NATIONAL JOB SATISFACTION OF ENTRY- AND MID-LEVEL STUDENT AFFAIRS PROFESSIONALS

Denise L. Davidson

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate College of
Bowling Green State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Higher Education Administration

Bowling Green, Ohio

August 2009

SUBMITTED TO:

William E. Knight, Advisor
Audrey E. Ellenwood, Graduate College Representative
Michael D. Coomes
Maureen E. Wilson

ABSTRACT

William E. Knight, Advisor

Most workers aspire to jobs where they are highly satisfied. This satisfaction may come from remuneration, opportunities for advancement, the work itself, or other factors. Although an awareness of job satisfaction has the potential to reduce absenteeism and employee turnover, we know little about the satisfaction levels of student affairs professionals. This study examined a population of entry- and mid-level student affairs practitioners in order to develop a profile of their levels of satisfaction with the overall job and five facets of satisfaction. In addition, differences were examined among demographic characteristics and predictors of job satisfaction for entry- and mid-level staff were explored.

Findings indicated significant differences between entry- and mid-level student affairs professionals' levels of job satisfaction when compared to the neutral level of job satisfaction established by the general population of workers. In addition, significant differences were identified in relation to age, gender, position level, and student affairs functional area. Predictive models were identified for entry-level professionals' satisfaction with opportunities for promotion and mid-level professionals' satisfaction with pay.

Suggestions for future research are provided. Implications for practice are noted including the recommendation that student affairs leaders should make much of the fact that student affairs is a satisfying line of work. In addition, results suggested that leaders within student affairs should attend to the differences in satisfaction levels between older and younger professionals at the entry and mid-levels. Further, results implied a generational influence on job satisfaction levels that has bearing on effective supervisory and leadership behaviors. Finally,

practitioners may find it useful to attend to the differing satisfaction levels between various functional areas and what these variations imply for leadership practice.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to the student affairs practitioners who took the time to participate in my study and those student affairs professionals and students who might benefit from its results.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation could not have been completed without support, guidance, and insights offered to me by a number of incredible people. They include Marcia Baxter Magolda and Judy Rogers, who got me started thinking about a doctorate when I worked on my Master's degree (so many moons ago!). Keith Hansen deserves all of the credit for pointing out that the time was right for returning to school. Maureen Wilson and Mike Coomes guided my work, offered alternate perspectives, and reinforced my thinking. Bill Knight, my dissertation committee chair, devoted long hours to reviewing and supporting my work and provided swift and useful feedback: for this, I am extremely grateful. Mike Dannells started the job, got me off on the right foot, and continues to provide support and encouragement.

Although the work in this dissertation—and the overall doctoral degree—was my own, I was never alone. My classmates have been there at the darkest moments. I would not have finished this without them. They include my cohort members (AKA the "Dirty Dozen"), who urged me along and provided the sense of teamwork and camaraderie crucial to degree completion. I am grateful to Michelle Rodems, Casey Sacks, and Kacee Ferrell Snyder, who were in different cohorts but supported me nonetheless and offered important influences on my thinking. I am most grateful to three fellow students who pushed me, poked at my thinking, told me when I was wrong (without any hesitation!) and never failed to encourage, push, and cheer me on : Evelyn Ashley, Cynthia Fulford, and Peter Meagher. Thanks for being there through thick and thin and for helping me work to my potential.

Amy Paciej has been a tireless supporter as we progress through similar processes hundreds of miles apart. Kathy Hammett has been a strong, supportive, and consistent friend since we met at Miami University in 1985 and I thank her for always being willing to listen!

Of course, my family—my mother, Joani, father, Don, my brother, Kevin, my step-daughter Charlie, and my various cousins and relatives—have offered encouragement and urged me along. Dan Fineran has been my stress outlet, my cheerleader, and my source of reality and strength.

I thank you all for helping me get through!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Americans have developed a peculiar way of looking at work. Rather than focusing on the meaning of the word "work," generally referred to as something involving labor or exertion, our culture thinks of work as activity that should be at least tolerable and, ideally, enjoyable and fulfilling. Satisfaction—the degree to which one is happy about work, content while at the workplace, and pleased with one's efforts and how they are rewarded—becomes a gauge of the suitability of employment. Inferences can be made that low satisfaction causes poor productivity, performance, and employee turnover, while logic would indicate that high satisfaction would be related to opposite effects.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to provide a comprehensive, systematic examination of job satisfaction of entry- and mid-level student affairs professionals. Specifically, this study provided descriptive information about job satisfaction of student affairs professionals at the entry and mid-levels, compared them to a national "average" level of satisfaction in the American workforce, and identified the predictors of job satisfaction for student affairs workers based on level of experience. This examination resulted in recommendations for practice toward the goal of improving the work experience and retention of entry- and mid-level student affairs staff in higher education across the nation.

Statement of the Problem

Job satisfaction has been heavily researched in many fields and has led to a better understanding of the factors that increase worker satisfaction, their productivity, and their retention. Studies on job satisfaction that address student affairs professionals have provided important information but do not comprehensively examine position level of the participants

from a nation-wide perspective; available literature presents an incomplete picture of job satisfaction in student affairs. No single study has attempted to examine job satisfaction for a nationwide sample of entry- and mid-level professionals using a valid and reliable instrument.

Research Questions

The following research questions arose from the purpose of this study:

1. What are the levels of overall and facet job satisfaction for entry- and mid-level student affairs professionals employed by institutions of higher education?
2. Are the levels of global job satisfaction for entry- and mid-level student affairs professionals representative of individuals employed at non-profit organizations?
3. Are the levels of the five facets of job satisfaction (i.e., pay, opportunities for promotion, people at work, supervision, and the work itself) for entry- and mid-level student affairs professionals representative of individuals employed at non-profit organizations?
4. Are there statistically significant differences in levels of global job satisfaction for entry- and mid-level student affairs professionals based on:
    a. gender
    b. position level
    c. ethnicity
    d. age
    e. student affairs functional area
5. Are there statistically significant differences in levels of the five facets of job satisfaction for entry- and mid-level student affairs professionals based on:
    a. gender
    b. position level

   c. ethnicity
   d. age
   e. student affairs functional area
6. What combination of variables predicts high levels of global job satisfaction for:
   a. entry-level professionals?
   b. mid-level professionals?
7. What combination of variables predicts high levels of satisfaction on each of the five satisfaction facets for:
   a. entry-level professionals?
   b. mid-level professionals?

Importance of the Study

The primary consideration that drove this study rose from the relationship of attrition from the student affairs profession to job satisfaction. Theoretical frameworks provide direct connections between low levels of satisfaction and employee absenteeism and, importantly, employee turnover.

Attrition from Student Affairs

The rate of attrition from the student affairs field is commonly thought to be high and problematic for the profession. Renn and Hodges (2007) noted studies that estimated attrition rates between 50% and 60% before the fifth year of employment in student affairs. In a study of 182 graduates of student affairs master's degree programs 3 through 11 years after graduation, Burns (1982) reported an attrition rate of 39%. While certainly not a profession-wide examination of attrition rates, these figures are troubling to student affairs professionals.

Attrition results in direct costs associated with the selection and hiring processes implemented to replace the employee, indirect costs related to orientation and training of new staff, and lost work time between employees. There is also a loss of momentum and productivity that comes from the new staff member acclimating and "catching up" to where the previous employee may have been in terms of skills, knowledge of the campus and job, and established relationships. Generally, student affairs professionals speak of attrition as a negative factor for the field, as a symbol of failure within the particular department and the profession as a whole. If we cannot retain our employees, we have not been successful (Lorden, 1998).

Two reviews of the literature explored the relationship between job satisfaction and attrition from the student affairs profession. Although employee turnover brings in new staff with fresh perspectives (Lorden, 1998), it also puts pressure on the financial and human resources of the institution. "Given the time, resources, and energy being invested by students, faculty, and student affairs staff in the preparation of new professionals, the revolving door syndrome evident in the profession is a major concern" (Evans, 1988, p. 19). In times of financial constraint and poor national economic conditions, it becomes doubly important that we maximize the investment made in our employees.

Both Evans (1988) and Lorden (1998) articulated concerns with the available literature. The studies included in Evans' (1988) review were "limited to graduates of one preparation program or a particular region of the United States" (p. 23). Ten years later, the literature had expanded to include various populations "but generally have provided little detail about the characteristics of their subjects" making it "possible only to draw general conclusions" (Lorden, 1988, p. 208) about attrition from student affairs.

Despite these concerns with the available research, both Evans (1988) and Lorden (1998) highlighted several areas related to attrition—and by association—to job satisfaction. Attrition has been linked to dissatisfaction with pay, opportunities for promotion, and opportunities for advancement (Lorden). Evans noted that "very little data exist to indicate . . . reasons for attrition" (p. 23), but the perceptions of limited prospects for promotion and few opportunities for personal and professional development have been cited as factors.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a frequent subject of research for several reasons. Gruneberg (1979) claimed that job satisfaction is of interest because of "the belief that increasing job satisfaction will increase productivity and hence the profitability of organizations" (p. 1). Other researchers have noted a low but consistent relationship between satisfaction and productivity (Locke, 1976; Quarstein, McAfee, & Glassman, 1992) and job performance (Lawler, 1994; Lawler & Porter, 1969; O'Toole & Lawler, 2006).

While results have been inconsistent, there is a consensus that lower levels of job satisfaction are correlated with higher turnover (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; Lawler & Porter, 1969; Locke, 1976; Quarstein, McAfee, & Glassman, 1992) and absenteeism (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; Judge, Parker, Colbert, Heller, & Ilies, 2001; Lawler & Porter, 1969; Locke, 1976; O'Toole & Lawler, 2006; Quarstein, McAfee, & Glassman, 1992). Job satisfaction has also been connected to life satisfaction (Gruneberg, 1979; Judge & Watanabe, 1993; O'Toole & Lawler, 2006), physical and mental health (Gruneberg, 1979; Locke, 1976), and disruptive behaviors (e.g., intentionally poor work, gossip, etc.) (Gruneberg, 1979).

Certainly, as we enter a time of long-term economic uncertainty and changing perceptions of the role of higher education within society, improving the quantity and quality of work—whether directly or via reduced absenteeism, and turnover, increased life satisfaction, and other factors—is an important consideration. A greater understanding of job satisfaction within an organization can provide information that facilitates improvement of those factors that influence satisfaction and therefore organizational outcomes.

There is significant information available concerning job satisfaction within various industries including nursing, the legal field, elementary through postsecondary teaching, and higher education administration (c.f., Chiu, 1998; Davis & Wilson, 2000; Johnsrud & Rosser, 1997; Schiestel, 2007). Corresponding data about student affairs staff is available but incomplete.

Research that explores job satisfaction will aid the student affairs profession by providing insights into the aspects of work that provide greater or lesser satisfaction. This information will enable managers and supervisors to explore adjustments that might improve satisfaction and exploit those aspects of the work that produce high levels of satisfaction, and thus reduce staff turnover. Further, as the first study to thoroughly address job satisfaction of entry- and mid-level student affairs professionals, this exploration will provide information that may guide individuals to informed choices about future employment opportunities.

Overview of the Methodology

A quantitative methodology was selected to provide a foundation upon which other, and perhaps qualitative, studies could be conducted. A descriptive, survey design was used in which current student affairs professionals in postsecondary education institutions responded to two validated and nationally normed instruments. Participants completed the instruments through a

website which electronically collected and tabulated data. Access to a population of student affairs professionals was granted through a national student affairs professional association with membership of nearly 9,000 individuals from more than 1,500 public and private colleges and universities (American College Personnel Association, 2008a). Data analysis was conducted using SPSS software, applying both descriptive and inferential procedures to the collected data.

Limitations

This study was limited by several factors. First, although membership in this professional association is large, it does not include all student affairs practitioners. Notably absent are those individuals who work for for-profit institutions of higher education. There may also be under-representation of particular functional areas where other, more specialized professional organizations exist, for example, student health centers. Second, it is possible that individuals who become members of a professional association may be more committed and engaged with their work and have higher levels of satisfaction than individuals who are not members of professional associations. Third, the study relied on self-reported data, which might be subject to bias and perception errors (Gonyea, 2005). However, "[m]ost researchers agree that self-reported data are indispensible and a valuable contribution to higher education research" (p. 85). Use of a validated and reliable instrument addresses many of the concerns raised with self-report data. Fourth, data collection occurred during at time of broad-based national economic upheaval and uncertainty. The impact of individual perceptions concerning the security of their employment may have had unanticipated influences on participants' frame of reference while completing the instrumentation. Fifth, because communication with participants occurred through a third party, it is possible that some participants completed the instrument as many as three times, although this seems unlikely. Sixth, it was not possible to randomly select participants for this study

because the only access to the accessible population was to invite them all to participate. However, it is likely that those who chose to respond to the survey represent a random group from the accessible population. Seventh, because access to demographic data for the accessible population was denied, it was not possible to compare the participants in this study to the characteristics of the professional association from which they were drawn. This raises questions of generalizability of results. Finally, there are limitations that arise from soliciting participation via electronic communication. Hayslett and Wildemuth (2004) found that traditional pen and paper survey completion rates were higher than with surveys administered via e-mail notice. However, the use of computers with Internet connection has become increasingly common as the use of U.S. postal service has generally declined. This might suggest that web-based data collection methods are becoming the norm, rather than the exception.

CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Job satisfaction is best understood in the context of its definitions, theoretical frameworks, and various career types. This chapter addresses these areas and demonstrates the need for a national study on job satisfaction of entry- and mid-level professionals within the student affairs profession.

Definitions of Job Satisfaction

Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction "as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (p. 1300). Judge, Parker, Colbert, Heller, and Ilies (2001) pointed out that this definition includes cognitive and affective dimensions. According to Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969), "[j]ob satisfactions are feelings or affective responses to facet of the situation" (p. 6).

There is some difference of opinion about whether job satisfaction should be considered from an overall (or global) perspective or based upon its individual components. "Most scholars recognize that job satisfaction is a global concept that also comprises various facets" (Judge, Parker, Colbert, Heller, & Ilies, 2001, p. 26). Facets that have been considered include pay, opportunity for promotion, coworkers, and supervision, (Smith et al., 1969), as well as recognition, working conditions, company, and manager status (Locke, 1976).

Theorists separate global and facet measures of satisfaction because the importance of one aspect of satisfaction might outweigh all others and a simple additive approach to determining satisfaction may not be accurate. For example, an individual might be relatively dissatisfied with the working environment, coworkers, and supervisor but extremely satisfied with the level of pay. While one might consider this worker to be dissatisfied, he or she might

report high overall levels of satisfaction because remuneration outweighs all other aspects of satisfaction.

In addition, satisfaction is generally divided into either intrinsic or extrinsic factors. Intrinsic factors "stem directly from the performance itself" (Lawler, 1976, p. 92) and include achievement, responsibility, the work itself, and recognition (Lawler, 1976; King, 1976; Herzberg, 1976). Extrinsic features are '"part of the job situation and are given by others" (Lawler, 1976, p. 92) and involve pay, working conditions, supervision, and interpersonal relationships (Herzberg, 1976; King, 1976; Lawler & Porter, 1976). Using this framework, global satisfaction would relate to intrinsic satisfaction. Facets of satisfaction vary and might be either intrinsic or extrinsic aspects of satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction Theories

Job satisfaction theories can be grouped into three categories: content theories, situational theories, and process theories (Thompson, McNamara, & Hoyle, 1997). Content theories attempt to explain job satisfaction by focusing on the needs and values that must be fulfilled (Gruneberg, 1979). Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, Herzberg's two factor theory, Hackman and Oldham's Job Characteristics Model, and Locke's Range of Affect Theory are examples of content theories. Situational theories suggest that job satisfaction is influenced by the interaction between the job, the organization, and the individual (Thompson et al., 1997). Examples include Quarstein et al.'s Situational Occurrences Theory of Job Satisfaction and Glisson and Durick's Predictors of Job Satisfaction (Thompson et al., 1997). The third category, process theories, focuses on the interactions between factors (e.g., expectancies, values, and needs) and their influence on job satisfaction (Gruneberg, 1979; Locke, 1976). This category includes equity theory (e.g., Adams')

and expectancy theory (e.g., Vroom's Valence-Expectancy-Instrumentality theory and Lawler's expectancy-theory model (Gruneberg, 1979).

This study uses Lawler's expectancy-theory model as a framework for understanding job satisfaction with student affairs staff. However, it is important to understand a variety of theoretical approaches in order to place expectancy theory in context. Therefore, selected theories in each of the three categories are described here, leading to Lawler's theoretical approach to job satisfaction.

Content theories

Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Maslow (1954) offered a framework for human motivation that is generally considered a form of satisfaction theory because it proposed a hierarchy, or priority sequence, for the satisfaction of human needs. Consisting of five levels, Maslow suggested that individuals must first satisfy their physiological need for food. Once satisfied, individuals concern themselves with safety, belongingness and love, self-esteem, and, finally, self-actualization. While there is a hierarchy of needs, Maslow pointed out that a need may never be completely satisfied before another level of need emerges. In this way, individuals may move back and forth to satisfy more than one level, while still progressing toward the level of self-actualization. This implies that the outcomes of work need to support employee efforts to satisfy their various needs. For example, a job must provide sufficient remuneration for food and shelter in order for employees to develop and cultivate important working relationships.

Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. Herzberg et al. (1959) used a critical incident approach to explore job satisfaction with accountants and engineers in manufacturing and utility services. Participants were interviewed about events that represented particularly high or low periods of satisfaction with their jobs. Herzberg et al. concluded that there were two categories of

factors that influence job satisfaction. Hygiene factors include aspects such as working conditions, remuneration, and quality of supervision and "were not associated with the job itself but with conditions that *surround* the doing of the job" (p. 113). Recognition, interesting work, and responsibility are examples of motivators and are intrinsic in nature. The researchers concluded that hygiene factors serve as dissatisfiers. While their absence contributes to job dissatisfaction, increasing these aspects will raise satisfaction levels only so far. Similarly, motivator factors can improve satisfaction but their absence will not cause dissatisfaction.

Although a popular theory and often used as the theoretical foundation for research, there has been much criticism of the methodology and conclusions drawn by Herzberg et al. The results of their research have not been replicated and the conclusions are considered to be flawed (Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Judge et al., 2001).

Hackman and Oldham's Job Characteristics Model. The Job Characteristics model focuses on the nature of the work involved. Hackman and Oldham (1976) suggested that there are five job characteristics that are central to providing a job that is highly motivating and satisfying. These five characteristics (i.e., skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback) lead to three psychological states that "are the causal core of the model" (p. 255). The psychological states of experienced meaningfulness of the work, experienced responsibilities for the outcome of the work, and knowledge of work results contribute to the outcomes of high internal work motivation, high quality work performance, high satisfaction with the work, and low absenteeism and turnover. Thus, jobs that include the five core characteristics will promote the three psychological states, leading to the noted positive outcomes.

Dispositional theory. Judge, Locke, Durham, and Kluger (1998) used three samples and six validated instruments to explore the impact of individual disposition on job and life satisfaction. Dispositional factors were defined as "factors within the individual" (p. 17) which the authors related to core evaluations, or those "fundamental, subconscious conclusions individuals reach about themselves, other people, and the world" (p. 18). Their study specifically examined the internal core evaluations of self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and neuroticism and their impact on job and life satisfaction. Results indicated that core evaluations had a significant effect on their job and life satisfaction. "[T]he way in which people see themselves affects how they experience their jobs and even their lives" (p. 30).

Situational theories

Situational occurrences theory. Quarstein et al. (1992) posited that job satisfaction is a result of the interaction between the characteristics of the job, called situational characteristics. These include factors such as remuneration and advancement opportunities, and can be evaluated before one accepts the job. Situational occurrences are those issues that are more difficult to learn about in advance as well as those often not considered prior to accepting a job, such as supervisor recognition of employee efforts, failure to repair equipment, and the like. These factors are less predictable and are more changeable. Quarstein et al. noted that

> [O]verall job satisfaction can be better predicted from a knowledge of both situational characteristics and situational occurrences than from either factor alone. Situational characteristics were found to be more salient during the job selection process whereas situational occurrences become salient afterward. (p. 869)

Predictors of job satisfaction. A descriptive study was used by Glisson and Durick (1988) to examine the impact of organizational, worker, and job characteristics on worker satisfaction

and commitment. This was one of the early studies that examined the interplay between the worker and their situation. Glisson and Durick found that job characteristics were strong predictors of satisfaction and that lesser, but still important, roles were played by organizational and worker characteristics. The study further suggested that satisfaction can be increased by providing environments where workers apply their skills to clearly defined responsibilities.

Process theories

Equity theory. According to Adams (1963), inequity results when employees believe they are undervalued for their inputs relative to the inputs and outcomes of other employees that form a referent group. Adams specified that inputs involve the degree of effort invested in work but also one's education and previous work experience. Outcomes "include pay, rewards intrinsic to the job, seniority benefits, fringe benefits, job status and status symbols" (p. 423). The referent group might be one or more employees in the same position in the same company, employees at a different company, or employees in the closest comparison position. Equity theory suggests that an employee will increase or decrease inputs or outputs in order to match those of the referent group and thereby decrease the inequity. Adams also postulated that employees might leave their position or "psychologically distort" their perceptions of their inputs or outputs, thus equalizing themselves with the referent group.

Vroom's valence-expectancy-instrumentality theory. The Valence-Instrumentality-Expectancy theory is an expectancy theory that links effort, performance, and outcomes (Vroom, 1964). Using the terms instrumentality, valence, and expectancy, he suggested that a motivated employee will invest effort when he or she believes that higher performance is related to desired outcomes. Using an equation to calculate interactions between expectancy, instrumentality, and

valence, Vroom theorized that individuals will choose behaviors that they think they can do and that they believe will result in preferred outcomes.

Lawler's expectancy-theory model. Lawler (1994) postulated that employee perceptions of their inputs, perceptions of others' inputs and outcomes, and perceptions of characteristics of the job influence the employee's beliefs about the rewards that should be received. Lawler suggested that there are various forms of input including previous experience, formal education, past and present performance, age, and seniority. Job characteristics include such aspects as the amount of responsibility involved and difficulty of the job. In addition, Lawler argued that employees' perceptions of the rewards they receive are influenced by their perceptions of what others produce on the job in relation what the employee produces. These perceptions of rewards the employee believes should be received compared to what is actually received then can result in one of three levels of job satisfaction. When these are equal, the employee will be satisfied. Dissatisfaction results when actual rewards are less than the perception of what should be received. Finally, an employee may experience guilt or feelings of inequity when his or her rewards exceed what is believed to be warranted.

Lawler (1994) asserted that "[f]or work to be motivating, individuals need to feel personally responsible for the outcomes of the work, need to do something that they feel is meaningful, and need to receive feedback about what is accomplished" (p. xix). This aligns well with two common assumptions about student affairs work, namely that workers are granted high levels of autonomy in their work and that they must be interested in outcomes other than high levels of remuneration to find this work rewarding and enjoyable. An emphasis on intrinsic rather than extrinsic motivators and satisfiers is clear. In addition, the student affairs culture emphasizes the value of continuous improvement in skills, performance, and overall program

management. The underlying premise is that student affairs professionals are interested in work where they have the opportunity to craft and implement decisions that lead to making a difference in others while receiving feedback about the quality and impact of their efforts, as suggested by Lawler's expectancy-theory model.

Summary

Clearly, the three theoretical approaches to job satisfaction have value in the world of work. Expectancy theory presents a useful and interesting framework for understanding employee perceptions of satisfaction in relation to their work and their environment. Smith et al. (1969) used an expectancy theory approach to develop two measures of job satisfaction. "Job satisfactions are, we believe, a function of the perceived characteristics of the job in relation to an individual's frames of reference. Alternatives available in given situations, expectations, and experience play important roles in providing the relevant frame of reference" (p. 12). This particular framework enables the exploration of global and facet job satisfaction while accounting for the differing experiences, needs, and perceptions of employees. This is particularly useful when considering the variety of tasks, skills, and environments in which student affairs staff work and the varied experiences and educational backgrounds that bring them to the profession.

Job Satisfaction in Context

It is useful to view job satisfaction of student affairs staff by placing this particular profession within the context of other professional fields. For this reason, the following section describes studies about job satisfaction in nurses, lawyers, teachers, faculty members, and higher education administrators.

Job satisfaction and nurses

Studies concerning job satisfaction in the nursing profession have been categorized by the type of nurses involved and the approach of the study. Descriptive studies that identify levels of satisfaction with the job overall and/or facets of the job have been implemented for nurse practitioners (Schiestel, 2007; Wild, Parsons, & Dietz, 2006), surgical nurses and critical care nurses (Davis, Ward, Woodall, Shultz, & Davis, 2007), psychiatric nurses (Sharp, 2008), and nursing home nurse aides (Castle, 2007). Regression studies to determine the factors that predict job satisfaction have been implemented with various populations including nursing home nurse aides (Castle, Engberg, Anderson, & Men, 2007), registered nurses employed in metropolitan areas (Kovner, Brewer, Wu, Cheng, & Suzuki, 2006), and nurses and social workers (Ulrich, O'Donnell, Taylor, Farrar, Danis, & Grady, 2007).

Significance testing was employed in just over half of the studies concerning the nursing profession; however, in general, global satisfaction levels were reported to be moderate to high. Nurses appeared to be more satisfied with intrinsic factors (e.g., those related to content including the work itself, relationships with others, autonomy) than with those associated with extrinsic satisfaction, or job context (e.g., supervision, salary, working conditions). Few researchers examined respondents by race or, when they did, significance testing was not employed. Salary was a common variable in many studies and was generally found to be highly correlated with and a predictor of high levels of job satisfaction. High levels of satisfaction were associated with lower intent to turnover. Training was often explored and found to be a factor in higher levels of job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction and lawyers

The legal profession appears to approach research differently than other professions. Many studies of the job satisfaction of lawyers rely upon surveys administered by the American Bar Association and other groups (c.f., Career Satisfaction Survey administered and reported by *Corporate Legal Times* (2004)). Further, the requirements for publication in legal journals differ significantly from the standards within higher education. Fortney (2001) provided an example in her survey of associates where she reported only descriptive statistics with running narrative, instead of sections addressing available literature, method, results, and discussion. This complicates comparing job satisfaction studies across professions.

That said, there are some discernable patterns in the available literature. Gender is a popular focus of studies that examine lawyers and job satisfaction. Chiu (1998) applied a case study approach and compared job satisfaction levels of male and female lawyers. Mobley, Jaret, Marsh, and Lim (1994) explored the impact of mentoring on job satisfaction levels and compared this influence on men and women. Results from a previously implemented survey of lawyers was the data source for (Hull, 1999), who considered "patterns of gender difference in job satisfaction and [tested] competing explanations for the observed patterns" (p. 689). Relying on data from the National Survey of Career Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction implemented by the American Bar Association, Laband and Lentz (1998) examined the impact of sexual harassment of women on their job satisfaction.

Heinz, Hull, and Harter (1999) used data from a project of the American Bar Association and examined job satisfaction of practicing attorneys in the Chicago area. In addition to a demographic and descriptive profile, the authors examined differences between men and women and explored correlations between job satisfaction and work setting, number of children,

autonomy, and other factors. Norman (1994) surveyed attorneys in the Alabama state bar and described their satisfaction with various job related factors including compensation and working relationships.

In summary, results are mixed in relation to significant differences in overall job satisfaction levels by gender, although the majority of studies found no significant differences in levels between men and women. Conversely, studies have consistently demonstrated that women are significantly less satisfied with several facets of satisfaction including pay, opportunities for promotion, recognition, and work climate. In general, lawyers have reported high levels of job satisfaction. Higher levels of satisfaction have been reported for lawyers who are White, are older, earn higher levels of compensation, and report higher degrees of autonomy in the workplace. While most results regarding the influence of work setting (e.g., large firm, solo practice) have been inconsistent, lawyers working for the government report lower levels of job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction and teachers

Elementary and secondary school teachers are a popular focus of studies concerning job satisfaction. While descriptive (Mertler, 2002) and group comparison studies (Mau, Ellsworth, & Hawley, 2008; Schulz & Teddlie, 2001) are available, it appears that the majority of studies focus on determining the correlations between various aspects of job satisfaction or elements of work (Davis & Wilson, 2000; Eichinger, 2000; Hurren, 2006; Kreis & Brockopp, 2001; Rinehart & Short, 2003; Stempien & Loeb, 2002). Other approaches have been used including mixed methods (Huysman, 2008), path analysis (Culver, Wolfle, & Cross, 1990), and prediction (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Mau, Ellsworth, & Hawley, 2008).

Studies concerning teachers have demonstrated generally high levels of satisfaction, particularly when comparing studies of generalist teachers to those of specialty teachers (e.g., special education, reading, etc.). Teachers in specialty areas tend to have lower levels of job satisfaction. Longer career tenure, greater autonomy, and increased empowerment appear linked to higher job satisfaction. Although studies tend to find that women have higher satisfaction than men, results from the previously noted studies have not shown these differences to be significant. Results concerning ethnicity and job satisfaction have been inconsistent.

Job satisfaction and faculty members

Postsecondary faculty members have been the subject of a wide range of studies that involve job satisfaction. Research has included general descriptive studies (Pearson & Seiler, 1983) and comparisons between the first and third years of employment (Olsen, 1993). Diverse populations have been studied in terms of comparisons between African American faculty members at two- and four-year institutions (Flowers, 2005) and "the effects of diverse demographic characteristics" (Seifer & Umbach, 2008).

Although most research has focused on full-time faculty members, studies concerning job satisfaction and part-time faculty members have compared the satisfaction of part-time faculty members at community colleges to that of part-time faculty members at four-year institutions (Antony & Valadez, 2002; Valadez & Antony, 2001), examined the correlations between full-time faculty members, voluntary part-time faculty members, and involuntary part-time faculty members (Maynard & Joseph, 2008), and explored the influence of gender and part-time employment (Toutkoushian & Bellas, 2003). Job satisfaction has also been explored in relation to the turnover of faculty members (Daly & Dee, 2006) and intent to leave their institution or the

college teaching profession (Ambrose, Huston, & Norman, 2005; Rosser, 2004b; Rosser, 2005; Rosser & Townsend, 2006).

Studies about faculty members' job satisfaction have consistently (although not unanimously) found high levels of dissatisfaction or low levels of satisfaction with compensation. Diverse demographic characteristics have also been found to impact satisfaction, with women, Asian Pacific Islanders, and Latino faculty members less satisfied with various facets of job satisfaction. In contrast, satisfaction with autonomy has been found to be high regardless of gender, ethnicity, part- or full-time status, or institutional type. Job satisfaction has functioned as an intervening variable between worklife characteristics (e.g., autonomy, advising loads, quality of students) and intent to leave the institution or profession.

Job satisfaction in higher education administrators

There seems to be an uncoordinated approach to studying the job satisfaction of higher education administrators. Some researchers have focused on modeling satisfaction or the role of job satisfaction in intent to turnover, while others have focused on factors that influence job satisfaction. None of the following studies have utilized validated instruments. Although the theory and results of several studies related to job satisfaction suggest that satisfaction and job turnover are connected, other studies have examined intent to turnover without directly considering job satisfaction (c.f., Johnsrud & Rosser, 1997; Johnsrud, Heck, & Rosser, 2000)

In an early study of job satisfaction, Solmon and Tierney (1977) used a national sample of selected college administrators to examine the relationship between organizational role congruence and job satisfaction. A researcher-developed survey was used to collect data from a nationwide sample of administrators (i.e., presidents, vice presidents, college deans, and directors of admissions, financial aid, and student records) from liberal arts institutions. In

general, results indicated high levels of job satisfaction, although respondents were less satisfied with time available outside of work. Presidents and academic affairs administrators reported higher levels of satisfaction than other administrator groups and age was correlated with satisfaction with one's level of power and influence. Age was negatively associated with satisfaction with opportunities for promotion. Data also suggested that being a college president was a significant predictor of several aspects of job satisfaction including salary and benefits, autonomy, challenge, and variety within the job. Results led to the conclusion that "in essence, if an individual is satisfied with his job generally, he is more likely to indicate satisfaction with a wide variety of dimensions of that job" (p. 428).

As noted earlier, job satisfaction has been correlated with intent to turnover. Rosser (2004a) used structural equation modeling with a national sample of midlevel administrators from various institutional types to create a model of intent to turnover. The final model indicated that minority status and salary had a small negative impact on morale, while career support, recognition of employee competence, external relations, and review and intervention have small to moderate effects on job satisfaction. While morale had a moderately positive impact on intent to leave the organization, job satisfaction had a small negative effect. In addition, intent to leave was negatively influenced by the experience of discriminatory treatment. Job satisfaction, in this model, functioned as both a direct and moderating variable on intent to leave.

Volkwein and Zhou (2003) also used structural equation modeling but turned their attention to creating and testing a model of job satisfaction. Drawing upon data collected via a broad researcher-constructed survey, their final model incorporated 14 individual variables that influenced 7 factors, which, in turn, impacted 3 aspects of satisfaction which led to overall job satisfaction. Direct positive influences on overall job satisfaction included extrinsic satisfaction,

intrinsic satisfaction, interpersonal satisfaction, teamwork, job stress, and job insecurity. Volkwein and Zhou also found the highest levels of mean job satisfaction were reported by academic affairs administrators although there were no significant differences in overall job satisfaction by administrative area (i.e., student affairs, business affairs, human resources). In contrast to the general findings of job satisfaction studies of teachers, nurses, lawyers, and faculty members, background characteristics such as age and gender had no influence on job satisfaction. Instead, intrinsic satisfaction had the greatest influence on overall job satisfaction.

In an earlier study, Volkwein, Malik, and Napierski-Pranci (1998) also considered the regulatory climate in relation to the job satisfaction of administrators at public, research or doctoral-granting universities. They used data from several national databases (e.g., U.S. Census Bureau, National Center for Education Statistics/Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) and responses to two researcher-constructed surveys. Using multiple regression analyses to build five models, they found that all five aspects of satisfaction explored in their study (i.e., intrinsic, extrinsic, working conditions, interpersonal relationships, and overall satisfaction) were negatively correlated with a highly controlled work environment, high levels of workload/time stress, and interpersonal stress. Predictors of high levels of all aspects of satisfaction included high levels of administrative teamwork/commitment and low levels of interpersonal relationship stress.

A comparison of satisfaction of administrators at public and private doctoral-granting universities was the focus of a study by Volkwein and Parmley (2000). They used national datasets as in the Volkwein et al. (1998) study described above along with administrator personal characteristics and their responses to a researcher-constructed survey about job satisfaction. They explored overall satisfaction, intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, satisfaction with

working conditions, and satisfaction with relationships with others. Volkwein and Parmley "found more similarities than differences between the two populations" (p. 109). Administrators at private institutions reported significantly lower levels of extrinsic satisfaction (e.g., salary, benefits, opportunities for promotion) than their counterparts at public institutions, although the differences were small. Administrators at both public and private institutions indicated they were most satisfied with those areas of their work that were related to intrinsic satisfaction. Drawing connections between level of autonomy and institutional control, the researchers concluded "that autonomy in general, and type of [institutional] control in particular, do not account for meaningful differences in university administrators' job satisfaction" (p. 104). High levels of administrative teamwork and low levels of interpersonal conflict/stress were the strongest predictors of all five aspects of satisfaction for administrators regardless of institutional control. Results suggested that workplace environment, as represented by perceptions of teamwork and workplace relationships, "are almost universally important contributors to every dimension of administrator satisfaction" (p. 112).

Summary

While the scope of these studies of job satisfaction within various career fields is broad, in aggregate, they do not cover the range of possibilities related to job satisfaction. No systematic attempts have been made to examine age, ethnicity, gender, or institutional type in relation to both global and facet aspects of job satisfaction in nurses, lawyers, teachers, faculty members, or higher education administrators. Validated instruments were used in roughly a third of the studies cited in this review. Other data collection methods included researcher constructed surveys, the use of selected items from validated instruments or occupation-wide surveys, and

the use of data collected via occupation-wide surveys, such as the National Study of Post-Secondary Faculty.

The researchers of these studies often included a mini-review of the literature about job satisfaction theory but rarely identified a guiding conceptual framework that was linked to their specific research approach. Herzberg's two factor theory was most frequently cited; yet, this theory has been noted as imperfect resulting in questionable validity of associated study results.

Job satisfaction in student affairs staff

A number of studies have been conducted that concern student affairs staff and job satisfaction using national samples of participants. Although there are no obvious patterns in the constructs explored in these inquiries, one study examined satisfaction with interpersonal factors in one's job, while two studies explored relationships with coworkers. Intent to leave one's position was a factor in two inquires. The remaining three studies concerning job satisfaction bore no relationship to constructs included in the above noted investigations.

Beginning with four-year institutions with membership in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Loyd (2005) explored the intersections of job satisfaction and teamwork for student affairs administrators without regard for position level. She used the 12 items related to job satisfaction in a survey constructed by Volkwein and Zhou (2003) but reported no information about validity, reliability, or scoring. She noted the instrument contained three subscales: intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and interpersonal factors. Correlation procedures demonstrated significant relationships between the three job satisfaction factors and the eight aspects of teamwork at both the department and divisional levels.

Satisfaction with interpersonal relationships, intrinsic satisfaction, and extrinsic satisfaction and teamwork were examined in relation to a number of individual and institutional

characteristics including gender, race, education level, institutional control, student enrollment, and salary level. She found significant differences in relation to job satisfaction in only two areas: job tenure and work experience in student affairs. Specifically, respondents with 16 or more years of student affairs work experience had significantly higher levels of satisfaction on all three factors (i.e., intrinsic, extrinsic, and interpersonal satisfaction) than respondents with fewer years of experience in student affairs. Similarly, respondents with 9 or more years of experience in their current positions were significantly more satisfied on all three satisfaction factors than colleagues with fewer years of experience in their current positions.

Grant (2006) applied Herzberg's two factor theory of motivation to a national sample of mid-level student affairs administrators using an adaptation of a validated instrument. Results from 477 participants indicated that women were more satisfied than men, older respondents were more satisfied than younger respondents, Caucasian respondents were more satisfied than those reporting they were African American or Hispanic/Latino, and those with an Ed.D. or Ph.D. were more satisfied than respondents with other levels of education. In addition, individuals employed by public institutions were more satisfied than those working at private institutions. Individuals with 16 or more years of overall experience and those with 11 or more years in their current positions were more satisfied than those with fewer years of overall work experience and years in their current positions. Significance testing was not conducted on this data.

Herzberg et al. (1959) postulated that job dissatisfaction and satisfaction is promoted by different factors and that levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction can exist simultaneously. Thus, Grant explored the variables that predict these two areas. He found that the variables of opportunities for advancement, the work itself, achievement, recognition, and age accounted for

93% of the variance. Only the first four variables were significant predictors of job satisfaction; opportunities for advancement and the work itself were the strongest predictors. In contrast, job dissatisfaction was predicted by supervision, relationships with colleagues, salary, job security, and work balance, accounting for 90% of the variance related to job satisfaction. All of the variables were significant contributors to the prediction of job dissatisfaction. Job security and relationships with colleagues made the greatest contributions to the model.

Structural equation modeling was used by Rosser and Javinar (2003) with a national sample of mid-level student affairs staff to determine the direct and indirect effects of demographic variables and work life issues on morale, satisfaction, and intent to leave. Applying an instrument adapted from surveys used by two university systems, eight items were used to measure job satisfaction. The final model proposed that job tenure, discriminatory treatment, and salary made small negative contributions to morale. Small positive contributions were made to morale by recognition, intradepartmental relations, and working conditions. These three factors and perceived career support and external relations made small to moderate positive contributions to satisfaction, which had a small direct effect on moral. Salary, morale, and satisfaction were negatively related to intent to leave. The largest contribution to satisfaction was made by recognition. Together, morale and satisfaction accounted for 96% of the variance involved in intent to leave.

Rosser and Javinar made numerous observations about the various aspects of work life and their impact on morale, job satisfaction, and intent to leave. Finding patterns in how the various factors were associated with satisfaction, morale, and intent to turnover, they concluded "that the perceptions student affairs leaders' have of their professional and institutional work

lives have implications for their levels of satisfaction, morale, and whether they intend to stay in or leave their current position" (p. 825).

Tull (2006) also incorporated intent to leave in her correlational investigation. She explored the relationships between a synergistic supervision style, job satisfaction, and intent to leave their positions for a nationwide sample of new professionals using two validated instruments. Her examination of job satisfaction focused on correlations between synergistic supervision and satisfaction, satisfaction and gender pairings of the supervisor and supervisee, satisfaction and race pairings of the supervisor and supervisee, and satisfaction and the duration of the supervisor-supervisee relationship. Results indicated a significant positive relationship between synergistic supervision style and job satisfaction. Significant relationships were found in three of the four possible gender pairings, specifically female supervisor and supervisee, female supervisor and male supervisee, and male supervisor and female supervisee. These results suggested the absence of a pattern concerning gender and job satisfaction.

Significant positive correlations between synergistic supervision style and job satisfaction were found for pairings that included a White supervisor. No significant relationship was demonstrated for non-White supervisor pairings. Finally, duration of the supervisor-supervisee relationship was not found to be significant to the synergistic supervision-job satisfaction dynamic.

Three additional studies related to job satisfaction in student affairs professionals bear no patterned relationship to the constructs explored in the previously described inquiries. In an older, descriptive study, Richmond and Sherman (1991) collected data via a researcher-developed questionnaire. They implemented a national longitudinal study of graduate students and new professionals in student affairs in order to examine their "choices and satisfaction with

careers, preparation programs, mentor relationships, and other variables" (p. 8). The study began with one group of graduate students and followed them one year and three years after their graduation. The responses from new professionals three years after graduation were compared with a second sample of current graduate students. Both samples were taken from graduate preparation programs across the nation.

Although job satisfaction was only one aspect of this study, results indicated that "the vast majority [of new professionals] were satisfied with their current positions" (p. 15). Women reported greater satisfaction than men. Richmond and Sherman (1991) noted what appear to be conflicting results about how other people influenced the satisfaction levels of new professionals. They noted that "[participants] were evenly divided as to whether or not other professionals in the academic environment affect [their] satisfaction. Respondents indicated that both faculty and administrators have a strong influence on their job satisfaction" (p. 15). In addition, new professionals reported moderate satisfaction with opportunities for advancement.

Using a nationwide sample of mid- and senior level student affairs administrators matched with academic affairs administrators at the level of director or above, Tarver, Canada, and Lim (1999) explored job satisfaction and locus of control. Applying two validated instruments, including the Job in General Scale, Tarver et al. examined the relationship between job satisfaction and locus of control for student affairs administrators and academic affairs administrators for a series of dichotomous demographic characteristics. They found significant correlations for student affairs administrators on all variables except minority status and employment at a community college. Tarver et al. suggested that overall, student affairs administrators' job satisfaction was associated with beliefs that "they control their own lives and so they take a great deal of responsibility for their own behavior" (p. 97). Similar results were

found for academic administrators although significance was not found for those with minority status, who were female, did not have a doctorate, and worked at a community college. The strongest associations between job satisfaction and locus of control were found for older student affairs administrators and younger academic affairs administrators.

Tarver et al. (1999) further examined these correlations and compared student affairs and academic affairs administrators along each demographic variable. The only significant difference suggested that older student affairs administrators had significantly greater correlations between job satisfaction and locus of control than their academic affairs counterparts.

In a nationwide study of all experience levels, Boehman (2007) examined global job satisfaction, organizational support, organizational politics, and work/nonwork interaction as predictors of participants' affective commitment to their organizations. The researcher applied four validated instruments, including the Abridged Job in General Scale, and found overall job satisfaction to be significantly correlated with affective commitment, organizational support, and organizational politics. The correlations were positive and moderate between job satisfaction and affective commitment and between job satisfaction and organizational politics. A moderate negative correlation was found between job satisfaction and organizational politics. Gender, marital/partner status, and provider status (e.g., being a parent) were not significantly correlated with job satisfaction. The final regression model included organizational support and overall job satisfaction as positive contributors and organizational politics as a negative factor in affective organizational commitment. Organizational support accounted for almost half of the variance; overall job satisfaction was a small contributor. The role of job satisfaction in creating affective commitment to an organization is overshadowed by the strong influence of a supportive work environment.

Evans (1988) and Lorden (1998) both expressed concerns with the generalizability of results from studies included in their reviews of the literature concerning attrition and related issues of job satisfaction for student affairs professionals. The lack of patterns in theoretical frameworks, instrumentation, and variables is strikingly apparent. While two studies (i.e., Boehman, 2007; Tarver, Canada, & Lim, 1999) relied upon the constructs advanced by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969), three did not reference any specific theory (i.e., Richmond & Sherman, 1991; Rosser & Javinar, 2003; Tull, 2006), one (i.e., Loyd, 2005) referenced a model (rather than a theory), and Herzberg et al.'s theory was applied in one study (i.e., Grant, 2006).

There was similar variation in instrumentation; two studies applied widely used validated instruments (Boehman, 2007; Tarver et al., 1999), two adapted surveys or used only several individual items (Grant, 2006; Loyd, 2005; Tull, 2006), and researcher constructed surveys were used in two studies (Richmond & Sherman, 1991; Rosser & Janivar, 2003). Variables involved in these studies included demographic items, overall job satisfaction, extrinsic and intrinsic satisfaction, locus of control, morale, salary, synergistic supervision, and several others. Other than the constant of job satisfaction (sometimes as a dependent variable, other times as an independent variable), only intent to leave and relationships appeared more than once.

Summary

While we clearly have a substantial amount of information about job satisfaction in student affairs, gaps remain in our knowledge base, particularly as it relates to position level. While Richmond and Sherman (1991) and Tull (2006) examined new professionals, Grant (2006) and Rosser and Janivar (2003) used samples comprised of mid-level professionals. Both Boehman (2007) and Loyd (2005) examined "individuals from all experience levels (new professionals, mid-level professionals, and senior level professionals)" (Boehman, 2007, p. 313).

Tarver et al. (1999) conducted the only available study that utilized two position levels, focusing on mid- and senior level staff. No study has explored or compared job satisfaction of entry- and mid-level professionals.

As noted previously, Loyd (2005) found differences in satisfaction based on job tenure, with individuals who had been in their current positions for less than nine years reporting lower levels of intrinsic, extrinsic, and interpersonal satisfaction than participants with more years of experience. Grant (2006) also found differences based on job tenure. Individuals with fewer years of overall experience and fewer years in their current positions were less satisfied than those with more overall experience and longer job tenure. These two studies suggest the importance of examining position level, which is often linked to job tenure and overall years of experience in a career field, and exploring how job satisfaction might differ in the earlier stages of one's career.

Further, the available national studies of student affairs job satisfaction do not provide a complete examination of job satisfaction for multiple position levels using instrumentation that has been demonstrated to be reliable and valid. The focus of many studies has been very specific; rather than striving to present a profile of student affairs workers' job satisfaction, researchers have explored aspects of satisfaction, its relationship to other factors, the impact of factors on job satisfaction, and how job satisfaction influences other factors.

Of the studies concerning student affairs work, none has compared this occupation to work outside of higher education, despite the possibility that such a comparison may offer insights into our profession. A descriptive analysis, using widely accepted instrumentation grounded in theoretical constructs, increases our understanding of job satisfaction in student affairs professionals.

The logical approach to understanding job satisfaction with student affairs professionals involves application of validated instruments for global and facet satisfaction while exploring differences based on age, ethnicity, gender, job tenure, position level, and institutional type. In addition, it is useful to understand if student affairs satisfaction is similar to the national norms for satisfaction with nonprofit companies. This information will enable the construction of recommendations and implications for practice that enhance the work experiences of student affairs staff and help promote organizational efficiency and effectiveness.

CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

This study was a quantitative exploration of self-reported job satisfaction of entry-level and mid-level student affairs professionals. Members of ACPA-College Student Educators International who indicated they were working in entry-level or mid-level positions were asked to complete the Job Descriptive Index, Job in General Scale, and a number of demographic items. A descriptive study, this inquiry examined comparisons between the job satisfaction levels of student affairs professionals and national norms along several demographic variables for five facets of job satisfaction as well as global satisfaction. Further, the analyses explored significant differences between position level and demographic variables. Finally, predictors of satisfaction for entry-level and mid-level professionals were examined in relation to facets of and overall job satisfaction.

Research Design

According to Creswell (2005), a survey research design is most appropriate when the researcher wants to "learn about individual attitudes, opinions, beliefs, and practices" (p. 377) as in the present study. This was a descriptive study applying a survey research design that presented information about job satisfaction of student affairs professionals at two position levels. This inquiry was an exploration of the conditional effects of work and considers "whether various influential [work] experiences have the same aggregate or general effect for all [employees]" or if they "vary in their influence for different kinds of [workers]" (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005, p. 9). The study was cross-sectional, measuring job satisfaction at a single point in time (Creswell, 2005), and involved both descriptive and inferential statistical procedures. These analyses demonstrated the presence (or absence) of significant differences between groups

(based on independent variables) and identified the factors that predict high levels of job satisfaction based on position level.

Population Selection

The student affairs profession is guided and supported by two national professional associations. ACPA-College Educators International boasts almost 9,000 members from 1,500 public and private colleges and universities (ACPA, 2008a) who work in functional areas that range from admissions to women's resource centers and whose position levels span entry-level professional through senior student affairs officer. This organization has great credibility within the profession and its origins go back to 1924 (ACPA, 2008a).

Sampling Procedure

In accordance with ACPA practices (ACPA, 2008b), it was not possible to draw a random sample from the membership roster. Therefore, this study solicited participation from all ACPA members who identified their position level as entry or mid-level. Members who identified their position level as senior level, senior student affairs officer, undergraduate student, graduate student, faculty member, or college/university president were not included. The accessible population, as of November 2008, was 3609 ACPA members (V. Wall, personal communication, December 15, 2008). It is a recognized limitation of this study that recruiting participation from the entire ACPA membership does not equate to representation of all student affairs professionals as many choose an alternate professional association or none at all.

Procedure

It is the policy of ACPA to manage the process of sending initial and follow-up e-mails rather than sharing individual e-mail addresses with researchers. Originating messages from the ACPA central office may have provided credibility for the study and may have prevented

automatic deletion of the e-mail requests for participation. It may have also improved response rates because of the tacit endorsement from ACPA. This factor is important given the challenges involved in collecting data via electronic communication (Hayslett & Wildemuth, 2004).

A series of three e-mail messages was sent from the ACPA central office. The first e-mail, distributed on February 18, 2009, described the purposes of the study, requested participation, and incorporated a hyperlink to a secure website that included the instruments and several demographic items (See Appendix A). A second, follow-up e-mail with similar information was sent seven days later on February 25, 2009 (See Appendix B) and again six days later on March 2, 2009 (See Appendix C) in order to increase response rates. As a result of ACPA policy concerning e-mail messages to members, these three sequential e-mail messages were received by the individuals identified in my accessible population. Responses were received from 769 participants. Of these, three were unusable due to incomplete surveys. It was not possible to calculate a final response rate because ACPA staff were unwilling to share a specific count of members at the entry and mid-level. An estimated response rate of 21.2% was calculated from November 2008 membership data.

This response rate was lower than expected. In a review of the literature, Converse, Wolfe, Huang, and Oswald (2008) determined that web-based surveys resulted in lower response rates when compared to surveys mailed to potential participants, although no figures were reported to support this conclusion. Hayslett and Wildemuth (2004) noted a range of electronic response rates from 30% to 87% in an examination of five studies that compared electronic data collection to mail response rates. The paper response rate was 4% to 14% higher than the electronic response rate. Cooke, Heath, and Thompson (2000) conducted a meta-analysis of 49 studies that involved 68 surveys where response rates for electronic and paper instrumentation

were compared. The mean response rate for the web-based surveys in their meta-analysis was 34.66%. They also found that higher response rates were achieved with greater number of contacts from the researcher. Clearly, lower response rates can be expected from web-based data collection techniques than from traditional mailed surveys.

In a study of this size, it is important to properly target the minimum sample size needed to meet expectations concerning confidence intervals, sampling error, power, and effect size. A response rate of 300 or more "ensure[s] that 90 out of 100 times . . . [my] sample mean will have an equal chance (50/50 split) of differentiating among [my respondents] 96% of the time (or an error of 4%)" (Creswell, 2005, p. 583). A power analysis indicated that groups must have at least 65 members in order to achieve an alpha level of .05, an effect size of 0.5, and a power criterion of 0.8 (Creswell). The noted target group size was achieved for the statistical analyses that involved all respondents, position level, and gender.

Instrumentation

This study utilized two instruments that are considered both highly reliable and valid. They were accompanied by a series of demographic items to enable comparison to national norms and in-depth exploration of the factors related to levels of job satisfaction. The Job in General (JIG) Scales provided information about the job overall while the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) explicated separate components of satisfaction. See Appendix E for the selected items from the instruments.

Significantly, the selected instruments are based on the theoretical constructs attributed to expectancy theory. Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) hypothesized that the affective feelings attributed to job satisfaction are associated with a perceived difference between what is expected as a fair and reasonable return . . . and what is experienced" (Smith et al., 1969, p. 6). This aligns

with Lawler's expectancy theory of job satisfaction and was the foundation for the development of the Job Descriptive Index, the instrument used in this study to measure facets of job satisfaction. In addition, "global satisfaction was conceptualized as an overall, integrative feeling of satisfaction" (Balzer et al., 2000, p. 33), which guided the development of the Job in General Scale, which was used in this inquiry to measure global job satisfaction.

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI)

The JDI, noted as the most frequently used measure of job satisfaction (O'Connor, Peters, & Gordon, 1978; Yeager, 1981), assesses five facets of job satisfaction. It was developed from a list of adjectives culled from a review of the job satisfaction literature (Smith et al., 1969). Four different studies were conducted to establish validity using different samples representing different occupations and management levels. These studies explored discriminant validity between the several scales and convergent validity with other measures of job satisfaction, including critical incident interviews and participant graphic representations of satisfaction. Revisions of the JDI occurred in the early 1980s which resulted in minor adjustments to 11 items (Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, & Paul, 1989). The five facets measured by the JDI include the job itself, present pay, opportunity for promotion, coworkers, and supervision (Kinicki, McKee-Ryan, Schriesheim, & Carson, 2002). As noted earlier, people are considered to be satisfied intrinsically, meaning from within, or extrinsically, referring to external factors. Intrinsic satisfiers include the work itself, relationships, and personal growth (Lawler, 1976; King, 1976; Herzberg, 1976), while extrinsic factors include pay, tangible rewards, and opportunities for advancement (Herzberg, 1976; King, 1976; Lawler & Porter, 1976). Therefore, use of the JDI enabled the measurement of both intrinsic (e.g., the job itself, coworkers, and satisfaction) and extrinsic aspects of satisfaction (e.g., pay and promotion).

The JDI is comprised of 72 items (Kinicki et al., 2002). Respondents select "Y," "N," or "?" to indicate whether a brief phrase or single word is descriptive of their job (Kinicki et al., 2002). For example, the facet of work on present job includes "fascinating," "boring," and "can see results." A total score is developed for each facet by assigning a value of 3 to each "Y," a 0 to each "N," and 1 to each "?" response where the item indicates satisfaction (for example, "worthwhile") (Balzer et al., 2000). Items that indicate dissatisfaction, such as "uncomfortable," are reverse scored (Balzer et al., 2000). Facet scores are determined by summing all its items; the facets for present pay and opportunities for promotion are doubled as they contain half the number of items as the other three facets (Harwell, 2003). Scores for each of the facets range from o to 54. Reliability estimates are high; "Cronbach alpha coefficients ranged from .86 to .91" (Harwell, 2003, p. 491). Harwell reported that "in general, there is strong evidence of construct validity in that the JDI has been shown to correlate with other job satisfaction scales and with various job attitudes and behaviors" (Harwell, 2003, p. 491).

The Job in General Scale (JIG)

Global job satisfaction is measured by the JIG. This measure was developed from 42 words or phrases "concerning summary feelings about the job [that were selected] from a survey of the literature" (Ironson et al., 1989, p. 195). Correlational statistics, principle component analysis, and frequency of selection of response options were generated for several samples from an urban area in Florida and a broad-based university archival sample that involved a variety of occupations. The 42 items were reduced to 18 from these studies (Ironson et al.).

The 18 items of the JIG use the same response options as the JDI (Harwell, 2003). Examples include "pleasant," "waste of time," and "makes me content." A total score, between 0 and 54, is achieved in the same manner as the JDI (Balzer et al., 1997). Reliability estimates are

high with a Cronbach alpha of .91 (Harwell, 2003). Convergent and discriminant validity has been estimated as high, as well (Ironson et al., 1989). The JDI and JIG are nationally normed, allowing comparisons by organization type, age, gender, manager status, and job level (Harwell, 2003). Both instruments were renormed in 1997 (Harwell, 2003).

In addition to the JDI and JIG, a number of demographic questions were asked concerning respondent age; gender; ethnicity; job tenure; company tenure; student affairs tenure; educational attainment; current institutional size, type, scope, and location; and student affairs functional area (see Appendix E). There were 90 items in the combined JDI and JIG instrument with an estimated completion time of 10 minutes (M. Sliter, personal communication, October 24, 2008). Combined with the thirteen demographic items, estimated completion time was under 15 minutes.

Ethical considerations

In accordance with Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Research Board requirements, individual participants provided informed consent through their completion of the web-based instrument. Refer to Appendices A, B, and C for the specifics of the informed consent information.

Confidentiality of responses is crucial to obtaining a high response rate which is important to being able to make reliable inferences from respondents to the entire organization. Candid responses are also more likely when participants believe their individual answers will not be shared with the employer. For this reason, it was advantageous that communication came directly from ACPA.

The JDI Research Group of Bowling Green State University holds the copyright to the instrumentation. The instruments are available to researchers at no cost with the condition that

anonymous data are shared with the Research Group. The Research Group requires only to know the type of employer (e.g., for-profit, non-profit, self-employed, or government agency) and the industry (in this case, nonprofit higher education).

Independent and Dependent Variables

Dependent variables were drawn from the instrumentation and included global job satisfaction and the five facet measures of job satisfaction (work on present job, present pay, opportunities for promotion, coworkers, and supervision). Independent variables originated from a number of sources. Several variables were included to be able to compare results from student affairs staff to national norms (e.g., age, job tenure, company tenure). Additional independent variables were suggested from the results of previous studies including gender (Richmond & Sherman, 1991; Tarver et al., 1999), degree attainment (Tarver et al., 1999), and ethnicity (Tarver et al., 1999; Tull, 2006). Student affairs functional area and institutional characteristics were incorporated to be able to explore higher education and student affairs more specifically.

Data Analysis

After automatic electronic collection of data from the web-based instrument, data were transferred into spreadsheet format and then converted into SPSS software formatting. Data were screened and analyzed for outliers and appropriate statistical procedure assumptions. Descriptive statistics, group differences, and multiple regression procedures were applied in accordance with the research questions.

Data Screening

Three cases were determined to be unusable due to a lack of response to the survey items. The dataset was examined for missing data; less than 1.0% were missing. In accordance with the *User's Manual for the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; 1997 version) and the Job in General Scales*

(Balzer et al., 2000), individual responses to the 90 items of the two instruments were coded and scale scores were computed for each of the five facets of satisfaction and the Job in General. Per the recommendations of the *User's Manual*, scale scores were not computed for an individual respondent if she or he declined to respond to more than two or three items, depending on the particular scale. For example, the Pay and Promotion scales include only nine items; the JDI Research Group recommends eliminating the entire scale if more than two items are missing. Similarly, the remaining scales were not computed if more than three items are missing for a particular scale. This resulted in four missing cases for the Coworker scale and two missing cases for the Job in General scale. There was no appreciable impact on the overall percentage of missing data as it remained under one percent.

To increase power and effect size for the statistical analyses, the levels within several independent variables were collapsed or eliminated. Specifically, Gender was reduced to two levels (male and female) due to no responses in transgender and prefer not to respond. Ethnicity was collapsed from seven options to three: African American, Caucasian, and other person of color. Age categories were reduced from 10 to 5 by combining all respondents above 39 years of age. Within educational attainment, certificate was removed and educational specialist degrees were combined with master's degrees, creating seven levels. Individuals with 11 or more years of experience were combined into one level for job tenure and company tenure, while student affairs tenure was reduced from 7 to 5 levels by combining experience above 15 years. Public two-year institutions and private two-year institutions were combined into one level for institutional type and for-profit company, not-for-profit company, and other were dropped due to low or no responses in these options. Highest degree awarded by the institution was reduced

from 8 levels by dropping other, combining master's and educational specialist degrees, and combining professional and doctoral degrees.

Originally, 49 individuals self-identified their student affairs functional area as other. Where possible, individuals were sorted into an appropriate category (e.g., director of housing into residence life, senior student affairs officer for a branch campus into student affairs administration). Some respondents identifying as other were included with the newly created variables as described below. Student affairs functional areas were then clustered and reduced from the original 28 options to 9. The final student affairs functional areas included enrollment management which was developed by combining admissions, admissions/enrollment management, academic advising, financial aid, student orientation, and individuals in the other category who indicated responsibility for retention or new student/first year programs. The variable wellness was created by combining counseling, health/alcohol & drug, disability services, intramurals/recreational sports, religious and spirituality services. Student involvement was created by combining student activities, student union, Greek affairs, student leadership programs, and individuals describing their responsibilities as including civic engagement or community service. A cluster labeled special populations was developed by combining adult learning services, commuter and off-campus student services, GLBT awareness, international student services, multicultural student services, and women's resources, a collective that mirrors the standing committees of ACPA. The variable of academic endeavors was created by combining academic support services with faculty, academic administrators, living learning centers, student support services and EOP programs, and similar areas. Residence life, career services, student affairs administration, and student conduct programs each had a sufficient

number of responses to continue without combination. Assessment/Research, Food Service, and the remaining Others were dropped due to low response rate for a total reduction of 24 cases.

Frequency distributions and boxplots were examined for univariate outliers and normality. No univariate outliers were identified. A visual examination of univariate normality revealed non-normal distributions and Kologov-Smirnov testing confirmed this. Transformations were attempted on the six dependent quantitative variables using the square root and then, separately, logarithm methods. Neither noticeably affected normality; Kologov-Smirnov results remained significant indicating non-normal distributions. Therefore, the original, non-transformed data were used.

Homeoscedasticity (homogeneity of variance) was examined through a series of ANOVAs and indicated unequal variances. Mahalanobis distance was generated and a X^2 value of 22.45 (df=6) was identified. Five multivariate outliers above 22.5 were removed from the dataset. Scatterplots of quantitative variables were roughly oval in shape, indicating that multivariable normality and linearity were questionable.

Participants

There were 766 participants in this study with women responding at higher rates than men (n=530, 69.2%). As reported in Table 1, the characteristics of entry-level participants, mid-level participants, and the total sample were similar with two exceptions. An examination of all participants revealed that the majority reported they were Caucasian (n=631, 82.4%) and between 25 and 29 years of age (n=315, 41.2 %). Most participants earned a master's degree (n=627, 81.9%) compared to those with bachelor's (n=31, 4.0%) or doctoral degrees (n=69, 9.0%).

The majority considered themselves to be mid-level professionals (n=525, 68.5%), held their current positions for 2 to 5 years (n=433, 56.5%), worked for their current employer 2 to 5 years (n=413, 53.9%), and worked in the student affairs field between 2 and 10 years (n=529, 39.0%). Years of experience in student affairs varied somewhat between position levels with entry-level staff most frequently reporting 2 to 5 years of experience (n=153, 64.8%) and mid-level professionals most frequently reporting 6 to 10 years of experience (n=206, 39.2%). Residence life was the most frequently identified functional area (n=268, 36.1%) for all participants. Interestingly, although this was a study of entry- and mid-level professionals, 109 reported their age as 40 or more years of age (14.2%) and 174 (22.7%) worked in student affairs more than 10 years. Further, there were variations in age between entry- and mid-level participants. The largest percentage of entry-level professionals identified themselves as being between 25 and 29 years of age (n=172, 72.9%); the largest percentage of mid-level professionals reported they were between 30 and 34 years of age (n=156, 29.7%).

Employing institutions of all respondents tended to enroll between 2,000 and 9,999 students (n= 240, 31.3%), granted doctoral degrees (n=471, 62.0%), and were almost evenly divided between four-year public (n=398, 52.0%) and four-year private institutions (n=333, 43.5%).

Table 1
Characteristics of Participants

Characteristic	Entry-level		Mid-level		All participants	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Age						
< 25 years of age	30	12.7	7	1.3	37	4.8
25 - 29 years of age	172	72.9	142	27.0	315	41.2
30 - 34 years of age	25	10.6	156	29.7	181	23.7
35 - 39 years of age	5	2.1	117	22.3	124	16.2
40 - 44 years of age	2	0.8	43	8.2	45	14.1
45 - 49 years of age	1	0.4	25	4.8	27	3.5
50 - 54 years of age	1	0.4	20	3.8	22	2.9
55 - 59 years of age	0	0.0	11	2.1	11	1.4
60 - 64 years of age	0	0.0	3	0.6	3	0.4
Unreported	0	0.0	1	0.2	1	0.1
Gender						
Male	60	25.4	173	33.0	235	30.7
Female	176	74.6	351	66.9	530	69.2
Transgender	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Prefer not to respond	0	0.0	1	0.2	1	0.1
Ethnicity						
African American	18	7.6	44	8.4	63	8.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	1.3	10	1.9	13	1.7
Caucasian	198	83.9	430	81.9	631	82.4
Hispanic	7	3.0	12	2.3	20	2.6
Multiracial	6	2.5	11	2.1	17	2.2
Native American	0	0.0	1	0.2	1	0.1
Other	1	0.4	7	1.3	8	1.0
Prefer not to respond	3	1.3	10	1.9	13	1.7
Highest Degree Earned						
Certificate	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Associate	0	0.0	3	0.6	3	0.4
Bachelor's	19	8.1	12	2.3	31	4.0
Master's	211	89.4	413	78.7	627	81.9
Education Specialist	0	0.0	5	1.0	6	0.8
Professional	4	1.7	24	4.6	28	3.7
Doctorate	2	0.8	66	12.6	69	9.0
Other	0	0.0	2	0.4	2	0.3

Table continues

Table continued

Characteristic	Entry-level		Mid-level		All participants	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Position Level						
Entry-level	236	100.0	0	0.0	236	30.8
Mid-level	0	0.0	525	100.0	525	68.5
Unreported	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	0.7
Student Affairs Functional Area						
Academic Endeavors	8	3.4	18	3.4	26	3.5
Career Services	18	7.6	35	6.7	53	7.1
Enrollment Management	24	10.2	61	11.6	85	11.5
Residence Life	116	49.2	149	28.4	268	36.1
Special Populations	8	3.4	36	6.9	44	5.9
Student Affairs Administration	3	1.3	51	9.7	55	7.4
Student Conduct Programs	6	2.5	22	4.2	29	3.9
Student Involvement	45	19.1	107	20.4	152	20.5
Wellness	3	1.3	27	5.1	30	4.0
Other	5	2.1	19	3.6	24	3.1
Years in Current Job						
0 – 1 year	97	41.1	126	24.0	226	29.5
2 – 5 years	134	56.8	299	57.0	433	56.5
6 – 10 years	5	2.1	69	13.1	75	9.8
11 – 15 years	0	0.0	16	3.0	16	2.1
16 – 20 years	0	0.0	8	1.5	8	1.0
21 – 25 years	0	0.0	4	0.8	4	0.5
26 or more years	0	0.0	1	0.2	2	0.3
Not reported	0	0.0	2	0.4	2	0.3
Years in Company						
0 – 1 year	86	36.4	76	14.5	163	21.3
2 – 5 years	140	59.0	273	52.0	413	53.9
6 – 10 years	9	3.0	109	20.8	120	15.7
11 - 15 years	1	3.8	32	6.1	33	4.3
16 - 20 years	0	0.4	22	4.2	22	2.9
21 - 25 years	0	0.0	10	1.9	11	1.4
26 or more years	0	0.0	3	0.6	4	0.5

Table continues

Table continued

Characteristic	Entry-level		Mid-level		All participants	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Years in Student Affairs						
0 – 1 year	56	23.7	7	1.3	63	8.2
2 – 5 years	153	64.8	145	27.6	299	39.0
6 – 10 years	24	10.2	206	39.2	230	30.0
11 – 15 years	3	1.3	90	17.1	94	12.3
16 - 20 years	0	0.0	41	7.8	42	5.5
21 - 25 years	0	0.0	18	3.4	19	2.5
26 or more years	0	0.0	18	3.4	19	2.5
Highest Degree Awarded by Institution						
Certificate	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Associate	4	1.7	17	3.2	21	2.8
Bachelor's	26	11.0	52	9.9	78	10.3
Master's	50	21.2	104	19.8	157	20.5
Education Specialist	0	0.0	1	0.2	1	0.1
Professional	14	5.9	18	3.4	32	4.2
Doctorate	141	59.7	328	62.5	471	62.0
Other	0	0.0	4	0.8	4	0.1
Unreported	1	0.4	1	0.2	2	0.3
Institutional Enrollment (in students)						
Fewer than 2,000	30	12.7	78	14.9	109	14.2
2,000 – 9,999	84	35.6	153	29.1	240	31.3
10,000 – 19,999	46	19.5	98	18.7	144	18.8
20,000 – 29,999	39	16.5	97	18.5	136	17.8
30,000 – 39,999	19	8.1	56	10.7	75	9.8
40,000 or more	18	7.6	43	8.2	62	8.1
Institutional Type						
Private 2-year	0	0.0	2	0.4	2	0.3
Private 4-year	108	45.8	221	42.1	333	43.5
Public 2-year	5	2.1	19	3.6	24	3.1
Public 4-year	121	51.3	276	52.6	398	52.0
For-profit company	0	0.0	3	0.6	3	0.4
Non profit company	0	0.0	4	0.8	0	0.0
Other	1	0.4	0	0.0	5	0.7
Unreported	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.1

Note. The sum of entry-level and mid-level participants does not equal the number of total participants because some individuals did not report position level.

CHAPTER IV. RESULTS

The focus of this inquiry was job satisfaction of entry- and mid-level student affairs professionals using two valid and reliable instruments. In addition to providing descriptive information about overall satisfaction and five facets of satisfaction, this study looked for significant differences between the job satisfaction levels of these positions and national norms for employees of nonprofit organizations. Further, group differences were explored along a number of demographic variables and predictors of satisfaction at the entry- and mid-levels were examined.

Research Questions

Seven research questions were posed in this study. The first asked: what are the levels of overall and facet job satisfaction for student affairs professionals employed by institutions of higher education? The second and third questions asked: are the levels of job satisfaction (i.e., the job in general, pay, opportunities for promotion, coworkers, supervision, and the work itself) for entry- and mid-level student affairs professionals representative of individuals employed at non-profit organizations? The fourth and fifth questions explored group differences and inquired: is there a statistically significant difference in levels of global and facet job satisfaction for entry- and mid-level student affairs professionals based on age, gender, ethnicity, position level, and student affairs functional area? Finally, the sixth and seventh questions asked: what combination of variables predicts high levels of global and facet job satisfaction for entry-level professionals and mid-level professionals? These questions will be used as a framework to guide the reader through the results reported in chapter four.

Levels of Overall and Facet Job Satisfaction for Student Affairs Professionals

In response to research question one, means and standard deviations are reported for each of the five facets of job satisfaction and global job satisfaction. As indicated in Table 2, the highest mean level of satisfaction was reported for satisfaction with the work itself (M=42.17, SD=11.29) while the lowest average satisfaction was reported for opportunities for promotion (M=19.44, SD=14.86). As noted previously, scores can range from 0 to 54 on each of the 6 measures of job satisfaction.

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations for Levels of Facet and Global Job Satisfaction

Satisfaction Measure	*M*	*SD*
Global Satisfaction	41.83	11.82
Pay	27.58	15.45
Promotion	19.44	14.86
Coworkers	39.20	11.84
Supervision	38.79	13.81
Work Itself	42.17	11.29

Means and standard deviations for each of the six measures of job satisfaction along the independent variables of gender, position level, ethnicity, age, and student affairs functional area were generated. An examination of gender (Table 3) revealed that men reported higher levels of satisfaction compared to women in global satisfaction and all five facet areas of satisfaction: the job in general (M=41.97, SD=12.03), pay (M=29.08, SD=15.00), opportunities for promotion (M=21.26, SD=15.44), coworkers (M=39.64, SD=11.81), supervision (M=39.43, SD=14.38), and the work itself (M=42.69, SD=11.01).

When compared to entry-level professionals, mid-level professionals reported the highest levels of satisfaction with the job in general (M=42.71, SD=11.12), pay (M=28.16, SD=15.19), opportunities for promotion (M=20.02, SD=15.33), coworkers (M=39.68, SD=11.92),

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Levels of Global and Facet Job Satisfaction and Gender

Variable	Global Satisfaction		Pay		Promotion		Coworkers		Supervision		Work itself	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Gender												
Male	42.00	12.02	29.02	15.00	21.30_a	15.48	39.53	11.91	39.11	14.46	42.70	10.78
Female	42.05	11.52	27.09	15.47	18.64_a	14.62	39.26	11.66	38.66	13.42	42.14	11.20

Note. Means in a column with the same subscripts are significantly different. For all measures, higher means indicate higher levels of satisfaction.

supervision (M=38.85, SD=13.81), and the work itself (M=43.20, SD=10.71) as reported in Table 4.

As indicated in Table 5, individuals in the person of color category reported higher levels of satisfaction with the job in general (M=43.55, SD=11.76) and pay (M=31.91, SD=14.75). Participants identifying themselves as African American reported the highest levels of satisfaction with promotion (M=22.83, SD=17.34), coworkers (M=39.64, SD=11.21), supervision (M=41.40, SD=14.04), and the work itself (M=44.19, SD=9.35).

Older respondents, aged 40 or more years, reported higher satisfaction levels than their younger peers with the job in general (M=45.16, SD=9.97), pay (M=31.42, SD=15.10), coworkers (M=44.38, SD=8.61), supervision (M=40.30, SD=13.01), and the work itself (M=46.46, SD= 8.14) (see Table 6). Individuals between 30 and 34 years of age reported the highest levels of satisfaction with promotion (M= 20.20, SD=15.26).

There are no obvious patterns in relation to job satisfaction within student affairs functional areas, as reported in Tables 7 and 8. The highest levels of satisfaction with the job in general (M=47.92, SD=4.88) and the work itself (M=46.77, SD=7.64) were reported by those working in academic endeavors. Student affairs administrators reported the highest levels of satisfaction with pay (M=34.95, SD=14.68) and opportunities for promotion (M=25.13, SD=16.68). Student affairs professionals working within student conduct programs reported the highest levels of satisfaction with supervision (M=43.45, SD=12.46), while those working in wellness reported the highest levels of satisfaction with coworkers (M=44.67, SD=8.70).

Comparisons to the General Population of Workers

Balzer et al. (2000) noted that while there is no absolute level of satisfaction on the JDI or JIG, “there is a limited range on each scale that would characterize persons who feel neither

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Levels of Global and Facet Job Satisfaction and Position Level

	Global satisfaction		Pay		Promotion		Coworkers		Supervision		Work itself	
Variable	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Position Level												
Entry-level	39.82_a	12.95	26.21	15.87	18.02	13.87	38.13	11.65	38.37	13.83	39.80_a	11.98
Mid-level	43.09_a	10.86	28.39	15.05	20.15	15.37	39.92	11.73	37.75	13.71	43.51_a	10.40

Note. Means in a column with the same subscripts are significantly different. For all measures, higher means indicate higher levels of satisfaction.

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for Levels of Global and Facet Job Satisfaction and Ethnicity

	Global satisfaction		Pay		Promotion		Coworkers		Supervision		Work itself	
Variable	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Ethnicity												
African American	42.52	10.08	28.07	16.33	22.83	17.34	39.64	11.34	41.40	14.04	44.19	9.35
Caucasian	41.86	11.81	27.31	15.27	19.08	14.63	39.38	11.68	38.37	13.74	42.03	11.25
Person of Color	43.55	11.76	31.91	14.75	20.04	15.25	38.60	12.98	40.89	13.19	43.57	10.58

Note. Means in a column with the same subscripts are significantly different. For all measures, higher means indicate higher levels of satisfaction.

Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations for Levels of Global and Facet Job Satisfaction and Age

	Global Satisfaction		Pay		Promotion		Coworkers		Supervision		Work itself	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Age (in years)												
< 25	43.23	10.45	25.77_{a}	18.06	20.06	15.10	37.69_{a}	9.99	38.37	13.31	40.69_{a}	11.71
25 – 29	40.88	12.14	25.89	15.25	19.63	15.18	37.93_{b}	12.27	38.32	13.75	41.38_{b}	11.09
30 – 34	42.36	11.38	28.25	15.13	20.20	15.26	39.16_{c}	11.68	38.14	13.81	42.57_{c}	10.88
35 – 39	41.69	12.10	29.17_{a}	14.67	17.60	14.89	39.78_{d}	12.05	39.94	14.41	41.57_{d}	12.44
40 or more	45.16	9.97	31.42	15.10	19.67	13.55	$44.38_{a,b,c,d}$	8.61	40.30	13.01	$46.46_{a,b,c,d}$	8.14

Note. Means in a column with the same subscripts are significantly different. For all measures, higher means indicate higher levels of satisfaction.

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations for Levels of Global Satisfaction, Satisfaction with Pay, and Satisfaction with Opportunities for Promotion, and Student Affairs Functional Area

	Global Satisfaction		Pay		Promotion	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Functional Area						
Academic Endeavors	$47.92_{a,b,c,d}$	4.88	26.77_{a}	15.49	18.00	16.46
Career Services	44.77_{e}	10.16	$20.45_{b,c,d,e,f}$	15.48	17.51	15.16
Enrollment Management	43.19_{g}	9.84	$26.78_{b,g}$	15.41	18.98	15.35
Residence Life	$39.75_{a,e,f,g,h}$	12.88	$29.26_{c,h,i}$	15.21	18.95	14.57
Special Populations	40.52_{b}	11.68	$27.05_{d,j}$	15.05	17.19	14.18
Student Affairs Administration	$45.44_{g,i}$	10.86	$34.95_{a,e,g,h,j,k,l}$	14.68	25.13	16.68
Student Conduct Programs	39.52_{ci}	13.46	27.24_{k}	12.26	19.66	13.74
Student Involvement	42.17_{d}	11.65	$25.07_{i,l}$	15.22	19.44	14.41
Wellness	44.17_{h}	8.80	28.60_{f}	16.21	20.60	14.28

Note. Means in a column with the same subscripts are significantly different. For all measures, higher means indicate higher levels of satisfaction.

Table 8

Means *and Standard Deviations for Levels of Satisfaction with Coworkers, Supervision, and the Work Itself, and Student Affairs Functional Area*

	Coworkers		Supervision		Work itself	
Variable	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Functional Area						
Academic Endeavors	39.42	12.24	$43.15_{a,b}$	8.84	$46.77_{a,b,c}$	7.64
Career Services	40.72	11.46	38.60	12.90	42.51_{d}	10.16
Enrollment Management	39.94_{a}	10.56	38.99	13.86	42.46_{a}	10.13
Residence Life	$37.29_{a,b,c,d}$	12.35	$37.27_{a,c,d,e}$	14.09	$40.43_{b,e,f,g}$	12.08
Special Populations	39.88	11.31	39.83	12.97	43.50_{h}	9.92
Student Affairs Administration	41.69_{b}	11.24	$42.51_{c,f}$	11.62	$44.51_{e,i}$	10.03
Student Conduct Programs	38.10_{e}	11.48	$43.45_{d,g}$	12.46	$37.45_{c,d,h,I,j,k}$	11.12
Student Involvement	$40.14_{c,f}$	11.60	$37.53_{b,f,g,h}$	14.99	$43.46_{f,j}$	11.13
Wellness	$44.67_{d,e,f}$	8.70	$43.07_{e,h}$	12.57	$46.30_{g,k}$	8.95

Note. Means in a column with the same subscripts are significantly different. For all measures, higher means indicate higher levels of satisfaction.

good or bad about particular aspects of their job" (p. 24). The JDI Research group found it to be reasonably close to the middle range of possible scale scores (0 to 54), or around a score of 27. "Scores well above 27 (e.g., 32 or above) indicate satisfaction, while those well below 27 (e.g., 22 or below) indicate dissatisfaction" (p. 24).

While it would be ideal to compare the median norm value of each scale against the respondents in this study and thus answer research questions two and three, a single sample test that compares the median of that sample to a single value (similar to a *t*-test) was unavailable through the statistical analysis software applied in this study. Therefore, the original research questions could not be answered. Instead, single sample *t*-tests were conducted for means of each of the six scales against the suggested neutral value of 27. Table 9 reports this data.

Table 9
Job Satisfaction Differences Between Entry and Mid-level Student Affairs Professionals and Neutral Level of Job Satisfaction (i.e., 27)

Satisfaction Measure	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	Effect Size
Global satisfaction	41.83	11.82	763	34.66***	.78
Pay	27.58	15.45	765	37.17	
Promotion	19.44	14.86	760	-14.04***	.45
Coworkers	39.2	11.84	761	28.46***	.72
Supervision	39.79	13.81	765	23.63***	.65
Work itself	42.17	11.29	765	37.17***	.80

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

The *t*-tests revealed that entry- and mid-level student affairs staff were significantly more satisfied than the general population with the job in general, $t(763)=34.66$, $p=.000$, Cohen's $d=.782$, coworkers, $t(761)=28.46$, $p=.00$, Cohen's $d=.718$, supervision, $t(765)=23.63$, $p=.00$, Cohen's $d=.650$, and the work itself, $t(765)=37.17$, $p=.00$, Cohen's $d=.802$. Entry- and mid-level student affairs staff were significantly less satisfied with opportunities for promotion than the general population from which the norms were drawn, $t(760)=-14.04$, $p=.000$, Cohen's $d=0.454$.

No significant differences were found for satisfaction with pay. Notably, effect sizes for each of these analyses ranged from moderate to high.

Group Differences for Global Satisfaction with Gender, Position Level, Age, and Student Affairs Functional Area

Research questions four and five were answered through an examination of *t*-tests, analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures, and associated post-hoc testing to determine if statistically significant differences existed when considering the independent variables of gender, position level, ethnicity, age, and student affairs functional area on each of the six measures of job satisfaction.

Job in General

Satisfaction with the job in general was examined for the independent variables of gender, position level, ethnicity, age, and student affairs functional area to determine if significant differences existed between levels of these independent variables. There were no significant differences found on the job in general between the two genders examined in this study (See Table 10). Results of *t*-test analyses which indicated significant differences on satisfaction with the job in general on position level, $t(390.62)=-3.040$, $p=.003$, Cohen's $d=-.378$) are reported in Table 11. Mid-level professionals were significantly more satisfied than their entry-level peers. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) testing for the job in general found significant differences between student affairs functional areas, ($F(8, 731)=3.46$, $p=.001$, $\eta^2=.04$) (See Table 12). Post hoc testing reported in Table 7 using Least Significant Difference demonstrated that those working in the academic endeavors cluster were significantly more satisfied with the job in general when compared to those working in residence life, special populations, student conduct

Table 10
Job Satisfaction Differences Between Men and Women

	Men		Women				
Satisfaction Measure	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	Effect Size
Global satisfaction	41.97	12.034	41.76	11.748	761	0.22	
Pay	29.08	15.012	26.93	15.61	763	1.78	
Promotion	21.26	15.442	18.65	14.537	758	2.25*	.16
Coworkers	39.64	11.811	39.02	11.863	759	0.67	
Supervision	39.43	14.383	38.52	13.571	763	0.84	
Work itself	42.69	11.012	41.92	11.424	763	0.87	

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Table 11
Job Satisfaction Differences Entry-Level and Mid-Level Student Affairs Staff

	Entry-Level Student Affairs Staff		Mid-Level Student Affairs Staff				
Satisfaction Measure	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	Effect Size
Global satisfaction	39.72	13.13	42.71	11.12	390.62	-3.04**	.38
Pay	26.11	15.97	28.16	15.19	759.	-1.69	
Promotion	18.07	13.82	20.02	15.33	754.	-1.67	
Coworkers	38.12	11.60	39.68	11.91	755.	-1.69	
Supervision	38.54	13.89	38.85	13.81	759.	-0.28	
Work itself	39.70	12.23	43.20	10.71	403.5	-3.80***	.31

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

programs, and student involvement. Further, individuals working in residence life were more satisfied with the job in general when compared to entry- and mid-level professionals in career services, enrollment management, student affairs administration, and wellness. In addition, individuals working in student conduct programs were significantly less satisfied than those working in student affairs administration.

Facet Satisfaction and Gender, Position Level, Ethnicity, Age, and Student Affairs Functional Area

Pay

An ANOVA was conducted to examine satisfaction with pay and the independent variables of ethnicity, age, and student affairs functional area (see Table 13) while *t*-tests were conducted to examine satisfaction with pay for gender (See Table 10) and position level (See Table 11). No significant differences were found with pay for ethnicity; means and standard deviations are reported in Table 5. Significant differences were found for satisfaction with pay for age ($F(4, 760)=2.58$, $p=.036$, $\eta^2=.01$) and student affairs functional area ($F(8, 733)=4.14$, $p=.000$, $\eta^2=.04$). Least Significant Difference post hoc testing (See Table 6) demonstrated that individuals below 25 years of age were significantly less satisfied with pay compared to individuals aged 35 to 39. Table 7 reports post-hoc results for significant differences in satisfaction with pay between student affairs functional areas. Entry- and mid-level professionals working in career services were significantly less satisfied with pay when compared to professionals working in enrollment management, residence life, special populations, student affairs administration, and wellness. Those identifying their primary functional area as student affairs administration were significantly more satisfied with pay compared to all functional areas except wellness, where the higher satisfaction level was not significant.

Opportunities for promotion

Group differences for satisfaction with opportunities for promotion were examined through the original *t*-test procedures for gender (See Table 10) and position level (See Table 11). An ANOVA was generated to explore satisfaction with opportunities for promotion along ethnicity, age, and student affairs functional area as reported in Table 14. Significant differences

Table 12

One-Way Analyses of Variance for Effects of Ethnicity, Age, and Student Affairs Functional Area on Global Job Satisfaction

Variable and source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	Effect size
Race/Ethnicity					
Between groups	2	6.00	88.02	0.62	
Within groups	40	104,973.07	141.86		
Total	742	105,149.07			
Age					
Between groups	4	1,129.76	282.44	2.03	
Within groups	758	105,460.55	139.13		
Total	762	106,590.21			
Functional Area					
Between groups	8	3,780.72	472.59	3.46***	.04
Within groups	731	99,844.67	136.59		
Total	739	103,625.39			

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Table 13

One-Way Analyses of Variance for Effects of Ethnicity, Age, and Student Affairs Functional Area on Satisfaction with Pay

Variable and source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	Effect size
Race/Ethnicity					
Between groups	2	621.76	310.88	1.30	
Within groups	742	177,114.33	238.70		
Total	744	177,735.09			
Age					
Between groups	4	2,440.67	610.17	2.58*	.01
Within groups	760	179,891.33	236.70		
Total	764	182,332.00			
Functional Area					
Between groups	8	7,632.35	954.04	4.14***	.04
Within groups	733	168,823.13	230.32		
Total	741	176,455.48			

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

were found for gender, $t(758)=2.25$, $p=.025$, Cohen's $d=.163$), with men significantly more satisfied than women with opportunities for promotion. Table 3 reports means and standard deviations for gender with all six measures of job satisfaction.

Coworkers

An ANOVA generated for satisfaction with coworkers with ethnicity, age, and student affairs functional area indicated significant differences with age ($F(4,193.94)=5.74$, $p=.000$, $\eta^2=.02$) and student affairs functional area ($F(8, 729)=2.34$, $p=.017$, $\eta^2=.03$) as reported in Table 15. Least significant difference post hoc testing, reported in Table 6, indicated that individuals aged 40 or more years were significantly more satisfied with coworkers than all other age categories. Table 8 reports the results of post hoc testing for student affairs functional area which indicated that those working in residence life were significantly less satisfied with coworkers than those working in enrollment management, student affairs administration, student involvement, and wellness. Individuals working in wellness were significantly more satisfied than those working in student conduct programs and student involvement in relation to satisfaction with coworkers. *T*-tests generated to examine satisfaction with coworkers by gender (See Table 9) and position level (See Table 11) demonstrated no significant differences.

Supervision

Table 16 reports the results of ANOVA procedures for group differences on satisfaction with supervision with the independent variables of ethnicity, age, and student affairs functional area. Significant differences were found on student affairs functional area ($F(8, 733)=2.29$, $p=.020$, $\eta^2=.02$). Post hoc testing for (See Table 8) indicated that those working in residence life were significantly less satisfied than those working in academic endeavors, student affairs administration, student conduct programs, and wellness. Individuals working in student

Table 14

One-Way Analyses Variance for Effects of Ethnicity, Age, and Student Affairs Functional Area on Satisfaction with Promotion

Variable and s*ource*	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*
Race/Ethnicity				
Between groups	2	505.04	252.52	1.14
Within groups	737	163,745.18	222.18	
Total	739	164,250.22		
Age				
Between groups	4	299.41	74.85	0.340
Within groups	755	167,459.56	221.80	
Total	759	167,758.97		
Functional Area				
Between groups	8	2,390.43	298.80	1.36
Within groups	728	159,424.91	218.99	
Total	736	161,815.34		

$p < .05$. $^{**}p < .01$. $^{***}p < .001$.

Table 15

One-Way Analyses of Variance for Effects of Ethnicity, Age, and Student Affairs Functional Area on Satisfaction with Coworkers

Variable and source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	Effect size
Race/Ethnicity					
Between groups	2	21.76	10.88	0.08	
Within groups	739	103,797.96	140.46		
Total	741	103,819.72			
Age					
Between groups	4	2,621.00	655.25	5.74***	.02
Within groups	193.94	103,776.61	137.27		
Total	760	106,397.61			
Functional Area					
Between groups	8	2,568.32	321.04	2.34*	.03
Within groups	729	99,829.21	136.94		
Total	737	102,397.53			

$^{*}p < .05$. $^{**}p < .01$. $^{***}p < .001$.

involvement were significantly less satisfied than their peers working in academic endeavors, student affairs administration, student conduct programs, and wellness. *T*-tests generated to examine satisfaction with supervision by gender (See Table 10) and position level (See Table 11) demonstrated no significant differences.

The work itself

Satisfaction with the work itself along the independent variables of gender, position level, ethnicity, age, and student affairs functional area pointed to significant differences along position level, $t(403.50)=-3.80$, $p=.000$, Cohen's $d=-.308$), with mid-level student affairs professionals significantly more satisfied with the work itself compared to entry-level professionals (See Table 11). The ANOVA results reported in Table 16 note significant differences in age ($F(4, 760)=3.38$, $p=.009$, $\eta^2=.02$) and student affairs functional area ($F(8, 733)=3.16$, $p=.002$, $\eta^2=.03$). Least significant difference post hoc testing reported in Table 6 demonstrated that those aged 40 or more years were significantly more satisfied with the work itself compared to all other age groups.

While it might be postulated that the results indicating significant differences between position levels and age for satisfaction with the work itself were an artifact of participants who reported themselves as mid-level professionals aged 40 or more years, this appears not to be the case. As reported in Table 18, 13.4% of participants ($n=102$) were identified as mid-level professionals aged 40 or more years. The largest percentage of mid-level professionals (20.5%) identified their ages as between 30 and 34 years.

Post hoc testing for student affairs functional area reported in Table 8 indicated that those working in student conduct programs were significantly less satisfied with the work itself

Table 16

One-Way Analyses of Variance for Effects of Ethnicity, Age, and Student Affairs Functional Area on Satisfaction with Supervision

Variable and source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	Effect size
Race/Ethnicity					
Between groups	2	428.74	214.37	1.12	
Within groups	742	142,206.65	191.65		
Total	744	142,635.39			
Age					
Between groups	4	829.53	207.38	1.09	
Within groups	760	145,119.32	190.95		
Total	764	145,948.85			
Functional Area					
Between groups	8	3,460.03	432.50	2.29*	.02
Within groups	733	138,384.29	188.79		
Total	741	141,844.32			

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Table 17

One-Way Analyses of Variance for Effects of Ethnicity, Age, and Student Affairs Functional Area on Satisfaction with the Work Itself

Variable and source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	Effect size
Race/Ethnicity					
Between groups	2	146.24	73.12	0.57	
Within groups	742	94,626.82	127.53		
Total	744	94,773.06			
Age					
Between groups	4	1,702.17	425.54	3.38**	.02
Within groups	760	95,797.01	126.05		
Total	764	97,499.18			
Functional Area					
Between groups	8	3,094.45	386.81	3.16**	.03
Within groups	733	90,981.17	124.12		
Total	741	94,075.62			

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

compared to those working in all other functional areas. Significant differences were identified between student conduct programs and academic endeavors, career services, special populations ,student affairs administration, student involvement, and wellness. Residence life professionals also demonstrated significantly lower levels of satisfaction with the work itself when compared to those working in academic endeavors, student affairs administration, student involvement, and wellness. Finally, those working in academic endeavors were significantly more satisfied with the work itself when compared to those working in enrollment management.

Tables 19 and 20 summarize significant *t*-test and ANOVA results, respectively. Caution should be exercised when examining the significant results concerning age and functional area. A considerable proportion of respondents reported residence life as their primary functional area and the distribution of ages within this group of respondents does not replicate the age distribution of other study participants (See Table 21).

Predictors of Entry-level Professionals' Satisfaction

Several multiple regressions were conducted in order to answer research questions six and seven of this study. All scale variables entered into the regression were first re-coded into "dummy" categorical variables. Initial regression procedures were conducted to test for collinearity. In each of these procedures, one dummy-coded variable from each set was omitted (e.g., persons of color from ethnicity, residence life from student affairs functional area, etc.). Omitted variables included persons of color, job tenure of 11 or more years, company tenure of 11 or more years, student affairs tenure of 16 or more years, the functional area of student affairs administration, doctorate as highest degree earned, institutional enrollment of 40,000 or more students, and doctorate/professional degree as highest degree awarded by the institution.

Table 18
Comparison of Position Level by Age

	Age											
	< 25 years of age		25 – 29 years of age		30 – 34 years of age		35 – 39 years of age		40 or more years of age		Total	
Variable	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Entry-level	30	3.9	172	22.6	25	3.3	5	0.7	4	0.5	236	31.1
Mid-Level	7	0.9	142	18.7	156	20.5	117	15.4	102	13.4	524	68.9
Total	37	4.9	314	41.3	181	23.8	122	16.1	106	13.9	760	100.0

Table 19
Significant t-test Results

	Entry-level Student Affairs Staff		Mid-level Student Affairs Staff				
Satisfaction Measure	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	Effect Size
Global satisfaction between entry- and mid-level staff	39.72	13.13	42.71	11.12	390.62	-3.04**	.38
Work itself between entry- and mid-level staff	39.70	12.23	43.20	10.71	403.50	-3.80***	.31
	Men		Women				
Satisfaction Measure	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	Effect Size
Promotion	21.26	15.442	18.65	14.537	758	2.25*	.16

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Table 20
Significant ANOVA Results

Variable and source	*df*	SS	MS	*F*	Effect size
Age and Pay					
Between groups	4	2,440.67	610.17	2.58*	.01
Within groups	760	179,891.33	236.70		
Total	764	182,332.00			
Age and Coworkers					
Between groups	4	2,621.00	655.25	5.74***	.02
Within groups	193.94	103,776.61	137.27		
Total	760	106,397.61			
Age and the Work Itself					
Between groups	4	1,702.17	425.54	3.38**	.02
Within groups	760	95,797.01	126.05		
Total	764	97,499.18			
Functional Area and Global Satisfaction					
Between groups	8	3,780.72	472.59	3.46***	.04
Within groups	731	99,844.67	136.59		
Total	739	103,625.38			
Functional Area and Pay					
Between groups	8	7,632.35	954.04	4.14***	.04
Within groups	733	168,823.13	230.32		
Total	741	176,455.49			
Functional Area and Coworkers					
Between groups	8	2,568.32	321.04	2.34*	.03
Within groups	729	99,829.21	136.94		
Total	737	102,397.52			
Functional Area and Supervision					
Between groups	8	3,460.03	432.50	2.29*	.02
Within groups	733	138,384.29	188.79		
Total	741	141,844.32			
Functional Area and the Work Itself					
Between groups	8	3,094.45	386.81	3.16**	.03
Within groups	733	90,981.17	124.12		
Total	741	94,075.59			

Table 21
Comparison of Age Distribution by Student Affairs Functional Area

Variable	Residence life		All other functional areas		Difference	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Age						
< 25 years of age	20	7.5	17	3.4	3	4.1
25 – 29 years of age	126	47.0	189	38.0	-63	9.0
30 – 34 years of age	69	25.7	112	22.5	-43	3.2
35 – 39 years of age	28	10.4	96	19.3	-68	-8.9
40 – or more years of age	25	9.3	83	16.7	-58	-7.4
	n = 268		n = 497			

Tolerance levels below 0.1 were reported for individuals with bachelor's and master's degrees, company tenure of less than 1 year, 2 to 5 years, and 6 to 10 years, private four-year institutions, public four-year institutions, and those working in the functional area of residence life. The model dropped the variable of associate degree as the individual's highest degree earned and certificate as the highest degree awarded by the employing institution as a result of no responses. The regressions were repeated without these variables. In the second iteration of the regression, the model dropped job tenure of less than one year and student affairs tenure of two to five years.

The final variables included in the regression analyses for entry-level staff included African American, Caucasian, job tenure of 0 to 1 year, job tenure of 2 to 5 years, job tenure of 6 to 10 years, company tenure of 11 or more years, student affairs tenure of 0 to 1 year, student affairs tenure of 2 to 5 years, student affairs tenure of 6 to 10 years, student affairs tenure of 11 to 15 years, two year institutions, professional degree (e.g., J.D., M.D.) as the highest degree earned, institutional enrollment under 2,000 students, institutional enrollment of 2,000 to 9,999 students, institutional enrollment of 10,000 to 19,999 students, institutional enrollment of 20,000 to 29,999 students, institutional enrollment 30,000 to 39,999 students, associate degree as the

highest awarded by the institution, bachelor's degree as the highest awarded by the institution, master's or educational specialist degree as the highest awarded by the institution, the functional areas of enrollment management, special populations, wellness, student involvement, academic endeavors, career services, student conduct programs, and gender.

Predictors of entry-level professionals' satisfaction with the job in general were explored through multiple regression using the set of variables reported above. Results indicated that the model did not significantly predict entry-level professionals satisfaction with the job in general, R^2=.104, R^2_{adj}=.-.009, F(26,206)=.918, p=.583. This model accounted for 10.4% of the variance in entry-level professionals' satisfaction with the work itself. A summary of intercorrelations and regression coefficients are presented in Appendix F and G, respectively. The functional areas of academic endeavors and student involvement made significant moderate positive contributions to the model.

A second regression found that the model did not significantly predict entry-level professionals' satisfaction with pay, R^2=.149, R^2_{adj}=.042, F(26, 207)=1.40, p=.104. This model accounted for 14.9% of the variance in entry-level professionals' satisfaction with pay. Intercorrelations are reported in Appendix H. A summary of regression coefficients is presented in Appendix I and indicated that 3 (i.e., master's degree as highest awarded by the institution and the functional areas of special populations and student involvement) of the 26 variables made very small negative but significant contributions to the model.

Predictors of entry-level professionals' satisfaction with opportunities for promotion were examined and findings suggested that that the model significantly predicted satisfaction with opportunities for promotion for entry-level staff, R^2=.261, R^2_{adj}=.167, F(26, 206)=2.80, p=.000. Intercorrelations between variables are reported in Appendix J. This model accounted for 26.1%

of the variance in entry-level professionals' satisfaction with opportunities for promotion. A summary of regression coefficients is presented in Appendix K. The model indicated that less than one year of student affairs tenure and bachelor's degree as highest awarded by the institution made significant moderate positive contributions to the model.

A fourth multiple regression was conducted to determine the variables that predicted entry-level professionals' satisfaction with coworkers. Results indicated that the model did not significantly predict satisfaction with coworkers for entry-level staff, R^2=.140, R^2_{adj}=.032, F(26, 207)=1.301 p=.159. Intercorrelations between variables are reported in Appendix L. This model accounted for 14.0% of the variance in entry-level professionals' satisfaction with coworkers. A summary of regression coefficients is presented in Appendix M and indicated that 2 (i.e., the functional areas of enrollment management and student involvement) of the 28 variables made significant moderate positive contributions to the model.

A fifth multiple regression indicated that the utilized variables did not significantly predict satisfaction with supervision for entry-level staff, R^2=.095, R^2_{adj}=.-019, F(26, 207)=.831, p=.703. This model accounted for 9.50% of the variance in entry-level professionals' satisfaction with supervision. Appendix N reports intercorrelations between variables. A summary of regression coefficients is presented in Appendix O and indicated that none of the 28 variables made significant contributions to the model.

The results of a final multiple regression procedure suggested that the model did not significantly predict satisfaction with the work itself, R^2=.139, R^2_{adj}=.031, F(26, 207)=1.29, p=.170. This model accounted for 13.9% of the variance in entry-level professionals' satisfaction with the work itself. A summary of intercorrelations and regression coefficients are presented in

Appendix P and Appendix Q, respectively. The functional areas of academic endeavors and student involvement made significant small negative contributions to the model.

Predictors of Mid-level Professionals' Job Satisfaction

Initial regression procedures were conducted to test for collinearity within mid-level professionals and 36 independent variables after removing one dummy-coded variable from each set (e.g., persons of color from ethnicity, residence life from student affairs functional area, etc.). Omitted variables included persons of color, job tenure of 11 or more years, company tenure of 11 or more years, student affairs tenure of 16 or more years, the functional area of student affairs administration, doctorate as highest degree earned, institutional enrollment of 40,000 or more students, and doctorate/professional degree as highest degree awarded by the institution.

Tolerance levels below 0.1 were reported for private four-year institutions and public four-year institutions and these variables were removed from the analyses. The model dropped the variable of certificate as the highest degree because there were no correlations. The regressions were repeated without these variables.

The final variables included in the regression analyses for mid-level staff included African American, Caucasian, job tenure of 0 to 1 year, job tenure of 2 to 5 years, job tenure of 6 to 10 years, company tenure of 0 to 1 year, company tenure of 2 to 5 years, company tenure of 6 to 10 years, student affairs tenure of 0 to 1 year, student affairs tenure of 2 to 5 years, student affairs tenure of 6 to 10 years, student affairs tenure of 11 to 15 years, two year institutions, associate degree as the highest degree earned, bachelor's degree as the highest degree earned, master's or educational specialist degree as the highest degree earned, (e.g., J.D., M.D.) as the highest degree earned, institutional enrollment under 2,000 students, institutional enrollment of 2,000 to 9,999 students, institutional enrollment of 10,000 to 19,999 students, institutional

enrollment of 20,000 to 29,999 students, institutional enrollment 30,000 to 39,999 students, associate degree as the highest awarded by the institution, bachelor's degree as the highest awarded by the institution, master's or educational specialist degree as the highest awarded by the institution, the functional areas of enrollment management, special populations, wellness, student involvement, academic endeavors, career services, student conduct programs, and residence life, and gender.

The first regression was generated to determine predictors of mid-level professionals' satisfaction with the job in general. Results indicated that the model did not significantly predict satisfaction with the job in general, R^2=.073, R^2_{adj}=.008 F(34, 486)=1.12, p=.298. This model accounted for 7.3% of the variance in mid-level professionals' satisfaction with the job in general. Intercorrelations between variables are reported in Appendix R. A summary of regression coefficients is presented in Appendix S and indicated that only company tenure of zero to one year made a significant moderate negative contribution to the model.

A second regression found that the model significantly predicted mid-level satisfaction with pay, R^2=.147, R^2_{adj}=.087, F(34, 487)=2.47, p=.000. This model accounted for 14.7% of the variance in mid-level professionals' satisfaction with pay. Intercorrelations are reported in Appendix T. A summary of regression coefficients is presented in Appendix U. Seven variables (i.e., the functional areas of career services, enrollment management, and student involvement; student affairs tenure of 2 to 5 and 6 to 10 years; institutional enrollment below 2,000 students; and master's degree as the highest awarded by the institution) of the 34 variables made significant contributions to the model. Each of these variables made a small to moderate negative contribution except for master's degree as the highest degree awarded by the institution, which made a moderate positive contribution.

Predictors of mid-level professionals' satisfaction with opportunities for promotion were examined and findings suggested that that the model did not significantly predict satisfaction with opportunities for promotion for mid-level staff, R^2=.080, R^2_{adj}=.015, F(34, 483)=1.24, p=.172. This model accounted for 8.0% of the variance in mid-level professionals' satisfaction with opportunities for promotion. Intercorrelations between variables are reported in Appendix V. A summary of regression coefficients is presented in Appendix W and indicated that 6 (i.e., career tenure of 0 to 1 year; the functional areas of career services, enrollment management, and student involvement; and gender) made significant small to moderate negative contributions to the model, while job tenure of 0 to 1 year made a moderate positive contribution.

A fourth multiple regression was conducted and results indicated that the model did not significantly predict satisfaction with coworkers for mid-level staff, R^2=.080, R^2_{adj}=.015, F(34, 483)=1.23, p=.175. This model accounted for 8.0% of the variance in mid-level professionals' satisfaction with coworkers. Intercorrelations between variables are reported in Appendix X. A summary of regression coefficients is presented in Appendix Y and indicated that student affairs career tenure of 6 to 10 years made a significant moderate negative contribution to the model.

A fifth multiple regression indicated that the utilized variables did not significantly predict satisfaction with supervision for mid-level staff, R^2=.071, R^2_{adj}=.006, F(34, 487)=.1.09, p=.340. This model accounted for 7.1% of the variance in mid-level professionals' satisfaction with supervision. Appendix Z reports intercorrelations between variables. A summary of regression coefficients is presented in Appendix AA and indicated that none of the 34 variables made significant contributions to the model.

The results of a final, sixth multiple regression procedure suggested that the model was not a significant predictor of mid-level professionals satisfaction with the work itself, R^2=.075,

R^2_{adj}=.010, F(34, 487)=1.15, p=.257. This model accounted for 7.5% of the variance in mid-level professionals' satisfaction with the work itself. Appendix BB reports intercorrelations between variables. A summary of regression coefficients is presented in Appendix CC and indicated that 2 (i.e., company tenure of 0 to 1 and 2 to 5 years) of the 34 variables made significant moderate negative contributions to the model.

Summary

Significant results were found in relation to overall satisfaction levels of entry- and mid-level professionals when compared to a neutral level of satisfaction for the general population. In addition, significant differences were identified for position level and global satisfaction; position level and the work itself; gender and opportunities for promotion; student affairs functional area and the job in general; student affairs functional area and pay, age and coworkers; student affairs functional area and coworkers; student affairs functional area and supervision, age and the work itself; and student affairs functional area, and the work itself. Two of twelve prediction models were significant predictors of job satisfaction including entry-level professionals' satisfaction with opportunities for promotion and mid-level professionals' satisfaction with pay.

CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION

Five facets of job satisfaction and global satisfaction were examined in this study of entry- and mid-level student affairs professionals. Descriptive data were presented and differences examined between these two position levels and the general population of workers in the United States. Group differences were examined in relation to several demographic variables and predictors of job satisfaction were identified for each position level. Data were collected through two valid and reliable instruments.

Summary of Significant Findings

Statistically significant results were identified in several areas of this study. The mean levels of satisfaction on three of the five facets (i.e., pay, opportunities for promotion, coworkers, supervision, and the work itself) and the job in general were significantly higher than the general population. In addition, participants in this study reported significantly lower levels of satisfaction with opportunities for promotion than the neutral level indicated by the general population of workers.

Group differences were apparent when considering entry-level and mid-level professionals, with mid-level professionals significantly more satisfied with the job in general and the work itself when compared to entry-level respondents. Men were significantly more satisfied with opportunities for promotion than women. Significant differences were also found for age groups in relation to satisfaction with pay, coworkers, and the work itself where older participants were significantly more satisfied than their younger peers. Student affairs functional area was a factor in satisfaction with the job in general, pay, coworkers, supervision, and the work itself. Participants working in residence life and student conduct reported significantly lower levels of satisfaction in several areas, while student affairs administrators and those

working in academic endeavors reported significantly higher satisfaction in as many as five satisfaction measures.

Finally, two separate models were developed that predicted job satisfaction for entry-level and mid-level student affairs professionals. The first model concerned satisfaction with opportunities for promotion for entry-level professionals and identified job tenure of zero to one year and baccalaureate degree-granting institutions as significant factors in this model. A second model was found to be a significant predictor of satisfaction with pay for mid-level professionals. In this model, several variables made significant contributions including the functional areas of career services, enrollment management, and student involvement; student affairs tenure of 2 to 5 and 6 to 10 years; institutional enrollment below 2,000 students; and master's degree as the highest awarded by the institution.

Discussion

Although it is not possible to know if the sample was representative of membership in ACPA, a number of implications can be drawn from the results of this study. These implications are presented by first considering the research questions posed in this inquiry with further examination of the independent variables within these questions.

Comparisons to the general population

With the exception of satisfaction with opportunities for promotion, entry- and mid-level student affairs professionals reported higher levels of satisfaction than the neutral satisfaction level of the general population. In four of these areas, the difference was statistically significant, specifically global satisfaction, coworkers, supervision, and the work itself. The strong practical significance of these results is reflected in the reported effects sizes which ranged from .65 to .80. In their synthesis of the literature related to the effects of college and specifically

postsecondary educational attainment, Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) commented about the relationship between education and job satisfaction. Finding a complex relationship between educational levels and job satisfaction, they noted that

> the direct effect of having a college degree on job satisfaction tends to be negative, possibly because education functions to raise workers' expectations. Having higher expectations of the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards of one's work may partially explain depressed levels of job satisfaction when college graduates hold jobs that do not generally require a college degree. (p. 535)

As many positions within student affairs require at least a bachelor's degree and often a master's degree, this last relationship noted by Pascarella and Terenzini may not apply to the student affairs professionals in this study. The higher levels of job satisfaction reported in this inquiry may also be a reflection of the nature of student affairs jobs which are generally autonomous, flexible to individual and family circumstances, and highly focused on a positive work climate. Further, higher education offers an appealing climate and setting. Often physically attractive, the college environment is supportive of life-long learning, encourages involvement in cultural events, promotes the improvement of physical health through recreational activities, and endorses a general focus on self- and community-improvement.

Significantly lower levels of satisfaction with opportunities for promotion were found for participants in this study compared to the neutral level of satisfaction. This would logically stem from a lack of movement or turnover at upper levels of the field or a disparity between expectations for advancement in comparison with what is actually available. It is often noted that there are many more entry-level positions within student affairs, particularly within residence

life, than there are mid- or senior level opportunities, which may be a factor in perceptions regarding upward employment mobility.

In addition, varying perceptions of entry- and mid-level positions may be a factor in perspectives on opportunities for advancement. Participants in this inquiry self-reported their position level without being given any context. Some individuals in director positions might consider how they are situated within a student affairs division and regard themselves as mid-level professionals because they do not serve as the senior student affairs officer. Alternately, assistant directors in larger departments might label themselves as mid-level staff. These varying perceptions of current level may influence perceptions of advancement opportunities.

An interesting effect may also be related. At the time of data collection, significant public concern was devoted to the economic collapse and the roles of the banking and investment industries in that collapse. This attention may have heightening comparisons between student affairs work and more lucrative fields where advancement and promotion are seemingly more available and more critical to success. In addition, many colleges and universities elected to leave positions vacant in order to maximize available funding; this may have influenced participants' perceptions of available advancement opportunities in the short- and long-term.

Group Differences

Age. Respondents over the age of 39 reported significantly higher levels of satisfaction with pay, coworkers, and the work itself. Those who were 40 or more years of age reported significantly higher levels of satisfaction with coworkers and the work itself, which reinforces research conducted by Loyd (2005 and Grant (2006).

There were no discernable patterns for the lowest levels of satisfaction. While the data analyses in this study do not permit a certain conclusion, those who are older may have a greater

variety and more years of experience with which to compare their current work. This may mean that older participants intentionally selected their current positions based specifically on previous experiences, rather than age having an impact on satisfaction levels. As further support for this possibility, a pattern of progressively higher mean levels of satisfaction with pay, coworkers, and the work itself occurred in relation to increased age of respondents.

Ethnicity. In keeping with the general findings of the JDI Research Group (M. Sliter, personal communication, December 4, 2008), there were no significant differences in job satisfaction in relation to ethnicity of respondents. However, it is interesting that the respondents who identified themselves as Caucasian did not have higher mean levels of satisfaction in any of the six areas measured in this study. This contrasts with Grant (2006) who found that Caucasian respondents were more satisfied than those who identified themselves as African American or Hispanic/Latino. These results may indicate that, as a profession, student affairs is more successful at matching expectations, rewards, and perceptions for these populations at the entry and mid-levels.

Gender. Men were more satisfied than women with all five of the facets of job satisfaction; women reported higher levels of satisfaction with the job in general although significant differences were found only for satisfaction with opportunities for promotion where the practical impact was small. Grant (2006) and Chiu (1998) reported similar findings with men more satisfied with their jobs than women. These differences in satisfaction levels between genders may be related to the concept of gendered organizations. Acker (1990) argued that organizations are, by nature of their origins and control, not gender neutral and are oriented towards a male perspective of the world of work. In this view, "the structure of the labor market, relations in the workplace, the control of the work process, and the underlying wage relation are

always affected by symbols of gender, processes of gender identity, and material inequities between men and women" (p. 145-146). The satisfaction levels of women may be negatively influenced by work environments that are controlled by and oriented towards men.

Position Level. Although significant differences were found only for global satisfaction and the work itself where effect sizes were moderate, the results of this study were clear concerning position level. Mid-level staff reported higher mean satisfaction levels compared to entry-level staff in relation to the job in general, pay, opportunities for promotion, coworkers, and the work itself. Only in relation to supervision did entry-level staff report higher levels of satisfaction than their mid-level peers. There may be greater uncertainty among entry-level staff concerning the match between their values and the work they find themselves engaged in. Conversely, mid-level staff members generally enjoy higher levels of power and authority in relation to entry-level professionals. This sense of control over one's work influences job satisfaction (Tarver et al., 1999).

Student Affairs Functional Area. Comparative explorations of job satisfaction in several functional areas of student affairs is a new contribution to the literature. Significant differences in job satisfaction were found between student affairs functional areas on five of the six measures of job satisfaction. While it is not possible to conjecture about each of these areas, some conclusions can be drawn. Student affairs administrators reported the highest or second highest average levels of satisfaction in four areas: the job in general, pay, opportunities for promotion, and coworkers. The generalist nature of student affairs administration may be related to these higher satisfaction levels. In addition, those working in academic endeavors were significantly more satisfied with the job in general and the work itself. This may be linked to the different culture present in the academic realm of higher education, where individual work, a

focus on the content of one academic discipline, and the world of ideas are cherished, which contrasts with student affairs staff who tend to value team effort, an interdisciplinary approach, and practical application of ideas (Barrett, 2007; Bonfiglio, 2007).

There were no clear patterns in relation to the lowest mean levels of satisfaction, although data reported by those working in student conduct programs and residence life present some cause for concern. Student conduct staff members were significantly less satisfied with global satisfaction and the work itself. It should not be surprising that professionals working within student conduct are less satisfied with their work given the reactive nature of their efforts and the challenges inherent in developing long-term satisfying relationships with students when they often perceive the staff member as "the one who got me in trouble." While student conduct professionals may be fulfilled by opportunities to impact the development of individual students, they often do not have the opportunity to observe the effects of their work with students.

Interestingly, residence life staff reported the lowest or second lowest levels of satisfaction in relation to global satisfaction, coworkers, supervision, and the work itself; differences were significant on each of these measures. In a study of students enrolled in student affairs graduate preparation programs, participants identified quality of life considerations among the primary reasons for not pursuing a career in residence life (Belch & Mueller, 2003), which may relate to the lower levels of satisfaction reported in this study.

Predictors of Satisfaction

Two significant prediction models were identified including entry-level professionals and their satisfaction with opportunities for promotion and mid-level professionals' satisfaction with pay. The model for entry-level satisfaction with opportunities for promotion implies that newer professionals working at baccalaureate degree-granting institutions (our "colleges") are more

likely to be satisfied with opportunities for promotion. This is an interesting result, as most baccalaureate institutions are smaller with flatter organizational structures that suggest fewer opportunities for advancement within these institutions. In fact, it may be that institutional personnel are keenly aware of the lack of internal opportunities for advancement and strive to cultivate staff so that they are better prepared for and more aware of opportunities for internal lateral movement, shifts to other divisions, and external employment.

A number of variables were identified as significant predictors of mid-level staff satisfaction with pay. This model suggested that professionals with 2 to 10 years of student affairs work experience who work in career services, enrollment management, or student involvement at an institution with more than 2,000 students where an associate, bachelor's, professional, or doctoral degree is the highest degrees awarded will be less satisfied with their pay. Absent specific data concerning these variables, this model may be attributed to participants' perceptions of their inputs into their work relative their perceptions of the efforts of other people at work, the rewards received by these other people, and the characteristics of their specific jobs. There may also be characteristics related to the pay structures of these particular institutional sizes and types that are, in fact, related to higher levels of pay.

The variance explained by these models did not exceed 27%. Certainly the choice of a broad range of independent variables drawn from the literature and the instrumentation impacted these results. Focusing solely on variables identified in the literature and omitting variables related to the instrument norms may bring about different outcomes with larger practical impact. Further, there are obviously other factors that are more significant to the development of models that predict the job satisfaction of entry- and mid-level professionals. For example, data related

to salary, number of positions to which participants might aspire at their institution, or number of coworkers might contribute to more effective predictive models.

Limitations Revisited

There are several limitations to this study that should be noted. Not all entry- or mid-level student affairs practitioners were included in this inquiry as many do not hold membership in ACPA. The ethnicities of the participants in this study were not balanced nor was there equal representation from all student affairs functional areas. Self-reported data are affected by errors of bias and perception. The impact of the turmoil in the general economy and higher education specifically is unknown. Access to the population of entry- and mid-level professionals was mediated by the ACPA central office which may have impacted response rates, multiple submissions, and prevented the use of a randomly generated sample. Further, it is not possible to generalize results to ACPA membership with complete confidence. The electronic nature of communication with potential participants made it possible for the message and hyperlink to be forwarded to individuals who were not members of ACPA.

Implications for Practice

Lawler (1994) suggested that individuals will be satisfied when the rewards received by the employee match what the employee believes should be received in comparison with the employee's perceptions of the rewards that others receive for what they have invested in the job in relation to the characteristics of the job. Lawler's theory suggests that attending to the expectancies and perceptions of staff will increase job satisfaction. Supervisors might accomplish this by encouraging dialogue with staff about the various aspects of satisfaction to promote articulation of expectations and perceptions of other employees. Early, and ideally annual, conversations about rewards (as might be defined by the department or institution as well

as the employee) will help align institutional and employee values regarding rewards. Similarly, dialogue about expectations for employee feedback in comparison with institutional expectations for the individual and employees in general will facilitate exchanges that will then help make expectations, perceptions, and reality congruent. Employees need not wait for supervisors to initiate this communication. It is good practice to ask questions and make observations about the work environment, how one is rewarded for good work, and the steps the organization takes to align effort and reward between employees.

Student affairs is a satisfying line of work

It is notable that the participants in this study reported significantly higher levels of satisfaction in four of the six measures of satisfaction than the "generally satisfied" levels reported by the general population of workers in the United States. However, the student affairs profession falls short in relation to satisfaction with opportunities for advancement. Expectancy theory suggests that increasing the congruency between expectations and reality will adjust satisfaction levels in this area. Therefore, one approach involves direct communication with employees about what is and is not possible within one's organization in relation to advancement. Similarly, greater satisfaction may be promoted by clear articulation of what is involved in moving up in the student affairs profession generally, rather than at a specific institution. Student affairs professionals are typically quite mobile. They tend to work for more than one institution and often relocate geographically for new positions, particularly to be able to advance in the profession. Supervisors can promote higher levels of satisfaction with opportunities for promotion by framing advancement as movement within departments or divisions, lateral moves to other divisions, between institutions, or between institutional types

and sizes. Further, supervisors can enhance the likelihood of such career progression by introducing staff to advanced tasks and cultivating the skills necessary to perform them.

The profession can use this information about significantly higher levels of satisfaction to promote itself. Student affairs practitioners should be proud of the fact that our entry- and mid-level professionals are more satisfied than the general workforce with the job in general, coworkers, supervision, and the work itself. This is information that can be used to attract talented individuals to the student affairs field.

It is important, however, that efforts are made to attenuate the areas of satisfaction where student affairs professionals do not compare favorably to the "generally satisfied" level. Student affairs professionals reported being less satisfied with the extrinsic rewards of their work, specifically, opportunities for promotion and pay. While it would be ideal to increase remuneration and provide increased numbers of advanced positions, this is unrealistic. Instead, the student affairs profession might benefit from focusing on the features that initially drew entry- and mid-level professionals to this work and to help these employees develop and maintain realistic expectations of what they can expect in terms of pay and advancement, thus more appropriately balancing expectations, perceptions, and rewards as postulated by expectancy theory.

Age matters

In general, respondents over 39 years of age were more satisfied than younger individuals involved in this study. In particular, the differences were significant along the measures of satisfaction with the work itself, pay, opportunities for promotion, coworkers, and the work itself. The results concerning age in combination with Lawler's theory (1994) suggest that attending to the expectancies and perceptions of younger staff will increase facet satisfaction. As

previously noted, candid conversations about expectations and perceptions may decrease the gap that can result in lower levels of satisfaction. This education of younger staff is particularly important given their probable lack of familiarity with the world of work and with student affairs in particular. Further, such exchanges will lay a productive foundation for the profession by modeling dialogues that contribute to the development of satisfied student affairs professionals. In addition, as many younger professionals quickly find a niche and specialization in student affairs, they may have limited awareness of the demands and challenges involved in other areas of student affairs. Bringing staff together to discuss both the difficulties and rewards of their daily efforts will help ground perceptions in the reality of others' work.

The Millennials at work

Forty-six percent of participants in this study reported their age as being below 30 years and 69% reported having between 0 and 5 years of experience in the student affairs profession. While the specific numbers are unknown, it is possible to hypothesize that many of these participants were born after 1985, placing them within the Millennial generation (Strauss & Howe, 2000). Describing members of the Millennial generation as special, sheltered, confident, team-oriented, achieving, pressured, and conventional, Strauss and Howe explored the general implications of this generation for society. As increasing numbers of these individuals begin to enter the workforce, additional attention has centered on what this means for organizations, coworkers, and supervisors (c.f., Textor, 2007). It is possible to hypothesize that Millennial characteristics have influenced the results of this study. For example, ". . . Millennials have been regarded as special since birth and have been more obsessed-over at every age than" the previous generation (Strauss & Howe, 2000, p. 13). It is unlikely that, as professionals, Millennials will easily—or willingly—shed this special status. Supervisors, therefore, would be well advised to

educate themselves about the Millennial generation in order to understand their impact on the workplace and how to provide appropriate supervision that fosters skill development and effective job performance.

The beginning is important

Entry-level staff reported lower levels of satisfaction on five of the six measures of satisfaction. While these differences were significant only for satisfaction with the job in general and the work itself, results imply that much effort should be invested to help increase the job satisfaction of student affairs entry-level staff. It bears repeating that expectancy theory suggests that higher job satisfaction will result when perceptions of what should be received (based on one's inputs into the job) are equal to perceptions of what others receive relative to their inputs and differing job characteristics (Lawler, 1994). Therefore, entry-level staff members are more likely to be satisfied when they are aware of how rewards relate to what they have invested in the job and how rewards with their perceptions of others' efforts and rewards. In order to accomplish this, organizations should strive for greater transparency regarding expectations of employees and how rewards are determined. Further, staff—particularly newer staff with less familiarity with student affairs generally, their job in particular, and the work of others in the organization—will benefit from routine conversations about these matters.

There are additional implications for the profession in relation to our less satisfied entry-level professionals and attrition from the profession. The literature points to a relationship between lower levels of job satisfaction and higher turnover (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; Lawler & Porter, 1969; Locke, 1976; Quarstein, McAfee, & Glassman, 1992). Given the lower satisfaction levels of entry-level staff, it should not be surprising that student affairs loses a significant proportion of professionals by the fifth year of employment (Renn & Hodges, 2007).

The implications for the profession should be clear: if we are to retain greater proportions and numbers of entry-level staff, then we must assist them in reconciling differences between the rewards they expect for their specific jobs, what they receive, and their perceptions of this dynamic for other staff.

Although the research questions for this study did not specifically explore the relationship between entry-level staff and their ages, we might presume that participants who identified themselves as entry-level also tend to be younger. Therefore, the effect of age in combination with position level on job satisfaction should not be overlooked. In other words, younger, entry-level staff may have even more need for assistance in reconciling perceptions, expectations, and reality in relation to the inputs and rewards of work. Graduate preparation programs offer one setting for such discussions, helping set the stage for realistic expectations for entry-level staff. In addition, prospective employers might find it beneficial to share relevant information during the recruitment and selection process in order to prevent negative dissonance as a new hire begins work.

Where you work in the organization matters

Differences in levels of job satisfaction were most frequent and striking when comparing the functional areas of student affairs. Significant differences were found for satisfaction with the job in general and four of the five facets of satisfaction, excluding only satisfaction with opportunities for promotion. Several key functional areas are discussed below.

With the exception of satisfaction with the work itself and supervision, those working in student affairs administration reported the highest or second highest levels of satisfaction on all measures. It is possible to infer that generalist responsibilities are a factor in high levels of job satisfaction. Higher satisfaction levels might be promoted by redesigning positions to encompass

more than one functional area through a large-scale reconceptualization of student affairs work within an institution, division, or department, the creation of collateral assignments, or intentional involvement of entry- and mid-level professionals in broad-based projects, committees, or work tasks.

On the other end of the spectrum, professionals involved in both career services and student conduct programs reported lower levels of job satisfaction in key areas. The statistically lower levels of satisfaction with pay for career services professionals may be the result of exposure to the larger world of work outside of student affairs and higher education. Interaction with and knowledge of other fields may provide a different comparison group for career services professionals. In addition, career services professionals are frequently drawn from the world of corporate employment and may enter student affairs with disparate expectations and perceptions of career services work in the higher education setting. These differing expectations would, according to Lawler, impact their levels of job satisfaction. Supervision of these professionals should involve the employee's expectancies-perceptions-rewards triangle with attention to the intrinsic rewards that tend to drive the student affairs profession. Although today's economic times are difficult, creative approaches to rewards (e.g., flexible hours, office enhancements, opportunity to select assignments, public recognition for good work) should not be overlooked. This approach applies, of course, to all functional areas, but particularly to career services where the lower satisfaction levels are significant.

Student conduct staff reported lower levels of satisfaction with the work itself in relation to all other functional areas; six of these differences were significant. Although student conduct administrators may be motivated by the opportunity to influence individual students' cognitive and moral development in positive ways, evidence of this impact may be delayed. Further, the

developmental influence on students may not be immediate and students themselves may not recognize or appreciate the impact of a behavioral intervention until years have passed. Job satisfaction levels may thus be negatively affected for those working in student conduct because visible achievement of their goals may be thwarted.

In relation to expectancy theory, this repeated lack of reinforcement of the positive outcomes involved in student conduct may intensify perceptions of disparity between inputs and rewards in relation to other student affairs staff and their efforts. Rosser and Janivar (2003) found that recognition was the greatest contributor to job satisfaction in their model for mid-level student affairs professionals' intent to leave. Student affairs organizations and their institutions will benefit from increasing and making prominent their appreciation for the work of those involved in student conduct efforts, regardless of visible outcomes for students. While it is not recommended that supervisors single out these professionals to the exclusion of other staff, careful reminders of the challenges involved in student conduct will help balance the perception-expectation-rewards equation. Another approach suggests that it may be beneficial to help everyone within student affairs notice and appreciate the ways in which they already address and potentially impact student behavior, as there may be misperceptions that only student conduct staff have the ability to hold students accountable and are involved in the less enjoyable aspects of upholding institutional standards.

As the largest segment of entry- and mid-level professionals in student affairs, attention should be directed to the work experiences of residence life professionals. Although mean scores on the six measures of job satisfaction were not necessarily the lowest of the various functional areas, statistically significant differences were found in all areas except satisfaction with opportunities for promotion. This is cause for concern as so many of our new professionals begin

their student affairs careers in residence life positions, as evidenced in this study where 36% of respondents reported working in residence life/housing. If these professionals have significantly lower levels of job satisfaction in multiple areas, our profession is likely to continue to experience high rates of attrition and turnover. While specific recommendations will vary based on institutional context and position responsibilities, Belch, Wilson, and Dunkel (in press) found four aspects of organizational culture that support the recruitment and retention of entry-level residence life staff. Linking organizational culture to job satisfaction, they suggested that a clearly articulated mission (either departmental or institutional) along with a culture that supports engagement with department activities, professionalism, and professional development opportunities will enhance efforts to attract and retain entry-level residence life staff.

In a different vein, there are some positive results within functional areas, notably within academic endeavors and wellness. The professionals clustered into academic endeavors all shared a common focus on the academic efforts of students. The high levels of satisfaction reported for global satisfaction and the work itself imply a relationship with a shared goal of student academic success and the type of work involved in promoting that success. Inculcating collaboration between academic and student affairs personnel, recommended as good practice for higher education (Whitt, Elkins Nesheim, Kellogg, McDonald & Wells, 2008), would likely support higher satisfaction levels in additional functional areas of student affairs.

Implications for Future Research

The next logical study concerns replicating this inquiry for senior level student affairs professionals in order to capture this remaining population within the profession. Further, a comparative look at all three levels would add to our knowledge of student affairs professionals' job satisfaction. In-depth examination of student affairs functional areas would provide important

insights into the significant differences identified in this study, particularly in relation to those working in academic endeavors and wellness, where satisfaction levels were high, and residence life, where satisfaction levels were low, so that we might either transfer or diminish related job features to other functional areas. In addition, attention should be focused on variables that more effectively predict job satisfaction for entry- and mid-level student affairs staff (e.g., remuneration levels and types, supervisor experience levels, size of department, number of coworkers). Further, it would be interesting to more closely examine the expectations of entry-level professionals in relation to actual satisfaction levels in order to better understand attrition of these professionals. Finally, a qualitative exploration of job satisfaction would help us better understand why entry- and mid-level professionals have reported the levels of job satisfaction noted in this study. Such an exploration might focus on particular position level, age grouping, or functional area in order to reveal important insights into job satisfaction within student affairs.

Conclusion

Job satisfaction in student affairs has been connected to teamwork (Loyd, 2005), employee and institutional characteristics (Grant, 2006), synergistic supervision (Tull, 2006), locus of control (Tarver, et al., 1999) and organizational commitment and organizational politics (Boehman, 2007). This study used two valid and reliable instruments and expectancy theory to examine job satisfaction in relation to the general population and identified significant group differences between various individual characteristics. Further, predictors of satisfaction with opportunities for promotion and pay were identified for entry- and mid-level staff, respectively.

Recommendations arising from the results of this study included using study data to promote careers in student affairs, using Lawler's Expectancy-Theory as a guide when working with younger professionals, understanding the Millennial generation at work, focusing on entry-

level staff and their satisfaction as a way to reduce attrition from the profession, and several suggestions specific to functional areas within student affairs.

While satisfaction with one's job is somewhat of a moving target due to the changing nature of work, which is exacerbated by the current status of the economy and pressures on higher education, there are specific frameworks that can be used and actions that can be taken to maximize entry- and mid-level student affairs professionals' satisfaction with their jobs. It is incumbent upon supervisors and leaders to attend to these factors in order to provide students with environments that maximize their learning while in college.

REFERENCES

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, and bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society, 4,* 139-158.

Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67,* 422-436.

Ambrose, S., Huston, T., & Norman, M. (2005). A qualitative method for assessing faculty satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 46,* 803-830.

American College Personnel Association. (2008a). *About ACPA.* Retrieved November 21, 2008, from http://www.myacpa.org/au/au_index.cfm

American College Personnel Association. (2008b). *Guidelines and instructions for requests for access to membership for research and assessment purposes*. Retrieved November 21, 2008, from http://www.myacpa.org/research/guidelines.cfm

Antony, J. S., & Valadez, J. R. (2002). Exploring the satisfaction of part-time college faculty in the United States. *Review of Higher Education, 26,* 41-56.

Balzer, W. K., Kihm, J. A., Smith, P. C., Irwin, J. L., Bachiochi, P. D., Robie, C., Sinar, E. F., & Parra, L. F. (1997). *User's manual for the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; 1997 revision) and the Job in General (JIG) scales.* Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.

Balzer, W. K., Kihm, J. A., Smith, P. C., Irwin, J. L., Bachiochi, P. D., Robie, C., Sinar, E. F., & Parra, L. F. (2000). Users' manual for the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; 1997 version) and the Job in General scales. In J. M. Stanton & C. D. Crossley (Eds.), *Electronic resources for the JDI and JIG*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.

Barrett, K. (2007, July 13). Bridging the cultural divide between academic and student affairs. *NetResults*. Retrieved October 16, 2007, from http://www.naspa.org

Belch, H. A., & Mueller, J. A. (2003). Candidate pools or puddles: Challenges and trends in the recruitment and hiring of resident directors. *Journal of College Student Development, 44,* 29-46.

Belch, H. A., Wilson, M. E., & Dunkel, N. (in press). Cultures of success: Recruiting and retaining new live-in residence life professionals. *College Student Affairs Journal.*

Billingsley, B. S., & Cross, L. H. (1992). Predictors of commitment, job satisfaction, and intent to stay in teaching: A comparison of general and special educators. *Journal of Special Education, 25,* 453-471.

Boehman, J. (2007). Affective commitment among student affairs professionals. *NASPA Journal, 44,* 307-326.

Bonfiglio, R. A. (2007, September 26). Two cultures. *NetResults*. Retrieved September 27, 2007, from http://www.naspa.org

Burns, M. A. (1982). Who leaves the student affairs field? *NASPA Journal, 20*(2), 9-12.

Castle, N. G. (2007). Assessing job satisfaction of nurse aides in nursing homes. *Journal of Gerontological Nursing, 33*(5), 41-47.

Castle, N. G., Engberg, J., Anderson, R. A., & Men, A. (2007). Job satisfaction of nurse aides in nursing homes: Intent to leave and turnover. *The Gerontologist, 47*, 193-204.

Chiu, C. (1998). Do professional women have lower job satisfaction than professional men? Lawyers as a case study. *Sex Roles, 38,* 521-537.

Converse, P. D., Wolfe, E. W., Huang, X., & Oswald, F. L. (2008). Response rates for mixed-method surveys using mail and e-mail/web. *American Journal of Evaluation, 29,* 99-107.

Cook, C., Heath, F., & Thompson, R. L. (2000). A meta-analysis of response rates in web- or internet-based surveys. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 60,* 821-836.

Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Culver, S. M., Wolfe, L. M., & Cross, L. H. (1990). Testing a model of teacher satisfaction for Blacks and Whites. *American Educational Research Journal, 27,* 323-349.

Daly, C. J., & Dee, J. R. (2006). Greener pastures: Faculty turnover intent in urban public universities. *Journal of Higher Education, 77,* 776-803.

Davis, B. A., Ward, C., Woodall, M., Shultz, S., & Davis, H. (2007). Comparison of job satisfaction between experienced medical-surgical nurses and experienced critical care nurses. *MEDSURG Nursing, 16*(5), 311-316.

Davis, J., & Wilson, S. M. (2000). Principals' efforts to empower teachers: Effects on teacher motivation and job satisfaction and stress. *The Clearing House, 73,* 349-353.

Eichinger, J. (2000). Job stress and satisfaction among special education teachers: Effects of gender and social role orientation. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 47,* 397-412.

Evans, N. J. (1988). Attrition of student affairs professionals: A review of the literature. *Journal of College Student Development, 29,* 19-24.

Flowers, L. A. (2005). Job satisfaction differentials among African American faculty at 2-year and 4-year institutions. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 29*, 317-328.

Fortney, S. S. (2001). An empirical study of associate satisfaction, law firm culture, and the effects of billable hour requirements. 64 Tex. B. J. 1060.

Glisson, C., & Durick, M. (1988). Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in human service organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 33,* 61-81.

Gonyea, R. M. (2005). Self-reported data in institutional research: Review and recommendations. In P. D. Umbach (Ed.), *Survey research: Emerging issues* (pp. 73-89). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Grant, J. L. (2006). *An examination of the job satisfaction of mid-level managers in student affairs administration.* Doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI.

Gruneberg, M. M. (1979). *Understanding job satisfaction.* London: MacMillian.

Hackman, R. J., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational behavior and human performance, 16,* 250-279.

Harwell, M. R. (2003). Review of the Job Descriptive Index (1997 Revision) and the Job In General Scales. In B. S. Plake, J. C. Impara, & R. A. Spies (Eds.). *The fifteenth mental measurements yearbook* (pp. 490-492). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.

Hayslett, M. M., & Wildemuth, B. M. (2004). Pixels or pencils? The relative effectiveness of web-based versus paper surveys. *Library & Information Science Research, 24,* 73-93.

Heinz, J. P., Hull, K. E., & Harter, A. A. (1999). Lawyers and their discontents: Findings from a survey of the Chicago bar. 74 Ind. L.J. 735.

Herzberg, F. (1976). One more time: How do you motivate employees? In M. M. Gruneberg (Ed.), *Job satisfaction—a reader* (pp. 17-32). New York: Wiley.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Hull, K. E. (1999). The paradox of the contented female lawyer. *Law and Society Review, 33,* 687-702.

Hurren, B. L. (2006). The effects of principals' humor on teachers' job satisfaction. *Educational Studies, 32,* 373-385.

Huysman, J. T. (2008). Rural teacher satisfaction: An analysis of beliefs and attitudes of rural teachers' job satisfaction. *The Rural Educator, 29*(2)*,* 31-38.

Ironson G. H., Smith, P. C., Brannick, M. T., Gibson, W. M., & Paul, K. B. (1989). Construction of a Job in General Scale: A comparison of global, composite, and specific measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74,* 193-200.

Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (1997). Administrative staff turnover: Predicting the intentions of stayers and leavers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Albuquerque, NM, November 1997.

Johnsrud, L. K., Heck, R. H., & Rosser, V. J. (2000). Morale matters: Midlevel administrators and their intent to leave. *Journal of Higher Education, 71,* 34-59.

Judge, T. A., & Watanabe, S. (1993), Another look at the job satisfaction-life satisfaction relationship, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78,* 939-948.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83,* 17-34.

Judge, T. A., Parker, S., Colbert, A. E., Heller, D., & Ilies, R. (2001). Job satisfaction: A cross-cultural review. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, S. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology,* Volume 2, Organizational Psychology (pp. 25-52). London: Sage.

King, N. (1976). Clarification and evaluation of the two-factor theory of job satisfaction. In M. M. Gruneberg (Ed.), *Job satisfaction—a reader* (pp. 33-55). New York: Wiley.

Kinicki, A. J., McKee-Ryan, F. M., Schriesheim, C. A., & Carson, K. P. (2002). Assessing the construct validity of the Job Descriptive Index: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 14-32.

Kovner, C., Brewer, C., Wu, Y., Cheng, Y., & Suziki, M. (2006). Factors associated with work satisfaction of registered nurses. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 35,* 71-79.

Kreis, K., & Brockopp, D. Y. (2001). Autonomy: A component of teacher job satisfaction. *Education, 107*, 110-115.

Laband, D. N., & Lentz, B. F. (1998). The effects of sexual harassment on job satisfaction, earnings, and turnover, among female lawyers. 51 Ind. & Lab. Rel. Rev 594.

Lawler, E. E., III. (1976). Job design and employee motivation. In M. M. Gruneberg (Ed.), *Job satisfaction—a reader* (pp. 90-98). New York: Wiley.

Lawler, E. E. III. (1994). *Motivation in work organizations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lawler, E. E., III, & Porter, L. W. (1969). The effect of performance on job satisfaction. *Industrial Relations, 8*, 20-28.

Lawler, E. E., III, & Porter, L. W. (1976). The effect of performance on job satisfaction. In M. M. Gruneberg (Ed.), *Job satisfaction—a reader* (pp. 207 -217). New York: Wiley.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing.

Lorden, L. P. (1998). Attrition in the student affairs profession. *NASPA Journal, 35,* 207-216.

Loyd, N. L. (2005). *The impact of a teamwork environment on job satisfaction: A study of college and university student affairs administrators.* University of Virginia.Charlottesville, VA??

Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality.* New York: Harper & Row.

Mau W. J., Ellsworth, R., & Hawley, D. (2008). Job satisfaction and career persistence in beginning teachers. *International Journal of Educational Management, 22,* 48-61.

Maynard, D. C., & Joseph, T. A. (2008). Are all part-time faculty underemployed? The influence of faculty status preference on satisfaction and commitment. *Higher Education, 55,* 139-154.

Mertler, C. (2002). Job satisfaction and perception of motivation among middle and high school teachers. *American Secondary Education, 31*(1), 43-53.

Mobley, G. M., Jaret, C., Marsh, K. & Lim, Y. Y. (1994). Mentoring, job satisfaction, gender, and the legal profession. *Sex Roles, 31,* 79-98.

Norman, K. B. (1994). The Alabama state bar quality of life survey results. 55 Ala. Law 152.

O'Connor, E. J., Peters, L. H., & Gordon, S. M. (1978). The measurement of job satisfaction: Current practices and future considerations. *Journal of Management, 4*(2), 17-26.

O'Toole, J., & Lawler, E. E., III. (2006). *The new American workplace.* New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Olsen, D. (1993). Work satisfaction and stress in the first and third year of academic appointment. *Journal of Higher Education, 64,* 453-471.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research, Volume 2*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pearson, D. A., & Seiler, R. E. (1983). Environmental satisfiers in academe. *Higher Education, 12,* 35-47.

Quarstein, V. A., McAfee, R. B., & Glassman, M. (1992). The situational occurrences theory of job satisfaction. *Human Relations, 45,* 859-873.

Renn, K. A., & Hodges, J. P. (2007). The first year on the job: Experiences of new professionals in student affairs. *NASPA Journal, 44,* 367-391.

Richmond, J., & Sherman, K. (1991). Student-development preparation and placement: A longitudinal study of graduate students' and new professionals' experiences. *Journal of College Student Development, 32,* 8-32.

Rinehart, J. S., & Short, P. M. (2003). *Education, 114,* 570-580.

Rosser, V. J. (2004a). A national study on midlevel leaders in higher education: The unsung professionals in the academy. *Higher Education, 48,* 317-337.

Rosser, V. J. (2004b). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their worklife and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 45,* 285-309.

Rosser, V. J. (2005). Measuring change in faculty perceptions over time: An examination of their worklife and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 46,* 81-107.

Rosser, V. J., & Javinar, J. M. (2003). Midlevel student affairs leaders' intentions to leave: Examining the quality of their professional and institutional work life. *Journal of College Student Development, 44,* 813-830.

Rosser, V. J., & Townsend, B. K. (2006). Determining public 2-year college faculty's intent to leave: An empirical model. *Journal of Higher Education, 77,* 125-147.

Schiestel, C. (2007). Job satisfaction among Arizona adult nurse practitioners. *Journal of the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners, 19*, 30-34.

Schulz, I. L., & Teddlie, C. (2001). The relationship between teachers' job satisfaction and their perceptions of principals' use of power and school effectiveness. *Education, 109,* 461-468.

Seifert, T. A., & Umbach, P. D. (2008). The effects of faculty demographic characteristics and disciplinary context on job satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 49,* 357-381.

Sharp, T. P. (2008). Job satisfaction among psychiatric registered nurses in New England. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing, 15,* 374-378.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement: A strategy for the study of attitudes.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Solmon, L. C., & Tierney, M. L. (1977). Determinants of job satisfaction among college administrators, *Journal of Higher Education, 48,* 412-431.

Stempien, L. R., & Loeb, R. C. (2002). Differences in job satisfaction between general education and special education teachers: Implications for researchers. *Remedial and Special Education, 23*, 258-267.

Strauss, N., & Howe, S. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation.* New York: Vintage.

Tarver, D., Canada, R., & Lim, M. (1999). The relationship between job satisfaction and locus of control among college student affairs administrators and academic administrators. *NASPA Journal, 36,* 96-105.

Textor, K. (Producer). (November 11, 2007). The millennials are coming! *60 minutes.* [Television broadcast]. New York: Central Broadcasting Service.

Thompson, D. P., McNamara, J. F. & Hoyle, J. R. (1997). Job satisfaction in educational organizations: A synthesis of research findings. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 33,* 7-37.

Toutkoushian, R. K., & Bellas, M. L. (2003). The effects of part-time employment and gender on faculty earnings and satisfaction. *Journal of Higher Education, 74,* 172-195.

Tull, A. (2006). Synergistic supervision, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development, 47,* 465-480.

Ulrich, C., O'Donnell, P., Taylor, C., Farrar, A., Danis, M., & Grady, C. (2007). Ethical climate, ethic stress, and the job satisfaction of nurses and social workers in the United States. *Social Science and Medicine, 65,* 1708-1719.

Valadez, J. R., & Antony, J. S. (2001). Job satisfaction and commitment of two-year college part-time faculty. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 25*, 97-108.

Volkwein, J. F., & Parmley, K. (2000). Comparing administrative satisfaction in public and private universities. *Research in Higher Education, 41,* 95-116.

Volkwein, J. F., & Zhou, Y. (2003). Testing a model of administrative job satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 44,* 149-171.

Volkwein, J. F., Malik, S. M., & Naipierski-Pranci, M. (1998). Administrative satisfaction and the regulatory climate at public universities. *Research in Higher Education, 39,* 43-63.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.

Whitt, E. J., Elkins Nesheim, B., Kellogg, A. H., McDonald, W. M., & Wells, C. A. (2008). "Principles of good practice" for academic and student affairs partnership programs. *Journal of College Student Development*, *49*, 235-249.

Wild, P., Parsons, V., & Dietz, E. (2006). Nurse practitioner's characteristics and job satisfaction. *Journal of the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners, 18*, 544-549.

Yeager, S. J. (1981). Dimensionality of the Job Descriptive Index. *Academy of Management Journal, 24,* 205-212.

APPENDIX A

First E-mail with Informed Participant Consent

Subject line: Job Satisfaction Survey

Dear Colleague,

Greetings! We hope your semester has gotten off to a positive start. Denise Davidson is conducting a national study about job satisfaction of entry-level and mid-level student affairs professionals in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree in higher education administration at Bowling Green State University. The data collected from this study will be published in her doctoral dissertation.

You have been identified as a student affairs professional based on your most recent ACPA membership application and have been selected for this study because of your position level (i.e., entry-level or mid-level professional). You are being asked to provide information about your satisfaction with several aspects of your current position including the work itself, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, the people in your workplace, and the job in general. Additional demographic questions are also included that concern you, your work, and your institution.

Very little statistical data is available about job satisfaction of student affairs professionals working at different position levels throughout the nation using a valid and reliable instrument. Your participation in this study will help fill that gap in our knowledge. The survey will be administered online and will be available for you to complete from **February 17th through March 3rd.** The survey should take you approximately 10 to15 minutes to complete. Completion and submission of the survey indicates your consent to participate in this study. After completing the survey, please clear your browser cache and page history.

Although e-mail and electronic communication are not 100% secure, no personal information about you or any information identifying your institution will be collected or retained. Data concerning job and company tenure, age, educational attainment, ethnicity, gender, and full- or part-time status will be shared with Bowling Green State University in order to refine national norms on job satisfaction. Participation in this study is voluntary. You do not have to answer any question you are not comfortable answering and you may end your participation in the study by closing your browser window and not submitting the survey at any time. There are no anticipated risks associated with completing this survey.

Should you have any questions about your participation in this study, please contact Denise L. Davidson, Doctoral Student, Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs, Bowling Green State University, at denised@bgsu.edu, 419-372-7305, her dissertation chairperson, Dr. William E. Knight, at wknight@bgsu.edu, 419-372-7816, or members of her committee (Dr. Michael D. Coomes, mcoomes@bgsu.edu, 419-372-7157 and Dr. Maureen E. Wilson, mewilso@bgsu.edu, 419-372-7321). If you have questions about the conduct of this study or your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of Bowling Green State University's Human Subjects Review Board at (419) 372-7716 (hsrb@bgsu.edu).

Please click here to complete the survey: http://survey.bgsu.edu/surveys/ir/jdijig/jdijig.htm The survey will be available from February 17-March 3, 2009.

Thank you for your participation,

Denise L. Davidson
Doctoral Student
Higher Education and Student Affairs
Bowling Green State University

Vernon A. Wall
Director
Educational Programs & Publications
ACPA

BGSU HSRB – Approved for Use
ID # H09D156GX2
EFFECTIVE 2/12/09
EXPIRES 1/20/10

APPENDIX B

Second E-mail with Informed Participant Consent

Subject line: Job Satisfaction Survey – 7 days remaining

Dear Colleague,

Last week you received a request to participate in a study to collect information about your satisfaction with your current position in student affairs. We recognize that your time is precious and occupied with many competing demands. If you have already completed the survey, thank you very much for your time and the valuable information you provided.

If you have not yet completed the survey, there is still time for you to participate. The survey will be available through March 3rd and should only take approximately 10 to15 minutes to complete. Please click on the following link to access the survey: http://survey.bgsu.edu/surveys/ir/jdijig/jdijig.htm

This research is being conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree in higher education administration at Bowling Green State University. Your responses will be anonymous; no personally identifiable information will be collected. Data concerning job and company tenure, age, educational attainment, ethnicity, gender, and full- or part-time status will be shared with Bowling Green State University in order to refine national norms on job satisfaction. You may choose not to participate in this research, as well as not to answer any question without penalty. Beginning the survey constitutes your consent to participate in this research. To prevent others from accessing your responses, please delete your cache and close your browser window after submitting the survey.

Should you have any questions about your participation in this study, please contact Denise L. Davidson, Doctoral Student, Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs, Bowling Green State University, at denised@bgsu.edu, 419-372-7305, her dissertation chairperson, Dr. William E. Knight, at wknight@bgsu.edu, 419-372-7816, or members of her committee (Dr. Michael D. Coomes, mcoomes@bgsu.edu, 419-372-7157 and Dr. Maureen E. Wilson, mewilso@bgsu.edu, 419-372-7321). If you have questions about the conduct of this study or your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of Bowling Green State University's Human Subjects Review Board at (419) 372-7716 (hsrb@bgsu.edu).

The survey will be available at http://survey.bgsu.edu/surveys/ir/jdijig/jdijig.htm through March 3, 2009.

Thank you,

Denise L. Davidson
Doctoral Student
Higher Education and Student Affairs
Bowling Green State University

Vernon A. Wall
Director
Educational Programs & Publications
ACPA

BGSU HSRB – Approved for Use
ID # H09D156GX2
EFFECTIVE 2/12/09
EXPIRES 1/20/10

APPENDIX C

Third E-mail with Informed Participant Consent

Subject line: Job Satisfaction Survey – 1 day remaining

Dear Colleague,

You were selected to participate in a study to collect information about your work in student affairs. We recognize that your time is precious and occupied with many competing demands. If you have already completed the survey, thank you very much for your time and the valuable information you provided.

If you have not yet completed the survey, there is still time for you to participate. The survey will be available through tomorrow, March 3rd and should only take approximately 10 to15 minutes to complete. Please click on the following link to access the survey: http://survey.bgsu.edu/surveys/ir/jdijig/jdijig.htm

This research is being conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree in higher education administration at Bowling Green State University. Your responses will be anonymous; no personally identifiable information will be collected. Data concerning job and company tenure, age, educational attainment, ethnicity, gender, and full- or part-time status will be shared with Bowling Green State University in order to refine national norms on job satisfaction. You may choose not to participate in this research, as well as not to answer any question without penalty. Beginning the survey constitutes your consent to participate in this research. To prevent others from accessing your responses, please delete your cache and close your browser window after submitting the survey.

Should you have any questions about your participation in this study, please contact Denise L. Davidson, Doctoral Student, Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs, Bowling Green State University, at denised@bgsu.edu, 419-372-7305, her dissertation chairperson, Dr. William E. Knight, at wknight@bgsu.edu, 419-372-7816, or members of her committee (Dr. Michael D. Coomes, mcoomes@bgsu.edu, 419-372-7157 and Dr. Maureen E. Wilson, mewilso@bgsu.edu, 419-372-7321). If you have questions about the conduct of this study or your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of Bowling Green State University's Human Subjects Review Board at (419) 372-7716 (hsrb@bgsu.edu).

The survey will be available at http://survey.bgsu.edu/surveys/ir/jdijig/jdijig.htm through March 3, 2009.

Thank you,

Denise L. Davidson
Doctoral Student
Higher Education and Student Affairs
Bowling Green State University

Vernon A. Wall
Director
Educational Programs & Publications
ACPA

BGSU HSRB – Approved for Use
ID # H09D156GX2
EFFECTIVE 2/12/09
EXPIRES 1/20/10

APPENDIX D

Sample Items from the Job Descriptive Index and Job in General Scales

WORK ON PRESENT JOB

Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work?

Circle: 1 for "Yes" if it describes your work
2 for "No" if it does not describe it
3 for "?" if you cannot decide

	Yes	No	?
Fascinating	1	2	3
Routine	1	2	3
Satisfying	1	2	3
Boring	1	2	3

PRESENT PAY

Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your present pay?

	Yes	No	?
Income adequate for normal expenses	1	2	3
Fair	1	2	3
Barely live on income	1	2	3
Bad	1	2	3

COWORKERS

Think of the majority of people that you work with now or the people you meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these people?

	Yes	No	?
Stimulating	1	2	3
Boring	1	2	3
Slow	1	2	3
Helpful	1	2	3

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION

Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your opportunities for promotion?

	Yes	No	?
Good opportunities for promotion	1	2	3
Opportunities somewhat limited	1	2	3
Promotion on ability	1	2	3
Dead-end job	1	2	3

SUPERVISION

Think of your supervisor and the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your supervision?

	Yes	No	?
Asks my advice	1	2	3
Hard to please	1	2	3
Impolite	1	2	3
Praises good work	1	2	3

JOB IN GENERAL

Think of your job in general. All in all, what is it like most of the time? For each of the following words or phrases, circle:

	Yes	No	?
Pleasant	1	2	3
Bad	1	2	3
Ideal	1	2	3
Waste of time	1	2	3

APPENDIX E

Demographic Survey Items

1. With which gender do you identify?
    a. Male
    b. Female
    c. Transgender
    d. Prefer not to respond

2. With which race/ethnicity do you identify?
    a. African American
    b. Asian/Pacific Islander
    c. Caucasian
    d. Hispanic
    e. Multiracial
    f. Native American
    g. Other
    h. Prefer not to respond

3. What is your age?
    a. < 25 years of age
    b. 25 - 29 years of age
    c. 30 - 34 years of age
    d. 35 - 39 years of age
    e. 40 - 44 years of age
    f. 45 - 49 years of age
    g. 50 - 54 years of age
    h. 55 - 59 years of age
    i. 60 - 64 years of age
    j. 65 years of age and older

4. Please indicate your highest level of education:
    a. Certificate
    b. Associate
    c. Bachelor's
    d. Master's
    e. Education Specialist
    f. Professional (M.D., J.D., etc.)
    g. Doctorate (Ph.D., Ed.D.)
    h. Other

5. Please select your current position level:
    a. Entry-level
    b. Mid-level

6. Is your current position:
    a. Full-time (35 or more hours per week)?
    b. Part-time?

7. How long have you held your current position? Please round up to the nearest year
    a. 0 - 1 year
    b. 2 - 5 years
    c. 6 - 10 years
    d. 11 - 15 years
    e. 16 - 20 years
    f. 21 – 25 years
    g. 26 or more years

8. How long have you worked for your current institution? Please round up to the nearest full year.
    a. 0 - 1 year
    b. 2 - 5 years
    c. 6 - 10 years
    d. 11 - 15 years
    e. 16 - 20 years
    f. 26 or more years

9. How long have you worked in student affairs? Please do not include graduate assistantships and round up to the nearest year.
    a. 0 - 1 year
    b. 2 - 5 years
    c. 6 - 10 years
    d. 11 - 15 years
    e. 16 - 20 years
    f. 21 - 25 years
    g. 26 or more years

10. Please note state in which your institution is located.
    a. Institution Type
    b. Private 2-year
    c. Public 2-year
    d. Private 4-year
    e. Public 4-year
    f. For-profit company
    g. Non-profit company
    h. Other

11. Institutional enrollment
    a. Fewer than 2,000 students
    b. 2,000 - 9,999 students
    c. 10,000 – 19,999 students

d. 20,000 – 29,999 students
e. 30,000 – 39,000 students
f. 40,000 or more students

12. Highest Degree Awarded by Your Institution
    a. Certificate
    b. Associate
    c. Bachelor's
    d. Master's
    e. Education Specialist
    f. Professional (M.D., J.D., etc.)
    g. Doctorate (Ph.D., Ed.D.)
    h. Other

APPENDIX F

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Entry Level Professionals' Global Job Satisfaction and Predictor Variables

Variable	*M*	*SD*
Job in General		
Predictor variable		
1. African American	0.08	0.267
2. Caucasian	0.84	0.370
3. Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.41	0.494
4. Job Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.56	0.497
5. Job Tenure 6 -10 years	0.02	0.145
6. Company Tenure 11 or more years	0.00	0.065
7. Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.24	0.428
8. Student Affairs Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.65	0.479
9. Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.10	0.304
10. Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	0.01	0.113
11. Two year institutions	0.02	0.145
12. Professional degree as highest earned	0.02	0.130
13. Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	0.13	0.335
14. Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	0.36	0.481
15. Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	0.20	0.398
16. Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	0.17	0.373
17. Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	0.08	0.267
18. Highest degree awarded - Associate	0.02	0.130
19. Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	0.11	0.315
20. Highest degree awarded - Master's	0.21	0.411
21. Enrollment Management	0.10	0.298
22. Special Populations	0.02	0.145
23. Wellness	0.01	0.113
24. Student Involvement	0.19	0.395
25. Academic Endeavors	0.03	0.182
26. Career Services	0.08	0.267
27. Student Conduct	0.03	0.158
28. Gender	1.75	0.433

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
JIG	.014	.045	-.020	.026	-.021	.027	.043
Predictor variable							
1	--	-.655	.049	-.101	.179	-.019	.063
2		--	-.075	.149	-.255	.029	-.078
3			--	-.957	-.125	-.055	.666
4				--	-.168	.058	-.637
5					--	-.010	-.083
6						--	-.037
7							--
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
JIG	-.038	.005	-.015	-.024	.001	-.058	-.065
Predictor variable							
1	-.188	.219	-.033	-.038	-.038	-.063	-.050
2	.181	-.156	-.053	.058	-.031	-.004	.065
3	-.481	-.143	-.096	-.045	-.122	.065	-.072
4	.536	.043	.024	.050	.117	-.048	.068
5	-.199	.340	.246	-.020	-.020	-.057	.012
6	-.088	-.022	.575	-.009	-.009	-.025	-.049
7	-.756	-.191	-.064	-.074	-.074	.054	.017
8	--	-.456	-.154	.098	-.040	.018	.017
9		--	-.039	-.045	.173	-.088	-.019
10			--	-.015	-.015	-.044	-.086
11				--	-.017	-.051	.038
12					--	.048	-.030
13						--	-.289
14							--
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
JIG	.770	.000	.049	-.055	-.006	-.052	.117
Predictor variable							
1	-.019	.129	-.024	-.033	.000	-.073	-.038
2	.010	-.082	-.003	.050	.009	.061	-.016
3	-.038	.088	.017	-.019	.005	-.060	.025
4	.015	-.068	-.004	.024	-.017	.040	-.011
5	.078	-.066	-.043	-.017	.042	.067	-.048
6	.134	-.029	-.019	-.007	-.023	-.034	.203
7	-.097	.017	.063	-.064	.056	.000	-.044
8	-.045	-.027	.014	.085	-.021	.018	-.036
9	.156	-.001	-.098	-.039	-.030	-.005	.084
10	.137	.051	-.033	-.013	-.040	-.060	.093
11	-.065	-.059	.086	.864	-.047	-.069	.070
12	.103	-.059	-.038	-.015	-.047	.092	-.043
13	-.188	-.172	-.111	-.044	.556	.111	-.080
14	-.367	-.337	-.217	.073	-.011	.391	-.028
15	--	-.219	-.142	-.056	-.173	-.150	.065
16		--	-.130	-.051	-.159	-.234	-.027
17			--	-.033	-.103	-.151	-.038
18				--	-.040	-.060	.093
19					--	-.018	-.114
20						--	-.097
21							--
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
JIG	-.073	.017	.056	.091	.121	-.052	.102
Predictor variable							
1	-.043	-.033	.103	.034	-.024	.054	-.019
2	-.015	-.156	-.019	-.044	.041	-.002	.095
3	-.005	-.019	.072	-.016	.082	.193	.003
4	.011	.024	-.050	-.024	-.069	-.184	.032
5	-.022	-.017	-.072	.135	-.043	-.024	-.120
6	-.010	-.007	-.032	-.012	-.019	-.011	.038
7	.055	-.064	.030	.004	.063	.099	-.025
8	-.014	.085	.001	-.007	.014	-.105	.069
9	-.050	-.039	-.023	.014	-.098	.034	-.066
10	-.017	-.013	-.056	-.022	-.033	-.019	-.022
11	-.020	-.015	.103	-.025	-.038	-.021	.076
12	-.020	-.015	-.065	-.025	-.038	-.021	.000
13	.032	-.044	.104	-.022	-.015	-.062	.043
14	.012	-.006	-.028	-.043	.017	-.009	.019
15	-.072	.041	-.019	.027	-.019	-.080	-.045
16	.092	-.051	.014	-.085	-.044	.145	-.008
17	-.043	.110	-.060	.034	.037	-.047	-.056
18	-.017	-.013	.137	-.002	-.033	-.019	.066
19	.136	.080	.034	-.067	.102	.058	-.048
20	-.077	-.060	-.017	.074	-.151	-.019	.059
21	-.048	-.037	-.158	.061	-.093	-.052	.084
22	--	-.017	-.072	-.028	-.043	-.024	.085
23		--	-.056	-.022	-.033	-.019	-.110
24			--	-.092	-.142	-.080	-.020
25				--	-.055	-.031	.109
26					--	-.047	.129
27						--	-.094
28							--

APPENDIX G

Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Entry Level Professionals' Global Job Satisfaction

Variable	*B*	*SEB*	β
African American	-3.30	4.62	-0.067
Caucasian	-3.37	3.38	-0.095
Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	-3.58	2.49	-0.134
Job Tenure 6 -10 years	-2.41	7.27	-0.027
Company Tenure 11 or more years	1.75	19.98	0.009
Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	4.00	2.82	0.130
Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.20	3.32	0.005
Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	-4.48	10.25	-0.038
Two year institutions	9.10	13.69	0.090
Professional degree as highest earned	1.27	7.01	0.013
Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	-4.80	5.01	-0.122
Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	-1.75	3.87	-0.064
Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	2.23	3.92	0.067
Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	1.38	4.02	0.039
Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	1.82	4.69	0.037
Highest degree awarded - Associate	-17.08	15.83	-0.147
Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	4.29	3.95	0.103
Highest degree awarded - Master's	1.35	2.77	0.042
Enrollment Management	7.41	3.30	0.165*
Special Populations	-6.34	6.24	-0.070
Wellness	2.20	8.22	0.019
Student Involvement	4.68	2.39	0.141
Academic Endeavors	7.85	5.01	0.109
Career Services	7.23	3.50	0.147*
Student Conduct	0.02	5.80	0.000
Gender	2.80	2.13	0.092

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

APPENDIX H

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Entry Level Professionals' Satisfaction with Pay and Predictor Variables

Variable	*M*	*SD*
Job in General		
Predictor variable		
1. African American	0.08	0.267
2. Caucasian	0.84	0.370
3. Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.41	0.494
4. Job Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.56	0.497
5. Job Tenure 6 -10 years	0.02	0.145
6. Company Tenure 11 or more years	0.00	0.065
7. Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.24	0.428
8. Student Affairs Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.65	0.479
9. Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.10	0.304
10. Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	0.01	0.113
11. Two year institutions	0.02	0.145
12. Professional degree as highest earned	0.02	0.130
13. Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	0.13	0.335
14. Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	0.36	0.481
15. Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	0.20	0.398
16. Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	0.17	0.373
17. Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	0.08	0.267
18. Highest degree awarded - Associate	0.02	0.130
19. Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	0.11	0.315
20. Highest degree awarded - Master's	0.21	0.411
21. Enrollment Management	0.10	0.298
22. Special Populations	0.02	0.145
23. Wellness	0.01	0.113
24. Student Involvement	0.19	0.395
25. Academic Endeavors	0.03	0.182
26. Career Services	0.08	0.267
27. Student Conduct	0.03	0.158
28. Gender	1.75	0.433

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Pay	-.017	-.023	-.046	.046	-.001	.016	-.015
Predictor variable							
1	--	-.656	.050	-.102	.179	-.019	.064
2		--	-.076	.150	-.255	.029	-.079
3			--	-.957	-.124	-.055	.667
4				--	-.168	.058	-.638
5					--	-.010	-.083
6						--	-.037
7							--
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Pay	.005	.018	-.015	-.134	.037	-.032	-.040
Predictor variable							
1	-.188	.220	-.033	-.043	-.038	-.063	-.049
2	.182	-.157	-.053	.065	-.031	-.004	.064
3	-.482	-.141	-.096	-.064	-.111	.067	-.069
4	.537	.042	.024	.070	.116	-.050	.065
5	-.199	.340	.246	-.022	-.019	-.057	.013
6	-.088	-.022	.575	-.010	-.009	-.025	-.049
7	-.757	-.190	-.064	-.083	-.074	.055	.019
8	--	-.456	-.154	.110	-.040	.017	.015
9		--	-.039	-.050	.173	-.088	-.018
10			--	-.017	-.015	-.044	-.085
11				--	-.019	-.057	.013
12					--	.048	-.030
13						--	-.287
14							--
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Pay	.087	.089	-.140	-.124	.036	-.138	.002
Predictor variable							
1	-.022	.129	-.023	-.038	.000	-.072	-.041
2	.014	-.083	-.003	.058	.008	.060	-.010
3	-.045	.089	.018	-.044	.006	-.058	.014
4	.023	-.069	-.005	.049	-.018	.038	.001
5	.076	-.066	-.043	-.019	.042	.067	-.049
6	.132	-.029	-.019	-.009	-.023	-.034	.198
7	-.101	.018	.064	-.074	.057	.001	-.051
8	-.038	-.028	.013	.098	-.022	.016	-.025
9	.152	.000	-.098	-.045	-.030	-.004	.078
10	.135	.051	-.033	-.015	-.040	-.059	.090
11	.001	-.066	.068	.892	-.052	-.077	.150
12	.101	-.059	-.038	-.017	-.047	.092	-.044
13	-.190	-.171	-.111	-.051	.556	.112	-.084
14	-.370	-.335	-.216	.039	-.009	.392	-.038
15	--	-.221	-.143	.018	-.175	-.153	.090
16		--	-.129	-.059	-.158	-.233	-.032
17			--	-.038	-.102	-.150	-.041
18				--	-.047	-.069	.178
19					--	-.184	-.117
20						--	-.102
21							--
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Pay	-.145	-.024	-.112	-.007	-.053	-.007	-.006
Predictor variable							
1	-.043	-.033	.103	.034	-.023	.055	-.020
2	-.015	-.156	-.020	-.045	.040	-.002	.096
3	-.004	-.019	.074	-.015	.083	.193	.001
4	.011	.024	-.052	-.024	-.070	-.185	.034
5	-.022	-.017	-.072	.135	-.043	-.024	-.121
6	-.010	-.007	-.032	-.012	-.019	-.011	.038
7	.056	-.064	.031	.005	.064	.099	-.026
8	-.014	.084	-.001	-.008	.013	-.106	.071
9	-.050	-.039	-.022	.014	-.098	.034	-.067
10	-.017	-.013	-.056	-.021	-.033	-.018	-.230
11	-.022	-.017	.078	-.028	-.043	-.024	.085
12	-.019	-.015	-.064	-.025	-.038	-.021	-.001
13	.032	-.044	.105	-.002	-.015	-.062	.043
14	.013	-.006	-.026	-.043	.018	-.009	.017
15	-.073	.039	-.023	.025	-.022	-.080	-.040
16	.093	-.051	.015	-.084	-.043	.145	-.009
17	-.043	.110	-.059	.034	.037	-.047	-.057
18	-.019	-.015	.103	-.025	-.038	-.021	.076
19	.136	.081	.035	-.067	.102	-.057	-.490
20	-.077	-.059	-.016	.074	-.150	-.019	.058
21	-.049	-.038	-.161	-.062	-.095	-.054	.090
22	--	-.017	-.072	-.028	-.043	-.024	.085
23		--	-.056	-.021	-.033	-.018	-.111
24			--	-.092	-.141	-.079	-.021
25				--	-.054	-.031	.108
26					--	-.047	.129
27						--	-.095
28							--

APPENDIX I

Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Entry Level Professionals' Satisfaction with Pay

Variable	*B*	*SEB*	β
African American	-6.39	5.46	-0.107
Caucasian	-4.23	4.01	-0.098
Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	-2.73	2.94	-0.084
Job Tenure 6 -10 years	1.20	8.61	0.011
Company Tenure 11 or more years	14.26	20.09	0.058
Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	2.10	3.33	0.056
Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	-2.02	3.93	-0.038
Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	-14.98	12.13	-0.106
Two year institutions	-7.82	16.20	-0.071
Professional degree as highest earned	2.54	8.30	0.021
Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	-1.41	5.92	-0.030
Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	1.28	4.57	0.039
Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	2.59	4.59	0.065
Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	3.34	4.75	0.078
Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	-9.36	5.54	-0.156
Highest degree awarded - Associate	-8.41	18.15	-0.068
Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	2.80	4.67	0.055
Highest degree awarded - Master's	-8.16	3.27	-0.21*
Enrollment Management	-3.05	3.87	-0.057
Special Populations	-24.06	7.39	-2.18**
Wellness	-8.35	9.73	-0.059*
Student Involvement	-6.06	2.83	-0.150
Academic Endeavors	-1.90	5.92	-0.022
Career Services	-8.00	4.15	-0.133
Student Conduct	-3.32	6.86	-0.033
Gender	1.77	2.52	0.048

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

APPENDIX J

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Entry Level Professionals' Satisfaction with Opportunities for Promotion and Predictor Variables

Variable	*M*	*SD*
Job in General		
Predictor variable		
1. African American	0.08	0.267
2. Caucasian	0.84	0.370
3. Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.41	0.494
4. Job Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.56	0.497
5. Job Tenure 6 -10 years	0.02	0.145
6. Company Tenure 11 or more years	0.00	0.065
7. Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.24	0.428
8. Student Affairs Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.65	0.479
9. Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.10	0.304
10. Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	0.01	0.113
11. Two year institutions	0.02	0.145
12. Professional degree as highest earned	0.02	0.130
13. Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	0.13	0.335
14. Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	0.36	0.481
15. Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	0.20	0.398
16. Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	0.17	0.373
17. Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	0.08	0.267
18. Highest degree awarded – Associate	0.02	0.130
19. Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	0.11	0.315
20. Highest degree awarded - Master's	0.21	0.411
21. Enrollment Management	0.10	0.298
22. Special Populations	0.02	0.145
23. Wellness	0.01	0.113
24. Student Involvement	0.19	0.395
25. Academic Endeavors	0.03	0.182
26. Career Services	0.08	0.267
27. Student Conduct	0.03	0.158
28. Gender	1.75	0.433

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Promotion	.121	-.132	.303	-.299	-.009	-.029	.346
Predictor variable							
1	--	-.655	.052	-.104	.179	-.019	.063
2		--	-.079	.153	-.255	.029	-.078
3			--	-.957	-.124	-.055	.672
4				--	-.169	.057	-.643
5					--	-.010	-.083
6						--	-.037
7							--
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Promotion	-.215	-.114	-.100	-.091	-.044	-.054	-.100
Predictor variable							
1	-.191	.228	-.033	-.043	-.038	-.063	-.047
2	.186	-.165	-.053	.065	-.031	-.004	.062
3	-.479	-.160	-.096	-.064	-.111	.069	-.076
4	.534	.057	.023	.070	.116	-.052	.072
5	-.201	.348	.246	-.022	-.020	-.057	.014
6	-.089	-.022	.575	-.010	-.009	-.025	-.049
7	-.763	-.186	-.064	-.083	-.074	.054	.022
8	--	-.449	-.155	.109	-.041	.015	.023
9		--	-.038	-.049	.178	-.084	-.036
10			--	-.017	-.015	-.044	-.085
11				--	-.020	-.057	.014
12					--	.048	-.029
13						--	-.286
14							--
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Promotion	-.016	.050	.203	-.111	.055	-.094	.017
Predictor variable							
1	-.022	.129	-.024	-.038	.000	-.073	-.038
2	.015	-.082	-.003	.058	.009	.061	-.016
3	-.043	.092	.019	-.044	.008	-.055	-.002
4	.020	-.072	-.006	.049	-.020	.035	.016
5	.075	-.066	-.043	-.020	.042	.067	-.048
6	.132	-.029	-.019	-.009	-.023	-.034	.203
7	-.102	.017	.063	-.074	.056	.000	-.044
8	-.041	-.031	.011	.097	-.024	.013	-.008
9	.161	.006	-.096	-.044	-.026	.002	.041
10	.135	.051	-.033	-.015	-.040	-.060	.093
11	.001	-.066	.068	.892	-.052	-.077	.155
12	.100	-.059	-.038	-.017	-.047	.092	-.043
13	-.191	-.172	-.111	-.051	.556	.111	-.080
14	-.369	-.334	-.215	.040	-.007	.397	-.056
15	--	-.222	-.144	.017	-.176	-.154	.098
16		--	-.130	-.059	-.159	-.234	-.027
17			--	-.038	-.103	-.151	-.038
18				--	-.047	-.069	.183
19					--	-.185	-.114
20						--	-.097
21							--
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Promotion	-.091	.065	.044	-.056	.079	.073	.042
Predictor variable							
1	-.043	-.033	.103	.034	-.024	.054	-.019
2	-.015	-.156	-.019	-.044	.041	-.002	.095
3	-.004	-.018	.076	-.014	.084	.194	-.002
4	.010	.023	-.055	-.025	-.071	-.186	.037
5	-.022	-.017	-.072	.135	-.043	-.024	-.120
6	-.010	-.007	-.032	-.012	-.019	-.011	.038
7	.055	-.064	.030	.004	.063	.099	-.025
8	-.015	.084	-.004	-.009	.011	-.107	.075
9	-.049	-.038	-.016	.017	-.096	.037	-.076
10	-.017	-.013	-.056	-.022	-.033	-.019	-.022
11	-.022	-.017	.078	-.028	-.043	-.024	.085
12	-.020	-.015	-.065	-.025	-.038	-.021	.000
13	.032	-.044	.104	-.002	-.015	-.062	.043
14	.014	-.005	-.023	-.042	.020	-.008	.014
15	-.073	.039	-.024	.025	-.022	-.081	-.039
16	.092	-.051	.014	-.085	-.044	.145	-.008
17	-.043	.110	-.060	.034	.037	-.047	-.056
18	-.020	-.015	.103	-.025	-.038	-.021	.076
19	.136	.080	.034	-.067	.102	-.058	-.048
20	-.077	-.060	-.017	.074	-.151	-.019	.059
21	-.048	-.037	-.158	-.061	-.093	-.052	.084
22	--	-.017	-.072	-.028	-.043	-.024	.085
23		--	-.056	-.022	-.033	-.019	-.110
24			--	-.092	-.142	-.080	-.020
25				--	-.055	-.031	.109
26					--	-.047	.129
27						--	-.094
28							--

APPENDIX K

Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Entry Level Professionals' Satisfaction with Opportunities for Promotion

Variable	*B*	*SEB*	*B*
African American	1.32	4.42	0.025
Caucasian	-3.38	3.24	-0.090
Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	2.48	2.40	0.088
Job Tenure 6 -10 years	8.50	6.97	0.089
Company Tenure 11 or more years	10.30	16.26	0.049
Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	8.14	2.71	0.251**
Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	-5.54	3.25	-0.119
Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	-17.72	9.82	-0.144
Two year institutions	-2.12	13.10	-0.022
Professional degree as highest earned	2.61	6.71	0.025
Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	-8.35	4.80	-0.202
Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	-3.42	3.71	-0.118
Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	0.86	3.71	0.025
Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	1.22	3.84	0.033
Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	8.61	4.48	0.166
Highest degree awarded - Associate	-8.66	14.68	-0.081
Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	8.38	3.78	0.191*
Highest degree awarded - Master's	1.40	2.66	0.042
Enrollment Management	3.05	3.18	0.064
Special Populations	-11.64	5.98	-0.122
Wellness	4.97	7.87	0.040
Student Involvement	2.24	2.29	0.064
Academic Endeavors	-5.77	4.79	-0.076
Career Services	1.20	3.35	0.023
Student Conduct	4.49	5.55	0.051
Gender	3.55	2.04	0.111

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

APPENDIX L

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Entry Level Professionals' Satisfaction with Coworkers and Predictor Variables

Variable	*M*	*SD*
Job in General		
Predictor variable		
1. African American	0.08	0.267
2. Caucasian	0.84	0.370
3. Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.41	0.494
4. Job Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.56	0.497
5. Job Tenure 6 -10 years	0.02	0.145
6. Company Tenure 11 or more years	0.00	0.065
7. Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.24	0.428
8. Student Affairs Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.65	0.479
9. Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.10	0.304
10. Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	0.01	0.113
11. Two year institutions	0.02	0.145
12. Professional degree as highest earned	0.02	0.130
13. Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	0.13	0.335
14. Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	0.36	0.481
15. Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	0.20	0.398
16. Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	0.17	0.373
17. Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	0.08	0.267
18. Highest degree awarded - Associate	0.02	0.130
19. Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	0.11	0.315
20. Highest degree awarded - Master's	0.21	0.411
21. Enrollment Management	0.10	0.298
22. Special Populations	0.02	0.145
23. Wellness	0.01	0.113
24. Student Involvement	0.19	0.395
25. Academic Endeavors	0.03	0.182
26. Career Services	0.08	0.267
27. Student Conduct	0.03	0.158
28. Gender	1.75	0.433

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Coworkers	.028	.001	-.098	.109	-.040	-.029	-.102
Predictor variable							
1	--	-.656	.050	-.102	.179	-.019	.064
2		--	-.076	.150	-.255	.029	-.079
3			--	-.957	-.124	-.055	.667
4				--	-.168	.058	-.638
5					--	-.010	-.083
6						--	-.037
7							--
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Coworkers	.084	.033	-.061	-.061	.016	-.082	.048
Predictor variable							
1	-.188	.220	-.033	-.043	-.038	-.063	-.049
2	.182	-.157	-.053	.065	-.031	-.004	.064
3	-.482	-.141	-.096	-.064	-.111	.067	-.069
4	.537	.042	.024	.070	.116	-.050	.065
5	-.199	.340	.246	-.022	-.019	-.057	.013
6	-.088	-.022	.575	-.010	-.009	-.025	-.049
7	-.757	-.190	-.064	-.083	-.074	.055	.019
8	--	-.456	-.154	.110	-.040	.017	.015
9		--	-.039	-.050	.173	-.088	-.018
10			--	-.017	-.015	-.044	-.085
11				--	-.019	-.057	.013
12					--	.048	-.030
13						--	-.287
14							--
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Coworkers	-.013	.018	.009	-.033	.074	-.079	.163
Predictor variable							
1	-.022	.129	-.023	-.038	.000	-.072	-.041
2	.014	-.083	-.003	.058	.008	.060	-.010
3	-.045	.089	.018	-.044	.006	-.058	.014
4	.023	-.069	-.005	.049	-.018	.038	.001
5	.076	-.066	-.043	-.019	.042	.067	-.049
6	.132	-.029	-.019	-.009	-.023	-.034	.198
7	-.101	.018	.064	-.074	.057	.001	-.051
8	-.038	-.028	.013	.098	-.022	.016	-.025
9	.152	.000	-.098	-.045	-.030	-.004	.078
10	.135	.051	-.033	-.015	-.040	-.059	.090
11	.001	-.066	.068	.892	-.052	-.077	.150
12	.101	-.059	-.038	-.017	-.047	.092	-.044
13	-.190	-.171	-.111	-.051	.556	.112	-.084
14	-.370	-.335	-.216	.039	-.009	.392	-.038
15	--	-.221	-.143	.018	-.175	-.153	.090
16		--	-.129	-.059	-.158	-.233	-.032
17			--	-.038	-.102	-.150	-.041
18				--	-.047	-.069	.178
19					--	-.184	-.117
20						--	-.102
21							--
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Coworkers	.050	.101	.121	-.067	.022	-.089	-.017
Predictor variable							
1	-.043	-.033	.103	.034	-.023	.055	-.020
2	-.015	-.156	-.020	-.045	.040	-.002	.096
3	-.004	-.019	.074	-.015	.083	.193	.001
4	.011	.024	-.052	-.024	-.070	-.185	.034
5	-.022	-.017	-.072	.135	-.043	-.024	-.121
6	-.010	-.007	-.032	-.012	-.019	-.011	.038
7	.056	-.064	.031	.005	.064	.099	-.026
8	-.014	.084	-.001	-.008	.013	-.106	.071
9	-.050	-.039	-.022	.014	-.098	.034	-.067
10	-.017	-.013	-.056	-.021	-.033	-.018	-.023
11	-.022	-.017	.078	-.028	-.043	-.024	.085
12	-.019	-.015	-.064	-.025	-.038	-.021	-.001
13	.032	-.044	.105	-.002	-.015	-.062	.043
14	.013	-.006	-.026	-.043	.018	-.009	.017
15	-.073	.039	-.023	.025	-.022	-.080	-.040
16	.093	-.051	.015	-.084	-.043	.145	-.009
17	-.043	.110	-.059	.034	.037	-.047	-.057
18	-.019	-.015	.103	-.025	-.038	-.021	.076
19	.136	.081	.035	-.067	.102	-.057	-.049
20	-.077	-.059	-.016	.074	-.150	-.019	.058
21	-.049	-.038	-.161	-.062	-.095	-.054	.090
22	--	-.017	-.072	-.028	-.043	-.024	.085
23		--	-.056	-.021	-.033	-.018	-.111
24			--	-.092	-.141	-.079	-.021
25				--	-.054	-.031	.108
26					--	-.047	.129
27						--	-.095
28							--

APPENDIX M

Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Entry Level Professionals' Satisfaction with Coworker

Variable	*B*	*SEB*	*B*
African American	2.43	3.96	0.056
Caucasian	1.59	2.91	0.051
Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	-1.75	2.13	-0.075
Job Tenure 6 -10 years	-1.65	6.25	-0.021
Company Tenure 11 or more years	-8.78	14.58	-0.050
Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	-1.67	2.42	-0.062
Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	-0.32	2.85	-0.008
Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	-4.23	8.80	-0.041
Two year institutions	-12.45	11.76	-0.156
Professional degree as highest earned	4.64	6.02	0.052
Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	-5.03	4.30	-0.146
Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	0.98	3.32	0.041
Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	0.06	3.33	0.002
Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	1.60	3.44	0.052
Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	2.22	4.02	0.051
Highest degree awarded - Associate	3.67	13.17	0.041
Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	5.94	3.39	0.162
Highest degree awarded - Master's	0.05	2.38	0.002
Enrollment Management	9.71	2.81	0.251**
Special Populations	5.05	5.36	0.063
Wellness	10.30	7.06	0.101
Student Involvement	5.75	2.05	0.197**
Academic Endeavors	-0.75	4.30	-0.012
Career Services	2.72	3.01	0.063
Student Conduct	-3.33	4.98	-0.046
Gender	-0.57	1.83	-0.021

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

APPENDIX N

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Entry Level Professionals' Satisfaction with Supervision and Predictor Variables

Variable	*M*	*SD*
Supervision		
Predictor variable		
1. African American	0.08	0.267
2. Caucasian	0.84	0.370
3. Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.41	0.494
4. Job Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.56	0.497
5. Job Tenure 6 -10 years	0.02	0.145
6. Company Tenure 11 or more years	0.00	0.065
7. Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.24	0.428
8. Student Affairs Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.65	0.479
9. Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.10	0.304
10. Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	0.01	0.113
11. Two year institutions	0.02	0.145
12. Professional degree as highest earned	0.02	0.130
13. Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	0.13	0.335
14. Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	0.36	0.481
15. Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	0.20	0.398
16. Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	0.17	0.373
17. Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	0.08	0.267
18. Highest degree awarded - Associate	0.02	0.130
19. Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	0.11	0.315
20. Highest degree awarded - Master's	0.21	0.411
21. Enrollment Management	0.10	0.298
22. Special Populations	0.02	0.145
23. Wellness	0.01	0.113
24. Student Involvement	0.19	0.395
25. Academic Endeavors	0.03	0.182
26. Career Services	0.08	0.267
27. Student Conduct	0.03	0.158
28. Gender	1.75	0.433

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Supervision	.016	-.098	-.026	.002	.082	.031	.067
Predictor variable							
1	--	-.656	.050	-.102	.179	-.019	.064
2		--	-.076	.150	-.255	.029	-.079
3			--	-.957	-.124	-.055	.667
4				--	-.168	.058	-.638
5					--	-.010	-.083
6						--	-.037
7							--
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Supervision	-.087	.031	.029	-.018	.100	-.052	-.101
Predictor variable							
1	-.188	.220	-.033	-.043	-.038	-.063	-.049
2	.182	-.157	-.053	.065	-.031	-.004	.064
3	-.482	-.141	-.096	-.064	-.111	.067	-.069
4	.537	.042	.024	.070	.116	-.050	.065
5	-.199	.340	.246	-.022	-.019	-.057	.013
6	-.088	-.022	.575	-.010	-.009	-.025	-.049
7	-.757	-.190	-.064	-.083	-.074	.055	.019
8	--	-.456	-.154	.110	-.040	.017	.015
9		--	-.039	-.050	.173	-.088	-.018
10			--	-.017	-.015	-.044	-.085
11				--	-.019	-.057	.013
12					--	.048	-.030
13						--	-.287
14							--
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Supervision	.107	-.034	.079	-.038	.003	-.070	.061
Predictor variable							
1	-.022	.129	-.023	-.038	.000	-.072	-.041
2	.014	-.083	-.003	.058	.008	.060	-.010
3	-.045	.089	.018	-.044	.006	-.058	.014
4	.023	-.069	-.005	.049	-.018	.038	.001
5	.076	-.066	-.043	-.019	.042	.067	-.049
6	.132	-.029	-.019	-.009	-.023	-.034	.198
7	-.101	.018	.064	-.074	.057	.001	-.051
8	-.038	-.028	.013	.098	-.022	.016	-.025
9	.152	.000	-.098	-.045	-.030	-.004	.078
10	.135	.051	-.033	-.015	-.040	-.059	.090
11	.001	-.066	.068	.892	-.052	-.077	.150
12	.101	-.059	-.038	-.017	-.047	.092	-.044
13	-.190	-.171	-.111	-.051	.556	.112	-.084
14	-.370	-.335	-.216	.039	-.009	.392	-.038
15	--	-.221	-.143	.018	-.175	-.153	.090
16		--	-.129	-.059	-.158	-.233	-.032
17			--	-.038	-.102	-.150	-.041
18				--	-.047	-.069	.178
19					--	-.184	-.117
20						--	-.102
21							--
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Supervision	.004	.015	.000	.021	.083	.022	.012
Predictor variable							
1	-.043	-.033	.103	.034	-.023	.055	-.020
2	-.015	-.156	-.020	-.045	.040	-.002	.096
3	-.004	-.019	.074	-.015	.083	.193	.001
4	.011	.024	-.052	-.024	-.070	-.185	.034
5	-.022	-.017	-.072	.135	-.043	-.024	-.121
6	-.010	-.007	-.032	-.012	-.019	-.011	.038
7	.056	-.064	.031	.005	.064	.099	-.026
8	-.014	.084	-.001	-.008	.013	-.106	.071
9	-.050	-.039	-.022	.014	-.098	.034	-.067
10	-.017	-.013	-.056	-.021	-.033	-.018	-.023
11	-.022	-.017	.078	-.028	-.043	-.024	.085
12	-.019	-.015	-.064	-.025	-.038	-.021	-.001
13	.032	-.044	.105	-.002	-.015	-.062	.043
14	.013	-.006	-.026	-.043	.018	-.009	.017
15	-.073	.039	-.023	.025	-.022	-.080	-.040
16	.093	-.051	.015	-.084	-.043	.145	-.009
17	-.043	.110	-.059	.034	.037	-.047	-.057
18	-.019	-.015	.103	-.025	-.038	-.021	.076
19	.136	.081	.035	-.067	.102	-.057	-.049
20	-.077	-.059	-.016	.074	-.150	-.019	.058
21	-.049	-.038	-.161	-.062	-.095	-.054	.090
22	--	-.017	-.072	-.028	-.043	-.024	.085
23		--	-.056	-.021	-.033	-.018	-.111
24			--	-.092	-.141	-.079	-.021
25				--	-.054	-.031	.108
26					--	-.047	.129
27						--	-.095
28							--

APPENDIX O

Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Entry Level Professionals' Satisfaction with Supervision

Variable	*B*	*SEB*	β
African American	-5.41	4.90	-0.104
Caucasian	-5.56	3.60	-0.148
Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	-4.24	2.64	-0.180
Job Tenure 6 -10 years	7.14	7.73	0.074
Company Tenure 11 or more years	4.00	18.04	0.019
Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	5.45	2.99	0.167
Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	-0.68	3.53	-0.015
Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	-3.44	10.89	-0.028
Two year institutions	5.39	14.55	0.056
Professional degree as highest earned	11.29	7.45	0.105
Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	-6.57	5.32	-0.158
Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	-4.62	4.11	-0.159
Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	0.96	4.12	0.028
Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	-2.49	4.26	-0.067
Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	1.68	4.97	0.032
Highest degree awarded - Associate	-10.41	16.29	-0.097
Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	3.81	4.19	0.086
Highest degree awarded - Master's	0.64	2.94	0.019
Enrollment Management	4.55	3.47	0.097
Special Populations	0.90	6.64	0.009
Wellness	-0.74	8.74	-0.006
Student Involvement	2.89	2.54	0.082
Academic Endeavors	1.05	5.32	0.014
Career Services	5.40	3.72	0.104
Student Conduct	6.26	6.13	0.091
Gender	1.16	2.27	0.036

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

APPENDIX P

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Entry Level Professionals' Satisfaction with the Work Itself and Variables

Variable	*M*	*SD*
Work Itself		
Predictor variable		
1. African American	0.08	0.267
2. Caucasian	0.84	0.370
3. Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.41	0.494
4. Job Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.56	0.497
5. Job Tenure 6 -10 years	0.02	0.145
6. Company Tenure 11 or more years	0.00	0.065
7. Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.24	0.428
8. Student Affairs Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.65	0.479
9. Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.10	0.304
10. Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	0.01	0.113
11. Two year institutions	0.02	0.145
12. Professional degree as highest earned	0.02	0.130
13. Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	0.13	0.335
14. Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	0.36	0.481
15. Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	0.20	0.398
16. Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	0.17	0.373
17. Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	0.08	0.267
18. Highest degree awarded - Associate	0.02	0.130
19. Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	0.11	0.315
20. Highest degree awarded - Master's	0.21	0.411
21. Enrollment Management	0.10	0.298
22. Special Populations	0.02	0.145
23. Wellness	0.01	0.113
24. Student Involvement	0.19	0.395
25. Academic Endeavors	0.03	0.182
26. Career Services	0.08	0.267
27. Student Conduct	0.03	0.158
28. Gender	1.75	0.433

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Work Itself	.010	-.016	-.012	.018	-.022	.029	.070
Predictor variable							
1	--	-.656	.050	-.102	.179	-.019	.064
2		--	-.076	.150	-.255	.029	-.079
3			--	-.957	-.124	-.055	.667
4				--	-.168	.058	-.638
5					--	-.010	-.083
6						--	-.037
7							--
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Work Itself	-.072	.039	-.068	-.121	.020	.049	-.064
Predictor variable							
1	-.188	.220	.-.033	-.043	-.038	-.063	-.049
2	.182	-.157	-.053	.065	-.031	-.004	.064
3	-.482	-.141	-.096	-.064	-.111	.067	-.069
4	.537	.042	.024	.070	.116	-.050	.065
5	-.199	.340	.246	-.022	-.019	-.057	.013
6	-.088	-.022	.575	-.010	-.099	-.025	-.049
7	-.757	-.190	-.064	-.083	-.074	.055	.019
8	--	-.456	-.154	.110	-.040	.017	.015
9		--	-.039	-.050	.173	-.088	-.018
10			--	-.017	-.015	-.044	-.085
11				--	-.019	-.057	.013
12					--	.048	-.030
13						--	-.287
14							--
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Work Itself	.002	-.002	.031	-.047	.086	-.031	.048
Predictor variable							
1	-.022	.129	-.023	-.038	.000	-.072	-.041
2	.014	-.083	-.003	.058	.008	.060	-.010
3	-.045	.089	.018	-.044	.006	-.058	.014
4	.023	-.069	-.005	.049	-.018	.038	.001
5	.076	-.066	-.043	-.019	.042	.060	-.049
6	.132	-.029	-.019	-.009	-.023	-.034	.198
7	-.101	.018	.064	-.074	.057	.001	-.051
8	-.038	-.028	.013	.098	-.022	.016	-.025
9	.152	.000	-.098	-.045	-.030	-.004	.078
10	.135	.051	-.033	-.015	-.040	-.059	.090
11	.001	-.066	.068	.892	-.052	-.077	.150
12	.101	-.059	-.038	-.017	-.047	.092	-.044
13	-.190	-.171	-.111	-.051	.556	.112	-.084
14	-.370	-.335	-.216	.039	-.009	.392	-.038
15	--	-.221	-.143	.018	-.175	-.153	.090
16		--	-.129	-.059	-.158	-.233	-.032
17			--	-.038	-.102	-.150	-.041
18				--	-.047	-.069	.178
19					--	-.184	-.117
20						--	-.102
21							--
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Work Itself	-.017	.075	.131	.120	.052	-.123	.074
Predictor variable							
1	-.043	-.033	.103	.034	-.023	.055	-.020
2	-.015	-.016	-.020	-.045	.040	-.002	.096
3	-.004	-.019	.074	-.015	.083	.193	.001
4	.011	.024	-.052	-.024	-.070	-.185	.034
5	-.022	-.017	-.072	.135	-.043	-.024	-.121
6	-.010	-.007	-.032	-.012	-.019	-.011	-.038
7	.056	-.064	.031	.005	.064	.099	-.026
8	-.014	.084	-.001	-.008	.013	-.106	.071
9	-.050	-.039	-.022	.014	-.098	.034	-.067
10	-.017	-.013	-.056	-.021	-.033	-.018	-.023
11	-.022	-.017	.078	-.028	-.043	-.024	.085
12	-.019	-.015	-.064	-.025	-.038	-.021	-.001
13	.032	-.044	.105	-.002	-.015	-.062	-.043
14	.013	-.006	-.026	-.043	.018	-.009	.017
15	-.073	.039	-.023	.025	-.022	-.080	-.040
16	.093	-.051	.015	-.084	-.043	.145	-.009
17	-.043	.110	-.059	.034	.037	-.047	-.057
18	-.019	-.015	.103	-.025	-.038	-.021	.076
19	.136	.081	.035	-.067	.102	-.057	-.049
20	-.077	-.059	-.016	.074	-.015	-.019	.058
21	-.049	-.038	-.161	-.062	-.095	-.054	.090
22	--	-.017	-.072	-.028	-.043	-.024	.085
23		--	-.056	-.021	-.033	-.018	-.111
24			--	-.092	-.141	-.079	-.021
25				--	-.054	-.031	.108
26					--	-.047	.129
27						--	-.095
28							--

APPENDIX Q

Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Entry Level Professionals' Satisfaction with the Work Itself

Variable	*B*	*SEB*	β
African American	-1.51	4.20	-0.033
Caucasian	-0.07	3.08	-0.002
Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	-3.15	2.26	-0.127
Job Tenure 6 -10 years	-0.49	6.62	-0.006
Company Tenure 11 or more years	13.21	15.46	0.071
Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	4.62	2.57	0.161
Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	2.24	3.02	0.056
Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	-11.53	9.34	-0.106
Two year institutions	5.33	12.47	0.063
Professional degree as highest earned	3.35	6.39	0.036
Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	-2.19	4.56	-0.060
Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	-2.08	3.52	-0.082
Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	-0.65	3.53	-0.021
Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	0.90	3.65	0.027
Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	0.11	4.26	0.002
Highest degree awarded - Associate	-21.72	13.97	-0.231
Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	4.32	3.59	0.111
Highest degree awarded - Master's	0.64	2.52	0.022
Enrollment Management	5.41	2.98	0.132
Special Populations	-1.78	5.69	-0.021
Wellness	10.80	7.49	0.100
Student Involvement	6.24	2.18	0.201**
Academic Endeavors	9.50	4.56	0.141**
Career Services	3.75	3.19	0.082
Student Conduct	-6.44	5.28	-0.083
Gender	1.89	1.94	0.067

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

APPENDIX R

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Mid-level Professionals' Global Job Satisfaction and Predictor Variables

Variable	*M*	*SD*
Job in General		
Predictor variable		
1. African American	0.08	0.278
2. Caucasian	0.82	0.385
3. Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.24	0.427
4. Job Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.57	0.495
5. Job Tenure 6 -10 years	0.13	0.339
6. Company Tenure 0 - 1 year	0.14	0.351
7. Company Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.52	0.500
8. Company Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.21	0.407
9. Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.01	0.115
10. Student Affairs Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.28	0.447
11. Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.39	0.498
12. Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	0.17	0.378
13. Two year institutions	0.04	0.197
14. Associate degree as highest earned	0.01	0.076
15. Bachelor's degree as highest earned	0.02	0.150
16. Master's degree as highest earned	0.80	0.404
17. Professional degree as highest earned	0.05	0.210
18. Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	0.15	0.357
19. Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	0.29	0.455
20. Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	0.19	0.391
21. Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	0.18	0.386
22. Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	0.11	0.310
23. Highest degree awarded - Associate	0.03	0.178
24. Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	0.10	0.300
25. Highest degree awarded - Master's	0.20	0.400
26. Enrollment Management	0.12	0.322
27. Special Populations	0.06	0.233
28. Wellness	0.05	0.218
29. Student Involvement	0.20	0.404
30. Academic Endeavors	0.03	0.183
31. Career Services	0.07	0.250
32. Student Conduct	0.04	0.201
33. Residence Life	0.30	0.456
34. Gender	1.67	0.471

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
JIG	-.034	.022	.016	-.083	.017	-.087	-.027
Predictor variable							
1	--	-.647	.056	-.057	.004	.052	-.068
2		--	-.017	.006	.036	-.007	.019
3			--	-.647	-.220	.691	-.216
4				--	-.450	-.472	.555
5					--	-.128	-.384
6						--	-.427
7							--
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
JIG	.015	.049	-.008	-.061	.001	.023	.041
Predictor variable							
1	-.003	.025	-.018	-.017	.026	.148	.159
2	-.016	.011	.044	-.053	.016	-.081	-.162
3	-.201	.169	.195	-.046	-.102	.045	-.043
4	-.106	-.101	.060	.093	.017	-.059	-.036
5	.481	-.046	-.241	.035	.106	.006	-.030
6	-.211	.142	.174	-.049	-.057	.027	-.031
7	-.536	-.021	.250	.101	-.151	-.038	-.079
8	--	-.060	-.276	.148	.152	-.033	.023
9		--	-.072	-.094	-.053	.061	-.009
10			--	-.496	-.282	-.061	-.047
11				--	-.367	-.024	-.009
12					--	.087	-.035
13						--	-.016
14							--
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
JIG	.076	-.056	-.026	.019	-.019	-.019	-.001
Predictor variable							
1	-.001	.001	-.067	-.069	.018	.083	-.036
2	-.094	-.004	.055	.029	-.028	-.042	.041
3	.004	.074	-.038	-.072	.055	.052	-.009
4	.030	-.038	.080	.093	-.065	-.019	.029
5	-.022	.002	-.032	-.021	.023	-.043	-.053
6	-.063	.100	-.038	-.065	.098	.054	-.052
7	.096	.044	.046	.145	-.060	-.059	.036
8	-.048	-.019	.022	-.057	.033	.018	-.035
9	.093	.018	-.026	-.049	.035	.072	-.012
10	.105	.112	-.013	.077	-.019	-.012	-.025
11	-.045	.048	.068	.016	-.039	.006	.018
12	-.070	-.044	-.028	-.007	.042	.040	-.045
13	-.031	-.017	.002	-.031	-.003	.051	-.046
14	-.012	-.150	-.017	.039	.007	.028	-.036
15	--	-.302	-.034	-.029	-.014	.057	.060
16		--	-.432	.093	.044	-.023	-.092
17			--	-.015	.020	-.059	.015
18				--	-.269	-.202	-.198
19					--	-.309	-.303
20						--	-.227
21							--
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
JIG	.011	.008	.026	.012	-.006	-.014	.035
Predictor variable							
1	.030	.100	-.055	.004	.040	.221	-.038
2	-.034	-.054	.040	.022	-.046	-.205	.062
3	-.061	-.002	.008	.023	.075	-.042	-.026
4	-.017	-.015	-.008	.007	-.021	.048	-.086
5	.105	-.008	-.017	.017	-.037	.001	.092
6	-.034	-.014	-.027	.055	.072	-.031	.006
7	-.058	-.018	.076	.028	.003	-.010	-.062
8	.038	-.041	-.030	-.044	-.011	.015	-.031
9	-.040	-.021	-.039	.109	-.042	.043	.050
10	-.017	-.065	.124	-.008	.055	-.005	-.043
11	.006	-.015	-.018	.013	.038	-.013	-.094
12	-.025	.116	-.034	.013	.007	.018	.082
13	.057	.896	-.036	-.078	.016	.033	.087
14	-.026	-.014	-.025	.025	-.028	-.019	-.017
15	-.053	-.028	-.008	-.045	.024	.072	-.035
16	-.011	-.040	.058	.087	.052	.003	-.167
17	.044	.011	.080	-.041	-.052	-.054	-.050
18	-.144	-.077	.542	.181	-.002	-.104	-.022
19	-.220	.001	-.016	.345	.016	-.014	-.089
20	-.165	.050	-.160	-.130	-.038	.008	.115
21	-.162	-.031	-.157	-.236	-.017	.075	.006
22	--	.078	-.114	-.140	-.028	.022	.007
23		--	-.061	-.092	-.033	.001	.107
24			--	-.166	.078	-.082	-.076
25				--	.042	-.041	-.070
26					--	-.090	-.083
27						--	-.057
28							--
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	29	30	31	32	33	34
JIG	-.022	.103	.045	-.041	-.077	-.044
Predictor variable						
1	-.068	.018	-.054	-.064	-.015	.024
2	.039	.007	.026	.099	.020	-.023
3	-.016	.017	-.061	.038	.030	.014
4	.044	-.027	-.030	-.010	-.007	-.028
5	-.057	.050	.076	.002	-.017	.023
6	-.031	-.078	-.066	.131	.034	-.001
7	.066	.055	-.018	-.104	.050	-.008
8	-.049	-.020	.069	.033	-.033	.012
9	-.018	.069	-.031	-.025	-.003	.011
10	.050	.024	.006	-.023	.004	.062
11	-.005	-.023	.052	.047	.049	-.052
12	-.029	.025	-.062	-.045	-.062	-.012
13	.042	-.039	.023	-.043	-.133	.020
14	-.038	-.014	-.020	-.016	.006	.054
15	-.014	.111	-.041	-.032	.013	.000
16	.033	-.034	.079	-.106	.131	.106
17	.048	.009	-.059	.182	-.042	-.098
18	.028	.009	.016	-.061	.011	-.001
19	.127	-.052	.013	.033	-.046	.040
20	-.072	.017	.008	-.003	.054	-.036
21	.008	.020	-.047	-.025	-.001	.016
22	-.065	.038	.033	.052	.010	-.063
23	.068	-.035	.037	-.039	-.119	.038
24	.054	.007	-.038	-.038	.009	.031
25	.022	.011	.000	.015	.034	.036
26	-.184	-.069	-.098	-.076	-.236	.079
27	-.125	-.047	-.066	-.052	-.160	.034
28	-.116	-.043	-.062	-.048	-.148	.012
29	--	-.096	-.136	-.106	-.327	.042
30		--	-.051	-.040	-.123	-.001
31			--	-.056	-.174	.092
32				--	-.136	-.115
33					--	-.088
34						--

APPENDIX S

Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Mid-level Professionals' Global Job Satisfaction

Variable	*B*	*SEB*	β
African American	-1.56	2.39	-0.039
Caucasian	0.25	1.72	0.009
Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	-1.22	2.98	-0.047
Job Tenure 2 - 5 years	-5.16	2.72	-0.230
Job Tenure 6 -10 years	-4.82	2.85	-0.147
Company Tenure 0 to 1 year	-6.67	2.88	-0.211*
Company Tenure 2 - 5 years	-1.79	2.27	-0.080
Company Tenure 6 - 10 years	-0.62	2.23	-0.023
Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	3.52	4.83	0.036
Student Affairs Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.64	2.13	0.026
Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	-0.19	1.95	-0.008
Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	-0.05	1.96	-0.002
Two year institutions	4.27	5.88	0.076
Associate degree as highest earned	3.32	6.92	0.023
Bachelor's degree as highest earned	4.82	3.71	0.065
Master's degree as highest earned	-0.40	1.60	-0.014
Professional degree as highest earned	-1.51	2.77	-0.028
Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	-1.38	2.62	-0.044
Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	-1.37	2.11	-0.056
Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	-1.41	2.09	-0.049
Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	-0.91	2.06	-0.032
Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	-0.33	2.30	-0.009
Highest degree awarded - Associate	-3.90	6.51	-0.062
Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	1.62	2.26	0.044
Highest degree awarded - Master's	1.56	1.57	0.056
Enrollment Management	-1.52	2.05	-0.044
Special Populations	-1.68	2.55	-0.035
Wellness	-0.11	2.67	-0.002
Student Involvement	-1.84	1.79	-0.067
Academic Endeavors	3.41	3.05	0.056
Career Services	0.34	2.41	0.008
Student Conduct	-2.65	2.83	-0.048
Residence Life	-2.70	1.69	-0.111
Gender	-1.44	1.07	-0.061

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

APPENDIX T

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Mid-level Professionals' Satisfaction with Pay and Predictor Variables

Variable	*M*	*SD*
Pay		
Predictor variable		
1. African American	0.08	0.278
2. Caucasian	0.82	0.385
3. Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.24	0.427
4. Job Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.57	0.495
5. Job Tenure 6 -10 years	0.13	0.339
6. Company Tenure 0 - 1 year	0.14	0.351
7. Company Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.52	0.500
8. Company Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.21	0.407
9. Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.01	0.115
10. Student Affairs Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.28	0.447
11. Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.39	0.498
12. Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	0.17	0.378
13. Two year institutions	0.04	0.197
14. Associate degree as highest earned	0.01	0.076
15. Bachelor's degree as highest earned	0.02	0.150
16. Master's degree as highest earned	0.80	0.404
17. Professional degree as highest earned	0.05	0.210
18. Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	0.15	0.357
19. Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	0.29	0.455
20. Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	0.19	0.391
21. Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	0.18	0.386
22. Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	0.11	0.310
23. Highest degree awarded - Associate	0.03	0.178
24. Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	0.10	0.300
25. Highest degree awarded - Master's	0.20	0.400
26. Enrollment Management	0.12	0.322
27. Special Populations	0.06	0.233
28. Wellness	0.05	0.218
29. Student Involvement	0.20	0.404
30. Academic Endeavors	0.03	0.183
31. Career Services	0.07	0.250
32. Student Conduct	0.04	0.201
33. Residence Life	0.30	0.456
34. Gender	1.67	0.471

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Pay	-.016	-.009	.021	-.037	.000	-.039	-.101
Predictor variable							
1	--	-.647	.056	-.057	.004	.053	-.068
2		--	-.017	.007	.036	-.007	.020
3			--	-.647	-.219	.692	-.217
4				--	-.450	-.472	.556
5					--	-.128	-.384
6						--	-.427
7							--
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Pay	.056	.030	-.140	-.058	.070	.139	.003
Predictor variable							
1	-.003	.025	-.018	-.018	.026	.148	.159
2	-.017	.011	.044	-.052	.016	-.082	-.162
3	-.200	.169	.196	-.047	-.102	.045	-.043
4	-.107	-.101	.059	.095	.017	-.059	-.036
5	.481	-.046	-.241	.034	.106	.006	-.030
6	-.210	.142	.175	-.050	-.057	.027	-.031
7	-.536	-.022	.249	.103	-.151	-.038	-.079
8	--	-.060	-.275	.147	.152	-.033	.023
9		--	-.072	-.094	-.053	.061	-.009
10			--	-.496	-.282	-.061	-.047
11				--	-.367	-.025	-.009
12					--	.087	-.035
13						--	-.016
14							--
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Pay	.037	-.054	-.002	-.090	.012	.038	.160
Predictor variable							
1	-.001	.000	-.067	-.069	.018	.084	-.036
2	-.094	-.003	.055	.029	-.029	-.043	.040
3	.004	.074	-.037	-.071	.055	.052	-.009
4	.030	-.038	.079	.092	-.066	-.019	.028
5	-.022	.002	-.032	-.021	.024	-.043	-.052
6	-.063	.100	-.038	-.064	.098	.055	-.052
7	.096	.045	.046	.144	-.061	-.060	.035
8	-.047	-.019	.022	-.057	.034	.019	-.035
9	.093	.018	-.026	-.049	.035	.072	-.012
10	.106	.112	-.013	.078	-.018	-.011	-.025
11	-.045	.049	.067	.015	-.041	.005	.017
12	-.070	-.045	-.028	-.006	.042	.040	-.044
13	-.031	-.017	.002	-.031	-.002	.051	-.046
14	-.012	-.150	-.017	.039	.007	.028	-.036
15	--	-.302	-.034	-.028	-.014	.057	.060
16		--	-.432	.093	.043	-.023	-.093
17			--	-.015	.020	-.059	.015
18				--	-.269	-.202	-.198
19					--	-.308	-.302
20						--	-.227
21							--
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Pay	-.040	.123	-.081	.039	-.035	.008	.022
Predictor variable							
1	.029	.100	-.055	.004	.040	.221	-.038
2	-.031	-.054	.039	.022	-.047	-.206	.061
3	-.064	-.002	.008	.024	.075	-.042	-.025
4	-.012	-.015	-.009	.006	-.022	.048	-.086
5	.102	-.008	-.016	.018	-.036	.001	.093
6	-.036	-.014	-.027	.055	.072	-.031	.007
7	-.052	-.019	.076	.027	.003	-.010	-.063
8	.035	-.041	-.029	-.044	-.011	.015	-.031
9	-.040	-.021	-.039	.109	-.042	.043	.050
10	-.020	-.065	.124	-.007	.056	-.005	-.043
11	.013	-.015	-.019	.011	.037	-.013	-.094
12	-.027	.116	-.033	.014	.008	.018	.082
13	.055	.896	-.036	-.078	.017	.033	.088
14	-.026	-.014	-.025	.026	-.028	-.019	-.017
15	-.053	-.028	-.008	-.045	.024	.072	-.035
16	-.008	-.041	.058	.087	.052	.003	-.167
17	.042	.011	.080	-.041	-.051	-.054	-.050
18	-.145	-.077	.542	.181	-.002	-.103	-.022
19	-.222	.001	-.016	.345	.016	-.013	-.089
20	-.167	.050	-.160	-.129	-.037	.008	.115
21	-.164	-.031	-.157	-.235	-.017	.076	.006
22	--	.076	-.115	-.142	-.030	.021	.006
23		--	-.061	-.092	-.033	.001	.107
24			--	-.166	.078	-.082	-.076
25				--	.043	-.041	-.070
26					--	-.090	-.083
27						--	-.057
28							--
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	29	30	31	32	33	34
Pay	-.073	-.010	-.160	-.001	.053	-.085
Predictor variable						
1	-.069	.018	-.054	-.064	-.015	.023
2	.040	.007	.026	.098	.019	-.023
3	-.018	.017	-.061	.039	.031	.014
4	.047	-.027	-.031	-.011	-.008	-.027
5	-.058	.050	.076	.003	-.017	.022
6	-.032	-.077	-.066	.132	.034	-.002
7	.069	.055	-.019	-.104	.048	-.007
8	-.051	-.020	.070	.033	-.033	.011
9	-.018	.069	-.031	-.024	-.002	.011
10	.048	.024	.006	-.023	.005	.061
11	.000	-.023	.051	.046	.047	-.050
12	-.031	.025	-.062	-.045	-.062	-.013
13	.041	-.039	.023	-.043	-.132	.020
14	-.039	-.014	-.020	-.016	.006	.054
15	-.015	.111	-.041	-.032	.013	-.001
16	.034	-.034	.079	-.106	.131	.106
17	.047	.009	-.059	.182	-.042	-.098
18	.027	.009	.017	-.061	.012	-.002
19	.124	-.052	.014	.033	-.045	.039
20	-.074	.017	.008	-.003	.055	-.037
21	.006	.020	-.047	-.025	.000	.016
22	-.053	.036	.031	.051	.007	-.058
23	.067	-.035	.037	-.038	-.119	.037
24	.053	.007	-.038	-.038	.009	.030
25	.020	.011	.001	.015	.035	.035
26	-.185	-.069	-.098	-.076	-.235	.079
27	-.125	-.047	-.066	-.052	-.160	.034
28	-.116	-.043	-.061	-.048	-.148	.012
29	--	-.096	-.136	-.107	-.328	.045
30		--	-.051	-.040	-.122	-.001
31			--	-.056	-.173	.091
32				--	-.136	-.116
33					--	-.089
34						--

APPENDIX U

Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Mid-level Professionals' Satisfaction with Pay

Variable	*B*	*SEB*	β
African American	-4.58	3.13	-0.084
Caucasian	-1.68	2.24	-0.042
Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	5.79	3.90	0.163
Job Tenure 2 - 5 years	2.86	3.56	0.093
Job Tenure 6 -10 years	-0.61	3.73	-0.014
Company Tenure 0 to 1 year	-5.81	3.77	-0.134
Company Tenure 2 - 5 years	-3.23	2.96	-0.106
Company Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.40	2.92	0.011
Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	-7.00	6.32	-0.053
Student Affairs Tenure 2 - 5 years	-8.59	2.79	-0.253*
Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	-6.80	2.55	-0.219*
Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	-4.77	2.57	-0.119
Two year institutions	12.11	7.69	0.157
Associate degree as highest earned	-2.94	9.06	-0.015
Bachelor's degree as highest earned	6.65	4.85	0.066
Master's degree as highest earned	1.82	2.09	0.048
Professional degree as highest earned	0.83	3.63	0.011
Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	-6.97	3.43	-0.164*
Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	-3.75	2.76	-0.112
Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	-2.04	2.74	-0.052
Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	-2.41	2.70	-0.061
Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	-5.02	3.00	-0.102
Highest degree awarded - Associate	0.03	8.53	0.000
Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	1.04	2.96	0.021
Highest degree awarded - Master's	4.25	2.05	0.112*
Enrollment Management	-5.76	2.69	-0.122*
Special Populations	-4.55	3.34	-0.070
Wellness	-3.93	3.50	-0.056
Student Involvement	-6.71	2.34	-0.178**
Academic Endeavors	-5.02	3.99	-0.060
Career Services	-13.17	3.15	-0.217***
Student Conduct	-4.92	3.71	-0.065
Residence Life	-3.13	2.22	-0.094
Gender	-2.25	1.40	-0.070

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

APPENDIX V

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Mid-level Professionals' Satisfaction with Opportunities for Promotion and Predictor Variables

Variable	*M*	*SD*
Promotion		
Predictor variable		
1. African American	0.08	0.278
2. Caucasian	0.82	0.385
3. Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.24	0.427
4. Job Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.57	0.495
5. Job Tenure 6 -10 years	0.13	0.339
6. Company Tenure 0 - 1 year	0.14	0.351
7. Company Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.52	0.500
8. Company Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.21	0.407
9. Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.01	0.115
10. Student Affairs Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.28	0.447
11. Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.39	0.498
12. Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	0.17	0.378
13. Two year institutions	0.04	0.197
14. Associate degree as highest earned	0.01	0.076
15. Bachelor's degree as highest earned	0.02	0.150
16. Master's degree as highest earned	0.80	0.404
17. Professional degree as highest earned	0.05	0.210
18. Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	0.15	0.357
19. Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	0.29	0.455
20. Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	0.19	0.391
21. Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	0.18	0.386
22. Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	0.11	0.310
23. Highest degree awarded - Associate	0.03	0.178
24. Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	0.10	0.300
25. Highest degree awarded - Master's	0.20	0.400
26. Enrollment Management	0.12	0.322
27. Special Populations	0.06	0.233
28. Wellness	0.05	0.218
29. Student Involvement	0.20	0.404
30. Academic Endeavors	0.03	0.183
31. Career Services	0.07	0.250
32. Student Conduct	0.04	0.201
33. Residence Life	0.30	0.456
34. Gender	1.67	0.471

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Promotion							
Predictor variable	.025	.002	.103	-.011	-.093	-.001	.027
1							
2	--	-.643	.061	-.063	.006	.057	-.076
3		--	-.020	.010	.035	-.010	.025
4			--	-.645	-.220	.689	-.214
5				--	-.451	-.470	.556
6					--	-.128	-.386
7						--	-.426
8							--
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Promotion	-.027	-.033	.045	-.020	.021	.045	.010
Predictor variable							
1	.001	.025	-.014	-.027	.028	.151	.161
2	-.020	.011	.041	-.047	.015	-.082	-.163
3	-.199	.169	.190	-.043	-.102	.045	-.043
4	-.110	-.101	.066	.091	.018	-.059	-.036
5	.484	-.046	-.242	.034	.105	.006	-.030
6	-.210	.143	.167	-.045	-.056	.028	-.031
7	-.536	-.022	.255	.104	-.152	-.038	-.080
8	--	-.060	-.274	.143	.153	-.033	.023
9		--	-.072	-.094	-.054	.061	-.009
10			--	-.496	-.283	-.061	-.047
11				--	-.368	-.025	-.009
12					--	.087	-.035
13						--	-.016
14							--
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Promotion	.033	-.016	-.037	.071	-.013	-.018	-.001
Predictor variable							
1	.000	-.002	-.066	-.068	.021	.089	-.050
2	-.095	-.003	.055	.028	-.030	-.046	.048
3	.004	.074	-.038	-.072	.056	.044	-.003
4	.030	-.039	.080	.094	-.065	-.012	.021
5	-.023	.004	-.032	-.022	.022	-.043	-.050
6	-.063	.099	-.037	-.064	.100	.044	-.047
7	.096	.046	.046	.144	-.061	-.055	.025
8	-.047	-.020	.023	-.057	.035	.022	-.030
9	.093	.018	-.026	-.049	.035	.072	-.011
10	.106	.112	-.013	.078	-.019	-.020	-.019
11	-.045	.048	.068	.016	-.040	.010	.016
12	-.071	-.043	-.028	-.008	.040	.041	-.042
13	-.032	-.016	.001	-.032	-.003	.052	-.045
14	-.012	-.150	-.017	.039	.007	.029	-.036
15	--	-.302	-.034	-.029	-.015	.058	.062
16		--	-.432	.095	.046	-.024	-.097
17			--	-.016	.019	-.059	.017
18				--	-.271	-.202	-.197
19					--	-.309	-.301
20						--	-.225
21							--
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Promotion	-.057	.044	.039	-.020	-.032	-.017	.006
Predictor variable							
1	.030	.102	-.054	.008	.046	.225	-.037
2	-.032	-.055	.039	.019	-.054	-.207	.061
3	-.064	-.002	.008	.027	.069	-.042	-.025
4	-.011	-.015	-.008	.003	-.020	.049	-.086
5	.101	-.008	-.018	.018	-.033	.000	.092
6	-.036	-.013	-.026	.059	.062	-.030	.007
7	-.052	-.019	.076	.032	.015	-.011	-.063
8	.036	-.041	-.029	-.053	-.019	.015	-.031
9	-.041	-.022	-.039	.109	-.042	.043	.050
10	-.020	-.065	.124	-.005	.050	-.005	-.043
11	.013	-.015	-.018	.006	.036	-.013	-.094
12	-.028	.116	-.034	.014	.012	.017	.081
13	.055	.896	-.036	-.078	.019	.033	.087
14	-.027	-.014	-.025	.026	-.027	-.019	-.018
15	-.054	-.028	-.009	-.045	.026	.072	-.035
16	-.007	-.040	.059	.087	.048	.004	-.167
17	.042	.011	.079	-.041	-.050	-.055	-.051
18	-.147	-.078	.542	.182	.002	-.104	-.023
19	-.224	.000	-.018	.348	.023	-.015	-.090
20	-.167	.050	-.160	-.128	-.047	.008	.116
21	-.163	-.030	-.156	-.233	-.009	.078	.008
22	--	.075	-.116	-.142	-.027	.020	.005
23		--	-.062	-.092	-.032	.001	.107
24			--	-.166	.082	-.083	-.077
25				--	.035	-.041	-.070
26					--	-.089	-.082
27						--	-.057
28							--
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	29	30	31	32	33	34
Promotion	-.028	-.004	-.084	-.020	.020	-.119
Predictor variable						
1	-.083	.019	-.053	-.063	-.011	.020
2	.050	.006	.026	.099	.016	-.022
3	-.015	.017	-.061	.039	.033	.014
4	.045	-.027	-.030	-.010	-.010	-.029
5	-.058	.050	.076	.002	-.017	.025
6	-.029	-.077	-.066	.133	.038	-.003
7	.065	.055	-.019	-.105	.044	-.007
8	-.048	-.020	.070	.033	-.030	.011
9	-.018	.069	-.032	-.025	-.002	.012
10	.051	.024	.006	-.023	.007	.062
11	-.005	-.023	.052	.047	.052	-.052
12	-.031	.024	-.063	-.046	-.062	-.010
13	.041	-.039	.023	-.043	-.133	.021
14	-.039	-.014	-.021	-.016	.006	.054
15	-.014	.111	-.041	-.032	.013	.000
16	.034	-.033	.080	-.105	.132	.104
17	.048	.008	-.059	.181	-.042	-.097
18	.027	.009	.016	-.062	.011	.001
19	.125	-.053	.012	.032	-.045	.043
20	-.072	.017	.009	-.003	-.058	-.038
21	.000	.021	-.046	-.024	-.005	.011
22	-.053	.036	.030	.050	.006	-.057
23	.068	-.035	.037	-.039	-.119	.039
24	.053	.007	-.039	-.038	.009	.032
25	.023	.011	.001	.015	.038	.035
26	-.182	-.068	-.097	-.076	-.232	.074
27	-.126	-.047	-.067	-.052	-.161	.035
28	-.117	-.044	-.062	-.048	-.149	.013
29	--	-.096	-.137	-.107	-.328	.045
30		--	-.051	-.040	-.123	.000
31			--	-.057	-.174	.093
32				--	-.136	-.115
33					--	-.089
34						--

APPENDIX W

Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Mid-level Professionals' Satisfaction with Opportunities for Promotion

Variable	*B*	*SEB*	β
African American	2.55	3.31	0.046
Caucasian	1.54	2.36	0.039
Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	8.43	4.10	0.234*
Job Tenure 2 - 5 years	1.83	3.73	0.059
Job Tenure 6 -10 years	-1.76	3.92	-0.039
Company Tenure 0 to 1 year	-8.61	3.97	-0.196*
Company Tenure 2 - 5 years	-3.20	3.12	-0.104
Company Tenure 6 - 10 years	-1.45	3.08	-0.038
Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	-3.68	6.64	-0.028
Student Affairs Tenure 2 - 5 years	3.64	2.96	0.106
Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	2.63	2.71	0.084
Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	2.55	2.72	0.063
Two year institutions	0.55	8.08	0.007
Associate degree as highest earned	0.18	9.51	0.001
Bachelor's degree as highest earned	3.42	5.09	0.033
Master's degree as highest earned	-0.21	2.20	-0.005
Professional degree as highest earned	-4.16	3.81	-0.057
Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	3.10	3.64	0.072
Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	0.44	2.94	0.013
Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	-1.76	2.91	-0.045
Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	-0.87	2.87	-0.022
Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	-2.82	3.16	-0.057
Highest degree awarded - Associate	3.47	8.95	0.040
Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	-1.01	3.11	-0.020
Highest degree awarded - Master's	-1.40	2.18	-0.036
Enrollment Management	6.04	2.84	-0.125*
Special Populations	-4.99	3.51	-0.076
Wellness	-2.93	3.67	-0.042
Student Involvement	-5.33	2.46	-0.14*
Academic Endeavors	-5.40	4.18	-0.064
Career Services	-8.37	3.31	-0.137*
Student Conduct	-4.79	3.89	-0.063
Residence Life	-3.85	2.33	-0.114
Gender	-3.84	1.47	-0.118**

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

APPENDIX X

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Mid-level Professionals' Satisfaction with CoWorkers and Predictor Variables

Variable	*M*	*SD*
Coworkers		
Predictor variable		
1. African American	0.08	0.278
2. Caucasian	0.82	0.385
3. Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.24	0.427
4. Job Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.57	0.495
5. Job Tenure 6 -10 years	0.13	0.339
6. Company Tenure 0 - 1 year	0.14	0.351
7. Company Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.52	0.500
8. Company Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.21	0.407
9. Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.01	0.115
10. Student Affairs Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.28	0.447
11. Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.39	0.498
12. Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	0.17	0.378
13. Two year institutions	0.04	0.197
14. Associate degree as highest earned	0.01	0.076
15. Bachelor's degree as highest earned	0.02	0.150
16. Master's degree as highest earned	0.80	0.404
17. Professional degree as highest earned	0.05	0.210
18. Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	0.15	0.357
19. Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	0.29	0.455
20. Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	0.19	0.391
21. Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	0.18	0.386
22. Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	0.11	0.310
23. Highest degree awarded - Associate	0.03	0.178
24. Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	0.10	0.300
25. Highest degree awarded - Master's	0.20	0.400
26. Enrollment Management	0.12	0.322
27. Special Populations	0.06	0.233
28. Wellness	0.05	0.218
29. Student Involvement	0.20	0.404
30. Academic Endeavors	0.03	0.183
31. Career Services	0.07	0.250
32. Student Conduct	0.04	0.201
33. Residence Life	0.30	0.456
34. Gender	1.67	0.471

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Coworkers	-.027	.031	-.006	-.046	-.013	-.094	-.017
Predictor variable							
1	--	-.647	.046	-.050	.006	.037	-.063
2		--	-.002	-.004	.034	.002	.011
3			--	-.644	-.219	.693	-.212
4				--	-.453	-.471	.556
5					--	-.128	-.388
6						--	-.428
7							--
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Coworkers	-.008	.031	-.044	-.099	.025	.026	.021
Predictor variable							
1	.002	.025	-.015	-.011	.011	.151	.161
2	-.012	.011	.040	-.053	.024	-.084	-.164
3	-.206	.170	.201	-.046	-.110	.046	-.043
4	-.107	-.101	.058	.093	.022	-.059	-.037
5	.488	-.046	-.243	.036	.108	.006	-.030
6	-.208	.143	.178	-.044	-.069	.028	-.031
7	-.534	-.022	.247	.106	-.149	-.039	-.080
8	--	-.060	-.274	.140	.159	-.032	.024
9		--	-.073	-.094	-.053	.061	-.009
10			--	-.496	-.283	-.062	-.047
11				--	-.364	-.024	-.009
12					--	.088	-.035
13						--	-.016
14							--
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Coworkers	.020	-.104	.004	.021	-.046	.043	-.030
Predictor variable							
1	.000	-.002	-.066	-.068	.010	.087	-.034
2	-.096	.000	.054	.026	-.017	-.046	.037
3	.005	.072	-.037	-.070	.046	.055	-.007
4	.030	-.037	.080	.092	-.062	-.020	.027
5	-.023	.004	-.032	-.022	.027	-.044	-.054
6	-.063	.099	-.037	-.064	.094	.056	-.051
7	.096	.048	.045	.143	-.059	-.062	.033
8	-.047	-.022	.024	-.055	.034	.021	-.032
9	.093	.018	-.026	-.049	.036	.072	-.012
10	.105	.114	-.014	.076	-.014	-.014	-.027
11	-.044	.046	.069	.018	-.045	.008	.020
12	-.070	-.046	-.027	-.006	.038	.041	-.044
13	-.032	-.016	.001	-.032	-.001	.051	-.047
14	-.012	-.150	-.017	.039	.008	.028	-.036
15	--	-.302	-.034	-.029	-.013	.057	.060
16		--	-.432	.095	.040	-.021	-.091
17			--	-.016	.022	-.060	.014
18				--	-.268	-.203	-.200
19					--	-.307	-.301
20						--	-.229
21							--
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Coworkers	-.006	.017	-.013	-.041	-.024	.039	.096
Predictor variable							
1	.030	.102	-.054	.009	.046	.225	-.037
2	-.033	-.056	.038	.014	-.040	-.209	.061
3	-.063	-.001	.010	.032	.071	-.041	-.024
4	-.013	-.016	-.009	-.003	-.021	.048	-.087
5	.101	-.008	-.018	.020	-.033	.000	.092
6	-.036	-.013	-.026	.061	.079	-.030	.007
7	-.053	-.019	.075	.026	.014	-.012	-.064
8	.037	-.040	-.028	-.049	-.033	.016	-.030
9	-.041	-.022	-.039	.110	-.042	.043	.050
10	-.022	-.066	.123	-.004	.062	-.006	-.044
11	.015	-.014	-.017	.002	.025	-.012	-.093
12	-.027	.117	-.033	.019	.014	.019	.083
13	.055	.896	-.036	-.077	.019	.033	.087
14	-.027	-.014	-.025	.026	-.027	-.019	-.018
15	-.054	-.028	-.009	-.044	.026	.072	-.035
16	-.007	-.040	.059	.085	.048	.004	-.167
17	.042	.011	.079	-.040	-.050	-.055	-.051
18	-.147	-.078	.542	.185	.002	-.104	-.023
19	-.221	.003	-.014	.350	.014	-.011	-.087
20	-.168	.049	-.161	-.128	-.034	.007	.115
21	-.165	-.031	-.158	-.235	-.013	.075	.005
22	--	.075	-.116	-.141	-.027	.020	.005
23		--	-.062	-.091	-.032	.001	.107
24			--	-.165	.082	-.083	-.077
25				--	.036	-.040	-.069
26					--	-.089	-.082
27						--	-.057
28							--
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	29	30	31	32	33	34
Coworkers	-.018	.034	.043	.020	-.100	-.020
Predictor variable						
1	-.066	.019	-.053	-.063	-.026	.034
2	.035	.005	.024	.098	.024	-.027
3	-.013	.018	-.060	.040	.027	.018
4	.043	-.027	-.031	-.011	-.004	-.031
5	-.058	.050	.076	.002	-.017	.023
6	-.029	-.077	-.066	.133	.026	.007
7	.063	.055	-.020	-.106	.050	-.008
8	-.046	-.019	.072	.034	-.027	.005
9	-.018	.069	-.032	-.025	-.002	.012
10	.048	.023	.005	-.024	.004	.062
11	-.003	-.022	.053	.048	.055	-.058
12	-.028	.025	-.061	-.045	-.071	-.005
13	.041	-.039	.023	-.043	-.133	.020
14	-.039	-.014	-.021	-.016	.006	.054
15	-.014	.111	-.041	-.032	.013	.000
16	.034	-.033	.080	-.105	.132	.106
17	.048	.008	-.059	.181	-.042	-.098
18	.027	.009	.016	-.062	.011	-.001
19	.122	-.051	.016	.035	-.047	.041
20	-.074	.016	.007	-.004	.055	-.036
21	.007	.019	-.048	-.026	-.001	.016
22	-.053	.036	.030	.050	.006	-.058
23	.068	-.035	.037	-.039	-.119	.038
24	.053	.007	-.039	-.038	.009	.031
25	.014	.012	.002	.016	.041	.030
26	-.182	-.068	-.097	-.076	-.232	.072
27	-.126	-.047	-.067	-.052	-.161	.034
28	-.117	-.044	-.062	-.048	-.149	.012
29	--	-.096	-.137	-.107	-.328	.043
30		--	-.051	-.040	-.123	-.001
31			--	-.057	-.174	.092
32				--	-.136	-.116
33					--	-.083
34						--

APPENDIX Y

Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Mid-level Professionals' Satisfaction with Coworkers

Variable	*B*	*SEB*	β
African American	-1.08	2.58	-0.025
Caucasian	0.77	1.85	0.025
Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	-0.08	3.20	-0.003
Job Tenure 2 - 5 years	-3.94	2.90	-0.164
Job Tenure 6 -10 years	-4.89	3.05	-0.139
Company Tenure 0 to 1 year	-5.63	3.10	-0.165
Company Tenure 2 - 5 years	-0.01	2.42	0.000
Company Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.01	2.39	0.000
Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	-0.17	5.16	-0.002
Student Affairs Tenure 2 - 5 years	-3.88	2.28	-0.146
Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	-4.47	2.09	-0.183*
Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	-2.80	2.10	-0.089
Two year institutions	1.94	6.28	0.032
Associate degree as highest earned	-1.20	7.39	-0.008
Bachelor's degree as highest earned	-0.45	3.96	-0.006
Master's degree as highest earned	-1.94	1.71	-0.066
Professional degree as highest earned	-0.67	2.96	-0.012
Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	1.74	2.83	0.052
Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	-0.94	2.29	-0.036
Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	0.21	2.25	0.007
Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	-2.32	2.22	-0.075
Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	-1.16	2.46	-0.030
Highest degree awarded - Associate	-2.14	6.96	-0.032
Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	-1.80	2.42	-0.045
Highest degree awarded - Master's	-1.22	1.71	-0.041
Enrollment Management	0.48	2.21	0.013
Special Populations	3.04	2.73	0.060
Wellness	3.31	2.86	0.061
Student Involvement	0.02	1.91	0.001
Academic Endeavors	1.93	3.25	0.030
Career Services	2.19	2.57	0.046
Student Conduct	2.23	3.03	0.038
Residence Life	-1.32	1.81	-0.050
Gender	-0.46	1.15	-0.018

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

APPENDIX Z

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Mid-level Professionals' Satisfaction with Supervision and Predictor Variables

Variable	*M*	*SD*
Supervision		
Predictor variable		
1. African American	0.08	0.278
2. Caucasian	0.82	0.385
3. Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.24	0.427
4. Job Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.57	0.495
5. Job Tenure 6 -10 years	0.13	0.339
6. Company Tenure 0 - 1 year	0.14	0.351
7. Company Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.52	0.500
8. Company Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.21	0.407
9. Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.01	0.115
10. Student Affairs Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.28	0.447
11. Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.39	0.498
12. Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	0.17	0.378
13. Two year institutions	0.04	0.197
14. Associate degree as highest earned	0.01	0.076
15. Bachelor's degree as highest earned	0.02	0.150
16. Master's degree as highest earned	0.80	0.404
17. Professional degree as highest earned	0.05	0.210
18. Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	0.15	0.357
19. Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	0.29	0.455
20. Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	0.19	0.391
21. Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	0.18	0.386
22. Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	0.11	0.310
23. Highest degree awarded - Associate	0.03	0.178
24. Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	0.10	0.300
25. Highest degree awarded - Master's	0.20	0.400
26. Enrollment Management	0.12	0.322
27. Special Populations	0.06	0.233
28. Wellness	0.05	0.218
29. Student Involvement	0.20	0.404
30. Academic Endeavors	0.03	0.183
31. Career Services	0.07	0.250
32. Student Conduct	0.04	0.201
33. Residence Life	0.30	0.456
34. Gender	1.67	0.471

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Supervision	.022	-.019	.012	-.050	.005	-.055	-.045
Predictor variable							
1	--	-.647	.056	-.057	.004	.053	-.068
2		--	-.017	.007	.036	-.007	.020
3			--	-.647	-.219	.692	-.217
4				--	-.450	-.472	.556
5					--	-.128	-.384
6						--	-.427
7							--
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Supervision	.042	.042	-.051	-.049	.038	.052	.030
Predictor variable							
1	-.003	.025	-.018	-.018	.026	.148	.159
2	-.017	.011	.044	-.052	.016	-.082	-.162
3	-.200	.169	.196	-.047	-.102	.045	-.043
4	-.107	-.101	.059	.095	.017	-.059	-.036
5	.481	-.046	-.241	.034	.106	.006	-.030
6	-.210	.142	.175	-.050	-.057	.027	-.031
7	-.536	-.022	.249	.103	-.151	-.038	-.079
8	--	-.060	-.275	.147	.152	-.033	.023
9		--	-.072	-.094	-.053	.061	-.009
10			--	-.496	-.282	-.061	-.047
11				--	-.367	-.025	-.009
12					--	.087	-.035
13						--	-.016
14							--
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Supervision	.042	-.072	-.011	-.019	.026	.026	-.059
Predictor variable							
1	-.001	.000	-.067	-.069	.018	.084	-.036
2	-.094	-.003	.055	.029	-.029	-.043	.040
3	.004	.074	-.037	-.071	.055	.052	-.009
4	.030	-.038	.079	.092	-.066	-.019	.028
5	-.022	.002	-.032	-.021	.024	-.043	-.052
6	-.063	.100	-.038	-.064	.098	.055	-.052
7	.096	.045	.046	.144	-.061	-.060	.035
8	-.047	-.019	.022	-.057	.034	.019	-.035
9	.093	.018	-.026	-.049	.035	.072	-.012
10	.106	.112	-.013	.078	-.018	-.011	-.025
11	-.045	.049	.067	.015	-.041	.005	.017
12	-.070	-.045	-.028	-.006	.042	.040	-.044
13	-.031	-.017	.002	-.031	-.002	.051	-.046
14	-.012	-.150	-.017	.039	.007	.028	-.036
15	--	-.302	-.034	-.028	-.014	.057	.060
16		--	-.432	.093	.043	-.023	-.093
17			--	-.015	.020	-.059	.015
18				--	-.269	-.202	-.198
19					--	-.308	-.302
20						--	-.227
21							--
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Supervision	-.016	.035	-.030	-.003	-.036	.018	.080
Predictor variable							
1	.029	.100	-.055	.004	.040	.221	-.038
2	-.031	-.054	.039	.022	-.047	-.206	.061
3	-.064	-.002	.008	.024	.075	-.042	-.025
4	-.012	-.015	-.009	.006	-.022	.048	-.086
5	.102	-.008	-.016	.018	-.036	.001	.093
6	-.036	-.014	-.027	.055	.072	-.031	.007
7	-.052	-.019	.076	.027	.003	-.010	-.063
8	.035	-.041	-.029	-.044	-.011	.015	-.031
9	-.040	-.021	-.039	.109	-.042	.043	.050
10	-.020	-.065	.124	-.007	.056	-.005	-.043
11	.013	-.015	-.019	.011	.037	-.013	-.094
12	-.027	.116	-.033	.014	.008	.018	.082
13	.055	.896	-.036	-.078	.017	.033	.088
14	-.026	-.014	-.025	.026	-.028	-.019	-.017
15	-.053	-.028	-.008	-.045	.024	.072	-.035
16	-.008	-.041	.058	.087	.052	.003	-.167
17	.042	.011	.080	-.041	-.051	-.054	-.050
18	-.145	-.077	.542	.181	-.002	-.103	-.022
19	-.222	.001	-.016	.345	.016	-.013	-.089
20	-.167	.050	-.160	-.129	-.037	.008	.115
21	-.164	-.031	-.157	-.235	-.017	.076	.006
22	--	.076	-.115	-.142	-.030	.021	.006
23		--	-.061	-.092	-.033	.001	.107
24			--	-.166	.078	-.082	-.076
25				--	.043	-.041	-.070
26					--	-.090	-.083
27						--	-.057
28							--
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	29	30	31	32	33	34
Supervision	-.071	.078	-.044	.091	-.069	-.040
Predictor variable						
1	-.069	.018	-.054	-.064	-.015	.023
2	.040	.007	.026	.098	.019	-.023
3	-.018	.017	-.061	.039	.031	.014
4	.047	-.027	-.031	-.011	-.008	-.027
5	-.058	.050	.076	.003	-.017	.022
6	-.032	-.077	-.066	.132	.034	-.002
7	.069	.055	-.019	-.104	.048	-.007
8	-.051	-.020	.070	.033	-.033	.011
9	-.018	.069	-.031	-.024	-.002	.011
10	.048	.024	.006	-.023	.005	.061
11	.000	-.023	.051	.046	.047	-.050
12	-.031	.025	-.062	-.045	-.062	-.013
13	.041	-.039	.023	-.043	-.132	.020
14	-.039	-.014	-.020	-.016	.006	.054
15	-.015	.111	-.041	-.032	.013	-.001
16	.034	-.034	.079	-.106	.131	.106
17	.047	.009	-.059	.182	-.042	-.098
18	.027	.009	.017	-.061	.012	-.002
19	.124	-.052	.014	.033	-.045	.039
20	-.074	.017	.008	-.003	.055	-.037
21	.006	.020	-.047	-.025	.000	.016
22	-.053	.036	.031	.051	.007	-.058
23	.067	-.035	.037	-.038	-.119	.037
24	.053	.007	-.038	-.038	.009	.030
25	.020	.011	.001	.015	.035	.035
26	-.185	-.069	-.098	-.076	-.235	.079
27	-.125	-.047	-.066	-.052	-.160	.034
28	-.116	-.043	-.061	-.048	-.148	.012
29	--	-.096	-.136	-.107	-.328	.045
30		--	-.051	-.040	-.122	-.001
31			--	-.056	-.173	.091
32				--	-.136	-.116
33					--	-.089
34						--

APPENDIX AA

Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Mid-level Professionals' Satisfaction with Supervision

Variable	*B*	*SEB*	β
African American	0.00	2.97	0.000
Caucasian	-0.48	2.13	-0.013
Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	-0.85	3.70	-0.026
Job Tenure 2 - 5 years	-4.45	3.37	-0.159
Job Tenure 6 -10 years	-5.42	3.54	-0.133
Company Tenure 0 to 1 year	-5.48	3.57	-0.139
Company Tenure 2 - 5 years	-0.38	2.81	-0.014
Company Tenure 6 - 10 years	1.40	2.77	0.041
Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	2.13	5.99	0.018
Student Affairs Tenure 2 - 5 years	-1.13	2.64	-0.037
Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	-1.24	2.42	-0.044
Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	-0.42	2.44	-0.012
Two year institutions	6.80	7.30	0.087
Associate degree as highest earned	-0.49	8.59	-0.003
Bachelor's degree as highest earned	3.17	4.60	0.034
Master's degree as highest earned	-0.60	1.98	-0.017
Professional degree as highest earned	-2.17	3.44	-0.033
Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	-0.87	3.25	-0.022
Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	-0.42	2.62	-0.014
Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	-1.44	2.60	-0.041
Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	-3.71	2.56	-0.104
Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	-2.61	2.84	-0.058
Highest degree awarded - Associate	-4.07	8.09	-0.052
Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	-1.47	2.81	-0.032
Highest degree awarded - Master's	-0.35	1.95	-0.010
Enrollment Management	-3.59	2.55	-0.084
Special Populations	-1.62	3.17	-0.027
Wellness	1.89	3.32	0.030
Student Involvement	-4.22	2.22	-0.123
Academic Endeavors	2.92	3.78	0.039
Career Services	-4.94	2.99	-0.089
Student Conduct	4.92	3.52	0.072
Residence Life	-3.57	2.10	-0.118
Gender	-0.77	1.33	-0.026

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

APPENDIX BB

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Mid-level Professionals' Satisfaction with the Work Itself and Predictor Variables

Variable	*M*	*SD*
Work Itself		
Predictor variable		
1. African American	0.08	0.278
2. Caucasian	0.82	0.385
3. Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.24	0.427
4. Job Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.57	0.495
5. Job Tenure 6 -10 years	0.13	0.339
6. Company Tenure 0 - 1 year	0.14	0.351
7. Company Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.52	0.500
8. Company Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.21	0.407
9. Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	0.01	0.115
10. Student Affairs Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.28	0.447
11. Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	0.39	0.498
12. Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	0.17	0.378
13. Two year institutions	0.04	0.197
14. Associate degree as highest earned	0.01	0.076
15. Bachelor's degree as highest earned	0.02	0.150
16. Master's degree as highest earned	0.80	0.404
17. Professional degree as highest earned	0.05	0.210
18. Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	0.15	0.357
19. Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	0.29	0.455
20. Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	0.19	0.391
21. Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	0.18	0.386
22. Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	0.11	0.310
23. Highest degree awarded - Associate	0.03	0.178
24. Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	0.10	0.300
25. Highest degree awarded - Master's	0.20	0.400
26. Enrollment Management	0.12	0.322
27. Special Populations	0.06	0.233
28. Wellness	0.05	0.218
29. Student Involvement	0.20	0.404
30. Academic Endeavors	0.03	0.183
31. Career Services	0.07	0.250
32. Student Conduct	0.04	0.201
33. Residence Life	0.30	0.456
34. Gender	1.67	0.471

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Work Itself	.036	-.032	.034	-.082	.009	-.077	-.035
Predictor variable							
1	--	-.647	.056	-.057	.004	.053	-.068
2		--	-.017	.007	.036	-.007	.020
3			--	-.647	-.219	.692	-.217
4				--	-.450	-.472	.556
5					--	-.128	-.384
6						--	-.427
7							--
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Work Itself	-.017	.034	.012	-.081	-.020	-.025	.055
Predictor variable							
1	-.003	.025	-.018	-.018	.026	.148	.159
2	-.017	.011	.044	-.052	.016	-.082	-.162
3	-.200	.169	.196	-.047	-.102	.045	-.043
4	-.107	-.101	.059	.095	.017	-.059	-.036
5	.481	-.046	-.241	.034	.106	.006	-.030
6	-.210	.142	.175	-.050	-.057	.027	-.031
7	-.536	-.022	.249	.103	-.151	-.038	-.079
8	--	-.060	-.275	.147	.152	-.033	.023
9		--	-.072	-.094	-.053	.061	-.009
10			--	-.496	-.282	-.061	-.047
11				--	-.367	-.025	-.009
12					--	.087	-.035
13						--	-.016
14							--
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Work Itself	.030	-.065	-.003	.029	-.014	-.056	.031
Predictor variable							
1	-.001	.000	-.067	-.069	.018	.084	-.036
2	-.094	-.003	.055	.029	-.029	-.043	.040
3	.004	.074	-.037	-.071	.055	.052	-.009
4	.030	-.038	.079	.092	-.066	-.019	.028
5	-.022	.002	-.032	-.021	.024	-.043	-.052
6	-.063	.100	-.038	-.064	.098	.055	-.052
7	.096	.045	.046	.144	-.061	-.060	.035
8	-.047	-.019	.022	-.057	.034	.019	-.035
9	.093	.018	-.026	-.049	.035	.072	-.012
10	.106	.112	-.013	.078	-.018	-.011	-.025
11	-.045	.049	.067	.015	-.041	.005	.170
12	-.070	-.045	-.028	-.006	.042	.040	-.044
13	-.031	-.017	.002	-.031	-.002	.051	-.046
14	-.012	-.150	-.017	.039	.007	.028	-.036
15	--	-.302	-.034	-.028	-.014	.057	.060
16		--	-.432	.093	.043	-.023	-.093
17			--	-.015	.020	-.059	.015
18				--	-.269	-.202	-.198
19					--	-.308	-.302
20						--	-.227
21							--
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Work Itself	.008	-.035	.021	-.005	-.027	.026	.062
Predictor variable							
1	.029	.100	-.055	.004	.040	.221	-.038
2	-.031	-.054	.039	.022	-.047	-.206	.061
3	-.064	-.002	.008	.024	.075	-.042	-.025
4	-.012	-.015	-.009	.006	-.022	.048	-.086
5	.102	-.008	-.016	.018	-.036	.001	.093
6	-.036	-.014	-.027	.055	.072	-.031	.007
7	-.052	-.019	.076	.027	.003	-.010	-.063
8	.035	-.041	-.029	-.044	-.011	.015	-.031
9	-.040	-.021	-.039	.109	-.042	.043	.050
10	-.020	-.065	.124	-.007	.056	-.005	-.043
11	.013	-.015	-.019	.011	.037	-.013	-.094
12	-.027	.116	-.033	.014	.008	.018	.082
13	.055	.896	-.036	-.078	.017	.033	.088
14	-.026	-.014	-.025	.026	-.028	-.019	-.017
15	-.053	-.028	-.008	-.045	.024	.072	-.035
16	-.008	-.041	.058	.087	.052	.003	-.167
17	.042	.011	.080	-.041	-.051	-.054	-.050
18	-.145	-.077	.542	.181	-.002	-.103	-.022
19	-.222	.001	-.016	.345	.016	-.013	-.089
20	-.167	.050	-.160	-.129	-.037	.008	.115
21	-.164	-.031	-.157	-.235	-.017	.076	.006
22	--	.076	-.115	-.142	-.030	.021	.006
23		--	-.061	-.092	-.033	.001	.107
24			--	-.166	.078	-.082	-.076
25				--	.043	-.041	-.070
26					--	-.090	-.083
27						--	-.057
28							--
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							

Table continues

Table continued

Variable	29	30	31	32	33	34
Work Itself	.008	.059	-.008	-.081	-.030	-.060
Predictor variable						
1	-.069	.018	-.054	-.064	-.015	.023
2	.040	.007	.026	.098	.019	-.023
3	-.018	.017	-.061	.039	.031	.014
4	.047	-.027	-.031	-.011	-.008	-.027
5	-.058	.050	.076	.003	-.017	.022
6	-.032	-.077	-.066	.132	.034	-.002
7	.069	.055	-.019	-.104	.048	-.007
8	-.051	-.020	.070	.033	-.033	.011
9	-.018	.069	-.031	-.024	-.002	.011
10	.048	.024	.006	-.023	.005	.061
11	.000	-.023	.051	.046	.047	-.050
12	-.031	.025	-.062	-.045	-.062	-.013
13	.041	-.039	.023	-.043	-.132	.020
14	-.039	-.014	-.020	-.016	.006	.054
15	-.015	.111	-.041	-.032	.013	-.001
16	.034	-.034	.079	-.106	.131	.106
17	.047	.009	-.059	.182	-.042	-.098
18	.027	.009	.017	-.061	.012	-.002
19	.124	-.052	.014	.033	-.045	.039
20	-.074	.017	.008	-.003	.055	-.037
21	.006	.020	-.047	-.025	.000	.016
22	-.053	.036	.031	.051	.007	-.058
23	.067	-.035	.037	-.038	-.119	.037
24	.053	.007	-.038	-.038	.009	.030
25	.020	.011	.001	.015	.035	.035
26	-.185	-.069	-.098	-.076	-.235	.079
27	-.125	-.047	-.066	-.052	-.160	.034
28	-.116	-.043	-.061	-.048	-.148	.012
29	--	-.096	-.136	-.107	-.328	.045
30		--	-.051	-.040	-.122	-.001
31			--	-.056	-.173	.091
32				--	-.136	-.116
33					--	-.089
34						--

APPENDIX CC

Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Mid-level Professionals' Satisfaction with the Work Itself

Variable	*B*	*SEB*	β
African American	0.82	2.30	0.021
Caucasian	-0.40	1.65	-0.014
Job Tenure 0 to 1 year	3.17	2.87	0.126
Job Tenure 2 - 5 years	-1.23	2.61	-0.057
Job Tenure 6 -10 years	-1.18	2.74	-0.037
Company Tenure 0 to 1 year	-9.42	2.77	-0.308**
Company Tenure 2 - 5 years	-4.60	2.18	-0.214*
Company Tenure 6 - 10 years	-3.52	2.15	-0.134
Student Affairs Tenure 0 to 1 year	3.02	4.64	0.032
Student Affairs Tenure 2 - 5 years	0.89	2.05	0.037
Student Affairs Tenure 6 - 10 years	-0.54	1.88	-0.025
Student Affairs Tenure 11 to 15 years	-0.88	1.89	-0.031
Two year institutions	0.09	5.65	0.002
Associate degree as highest earned	4.27	6.66	0.030
Bachelor's degree as highest earned	0.24	3.56	0.003
Master's degree as highest earned	-0.73	1.54	-0.028
Professional degree as highest earned	0.18	2.67	0.003
Institutional Enrollment under 2000 students	0.87	2.52	0.029
Institutional Enrollment 2,000 - 9,999 students	-0.08	2.03	-0.003
Institutional Enrollment 10,000 - 19,999 students	-1.77	2.01	-0.064
Institutional Enrollment 20,000 - 29,999 students	0.10	1.99	0.003
Institutional Enrollment 30,000 - 39,999 students	-0.09	2.20	-0.003
Highest degree awarded - Associate	-3.04	6.26	-0.050
Highest degree awarded - Bachelor's	0.00	2.17	0.000
Highest degree awarded - Master's	0.07	1.51	0.003
Enrollment Management	-0.47	1.98	-0.014
Special Populations	0.93	2.45	0.020
Wellness	2.80	2.57	0.057
Student Involvement	0.24	1.72	0.009
Academic Endeavors	2.06	2.93	0.035
Career Services	-0.05	2.32	-0.001
Student Conduct	-3.68	2.73	-0.069
Residence Life	-0.43	1.63	-0.018
Gender	-1.75	1.03	-0.077

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.