

EXAMINING DIFFERENCES IN JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL
COMMITMENT OF BLACK STUDENT AFFAIRS PROFESSIONALS AT PWIS AND
HBCUS

by

DARREN JONES

(Under the Direction of Laura A. Dean)

ABSTRACT

Retention of student affairs administrators is vital for institutions to achieve positive operational and student outcomes (Conley, 2001; Davidson, 2012). Specifically, institutional efforts to retain Black student affairs professionals show a commitment to improving their experiences through increased job satisfaction and organizational commitment. However, minimal research exists that sheds light on job satisfaction and organizational commitment for Black student affairs professionals (Hirt et al., 2006; Marcus, 2000; Steele, 2018). Literature about Black student affairs professionals at HBCUs is even scarcer. Given the distinct cultural elements of both PWIs and HBCUs, little is known about whether the Black student affairs professionals at both institution types share similar attitudes and feelings toward their job and the organization.

This quantitative study sought to extend on existing literature to examine the differences in job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Black student affairs professionals at PWIs and HBCUs. Two hundred eighty-eight Black student affairs professionals at PWIs (n=218) and HBCUs (n=70) participated in the study. The survey consisted of three validated instruments

that measured global job satisfaction, job facet satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The *Abridged Job in General Scale* (Russell et al., 2004) measured global satisfaction. The *Abridged Job Descriptive Index* (Stanton et al., 2001) measured satisfaction with job facets (work, pay, promotion, supervision, and coworker). The revised *Three-Component Model Employee Commitment Survey* (Meyer & Allen, 1993) measured three components of organizational commitment (affective, continuance, and normative). Independent t-tests were run to analyze the results.

Findings indicated no differences amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs as compared to those at HBCUs for the following dependent variables: global job satisfaction, work, pay, promotion, supervision, affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. However, there was a difference in the coworker job facet. Respondents at PWIs reported a higher level of satisfaction than those at HBCUs. Understanding the levels assists student affairs leaders in their retention efforts for Black student affairs professionals. Furthermore, knowing where the differences exist allows student affairs leaders to cater their retention efforts to the institutional context and adopt universal retention strategies in areas where no differences exist.

INDEX WORDS: Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Black Student Affairs Professionals, PWIs, HBCUs, Job Facets, Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment, Normative Commitment, Student Affairs, Higher Education

EXAMINING DIFFERENCES IN JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL
COMMITMENT OF BLACK STUDENT AFFAIRS PROFESSIONALS AT PWIS
AND HBCUS.

by

DARREN JONES

BA, The University of Virginia, 2007

MA, The George Washington University, 2009

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2020

© 2020

Darren Jones

All Rights Reserved

EXAMINING DIFFERENCES IN JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL
COMMITMENT OF BLACK STUDENT AFFAIRS PROFESSIONALS AT PWIS AND
HBCUS.

by

DARREN JONES

Major Professor:	Laura A. Dean
Committee:	Darris R. Means
	Merrily S. Dunn

Electronic Version Approved:

Ron Walcott
Interim Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2020

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are many people I wish to acknowledge that have contributed to my professional and personal journey to this point. First, thank you to all my loved ones who have challenged and supported me during my ups and downs. Thank you for being a listening ear and a strong source of empowerment and encouragement. A special shout out to Michael Turner, Maurice Washington, and Timothy Sams, who were gracious enough to write my letters of recommendation for the program. To the faculty of the Student Affairs Leadership Doctoral program, you all are awesome! Thank you for seeing what we could not see in ourselves. Thank you to my committee members Merrily Dunn, Darris Means, and my wonderful chair, Laura Dean. Dr. Dean, thank you for always pushing me to make my work “just a little bit better and stronger.” To my cohort, you all are so amazing! We went in with the commitment to the program and each other, and we made it! To Black SAL, y’all are some “real ones.” Thank you for the laughs and support and, most importantly, “tea time.” Make sure you all keep our traditions strong!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Research Purpose & Design.....	7
Significance of the Study	9
Positionality	10
Conclusion	11
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	13
Understanding Job Satisfaction.....	13
Job Satisfaction for Black Student Affairs Professionals	20
Job Satisfaction Theories	22
Understanding Organizational Commitment	26
Conclusion	30
3 METHODOLOGY	32
Research Design.....	32
Instruments.....	35
Data Collection	39
Data Analysis	40

Conclusion	41
4 DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	42
Description of Respondents	42
Research Question 1	47
Research Question 2	49
Research Question 3	52
Conclusion	54
5 DISCUSSION	56
Discussion of Findings.....	56
Limitations	63
Implications and Recommendations for Practice	63
Recommendations for Future Research	67
Conclusion	69
REFERENCES	71
APPENDICES	
A PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT ADVERTISEMENT.....	84
B AAKC AGREEMENT TO POST ON FACEBOOK PAGE	85
C MESSAGE TO PROFESSIONAL CONTACTS	86
D MESSAGE TO CSAOS AT HBCUS	87
E PERMISSION TO USE AJDI/AJIG	88
F PERMISSION TO USE THE THREE-COMPONENT MODEL SURVEY	89
G QUALTRICS SURVEY	90

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Determinants of Job Satisfaction by Category with Number of Citations	15
Table 2: Respondent Summary by Institution Type	42
Table 3: Respondent Summary by Gender and Institution Type.....	43
Table 4: Respondent Summary by Current Professional Level and Institution Type	43
Table 5: Respondent Summary by Years of Full-time Student Affairs Experience and Institution Type.....	44
Table 6: Respondent Summary of Primary Functional Area and Institution Type	45
Table 7: Descriptive Statistics for Global Job Satisfaction Scores of Respondents at PWIs and HBCUs.....	47
Table 8: Independent T-test for Global Job Satisfaction Scores of Respondents at PWIs and HBCUs.....	48
Table 9: Descriptive Statistics for Job Facet Satisfaction Scores of Respondents at PWIs and HBCUs.....	49
Table 10: Independent T-test for Job Facet Satisfaction Scores of Respondents at PWIs and HBCUs.....	51
Table 11: Descriptive Statistics for Organizational Commitment Component Scores of Respondents at PWIs and HBCUs.....	52
Table 12: Independent T-test for Organizational Commitment Component Scores of Respondents at PWIs and HBCUs	53

Table 13: Results of Job Facet Satisfaction Scores of Respondents at PWIs and HBCUs in

Descending Order	60
------------------------	----

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Black representation in student affairs leadership is an ongoing challenge (Gardner et al., 2014). Increased representation is evidence of an institution's commitment to diversity at predominately White institutions (Davis, 1994; Jackson 2002). It also promotes a welcoming environment for Black students (Jackson, 2002). Although diverse representation promotes positive outcomes, staff attrition counteracts progress towards the goal of diverse representation. Staff attrition, turnover, and retention have been a concern in higher education for decades, yet the data on attrition and turnover rates have been inconsistent and outdated (Lorden, 1998). For example, an internet search for attrition rates in the field yields just two specific studies, both from the 1980s. One statistic reported an attrition rate of 32% for new professionals within their first five years in student affairs (Wood et al., 1985). Another statistic has shown an attrition rate of 61% within six years (Holmes et al., 1982). While no more recent comparable studies have been published, anecdotally, the revolving door of student affairs administrator employment is typical, and it is vital to consider the implications of this phenomenon (Conley, 2001).

Separation and replacement costs are significant implications of attrition (Allen et al., 2010). Separation costs are tangible (e.g., accrued paid time off and temporary staff) and intangible (e.g., team disruptions, loss of organizational memory, increased workload for other staff members) (Allen et al., 2010). Replacement costs are associated with the employee recruitment process (e.g., advertisements, candidate travel, relocation expenses) (Allen et al., 2010). "When turnover is high, units lose efficiency, consistency, and quality in the delivery of

services, as well as the investment made in the knowledge base of the institution or unit” (Rosser & Javinar, 2003, p. 825). In addition to losing the quality of services, student affairs is threatened by the loss of team diversity (Allen et al., 2010). Therefore, student affairs leaders must understand how to promote healthy levels of job satisfaction and cultivate committed employees who will ultimately make a positive impact on students and institutional outcomes (Conley, 2001; Davidson, 2012).

The literature on job satisfaction describes it as a factor to consider ensuring company vitality and prosperity (Volkwein & Parmley, 2000). Job satisfaction, along with organizational commitment, has been consistently identified as a reason for staff attrition and turnover (Anderson et al., 2000; Bender, 2009; Boehman, 2007; Marshall et al., 2016; Volkwein & Parmley, 2000). Both concepts are used interchangeably and are often confused with one another (Buck & Watson, 2002). Job satisfaction is a global feeling about a job or various facets of the job (Spector, 1997). Organizational commitment is related to an individual attitude towards and attachment to an organization (Allen & Meyer, 1996). Someone’s response to their job responsibilities may not reflect how they feel about the organization. It is important to note that day-to-day events can impact job satisfaction. If a position is eliminated in an office, and an employee must absorb additional responsibilities without a pay increase, their feeling about the job and specific facets may change. However, the shift in attitude may not change their emotional attachment to the organization, which is built over time (Buck & Watson, 2002; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979).

Fife (1992) noted, “most satisfied workers perform at their maximum capacity for the good of the organization” (p. xvii). Committed staff develop an emotional attachment and a strong sense of loyalty to the profession and the organization (Boehman, 2007). In higher

education, there are fewer studies that attempt to solidify a model allowing managers to correlate job factors to overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Johnsrud, 2002). Much of the research on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the higher education context has focused primarily on faculty (Iacqua, Schumacher, & Li, 2001). Regardless, there has been interest in learning about what keeps staff satisfied, motivated, and committed to student affairs and their institution of employment (Anderson et al., 2000; Bender, 2009; Boehman, 2007; Tull, 2006).

Although attrition is typical for staff in student affairs roles (Conley, 2001), most professionals indicate high levels of job satisfaction (Bender, 2009). This presents an inconsistency from the reported attrition rates and commitment to the profession (Boehman, 2007). Black student affairs professionals have been reported to experience lower levels of job satisfaction (Marcus, 2000). Job satisfaction has been discussed as a component of organizational commitment, but neither has been addressed in the context of race or institutional type, specifically predominately White institutions (PWIs) and historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs). Research conducted on job satisfaction and organizational commitment by institutional type and race will be discussed later in this chapter as well as Chapter 2. The research on organizational commitment in student affairs only highlighted the correlations of factors that impact affective organizational commitment but did not measure levels (Boehman, 2007).

In terms of staff diversity in student affairs, the literature suggests that retention of Black student affairs professionals is an area in need of improvement in staffing practices for predominately White institutions (Jackson, 2001; Sagria & Johnsrud, 1991). To improve retention efforts, institutions must have a better understanding of their Black staff experiences to

create intentional strategies of retention and support. There is limited research that examines Black student affairs professionals' experiences and the difficulties faced in the workplace (Steele, 2018). Gardner, Barret, and Pearson (2014) identified enablers and barriers to career success for African-American administrators at PWIs. Enablers consisted of "adjustment issues, institutional factors, and career dynamics" (p. 236). Barriers to success for Black student affairs professionals that emerged from the literature review were discrimination, career ambiguity, compensation, and working conditions (Gardner et al., 2014). Toxicity in the workplace for Black student affairs professionals was linked to issues of staff support, institutional politics, invisibility, and the environment (Steele, 2018). Even though core issues with experiences and retention have been identified, the information does not describe the varying levels of job satisfaction or organizational commitment. Also, there is no evidence that these experiences include Black staff at HBCUs.

Historically Black Colleges & Universities (HBCUs) provide a unique experience for students being that they were founded to educate Black students (Hirt et al., 2006). Presumably, this makes the experience for Black student affairs staff different, including their attitudes about the institutional culture and workplace. Black student affairs professionals reported a positive outlook on the environment; being able to positively impact and uplift students resulted in a fulfilling employment experience (Hirt et al., 2006). This is due to the shared commitment from staff members who take on a nurturing role for the students. Students see the staff as more of a relative than a staff member due to their devotion (Hirt et al., 2006).

Conversely, these institutions often lack resources, both financial and human, which requires staff to overwork themselves to meet the demands of leadership (Hirt et al., 2006). Lack of financial and human resources for HBCUs can be attributed to many causes including but not

limited to lower endowments as compared to PWIs, historical discrimination in funding for both public and private HBCUs, and tighter operating budgets that are tuition-driven (Bowman, 2010; Gasman, 2009; Gasman & Drezner, 2010). Also, challenges related to lack of financial and human resources exist at HBCUs and make it difficult to enact change (Hirt et al., 2006), but no empirical evidence has been presented that describes levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Black student affairs professionals at HBCUs.

The success in retention of Black student affairs staff is an indication of an institution's commitment to diversity (Davis, 1994; Jackson 2002). At HBCUs and PWIs, retention efforts ensure consistency in leadership. Diverse representation in student affairs staff is considered a way of supporting the success of Black students. This is especially important since the percentage of associate's and bachelor's degrees awarded to Black students in 2016 were 14% and 11% respectively (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017), but in the same year, Black people represented only 7% of the racial/ethnic composition of higher education administrators (Bichsel & McChesney, 2017). By default, there are fewer Black student affairs professionals, not only in the profession, but in leadership roles that promote policies, programs, and services that provide advocacy for Black students, specifically at PWIs.

The presence of Black student affairs professionals assists in presenting a welcoming environment for Black students at PWIs (Jackson, 2000). Black students may experience feelings of isolation and will look for visual representation within their peer group and university faculty and staff. The lack of diversity in staff can impact student interactions with staff, which, in turn, influences how they utilize university resources that are meant to support their academic success and social adjustment (Swail et al., 2003). The retention of Black staff is an intervention reflective of the institution's commitment not only to staff diversity but also an acknowledgment

of the value-add for the institution and the students. It also supports the idea of *representative bureaucracy*, which is the idea that officers are chosen to represent the ideas, experiences, interests, and points of view of the community they serve (Mosher, 1982). Student affairs professionals advocate for the interests of the students, and, anecdotally speaking, diverse staff increases the likelihood of having diverse points of view that represent the increasingly diverse student body.

Students at HBCUs, who generally have guaranteed representation in student affairs roles, may face different issues connected with staff retention. For Black students, race is an important variable that strengthens the bond between staff mentors and students and creates a foundation to develop effective communication and trust (Lee, 1999). This aspect of student support further validates the need to give attention to satisfaction and commitment for Black student affairs professionals. Black students may choose to attend an HBCU to have guaranteed representation. The representation potentially contributes to a seamless cultural adjustment to a new environment.

Additionally, it has been noted that the relationships between students and staff are unique in that they resemble a family relationship termed *institutional guardianship* (Hirt et al., 2008). Students experience an ethic of care approach to student affairs reflective of institutional guardianship (Manning et al., 2014). Consistency in staff has an impact on the ability of staff to cultivate relationships with students. Therefore, staff retention impacts the students' ability to receive consistent mentorship, which is an important intervention for student retention and contributes to degree attainment (Lee, 1999).

Research Purpose & Design

Few studies discuss the experiences of Black student affairs professionals (Hirt et al., 2006; Marcus, 2000; Steele, 2018), job satisfaction in students affairs (Anderson, Guido-DiBrito, & Morrell, 2000; Bender, 2009), and organizational commitment in student affairs (Boehman, 2007). Studies about the experiences of Black student affairs professionals do not discuss levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, which will be discussed in detail in Chapter 2. The literature on job satisfaction in student affairs indicates that Black student affairs professionals have lower levels of satisfaction than White student affairs professionals (Marcus, 2000), but there is no indication of the differences between PWIs and HBCUs. Furthermore, there is no indication of the facets of the job with which Black student affairs professionals are most and least satisfied, nor is there a measure of the various forms of organizational commitment. Therefore, the purpose of this quantitative study was to describe the differences in levels of overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with specific job facets, and organizational commitment of Black student affairs professionals at HBCUs and PWIs.

Research Design

To answer the research questions, the researcher utilized three established instruments to collect data. The *Abridged Job in General Scale* (Russell et al., 2004) was used to measure global job satisfaction. The *Abridged Job Descriptive Index* (Stanton et al., 2001) measured satisfaction with five job facets (work itself, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, coworkers). Organizational commitment levels were measured using the *Revised Three-Component Model* survey (Meyer & Allen, 1993) for employee commitment in affective, normative, and continuance organizational commitment. The researcher used descriptive and inferential statistics to compare the results of study participants at predominantly White

institutions and historically Black colleges & universities. The research methodology will be explained in detail in Chapter 3.

Research Questions

The research was designed to answer the following questions:

- What are the differences in global job satisfaction, as measured by the Abridged Job in General (aJIG) scale, for Black student affairs professions at predominately White institutions (PWIs) as compared to those at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs)?
- What are the differences in satisfaction with job facets, as defined by the Abridged Job Descriptive Index (aJDI), for Black student affairs professions at predominately White institutions (PWIs) as compared to those at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs)?
- What are the differences in the types of organizational commitment, as used in the Revised Three-Component Model (TCM) survey of employee commitment, for Black student affairs professions at predominately White institutions (PWIs) as compared to those at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs)?

Operational Definitions

- Student affairs professionals – “persons who are employed to attend effectively to both the educational mission of the institution and the organization’s maintenance requirements in ways that are consistent with the historical values and ethical principles of the field” (Winston et al., 2001, p. 5).
- Black – racial identity used for those from African descent; used instead of African-American to be inclusive of those of African descent born in other nations.

- Job Satisfaction – “global feeling about the job or as a related constellation of attitudes about various aspects or facets of the job” (Spector, 1997, p. 2). The feeling about the job is immediate.
- Job Facet – An aspect of work experiences (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969)
- Organizational Commitment - “psychological link between the employee and his or her organization that makes it less likely that the employee will voluntarily leave the organization” (Allen & Meyer, 1996, p. 252). The psychological link reflects an emotional attachment that is enduring.
- Affective Commitment - “employees' emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in, the organization” (Allen & Meyer, 1990, p. 1).
- Continuance Commitment – “commitment based on the costs that employees associate with leaving the organization” (Allen & Meyer, 1990, p. 1).
- Normative Commitment – “employee’s feelings of obligation to remain with the organization” (Allen & Meyer, 1990, p. 1).
- Predominately White Institutions (PWIs) – institutions of higher education where the student demographics majorly consist of those who identify as White or Caucasian.
- Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) – institutions of higher education that were founded to educate students who identify as Black.

Significance of the Study

This research will assist student affairs leaders to create professional environments that cultivate growth and success for Black student affairs professionals. On a macro-level, the comparison of institutional types will indicate whether inferences can be made about job satisfaction and organizational commitment for Black student affairs professionals. This

information provides for a stronger foundation to create retention strategies for Black student affairs professionals across a national higher education landscape and potentially adapt for institution type if differences exist. On a micro-level, supervisors will be able to determine the necessary improvements in the work environment or job-specific aspects from the information found (Chen et al., 2006). Additionally, with these insights, the institution would be in a better place to promote staff diversity, enhancing its efforts to strengthen the commitment to diversity while placing importance on representation (Davis, 1994; Gardner et al., 2014; Jackson 2002; Mosher, 1982).

Positionality

In studying Black student affairs professionals at predominately White institutions (PWIs) and historically Black colleges & universities (HBCUs), I must acknowledge what experiences I bring to the research. Acknowledgment of my experiences provides context for the reader to understand the motivation behind identifying this problem. I have served in several roles in both PWIs and HBCUs. I have eleven years of full-time experience in student affairs, among five institutions. The longest position tenure has been approximately three years, and the shortest has been a year and a half.

Some factors impacted my experiences and decision to leave one institution for another. As a Black man at a PWI, I have experienced feelings of isolation in being the only person of color in an office. Geographic location has also contributed to feelings of isolation at a PWI in moments where I lived in a rural location and desired more of a metropolitan area. I have felt varying levels of challenges in roles at both PWIs and HBCUs, and the work became routine with the feeling of little opportunity for growth.

At PWIs, I have witnessed colleagues of color transition out of roles and have been a part of their experiences. As I transitioned into roles supervising full-time staff, I have had conversations with staff who are contemplating searching for new opportunities and have given exit interviews to staff to understand their experiences and what led them to decide to leave the institution. I want to be able to improve the experiences of Black student affairs professionals and consult with other organizations on staff retention strategies. At both PWIs and HBCUs, I have witnessed the impact that I have had on students once I have announced that I was departing. The disappointment is always difficult to experience because students rely on those with whom they have built a strong relationship. The authentic connections that student affairs professionals cultivate with students can make or break an experience or determine a trajectory.

Conclusion

Interest in job satisfaction and organizational commitment has increased over the decades. “The underrepresentation of administrators of color in higher education is one of the most important ethical dilemmas facing college and universities today” (Wolfe & Freeman, 2013, p. 1). As the national demographics of the country shift to increased minority populations, diverse representation at institutions is more important than ever before. Therefore, institutions must understand not only the experiences of Black student affairs professionals but job satisfaction both globally and with specific job facets. Also, senior leaders must understand associated levels of organizational commitment as that impacts a professional’s intent to leave (Buck & Watson, 2002). This study seeks to provide insight into job satisfaction and organizational commitment as a foundation for institutions to develop intentional and relevant retention strategies for Black student affairs professionals.

Chapter 1 of this dissertation gives an overview of the problem, provides the research questions, defines key terms, and discusses the significance of the study. Chapter 2 provides an in-depth analysis of the literature, focusing on themes that surround the topic to include job satisfaction, job satisfaction and experiences of Black student affairs professionals at PWIs and HBCUs, and organizational commitment. Chapter 3 discusses the methodology, including discussion of the instruments, participant recruitment, and data collection and analysis. Chapter 4 provides the results of the analysis and an initial interpretation of the collected data. Chapter 5 summarizes the findings, discusses implications, and provides recommendations for practice and future research.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This study examines job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Black student affairs professionals at PWIs and HBCUs. Specifically, the study examines the differences in their reported levels of overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with job facets, and components of organizational commitment. This chapter reviews literature that allows the reader to develop an understanding of job satisfaction and organizational commitment and how they connect to the experiences of Black student affairs professionals. Within job satisfaction, the review will give insight into job satisfaction in higher education and student affairs and corresponding determinants as well as related theories. Specific attention will be given to the literature on the experiences of Black student affairs professionals and their levels of job satisfaction, including factors of the environment that have an impact. In organizational commitment, the literature will explain the components of commitment and what studies have been done for higher education and student affairs. Finally, the theories that relate to job satisfaction will also be discussed.

Understanding Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is one prominent area of research focused on organizational productivity and success (Suki & Suki, 2011). 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). Spector (1997) stripped the value judgment placed on the definition and defined it merely as how someone feels about facets of the job. Spector’s definition viewed job satisfaction as a phenomenon that can be assessed and measured on a spectrum from dissatisfied to satisfied. An

individual's place on the satisfaction continuum can result in various levels of productivity and organizational performance (Eslami & Gharakhani, 2012). There exists a high, positive correlation between job satisfaction and job performance (Brass, 1981; Davar & Bala, 2012). Employees who experience high levels of job satisfaction will exhibit higher levels of productivity and positive performance (Wu, Chen, & Chen, 2017). Inversely, employees who experience lower levels of job satisfaction will exhibit low performance. The consequences associated with low levels of job satisfaction include low productivity, absenteeism, accidents, and turnover (Chen et al., 2006; Giese and Ruter, 1949; Kerr et al., 1951; Lee, 1988; Spector, 1997; Stagner, Flebbe, and Wood, 1952; Wu, Chen, and Chen, 2017).

Determinants of Job Satisfaction

The determinants/predictors of job satisfaction can be placed into three categories that describe job role/tasks, organization, and the individual in the job role (Glisson & Durick, 1988). According to Glisson and Durick (1988), the variables that describe job tasks have received the most empirical attention in the study of job satisfaction, followed by predictors that describe the organization at which the employee completes their job tasks. The least amount of attention has been devoted to employee demographics and their relationship to job satisfaction. (Iacqua, Schumacher, & Li, 2001; Locke, 1976; O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1980; Oshagbemi, 2003). Table 1 lists determinants describing job tasks and the organization as grouped by Glisson and Durick (1988), including the number of citations found showing evidence of the heavy research conducted to understand factors impacting job satisfaction. Within the last decade, many of these variables have been tested with employees from varying occupations in different national contexts. Results from studies validate the impact on job satisfaction,

supporting the notion that there has not been much change in the research over the years (Balock et al., 2014; Liu & White, 2011; Sharma et al., 2018; Xingkun & Weijie, 2013).

Table 1

Determinants of Job Satisfaction by Category with Number of Citations

Determinants	Citations	# of Citations
<u>Category 1: Job Tasks</u>		
Autonomy	Brass, 1981; Chen & Silverthorne, 2008; Gladstein, 1984; Glick, Jenkins, & Gupta, 1986; Iacqua, Schumacher, Li, 2001; Kalleberg, 1977; Locke, 1976	7
Role ambiguity	Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Gladstein, 1984; Locke, 1976; Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970	4
Role conflict	Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Bedeian & Armenakis, 1981; Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Haynes, 1979; Katz, 1978; Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970	6
Skill variety or complexity	Abel-Halim, 1981; Brass, 1981; Gerhart, 1988; Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Haynes, 1979; Kalleberg, 1977; Katz, 1978; Locke, 1976	8
Task feedback	Brass, 1981; Glick, Jenkins, & Gupta, 1986	2
Task identity	Bedeian & Armenakis, 1981; Brass, 1981; Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Haynes 1979; Kalleberg, 1977; Katz, 1978; Oshagbemi, 1997b; Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970	8
Task significance	Bedeian & Armenakis, 1981; Brass, 1981; Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Haynes, 1979; Kalleberg, 1977; Katz 1978; O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1980; Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970	8
Task support	Brass, 1981; Iacqua, Schumacher, & Li, 2001	2

Category 2: Organization

Benefits	Iacqua, Schumacher, & Li, 2001; Kalleberg, 1977; Locke, 1976	3
Co-workers	Kalleberg, 1977; Locke, 1976; Oshagbemi, 1997b	3
Leadership	Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Gladstein, 1984; Haynes, 1979; House, Filley, & Kerr, 1971; Testa, 1999	5
Pay	Kalleberg, 1977; Locke, 1976; O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1980	3
Promotions	Bateman & Organ, 1983; Kalleberg, 1977; Locke, 1976; O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1980	4
Recognition	Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Iacqua, Schumacher, & Li, 2001; Kalleberg, 1977; Locke, 1976	4
Supervision	Bateman & Organ, 1983; Brass, 1981; Gladstein, 1984; Locke, 1976; Hatfield & Huseman, 1982; Podsakoff, Todor, & Skov, 1982	6
Working conditions	Kalleberg, 1977; Locke, 1976; O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1980; Oshagbemi, 1997b	4

Sharma et al. (2018) conducted a study to find the determinants of job satisfaction among primary health care doctors in Anand, Gujarat, India. Fifty participants completed a questionnaire that measured four components of job satisfaction: workload, availability of infrastructure, personal difficulties, and relationships with staff. Each component was broken

down into subcomponents. The workload subcomponents consisted of administrative, clinical, and medico-legal. The relationship at workplace subcomponents included subordinates, seniors, powers in execution of work, external pressures, and conflict with field staff. The personal difficulties subcomponents included commuting, working in difficult terrain, and difficulty in provided education to children. The infrastructure subcomponents consisted of a lack of infrastructure to work, improper facilities, and inappropriate support services. The factors that had the strongest indicators of job satisfaction along with the correlations to previously mentioned determinants were the workload (task significance), relationship with subordinates and seniors (supervision and coworkers), commuting (working conditions), working in a difficult terrain (working conditions), and improper facilities (working conditions) (Sharma et al. 2018).

Baloch et al. (2014) also conducted a study that supports previous research on the determinants of job satisfaction. In their study, the researchers sought to understand “the relationship between pay, promotion, family-work conflict, work-family conflict, extended flight hours, co-workers support and supervision on job satisfaction, performance, absenteeism, and turnover intention of cabin crew of PIA Peshawar base” (Baloch et al., 2014, p. 118). One hundred thirty-two cabin crew members participated in the study by completing a survey questionnaire consisting of Likert scaled items from 1-5, with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree. Regression analysis was used to determine the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The results indicated a strong positive relationship between independent variables (pay, promotion, supervision, and co-workers) and dependent variables (job satisfaction, turnover intention, performance, and absenteeism) (Baloch et al., 2014). Each independent variable correlates to the determinants of job satisfaction previously discussed.

Yang and Wang (2013) tested determinants of job satisfaction to account for the differences in the institutional and cultural context of Chinese civil servants. Five hundred forty civil servants completed a survey questionnaire, and a regression analysis was conducted to analyze the relationship between the independent variables and job satisfaction. The independent variables associated with job and organizational characteristics were found to have a statistically significant impact on job satisfaction. These organizational variables included relationships with coworkers and work environment safety, which correlates to coworker and working conditions determinants previously discussed (Yang & Wang, 2013). The job characteristic variables included weekly working hours, salary, balance of work and family, task variety, and confidence in career development, which correlates to the promotion, task support, task variety, pay, and supervision determinants previously discussed (Yang & Wang, 2013).

Determinants of job satisfaction of the previously discussed studies support the notion that they are still relevant. The studies occurred with varying cultural contexts, and the samples covered different occupations. Because similar determinants were found to impact job satisfaction across the studies, it is appropriate to utilize the determinants to assess job satisfaction for Black student affairs professionals.

Job Satisfaction in Higher Education

Although there are several research studies addressing job satisfaction in the private/public sector, attention to the higher education realm has been limited (Volkwein & Parmley, 2000). Studies examining the job satisfaction of higher education administrators have focused on understanding overall satisfaction as opposed to the variables that affect satisfaction (Volkwein & Parmley, 2000). Because administrator satisfaction is linked to college performance, “measures of student, faculty, and administrative satisfaction in colleges and

universities receive increasing attention as indicators of organizational climate and educational effectiveness” (Volkwein & Zhou, 2003, p. 150).

Studies conducted on job satisfaction in higher education support the determinants previously discussed and show similarities and differences amongst faculty and staff. The work environment and the content of the work are strong indicators of job satisfaction (Castillo & Cano, 2004; Johnson & Rosser, 1999; Volkwein & Zhou, 2003). In these studies, the work environment was defined as consisting of both the physical conditions and staff relationships with coworkers and supervisors. The content of the work consisted of the staff or faculty’s ability to have autonomy, be creative, and be challenged. Johnson and Rosser’s (1999) study expounded upon the work environment and found that perception of discrimination was highlighted as a significant factor that impacted job satisfaction, which has implications when thinking about Black student affairs administrators at PWIs.

Job Satisfaction in Student Affairs

Very little research has been conducted exclusively on student affairs administrators (Anderson, Guido-DiBrito, & Morrell, 2000; Bender, 2009). The nature of student affairs work presents differences in work experiences that could have an impact on overall satisfaction as well as satisfaction with job facets. For example, employees in student affairs can be more “outward” facing with high interaction with students, families, alumni, and the surrounding community. Someone who works in information technology, although considered a higher education administrator, can be “inward” facing with little student contact, which presents a different experience. Both could experience satisfaction with their work environment in different ways. The studies discussed in the previous section included all administrative staff at universities. Bender (2009) administered a survey to NASPA Region II to assess job satisfaction of student

affairs administrators. Sixty-one percent of respondents stated that they were satisfied with their jobs, 24% were dissatisfied, and 15% were undecided. Over 90% of respondents reported that they enjoyed working with their coworkers and students, felt a sense of accomplishment, and believed that the work is important. There were different results among men and women. Most notably, 48% percent of men reported they were satisfied with advancement opportunities, but only 23% of women reported satisfaction. The results did not indicate which elements correlated to high or low levels of satisfaction.

Davidson (2012) conducted a study to understand the determinants of job satisfaction of student affairs professionals, specifically entry-level staff in residence life. Descriptive statistics indicated respondents were most satisfied with the work itself and least satisfied with promotional opportunities. Multiple regression analysis was done to provide a predictive model of job satisfaction from five job facets: work itself, pay, promotion, coworkers, and supervision. The most significant predictor for job satisfaction was opportunities for promotion. Results in this study, as well as Bender's study, supported the notion that although student affairs professionals are satisfied with the work, there is a concern about being able to advance at the institution. If the advancement opportunities do not exist, then it will prompt student affairs professionals to seek opportunities at other institutions. No results from either study highlighted whether it is generalizable based on race and institution type, making it difficult for institutions to determine how the information can be used to improve practice considering the institutional context.

Job Satisfaction for Black Student Affairs Professionals

As previously stated, not much research has been conducted on job satisfaction of higher education administrators. Research highlighting job satisfaction for racial groups in student

affairs is even scarcer. Most of the literature that focuses on Black student affairs professionals focus more on their experiences than their satisfaction with them. Marcus (2000) conducted a case study of student affairs professionals at a community college to highlight how staff experiences impact the potential of improving staff diversity related to representation. Results indicated that 70% of staff felt a sense of success at the college, but there was a discrepancy when the data were disaggregated by race. Only half of the staff of color felt a sense of success, while all but one White staff member felt a sense of success. Although evidence supported that satisfaction levels are lower for staff of color, the staff of color sample does not indicate Black staff explicitly.

Steele (2018) conducted a qualitative study to understand the experiences of staff of color at PWIs and the environmental factors that influenced their decision to leave or stay at an institution. The sample consisted of 18 participants. All but two participants identified as Black or African-American. Four themes emerged, focusing on the environment, “invisible employee,” support, and navigating the institution. Participants felt that their institutions did not present a welcoming environment, but they did feel more welcome in certain spaces, such as their workspace or specific office. They experienced the sense of “tokenism,” and at times, felt undervalued. There was a sense of caution, as participants discussed how they navigated the institution. Also, they did not want to be considered a disruption, which resulted in staff accepting the status quo. Although the previous studies provide insight into Black student affairs professionals’ experiences at PWIs, they do not measure overall levels of satisfaction, and the results did not apply to HBCUs.

Hirt et al. (2006) explored the nature of work at HBCUs through three constructs: how work gets done, the pace, and the environment. In this mixed-methods study, 70 administrators

participated by completing a survey, which was supplemented by one-on-one interviews. Eighty-nine percent of participants identified as African-American. Regarding the pace of work, most participants responded that they felt the pace was positively challenging, but that it was also highly stressful, and that the institution was slow to adopt change. In terms of how work gets done, most participants responded that they had to multi-task, and it was hard to say no. They also responded that the work was collaborative and team-oriented. Regarding the work environment, participants responded that the environment was highly professional, student-centered, and service-oriented. Although the findings give insight into an institution type with scarce research, it does not correlate or relate the experiences to global satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction Theories

Theories have been created to help frame job satisfaction and employee behavior for organizational leaders (Acevedo, 2018). Specifically, Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (1943, 1954) and Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene or Two-Factor Theory (1959) frame job satisfaction using determinants previously discussed. Framing job satisfaction through the content theories guides professionals in translating the theory to practice.

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (1943, 1954) is a theoretical framework utilized to understand motivation through the lens of human needs. It is considered to be one of the most widely used and influential motivational theories in organizational management and behavior (Acevedo, 2018). The framework operates under three assumptions: unsatisfied needs impact behavior, needs range from most basic to complex, and lower levels of need must be met before moving upward to a different area of need (Berl et al., 1984). Each area of need, as described by Maslow (1943, 1959), is described below in hierarchical order from basic to complex:

- Physiological needs: food, water, shelter
- Safety needs: security, stability, protection
- Love & Belongingness needs: love, affection, relationships
- Self-esteem needs: achievement, recognition, appreciation
- Self-actualization needs: fulfillment, reaching potential

Berl et al. (1984) translated the five classifications of needs into job characteristics. They are as follows:

- Physiological needs: compensation, working conditions, office space
- Safety needs: job security and fringe benefits
- Love & Belongingness needs: office culture, rapport with supervisor and colleagues, and customers
- Self-esteem needs: supportive management, promotions, raises or merit increases, enhanced responsibilities
- Self-actualization needs: being challenged and developed in the role

The researchers tested Maslow's theory on sales representatives to see if they progress systematically through the hierarchy. Two hundred sixty-six completed questionnaires from sales representatives representing 14 companies were used in the study. Although the study indicated which areas employees experienced satisfaction, none of the participants moved systemically through the hierarchy (Berl et al., 1984).

Although Maslow's framework is widely used, it is not without its critiques. One critique is that there is little empirical evidence to support the theory (Locke, 1976; Wahba & Bridwell, 1976). It is important to note that the theory was developed based on clinical experience, preventing it from being tested with traditional research methods (Maslow, 1943). Additionally,

testing the theory would be difficult as the definitions of the classification are not standard constructs, making it ambiguous (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977; Wahba & Bridwell, 1976).

Another critique noted by several researchers is that the model does not consider how social identities and environments interact with need (Acevedo, 2018; Aron, 1977; Geller, 1982; Neher, 1991). Social identities can impact how people build relationships in the workplace. If someone identifies with a minoritized group, they will interact with the environment and others differently. As an example, a staff member who identifies as Black may be more cognizant of racial dynamics in the workplace if they are in a predominately White setting. If there is evidence of racial insensitivity or microaggressions, the Black staff member may be more hesitant to connect with non-minoritized groups. A final critique in the literature addresses the hierarchical nature of the theory. Previously stated, one assumption of the theory is that one layer of need has to be met before moving to the next. Neher (1991) challenged this notion by explaining that even though an individual may struggle with physiological needs, it does not impact one's ability to build relationships or experience love and belonging. Although heavily critiqued, the framework allows managers to assess employees' experiences intentionally guided by the areas of need. Additionally, as previously discussed, the levels of need translate to determinants of job satisfaction (Bert, 1984).

Herzberg Motivator-Hygiene Theory

Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene or Two-Factor Theory (1959) is a content theory that helps to describe employee job satisfaction. In a study, Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) interviewed approximately 200 accountants and engineers. In the interview, they asked the participants to describe specific moments when they felt exceptionally good and exceptionally bad about their jobs. Defined as "critical incidents," Herzberg, Mausner, and

Snyderman analyzed the information and organized the aspects into two aspects of the job: satisfiers and dissatisfiers. They found that satisfiers contained intrinsic aspects of the job, also known as “motivators.” These include achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, growth, and advancement. Dissatisfiers, also known as “hygiene factors,” were found to be related to extrinsic aspects of the job to include company policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations (superior, subordinate, and peers), salary, status, job security, and personal life.

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) found that hygiene and motivational factors are placed on a unidimensional scale with a neutral point and do not interact with each other to determine job satisfaction. From the neutral point, the employee does not experience satisfaction nor dissatisfaction. Satisfiers move the experience from a neutral point to increase satisfaction. The absence of satisfaction places the individual at the neutral point. Inversely, dissatisfiers increase dissatisfaction. Lack of dissatisfiers places the individual back to the neutral point. As previously stated, the satisfiers/dissatisfiers do not interact to determine satisfaction. Therefore, a lack of satisfiers does not make an employee dissatisfied, only less satisfied. Lack of dissatisfiers does not result in satisfaction; it only makes the employee feel less dissatisfied.

Several researchers have provided critiques of Herzberg’s theory. First, researchers have raised questions about the generality and validity of the semi-structured interview as the single data collection method (Behling, Labovitz, & Kosmo, 1968; Brenner, Carmack, & Weinstein, 1971; Ewen, 1964). Second, collecting data based on a “critical incident” response increased the chances of bias, preventing the participant from discussing their experience from an overall reflection (Brenner, Carmack, & Weinstein, 1971; House & Wigdor, 1967). Third, there was no

attempt to measure overall job satisfaction (Brenner, Carmack, & Weinstein, 1971; Ewen, 1964). The study highlighted facets of job satisfaction, but there was no global scale used to validate the motivators' contribution to overall job satisfaction. Fourth, the sample was restricted to engineers and accountants (Ewen, 1964).

The nature of the job can influence an employee's perception of their responsibilities as well as of the organizational culture. In a comparative study by Maidani (1991), Herzberg's theory was applied to private and public sector employees. It was found that although the satisfaction of both groups was not attributed to hygiene factors, public sector employees valued extrinsic factors more than private-sector employees. Fifth, the hygiene and motivator factors were not mutually exclusive (Burke, 1966; Ewen, 1964; Malinovsky & Barry, 1965).

Correlations between factors resulted in "response-set effects - tendency of the workers to respond in the same manner to like-worded statements" (House & Wigdor, 1967, p. 373). The critiques highlight the complexities by using Herzberg to measure job satisfaction, but like Maslow, Herzberg's theory provides a framework to consider various areas of a job and the employees' corresponding attitudes.

Understanding Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment has been identified as an important variable for staff retention, and the research on the topic gained attention because of its influence on stability and innovation (Suki & Suki, 2011). Organizational commitment is defined as the "psychological link between the employee and his or her organization that makes it less likely that the employee will voluntarily leave the organization" (Allen & Meyer, 1996, p. 252). In the mid-1970s, there was a shift in the research on organizational comments transitioned the focus from employee behaviors to attitudes (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). Meyer & Allen (1991) argued that

organizational commitment was comprised of three separate components: *affective commitment*, *continuance commitment*, and *normative commitment*.

Affective Commitment

Affective commitment relates to the desire to leave an organization (Allen & Meyer, 1991). It is linked to an individual emotional attachment and identification with the organization. Antecedents of affective commitment were organized into four categories: personal characteristics, structural characteristics, job-related characteristics, and subjective work experiences (Allen & Meyer, 1991). An example of personal characteristics as an antecedent is if a student affairs professional has a strong religious identity and is employed as a religiously affiliated institution that is like theirs. The identity alignment would strengthen the affective commitment. In this case, the professional would have positive work attitudes due to their compatibility with the environment (Allen & Meyer, 1991). Structural characteristics that have been shown to relate to how decisions are made in an organization and formalization of policy and procedure, staff relations, role clarity, and feelings of importance (Allen & Meyer, 1991; Morris & Steers, 1980). This may manifest as a staff member getting frustrated with the lack of support from colleagues and supervisors. For job-related and work experiences, variables were organized into two categories: those that satisfied psychological and physical needs and those that contributed to a feeling of competence. This includes many elements found in Herzberg Motivator-Hygiene Theory (1949), including achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, growth, and advancement, amongst many others.

Continuance Commitment

Continuance commitment relates to the perceived cost associated with leaving an organization (Allen & Meyer, 1991). This form of commitment is when an individual does a

cost-benefit analysis. As an example, a staff member who had a child that would like to attend the college where the staff member is employed, the staff member may remain at the institution to take advantage of the dependent tuition benefits. Another example could be a staff member who wants to remain close to family, and there are only a few institutions in the geographic area.

Normative Commitment

Normative commitment relates to an individual's feeling of an obligation to stay at an organization. (Allen & Meyer, 1991). The obligatory feeling is the result of the internalization of normalized pressure (Wiener, 1982). As an example, a staff member may choose to stay at an institution because their mentor created a position for them. The staff member may not want to disappoint their mentor and negatively impact the relationship. It is important to note that the difference between normative and affective is based on the foundation of reciprocity. Affective commitment is based on reciprocity by desire, and normative commitment is based on reciprocity by obligation (Allen & Meyer, 1991).

Factors Impacting Organizational Commitment

The literature presents various varying perspectives on which factors have a stronger impact on organizational commitment. Allen and Meyer (1990) conducted a two-part study to test a three-component model of organizational commitment: affective, continuance, and normative, all of which have been previously discussed. The purpose of the first study was to develop independent measures. Two hundred fifty-six non-unionized employees from two manufacturing firms and a university completed the questionnaire. The results indicated that all three components of organizational commitment could be reliably measured with the following scores (coefficient alpha): affective commitment, .87; continuance commitment, .75; normative commitment, .79.

The second study was to test whether there was a correlation between the three components of organizational commitment and variables assumed to be antecedents. Like the procedure in the first study, a questionnaire was administered to employees at a retail department store, hospital, and university library. Three hundred thirty-seven questionnaires were completed. The findings highlight variables which had a significant correlation to each component. There was a strong correlation between the affective commitment variables with correlations ranging from .46 to .87. Employees who felt comfortable and competent reported higher levels of affective commitment. Higher levels of continuance commitment were reflective of employees who perceived the availability of alternatives and the magnitude of investment. No variables correlated to normative commitment, but in a study by O'Reilly et al. (1991), it was found that person-environment fit was a strong predictor of normative commitment.

Mathieu and Zajac (1990) found that position tenure, job involvement, and job facets such as supervision, promotion opportunities, and work itself were strong correlates to organizational commitment. Beck and Wilson (2000), in the first study to examine how commitment changes over time, analyzed the impact of position tenure of Australian police from the largest department in Australia. A police organization was chosen for a longitudinal study because its "low levels of turnover limit the potential for selective attrition within the sample and cohort effects are minimized by stable selection and training practices" (Beck & Wilson, 2000, p. 120). A survey was administered to ten cohorts of the police organizations resulting in a sample total of four hundred seventy-nine respondents. The results indicated a statistically significant correlation between commitment and tenure ($r = -.27$, $p = .03$). Affective commitment decreased

as tenure increased. This contradicts the assumption that tenure is reflective of strong commitment, making it a challenge for leaders to target interventions to improve commitment.

Organizational Commitment in Higher Education

The literature on organizational commitment in higher education is extremely scarce. Fjortoft (1993) conducted a study to understand what variables could be used to predict commitment. The results indicated that influence on department policy, institution reputation, participation in department meetings, and administrative style of the department were the strongest indicators. In contrast, Neumann and Finaly-Neumann (1990) found that determinants of commitment varied based on the discipline. Determinants for faculty in physics were work significance and rewards. For sociology faculty, determinants were supportive chair and rewards. For electrical engineering faculty, determinants were supportive colleagues and rewards. For education faculty, the determinants were work significance, supportive colleagues, and supportive chair.

There can be connections made from determinants of organizational commitment of faculty to determinants of student affairs professionals. Boheman (2007) conducted a study to measure affective commitment of student affairs professionals. The results indicated that organizational support has the strongest predictive values for affective commitment. Organizational support relates to determinants from the previously mentioned studies, as many of the faculty had higher levels of commitment if they had a supportive chair or colleague.

Conclusion

The purpose of this literature review is to highlight the research that has been conducted in the areas of job satisfaction (determinants, content theories, levels in higher education and student affairs, as well as the levels and experiences of Black student affairs professionals at

PWIs and HBCUs) and organizational commitment (overall, components, antecedents, and for student affairs). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment is a popular topic of research and has been used to understand employee motivation (Eslami & Gharakhani, 2012; Suki & Suki, 2011). Attitudes towards the job and the organization are an indication of how staff perform, which affects the organization's success and productivity. Job satisfaction correlates to higher productivity and performance, while strong organizational commitment correlates to stronger retention rates amongst staff (Brass, 1981; Davar & Bala, 2012; Wu, Chen & Chen, 2017). Conversely, if job satisfaction and organizational commitment are not addressed, then staff will experience higher levels of absenteeism and turnover (Chen et al., 2006; Spector, 1997; Wu, Chen, and Chen, 2017).

There is less research on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the higher education context. The research that exists highlights that student affairs professionals are generally satisfied with their jobs, but much of the research that measures job satisfaction does not disaggregate the data to account for differences in race and institution type (Bender, 2009). Further research is needed in understanding levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Black student affairs professionals at PWIs and HBCU. Research has shown that the retention of Black student affairs professionals is a major area of needed improvement for PWIs (Jackson, 2001; Sagria & Johnsrud, 1991). Also, the retention of staff has an impact on students, and it disrupts the support, mentorship, and continuity of services and programs (Rosser & Javinar, 2003). PWIs and HBCUs provide different experiences for Black student affairs professionals, and it is important for the success of both organizations to understand the experiences of these professionals through the context of organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the differences in overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with specific job facets, and organizational commitment of Black student affairs professionals at predominantly White institutions (PWIs) and historically Black college and universities (HBCUs). The goal of this chapter is to discuss the research design, participants & recruitment, data collection methods, instruments, and data analysis.

Research Design

The research questions for the study focus on identifying whether there are differences in the experiences of Black student affairs professionals at PWIs compared with those at HBCUs. Since the questions can best be answered using quantitative methods, this study utilized survey methodology to administer instruments to gather data on designated variables. The data was then analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics to answer the research questions. Survey research is beneficial for its efficiency in data collection and analysis, as well as the ability to have a large sample (Fowler et al., 2014). It is also beneficial due to the turnaround time for responders, and it is easier to repeat the study for validity and reliability (Creswell, 2014). Using a survey is cost-efficient using no-cost software such as *Google forms*, *Survey Monkey*, or *Qualtrics* (Johnson & Christenson, 2017). The survey was administered through *Qualtrics*.

Participants and Recruitment

The target population for this study was Black student affairs professionals who are employed full-time at a predominantly White institution or historically Black college and

university on a physical campus at the time of the study. “Black” is used in this study as opposed to “African-American” because the term “African-American” is restricted to those who have origins in America. The term “Black” is inclusive of those who are in the US but have origins from other nations or who identify as Black but do not identify as someone of African Descent. Participants were primarily recruited through ACPA: College Student Educators International and Facebook groups. The researcher submitted a formal request to ACPA: College Student Educators International to disseminate the survey to their membership that identified as Black, which totaled 389 members. Recruiting through Black communities on Facebook was beneficial due to the ability to target the specific audience, control post frequency, and creates the ability for others to share with other potential participants and post in other Facebook groups. The Facebook groups (online communities) that were used to supplement recruitment are as follows:

- Alphas in Higher Education (738 members) -
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/2318526158/>
- Black LGBTQIA+ SA Pros (384 members) -
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/844242119251696/>
- Black Males in Higher Education and Student Affairs Collective (823 members) -
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/239309822774563/>
- Black Students Pursuing Doctoral Degrees (1,372 members) -
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1390086847728479/>
- BLKSAP (Black Student Affairs Professionals) (11,442 members) -
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/blksap/>

- Housing While Black: The Black Housing Professionals Network (374 members) -
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/701709019980724/>
- Minority Doctoral Network (4,012 members) -
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/343284949083620/>
- NASPA African-American Knowledge Community (1,587 followers) -
<https://www.facebook.com/AAKCNASPA/>
- NPHC Higher Education Network (968 members) -
https://www.facebook.com/groups/542402685798546/?ref=group_browse
- Pan African Network of ACPA (1,287 members) -
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/ACPAPAN/>

In the Facebook groups, the researcher posted a message in each group, which included the following message: “Are you satisfied with your job? Are you committed to your institution? I welcome you to share your feelings and attitudes about both. I am seeking Black student affairs professionals to take a brief 10-12-minute survey about job satisfaction and organizational commitment. You must identify as Black and work full-time on a physical campus in a student affairs position at an HBCU or PWI. To take the survey, go to tinyurl.com/blksapjobsatisfaction. Please feel free to send to others that meet the criteria or post in other Facebook groups.” An advertisement was included in the post that has the survey link, the purpose of study, and qualifications (See Appendix A). Permission to post the survey link in the Facebook groups was not needed. The NASPA African American Knowledge Community (AAKC) Facebook page procedures call for the co-chairs to send it to their social media team to post on the Facebook page (See Appendix B). Finally, the researcher asked professional contacts to send the recruitment advertisement to their professional networks (See Appendix C) with additional focus

on Black student affairs professionals. The researcher sent a similar message to chief student affairs officers at HBCUs (See Appendix D).

The researcher utilized a power calculator to determine the minimum sample size need for each group. The results indicated that each sample that was compared at a .8 effect size, .8 power, and .05 significance level for two samples in a two-sided test needed a minimum of twenty-five participants per sample. Descriptive statistics for the sample will be discussed in Chapter 4.

Instruments

This study utilized three instruments. The *Abridged Job in General Scale* (Russell et al., 2004) measured global satisfaction. The *Abridged Job Descriptive Index* (Stanton et al., 2001) measured satisfaction with job facets. The revised *Three-Component Model Employee Commitment Survey* (Meyer & Allen, 1993) measured organizational commitment. These three instruments are the shortened versions of the original instruments and are discussed below.

Abridged Job in General Scale

The original Job in General Scale (JIG) (Ironson et al., 1989) was created to measure global satisfaction with a job, in accompaniment to the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). The JIG was validated with several sample groups totaling 10,380 participants. The 18-item scale produced an alpha coefficient of .91 and above, meaning that the scale has high internal consistency. It was developed to have the following characteristics: multiple items, ease of reading and response, minimal redundancy, demonstrated convergent validity, and compatibility with JDI (Ironson et al., 1989). Participants are asked to respond with a yes (Y), no (N), or not sure (?) to each descriptive word related to their job. For positive items,

numbers associated with the responses are Y=3, N=0, and ?=1. For negative items, the responses are scored in reversed as Y=0, N=3, and ?=1. The score range is 0 – 54.

The goal of the abridged version of JIG (AJIG), which was the instrument used in this study, was to take advantage of the simple implementation while maintaining the psychometric elements in the original (Russell et al., 2004). The researchers used the combinatorial approach described by Stanton et al. (2002) to choose the items for the AJIG. The newly designed AJIG was validated across three studies and presented alpha coefficients of .85 and above. AJIG consisted of 8 items that could replace the original JIG without impacting psychometric properties (Russell et al., 2004). For positive items, numbers associated with the responses are Y=3, N=0, and ?=1. For negative items, the responses are scored in reversed as Y=0, N=3, and ?=1. The score range is 0 – 24. The researcher recoded the values in the *Qualtrics* survey before recruiting participants so that the scores would be automatically computed. Higher scores indicated higher levels of overall job satisfaction. The researcher received permission to use the instrument from the JDI Office in the Department of Psychology at Bowling Green State University (see Appendix E).

Abridged Job Descriptive Index

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969) is used to measure satisfaction with specific job facets related to a worker's experience. The facets include the work itself, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, and coworkers. The original instrument consisted of 72 scale items divided amongst the job facets where participants were asked to respond with a yes (Y), no (N), or not sure (?) to each descriptive word related to each job facet. For positive items, numbers associated with the responses are Y=3, N=0, and ?=1. For negative items, the responses are scored in reversed as Y=0, N=3, and ?=1. Work, supervision, and

coworker facets have 18 items, each with a score range of 0 – 54 per facet. Pay and promotion facets have 9 items, each with a score range of 0 – 27 per facet.

Kinicki et al. (2002) conducted a study to investigate the construct validity of the JDI. The meta-analysis included 152 studies containing 267 individual samples. The JDI possessed adequate internal consistency reliability with estimates ranging from .87-.89 for each subscale, proving that the items consistently measure job satisfaction.

The original JDI consisted of 72-items requiring a large amount of space on the instrument and required substantial time to complete (Stanton et al., 2002). Stanton et al. (2002) created the Abridged Job Descriptive Index (AJDI), which is a shorter version, to prevent the likelihood of survey fatigue and nonresponse. The AJDI was used in this study. In developing the AJDI, the researchers aimed to ensure that the measures had similar correlations as the JDI through the comparison of two studies. The first study included a cross-section of the U.S. workforce, and the second study included a sample of university administrators. The comparison of the JDI and AJDI indicated no changes in the correlations with no alpha reliabilities below .75 (Stanton et al., 2002). Thus, the researchers were successful in creating a shorter instrument with 30 items that minimized instrument space and time to complete. In the AJDI, each facet has 6 items with a score range of 0 – 18 per facet. The researcher recoded the values in the *Qualtrics* survey before recruiting participants so that the scores for each facet would be automatically computed. Higher scores indicated higher levels of job satisfaction in the specific job facet.

The researcher received permission to use the instrument from the JDI Office in the Department of Psychology at Bowling Green State University (See Appendix E).

The Revised Three-Component Model Employee Commitment Survey

The Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey (Meyer & Allen, 1991) measures three components of organizational commitment. The survey includes three validated scales for each component of commitment. The scale and the reliabilities are as follows: affective (ACS), .87; normative (NCS), .79; continuance (CCS), .75, which are evaluated separately to create a “commitment profile” for staff (Meyer & Allen, 2004). The TCM survey consists of 8 items for each commitment scale that rate the strength of agreement from 1 to 7, with 1 being strongly disagree and 7 being strongly agree. Some items in the scales are “reverse-keyed” with strongly agree meaning less commitment. The scores may range from 6 – 42 per component. Before the survey was administered, the researcher recoded the values in the *Qualtrics* survey (1=7, 2=6,.....7=1) before recruiting participants so that the scores would be automatically computed. The scores were computed for each commitment scale (ACS, NCS, and CCS) and were not combined for overall commitment as the instrument is designed to measure the types of organizational commitment separately. There were three individual scores for each respondent with higher scores indicating stronger commitment (Meyer & Allen, 2004).

Maqsood et al. (2012) conducted a study to validate the TCM Employee Commitment Survey. The participants included a sample of 426 faculty members of public and private universities in Pakistan. The results suggested, “that the factor loadings for the existing factorial structure of Organizational Commitment Questionnaire are generally within an acceptable range representing considerable support” (Maqsood et al., 2012, p. 141). The results provided empirical support in the validation of the TCM survey.

Meyer et al. (1993) conducted a study to test the generalization of the three-component model to occupational commitment. In developing the scale, the researchers sought to eliminate

the redundancy in the original three-component scales. The items for each component were reduced from 8-items to 6-items per component. Data were collected from two samples: 366 usable surveys completed by student nurses and 603 usable surveys completed by registered nurses. The results from correlation statistics and regression supported the generalizability of the three-component model of organizational commitment. The researcher received permission to use the instrument (See Appendix F).

In addition to the three instruments, the researcher collected demographic information to describe the sample including gender, current professional level (NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, 2016), full-time years of student affairs experience, primary functional area (NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, 2016), and secondary functional area (NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, 2016) (See Appendix G).

The researcher pilot tested the instrument to ensure that it worked properly and that the data could be exported instantly. In the pilot, the researcher used four individuals from their professional network to take the survey and provide feedback on completion time and clarity of instructions and questions. As a result of the pilot, the completion time was placed on the participant recruitment materials, and no changes were made to the instruction. Additionally, the researcher tested the data export and analysis to ensure the results were calculated appropriately. The data was exported and calculated correctly.

Data Collection

Using the recruitment process described earlier, the invitation to participate contained the link to the instrument, which began with the IRB approved informed consent information and

then took participants to the survey items (see Appendix G). The link was available for 3 weeks and did not need to be extended due to achieving a substantial number of responses.

The instrument was administered through *Qualtrics*, a survey platform available through the researcher's institution, which also stored the data. It included all questions from three instruments, discussed in the next section, that were used to measure what was examined in this study. Participants were able to take the survey on an internet-enabled device, including a laptop, mobile phone, iPad, tablet, or desktop computer. There was a week's time limit in *Qualtrics* for participants to complete the survey once it was started. After a week, the survey responses were automatically recorded. Questions had a required response trigger that prevented participants from submitting incomplete surveys unless the survey was not completed within the week time limit. Additionally, participants were not able to submit information twice from the same IP address. Final responses were downloaded into an SPSS file.

Data Analysis

The following research questions guided the study:

1. Is there a significant difference in global satisfaction among Black student affairs professionals at PWIs compared to those at HBCUs?
 - a. To answer this question, the researcher ran descriptive statistics to describe overall job satisfaction for both groups and also an independent t-test for the Abridged Job in General (AJIG) scale to compare the scores of respondents from HBCUs and PWIs to determine if there is a statistically significant difference in overall job satisfaction.
2. Are there significant differences in satisfaction with job facets among Black student affairs professionals at PWIs compared to those at HBCUs?

- a. To answer this question, the researcher ran descriptive statistics to describe satisfaction with each job facet for both groups and also an independent t-test for the Abridged Job Descriptive Index (AJDI) scales for each job facet (work itself, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, and coworkers) to compare the scores of respondents from HBCUs and PWIs to determine if there are statistically significant differences in satisfaction with each job facet.
3. Are there significant differences in affective, normative, and continuance organizational commitment among Black student affairs professionals at PWIs compared to those at HBCUs?
 - a. To answer this question, the researcher ran descriptive statistics to describe commitment for both groups and also an independent t-test for the affective commitment scale (ACS), normative commitment scale (NCS), and continuance commitment scale (CCS) in the Revised Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey to compare the scores of respondents from HBCUs and PWIs to determine if there are statistically significant differences between those two groups in the three components of organizational commitment.

Conclusion

The goal of this chapter was to discuss the methodology to be used in the study. Details were provided regarding the research design, participants & recruitment, data collection procedures, instruments, and data analysis. The next chapter will present the data analysis and results.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine the differences in job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Black student affairs professionals at PWIs and HBCUs. Chapter 1 explained the necessity of the research as it contributes to staff retention as well as strengthens the commitment to staff diversity, which can have an impact on students. Chapter 2 synthesized existing literature on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, related theories, and experiences of Black student affairs professionals. Chapter 3 described the study methodology used to answer the research questions to see where the differences existed with global job satisfaction, job facet satisfaction, and organizational commitment amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs as compared to those at HBCUs. This chapter will present a description of the respondents as well as the results from the data analysis for each research question.

Description of Respondents

Three-hundred eighty-seven respondents started the survey. Two hundred eighty-eight respondents completed the survey. Table 2 summarizes the respondents by institution type. The largest percentage of respondents were those at PWIs at 75.7% ($n=218$). Those at HBCUs were 24.3% ($n=24.3\%$) of respondents.

Table 2

Respondent Summary by Institution Type

Institution Type	N	Total Percent
PWI	218	75.7

HBCU	70	24.3
Total	288	100

Table 3 summarizes the respondents by gender and institution type. The largest percentage of respondents were women at 63.9% ($n=184$). Men were 34.4% ($n=99$) of respondents. Respondents that identified as genderfluid or non-binary or who preferred not to answer were the smallest groups at .7% ($n=2$) and 1% ($n=3$).

Table 3

Respondent Summary by Gender and Institution Type

Gender	HBCU	PWI	Total	Total Percent
Genderfluid or Non-Binary	0	2	2	.7
Man	32	67	99	34.4
Woman	38	146	184	63.9
Prefer not to answer	0	3	3	1.0
Total	70	218	288	100.0

Table 4 summarizes the respondents by current professional level and institution type. The largest percentage of respondents were mid-level professionals at 58.3% ($n=168$). New professionals represented 19.1% ($n=55$) and senior-level professionals represented 12.8% ($n=37$) of respondents. The smallest groups were avp/number two and vice president of student affairs/csao, both at 4.9% ($n=14$).

Table 4

Respondent Summary by Current Professional Level and Institution Type

Professional Level	HBCU	PWI	Total	Total Percent
New Professional	9	46	55	19.1
Mid-Level Professional	34	134	168	58.3
Senior-Level Professional	15	22	37	12.8
Associate VP/ Number Two	5	9	14	4.9
Vice President of Student Affairs/CSAO	7	7	14	4.9
Total	70	218	288	100.0

Table 5 summarizes the respondents by years of full-time student affairs experience and institution type. The largest percentage of respondents were professionals with 0-5 full-time years of experience at 35.8% ($n=103$) followed by 6-10 years at 34.3% ($n=99$), 11-15 years at 15.3% ($n=44$), and 16+ years at 14.6% ($n=42$).

Table 5

Respondent Summary by Years of Full-time Student Affairs Experience and Institution Type

Years of Full-time Student Affairs Experience	HBCU	PWI	Total	Total Percent
0-5 years	22	81	103	35.8
6-10 years	25	74	99	34.4

11-15 years	13	31	44	15.3
16+ years	10	32	42	14.6
Total	70	218	288	100.0

Table 6 summarizes the respondents by primary functional area and institution type.

Three primary functional areas each had more than 10% of total respondents. The category “on-campus housing” represented 15.6% (n=45) of the respondents. The category “two or more functional areas” represented 15.3% (n=44) of respondents. The category “academic advising” represented 13.9% (n=40) of respondents. The remaining functional areas each had under 10% of respondents.

Table 6

Respondent Summary by Primary Functional Area and Institution Type

Primary Functional Area	HBCU	PWI	Total	Total Percent
On-Campus Housing	13	32	45	15.6
I have more than two functional areas	17	27	44	15.3
Academic Advising	13	27	40	13.9
Campus Activities	3	19	22	7.6
Multicultural Services	0	21	21	7.3
Career Services	2	12	14	4.9
Student Conduct (Behavioral Case Management)	5	8	13	4.5
TRIO/Educational Opportunity	1	12	13	4.5

Admissions	2	9	11	3.8
Orientation	2	9	11	3.8
Enrollment Management	2	5	7	2.4
Greek Affairs	1	6	7	2.4
Community Service/Service Learning	0	5	5	1.7
Graduate and Professional Student Services	0	4	4	1.4
Wellness Programs	0	4	4	1.4
Disability Support Services	1	2	3	1.0
Learning Assistance/Academic Support Services	1	2	3	1.0
Counseling Services	1	1	2	.7
Financial Aid	0	2	2	.7
Student Affairs Assessment	1	1	2	.7
Title IX	1	1	2	.7
Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement	0	1	1	.3
Clinical Health Programs	1	0	1	.3
College Union	0	1	1	.3
GLBT Student Services	0	1	1	.3
Intercollegiate Athletics	1	0	1	.3
International Student Services	0	1	1	.3

Nontraditional-student Services	0	1	1	.3
Spiritual Life/Campus Ministry	0	1	1	.3
Student Affairs Fundraising and Development	1	0	1	.3
Student Affairs Research	0	1	1	.3
Student Conduct (Academic Integrity)	0	1	1	.3
Student Media	1	0	1	.3
Women's Center	0	1	1	.3
Total	70	218	288	100.0

Research Question 1

Is there a significant difference in global satisfaction amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs compared to those at HBCUs?

To answer this research question, the researcher ran descriptive statistics and an independent t-test to compare the means of the global job satisfaction scores for the respondents at PWIs and HBCUs. Descriptive statistics, including the mean, standard deviation, and standard error of the mean, for the scores for each group, are provided in Table 7. The global job satisfaction scores range from 0-24, with higher scores representing higher levels of satisfaction.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for Global Job Satisfaction Scores of Respondents at PWIs and HBCUs

Institution Type	N	M	SD	SEM
PWI	218	16.11	8.275	.989

HBCU	70	15.10	7.331	.497
Both	288	15.87	7.569	.446

The Levene's test and independent t-test results for global job satisfaction scores are represented in Table 8. The Levene's test was used to assess the equality of variances of global satisfaction scores to determine if the variances can be assumed. For global job satisfaction, the results indicated there was no statistically significant difference between the scores at the 95% confidence interval ($T=-.976$, $DF=286$, $p=.330$) amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs ($N=218$, $M=16.11$, $SD=7.331$, $SEM=.497$) compared to those at HBCUs ($N=70$, $M=15.10$, $SD=8.275$, $SEM=.989$).

Table 8

Independent T-test for Global Job Satisfaction Scores of Respondents at PWIs and HBCUs

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	T	DF	<i>p</i>
<i>Equal variances assumed</i>	3.541	.061	-.976	286	.330
<i>Equal variances not assumed</i>			-.917	106.023	.361

Research Question 2

Are there significant differences in satisfaction with job facets amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs compared to those at HBCUs?

To answer this research question, the researcher ran descriptive statistics and an independent t-test to compare the means of each of the job facet satisfaction scores for the respondents at PWIs and HBCUs. Descriptive statistics, including the mean, standard deviation, and standard error of the mean for the scores, are provided in Table 9. The scores range from 0-18 for each job facet, with higher scores representing higher levels of satisfaction. A significant difference was identified for satisfaction with one job facet, as described below.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for Job Facet Satisfaction Scores of Respondents at PWIs and HBCUs

Job Facet	Institution Type	N	M	SD	SEM
Work	HBCU	70	13.71	5.267	.630
	PWI	218	12.57	5.039	.341
	Both	288	12.85	5.109	.301
Pay	HBCU	70	8.17	5.846	.699
	PWI	218	9.23	5.437	.368
	Both	288	8.98	5.548	.327
Promotion	HBCU	70	5.09	5.075	.607
	PWI	218	4.44	4.146	.281
	Both	288	4.60	4.389	.259
Supervision	HBCU	70	9.56	6.525	.780
	PWI	218	10.44	6.088	.412
	Both	288	10.23	6.197	.365
Coworker	HBCU	70	10.54	5.434	.649
	PWI	218	12.64	5.172	.350
	Both	288	12.13	5.304	.313

The Levene's test and independent t-test results for job facet satisfaction scores are represented in Table 10. The Levene's test was used to assess the equality of variances of job facet satisfaction scores to determine if the variances can be assumed. For the *work* job facet, the results indicated there was no statistically significant difference between the scores at the 95% confidence interval ($T=1.630$, $DF=286$, $p=.104$) amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs ($N=218$, $M=12.57$, $SD=5.039$, $SEM=.341$) compared to those at HBCUs ($N=70$, $M=13.71$, $SD=5.267$, $SEM=.630$). For the *pay* job facet, the results indicated there was no statistically significant difference between the scores at the 95% confidence interval ($T=-1.396$, $DF=286$, $p=.164$) amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs ($N=218$, $M=9.23$, $SD=5.437$, $SEM=.368$) compared to those at HBCUs ($N=70$, $M=8.17$, $SD=5.846$, $SEM=.699$). For the *promotion* job facet, the results indicated there was no statistically significant difference between the scores at the 95% confidence interval ($T=.965$, $DF=100.269$, $p=.337$) amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs ($N=218$, $M=4.44$, $SD=4.146$, $SEM=.281$) compared to those at HBCUs ($N=70$, $M=5.09$, $SD=5.075$, $SEM=.607$). For the *supervision* job facet, the results indicated there was no statistically significant difference between the scores at the 95% confidence interval ($T=-1.038$, $DF=286$, $p=.300$) amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs ($N=218$, $M=10.44$, $SD=6.088$, $SEM=.412$) compared to those at HBCUs ($N=70$, $M=9.56$, $SD=6.525$, $SEM=.780$). However, for the *coworker* job facet, the results indicated there was a statistically significant difference between the scores at the 95% confidence interval ($T=-2.912$, $DF=286$, $p=.004$) amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs ($N=218$, $M=12.64$, $SD=5.172$, $SEM=.350$) compared to those at HBCUs ($N=70$, $M=10.54$, $SD=5.434$, $SEM=.649$), with professionals at PWIs reporting significantly higher satisfaction with their coworkers than their counterparts at HBCUs.

Table 10

Independent T-test for Job Facet Scores of Respondents at PWIs and HBCUs

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig	T	DF	p
Work	Equal variances assumed	.049	.826	1.630	286	.104
	Equal variances not assumed			1.593	112.422	.114
Pay	Equal variances assumed	1.720	.191	-1.396	286	.164
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.345	109.960	.181
Promotion	Equal variances assumed	5.382	.021	1.071	286	.285
	Equal variances not assumed			.965	100.269	.337
Supervision	Equal variances assumed	.987	.321	-1.038	286	.300
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.001	110.229	.319
Coworkers	Equal variances assumed	.437	.509	-2.912	286	.004
	Equal variances not assumed					

Equal variances not assumed	-2.839	111.967	.005
--------------------------------------	--------	---------	-------------

Research Question 3

Are there significant differences in affective, normative, and continuance organizational commitment amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs compared to those at HBCUs?

To answer this research question, the researcher ran descriptive statistics and an independent t-test to compare the means of the organizational commitment component scores for the respondents at PWIs and HBCUs. Descriptive statistics for the scores, including the mean, standard deviation, and standard error of the mean are provided in Table 11. The organizational commitment component scores range from 6-42 for each job facet, with higher scores representing higher levels of commitment.

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics for Organizational Commitment Component Scores of Respondents at PWIs and HBCUs

Commitment Component	Institution Type	N	M	SD	SEM
Affective	HBCU	70	22.29	9.205	1.100
	PWI	218	21.11	8.766	.594
	Both	288	21.39	8.873	.523
Continuance	HBCU	70	21.90	7.885	.942
	PWI	218	23.59	8.550	.579
	Both	288	23.18	8.412	.496
Normative	HBCU	70	19.30	8.877	1.061
	PWI	218	18.85	9.180	.622
	Both	288	18.96	9.094	.536

The Levene's test and independent t-test results for organizational commitment component scores are represented in Table 12. The Levene's test was used to assess the equality of variances of organizational commitment component scores to determine if the variances can be assumed. For the *affective* commitment component, the results indicated there was no statistically significant difference between the scores at the 95% confidence interval ($T=.968$, $DF=286$, $p=.334$) amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs ($N=218$, $M=21.11$, $SD=8.766$, $SEM=.594$) compared to those at HBCUs ($N=70$, $M=22.29$, $SD=9.205$, $SEM=1.100$). For the *continuance* commitment component, the results indicated there was no statistically significant difference between the scores at the 95% confidence interval ($T=-1.467$, $DF=286$, $p=.134$) amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs ($N=218$, $M=23.59$, $SD=8.500$, $SEM=.579$) compared to those at HBCUs ($N=70$, $M=21.90$, $SD=7.885$, $SEM=.942$). For the *normative* commitment component, the results indicated there was no statistically significant difference between the scores at the 95% confidence interval ($T=.361$, $DF=286$, $p=.719$) amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs ($N=218$, $M=18.85$, $SD=9.180$, $SEM=.622$) compared to those at HBCUs ($N=70$, $M=19.30$, $SD=8.877$, $SEM=1.061$).

Table 12

Independent T-test for Organizational Commitment Component Scores for Respondents at PWIs and HBCUs

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig	T	DF	p
Affective	Equal variances assumed	.930	.336	.968	286	.334

	Equal variances not assumed			.944	112.018	.347
Continuance	Equal variances assumed	.729	.394	-1.467	286	.143
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.529	125.260	.129
Normative	Equal variances assumed	1.032	.310	.361	286	.719
	Equal variances not assumed			.367	120.027	.714

Conclusion

This chapter described the data analysis to answer the research questions and summarized the results. Descriptive statistics were run to provide an overview of the respondent scores. Independent t-tests were run to determine if there were statistically significant differences in global job satisfaction, job facet satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The results indicated there was no statistically significant difference in global job satisfaction amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs as compared to those at HBCUs. In terms of job facets, the results indicated there were no statistically significant differences in satisfaction with the following job facets: work, pay, promotion, and supervision. However, there was a statistically significant difference in satisfaction with the coworker job facet. Finally, there was no statistically significant difference in organizational commitment amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs as compared to those at HBCUs. In chapter 5, the findings will be

summarized and interpreted, and study limitations will be identified. Also, implications and recommendations for practice and further study will be provided.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were differences in job satisfaction and organizational commitment amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs compared to those at HBCUs. This chapter will recap the results and give an overall analysis of the findings while integrating existing and relevant literature where possible. Implications for practice and study limitations will be provided, concluding with recommendations for further research.

Discussion of Findings

In this study, 288 Black student affairs professionals completed the survey, which consisted of three validated instruments that measured global job satisfaction, job facet satisfaction, and organizational commitment (see Appendix G). The *Abridged Job in General Scale* (Russell et al., 2004) measured global satisfaction. The *Abridged Job Descriptive Index* (Stanton et al., 2001) measured satisfaction with job facets (work, pay, promotion, supervision, and coworker). The revised *Three-Component Model Employee Commitment Survey* (Meyer & Allen, 1993) measured three components of organizational commitment (affective, continuance, and normative).

Demographics comprised of institution-type, gender, professional level, years of full-time student affairs experience, and primary functional area were collected from the respondents. Out of the 288 respondents, 218 were from PWIs, and 70 were from HBCUs. For gender, the largest respondent group was women, with 184 respondents followed by men at 99. Those that

identified as genderfluid or non-binary consisted of 2 respondents. Three respondents preferred not to answer. For professional level, the largest respondent group was mid-level professionals with 186 respondents. The smallest groups were associate vice president and vice president of student affairs, both at 14 respondents each. For full-time student affairs experience, those that had 0-5 and 6-10 years of experience were the largest respondent groups with 103 and 99 respondents, respectively. Finally, for primary functional area, the three largest respondent groups were on-campus housing with 45 respondents, “two or more functional areas” with 44 respondents, and academic advising with 40 respondents. Descriptive statistics were run to describe the results, and independent t-tests were run to answer the research questions.

Due to the absence of literature that defines high and low-level scores, for the purposes of this study and the discussion that follows, the score ranges were divided into thirds to discuss high, moderate, and low levels of each measure. For global job satisfaction, low-level scores were from 0-7, moderate level scores were 8-16, and high-level scores were 17-24. For job facet satisfaction, low-level scores were from 0-5, moderate level scores were 6-12, and high-level scores were 13-18. For organization commitment components, low-level scores were from 6-17, moderate level scores were 18-30, and high-level scores were 31-42.

Differences in Global Job Satisfaction

Research question 1 examined the differences in global job satisfaction amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs compared to those at HBCUs. The findings indicated moderate levels of global job satisfaction with no differences amongst those at PWIs as compared to those at HBCUs. This is consistent with results from Bender’s (2009) study measuring job satisfaction for student affairs professionals. Although the distinctive elements of both types of institutions may impact how Black student affairs professionals experience the

environment, they have similar feelings about their overall job in both settings. The levels do not reflect active job searching behavior as determined by Russell et al. (2004), who discovered in a study that active job searching happened with global job satisfaction scores from 4-5 out of 24. Though the responses in this study represented moderate levels (M=16.01 for PWIs and M=15.11 for HBCUs), it is important to consider that high job satisfaction levels are more desirable to improve staff retention.

Differences in Job Facet Satisfaction

Research question 2 examined the differences in job facet satisfaction amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs as compared to HBCUs. Table 13 shows the results in descending order of facet satisfaction scores. The findings indicated that respondents are most satisfied with the work itself. Overall, Black student affairs professionals are most satisfied with their work and coworkers. Scores reflecting higher levels of satisfaction with the work itself are consistent with the results of Davidson's (2012) study of satisfaction among entry-level residence life professionals, in which the respondents also ranked satisfaction with the work itself highest among the job facets included.

Coworker, supervision, and pay job facet scores were in the moderate level range, with pay being in the lowest end. The coworker job facet was the only facet where there was a significant difference in scores. Black student affairs professionals at PWIs were more satisfied with their coworkers than their counterparts at HBCUs. This difference indicates that there may be elements of the staffing practices, environment, and interactions between coworkers at PWIs and HBCUs that impact the dynamics of relationships between colleagues that cannot be determined by this study. According to Hirt et al. (2006), some of the elements of student affairs work at HBCUs that could negatively impact relationships amongst Black student affairs staff

are that the environment is high stress and slow to change. Some of the stress could be due to HBCUs being under-resourced, which could negatively impact staffing and the need for HBCU student affairs staff to multitask to achieve organizational objectives (Hirt et al., 2006).

Staffing practices could also be a contributing factor to the variance of coworker satisfaction. There are a number of HBCU student affairs administrators that are employed by their undergraduate alma mater, which could decrease the likelihood that a diverse set of institutional experiences would contribute to improving practice (Harper & Kimbrough, 2005). Additionally, there are lower numbers of HBCU student affairs administrators with formal education in student affairs/higher education that contribute to a role (Harper & Kimbrough, 2005). HBCUs have low participation rates in placement services with national student affairs organizations, which can impact how competitive a search could be (Harper & Kimbrough, 2005). Low participation rates can be attributed to the lack of funding that exists to cover the costs of participation. Additionally, low funding lessens the opportunities for administrators to participate in professional development opportunities allowing staff to translate new knowledge and experiences into practice that will positively contribute to the institution.

For supervision, Black student affairs professionals reportedly experience similar feelings and attitudes regardless of institution type. Moderate level scores for supervision indicate that Black student affairs professionals share similar attitudes towards their supervisors regardless of institution type. At PWIs, a barrier to success is discrimination in the workplace (Gardner et al., 2014), so at an HBCU, one could assume that Black staff could have a stronger affinity to their supervisor if there is a shared identity. There are other dynamics to be explored and considered, such as other intersecting identities, generational differences, or supervision style.

Results for pay and promotion job facets indicated the lowest levels of satisfaction compared to the other job facets. Black staff at PWIs and HBCUs expressed similar feelings, which is consistent in the literature where compensation was identified as a barrier to success for Black student affairs professionals (Gardner et al., 2014). Even though institutions with more resources may be able to allocate more competitive compensation packages, Black student affairs professionals at both institution types are not satisfied with their pay. This negates a common assumption that those at PWIs are more satisfied with their compensation than those at HBCUs. Additionally, Davidson (2014) concluded that entry-level residence life staff were least satisfied with promotional opportunities. Low satisfaction with promotion and pay can lead to staff seeking other opportunities for advancement.

Table 13

Results of Job Facet Satisfaction Scores of Respondents at PWIs and HBCUs in Descending Order

Job Facet	Institution Type	N	M	SD	SEM
Work	HBCU	70	13.71	5.267	.630
	PWI	218	12.57	5.039	.341
	Both	288	12.85	5.109	.301
Coworker	HBCU	70	10.54	5.434	.649
	PWI	218	12.64	5.172	.350
	Both	288	12.13	5.304	.313
Supervision	HBCU	70	9.56	6.525	.780
	PWI	218	10.44	6.088	.412
	Both	288	10.23	6.197	.365
Pay	HBCU	70	8.17	5.846	.699
	PWI	218	9.23	5.437	.368
	Both	288	8.98	5.548	.327
Promotion	HBCU	70	5.09	5.075	.607
	PWI	218	4.44	4.146	.281
	Both	288	4.60	4.389	.259

Differences in Organizational Commitment

Research question 3 examined the differences in organizational commitment. The three components of organizational commitment that were measured included affective, continuance, and normative commitment, which are different perspectives of why someone would leave or stay at an organization. The findings indicated moderate levels for each component with no differences amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs compared to those at HBCUs. High commitment levels mean employees are less likely to leave (Lambert & Hogan, 2009).

For affective commitment, all respondents share similar levels of emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in their respective institutions. Since HBCUs primarily consist of faculty, staff, and students that identify as Black, one would surmise that Black student affairs professionals would have a higher level of commitment to their institutions due to its affirming nature (Hirt et al., 2006). When referencing emotional attachment to an institution, race could have a significant impact, which would make sense for Black staff at HBCUs. The same might be true for Black staff at PWIs that work in identity-based functional areas. There could be an emotional attachment in general to the work itself, regardless of institution type, due to the nature of student affairs work.

For continuance commitment results, the findings indicate that the costs associated with leaving an institution are not high enough to prevent someone from leaving, but the costs are also not low enough for the decision to leave to be simple. There could be factors both internal and external that could impact continuance commitment. The factors would have to be valuable enough to the individual to prevent them from leaving. For example, if a staff member or their dependent is enrolled in a degree program at their institution of employment, and they receive tuition benefits, then they may stay to continue those benefits.

Normative commitment results measured the respondent's obligation to remain at an institution because they feel as though they should (Allen & Meyer, 1996). The findings indicated moderate levels of normative commitment with no differences between those at PWIs and those at HBCUs. The results mean all respondents feel a moderate obligation to remain since normative commitment is the feeling of one's own obligation to an organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Like affective commitment, one would surmise that Black student affairs professionals at HBCUs would have higher levels of normative commitment than those at PWIs due to the predominantly shared identity among students and the desire to support their success. There could be other factors that lead to a strong obligation that remain unidentified.

The results extend upon existing literature on job satisfaction and organizational commitment to address levels of both Black student affairs professionals at PWIs and HBCUs. The experiences for staff that occur due to the distinctly historical nature and culture of each institution would be expected to be different. However, findings from this study suggest that the attitudes and feelings about the work and the organizations are similar. Black student affairs professionals are most satisfied with work and coworkers compared to the other job facets. However, there is an element of each environment that results in a difference in satisfaction in coworker relationships amongst Black staff at PWIs and at HBCUs, where Black staff at PWIs are more satisfied with coworkers than those at HBCUs. Based on existing literature, the difference can be connected to HBCUs having a pace of work that is highly stressful and slow to change (Hirt et al., 2006). Black staff at both types of institutions are least satisfied with pay and promotion.

Regarding commitment levels, Black staff at both types of institutions experience similar levels of organizational commitment resulting in similar chances that they are likely to leave

their organization. Surprisingly, the results do not indicate the differences one would assume, based on the institutional setting. Where the differences do exist, they are not in the direction one would expect regarding coworkers. One would expect that Black student affairs professionals would be more satisfied with coworkers at HBCUs than those at PWIs, but the results indicated otherwise.

Limitations

There was one main limitation associated with this study. Some respondents sent an email to the researcher questioning whether they were qualified to respond because their current role was not in a division of student affairs. For example, at some institutions, housing may report through a division of business and finance. Similarly, academic advising may report through academic affairs. Some offices related to diversity, equity, and Title IX can be in a division of institutional diversity and equity. For those that questioned whether they qualified, they may have decided not to partake, impacting respondent numbers. The recruitment and consent form could have specified that the role did not have to be in a student affairs division. Another limitation related to interpreting the results was the lack of research on HBCUs and organizational commitment in student affairs. Most of the literature focused on either Black student affairs professionals at PWIs, all Black student affairs professionals, or Black students at PWIs and HBCUs. As a result, no comparisons can be made to determine if the findings suggest something new or result in different implications.

Implications and Recommendations for Practice

There are several implications of this study. The findings will impact student affairs leaders' awareness of the work environment and experiences of their Black staff. Specifically, supervisors of all levels need to continuously assess the environment, morale, and potential

tenure cycle of employees. Even though there are distinctive elements of PWIs and HBCUs, Black student affairs professionals have very similar feelings and attitudes towards job satisfaction and organizational commitment, except for coworker relationships. As a result, universal retention strategies can be developed based on literature.

Additionally, leaders at HBCUs should be conscious of team dynamics in the work environment. Relationships among the staff could have an impact on productivity and morale. The nature of work at HBCUs was characterized as highly collaborative and team-oriented and was also characterized to be highly stressful (Hirt et al., 2006). Having a highly stressful environment can have an impact on how staff engage with each other. HBCU leaders should work with staff members to assess their support needs.

Furthermore, it would be beneficial for leaders to evaluate their expectations of staff performance considering existing human and fiscal resources. At times there may be institutional pressure to achieve specific outcomes such as student recruitment, retention, graduation, job placement, or sponsored events. Before key performance indicators are set, HBCU leaders should work with their staff to better understand what is realistic given their current set of responsibilities.

Also, HBCU leaders should encourage creativity and innovation in student affairs work from all staff. Challenges in co-worker dynamics can be impacted by a slow-changing environment, which creates obstacles when gaining buy-in for new initiatives (Hirt et al., 2006). Creativity and innovation could be achieved by providing professional development opportunities for national/regional conferences or expert speakers that could provide sessions for staff.

Successful retention and staffing plans would increase satisfaction and commitment resulting in representative and continuous leadership. The plans would also contribute to positive student outcomes through consistent mentorship and support for Black students. Finally, the results challenge the notion that the experiences for staff at both types of institutions are as different as one would assume given the differences in institution type. This means that student affairs leaders can adopt best practices related to staff engagement and retention created on a national level. Institutional context is important to understand when developing intentional retention and support strategies for Black student affairs professionals, and the results show the need for attention to coworker relationships at HBCUs.

Based on the findings and implications, there are several recommendations for practice for student affairs leaders. First, institutions should establish a cycle of assessment regarding staffing practices. An assessment plan, which could include a staffing survey, would provide the data on the work environment and relationships needed for institutional leaders to understand staff experiences. The results of the assessment should be used in complement with organizational theory to design strategies to achieve targeted objectives for increased levels of satisfaction and organizational commitment. Emphasis needs to be placed on understanding the dynamic amongst coworkers and the impact the environment must create strategies to create synergies amongst staff.

Second, there should be increased financial investment in the recruitment, selection, and professional development process at HBCUs since who is hired could have an impact on coworker relationships. Increased investment in recruitment and selection could improve the competitiveness of candidate pools and increase the likelihood of hiring those with diverse experiences. Investment in professional development would strengthen competencies within the

field and functional areas. The challenge with this recommendation is the limited financial resources at HBCUs. To address this challenge, HBCUs can evaluate how to use grant funding to support staff development from the Department of Education via the Title III grant (Strengthening Institutions). Working towards grants such as Title III would require an institutional commitment to enhancing staffing practices.

Third, organizational support has been identified as a strong indicator of affective commitment (Boheman, 2007). As such, institutions should create formalized professional development and succession planning, which would send a message that the institution is investing in its staff. Additionally, promoting from within would eliminate the costs associated with hiring external candidates, which would benefit institutions that do not have the funding to participate in student affairs placement programs and post to external job posting websites. Although promoting from within comes with its challenges regarding the diversity of experiences, when implemented strategically, the professional investment in the staff could increase promotional opportunities. As reflected in the results of the study, this recommendation could be applied to all Black student affairs professionals.

Finally, institutions should analyze compensation packages for staff to ensure that it is competitive with the market rate. This does not mean that institutions should not aim to meet the rate but aim to exceed and make the rate relevant to the skills, qualifications, and accomplishments of the staff. Conversations should be had about the nature of student affairs work, the associated risk with managing the health and safety of students, work hours, and required credentials and how it correlates to compensation bands. At private institutions, conversations need to happen internally, but at public institutions, conversations need to be had in the state/university system level.

Recommendations for Future Research

There are several recommendations for future research. First, this study focused on Black student affairs professionals at PWIs and HBCUs and did not address the differences amongst participant demographics. Bender (2009) discussed job satisfaction of student affairs professionals. Although the statistical analysis in Bender's study did not detect differences in overall job satisfaction, there were gender differences in satisfaction with promotional opportunities. Also, Bender's research did not indicate differences amongst race or institution type, so this presents an opportunity to investigate the gender differences amongst Black student affairs professionals. By examining the gender differences, institutions could know if there are gender differences in job satisfaction and organizational commitment amongst Black student affairs professionals at PWIs and HBCUs. The results could inform where the emphasis for support and retention strategies should be placed.

Second, this study contained information about the respondent's functional areas. The duties represented in various areas are different and may impact a staff's experience. For example, those that work in residence life may dedicate more hours on campus due to their on-campus residence and 24/7 on-call support. This is starkly different than someone who works in academic advising who can maintain a 9 am-5 pm work schedule. Further research can be conducted to see if there are differences amongst other functional areas that could inform of where the emphasis should be placed in developing staff support and retention strategies.

Third, since the study focused more on differences within the same population, there was no control group to determine if they are more or less satisfied than non-Black student affairs professionals. Literature supports the notion that Black student affairs professionals have lower levels of satisfaction than White student affairs professionals (Marcus, 2000), but further

research can examine the differences in specific job facets and get an understanding of commitment levels. The results would give additional context on job satisfaction and organizational commitment by providing an understanding of racial differences. The results would be more relevant for PWIs that want to promote staff diversity.

Fourth, this study focused on two institution types: PWIs and HBCUs, which are very distinct in terms of historical significance and populations served. There may be other institutional factors that impact how they operate, which may have an impact on staff experiences and satisfaction, such as private vs. public, size, location, or 2-year vs. 4-year. Standard operating procedures, including compensation evaluation and promotions, can be impacted by such institutional factors. Staff may have more opportunities for advancement at larger institutions. Some may have stronger relationships with coworkers and supervisors at smaller institutions.

Fifth, this study highlighted differences in job satisfaction and organizational commitment through quantitative analysis. A mixed-methods approach would provide a more in-depth analysis of the experiences. There can be a deeper investigation of the differences to understand the narratives, which will give an additional layer of meaning to differences. For example, the narrative could provide information regarding their perceptions of pay and promotions, and if they feel as though they are less likely to receive a raise or promotion. Another approach could be to interview those who exhibit high and low levels of satisfaction and commitment to understanding the institutional conditions that contributed to their attitudes and feelings.

Sixth, research supports the notion that job satisfaction impacts organizational commitment, which, in turn, impacts an employee's intent to leave (Agarwal & Sajid, 2017).

Further research can focus on Black student affairs professionals to understand which scores of organizational commitment lead to turnover. For global job satisfaction, Russell et al. (2004) discovered that active job search behavior occurred at Job in General (JIG) scores within the 4-5 range. Additional research can be conducted to see if this holds true for Black student affairs professionals and what the differences would be as compared to White student affairs professionals.

Conclusion

This study sought to add to the existing literature on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in student affairs (Anderson, Guido-DiBrito, & Morrell, 2000; Bender, 2009; Boheman, 2007; Davison, 2012). Literature exists that highlight experiences of Black student affairs professionals, but they are not discussed in terms of job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Gardner, Barret, & Pearson, 2014; Steele, 2018). There are even fewer studies that focus on staff at HBCUs (Hirt et al., 2008). Since retention of Black staff is an area of improvement for PWIs, it is imperative that a foundational understanding of job satisfaction and organizational commitment is established (Jackson, 2001; Sagria & Johnsrud, 1991). Additionally, retention of Black student affairs professionals assists with achieving positive outcomes for Black students at both PWIs and HBCUs (Hirt et al., 2008; Jackson, 2000; Lee, 1999; Swail et al., 2003).

For Black student affairs professionals, the institution type does not change how they feel about the job, most of its facets, or organizational commitment. Levels of satisfaction can be assessed to create interventions for staff to improve their experience and reduce attrition. Professionals at both types of institutions expressed similar levels of commitment, conveying that the nature of the institutional culture does not make a difference in their commitment to the

institution. Similar levels of satisfaction and commitment allow leaders to design strategies to improve the experiences for Black student affairs professionals without having to account for cultural and environmental differences. However, for HBCUs, there can be an emphasis placed on understanding and designing strategies to address coworker job facet satisfaction.

Overall, the information provided in the study supports the notion that Black student affairs professionals working at PWIs and HBCUs experience similar feelings and attitudes towards their job and organization, but there is a difference based on the setting when it comes to feelings and attitudes about co-workers. Student affairs leaders need to design support strategies to improve levels of satisfaction and commitment to decrease the likelihood of staff turnover. HBCUs should place a specific emphasis on elements of the institutional operations and culture that could explain a lower level of satisfaction with coworkers than Black student affairs professionals at PWIs. There is possibly something about the environment that has an impact on interactions amongst colleagues, or it could be connected to recruitment, selection, and training. Furthermore, as institutional leaders seek to support staff retention and improve their experiences, relevant strategies can be applied on a national landscape and used in professional development programming in national student affairs associations due to similar levels of satisfaction and commitment in most areas.

REFERENCES

- Abdel-Halim, A. A. (1981). Effects of role stress-job design-technology interaction on employee work satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24(2), 260-273.
- Acevedo, A. (2018). A personalistic appraisal of Maslow's needs theory of motivation: From "humanistic" psychology to integral humanism. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148(4), 741–763.
- Agarwal, P. & Sajid, S. M. (2017). A study of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention among public and private sector employees. *Journal of Management Research*, 17(3), 123-136.
- Allen, D. G., Bryant, P. C., & Vardaman, J. M. (2010). Retaining talent: Replacing misconceptions with evidence-based strategies. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24(2), 48–64.
- Allen, N. J., Meyer, J. P. (1990). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment scales. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1–18.
- Allen, N. J., Meyer, J.P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49(3), 252-276.
- Anderson, J. E., Guido-DiBrito, F., Morrell, J. S. (2000). Factors that influence satisfaction for student affairs administrators. In Hagedorn, L.S., *Institutional Research in a Digital Era* (New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 105, pp. 99-110). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Aron, A. (1977). Maslow's other child. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 17(2), 9-24.
- Austin, A. E., and Gamson, Z. F. (1983). Academic workplace: New demands, heightened tensions. ASHE/ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 10. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Baloch, Q. B., Zaman, G., & Jamshed, J. (2014). Determinants of job satisfaction and employees turnover intentions. *Abasyn University Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(1), 118–136.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 587-595.
- Bateman, T. S., & Strasser, S. (1984). A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27(1), 95-112.
- Beck, K. & Wilson, C. (2000). Development of affective organizational commitment: A cross-sequential examination of change with tenure. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56(1), 114-136.
- Bedeian, A.G., & Armenakis, A.A. (1981). A path-analytic of the consequences of role conflict and ambiguity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24(2), 417-424.
- Behling, O., Labovitz, G., & Kosmo, R. (1968). The Herzberg controversy: A critical reappraisal. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 99(1), 98-108.
- Bender, B. E. (2009). Job satisfaction in student affairs. *NASPA Journal*, 46(4), 553-565.
- Berl, R. L., Williamson, N. C., & Powell, T. (1984). Industrial salesforce motivation: A critique and test of Maslow's hierarchy of need. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 4(1), 33–39.
- Bichsel, J. & McChesney, J. (2017). *Pay and representation of racial/ethnic minorities in higher*

- education administrative positions: The century so far*. Research report. CUPA-HR.
- Boehman, J. (2007). Affective commitment among student affairs professionals. *NASPA Journal*, 44(2), 307–326.
- Bowman, N. (2010). Fundraising during an economic downturn within the historically Black college and university environment. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 9(4), 266–272.
- Brass, D. J. (1981). Structural relationships, job characteristics, and worker satisfaction and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(3), 331-348.
- Brenner, V. C., Carmack, C. W., & Weinstein, M. G. (1971). An empirical test of the motivation-hygiene theory. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 9(2), 359-366.
- Buck, J. M., & Watson, J. L. (2002). Retaining staff employees: The relationship between human resources management strategies and organizational commitment. *Innovative Higher Education*, 26(3), 175–193.
- Buckley, M. R., Carraher, S. M., & Cote, J. A. (1992). Measurement issues concerning the use of inventories of job satisfaction. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52(3), 529–543.
- Burke, R. J. (1966). Are Herzberg's motivators and hygienes unidimensional. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 50(4), 317-321.
- Castillo, J. X. and Cano, J. (2004). Factors explaining job satisfaction among faculty. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 45(3), 65-74.
- Chen, J., & Silverthorne, C. (2008). The impact of locus of control on job stress, job performance and job satisfaction in Taiwan. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29(7), 572-582.

- Chen, S. H., Yang, C. C., Shiau, J. Y., & Wang, H. H. (2006). The development of an employee satisfaction model for higher education. *The TQM Magazine*, 18(5), 484-500.
- Conley, V. M. (2001). Separation: An integral aspect of the staffing process. *The College Student Affairs Journal*, 21(1), 57-63.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Davar, S. C., & Bala, R. (2012). Relationship between job satisfaction & job performance: A meta-analysis. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 48(2), 290-305.
- Davidson, D. L. (2012). Job satisfaction, recruitment, and retention of entry-level Residence life and housing staff. *Journal of College & University Student Housing*, 38/39(2/1), 78-93.
- Davis, J. (1994). *Coloring the halls of ivy: Leadership & diversity in the academy*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Eslami, J. & Gharakhani, D. (2012). Organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal of Science and Technology*, 2(2), 85-91.
- Ewen, R. B. (1964). Some determinants of job satisfaction: A study of the generality of Herzberg's theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 48(3), 161-163.
- Fife, J. D. (1992). Foreword. In Tack, M. W., & Patitu, C. L., *Faculty job satisfaction: Women and minorities in peril, ASHE-ERIC higher education report four* (xvii-xviii). Washington, DC: George Washington University.
- Fjortoft, N. (1993). Factors predicting faculty commitment to the university. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (33rd, Chicago, IL, May 1993).

- Gardner, L. J., Barrett, T. G., & Pearson, L. C. (2014). African-American administrators at pwis: Enablers of and barriers to career success. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 7(4), 235-251.
- Gasman, M. (2009). Historically Black colleges and universities in a time of economic Crisis. *Academe*, 95(6), 26–28.
- Gasman, M. & Drezner, N. D. (2010). Fundraising for black colleges during the 1960s and 1970s: The case of hampton institute. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 39(2), 321–342.
- Geller, L. (1982). The failure of self-actualization theory: A critique of Carl Rogers and Abraham Maslow. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 22(2), 56–73.
- Gerhart, B. (1988). Sources of variance in incumbent perceptions of job complexity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(2), 154–162.
- Giese, W. J., & Ruter, H. W. (1949). An objective analysis of morale. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 33(5), 421-427.
- Gladstein, D. L. (1984). Groups in context: A model of task group effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29(4), 499-517.
- Glick, W. H., Jenkins, J. D., & Gupta, N. (1986). Method versus substance: How strong are underlying relationships between job characteristics and attitudinal outcomes? *Academy of Management Journal*, 29(3), 441-464.
- Glisson, C., & Durick, M. (1988). Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in human service organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33(1), 61-81.
- Groves, R. M., Fowler, F. J., Couper, M., Lepkowski, J. M., Singer, E., & Tourangeau, R. (2009). *Survey methodology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(2), 159-170.
- Harper, S. R., & Kimbrough, W. M. (2005). Staffing practices, professional preparation trends, and demographics among student affairs administrators at HBCUs: Implications from a national study. *NASAP Journal*, 8(1), 8-25.
- Hatfield, J. D. & Huseman, R.C. (1982). Perceptual congruence about communication as related to satisfaction: Moderating effects of individual characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25(2), 349-358.
- Haynes, K. (1979). Job satisfaction of mid-management social workers. *Administration in Social Work*, 3(2), 201-217.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Hirt, J. B., Strayhorn, T. L., Amelink, C. T., & Bennett, B. R. (2006). The nature of student affairs work at historically Black colleges and universities. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(6), 661-676.
- Hirt, J. B., Amelink, C. T., McFeeters, B. B., & Strayhorn, T. L. (2008). A system of othermothering: Student affairs administrators' perceptions of relationships with students at historically Black colleges. *NASPA Journal*, 45(2), 210-236.
- Holmes, D. R., Verrier, D., & Chisholm, P. (1982). Exploring career patterns in student affairs: Problems of conception and methodology. *NASPA Journal*, 20(2), 27-35.
- House, R. J., & Wigdor, L. A. (1967). Herzberg's dual-factor theory of job satisfaction and motivation: A review of the evidence and a criticism. *Personnel Psychology*, 20(4), 369-389.

- House, R. J., Filley, A. C., & Kerr, S. (1971). Relation of leader consideration and initiating structure to r and d subordinates' satisfaction. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16(1), 19-30.
- Iiacqua, J. A., & Schumacher, P. (1995). Factors contributing to job satisfaction in higher education. *Education*, 116(1), 51-61.
- Ironson, G., Smith, P., Brannick, M., Gibson, W., & Paul, K. (1989). Construction of a job in general scale: A comparison of global, composite, and specific measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(2), 193-198.
- Jackson, J. F. L. (2000) Administrators of color at predominantly White institutions. In L. Jones(Ed.), *Brothers of the academy: Up and coming African Americans earning our way in higher education* (pp. 42-52). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Jackson, J. F. L. (2002). Retention of African American administrators at predominantly White institutions: Using professional growth factors to inform the discussion. *College and University*, 78(2), 11-16.
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. B. (2017). *Educational research : quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Johnsrud, L. K. (2002). Measuring the quality of faculty and administrative worklife: Implications for college and university campuses. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(3), 379-395.
- Johnsrud, L. K. & Rosser, V. J. (1999). College and university midlevel administrators: Explaining and improving their morale. *The Review of Higher Education*, 22(2), 121-141.
- Kalleberg, A. L. (1977). Work values and job rewards: A theory of job satisfaction. *American Sociological Review*, 42(1), 124-143.

- Katz, R. (1978). Job longevity as a situational factor in job satisfaction. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23(2), 204-223.
- Kerr, W. A., Koppelman, G. J., & Sullivan, J. J. (1951). Absenteeism, turnover and morale in a metals fabrication factory. *Occupational Psychology*, 25(1), 50-55.
- 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(1), 14-32.
- Lambert, E., & Hogan, N. (2009). The importance of job satisfaction and organizational Commitment in shaping turnover intent: A test of a causal model. *Criminal Justice Review*, 34(1), 96-118.
- Lee, T. W. (1988). How job dissatisfaction leads to employee turnover. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 2(3), 263-271.
- Lee, W. (1999). Striving toward effective retention: The effect of race on mentoring African American students. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 74(2), 27-43.
- Liu, C. S., & White, L. (2011). Key determinants of hospital pharmacy staff's job satisfaction. *Research in Social & Administrative Pharmacy: RSAP*, 7(1), 51-63.
- Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organisational Psychology* (1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand-McNally.
- Maidani, E. A. (1991). Comparative study of Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction among public and private sectors. *Public Personnel Management*, 20(4), 441-448.
- Malinovsky, M. R., & Barry, J. R. (1965). Determinants of work attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49(6), 446-451.

- Manning, K., Kinzie, J., & Schuh, J. H. (2014). *One size does not fit all: Traditional and innovative models of student affairs practice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Marcus, L. R. (2000). Staff diversity and the leadership challenge. *Equity & Excellence in Education.*, 33(2), 61-67.
- Markovits, Y., Davis, A. J., & van Dick, R. (2007). Organizational commitment profiles and job satisfaction among Greek private and public sector employees. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 7(1), 77–99.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). Theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Maqsood, A., Hanif, R., Rehman, G., & Glenn, W. (2012). Validation of the three-component model of organizational commitment questionnaire. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(2), 135–145.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 171-194.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (2004). *TCM employee commitment survey academic users guide 2004*. Ontario, Canada: The University of Western Ontario, Department of Psychology. Retrieved March 31, 2019 from: <http://employeecommitment.com/TCM-Employee-Commitment-Survey-Academic-Package-2004.pdf>
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 538–551.

- Morris, J. H., & Steers, R. M. (1980). Structural influences on organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 17(1), 50–57.
- Mosher, F. C. (1982). *Democracy and the public service*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., Porter, L. W. (1979). The Measurement of Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 224–47.
- NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education (2016). Professional Details. Retrieved from <https://engage.naspa.org/myprofstudentdemographics>
- National Center for Education and Statistics (2017). Indicator 24: Degrees Awarded. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/raceindicators/indicator_ree.asp
- Neher, A. (1991). Maslow's theory of motivation: A critique. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 31(3), 89–112.
- Neumann, Y., & Finaly-Neumann, E. (1990). The reward-support framework and faculty commitment to their university. *Research in Higher Education*, 31(1), 75-97.
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Caldwell, D. F. (1980). Job choice: The impact of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on subsequent satisfaction and commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65(5), 559-565.
- O'Reilly III, C. A., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3), 487–516.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2003). Personal correlates of job satisfaction: Empirical evidence from UK universities. *International Journal Of Social Economics*, 30(11), 1210-1232.
- Podsakoff, P., Todor, W., & Skov, R. (1982). Effects of leader contingent and noncontingent

- reward and punishment behaviors on subordinate performance and satisfaction. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 25(4), 810-821.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(5), 603–609.
- Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15(2), 150-163.
- 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(6), 813-830.
- Russell, S. S., Spitzmuller, C., Lin, L. F., Stanton, J. M., Smith, P. C., & Ironson, G. H. (2004). Shorter can also be better: The abridged job in general scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 64(5), 878-893.
- Sagaria, M. A., & Johnsrud, L. K. (1991). Recruiting, advancing, and retaining minorities in student affairs: Moving from rhetoric to results. *NASPA Journal*, 28(2), 105–120.
- Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1977). An examination of need-satisfaction models of job attitudes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22(3), 427–456.
- Sharma, D. B., Shah, U. M., Patel, R., Gupta, V., & Singh, U. S. (2018). Determinants of job satisfaction amongst medical officers of primary health centre in anand district, Gujarat, India. *Journal of Clinical & Diagnostic Research*, 12(4), 13–17.
- Smerek, R. E., & Peterson, M. (2007). Examining Herzberg's theory: Improving job satisfaction among non-academic employees at a university. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(2), 229-250.

- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: application, assessment, cause, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Stagner, R., Flebbe, D. R., & Wood, E. V. (1952). Working on the railroad: A study of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 5(4), 293-306.
- Stanton, J. M., Sinar, E. F., Balzer, W. K., Julian, A. L., Thoreson, P., Aziz, S., Fisher, G. G., & Smith, P. C. (2002). Development of a compact measure of job satisfaction: The abridged job descriptive index. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 62(1), 173-191.
- Steele, T. (2018). Toxicity in the work environment: Retaining staff members of color at a predominantly white institution. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 36(1), 109-123.
- Suki, N., & Suki, N. (2011). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment: The effect of gender. *International Journal of Psychology Research*, 6(5), 1-15.
- Swail, W., Redd, K., & Perna, L. (2003). Retaining minority students in higher education: A framework for success (Report No. 2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED483024).
- Testa, M. R. (1999). Satisfaction with organizational vision, job satisfaction and service efforts: An empirical investigation. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 20(2), 154-161.
- Volkwein, J. F., & Parmley, K. (2000). Comparing administrative satisfaction in public and private universities. *Research in Higher Education*, 41(1), 95-116.
- Volkwein, J. F., & Zhou, Y. (2003). Testing a model of administrative job satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 44(3), 149-171.

- Wahba, M. A., & Bridwell, L. G. (1976). Maslow reconsidered: A review of research on the need hierarchy theory. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*, 15(2), 212–240.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review*, 7(3), 418–428.
- Winston, R., Creamer, D., & Miller, T. (2001). *The professional student affairs administrator: Educator, leader, and manager*. New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge.
- Wood, L., Winston, R. B., & Polkosnik, M. C. (1985). Career orientations and professional development of young student affairs professionals. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 26(6), 532–539.
- Wu, C., Chen, I., & Chen, J. (2017). A study into the impact of employee wellness and job satisfaction on job performance. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation*, 10(2), 253-269.
- Yang, X. & Weijie Wang, W. (2013). Exploring the determinants of job satisfaction of civil servants in Beijing, China. *Public Personnel Management*, 42(4), 566–587.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Participant Recruitment Advertisement



PARTICIPANTS NEEDED

JOB SATISFACTION & ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT OF BLACK STUDENT AFFAIRS PROFESSIONALS AT PWIS AND HBCUS

DO YOU:

- Identify as Black?
- Work as a full-time student affairs professional?
- Currently work on a physical campus at a Predominately White Institution (PWI) or Historically Black College & University (HBCU)?

If so, then you are eligible to participate in a research study.

The purpose of this study is to the examine the differences in job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Black student affairs professionals at PWIs and HBCUs

**To participate in this research study, go to
tinyurl.com/blksapjobsatisfaction
The survey will take 10-12 minutes to complete.**

Questions can be forwarded to Darren Jones, Doctoral Candidate at the University of Georgia at darren.jones@uga.edu.
"Approved by UGA IRB, #XXXXXXX"

Appendix B

AAKC Agreement To Post On Facebook Page

7/22/2019

Mary Baldwin University Mail - Dissertation participant recruitment inquiry



Darren Jones <dcjones@marybaldwin.edu>

Dissertation participant recruitment inquiry

Gary, Demetrius T <dtgary@illinois.edu>

Mon, Jul 15, 2019 at 3:25 PM

To: Darren Jones <dcjones@marybaldwin.edu>, "ldacker@brockport.edu" <ldacker@brockport.edu>

Thanks for reaching out!

You can send the information to us and we will share it with our social media team to publicize on our social media outlets.

Also, we'd encourage you to consider submitting a program proposal on your work at NASPA.

Thank you!

DEMETRIUS T. GARY (he, him, his)

Area Coordinator

University Housing | Student Affairs | University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

144 Allen Hall | [1005 West Gregory Drive](#) | M/C 050 | Urbana, IL 61801

217.333.4134 | fax: 217.244.2324 | dtgary@illinois.edu

www.housing.illinois.edu



Appendix C

Message to Professional Contacts

Hello:

My name is Darren Jones, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Student Affairs Leadership program at the University of Georgia. Under the direction of Dr. Laura A. Dean, I am recruiting participants for my dissertation study on job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Black student affairs professionals at PWIs and HBCUs. My hope is for the results of the study to provide insight to student affairs leaders as they design strategies for student retention and support. If you are someone you know identifies as Black and is currently employed full-time on a physical campus at a PWI or HBCU, please encourage them to participate. You can send them the advertisement below and/or send them the following link: tinyurl.com/blksapjobsatisfaction for more information and to take the survey. The survey will take 10-12 minutes to complete. If you have any questions, please contact me at Darren.jones@uga.edu.

Thanks so much!

Darren



PARTICIPANTS NEEDED
JOB SATISFACTION & ORGANIZATIONAL
COMMITMENT OF BLACK STUDENT AFFAIRS
PROFESSIONALS AT PWIS AND HBCUS

DO YOU:

- Identify as Black?
- Work as a full-time student affairs professional?
- Currently work on a physical campus at a Predominately White Institution (PWI) or Historically Black College & University (HBCU)?

If so, then you are eligible to participate in a research study.

The purpose of this study is to examine the differences in job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Black student affairs professionals at PWIs and HBCUs

To participate in this research study, go to
tinyurl.com/blksapjobsatisfaction
 The survey will take 10-12 minutes to complete.

Question can be forwarded to Darren Jones, Doctoral Candidate at the University of Georgia at Darren.jones@uga.edu
 *Approved by IRB #2021-001

Appendix D

Message to Chief Student Affairs Officers at HBCUs

Hello:

My name is Darren Jones, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Student Affairs Leadership program at the University of Georgia. Under the direction of Dr. Laura A. Dean, I am recruiting participants for my dissertation study on job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Black student affairs professionals at PWIs and HBCUs. I am reaching out to you as the Chief Student Affairs officer so that we may have a robust response rate from staff at HBCUs. My hope is for the results of the study to provide insight to student affairs leaders as they design strategies for student retention and support. You can send them the advertisement below that outlines participant criteria and/or send them the following link: tinyurl.com/blksapjobsatisfaction for more information and to take the survey. The survey will take 10-12 minutes to complete. If you have any questions, please contact me at Darren.jones@uga.edu.

Thanks so much!

Darren



PARTICIPANTS NEEDED
JOB SATISFACTION & ORGANIZATIONAL
COMMITMENT OF BLACK STUDENT AFFAIRS
PROFESSIONALS AT PWIS AND HBCUS

DO YOU:

- Identify as Black?
- Work as a full-time student affairs professional?
- Currently work on a physical campus at a Predominately White Institution (PWI) or Historically Black College & University (HBCU)?

If so, then you are eligible to participate in a research study.

The purpose of this study is to the examine the differences in job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Black student affairs professionals at PWIs and HBCUs

To participate in this research study, go to
tinyurl.com/blksapjobsatisfaction
The survey will take 10-12 minutes to complete.

Questions can be forwarded to Darren Jones, Doctoral Candidate at the University of Georgia at Darren.jones@uga.edu.
 Approved by UGA IRB: XXXXXXX

Appendix E

Permission to Use AJDI/AJIG

Re: AJDI/AJIG Scale Use Permission

JDI Research Assistance <jdi_ra@bgsu.edu>

Mon 5/27/2019 10:45 AM

To: Darren Jones <darren.jones@uga.edu>

Hi Darren,

You have our permission to use the JDI, aJDI, AJIG, and other related measures for your research. Best of luck with your study!

Best,
Claire

Claire Smith

JDI Research Assistant

Bowling Green State University

Email: jdi_ra@bgsu.edu

Tel: (419) 372-2693

<http://www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/psychology/services/job-descriptive-index.html>

Appendix F

Permission to Use The Three-Component Model Survey



June 13, 2019

Darren Jones
6 W 5th St
Milton PA, 17847, USA

Dear Mr. Jones,

Thank you for utilizing the TCM survey in your student research project. Subject to all terms and conditions to which you acknowledged and agreed on **2019-04-03** before downloading the TCM survey, Western confirms that its intent is to provide the TCM survey non-commercially to you personally (with no right to assign, sublicense or convey to others), for this one time use, at no cost. In the event of any conflict in terms or ambiguity created now or in the future as a result of the existence of this letter and the aforementioned T&Cs, the T&Cs shall always control. This letter is NOT an amendment to the aforementioned T&Cs which you have accepted.

All the very best with your student research project!

Regards,

Jordan Flemming
Digital Marketing Manager
WORLDdiscoveries at Western University

Appendix G

Qualtrics Survey



**UNIVERSITY OF
GEORGIA**

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
CONSENT LETTER
EXAMINING DIFFERENCES IN JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL
COMMITMENT OF BLACK STUDENT AFFAIRS PROFESSIONALS AT PWIS AND
HBCUS.

Researcher's Statement

We are asking you to take part in a research study. Before you decide to participate in this study, it is important that you understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. This form is designed to give you information about the study so you can decide whether to be in the study or not. Please take the time to read the following information carefully. Please email one of the researchers if there is anything that is not clear or if you need more information. When all your questions have been answered, you can decide if you want to be in the study or not. This process is called "informed consent." You are welcome to print this letter for your records.

Primary Researcher:

Darren Jones
Doctoral Student
University of Georgia
darren.jones@uga.edu

Principal Investigator:

Dr. Laura A. Dean
Department of Counseling & Human Development
University of Georgia
ladean@uga.edu

Study Details

This study is being conducted to examine the differences in job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Black student affairs professionals at PWIs and HBCUs and to fulfill part of the requirements of the co-investigator's doctoral dissertation. You are being asked to participate because you identify as Black and are currently employed in student affairs at a PWI or HBCU on a physical campus. Completion of this study should take 10-12 minutes for most participants. I do not anticipate any risks from participating in this research. There are no incentives provided for completing the study.

Study Details

This study is being conducted to examine the differences in job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Black student affairs professionals at PWIs and HBCUs and to fulfill part of the requirements of the co-investigator's doctoral dissertation. You are being asked to participate because you identify as Black and are currently employed full-time in student affairs at a PWI or HBCU. Completion of this study should take 10-12 minutes for most participants. I do not anticipate any risks from participating in this research. There are no incentives provided for completing the study. The benefit of your participation is that the information can be used by student affairs leaders to create retention strategies for Black student affairs professionals at both PWIs and HBCUs. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to respond to a total of 56 questions about your attitudes toward your job and the organization.

Privacy/Confidentiality

This research involves the transmission of data over the internet. Every reasonable effort has been taken to ensure the effective use of available technology to protect your privacy; however, confidentiality during online communication cannot be guaranteed. Your IP address may be recorded when you take this survey; it will not be retained after the data have been downloaded. Data from this survey may be used in publications, conference presentations, trainings, or presented through other similar media. Any information will be shared in aggregate form; individual responses will not be shared and only the research team and university research oversight board (if requested) will be able to access individual responses. You will not be asked to share your name, email address, or other such identifying information. No institutional identifiers will be collected.

Taking Part is Voluntary

Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate or to stop at any time without penalty. If you decide to stop or withdraw from the study, the information/data collected from or about you up to the point of your withdrawal will be kept as part of the study and may continue to be analyzed.

If You Have Questions

The main researchers conducting this study are Dr. Laura A. Dean, a professor, and Darren Jones, a doctoral student, at the University of Georgia. If you have questions, you may contact darren.jones@uga.edu. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your rights as a research participant in this study, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) Chairperson at 706.542.3199 or irb@uga.edu.

CLICKING BEGIN SURVEY

By clicking on the "begin survey" button, you indicate that you meet the entrance criteria listed above, that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study, and that you understand the information in this consent form. You have not waived any legal rights you otherwise would have as a participant in a research study.



**UNIVERSITY OF
GEORGIA**

Examining the Differences in Job Satisfaction and Organizational
Commitment of Black Student Affairs Professionals at PWIs and HBCUs.

This study is being conducted to examine the differences in job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Black student affairs professionals at PWIs and HBCUs. You will be asked questions about your attitudes and feelings regarding specific aspects of your current job and your institution.

Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work? (Stanton et al., 2001)

	No	Can't Decide	Yes
Fascinating	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Satisfying	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Good	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exciting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Rewarding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Uninteresting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your present pay? (Stanton et al., 2001)

	No	Can't Decide	Yes
Barely live on income	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bad	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Well paid	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Underpaid	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Comfortable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Enough to live on	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these? (Stanton et al., 2001)

	No	Can't Decide	Yes
Good opportunities for promotion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunities somewhat limited	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dead-end job	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Good chance for promotion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fairly good chance for promotion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Regular promotions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>





**UNIVERSITY OF
GEORGIA**

Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe this? (Stanton et al., 2001)

	No	Can't Decide	Yes
Praises good work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tactful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Influential	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Up to date	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Annoying	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Knows job well	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Think of the majority of people with whom you work or meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these people? (Stanton et al., 2001)

	No	Can't Decide	Yes
Boring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Slow	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Responsible	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Smart	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lazy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Frustrating	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Think of your job in general. All in all, what is it like most of the time? (Russell et al., 2004)

	No	Can't Decide	Yes
Good	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Undesirable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Better than most	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disagreeable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Makes me content	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Excellent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Enjoyable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Poor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>





UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Listed below is a series of statements that represent feelings that individuals might have about the company or organization for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the particular organization for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement (Meyer & Allen, 1993).

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Undecided	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning to me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>





UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Listed below is a series of statements that represent feelings that individuals might have about the company or organization for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the particular organization for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement (Meyer & Allen, 1993).

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Undecided	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>





Listed below is a series of statements that represent feelings that individuals might have about the company or organization for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the particular organization for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement (Meyer & Allen, 1993).

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Undecided	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This organization deserves my loyalty.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I owe a great deal to my organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>





What is your Gender?

Genderfluid or Non-binary

Man

Woman

I prefer not to answer

Identity not listed above

What is your current professional level?

New Professional

Mid-Level Professional

Senior Level Professional

Associate Vice President (AVP) or "Number Two" (direct report to the Chief Student Affairs Officer)

Vice President of Student Affairs/Chief Student Affairs Officer

Years of full-time student affairs experience?

0-5

6-10

11-15

16+

What is your primary functional area in your current role?

What is your secondary functional area in your current role?

Are you currently employed at a Predominately White Institution (PWI) or Historically Black College and University (HBCU)?

HBCU

PWI

