrators had higher levels of locus of control and job satisfaction.

*Education level.* Within the area of sociology, several studies (e.g., Agho, Mueller, & Price 1993; Glenn & Weaver, 1982; Locke, 1976; and Ross & Reskin, (1992) concluded that job satisfaction was indirectly linked to education. Elton and Smart,
(1988) and Fricko and Beehr (1992), determined that college major combined with job field congruence resulted in job satisfaction. For the purposes of these studies, job congruence was the degree to which there was a direct link between the knowledge gained by participants’ in their undergraduate major, the tasks in their current jobs aligned with the knowledge gained during college, and job satisfaction (Wolniak & Pascarella, 2005). Within higher education, Schonwetter, Bond and Perry, (1993) conducted a study that examined distinctive factors, including education, as related to job satisfaction of 150 volunteer senior and mid-level. Participants completed a portfolio of questionnaires regarding demographics and work styles of administrators enrolled in management courses at the Centre for Higher Education Research and Development at the University of Manitoba. Outcomes showed that female administrators with a doctorate indicated the highest level of job satisfaction within their role and occupation.

*Ethnicity/race.* The meta-analysis by Brush, Moch and Pooyan (1987) described within the previous category on age, also analyzed the factor of race. Eight of the 21 studies found that African American employees often reported a lower level of satisfaction than white employees. In contrast, in a study conducted by Jones, Hohenshil and Burge (2009) of African American counselors (AACs) within the American Counseling Association (ACA), researchers randomly selected 400 AACs in the organization to receive a job satisfaction survey based on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The modified version of the MSQ was completed by 199 participants resulting in a 49.8% return rate. Outcomes showed that 87% of the participants were very satisfied to satisfied with their professional positions.
In addition to African Americans, Mau and Kopischke (2001) examined the job satisfaction of Caucasian, African American, Hispanic American and Asian Americans college graduates. The sample consisted of 9,245 Caucasians, 663 African Americans, 587 Hispanic Americans and 437 Asian Americans. Data was based on the Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study (B&B) supported by the National Center for Educational Statistics. The B&B included a subgroup of students selected for the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study. A total of 1,386 institutions of higher education in the United States were represented. Results of MANOVA suggested significant differences in job satisfaction. Specifically, African and Asian Americans scored significantly lower than Caucasian and Hispanic Americans. Possible determinants included discrimination or perceived discrimination, interest congruence and work value correspondence.

*Gender.* Bender, Donohue and Heywood (2005) conducted a study using data from 1854 respondents included in the National Study of the Changing Workforce (NCSW) in 1997. Comparing various job satisfaction variables including gender, the researchers found that job satisfaction increased for male employees as their pay increased. This was not the case for female employees. A negative correlation existed between additional education and job satisfaction for male employees, and firm size and job satisfaction for female employees. Moreover, researchers added the gender composition of an employee’s worksite as a self-reported measure. The initial outcome for female employees indicated that job satisfaction increased as the number of female employees at the worksite increased. The outcome for male employees indicated higher job satisfaction in exclusively male worksites and limited differences in satisfaction with all other worksite compositions. In addition, the authors suggested that a majority of the
difference in satisfaction related to worksite gender composition was eliminated for female employees if flexibility between work and home was taken into consideration.

Within higher education DeAngelo, Hurtado, Pryor, Kelly and Santos (2009), authored a brief regarding the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) survey of faculty in 2007-2008 that included outcomes related to gender and job satisfaction. For the purposes of this study, 22,562 full-time college and university faculty at 372 four-year institutions of higher education in the United States completed a web-based survey. The results showed that 74.8% of the participants reported overall job satisfaction. Men, however, ranked higher on their level of satisfaction with job security (80.8% compared to 72.8% for women) and opportunities for advancement (57.7% compared to 49.9% for women). Moreover, academic rank impacted satisfaction. Male and female assistant professors reported similar levels of satisfaction while men at the full professor level were generally more satisfied than women. Men at the level of full professor also ranked higher in their satisfaction with scholarship activity (66% compared to 50.6% for women) and teaching load (66.2% for men compared to 53.2% for women). Subtle discrimination was noted as the area of greatest difference between men and women. Two times the number of women (38.7% compared with 18.2% for men) indicated experience with prejudice, racism and sexism.

**Intent to Leave or Stay in a Position**

Bender (1980), Glick (1992), and Murray and Murray (1998) indicated that low job satisfaction was associated with high worker turnover. Bluedorn, (1982) and Lee and Mowday, (1987) observed that the intent to leave or stay in a position is a tangible gauge of actual turnover.
Ward (1995) examined the relationship between the propensity of new professionals in student affairs to leave and role stress. Through a stratified random sample of new full-time student affairs administrators (defined as those employed for two years or less with the minimum of a master’s degree) at four year colleges and universities in the United States 158 employees were surveyed. The outcome showed that although new professionals indicated a high level of job satisfaction, they also indicated a high tendency to leave the profession.

A more recent study conducted by Rosser and Javinar, (2003) examined demographic variables, work-life factors and their impact on morale and satisfaction of mid-level student affairs professionals and their intent to leave their positions. One thousand one hundred and sixty six mid-level professionals (defined as academic or nonacademic support personnel within higher education organizations such as directors and coordinators of student housing, admissions and financial aid) were asked via a survey to indicate their level of agreement with 48 statements regarding the quality of their professional and institutional work lives. Intent to leave was measured by three selected items: the extent to which student affairs leaders would be likely to leave their current position, leave their institution, and leave their career/profession. Demographic variables including gender, race/ethnicity, minority status by gender/race in the work unit, salary level, years in position, years at the institution, administrative unit and type of institution (public or private) were also examined. Of the demographic variables, number of years worked at their current institution and salary level had a notable effect on the student affairs administrators’ morale and intent to leave. The longer an employee stayed at an institution, the lower their morale. However, because of their commitment to
student affairs and years of service, they were unlikely to leave their position. In addition, the most critical work life factor was the high degree of importance employees placed on collegial relationships within their work area. Overall job satisfaction and intent to stay increased with the presence of positive relationships.

Chapter II Summary

The literature review explained the history of student conduct at institutions of higher education in the United States and the evolution of the chief student conduct administrator position. Moreover, Herzberg’s theory of job satisfaction was discussed and an in-depth accounting of the intrinsic and extrinsic variables and demographics, with a sampling of related research findings provided. Next, chapter 3 offers a discussion of the methods utilized in this research study.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

While there has been a great deal of research done on job satisfaction in general, prior to this study no research was found in which the job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators and their intent to stay or leave had been investigated. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to explore, through a national study, the job satisfaction and intent to leave of chief student conduct administrators at four year public institutions in the United States. Herzberg's (1957; 1959) dual-factor theory (intrinsic and extrinsic factors) served as the conceptual framework.

Research Design

Quantitative methods are used when a researcher studies a sample of a larger population in order to generalize results to the larger population (Creswell, 2003). Survey instruments are useful in the collection of exploratory, descriptive, explanatory, or evaluative research and an effective and efficient way to gather data concerning individual perceptions (Dillman & Salant, 2008). Surveys can depict attitudes, opinions, or provide a quantitative description of trends within a sample of a population. Once the data is collected, statistical procedures are used by the researcher to determine if the data supports, expands upon or refutes the literature or known theories (McMillan, 2008; Creswell, 2003). Such a survey design was used in this study.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to determine the level of job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction of chief student conduct administrators at public institutions in the United
States and their intent to stay or leave their position. As a result, the study focused on the following questions:

1. To what extent are chief student conduct administrators at four-year public institutions of higher education satisfied with their jobs?

2. To what extent is job satisfaction of such chief student conduct administrators related to demographic characteristics (age, education level, institutional enrollment, ethnicity/race, gender, geographic region, and years of experience in student conduct)?

3. To what extent is job satisfaction of such chief student conduct administrators related to Herzberg’s intrinsic motivation factors (i.e., achievement/growth, advancement, recognition, responsibility, and work itself)?

4. To what extent is job satisfaction of such chief student conduct administrators related to Herzberg’s extrinsic hygiene factors (i.e., administrative policies, balance of work and personal life, compensation, job security, job status, relationship with colleagues, supervision, and working conditions)?

5. To what extent is the intent of the chief student conduct administrator to stay or leave the position related to job satisfaction?

Population and Sample

The population for this study encompassed all four-year public institutions of higher education in the United States with chief student conduct administrators who belong to the Association of Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA). Chief student conduct administrators are professionals with direct oversight of and responsibility for implementation of an institution’s conduct process. The sample consisted of chief student
conduct administrators from the membership of (ASCA) who granted permission for use of their membership list. The on-line survey was sent to 358 members of which 137 (38%) participated in the study through completion of a survey.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

The survey for this study was based on the Mid-Level Job Satisfaction Job Dissatisfaction Inventory (M-LJSJDI) created by Grant in 2006 to study job satisfaction levels of mid-level manager is student affairs. Based on permission from Grant (Appendix A), his survey was modified and used for this study on chief student conduct administrators (Appendix B). The determination to use Grant’s work was based on its measure of the job satisfaction level of mid-level administrators in student affairs (the typical job classification of chief student conduct administrators) and the use of Herzberg’s theoretical framework of job satisfaction to solicit participants’ responses about the intrinsic and extrinsic factors related to job satisfaction. Grant’s survey was modified to focus on job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators. The Chief Student Conduct Administrator Survey included the following: thirteen statements about job satisfaction designed to measure chief student conduct administrators’ experience with each of Herzberg’s (1957; 1959) intrinsic (achievement/growth, advancement, recognition, responsibility, and work itself) and extrinsic (administrative policies, balance of work and personal life, compensation, job security, job status, relationship with colleagues, supervision, and working conditions) variables of job satisfaction accompanied by three to five sub-statements specific to each variable and student conduct; one question on overall job satisfaction; two questions about intent to stay or leave accompanied by 5-8 sub-questions; four open-ended questions regarding
satisfaction and intent to stay or leave the position and demographics including gender, ethnic background, number of years served in student conduct, size of current institution's student population, highest degree attained by respondents, age and Circuit within ASCA. Descriptive information was listed below each demographic variable and respondents were asked to indicate a response. For example, under the gender variable, respondents were asked to indicate if they were female, male or transgender.

For all quantitative questions, respondents were asked to provide a ranking for each question based on a Likert scale with a range of 1-6. Respondents selected one of the following responses that corresponded with a number on the scale as follows: (1) strongly disagree, (2) moderately disagree, (3) slightly disagree, (4) slightly agree, (5) moderately agree, and (6) strongly agree.

Pilot Study

The purpose of the pilot study was to check the usability of the on-line format of the survey instrument used in this study to measure the level of job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators identified through ASCA. The survey was piloted with a small sample of individuals identified as current or past chief student conduct administrators. An email was sent asking the members identified to participate. In addition, a copy of the pilot survey was sent to the individuals, asking them to provide feedback on the usability of the instrument for the proposed study. Respondents were asked to review wording, question order, visual design, interconnections of questions, and implementation procedures. Modifications were made based upon their input.

Survey Distribution

To access potential participants, e-mail addresses were obtained from ASCA. Upon approval from the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (Appendix C), an
initial e-mail (Appendix D) was sent to 358 chief student conduct administrators within member institutions to notify them about the study and invite them to voluntarily participate by completing the survey. The e-mail contained a hyperlink to the survey hosted on Zoomerang. Second and third (Appendix E) e-mails were sent to study participants who had not accessed and completed the survey two and three weeks after the initial e-mail was sent. The content of the e-mails was similar to the initial message with an explanation of the study and an invitation to participate in the study by clicking on the hyperlink and completing the survey.

E-mail was chosen as the preferred method to ascertain participants for the study because each ASCA member listed an e-mail address at work. Therefore, communication was sent via this medium and participants accessed the survey via their computer as they were able. Moreover, distribution of the survey to a national population eliminated concerns about obtaining a representative subject group, and the costs of postage, envelopes, and photocopying. Dillman, Smyth and Christian's (2009) publication on internet surveys was used as a guide throughout this portion of the study.

The web-based on-line survey data was initially collected between October 1, 2009 – October 23, 2009. Two email reminders were sent to the population. At the end of week three, there were 122 respondents for a 34.08% response rate. Upon review of the data, the determination was made to extend the survey completion deadline in order to increase the number of respondents. HSIRB modifications were requested and approval was granted. An e-mail was sent to the population regarding the extension provided for those who had not yet responded. Additional data was collected between November 18,
2009 – November 25, 2009 which resulted in a final sum of 137 respondents, or a 38% overall response rate. After a review of the data, all 137 responses were usable.

Limitations and Delimitations

This study was delimited to job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators at public institutions in the United States. The applicability of this study is therefore delimited to like institutions (i.e., public institutions with chief student conduct administrators with membership in ASCA). The study excluded chief student conduct administrators at private colleges and universities and community colleges in the United States. Therefore, the outcomes of this study cannot be presupposed to generalize to chief student conduct administrators at these institutions. The use of Herzberg’s two-factor theory as the theoretical framework for this study was also a delimitation. Herzberg’s work was selected based on its timeless application, the range of applied extrinsic and intrinsic variables it affords and the extensive use of the theory within job satisfaction literature.

As survey research, the data obtained for this study was dependent upon honest self-reporting by chief student conduct administrators. This limitation may have introduced some undeterminable bias into the data received.

Data Analysis

The data analysis was done in correspondence with each research question. A crosswalk table was created in order to readily identify analysis processes for each question (Appendix F). Frequency and descriptive analysis were performed on the survey variables. Means were calculated for items with response scales. Open-ended questions
were categorized and the percentage of responses calculated within each group. A copy of the verbatim responses to the open ended-questions in contained in Appendix G.

Measures for Research Questions

Research question one asked the following: overall, to what extent are chief student conduct administrators at four-year public institutions of higher education satisfied with their jobs? Job satisfaction was calculated by the means and standard deviations for each intrinsic factor (achievement/growth, advancement, recognition, responsibility, work itself) and each extrinsic factor (administrative policies, balance of work and personal life, compensation, job security, job status, relationship with colleagues, supervision and work conditions). Reliability and validity tests were done prior to conducting the analysis to verify that the constructs in the study were appropriately measuring satisfaction via the survey.

Research question two asked the following: To what extent is job satisfaction of such chief student conduct administrators related to demographic characteristics (age, education level, institutional enrollment, ethnicity/race, gender, geographic region, and years of experience in student conduct)? The demographic characteristics served as the independent variables and job satisfaction the dependent variable. The first analysis was calculated by an ANOVA for each independent variable to determine if there were any significant differences in job satisfaction between groups. Multiple linear regressions were performed as the second analysis for each independent variable to determine if it was possible to predict job satisfaction based on one or more of the independent variables studied.
Research question three asked the following: to what extent is job satisfaction related to Herzberg's intrinsic factors (achievement/growth, advancement, recognition, responsibility and work itself) after controlling for demographic variables. Intrinsic variables served as the independent variables, job satisfaction as the dependent variable, and demographic variables as controls. The first analysis of each variable was measured by conducting a Cronbach’s alpha to ensure consistency of the questions on the survey pertaining to each variable. The second analysis was a multiple regression analysis of the independent variables to determine if it was possible to predict job satisfaction based on one or more of the independent variables studied.

Research question four asked the following: to what extent is job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators related to Herzberg's extrinsic factors (administrative policies, balance of work and personal life, compensation, job security, job status, relationship with colleagues, supervision, and working conditions)? The extrinsic factors served as the independent variables, job satisfaction as the dependent variable and demographic variables as controls. The first analysis of each variable was measured by conducting a Cronbach’s alpha to ensure consistency of the questions on the survey pertaining to each variable. Multiple linear regressions were performed as the second analysis for each independent variable to determine if it is possible to predict job satisfaction based on one or more of the independent variables studied.

Research question five asked the following: to what extent is the intent of the chief student conduct administrator to stay or leave the position related to job satisfaction?
Job satisfaction served as the independent variable, and intent to leave as the dependent variable. An ANOVA was conducted to determine whether those who were satisfied with their position had a greater intention of staying than those who were dissatisfied with their position.

Chapter III Summary

Chapter 3 presented the research questions, research design overview, population and sample, instrumentation and data collection methods, pilot study, survey distribution, delimitations and limitations, data analysis procedures and measures for research questions. Chapter 4 next presents the results of the measures for each research question.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the web based Chief Student Conduct Administrator National Survey administered to chief student conduct administrators affiliated with the Association of Student Conduct Administration (ASCA). This chapter begins by presenting demographic and institutional variables from respondents, as well as response rates. Next, the chapter addresses each of the five research questions. Results presented include frequency data, percentages, means, T-tests, ANOVAs, and multiple linear regressions.

Respondent Description and Demographic Variables

Within the ASCA database, 358 members identified as chief student conduct administrators at public institutions of higher education in the United States. An initial survey invitation e-mail was sent to the population (n= 358). A total of 137 chief student conduct administrators completed the survey (n=137, 38%).

Females represented 52.6% of the respondents. Caucasians were heavily represented by 80.1% of the respondents, followed by African Americans (13.2%). Education attained by respondents at the master’s degree level was highest at 63.5% followed by those with a Ph.D. or Ed.D. at 23.5%. All 11 geographic regions (circuits) were represented in the respondent group. The largest number of respondents (16.9%) were from Circuit 9 (Alaska, Arizona, California, Guam, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington). Table 1 displays the frequencies and percentages, all ranked from highest to lowest percentages.
Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics of Gender, Ethnicity, Highest Degree Attained, and ASCA Circuit*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity/Racial groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree Attained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. or Ed.D.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juris Doctor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCA Circuit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Alaska, Arizona, California, Guam, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 District of Columbia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Connecticut, New York, Vermont</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean number of years worked in student conduct was 9.28, with the minimum number of years served at .5 and the maximum at 43.

Respondents were sorted into six groups based on years in student conduct (0-3 years, 4-6 years, 7-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, and 22+ years). Nearly half (47.7%) of the respondents reported 4-10 years of experience in student conduct.

Respondents were also asked to indicate the size of the student population (both undergraduate and graduate) at their current institution. The mean number of students was 18,813 with the smallest institution reporting 2,000 students and the largest with 52,000 students. Responses were also sorted into four groups based on the student population size (1 - 4,999; 5,000 - 14,999; 15,000 - 24,999; 25,000+). Institutions with 5,000 - 14,999 students had the largest representation at 36.4%. Over half of the institutions had 15,000+ students (56.1%). Table 2 shows these results.

The youngest respondent was 21; the oldest was 66 years old. Responses were sorted into five groups based on age (21-35, 36-45, 46-55, 56-65, 66+). Nearly half (45.2%) of the respondents were between the ages of 36 and 45.

*Job Satisfaction of Chief Student Conduct Administrators*

Research question one asked “To what extent are chief student conduct administrators at four-year public institutions of higher education satisfied with their jobs?” The survey questions focused on the job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators regarding the intrinsic (achievement/growth, advancement, recognition, responsibility, and the work itself) and extrinsic (administrative policies, balance of work and personal life, compensation, job security, job status, relationship with colleagues, supervision, and work conditions) motivation factors.
Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of Years in Student Conduct, Student Population Size, and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years in Student Conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Population Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>18,813</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 – 14,999</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 – 24,999</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000+</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43.03</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 also shows that the mean age for respondents was 43.03 years of age.

Achievement/Growth

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a 6-point Likert scale (i.e., 1= strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, and 6=strongly agree) with three statements regarding achievement/growth.

Respondents were asked to respond to the statement “I am satisfied with the encouragement I receive from my supervisor to be involved in professional activities related to student conduct.” A majority (76%) of the respondents either slightly (16.8%), moderately (30.7%), or strongly (28.5%) agreed with this statement. Only 15 respondents slightly disagreed (10.9%), while 10 (7.3%) moderately disagreed and 8 (5.8%) strongly
disagreed. In addition, respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with "the opportunities for professional growth as a result of serving in the chief student conduct administrator position on a daily basis." The majority (70.4%) of respondents indicated slight (20.6%) moderate (27.2%) or strong (22.6%), or agreement. When asked to respond to the statement, "I am satisfied with the amount of time I have to engage in professional development opportunities within and external to my institution," 21.9% indicated mild agreement, 25.5% moderate agreement and 12.4% strongly agreement with this statement. Six respondents (4.4%) indicated strong disagreement, and 49 respondents either moderately (14.6%) or slightly (21.2%) disagreed that they are satisfied with the amount of time to engage in professional development.

Table 3 presents frequencies, percentages and means concerning achievement/growth as ranked from lowest to highest means.

Table 3

* Satisfaction with Personal Achievement/Growth *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent satisfied with:</th>
<th>Frequencies/Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>supervisor encour. prof. activities</td>
<td>8 (5.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional growth opp.</td>
<td>8 (5.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time for prof. dev</td>
<td>6 (4.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, 6=strongly agree
Advancement

Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction on issues related to advancement on a 6-point Likert scale (i.e., 1= strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, and 6=strongly agree).

Most of the respondents indicated that they slightly agree (17.5%), moderately agree (30.7%), or strongly agree (32.8%) with the statement “I am satisfied that my current position offers experiences necessary for future advancement to higher level positions.” Only 5 (3.6%) strongly disagreed with the statement. While the overwhelming majority see their current position offering valuable experience to prepare them for higher level positions, many less feel that there are opportunities for advancement at their own institution. Only 64 (46.7%) of the respondents agreed with the statement “I am satisfied with opportunities for advancement within my institution.” The remaining respondents slightly disagreed (14.6%), moderately disagreed (16.8%), or strongly disagreed (21.9%) that there are opportunities within their current institution for advancement. Lastly, the participants responded to the statement “I am satisfied with the way advancement opportunities are facilitated at my institution.” This was an area that more individuals disagreed with than agreed with. While 75 (54.9%) of the group slightly disagreed (14.7%), moderately disagreed (16.8%), or strongly disagreed (23.4%); 61 (45.1%) slightly agreed (19.9%), moderately agreed (18.2%), or strongly agreed (6.6%) with the way advancement opportunities are facilitated.

Table 4 displays the frequency and total percentage for each of the three questions posed concerning advancement as ranked from lowest to highest means.
Table 4

Satisfaction with Advancement Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent satisfied with:</th>
<th>Frequencies/Percentages</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp. offered to advance career</td>
<td>5 (3.6)</td>
<td>10 (7.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement opportunities</td>
<td>30 (21.9)</td>
<td>23 (16.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way adv’ment opp. handled by St. Affairs</td>
<td>32 (23.4)</td>
<td>23 (16.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, 6=strongly agree

Recognition

Chief student conduct administrators were asked three questions concerning the professional recognition they receive from their supervisors, colleagues at their institution, and colleagues at other institutions. Responses on a 6-point Likert scale (i.e., 1= strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, and 6=strongly agree) demonstrate that the respondents believe they received the most recognition from colleagues within their own institution ($m=4.24$), followed by colleagues from other institutions ($m=4.19$), and lastly from their supervisor ($m=4.13$). Nearly three-quarters (73.5%) of respondents either slightly (24.3%), moderately (30.1%), or strongly agree (19.1%) that they are satisfied with the recognition they receive from their colleagues within the institution.

Likewise, an overwhelming majority (74.6%) agree (slightly, moderately, or strongly) that they are satisfied with the recognition they receive from colleagues at other institutions. The majority of conduct administrators are also satisfied with the recognition received from their supervisor. Nearly three-quarters (71.8%) slightly
(23.7%), moderately (24.4%), or strongly (23.7%) agree that they are satisfied with the recognition received from their supervisors.

Details concerning frequencies and percentages as ranked from lowest to highest means are outlined in Table 5.

Table 5

**Satisfaction with Recognition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent satisfied with recognition from:</th>
<th>1=Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2=Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>3=Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>4=Slightly Agree</th>
<th>5=Moderately Agree</th>
<th>6=Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues within institution</td>
<td>6 (4.4)</td>
<td>13 (9.5)</td>
<td>17 (12.5)</td>
<td>33 (24.3)</td>
<td>41 (30.1)</td>
<td>26 (19.1)</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues outside of institution</td>
<td>4 (3.0)</td>
<td>11 (8.2)</td>
<td>19 (14.2)</td>
<td>42 (31.3)</td>
<td>37 (27.6)</td>
<td>21 (15.7)</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>11 (8.1)</td>
<td>20 (14.8)</td>
<td>7 (5.2)</td>
<td>32 (23.7)</td>
<td>33 (24.4)</td>
<td>32 (23.7)</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, 6=strongly agree

**Responsibility**

Chief student conduct administrators were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction on a 6-point Likert scale (i.e., 1= strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, and 6=strongly agree) regarding three elements of responsibility.

One of the questions in this variable asked the conduct administrators to respond to the statement “I am satisfied with the professional responsibilities in my job related to student conduct.” An overwhelming majority (84%) agreed (slightly, moderately, or strongly) with this statement. Another question asked respondents to rate their agreement or disagreement with the statement “I am satisfied with the opportunities to take on additional responsibilities.” Most (76%) student conduct administrators agreed with this
statement. The last question in this area asked student conduct administrators to respond to the statement “I am satisfied with the amount of time I have to carry out my responsibilities.” Nearly half (44.9%) of the respondents indicated that they slightly disagree (16.2%), moderately disagree (11.8%), or strongly disagree (16.9%).

Table 6 outlines the frequencies and percentages as ranked from lowest to highest means for each of the questions related to responsibility.

Table 6

*Satisfaction with Responsibility*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent satisfied with:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Slightly Agree n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Moderately Agree n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Strongly Agree n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional respons.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to take on additional respons.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of time for respons.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, 6=strongly agree

*Work Itself*

The participants were asked three questions related to their satisfaction with the work itself. Responses were ranked on a 6-point Likert scale (i.e., 1= strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, and 6=strongly agree).

The first question asked chief student conduct administrators to respond to the statement “I am satisfied with my ability to do my job.” Over 95% of the chief student conduct administrators agreed with this statement. In fact, 74 (54%) of the respondents stated that they strongly agree that they are satisfied with their ability to do their jobs.
When asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement on the following statement “I am satisfied that my job has a positive impact on the institution and surrounding community,” only 5 (2.9%) disagreed. Clearly, chief student conduct administrators believe their work has a positive impact on the institution and community. When asked to respond to the statement “I am satisfied that I meet the needs of the students and my institution in dealing with student behavior,” 127 (93.5%) slightly agreed (9.6%), moderately agreed (36.8%), or strongly agreed (47.1%).

Frequencies and percentages as ranked from lowest to highest means for the three questions related to work itself are detailed in Table 7.

Table 7

**Satisfaction with Work Itself**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent satisfied with:</th>
<th>Frequencies/Percentages</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to do my job</td>
<td>1 (.7)</td>
<td>2 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job has positive impact</td>
<td>1 (.7)</td>
<td>1 (.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet student/inst. needs</td>
<td>2 (1.5)</td>
<td>2 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1= strongly disagree, 2= moderately disagree, 3= slightly disagree, 4= slightly agree, 5= moderately agree, 6= strongly agree

**Administrative Policies**

Chief student conduct administrators were asked three questions related to their satisfaction with administrative policies. Responses were recorded on a 6-point Likert scale (i.e., 1= strongly disagree, 2= moderately disagree, 3= slightly disagree, 4= slightly agree, 5= moderately agree, and 6= strongly agree).
When asked to respond to the statement "I am satisfied with my level of involvement in decision-making regarding policies within the area of student conduct at my institution," over 85% of chief student conduct administrators agreed. Over a third strongly agreed (35.3%) with the statement and slightly more indicated they moderately agreed (36.0%) that they are satisfied with their level of involvement in making decisions regarding student conduct policies. Respondents were asked to indicate their level or agreement or disagreement with the statement "I am satisfied with the institution’s administrative policies that relate to the implementation of my job responsibilities.” Nearly 85% of chief student conduct administrators agreed with this statement. Student conduct administrators were also asked to respond to the statement “I feel my institution’s senior level administrators make policy decisions with fairness and integrity.” The number of student conduct administrators who indicated they agree with this statement was 109 (80.7%). Over half of the respondents agreed either moderately (31.1%) or strongly (25.9%) agreed that the senior level administrators act with fairness and integrity in decision-making.

Table 8 contains the frequencies and percentages as ranked from lowest to highest means for each of the questions related to administrative policies.

Balance of Work and Personal Life

Respondents were asked three questions pertaining to their satisfaction with balance of work and personal life. Responses were recorded on a 6-point Likert scale (i.e., 1= strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, and 6=strongly agree).
Table 8

Satisfaction with Administrative Policies Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent satisfied with:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in decision-making</td>
<td>5 (3.7)</td>
<td>7 (5.1)</td>
<td>7 (5.1)</td>
<td>20 (14.7)</td>
<td>49 (36.0)</td>
<td>48 (35.3)</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution's policies</td>
<td>10 (7.3)</td>
<td>3 (2.2)</td>
<td>7 (5.1)</td>
<td>30 (21.9)</td>
<td>61 (44.5)</td>
<td>26 (19.0)</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators make fair policy decisions</td>
<td>6 (4.4)</td>
<td>8 (5.9)</td>
<td>12 (8.9)</td>
<td>32 (23.7)</td>
<td>42 (31.1)</td>
<td>35 (25.9)</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, 6=strongly agree

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the statement “I am satisfied that my duties are in line with my career objectives.” Over three-quarters (86.7%) of the respondents agreed that their duties were in line with their career objectives. When asked to respond to the statement “I am satisfied with my supervisor’s desire to help me develop,” nearly three-quarters (70.8%) of the respondents agreed. Chief student conduct administrators were asked to respond to the statement “I am satisfied that my workload allows balance between work and my personal life.” More than a third (39.4%) of the respondents indicated that they are not satisfied with the balance between work and personal life. Fourteen (10.2%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with this statement, while 17 (12.4%) moderately disagreed and 23 (16.8%) slightly disagreed. Of those who agreed that they are satisfied with the balance between work and personal life, 16 (11.7%) strongly agreed, 41 (29.9%) moderately agreed, and 26 (16.8%) slightly agreed.

Table 9 includes the frequencies and percentages as ranked from lowest to highest means for each of the questions concerning balance of work and personal life.
### Table 9

**Satisfaction with Balance of Work and Personal Life**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent satisfied with:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duties in line w/career obj.</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor’s desire to help me develop</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(8.8)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(10.9)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance btw. work /personal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(10.2)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(12.4)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(16.8)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, 6=strongly agree

**Compensation**

Three questions were asked regarding chief student conduct administrators' satisfaction with three aspects of compensation: salary compared to others with similar backgrounds, education levels and positions; salary, given the responsibilities of the position, and the fringe benefits provided. Responses were recorded on a 6-point Likert scale (i.e., 1= strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, and 6=strongly agree).

Means from highest to lowest, showed chief student conduct administrators were most satisfied with their fringe benefits ($m=4.31$), followed by their salary compared to others with similar backgrounds, education levels, and positions ($m=3.49$); and by their salary, given the responsibilities of the position ($m=3.23$). When asked to respond to the statement “I am satisfied with the fringe benefits provided by my institution to me in my position as the chief student conduct administrator,” most of the participants agreed...
(75.1%) with 28 (20.4%) agreeing slightly, 40 (29.2%) moderately agreeing, and 35 (25.5%) strongly agreeing. When asked to respond to the statement “I am satisfied with my salary when compared to that of others with similar backgrounds, education levels and positions,” almost half (43.9%) of the respondents indicated they were not satisfied; 22 strongly disagreed (16.1%), 19 moderately disagreed (13.9%), and 29 (21.2%) slightly disagreed. When asked to respond to the statement “I am satisfied with my current salary level, given the responsibilities of the position,” over half of the chief student conduct administrators disagreed (58.8%). While chief student conduct administrators appear not to be satisfied with their salary as compared to others or given their responsibilities, they are satisfied with the fringe benefits afforded to them.

Detailed frequencies and percentages as ranked from lowest to highest means are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Satisfaction with Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent satisfied with:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td>12 (8.8)</td>
<td>10 (7.3)</td>
<td>12 (8.8)</td>
<td>28 (20.4)</td>
<td>40 (29.2)</td>
<td>35 (25.5)</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary, comprd. to others</td>
<td>22 (16.1)</td>
<td>19 (13.9)</td>
<td>29 (21.2)</td>
<td>18 (13.1)</td>
<td>35 (25.5)</td>
<td>14 (10.2)</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary, given respons.</td>
<td>27 (19.9)</td>
<td>24 (17.6)</td>
<td>29 (21.3)</td>
<td>15 (11.0)</td>
<td>29 (21.3)</td>
<td>12 (8.8)</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, 6=strongly agree
Job Security

To determine chief student conduct administrators satisfaction with job security, three questions were presented. Responses were recorded on a 6-point Likert scale (i.e., 1= strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, and 6=strongly agree).

The first area within job security addressed the security of the position within the student affairs division. Almost all of the respondents indicated they slightly agree (16.1%), moderately agree (25.5%), or strongly agree (50.4%) with the statement “I feel the position in which I serve is secure within the student affairs division at my institution.” When asked to respond to the statement “I feel the position in which I serve is secure within my institution,” chief student conduct administrators responded almost as positively, with 93.7% agreeing either slightly (19.0%), moderately (27.7%), or strongly (46.0%). The last statement posed to chief student conduct administrators regarding job security stated “I feel I am secure in my position.” Again, an overwhelming majority responded positively with 88.4% agreeing with the statement.

Detailed frequencies and percentages as ranked from lowest to highest means relating to job security are presented in Table 11.

Job Status

To determine chief student conduct administrators satisfaction with job status, three questions were posed. Responses were recorded on a 6-point Likert scale (i.e., 1= strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, and 6=strongly agree).
Table 11

Satisfaction with Job Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent satisfied with:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos. secure w/in St. Af.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos. secure w/in inst.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure in my position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, 6=strongly agree

The first statement, “I am satisfied with the privileges inherent in my job,” had more than 90% of the chief student conduct administrators responding affirmatively, with just over half (50.4%) strongly agreeing. The next two questions concerned the influence the position of chief student conduct administrator has within the institution and within student affairs. Over three-quarters (92.7%) of the respondents agreed either slightly (19.0%), moderately (27.7%), or strongly (46.0%) with the statement “I am satisfied with the level of influence my position has within my institution.” When responding to the statement “I am satisfied with the level of influence my position has within student affairs at my institution,” over three-quarters (88.4%) either slightly (19.0), moderately (28.5), or strongly (40.9) agreed.

Table 12 contains frequencies and percentages as ranked from lowest to highest means for the questions concerning job status.

Relationship with Colleagues

To determine chief student conduct administrators’ satisfaction in their relationship with colleagues, four questions were presented. Responses were recorded on
a 6-point Likert scale (i.e., 1= strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, and 6=strongly agree).

Table 12

*Satisfaction with Job Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent satisfied with:</th>
<th>Frequencies/Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job privilege</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence in inst.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence in St. Af.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, 6=strongly agree

A large percentage (93.8%) of respondents were in agreement with the statement “I am satisfied with my working relationships with colleagues holding similar level positions within the institution.” Only 8 (5.8%) student conduct administrators disagreed either slightly (4.4%), moderately (.7%), or strongly (.7%) concerning relationships with colleagues holding similar positions at the institution. When asked to respond to the statement “I am satisfied with my working relationships with entry-level colleagues at my institution,” the response again was very positive. Over 94% agreed with the statement and only 8 (5.8%) chief student conduct administrators disagreed either slightly (4.4%), moderately (.7%), or strongly (.7%). The next question concerning relationship with colleagues asked chief student conduct administrators to respond to the statement “I am satisfied with the level of respect I receive from my colleagues within student affairs. The overwhelming majority (90.4%) agreed either slightly (11.0%), moderately (39.0%), or strongly (40.4%). The last statement, “I am satisfied with my current working
relationships with senior level administrators at my institution,” found that over three-quarters (83.1%) of the respondents agreed either slightly (19.9%), moderately (35.3%), or strongly (27.9%).

Frequencies and percentages as ranked from lowest to highest means for each of the four questions can be found in Table 13.

Table 13

*Satisfaction with Relationship with Colleagues*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent satisfied with:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationships w/peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>1 (.7)</td>
<td>1 (.7)</td>
<td>6 (4.4)</td>
<td>24 (17.5)</td>
<td>51 (37.8)</td>
<td>52 (38.5)</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry-level colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>1 (.7)</td>
<td>1 (.7)</td>
<td>6 (4.4)</td>
<td>21 (15.6)</td>
<td>56 (41.5)</td>
<td>50 (37.0)</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>3 (2.2)</td>
<td>4 (2.9)</td>
<td>6 (4.4)</td>
<td>15 (11.0)</td>
<td>53 (39.0)</td>
<td>55 (40.4)</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships w/sr. staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>2 (1.5)</td>
<td>6 (4.4)</td>
<td>15 (11.0)</td>
<td>27 (19.9)</td>
<td>48 (35.3)</td>
<td>38 (27.9)</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, 6=strongly agree

*Supervision*

To determine chief student conduct administrators satisfaction with supervision, four questions were presented. Responses were made on a 6-point Likert scale (i.e., 1=strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, and 6=strongly agree).

When presented with the statement “I am satisfied that my decisions are valued and respected by my supervisor,” over three-quarters (85.4%) of the student conduct administrators agreed either slightly (18.2%), moderately (28.5%), or strongly (38.7%). The next question asked the respondents to consider the statement “I am satisfied with my relationship with my supervisor.” Only 33 (24.1%) disagreed either slightly (10.9%),
moderately (6.6%), or strongly (6.6%). When asked to respond to the statement “I feel my direct supervisor is competent/knowledgeable about issues related to student conduct,” over three-quarters (81.6%) of the respondents agreed either slightly (20.6%), moderately (25.0%), or strongly (36.0%). In addition, when asked to rate their level of satisfaction on the level of assistance from their supervisors, more than three-quarters (78.5%) responded that they slightly agree (19.3%), moderately agree (25.9%), or strongly agree (33.3%) with the statement “I am satisfied with the level of assistance from my supervisor.”

Table 14 contains the frequencies and percentages as ranked from lowest to highest means for the four questions related to supervision.

Table 14

Satisfaction with Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent satisfied with:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decisions valued</td>
<td>n (2.9)</td>
<td>n (5.1)</td>
<td>n (6.6)</td>
<td>n (18.2)</td>
<td>n (28.5)</td>
<td>n (38.7)</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor relation</td>
<td>9 (6.6)</td>
<td>15 (10.9)</td>
<td>17 (12.4)</td>
<td>32 (23.4)</td>
<td>55 (40.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor's knowledge</td>
<td>11 (8.0)</td>
<td>5 (3.7)</td>
<td>28 (20.6)</td>
<td>34 (25.0)</td>
<td>49 (36.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor's assistance</td>
<td>10 (7.3)</td>
<td>9 (6.6)</td>
<td>26 (19.3)</td>
<td>35 (25.9)</td>
<td>45 (33.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, 6=strongly agree

Work Conditions

To determine chief student conduct administrators’ satisfaction with their work conditions, five questions were presented. Responses were recorded on a 6-point Likert
Of the five areas explored within working conditions, respondents were most likely to agree (83%) with the statement “I am satisfied with my physical work conditions.” When chief student conduct administrators were presented with the statement “I am satisfied with the overall office environment,” over three-quarters (83%) were in agreement, either slightly (13.4%), moderately (41.0%), or strongly (30.6%). When presented with the statement “I am satisfied with the committee work included in my job,” most respondents (83.2%) agreed with this either slightly (16.8%), moderately (42.3%), or strongly (24.1%). When presented with the statement “I am satisfied that the political climate at my institution allows me to make decisions based on the facts specific to the situation with fairness and integrity,” over three-quarters (81.6%) agreed either slightly (14.0), moderately (38.2%), or strongly (29.4%). The last statement, “I am satisfied with my current work load as the chief student conduct administrator,” found 54 respondents (39.4%) who either slightly (18.2%), moderately (9.5%), or strongly (11.7%) disagreed.

Overall Job Satisfaction

The survey asked respondents to answer the following concerning job satisfaction: “Overall, I am satisfied with my position as the chief student conduct administrator at my institution.” Responses were recorded on a 6-point Likert scale (i.e., 1= strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, and 6=strongly agree).

Details concerning frequencies and percentages as ranked from lowest to highest means are found in Table 15.
5=moderately agree, and 6=strongly agree). Over three-quarters (86.4%) of the respondents indicated that they slightly agree (17.4%), moderately agree (45.5%), or strongly agree (23.5%) that they are satisfied with their position. Table 16 contains frequencies and percentages for this variable.

Table 15

*Satisfaction with Work Conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent satisfied with:</th>
<th>Frequencies/Percentages</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical work condition</td>
<td>9 (6.7)</td>
<td>6 (4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office env’ment</td>
<td>5 (3.7)</td>
<td>5 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee work</td>
<td>5 (3.6)</td>
<td>4 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political climate</td>
<td>6 (4.4)</td>
<td>10 (7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work load</td>
<td>16 (11.7)</td>
<td>13 (9.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, 6=strongly agree

Table 16

*Overall Job Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent satisfied with:</th>
<th>Frequencies/Percentages</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall job</td>
<td>4 (3.0)</td>
<td>6 (4.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, 6=strongly agree

To further analyze the data regarding overall job satisfaction, those who were satisfied and dissatisfied, were divided into two groups. The individuals who chose a 1, 2,
or 3 (strongly disagree, moderately disagree, slightly disagree) were assigned to the dissatisfied group. Respondents who chose a 4, 5, or 6 (slightly agree, moderately agree, strongly agree) were assigned to the satisfied group. An overwhelming majority indicated they were satisfied to some degree with their current position (86.4%), while 13.6% indicated they were dissatisfied to some degree. Frequencies and percentages as ranked from lowest to highest means are shown in Table 17.

Table 17

*Frequencies and Percentages of Aggregate Dissatisfied and Satisfied Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied (to some degree)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied (to some degree)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Intent to Stay or Leave Position*

Chief student conduct administrators were asked to answer five questions with regard to their intent to stay in their current position or leave their current position. Responses were recorded on a 6-point Likert scale (i.e., 1= strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=moderately agree, and 6=strongly agree).

The first statement, “I intend to remain in my position at this institution for at least the next year,” found that over three-quarters (84.1%) of the respondents agree either slightly (8.0%), moderately (19.7%), or strongly (56.4%). Nine respondents (6.6%) strongly disagreed, while 7 (5.1%) moderately disagreed, and 3 (2.2%) slightly disagreed that they intend to stay in their current position for at least the next year.
In response to the statement “I have yet to determine if I intend to stay or leave my current position within the next few years,” slightly more than half of the respondents (52.8%) disagreed either slightly (8.1%), moderately (16.2%), or strongly (28.5%).

When asked if they intend to seek a different position at another institution, slightly more than half disagreed (53.7%) either slightly (13.2%), moderately (11.8%), or strongly (28.7%). When asked about the intent to seek a different position at the same institution, over half (61.3%) disagreed either slightly (13.1%), moderately (11.7%), or strongly (36.5%).

When asked to respond to the statement “I intend to seek a Chief Student Conduct Administrator position at another institution within the next few years, a majority (75.9%) disagreed either slightly (15.3%), moderately (17.5%), or strongly (43.1%). Only 10 respondents (7.3%) strongly agreed that they would be looking for another position as chief student conduct administrator at another institution.

Table 18 details the frequencies and percentages as ranked from lowest to highest means for items regarding intent to stay or leave.

Factors Regarding Intent to Stay or Leave Position

Chief student conduct administrators were asked to answer eight questions with regard to major job factors based on the impact each has on their intent to stay or leave their position. Responses were recorded on a 6-point Likert scale (i.e., 1= strongly support my desire to leave my position, 2=moderately support my desire to leave my position, 3=slightly support my desire to leave my position, 4=slightly support my desire to remain in my position, 5=moderately support my desire to remain in my position, and 6=strongly support my desire to remain in my position). In order of means from highest
to lowest, the factors most likely to support chief student conduct administrators staying in their positions were students \((m=4.96)\), acquiring knowledge \((m=4.87)\), the opportunity to train others on the student conduct process \((m=4.78)\), collaborating with faculty \((m=4.55)\), collaborating with legal counsel \((m=4.44)\), parent interaction \((m=4.13)\), external constituents \((m=4.12)\), and navigating the politics at the institution \((m=3.57)\).

Table 18

*Intent to Stay or Leave Position*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intend to stay</td>
<td>9 (6.6)</td>
<td>7 (5.1)</td>
<td>3 (2.2)</td>
<td>11 (8.0)</td>
<td>27 (19.7)</td>
<td>80 (58.4)</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>39 (28.5)</td>
<td>22 (16.2)</td>
<td>11 (8.1)</td>
<td>23 (16.9)</td>
<td>19 (14.0)</td>
<td>22 (16.2)</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different pos. other inst.</td>
<td>39 (28.7)</td>
<td>16 (11.8)</td>
<td>18 (13.2)</td>
<td>25 (18.4)</td>
<td>20 (14.7)</td>
<td>18 (13.2)</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different pos. same inst.</td>
<td>50 (36.5)</td>
<td>16 (11.7)</td>
<td>18 (13.1)</td>
<td>26 (19.0)</td>
<td>21 (15.3)</td>
<td>6 (4.4)</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same pos. at diff inst.</td>
<td>59 (43.1)</td>
<td>24 (17.5)</td>
<td>21 (15.3)</td>
<td>14 (10.2)</td>
<td>9 (6.6)</td>
<td>10 (7.3)</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[1={\text{strongly disagree}}, 2={\text{moderately disagree}}, 3={\text{slightly disagree}}, 4={\text{slightly agree}}, 5={\text{moderately agree}}, 6={\text{strongly agree}}\]

Table 19 contains the frequencies and percentages as ranked from lowest to highest means for each of the factors regarding intent to stay or leave position.

When asked to rate the impact of “working with students alleged to have violated university policy,” the overwhelming majority (90.4%) indicated that working with such students supports their decision to stay in their position. Only 13 respondents (9.5%) indicated that working with such students would impact their decision to leave their position. Chief student conduct administrators reported that “acquiring knowledge of legal issues that pertain to student conduct” supported their decision to stay for 125 (91.9%) of the respondents. The ability to share their knowledge about student conduct
through “opportunities to train individuals about the student conduct process” supported the decision to stay for more than three-quarters of the respondents (86.7%). When asked to rate “collaborating with faculty regarding student conduct issues,” over three-quarters of the respondents (82.1%) indicated that collaborating with faculty supports their decision to stay in their position. Similarly, when asked to rate “collaborating with legal counsel regarding student conduct,” over three-quarters (79.8%) of the student conduct administrators indicated that this collaboration with legal counsel supports their decision to stay.

Table 19

Factors Regarding Intent to Stay or Leave Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of impact on decision to stay or leave:</th>
<th>Frequencies/Percentages</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Support Leaving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1 (.7)</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring knowledge</td>
<td>2 (1.5)</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train on st. conduct process</td>
<td>3 (2.2)</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with faculty</td>
<td>2 (1.5)</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with legal counsel</td>
<td>5 (3.7)</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent interaction</td>
<td>4 (2.9)</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External const.</td>
<td>5 (3.7)</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigating politics</td>
<td>17 (12.4)</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=strongly support my desire to leave my position, 2=moderately support my desire to leave my position, 3=slightly support my desire to leave my position, 4=slightly support my desire to stay in my position, 5=moderately support my desire to stay in my position, 6=strongly support my desire to stay in my position.
Interacting with parents supports 40 respondents’ (29.4%) decision to leave their position. Conversely, interacting with parents supports 96 (70.6%) respondents decision to stay. Nearly three-quarters (73.4%) agreed that “interacting with external constituents” supported their decision to stay in their position. When asked how “navigating the politics inherent in this position” impacted their decision to stay or leave, respondents were almost evenly split on whether this factor would sway them to stay or sway them to leave. Slightly over half (51.1%) indicated that navigating the politics slightly (19.7%), moderately (17.5%), or strongly (13.9%) supported them in their decision to stay. Table 20 collapses these data to show overall percentages as to how these factors support staying or leaving their student conduct positions to some degree.

Table 20

*Factors Impacting Aggregate Intent to Stay or Leave*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intend to Leave Frequency</th>
<th>Intend to Leave Percent</th>
<th>Intend to Stay Frequency</th>
<th>Intend to Stay Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring knowledge</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train on st. conduct process</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with faculty</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with legal counsel</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent interaction</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External const.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigating politics</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significance of Demographic Variables on Job Satisfaction

The second research question asked "To what extent is job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators related to demographic characteristics (age, education level, institutional enrollment, ethnicity/race, gender, geographic region, and years of experience in student conduct)?"

An independent-samples t test comparing the means of males and females on the variable of overall job satisfaction, as measured by responses to the question “Overall, I am satisfied with my position as the chief student conduct administrator at my institution,” found a significant difference between the means of the two groups ($t(128) = -2.33, p<.05$). The mean of the males was significantly higher ($M = 4.94, SD = .98$) than the mean of the females ($M = 4.45, SD = 1.363$). Table 21 shows the means of the two groups as well as the results of the $t$ test.

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.26*</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

A one-way ANOVA was conducted by comparing the mean job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators for each of the remaining demographic variables. No significant differences were found for any of the other demographic variables. Table 22 shows the results of the ANOVA computations for each demographic variable (ethnicity, years in student conduct, student population size, age, ASCA circuit, highest degree attained).
Table 22

*One-Way ANOVA Comparing Job Satisfaction and Demographic Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>186.70</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190.17</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in student conduct</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>185.80</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188.78</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student population size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>174.66</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175.02</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>184.30</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190.07</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASCA Circuit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>177.74</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190.53</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest degree attained</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>184.19</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190.64</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, a stepwise multiple linear regression was conducted with the demographic variables as the independent variables and job satisfaction as the dependent variable. The regression equation was significant for only one demographic variable; gender \( F(1,120) = 4.83, p < .05 \) with an \( R^2 \) of .04. The \( R^2 \) tells us the proportion of variance in job satisfaction that can be explained by variation in the demographic variables. Therefore,
4% of the variation in job satisfaction can be explained by differences in gender. Respondents' predicted job satisfaction is equal to $3.998 + .469 \times \text{Gender}$, where Gender is coded as 1 = Female and 2 = Male. Table 23 details the results of the regression computation.

Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Job Satisfaction as Related to Herzberg's Intrinsic Motivation Factors

Research question three asked "To what extent is job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators related to Herzberg's intrinsic motivation factors (i.e., achievement/growth, advancement, recognition, responsibility, and work itself)?" The following provides a summary of the core information regarding job satisfaction and Herzberg's intrinsic variables.

In order to measure internal consistency of each of the intrinsic motivation factors a Cronbach's alpha was computed. Cronbach's alpha results range from 0 to 1. Scores closer to 1 show a greater internal consistency between the items within the variable, and all those combined variables yielding a .70 or above are considered acceptable. All of my combined intrinsic variables have an alpha above .70 except the intrinsic variable of Recognition, which at .696 is a bit low, but still within a usable range (George & Mallery, 2003), and taking out individual questions for this variable did not increase the
Cronbach's alpha. Cronbach's alpha student conduct administrators for each of the five intrinsic motivators are presented in Table 24.

Table 24

*Cronbach's Alpha Levels for Intrinsic Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha level</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement/Growth</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A stepwise multiple linear regression was calculated to predict participants' job satisfaction based on the intrinsic variables of achievement/growth, advancement, recognition, responsibility, and work itself with demographic and institutional variables as controls. A significant regression equation was found \( F(4, 117) = 30.57, p<.001 \) with an \( R^2 \) of .511. The \( R \) Square tells us the proportion of variance in job satisfaction that can be explained by variation in the independent variables. Therefore, 51.1% of the variation in job satisfaction can be explained by differences in satisfaction with the intrinsic variables of responsibility, recognition, advancement, and work itself. Respondents' predicted job satisfaction is equal to .278 + .359(Responsibility) + .204(Recognition) + .177 (Advancement) + .262(Work itself). Table 25 shows the results of the regression computations for those variables which were found to be significant.

Job Satisfaction as Related to Herzberg's Extrinsic Motivation Factors

Research question four asked "To what extent is job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators related to Herzberg's extrinsic motivation factors (i.e.,
administrative policies, balance of work and personal life, compensation, Job security, job status, relationship with colleagues, supervision, and work conditions)?

Table 25

Multiple Regression Analysis for Intrinsic Motivation Variables Predicting Chief Student Conduct Administrators Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE_B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .001

Cronbach’s alpha tests were performed to measure internal consistency on the above extrinsic motivation factors. All of my combined extrinsic motivation variables have an alpha above .70, except the extrinsic variable of balance of work and personal life, which at .610 is a bit low, but still within a usable range (George & Mallery, 2003), and removing individual questions for this variable did not increase the Cronbach’s alpha. Table 26 details the Cronbach’s alpha level for each of the extrinsic motivation variables.

A stepwise multiple linear regression was calculated to predict participants’ job satisfaction based on the extrinsic variables of administrative policies, balance of work and personal life, compensation, job security, job status, relationship with colleagues, supervision, and work conditions while controlling for demographic and institutional variables. A significant regression equation was found ($F(4,117) = 56.74, p < .001$) with an $R^2$ of .660. The R Square tells us the proportion of variance in job satisfaction that can be explained by variation in the independent variables. Therefore, 66.0% of the variation in job satisfaction can be explained by differences in satisfaction with the extrinsic variables of
work conditions, personal life, job status, and relationship with colleagues. The
Respondents’ predicted job satisfaction is equal to -\.559 + .277(work conditions) + .428
(personal life) + .248 (job status) + .209 (relationship with colleagues). Table 27 details the
regression coefficients for the variables which were found to be of significance.

Table 26

*Cronbach’s Alpha for Extrinsic Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha level</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative policies</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of work and personal</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job status</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with colleagues</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work conditions</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27

*Multiple Regression Analysis for Extrinsic Motivation Variables Predicting Chief Student Conduct Administrators Job Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Conditions</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Life</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Status</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Colleagues</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
Extent to Stay or Leave Position as Related to Job Satisfaction

The fifth research question asked “To what extent is the intent to stay or leave of such chief student conduct administrators related to their job satisfaction?”

One of the survey items presented the following statement “In reference to your intent to stay or leave position, I intend to remain in my position at this institution for at least the next year.” Each respondent was assigned a value of “stay” if they answered 4, 5 or 6 (slightly agree, moderately agree, or strongly agree). If the respondent answered with a 1, 2, or 3 (strongly disagree, moderately disagree, or slightly disagree), they were assigned a value of “leave.”

A one-way ANOVA was computed comparing the job satisfaction of subjects and their intent to stay or leave their position. A significant difference was found \( F(1,130) = 14.55, p<.05 \). Participants who intend to stay in their positions had a significantly higher job satisfaction student conduct administrators \( M = 4.83, SD = 1.07 \) than those who intend to leave \( M = 3.72, SD = 1.57 \). Table 28 details the results of the one-way ANOVA.

Table 28

One-Way ANOVA Comparing Job Satisfaction and Intent to Stay or Leave Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent to stay or leave position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>19.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.19</td>
<td>14.55***</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>171.44</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190.64</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001
A stepwise multiple linear regression was calculated to predict participants’ intent to stay or leave their position based on the intrinsic variables of achievement/growth, advancement, recognition, responsibility, and work itself, with demographic and institutional variables as controls. A significant regression equation was found ($F(3, 125) = 7.14, p<.001$) with an $R^2$ of .149. The R Square tells us the proportion of variance in job satisfaction that can be explained by variation in the independent variables. Therefore, 14.9% of the variation in the intent to stay or leave their position can be explained by differences in satisfaction with the intrinsic variable of advancement, and the demographic variables of gender and age. Respondents’ predicted score on the question of intent to stay or leave is equal to $3.50 + .319 \text{ (Advancement)} -.643 \text{ (Gender)}$ where females are coded as “1” and males are coded as “2” $+.031 \text{ (Age)}$. Table 29 shows the results of the regression computations of the intrinsic motivation variables found to be significant.

**Table 29**

*Multiple Regression Analysis for Intrinsic Motivation Variables Predicting Chief Student Conduct Administrators Decision to Stay or Leave Position*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SEB$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.280**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.217*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p<.01

A stepwise multiple linear regression was also calculated to predict participants’ intent to stay or leave their position based on the extrinsic variables of administrative policies, balance of work and personal life, compensation, job security, job status, relationship with colleagues, supervision, and work conditions, with demographic and
institutional variables as controls. A significant regression equation was found \( F(3, 125) = 8.73, p<.001 \) with an \( R^2 \) of .177. The R Square tells us the proportion of variance in the intent to stay or leave position that can be explained by variation in the independent variables. Therefore, 17.7% of the variation in the intent to stay or leave their position can be explained by differences in satisfaction with the extrinsic variable of balance of work and personal life, and the demographic variables of gender and age. Respondents' predicted score on the question of intent to stay or leave is equal to \( 2.43 + .466 \) (Balance of work and personal life) \(+ .035 \) (Age) \(- .577 \) (Gender) where females are coded as "1" and males are coded as "2". Table 30 shows the results of the regression computations of the extrinsic motivation variables found to be significant.

Table 30

*Multiple Regression Analysis for Extrinsic Motivation Variables Predicting Chief Student Conduct Administrators Decision to Stay or Leave Position*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance of work and personal life</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, ***p < .001

Open-Ended Responses

Chief student conduct administrators were asked four open-ended questions concerning job satisfaction and intent to stay or leave. When asked the question "With what areas of your job are you most satisfied," there were several key areas mentioned by the 110 respondents who chose to respond to the question. The responses were read thoroughly several times and grouped according to like responses.
The most often cited area of job satisfaction was working with students. More than a third (40.9%) of the respondents mentioned the opportunity to work with students as an area of satisfaction with their jobs. Many of the comments included sentiments such as “I love working with the students and challenging them on their behavior and supporting them to make better decisions” and “working with the students.”

Facilitating student growth and development (27.0% of responses) and relationships with colleagues (12.7% of responses) were other top satisfaction areas cited. Comments concerning student growth included the following “Interacting with the students and see them evolved and grow as a result of their interaction with our office” and “Working with students and feeling that I am having a positive impact on them.” Respondents made comments such as “I enjoy the colleagues that I work with” and “Competent staff around me.”

The individual responses to this question are located in Appendix G Table 31 contains frequencies and percentages, from highest to lowest frequency, for the most often mentioned categories.

Table 31

Areas of Job Satisfaction (From Open-Ended Responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of job</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with students</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating student growth and development</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with colleagues</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with academic affairs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and compliance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from supervisor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with administrators</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising/interacting with student conduct board</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal and external constituents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chief student conduct administrators were also asked to respond to the question "With what areas of your job are you least satisfied?" Of the 137 respondents to the survey, 112 chose to respond to this question. The most frequent response (19.6%) was the political climate of the institution made it difficult for the chief student conduct administrators to do their job. Comments made often were similar to "campus politics" and "At times the political environment is frustrating and at times, the higher administrators have no real feel for this area." Also mentioned by over a tenth of the respondents was the lack of support or recognition they received from others in the institution (12.5%) or from their supervisors (10.7%). Concerning lack of support, comments such as "lack of appreciation for the level of responsibility entailed in this position" were submitted. In terms of supervisors, comments such as "My working relationship with my supervisor. Does not provide opportunities for professional growth outside of my current position. Has not been a positive role model or mentor for me" and "Lack of support from my supervisor."

Details concerning the frequencies and percentages, from highest to lowest, of responses are presented in Table 32.

In order to gain a better understanding of what factors influence the decision of chief student conduct administrators to stay in their positions, the respondents were asked to list the key reasons they would stay in their position. Of the 137 respondents, 112 chose to answer this question. Working with students and making a difference in their lives (35.7%) was listed most often as a key reason to stay in the position. Respondents made statements such as "I'm making a positive difference in student's lives" and "I enjoy feeling like I help students." The next most often cited reason for staying in the position
was personal/family reasons (29.5%). Respondents mentioned wanting to stay close to friends and family, not wanting to leave their children’s school district, and seeing this as their last position before they retire. Examples of personal/family reason comments made by respondents include “Don't want to move my family at this time in their lives” and “Family tied to area.” Table 33 contains the frequencies and percentages, from highest to lowest, for the main categories of responses for this question.

Table 32

Areas of Job Dissatisfaction (From Open-Ended Responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of job</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional political climate</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support/recognition</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from supervisor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough staff</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for advancement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work life balance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with parents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for physical safety</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paperwork</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33

Key Reasons to Stay in Current Position (From Open-Ended Responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Reasons to Stay in Current Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with students/making difference in lives</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/family</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues and supervisor</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution/administration</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development experience</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in position (rank)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work environment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on institution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The last open-ended question asked respondents to list the key reasons they would leave their current position. Of the 137 respondents, 116 chose to answer this question. Almost a third (32.8%) of the chief student conduct administrators stated that one of the key reasons they would leave their position was to take a position that would offer them the opportunity to advance in their careers or would provide them with professional growth. Respondents made statements such as “Opportunities for advancement at another institution” and “been in the position for a long time and it might be time to move on to something else.” Other responses included personal reasons (e.g., medical, partner takes a different job, move to be closer to family), 13.8%, compensation (10.3%), and the work itself (8.6%). More details concerning the key reasons respondents gave for leaving their positions are presented in Table 34.

Table 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Reasons to Leave Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional growth/opportunity to advance</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work itself</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work environment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter IV Summary

Chapter four presented descriptive and statistical analysis from the Chief Student Conduct Administrator Job Satisfaction survey. The respondents were found to have an
average of 9.28 years working in Student Conduct, with most of them serving as institutions with between 5,000 – 25,000 students. The average age of respondents was 43.03. More information concerning demographics is discussed in chapter five.

The study revealed that chief student conduct administrators are overwhelming satisfied with their positions. While they are satisfied with most of the intrinsic variables, there was a notable exception with advancement issues. This is one area where more respondents were dissatisfied with the opportunities for advancement and the way advancement opportunities are handled by Student Affairs. One other area where the respondents did not appear as satisfied was in the variable of responsibility. Almost half of the chief student conduct administrators do not feel they have enough time to carry out their responsibilities. They are most satisfied with the work itself. Of the extrinsic variables, the respondents are overwhelming satisfied with their job security, job status, satisfaction with colleagues, supervision, and work conditions. One notable exception in work conditions was the work load where more than a third of the respondents were not satisfied with their work load. Compensation and balance of work and personal life were other areas where more than a third of the chief student conduct administrators felt dissatisfaction.

When asked to rate their overall satisfaction with their positions, an overwhelming majority indicated they are satisfied with their position and most of them intend to stay in their positions. The factors which most impact the decision for a chief student conduct administrator to stay are working with students, acquiring knowledge and the opportunity to train others on student conduct issues.
The only demographic variable found to be related to job satisfaction was gender. Men are more satisfied with their positions than the women in the field.

The results revealed that the intrinsic variables of responsibility, recognition, advancement and work itself are predictors of satisfaction with the position. Additionally, the extrinsic factors for work conditions, personal life, job status, and relationship with colleagues are predictors of respondents' satisfaction with their positions.

Most of the chief student conduct administrators intend to stay in their position and those who intend to stay have higher job satisfaction.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study is to examine the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction of chief student conduct administrators at four-year public institutions of higher education in the United States based on Herzberg's (1966) dual-factor theory. Based on a dearth of previous research regarding job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators, this study serves as the first research to center on overall job satisfaction, level of satisfaction on stated intrinsic and extrinsic variables and the intent of chief student conduct administrators to stay or leave their positions. The lack of previous research prohibits a comparison of this study with any completed previously. Therefore, within this chapter analogous research contained within the literature is referenced regarding similarities and differences to the outcomes of this study. The format of this chapter includes the following: (a) key findings from the Chief Student Conduct Administrator National Survey and a comparison of the key findings from this study with previous literature, (b) implications of the study's findings for higher education leaders, and (c) recommendations for future research.

Key Findings and Connections to Previous Research

Demographic Characteristics

Demographic variables within this study included age, education level, institutional enrollment, ethnicity/race, gender, geographic region, and years of experience in student conduct. The sample was comprised of 47.4% males and 52.6% females. The majority of respondents are Caucasian (80.1%), followed by African Americans (13.2%). Participants with advanced degrees are the norm, with (92.7%)
having obtained a Master’s, Doctorate, Specialist, or Juris Doctorate. Surprisingly, there are no significant differences in job satisfaction on the demographic variables of ethnicity, years in student conduct, age, geographic location, or education level. There are also no significant differences in job satisfaction based on the size of the student population. This is a new finding in the field as no previous research regarding job satisfaction related to the demographic variables of ethnicity, years in student conduct, student population size, age, ASCA circuit and education level could be found.

The only demographic variable that shows a significant difference is gender. Male chief student conduct administrators are significantly more satisfied in their chief student conduct administrator positions than females. This represents a new finding in the field as no previous research on gender and job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators could be located.

**Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction**

My study found that an overwhelming majority (86.4%) of respondents were satisfied to some extent with their position (23.5% strongly; 45.5% moderately, 17.4% slightly). This also represents a new finding in the field as no previous research on overall job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators could be found.

Upon review of responses to questions concerning Herzberg’s (1966) intrinsic variables (achievement/growth, advancement, recognition, responsibility and work itself), respondents reported satisfaction on each. However, the variable regarding the nature of work itself stood out. Specifically, 95.6% agreed they possess the ability to do their jobs, 97.1% agreed they see their work has a positive impact on the institution, and 93.5% agree they meet the needs of students and the institution.
Although respondents reported overall satisfaction with the intrinsic collapsed variables of achievement/growth, advancement, and responsibility, some segments showed lower levels of satisfaction. This included questions related to aspects of achievement/growth and responsibility. Specifically, satisfaction was lower based on the amount of time available to spend on task (44.9% dissatisfied) and to participate in professional development opportunities (35.8% dissatisfied). While most participants were satisfied with opportunities to gain experience necessary for advancement (81%), fewer reported opportunities for advancement at their own institution (46.7%) and even fewer reported satisfaction with the way advancement is handled at their institution (44.7%).

Although Herzberg (1966) considered extrinsic variables (administrative policies, balance of work and personal life, compensation, job security, job status, relationship with colleagues, supervision and working conditions) as dissatisfiers, the results of my study contradicted his premise and revealed that some extrinsic variables actually served as satisfiers. Specifically, respondents were satisfied that their position matched their career objectives (86.7%), that their supervisor provided appropriate assistance (78.5%), and that fringe benefits offered within the compensation package were appropriate (75.1%). In addition, 83% of respondents were satisfied with physical work conditions, 85% with their office environment, 83.2% with committee work, and 81.6% with the institutional political climate.

My results did, however, confirm Herzberg's (1966) premise that the balance of work and personal life, salary and work conditions were dissatisfiers. Specifically, many (43.9%) were dissatisfied with their salary compared to others in similar roles with
similar education levels. Also, more than half (58.5%) of the chief student conduct administrators were dissatisfied with their salary given the responsibilities of their position. Outcomes related to current work load (an aspect of work conditions) revealed that more than a third (39.4%) of the respondents were dissatisfied with this variable.

*Intent to Stay or Leave*

Not surprisingly, participants who intend to stay in their positions had a significantly higher job satisfaction than those who intend to leave their positions. This finding is consistent with Rosser and Javinar (2003) who found that mid-level managers in student affairs were generally satisfied with their work life and therefore less likely to leave. My study found that most (84.1%) respondents intend to stay in their position for one year. This is also a new finding as no previous research regarding chief student conduct administrators’ intent to stay or leave could be found. Even when looking past one year, the majority of respondents indicate that they intend to stay in their positions. More than half (53.7%) will not seek a different position at another institution in the next few years and even more (61.3%) will not seek a different position at their own institution within the next few years. This finding indicates that a substantial number (40-50%) may seek a new job in the next few years. Three-quarters (75.9%) noted they will not seek a lateral move to another institution to serve as the chief student conduct administrator.

An overwhelming majority (90.4%) of chief student conduct administrators cited working with students as a key reason to stay in their position. This is another new finding based on the lack of previous research located. Moreover, responses to the open-ended questions showed that relationships with others is a key factor in the respondents’
decision to stay in their positions. In addition, quantitatively, 82.1% of the respondents reported collaboration with faculty, collaboration with legal counsel (79.8%), and training others on the student conduct process (86.7%) as important to their intent to remain in their position.

Although institutional politics was not a dissatisfier, it was the factor listed in the open-ended questions as the single highest area of job dissatisfaction (19.6%), while the second highest area of job dissatisfaction (12.5%) listed was lack of support and recognition.

Predictors of Job Satisfaction

By using a multiple regression, I was able to determine that the intrinsic variables of responsibility, recognition, advancement and work itself explain 51.1% of the variance in job satisfaction. This means that chief student conduct administrators are more satisfied if: given an appropriate amount of responsibility and not overloaded with too much work; are recognized by their colleagues and supervisor; see opportunities for advancement at their institution; believe they are good at their job; view that they have an impact on the institution; and feel they are meeting the needs of the students and the institution. This is consistent with part of Grant’s (2006) results that found if given an appropriate amount of work, responsibility, and recognition combined with opportunities for advancement, self-assuredness in their jobs, opportunities to have a positive impact on the institution, and are able to meet the needs of student and the institution, mid-level managers in student affairs will be satisfied. Supervisors of chief student conduct administrators should focus on these areas to make certain that these needs are addressed.
A second multiple regression focusing on the extrinsic variables found that 66.0% of the variance in job satisfaction can be explained by differences with work conditions, balance of work and personal life, job status, and relationship with colleagues. These data support the conclusion that supervisors should focus on helping the chief student conduct administrators navigate the politics of the institution, build relationships with colleagues, and ensure that there is a reasonable work and personal life balance. My findings confirm the part of Grant’s (2006) results that indicated variance in job satisfaction of mid-level managers was explained in part by differences in work conditions, balance of work and personal life, job status and relationship with colleagues.

In terms of predicting whether someone will stay or leave their position, these findings reveal that based on intrinsic variables, chief student conduct administrators who are more satisfied with the variable of advancement are more likely to stay. Supervisors should ensure that the chief student conduct administrators are offered experiences to help them advance, as well as identify opportunities for advancement within the institution. Although offering advancement opportunities may mean losing these chief student conduct administrators in the future, data reveal they will be more likely to stay in these positions and be more satisfied in the short term.

Satisfaction with the extrinsic variable of balance of work and personal life can predict if someone is more likely to stay in their position. Those who are more satisfied with the balance between work and personal life are more likely to stay in their position.

Table 35 shows a summary of the top findings of my study compared with previous research on job satisfaction.
Table 35

Top Findings of the Study and Comparison to Previous Research Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings (Nagel-Bennett, 2010)</th>
<th>Previous Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief student conduct administrators are overwhelming satisfied with their jobs.</td>
<td>No previous research found, thus Nagel-Bennett (2010) is a new finding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A majority of chief student conduct administrators intend to stay in their positions.</td>
<td>No previous research found, thus Nagel-Bennett (2010) is a new finding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with students is a key reason for chief student conduct administrators to stay in their positions.</td>
<td>No previous research found, thus Nagel-Bennett (2010) is a new finding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male chief student conduct administrators are significantly more satisfied in their positions than females.</td>
<td>No previous research found, thus Nagel-Bennett (2010) is a new finding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No significant differences based on ethnicity, years in student conduct, student population size, age, ASCA circuit, or education level.</td>
<td>No previous research found, thus Nagel-Bennett (2010) is a new finding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much of the variation in job satisfaction can be explained by the intrinsic variables of responsibility, recognition, advancement, and work itself.</td>
<td>Confirms Grant’s (2006) findings that much of the variation in job satisfaction of mid-level managers in student affairs is explained by the intrinsic variables of advancement, responsibility, recognition, and work itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much of the variation in job satisfaction can be explained by the extrinsic variables of work conditions, personal life, job status, and relationship with colleagues.</td>
<td>Confirms Grant’s (2006) findings that job satisfaction of mid-level managers in student affairs is explained by the extrinsic variables of work conditions, personal life, job status, and relationship with colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents who intend to stay in their positions are more satisfied with their position.</td>
<td>Confirms finding by Rosser and Javinar (2003) whereby mid-level leaders in student affairs who are satisfied are more likely to stay in their position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement opportunities, when combined with age and gender, can be used to predict whether or not a chief student conduct administrator will stay or leave their position.</td>
<td>No previous research found, thus Nagel-Bennett (2010) is a new finding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extrinsic variable of balance of work and personal life, when combined with age and gender, can be used to predict whether or not a chief student conduct administrator will stay or leave their position.</td>
<td>No previous research found, thus Nagel-Bennett (2010) is a new finding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implications for Leaders in Higher Education

My study revealed that chief student conduct administrators are generally satisfied by their work with students and interactions with colleagues. To maintain such levels of satisfaction it is important for supervisors of these professionals to ensure that the time with students is protected and opportunities made available to connect with colleagues regarding student conduct and other professional issues.

On the ever elusive quest to strike a balance between work and personal life, chief student conduct administrators need adequate resources in the form of budget and personnel to remain effective and focus on the tasks at hand. In addition, the political climate of each institution is unique and therefore can be a minefield for chief student conduct administrators who often find themselves in the middle of situations involving students, faculty, parents, community members and other constituents with various personalities, agendas, ties to the organization and the community. Crucial to their success is a supervisor and other upper level administrators who will assist in the successful navigation of this complex terrain.

Advancement opportunities at the chief student conduct administrator’s current institution are important to highlight and encourage the incumbent to seek. Based on the workload, chief student conduct administrators often do not have the chance to look around them and discover the greater landscape. Professional development opportunities that also facilitate professional growth while providing a chance to take a break from the daily caseload and hearings is an excellent compliment to options for upward mobility.

The depth and breadth of responsibilities for chief student conduct administrators is great. Leaders in higher education need to pay close attention to provide a salary that is
commensurate with this position. Appropriate compensation for the chief student conduct administrator responsible for the facilitation of campus civility and safety in a setting fraught with increasing risk and outward acts of violence is critical to the health of the institution and is a tangible way to acknowledge the importance of the position.

Based on my experience and conversations with current and past chief student conduct administrators, a question often asked is “why would you want a job in which you deal with conflict all day and are constantly placed in pressure-filled situations that only receive recognition if something goes wrong?” In order to help offset this perception and reality for many chief student conduct administrators, leaders in higher education must have an in-depth understanding of the work in student conduct and be facile in translating it to the larger university community. Serving as an advocate, supporter, and provider of meaningful recognition to the person serving as chief student conduct administrator will undoubtedly go a long way toward enhancing the experience of the professional in this position.

Recommendations for Future Study

First, the political nature of student affairs and institutions of higher education relative to chief student conduct administrators warrants research. Given the number of chief student conduct administrators that indicated, through the open-ended survey questions, that politics was a factor that precipitates job dissatisfaction; research in this area is necessary.

Second, an in-depth qualitative study that allows for further examination of the intrinsic and extrinsic variables and intent to stay or leave by chief student conduct administrators would provide further information on these factors and provide greater
insight for leaders in higher education who work with chief student conduct administrators.

Third, further study regarding the finding that men had a higher level of job satisfaction could be examined through Gilligan's (1994) theory of moral development. Gilligan posited that men operate from a justice perspective and women from a relationship perspective.

Fourth, delve further into the satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators to determine if their satisfaction is related to their actual salary, and if salary is related to gender.

Fifth, research aimed at job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators at private colleges and universities, community colleges and similar institutions should also occur. This would extend the understanding of job satisfaction related to all chief student conduct administrators in higher education, provide an evaluation of the differences and similarities to my study and an examination of the variables that contribute to these variations.

Conclusions

Since the early days of colleges and universities, dealing with student conduct has been a part of campus life. As students and the society in which they live have grown more complex, so too have the issues related to student behavior. In order to effectively facilitate civility and learning in this environment, chief student conduct administrators have been entrusted to apply the standards for student behavior, possess keen knowledge of case law and due process, limit liability for the institution, support faculty to further the academic mission, uphold institutional academic standards and serve to minimize
threat and disruption to the university community. Based on the essential nature of this position, knowledge about the facets related to the job satisfaction of the professional tapped to serve in this role is crucial.

My research has provided the genesis for a conversation in the literature regarding job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators. As the first national study of its kind, my survey elicited a good response rate and geographic representation within the sample. The results of my study showed that despite the pressures and challenges inherent in the position, chief student conduct administrators are, overall, satisfied with their jobs. However, work load, balance between work and personal life, opportunities and time for professional development, salary, and assistance working with the politics of the institution need to be addressed by supervisors to ensure that chief student conduct administrators remain firmly rooted in their jobs. In addition, although the mean number of years of experience of chief student conduct administrators is 9.28 years, and one could assume that only those satisfied responded to my survey, there was a broad range of ages (21-66) and years of experience (.5-43) and there were no significant differences in job satisfaction related to these areas. Therefore, I believe the sample was representative of a cross section of chief student conduct administrators.

In closing, I believe the following quote from Lancaster and Waryold (2008) captures the essence of the student conduct profession and can serve as a creed for all who undertake this formidable yet rewarding work:

Might we never forget that each and every student is unique and possesses his or her own life story. And each student has potential and every offender is redeemable in some fashion. Our work is both simple and complex, troubling and
exhilarating; our results are sometimes of minor consequence and at other times of profound importance to individuals and communities. We no longer need to be a beleaguered clan but a profession that speaks with the voice of education, hope, and resolution in the midst of great confusion and emotion. We are reasoned, thoughtful, and developmental in our practice. We balance justice with mercy and the individual with the community. We are the voice of student conduct professionals. (p.293)

Intervention by chief student conduct administrators can have a life-changing impact on students. Leaders in higher education have the opportunity to have a similar effect on the lives of chief student conduct administrators, particularly in the areas of work load, balance between personal and professional lives, salary, and navigation of institutional politics. Given the critical role chief student conduct administrators have in the life, health and well-being of those attending, teaching, and working at four-year public institutions of higher education, now is the time for leaders to act.
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Appendix A

Permission to Use Grant's Mid-Level Job Satisfaction Job Dissatisfaction Inventory
Dear Suzie:

This letter serves as permission for you to use and modify the Mid-Level Managers Job Satisfaction Job Dissatisfaction Survey I developed for my dissertation in 2006, for your own dissertation research at Western Michigan University. Based on your correspondence, I understand you plan to conduct your survey in spring 2009.

I would like a copy of your survey results and overall findings of your dissertation. Best wishes as you continue to move forward toward completion of your degree.

Sincerely,

Jessie Grant, Ph.D.
Appendix B

Chief Student Conduct Administrator National Survey (Nagel-Bennett, 2010)
Chief Student Conduct Administrator Job Satisfaction Survey

Please read this consent information before you begin the survey.

You are invited to participate in a research project titled "Job Satisfaction of University Chief Student Conduct Administrators and Their Intent to Stay or Leave the Position." You are invited because you are a chief student conduct administrator, at a four-year public institution and a member of the Association of Student Conduct Administration. This project will serve as Suzie Nagel's dissertation project.

The survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Your responses will be confidential and not connected to you or your institution in the data analysis or result sections of the study. Since this survey has been sent via an embedded URL, your e-mail address will not be connected with your survey responses.

Submitting this survey is evidence of your consent to allow your responses to be used as research data. If you choose not to participate simply exit now. If, after beginning the survey you decide you do not wish to continue, you may abort at any time. You also may choose not to respond to a particular question for any reason.

This study may provide information about the extent to which chief student conduct administrators are satisfied with their positions and the core components of their satisfaction so it will inform those who supervise chief student conduct administrators of the critical elements that contribute to their satisfaction as they perceive them. There are no benefits to you for participating in the survey.

This study was approved by the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSRIB) on September 9, 2009.

Should you have any questions prior to or during the study, you can contact the primary investigator, Dr. Louann Bierlein Palmer, at Western Michigan University 269-387-3596 or l.bierleinpalmer@wmich.edu or the student investigator, Suzie Nagel, at 269-387-2400 or suzie.nagel@wmich.edu. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (269-387-8293) or the Vice President for Research (269-387-8298) if questions or problems arise during the course of the study.

Thank you for participating!

[Consent to continue survey button]

http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/WEB22A47QG6K3

1/12/2010
Chief Student Conduct Administrator Job Satisfaction Survey

Directions: For each statement listed click the response button (1-6) which represents your level of agreement/disagreement with that statement.

1 In reference to **Achievement/Growth**, I am satisfied with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 In reference to **Advancement** issues, I am satisfied:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 In reference to **Recognition** issues,

I am satisfied with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>3 Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Slightly Agree</th>
<th>5 Moderately Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) the level of professional recognition I receive from my colleagues at my current institution.

c) the level of professional recognition I receive for achievements from colleagues outside my institution.

4 In reference to Responsibility, I am satisfied with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>3 Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Slightly Agree</th>
<th>5 Moderately Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) the professional responsibilities in my job related to student conduct.

c) the opportunities to take on additional responsibilities.

5 In reference to the Work Itself, I am satisfied:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>3 Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Slightly Agree</th>
<th>5 Moderately Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) that I meet the needs of the students and my institution in dealing with student behavior.

c) that my job has a positive impact on the institution and surrounding community.

6 In reference to Administrative Policies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>3 Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Slightly Agree</th>
<th>5 Moderately Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7 In reference to Balance of Work and Personal Life, I am satisfied:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8 In reference to Compensation issues, I am satisfied with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>3 Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Slightly Agree</th>
<th>5 Moderately Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In reference to Job Security:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) I feel the position in which I serve is secure within the student affairs division at my institution.

b) I feel the position in which I serve is secure within my institution.

b) I feel I am secure in my position.

In reference to Job Status, I am satisfied with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) the privileges inherent in my job.

b) the level of influence my position has within my institution.

c) the level of influence my position has within student affairs at my institution.

In reference to Relationship with Colleagues I am satisfied with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) my current working relationships with senior level administrators at my institution.

b) my working relationships with colleagues holding similar level positions within the institution.
c) my working relationships with entry-level colleagues at my institution.

- [ ] 1 Strongly Disagree
- [ ] 2 Moderately Disagree
- [ ] 3 Slightly Disagree
- [ ] 4 Slightly Agree
- [ ] 5 Moderately Agree
- [ ] 6 Strongly Agree

d) the level of respect I receive from my colleagues within student affairs.

- [ ] 1 Strongly Disagree
- [ ] 2 Moderately Disagree
- [ ] 3 Slightly Disagree
- [ ] 4 Slightly Agree
- [ ] 5 Moderately Agree
- [ ] 6 Strongly Agree

**In reference to Supervision issues:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>3 Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Slightly Agree</th>
<th>5 Moderately Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>I am satisfied that my decisions are valued and respected by my supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my relationship with my supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>I feel my direct supervisor is competent/knowledgeable about issues related to student conduct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the level of assistance from my supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In reference to Work Conditions,**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>3 Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Slightly Agree</th>
<th>5 Moderately Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>with my current work load as the chief student conduct administrator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>that the political climate at my institution allows me to make decisions based on the facts specific to the situation and with fairness and integrity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>with my physical work conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>with committee work included in my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>with the overall office environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 In reference to overall Job Satisfaction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, I am satisfied with my position as the chief student conduct administrator at my institution.

15 In reference to your Intent to Stay or Leave Position:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Moderately disagree</td>
<td>Slightly disagree</td>
<td>Slightly agree</td>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) I intend to remain in my position at this institution for at least the next year.

b) I intend to seek a Chief Student Conduct Administrator position at another institution within the next few years.

c) I intend to seek a different position at my current institution within the next few years.

d) I intend to seek a different position at another institution.

e) I have yet to determine if I intend to stay or leave my current position during the next few years.

16 Please rate these major job factors based on the impact each has regarding your intent to stay or leave your position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support my desire to remain in my position</td>
<td>Moderately support my desire to remain in my position</td>
<td>Slightly support my desire to remain in my position</td>
<td>Slightly support my desire to leave my position</td>
<td>Moderately support my desire to leave my position</td>
<td>Strongly support my desire to leave my position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Working with students alleged to have violated university policy.

b) Collaborating with faculty regarding student conduct issues.

c) Collaborating with legal counsel regarding student conduct.

d) Interacting with parents regarding student conduct issues.

e) Acquiring knowledge of legal issues that pertain to student conduct.

f) Opportunities to train individuals about the student conduct process.

g) Navigating the politics inherent in this position.

h) Working with constituents external to the institution regarding student conduct issues.

17 With what areas of your job are you most satisfied?

18 With what areas of your job are you least satisfied?

19 List the key reasons you would stay in your current position.

20 List the key reasons you would leave your current position.
Demographic information

21 Please indicate your gender:
- Female
- Male
- Transgender

22 Please indicate your ethnic background:
- African American
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Caucasian
- Hispanic/Latino(a)
- Multiracial
- Native American
- Other, please specify

23 Please indicate the number of years you have served in student conduct:

24 Please indicate the current student population (both undergraduate and graduate) attending your institution:

25 Please list the highest degree you have attained:
- Bachelor's degree or equivalent
- Master's degree or equivalent
- Specialist or equivalent
- Juris Doctor (JD)
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Initial Recruitment E-Mail to Study Participants
Recruitment Email
Dear Chief Student Conduct Administrator,

As a fellow member of the Association for Student Conduct Administration (ASCA), I invite you to participate in a national research study regarding the job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators and its impact on intent to stay or leave their positions. All members of the Association that serve in this position at four-year, public institutions are being invited to participate.

You may click this link to access the survey:

http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/?p=WEB229ENLX8ENC

This study utilizes an on-line survey that will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary and all responses will be kept confidential. For the purposes of this study, chief student conduct administrators are the individuals responsible for daily interaction with students regarding their behavior, coordinate conduct hearings, and are responsible for oversight of the student conduct processes on campus. If you have received this and your position responsibilities do not fit within this description, please forward this to the person who serves in this role at your institution.

Thank you in advance for your time and participation in this research effort.

Respectfully,

Suzie Nagel
Appendix E

Study Participant Reminder E-Mails
Email Reminder 1
Dear Chief Student Conduct Administrator,

Recently I wrote to invite you to participate in a national survey regarding the job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators and its impact on intent to stay or leave their positions.

If you have completed the survey, thank you very much for doing so. If you have not yet had the opportunity to complete the survey, please click this link to begin:
http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/?p=WEB229ENLX8ENC

This survey will take about 10 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary and all responses will be kept confidential. For the purposes of this study, chief student conduct administrators are the individuals responsible for daily interaction with students regarding their behavior, coordinate conduct hearings, and are responsible for oversight of the student conduct processes on campus. Personal identifiers are not associated with survey responses, therefore, one additional email reminder will be sent. Please participate in the study only once. The data period will remain open until the middle of October, 2009.

As a fellow member of the Association of Student Conduct Administration, your participation is most appreciated.

Respectfully,

Suzie Nagel
Email Reminder 2
Dear Chief Student Conduct Administrator,

Recently I wrote to invite you to participate in a national survey regarding the job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators and its impact on intent to stay or leave their positions.

If you have completed the survey, thank you for taking the time to do so.

If you have not yet had the opportunity to complete the survey, please click this link to begin:
http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/?p=WEB229ENLX8ENC

This survey will take about 10 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary and all responses will be kept confidential. For the purposes of this study, chief student conduct administrators are the individuals responsible for daily interaction with students regarding their behavior, coordinate conduct hearings, and are responsible for oversight of the student conduct processes on campus.

Please participate in the study only once. The data period will remain open until October 23, 2009, so this will be the last survey reminder.

Your time and willingness to assist me in this research endeavor is most appreciated.

Respectfully,

Suzie Nagel
Post Second HSIRB Approval Email
Dear Chief Student Conduct Administrator,

Recently, I wrote to invite you to participate in a national survey regarding the job satisfaction of chief student conduct administrators and its impact on intent to stay or leave their positions. If you completed the survey, thank you. For those who did not have the opportunity to take the survey, it is not too late! Your experience as a Chief Student Conduct Administrator is very important and critical to this research.

You may click on the link below to access the survey.
http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/?p=WEB229ENLX8ENC

This survey will take about 10 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary and all responses will be kept confidential. For the purposes of this study, chief student conduct administrators are the individuals responsible for daily interaction with students regarding their behavior, coordinate conduct hearings, and are responsible for oversight of the student conduct processes on campus.

Your time and input are most valued and appreciated.

Respectfully,

Suzie Nagel
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Cross-Walk Table
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are chief student conduct administrators at four-year public institutions of higher education satisfied with their jobs?</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction: 14</td>
<td>• Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is job satisfaction of such chief student conduct administrators related to demographic characteristics (age, education level, institutional enrollment, ethnicity/race, gender, geographic region, and years of experience in student conduct)?</td>
<td>Demographic Questions: 16-23</td>
<td>• A t-test or F-test for each of the demographic variables (bolded at left) being the independent variables and job satisfaction being the dependent variable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is job satisfaction of such chief student conduct administrators related to Herzberg’s intrinsic motivation factors (i.e. achievement/growth, advancement, recognition, responsibility, and work itself)?</td>
<td>Achievement/Growth: 1a-c Advancement: 2a-c Recognition: 3a-c Responsibility: 4a-c Work itself: 5a-c</td>
<td>• A Cronbach’s alpha will be run for each of the variables (bolded at left) to ensure internal consistency on the questions for each variable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct multiple regressions with intrinsic variables as the independent variables (bolded at left), job satisfaction as the dependent variable, and demographic and institutional variables as controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question</td>
<td>Survey Question</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is job satisfaction of such chief student conduct administrators</td>
<td>Administrative Policies: 6a-c</td>
<td>• A Cronbach’s alpha will be run for each of the variables (bolded at left) to ensure internal consistency on the questions for each variable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>related to Herzberg’s extrinsic factors (i.e. administrative policies, balance</td>
<td>Balance of Work and Personal Life: 7a-d</td>
<td>• Conduct multiple regressions with extrinsic variables as the independent variables (bolded at left), job satisfaction as the dependent variable, and demographic and institutional variables as controls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of work and personal life, compensation, job security, job status, relationship</td>
<td>Compensation: 8a-c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with colleagues, supervision, and working conditions)?</td>
<td>Job Security: 9a-c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Status: 10a-c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship with Colleagues: 11a-d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision: 12a-d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Conditions 13a-e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is the intent to stay or leave of such chief student conduct</td>
<td>Intention to Stay or Leave Position: 15a-d</td>
<td>• ANOVA with job satisfaction being the independent variable and intent to leave being the dependent variable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators related to their job satisfaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Open Ended Questions
Open-ended responses

*Responses were typed verbatim

**Question 17: With what areas of your job are you most satisfied?**

- Being able to work 1 to 1 with students, interacting with faculty and administrators, great colleagues, physical location of office and having a nice work environment.
- Critical incidents, Behavior Assessment Team, helping victims.
- Great institution. Give great latitude in making decisions.
- helping students
- day to day work with students one on one
- Reviewing reflection letters from students who "get it"
- Interaction with the Conduct Board and accused students.
- Participation in changing the culture away from being known as a party school.
- Relationships with staff
- Communication / interconnectedness with students, staff, and faculty
- collaboration on conduct issues with colleagues at institution
- Meeting with student accused of violating policies. Working with graduate students and new professionals in Student Affairs. Advising student orgs, including hearing boards.
- Administrative responsibilities
- Working with students.
- Interacting with the students and see them evolved and grow as a result of their interaction with our office.
- Working with students and feeling that I am having a positive impact on them.
- The autonomy I have in my position.
- working relationships with others in the institution and city
- Collaborations; control over code review, more respect by members of the university community.
- Working with teachable kids. Great overall DOSA staff relationships and the positive long term faculty relationships
- My interactions with the students and the relationships we build in the times they need support/direction.
- Student, student staff & entry level staff interactions
- Case load
  - Staff I supervise
  - Types of issues that are seen on campus
- Broad policy formulation and drafting; committee work; problem solving and crisis management/response;
- The areas of responsibility, the autonomy provided, and my staff.
- Student contact - committee work - wide range of projects
• Talking with students
• Student and faculty interactions. I also enjoy mentoring grad students.
• Student interaction
• working with students on a one on one basis in addition to advising student leadership organizations.
• My ability to work with students and provide mentorship to student groups
• making a difference; contributing to the safety and security of the institution; working with faculty;
• Opportunity to meet with students one on one and have direct impact on their behavior
• Autonomy and work with legal counsel.
• The ability to help students understand their role as community members and their responsibility with the community.
• Interacting with the faculty and students.
• Direct work with students - and success stories (behavioral turnarounds; obvious growth and development in students).
• Support of supervisor
• face to face interaction with students and the opportunities to educate them
• Staff is incredible. I also enjoy impacting students' lives.
• Challenges that are constantly unique and changing. Quality of colleagues working with me.
• all areas
• working with students, working at the institution in student affairs
• Working with students and faculty
• the opportunity to hold student conduct reviews with students; the opportunity to oversee Clery Act Compliance
• Being able to work with students and staff regarding conduct/legal issues
• Control over the conduct process and policies and ability to change/revise them.
• Supervisor, opportunity to work with students.
• policy development and implementation; educating students regarding decision-making
• a great balance between autonomy and collaboration with key players
• I love working with the students and challenging them on their behavior and supporting them to make better decisions.
• supportive institutional climate for conduct officer
• Working with people to resolve their conflicts in a proactive way
• Developing critical thinking skills in students, working with faculty, problem solving, crisis intervention, working with counsel, university police, sexual assault prevention, drug/alcohol task force.
• student interaction, office team, university support, ability to learn every day.
• My role in Student Development.
• Helping to develop the student to the next level of civility and personal
Responsibility.

- Student interaction, working with peers in my department and across campus
- The experience, meetings with students, evaluating policies and procedures, and ensuring fairness
- Student conduct process
  - Navigating politics
  - Legal issues
- Ability to make a difference in students' lives, prior to them getting into further difficulties outside of the university.
- Autonomy
- Close interactions with students.
- For the most part, I have a great degree of latitude in my job.
- I enjoy the colleagues that I work with and I have a good relationship with my supervisor.
- The supervisor I have is very supportive and acts as a good mentor.
- Helping the university maintain its community standards.
- Engaging with students during their development stage. Providing assistance and support to parents during student conduct issues. Seeing a student who has been challenged with a conduct issue walk across the stage and receive his/her diploma!!
- Seeing a student turn negative behavior into positive behavior
- Being in a position to affect change, being mentored by others with more experience and time in the field, working with students in both crisis situations and fun activities as well (which is different from my last position), and the ability to learn more about management.
- Competent staff around me

Internal and external collaborations, providing assistance to students in need, witnessing students graduate, positive influence on campus community, etc.

Responsibilities.
Relationship with core group of colleagues.
Ability to be involved in other areas of institution.
Level of collaboration between departments/campus units.
- Impacting students to want to change their behavior and become successful students.
- Interaction with numerous stakeholders, impact on students, training and supervision experience
- Opportunities to apply university standards and help students learn from their mistakes.
- My staff, working/interacting with students daily.
- Working with the students
- Working conditions
- Working with students and going through the learning process with them.
- autonomy and flexibility of creating and modifying policy
- Seeing my students understand their behavior and grow. Also working with the victims during the process.
- Meeting with the students alleged to have violated policies.
- Teaching aspects, interacting with students
- One on one meetings with students
- The people and support from up above.
- Supervisor is great
- Interaction with the students themselves which provide many opportunities to teach responsibility, communication, goal setting, and other leadership skills. I also enjoy working with a growing university that has opportunities to initiate change for the better in many processes and procedures.
- The interaction with students
- My staff and working environment.
- Student contact - philosophical alignment of the work with my own values - supportive supervisor and colleagues.
- Helping with educational outcomes for students
- Student interaction
- Supervisor, stated support for position although financial support isn't there.
- Getting to know students at a vulnerable time in their lives.
- I have a wonderful, dedicated and talented staff, and 80 super volunteers! I get things done - I am really good at what I do.
- The students, the policies, the conduct officers.
- Working with students one-on-one, giving presentations to faculty and staff, opportunity to initiate changes within the office.
- Supervision and care of students
- Seeing students learn and grow by going through the judicial process.
- I have been able to pursue areas of interest within student conduct administration and external to this area. The nature of the work is complex, and involves interaction/collaboration with professionals throughout the university. This is a very positive element. If the political climate were different, it would vastly affect the way I feel about my work. I think I am very fortunate in that respect.
- The facilitation of appropriate referrals for students who are in need of assistance.
- The general work environment of my current office. I have a great staff that make being in office fun even when the job is frustrating.
- Levels of responsibility and status
- Working with students. The staff with whom I directly work. Relationships on and off campus.
- Meetings
- Access to and work with my supervisor and the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs on policy issues and judicial cases
• Ability to work with a core group of people. Ability to play a role in retention at my institution and to work with students directly.

• Having a positive working relationship with Academic Affairs and our on-campus police department.

• Autonomy and respect that I have in running daily operations of the conduct office. That I have created a conduct office focused on student learning and development.
Question 18: With what areas of your job are you least satisfied?

- Not enough time in the day, working too many hours, too many interruptions, too many projects and not enough staff.
- Politics, lack of appreciation for the level of responsibility entailed in this position and therefore lack of compensation proportionate to responsibilities and work load.
- Workload, need more staff
- politics
- Salary, recognition
- salary, support, politics
- Dealing with parents!
- Political climate at my institution and parental interaction.
- Micromanagement by VP
- Time - need more than 24 hours per day
- Upward mobility options
- continuous paperwork.
- Politics of the University.
  Lack of support from my supervisor.
- campus politics
- The minimal pay and the lack of professional respect and support the office and my position receive from the institution.
- The campus cultural that perpetuate the inability to grasp the real cost of change, and hold tight to perceptions rather evolve and grow.
- Feeling that I have little control over a campus climate in which it is not always understood that what I do is, by its nature, often contentious.
- politics and my supervisor
- Lack of Staff
- Promotion opportunities, face time with senior staff; pay, no supervision and budget duties.
- new president's shaky commitment to consistent application of disciplinary policies and past procedures. Moving target environment makes for higher stress in division top down.
- conflicts with staff from other departments.
- Supervisor & institutional politics
- Office seems out of place with other units in department (progromatic v service oriented)

- Handling minor cases; lack of appreciation for stress of position by some administrators; low salary compared to other less critical positions on campus.
- The committee work that accomplishes little.
- Paperwork (But who isn't)
- Interference from the University's PR people
The work load is totally unreasonable. In order to try and keep up, it is sometimes necessary to work 70 hours/week. We have no in house legal counsel which is very concerning with regard to personal liability. Parents are increasingly argumentative. Community people have unrealistic expectations about how much control we can exert over off-campus behavior.

Professional growth within the institution

the lack of office budget to support professional development, quality database development and to retain and recruit quality employees.

The lack of respect in my position and the lack of information sharing within my division. This position would be positive at a different institution but here, I am not permitted to fully participate in the life of the division.

my own physical safety in my environment; seriousness with which leadership takes threats to our safety; administrative and staff support of paperwork and scheduling

Workload leaves little time for a personal life

Senior administrators and campus climate for dealing with student conduct.

How some of my colleagues do not understand the role conduct plays in the well-being of the university community.

The politics of my job, my job title, and no opportunities for upward advancement.

Workload/ stress on work-life balance during the academic year, and workload affecting my ability to continue my doctoral program due to hours required.

No room for advancement

because of workload, the inability to get as much accomplished as I would like in other areas in my role as dean of students

Compensation

Ability to get timely information from both campus and local police departments.

relationship with my supervisor, opportunities for advancement, opportunities for professional development

Colleagues that do not have the orientation and motivation needed to maintain the level of competence needed in student conduct affairs - attention to detail, neutral disposition, understanding the academic mission and what goes on in a classroom, etc.

lack of support from or feeling valued by supervisor

extra work outside of conduct/legal issues that my dept that takes me away from my core responsibilities and adds to the amount of late night and weekend work.

Relationship with supervisory

Safety and lack of understanding about student conduct with upper administration and some faculty and staff. Safety issues are a huge concern and we are seeing a huge increase in academic integrity issues.

need more staff

I am frustrated that we don't have the staff or the resources to sufficiently begin a restorative justice program.
• I don't appreciate or care for most of the political and legal issues related to higher education. And the case load is a bit too high.
• Workload is a challenge
• Not enough personnel to support the vision of resolving conflict proactively
• Micro-managed by supervisor; feel undervalued, pushed aside at every opportunity.
• External community factors that crept up over the last 8-10 months that are impeding students learning.
• Political climate, lack of support and security.
• The complexity of the process.
• My work load is too much for my department to cover (I'm the only conduct administrator in my department)
• Lack of support for professional development, job responsibilities no longer challenging, inadequate compensation in comparison to others, lack of opportunity to advance
• Supervision
• Work load
• Politics of the job.
• Silo challenges on this campus
• The amount of work that I am required to do because I am also responsible for student activities. I have no direct administrative assistant. The politics of the college prevent me from doing the job sometimes according to our procedures. Also, more senior administrators do not respect my position.
• My supervisor does not seem to be very supportive or interest in the judicial affairs portion of my job.

• I do not enjoy the culture of my current institution or the current sitting president. Both are very political that have a far greater impact on how I and others do their job. I also became a director very quickly in my career and at times I personally feel underqualified for my job. This aspect is more about me and less about my institution/supervisor etc. Additionally the student population my institution attracts tend to be less motivated and their parents in turn are very challenging. As an institution there is a large focus on customer service, which makes it challenging to find balance in what we do. Additionally this plays a role in the support we feel from higher administration. And finally personally I struggle with conflict over where my personal values are vs. where the University values are
• Work/life balance
• Conflicts with university staff and parents about rule interpretation.
• Lack of support from direct supervisor
• Salary
• Opportunity for advancement
• The politics that come with the job
• Learning how to manage difficult personalities, and dealing with the fact that my age gets in the way sometimes (I am slightly younger than the average age for my position type and my direct reports are older)
• The lack of staff and the number of vacant positions not filled
• Office location and condition, lack of human resources, inability to meet the demand for departmental services, Senior Administrators' limited knowledge concerning "best practices" in student conduct administration, putting politics ahead of student/staff interests, etc.
• Consistency level and professional competence of administration.

Student Affairs not valued at this institution.
• Directo Superviso and salary
• work/life balance, resources
• Lack of recognition for amount of work that is done by my office. Position is 11 month and requires 12 months to get it done. Therefore, vacation and personal time are not used. No intention for the university to increase me to a 12 month contract.
• Physical space, emotional intensity of some cases.
• salary, addressing self-harm issues with students, case load
• supervision and sharing of responsibility
• time commitment
• The political nature of the job and senior administrations lack of back bone.
• working with faculty
• Political battles with athletics and donors.
• My supervisor.
• death by meeting!
• paperwork and lack of appropriate administrative assistance
• Need for new space to expand our office and the slowness from administration to commit.
• Space issues
• Often I get overburdened with event planning that seems to get dumped in our office, often leaving me little time to actually do my main job.
• Lack of professional courtesy/recognition; lack of policies regarding disciplinary process
• That my own colleagues within student affairs do not understand the nature of what our office does day to day. They make unfair assumptions and sometimes side with students without any knowledge of a situation.
• The amount of paperwork - Relationship with a couple of folks at the institution.
• Emphasis on negative behaviors
• Serious lack of clerical support
• Resources. 1 position has been frozen for almost 3 years.
• Feeling bullied and beat up by some students and their parents.
• 1. My new supervisor. He is incompetent and a liability for the University.
• 2. My inability to do meaningful work on this campus outside of student conduct work. I used to have more responsibilities and worked longer hours but I was happier. This job has no balance. It is just negative.
• 3. Helicopter Parents
• 4. Institutional politics - new administration

• The quantity of cases
• none
• politics
• The politics and negative parental interference.
• If asked to manage this level of stress and complexity at work, I believe financial compensation should be higher. Not just for me - but for student conduct officers in general.
• The inability to effectively create a work/life balance.
• The political climate and having to work in a "boys club" environment.
• Leadership at the highest levels
• Budget issues. No support (do not mean money) for professional development beyond what is on campus. Office conditions are terrible (space needs).
• Paperwork and data tracking for legal intervention by parents
• The amount of time I have to work on policy updates and a campaign to educate the faculty and campus at large about judicial issues. I am both the Director of Student Life and Judicial Affairs, so a good portion of my job involves managing student life related issues, not just judicial affairs.
• At times the political environment is frustrating and at times, the higher administrators have no real feel for this area.
• My working relationship with my supervisor. Does not provide opportunities for professional growth outside of my current position. Has not been a positive role model or mentor for me.

• Role as Chief Student Conduct Officer is 50% time with large and complex caseload. I have significant other responsibilities as Assistant Dean of Student Affairs. Constantly balancing competing priorities in a time of declining resources.
Question 19: List the key reasons you would stay in your current position.

- Enjoy working in a university environment, enjoy working with students, I like the work, benefits are good and retirement is in sight.
- Helping students, professional growth into other positions within the institution.
- Lots of respect, great institution, lots of influence on policy and most university decisions.
- salary
- see most satisfied (#17)
- Change in responsibility
- Like my office staff
  Like the student population
  Pretty campus
  Small town
  Partner has to work in her position till she retires
- It is the area of the country where I plan to retire and where my family resides.
- Reputation of school and building experience to become a DoS in a few years
- Great people - staff, students, and faculty
- colleagues and supervisor.
- My family is happy with our situation at home and with schools.
  We are close to family and friends.
  Despite the politics and hierarchy at the University, it is a good place to work.
- I love my job
- students
- Innovations, willingness to change, honesty and integrity, intentionality, and strategic planning.
- There is no guarantee that the next position will turn out to be better, and also because of the expense and inconvenience of looking for a new job and relocating.
- Increase salary, responsibilities and title (move from Director to Assistant or Associate Dean).
- 1. I have a 12 year old son and am hesitant to move him; 2. I generally like my job
- Enjoy the work
- Did not find something else.
  Promotion.
  Gained supervisory and budgetary duties.
  Gained more face time with senior staff.
- Love the school, relationships over time with DOSA team and other campus administrators and faculty. Keeps you young working with students. Change is ever present. No motivation to chase the career ladder golden ring...
- Supportive staff in our office and from most other campus offices.
• Overall like for the institution and the location of the institution
  Established in the community
  Enjoying the work
• I am getting close to retirement age so I don't have a long term career advancement plan.
• I love it here.
• I work with amazing students at a dynamic institution with excellent colleagues and a very supportive supervisor.
• I live in this community and this is where I want to stay.
• I answered the supervisor questions based on my last supervisor since the current one is only here temporarily. There has been much supervisory turn over here which has been stressful. I may stay if the next supervisor is supportive.
• Mentor in senior administration (academic affairs)
• I have only been here for 1.5 years
• students and projects I am currently working on with them
• fantastic supervisor; good cultural fit with institution; level of respect I feel from faculty and others
• feel competent and like the opportunity to see people learn life lessons
• Convenience. I am currently working on my doctorate and it is not convenient to change jobs right now.
• Location, opportunity to work with students, faculty and community members with these issues.
• My continued work with faculty, teaching, publishing, and the students I remain connected with.
• Improvements to staffing, physical space and resources, increased compensation, and/or reorganization to reconfigure position responsibilities so that it is not entirely student conduct related.
• I enjoy the institutional culture
• best position on campus; great VP for student affairs (my direct supervisor)
• Staff, accomplish goals in work plan, and mentor staff members in student conduct.
• No other opportunities come up elsewhere on campus or another institution.
• I have complete control of my destiny. Complete support from the President of the university.

• like my colleagues, like the institution and department of student affairs
• Understanding of and commitment to my institution; respect from my colleagues and students; excitement generated by the job itself.
• I enjoy working the content of my work, my colleagues, and our students.
• job security, benefits
• Seniority
Salary
Benefits (retirement & medical)
• Better pay and advancement. Opportunity to teach in related area. I am near retirement and it benefits me to stay at my institution for 3 more years.
• I'm making a positive difference in student's lives; job security
• I care about people and believe that regardless of what someone may have done they have the ability to make better choices in their future. And I like in a loving way challenging people to become who they're capable of becoming.
• impact at the institution; overall professional experience
• The people I work with, in general, are awesome.
• listed in #17
• Students and my staff. The level of respect in doing this job.
• Don't want to move my family at this time in their lives.
• Anticipating a change of administration.
• Satisfaction over improving a situation.
• I enjoy feeling like I help students.
• if I received more challenging responsibilities, fair pay, more support for professional development
• Support from administration
  Opportunities for growth
• I enjoy my job for the most part, but my family is a big reason why I would stay in my current position.
• seniority, benefits, flexible work day
• None.
• I like the college where I am employed. I enjoy the staff within my department.
• Family obligations, ability to find another position, relationship with colleagues
• Enjoy the people (staff, faculty, students and community members) I work with
• My boss's consultation and support.
• Salary increase
  opportunity for advancement
• good place to work,
• -my current position provides much room for me to grow
  -the campus/community/city in which I work are family centered and has nice people without the crime rate I have grown accustomed to over the past few years.
  -upper administration trust me to do my job and support me.
  -Opportunity to advance my education
• Like the area, university, and job responsibilities
• Tenure, location, the challenge of daily operations, the advancement of the profession.
• Like the current situation.
  Enjoy core group of colleagues.
  Comfortable with responsibilities.
  Need to stay 2 more years to be vested.
• Family tied to area
  Health reasons
  Bad economy

• I believe my work is important and I enjoy the people I work with. I am learning a lot and developing professionally.
• I've been at this institution for 23+ years and plan to retire in a few years.
• Student interaction, wonderful staff/colleagues.
• Office atmosphere, enjoy office colleagues, other university commitments, tight job market, completion of dissertation
• student population, have good experience and longevity at institution
• better my future
• The students, my co-workers and the campus environment.
• autonomy, supervisor, working environment
• I like my institution and majority of our staff.
• Love the work!
• Opportunity to impact students in a positive manner
• The people, location, personal growth,
• Great administration
• I am very excited about working under the new Dean of Students--potential to assist in the reorganization of the department. Opportunity to learn a variety of job skills related to Student Affairs, not just judicial.
• Do not want to relocate my family
• I love my staff. I like working with students. I teach a class each fall which I enjoy. I like the state I live in. I like the place I live. I like my lifestyle.
• Excellent work - excellent working conditions - excellent institution
• Location (I like the mountainous area we live in)
• 1) Amiable work environment  2) Honest and ethical colleagues and supervisors who always strive to act in our students' best interests.  3) State funding and support for university has been reasonably consistent and predictable over the years and has avoided veering from one extreme to the other.
• Become fully staffed. Increased resources. Ability to add more programmatic areas.
• Dealing with conduct is exciting most of the time. I like to go from one crisis to the next. The students for the most part are very good people.
• My staff is outstanding--!
  Respect from others in the institution
  My family needs
  Unable to get another position
• The people I work with and the students.
• autonomy, salary, supervisor
• i am an alumnus of this institution and started from the ground up. i am very satisfied with the institution and my position as VP for Student Affairs
• I am within 5 years of retiring.  
  I don't really want to relocate at this time.
• My family is happy - it is a good work environment - I feel supported by my supervisor.
• Experience, responsibility to the office/institution, relationships with students and colleagues, possibilities for expansion
• I'm too young to quit and too old to start over.
• Great supervisor, great division
• Students
• Job security.
• The institution's transitions & growth, the students, the location/community
• Opportunities to work with students, the opportunity to shape policy, a wonderful staff, and a positive work environment.
• I like the size, the position, and the collaborative relationships I have established here.
• If relationship with current supervisor changes.
• Students, direct supervisor
• Economic concerns in the current financial climate about relocation. Have a long tenure at the institution with many positive relationships with colleagues. Institution is currently in transition, so some of the things I am dissatisfied with may change with hiring of new president.
Question 20: List the key reasons you would leave your current position.

- If I stop enjoying and caring about the students, faculty and staff then it would be time for me to leave or if I had to leave for medical reasons or for reasons beyond my control.
- Growth opportunities, ability to provide more for family in another institutions or industry.
- I have been here 11 years. My boss my be leaving. Budget cuts are severely crippling my office.
- salary
- see least satisfied (#18)
- Conduct is getting old....burnout setting in!
- Political climate
  Unstable work environment outside of my office
  Unfair treatment of certain staff
  Unethical behavior of top administration
- Retirement, lack of staff to do a thorough job.
- Becoming a DoS
- Lack of opportunity for career advancement
- Tire of the paperwork needed to be done to resolve cases.
- Fed up with items in #19.
- Budget cuts / weak Vice President
- politics of the institution
- Failure to support and develop, closed climate of opinion, and myopic mindset when it comes to change.
- Loss of the ability to travel for professional development for more than one year. Lack of support and understanding from higher administration -- not my immediate supervisor.
- Opportunities for advancement at another institution (especially if the institution has a Ph.D. or part-time J.D. program I'd be interested in); may also leave to pursue a terminal degree full time
- 1. I eventually would like a Dean of Students position. 2. There is no place within the institution to move up. 3. Politics
- Retirement
- Low pay.
  No propotions opportunities.
  Lack of supervisory and budgetary duties.
- STRESS and anxiety of never knowing "what's next" and the changing administration's micro-management tendencies. Tired of dealing with the "Dark Side of the Force" issues constantly, and overly involved parents.
- Key staff from other offices blocking changes to our program or taking new risks to educate/reach out to students.
- supervisor & institutional politics
• Boredom
  Looking for new challenges
• 1. Stress. 2. If another opportunity materialized on campus. 3. If the Obama administration passes universal health care.
• The K-12 school system sucks wind.
• If my position got cut or my family needed me to care for them.
• I’m hopeful that the conduct duties will soon be shifted away from my position.
• My physical health is suffering from the work load. Requests for additional staff are ignored despite data showing increased cases of growing complexity.
• Lack of growth potential
• lack of financial support for staff and office operations.
• lack of professional advancement, lack of communication among my peers, not a good fit for my skill level.
• family; personal safety (not from conduct students but from mental health students i also work with); lack of opportunity to advance at least in title if not salary
• unsupportive supervisor (currently not the case), faculty intervention in areas they know little about
• More responsibility. Better environment. Supportive colleagues and senior administrators.
• Personal family concerns, change in leadership or student development philosophy
• I need more experience such as Supervision, Budget, and my title and current position is not providing that.
• Lack of resources; burnout; lack of variety; infringement on personal goal to complete doctoral program.
• No promotional opportunities
• retirement in 21 months
• New opportunity or career advancement.
• Good opportunity to take another position with increased responsibilities/salary.
• Retirement
• been in the position for a long time and it might be time to move on to something else
• Greater salary; new challenge
• Abuse by supervisor
• I would like to be heard more. It’s not that I am always right, I would just like to be heard by supervisors.
• Burn out
  Fired
  Promotion
• Safety issues. Retireement after three years. Too much stress.
• opportunity to pursue research and writing
• 1. too long of a commute, would like a similar position closer to home 2. prefer a small, private institution, 3. ready for a dean position with broader responsibilities
• To many pressures where people believe and expect that you can 'control' the behavior of others and that our society as a whole continues to take less personal responsibility for personal behavior and choices and shift the blame on to others. And the increasing 'victim mentality' that seems to continually be increasing.
• none at present time
• No upward opportunities (it seems)
• listed in #18
• Dean position.
• Lack of pay and advancement at our campus.
• Professional Advancement & Opportunity.
• Tired of dealing with the problems.
• I really want to teach.
• If I found another position that would advance my career in student conduct
• Work load
  Salary
• If it got overly political.
• salary
• Politics
  Salary
  Balance
• Lack of support and/or interest from my supervisor.
• Institutional climate, Parent involvement, University values vs. personal values conflict
• If more work responsibilities given to me.
• Burnout.
• no future opportunity for advancement
  no salary increase
  supervisor management style
• currently there are none
• -professional opportunities for my partner (or lack thereof in this area)

• Move to be closer to family, promotion
• Resisstence to implement best practices, unethical decisions made by Senior Administration.
• some burn-out
  difficult supervisor
• Different position closer to home in Kansas.
  Dean of Students position elsewhere.
  If conditions here change dramatically.
- If political climate deteriorated
- If appropriate reorganization does not occur
- Burn out...too much to do, too little time and too little support.
- Position elimination.
- To move in a new direction, excellent opportunity.
- salary, lack of upward mobility, better career advancement opportunities
- fit with Division and personnel
- i would not
- To advance in position, obtaining a different experience - even in a student conduct position, political environment of current institution.
- promotion
- I would like to teach.
- The pay and my supervisor.
- Institutional politics, lack of respect for the profession of student affairs, in equities with regard to decision-making.
- burn out; need new challenges
- A senior position at another university that fits my overall goals.
- Family issues arose
- Salary and work schedule. Although we are told to work 40 hours/wk, I have presentations, workshops, and meetings several evenings per week and sometimes on the weekend with events. You are allowed to adjust your schedule but it never works out because of all the meetings and responsibilities you have during the regular work day. In this area, I would make far more money and work less hours as a regular classroom school teacher than in student affairs in a university
- Lack of recognition for the position I hold; upper administration disengagement; inadequate salary
- Want to work in a more balanced student affairs position where the tasks would include working with the student leaders who are not "in trouble" and the students who are. Too much stress and too high of a work load. No time to think.
- None
- Location (my wife would like to move to a warmer area of the country)
- The community in which my institution is located is small and very homogeneous. It is a comparatively prosperous town and is a pleasant place in which to live. However, it is severely lacking in diverse types of cultural, entertainment or intellectual opportunities. Outside of work, I feel stifled. If I leave my current position, it will be primarily because of this.
- Lack of resources.
- Dealing with so much negative energy.
- To get a better supervisor.
- To be a Dean of Students.
- To rejuvenate myself as a professional.
- the K-12 school system here sucks wind
- change of supervisor, opportunity to move out west,
• if the President changes and I am unhappy with new leadership
• Interest in trying something new in a new environment.
• Working with our attorneys can be very frustrating (even when they are trying to be helpful). Career advancement.
• N.A

• I didn't go into higher education to work with criminals. I no longer feel as though I am developing students, just corralling gangster wannabes. I'm seeing an increase in assaults of all types and drug violations including distribution.
• Budget Cuts
• being forced to make a decision that violates due process just to satisfy the administration.
• Growth and advancement.
• salary, a position with this being the primary focus, not all the additional responsibilities added on
• A desire to change geographic locations or a "can't resist this opportunity" position at another campus.
• To move closer to family in western Kansas.
• If working relationship with current supervisor does not change for the better.
• Politics of the university
• An opportunity for career advancement, new challenges to continue professional development, or an opportunity to work in a more positive, less conflicted, work environment.