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ABSTRACT

TO BE OR NOT TO BE SATISFIED: EXAMINING JOB SATISFACTION OF ENTRY-LEVEL RESIDENCE LIFE PROFESSIONALS AT HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

by Evingerleen Denise Blakney

December 2015

Research on historically Black college and universities (HBCUs) as institutions of higher education is limited. There is even less scholarship that brings forth an understanding of student affairs at these institutions. A gap in the higher education, student affairs, residence life, and job satisfaction literature suggested a need for research on residence life professionals at HBCUs. Therefore, the goal of this study was to examine job satisfaction of entry-level residence life professionals at HBCUs. For this study, the researcher looked for factors that contributed to overall job satisfaction and further examined the roles of both gender and public or private HBCU on job satisfaction.

Herzberg’s two-factor theory was used as the framework for this study and the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) by Paul Spector (1994) was used to collect data for further examination. The researcher found factors that agreed and disagreed with factors suggested by Herzberg that contribute to job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction. No statistically significant differences of gender and/or public or private HBCU on overall job satisfaction were found; however, mean scores suggested that there were some varying feelings toward job satisfaction for all groups. As a result of this study, there is more insight about residence life
professionals as representatives of student affairs administrators in the field of higher education, specifically at HBCUs. Also, there is a greater knowledge about feelings toward job satisfaction with relation to gender and public or private HBCU
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to examine job satisfaction of entry-level residence life professionals at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs). A goal of this study was to determine if there were differences in job satisfaction based on gender and/or public or private HBCU. The aim of this study was to help residence life professionals be better leaders and more informed in their work. Before discussing more about this study, however, the researcher will briefly discuss the social and institutional contexts of American higher education, student affairs, and job satisfaction.

Black Higher Education, Student Affairs, and Job Satisfaction

Blacks, as a minority population, have a history of being excluded in American society. One area where Blacks experienced the most resistance has been education. Before the end of slavery, Blacks were not allowed to be formally educated without running the risk of punishment. Until the Emancipation Proclamation, this restriction on Black education stayed intact. Once slaves were set free, they then sought to become educated. However, a major challenge existed for Blacks in their pursuit to obtain an education—they were not allowed to be educated alongside Whites. As a result of this came the rise of Black education. White missionaries from the North traveled south and opened institutions to educate former slaves, thus creating what would be historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) (Anderson, 1988; Brown, Donahoo, &
The education of Blacks and Whites remained separate in the United States until the middle of the 20th century. Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) became responsible for helping Blacks reach their educational and professional goals (Brown, 2013; Pifer, 1973; Williams & Ashley, 2007). While a number of HBCUs experienced significant challenges toward the end of the Civil Rights Movement, these institutions have continued to play an important role in higher education. Currently, there are over 100 HBCUs (Brown et al., 2001; Evans, Evans, & Evans, 2002), public, private, 4-year and 2-year HBCUs (Brown & Davis, 2001) are in 19 states, and they are primarily located in the United States’ southeastern region. HBCUs continue to be a place of access and opportunity for both students and professionals. Many students choose to attend HBCUs because of the opportunity to learn in an environment where they are supported academically, emotionally, and socially (Awokoya & Mann, 2011; Gasman & Palmer, 2008; Outcalt & Cox, 2002). In addition to student satisfaction at HBCUs, research suggests that in general professionals working at HBCUs express a favorable level of satisfaction in the workplace (Hirt, 2006, 2009; Hirt, Strayhorn, Amelink, & Bennett, 2006).

Student affairs is a vital component for any institution of higher learning as this division assists with the enhancement and development of students outside of the classroom during their college years. At the core of student affairs has always been the need to connect students with individuals who care about them.
Historically, the foundation of student affairs sprouted from the work of three groups of individuals: Deans of Men, Deans of Women, and Personnel. Individuals in each of these roles were responsible for addressing the needs of students on campuses across the United States (Rhatigan, 2009). As student affairs has evolved, there are two main functions for which these departments are known today. First, student affairs professionals are charged with the task of providing support to students thereby helping their respective institutions to fulfill their educational mission. Second, the many departments within the student affairs division often hold the responsibility of serving students in such a way that creates an environment for academic achievement and personal growth (Bliming & Whitt, 1999; Hirt, 2006, 2009;).

While departments of student affairs at different postsecondary institutions are similar in the fact that they seek to educate the whole student, it is important to understand that the organization and operation of departments of student affairs vary based on institution type, size, and geography. The missions of student affairs departments strongly relate to the missions of the institutions. Shaping the work of student affairs professionals with a mission statement provides direction to those who work for the institution (Hirt, 2006, 2009). For example, at HBCUs, the primary mission of these institutions is to serve Black students so that they will succeed. To accomplish this goal, there is such a heavy focus on students at HBCUs that most professionals employed at these institutions are characterized as guardians (Hirt, 2006). Although research helps with understanding the general nature of work of student affairs professionals at
HBCUs and makes it clear that there is low turnover overall (Hirt, 2006, 2009; Hirt et al., 2006), there is little exploration of what contributes to job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction.

To date, an awareness of employee satisfaction continues to emerge in literature on higher education and student affairs. An area of student affairs with the highest rate of employee turnover is college and university housing, now commonly known as residence life (Bailey, 1997; Messer-Roy, 2006; Weaver, 2005). The need to understand employee job satisfaction is important for a number of reasons. In an area such as student affairs, especially residence life, understanding job satisfaction of employees will enable supervisors to better retain employees (Bailey, 1997; Messer-Roy, 2006). Research on job satisfaction of residence life professionals has been conducted with all levels of administration. More specifically, research has sought to determine the job satisfaction of resident assistants (Kieffer, 2003; Morris, 2009; Onofrietti, 2000), senior-level residence life professionals (Bailey, 1997), emerging and middle-level residence life professionals, (Messer-Roy, 2006) and entry-level residence life professionals (Jennings, 2005; Weaver, 2005). However, there is no research regarding the job satisfaction of housing professionals at minority-serving institutions. In addition, research on job satisfaction for student affairs professionals has failed to take diversity of student affairs roles into account (Lombardi, 2013). Therefore, the goal of this study was to examine the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction of entry-level residence life professionals at HBCUs. More specifically, this research sought to explore individual
characteristics of these individuals that may influence job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction including gender and/or public or private HBCU.

Theoretical Framework

Herzberg’s motivator-hygiene theory was used as a guide for understanding job satisfaction of entry-level residence life professionals at HBCUs. Herzberg’s motivator-hygiene theory indicates that there are specific factors, hygiene or motivators, which contribute to job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; Herzberg, 1966, 1976a, 1976b; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993).

Statement of the Problem

A number of gaps exist in the literature on HBCUs, residence life, and job satisfaction. While there are several studies on leadership and administration, faculty, and students at HBCUs, a gap in the literature exists as it relates to student affairs professionals at these institutions. For instance, this research found only one study that has been conducted that examines the general nature of student affairs work at HBCUs (Hirt, Strayhorn, Amelink, & Bennett, 2006). A number of studies have been conducted in the area of student affairs; however, most of these studies focus on student development and leadership rather than the professionals charged to support students. More specifically, at HBCUs and historically White institutions (HWIs), the research on student affairs often fails to examine individual departments within the division.
One area of student affairs that lacks attention in the literature is college and university housing, more commonly known today as residence life. Research on job satisfaction exists within the student affairs and housing literature. However, in previous studies on job satisfaction, none take into account differences in satisfaction based on gender or institution type (public or private). Further, none of these studies examine job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction of student affairs professionals employed at HBCUs.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this research was to examine job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction of entry-level residence life professionals at HBCUs. To do so, this study employed the Job Satisfaction Survey to identify factors that contribute most to the job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction of entry-level residence life professionals at HBCUs. Additionally, this study sought to find if there is a difference in job satisfaction of housing professionals based on gender and/or public or private HBCU.

**Justification**

A gap in the higher education and student affairs literature pertaining to minority-serving institutions continues to exist. More specifically, the research on historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) is limited. As higher education professionals, it is important to have an awareness of HBCUs as they often serve and support a unique and diverse population of students. Furthermore, this study was aimed to increase awareness of HBCUs the field of higher education and student affairs. For administrators at HBCUs, this research can
possibly help supervisors of housing professionals provide leadership and make informed decision when working with their staff. Specifically, supervisors may have the ability to target problem areas with their staff and work to resolve their issues such that these professionals can be retained. Further, the greatest contribution to the literature that this research could provide is to serve as a resource for administrators at HBCUs for the continued growth and professionalization of student affairs staff at their respective institutions.

Research Questions

1. What are the feelings of entry-level residence life professionals at historically Black colleges and universities toward job satisfaction?

2. Are there differences in job satisfaction based on gender and/or public or private HBCU?

Definition of Terms

Entry-Level Residence Life Professionals- Full-time student affairs staff members who live in a college or university residence hall (Jennings, 2005; Weaver, 2005). For this project, ERLPs are supervised by mid-level residence life professionals (MRLPs) and are responsible for the direct supervision of graduate students and resident assistants (RAs). The titles most commonly associated with this position are resident director, hall director, residence life coordinator, and can include area coordinators.
Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)- As defined by Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, HBCUs are institutions that were established before 1964 whose primary missions was to provide education for Black people (Hirt, 2006; Thelin, 2006).

Historically White Institutions (HWIs)- Educational institutions most often known for having “histories, traditions, symbols, stories, icons, curriculum, and processes were all designed by whites, for whites, to reproduce whiteness via a white experience at the exclusion of others since the 1950s and 1960s” (Brunsma, Placie, & Brown, 2012, p. 719)

Institution Type- For this project, institution type is defined as a public or private establishment of post-secondary education.

Middle-Level Residence Life Professionals (MRLPs) Full-time professionals who, on the residential life organizational chart, fall between senior residence life professionals and ERLPs. Additionally, MRLPs are responsible for the supervision of ERLPs (Roy, 2006) and/or graduate students. For this study, MRLPs are responsible for the management of multiple buildings within a residence life program. For this project, individuals in this position hold titles that are commonly known as associate directors, assistant directors, and area coordinators.

Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs)- Institutions of higher learning in which the majority of the student population is made up of Whites.
*Private Institution*- A postsecondary institution of higher learning that is administered and funded through private monies. Examples of this kind of institution include religious seminaries and small liberal arts schools (Barr, 2003; Kaplin & Lee, 2009; Mawdsley, 2011).

*Public Institution*- A postsecondary establishment that is managed by a statewide organization that acts as a liaison between the institution and state government (Barr, 2003; Hutchens, 2011; Kaplin & Lee, 2009).

*Resident Assistants (RAs)*- Students who are enrolled in a college or university and work in the residence halls. More specifically, these individuals are typically first responders to crises situations and are responsible for building community in their residence halls (Kieffer, 2003; Morris, 2009; Onofrietti, 2000).

*Residence Life*- A department that is a part of the division of student affairs at an institution of higher learning and is responsible for offering housing to students. Additionally, the department offers students employment, leadership, and educational opportunities (Roy, 2006).

*Senior-Level Residence Life Professionals (SRLPs)*- Individuals who are responsible for overseeing the entirety of a residence life program at a college or university—commonly known as the director of residence life (Bailey, 1997; Roy, 2006).
**Student Affairs Professionals (SAPs)**- Individuals who work within the division of campus that is responsible for student life. Areas of student life where these individuals are employed include, but are not limited to, Greek life, student support services, counseling, judicial affairs, and student activities (Roy, 2006; Hirt, 2006).

**Assumptions**

For the purposes of this study, the following assumptions were made:

1. Entry-Level residence life professionals (ERLPs) participating in this study will complete one questionnaire voluntarily.
2. ERLPs were full-time live-in professionals.
3. Participants will answer all questions honestly.
4. A fairly representative population of ERLPs in the area of residence life at HBCUs in the southern region of the United States will participate.

**Delimitations**

For the purposes of this study, the following delimitations were recognized:

1. Participation in this study was delimited to postsecondary employees who are full-time, entry-level, live-in residence life professionals at HBCUs.
2. Residence life professionals or institutional employees whose job responsibilities do not include that of entry-level residence life professionals will not be included in the study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Historically, inequalities exist in the United States that created many hardships for minorities. At the start of American higher education, wealthy and Protestant White males were the only individuals afforded the opportunities for an education (Brown, Donahoo, & Bertrand, 2001; Lucas, 2006; Thelin, 2004). As a result of the lack of access to institutions of higher learning, a number of institutions have been founded to serve underrepresented groups based on race, gender, religion, and even economic status (Hamrick, Evans, & Schuh, 2002; Hirt, 2006). For example, Blacks, more than any other group in the United States, have faced incalculable barriers to higher education participation and attainment (Brown & Davis, 2001; Brown et al., 2001). Much of what we know about Blacks in higher education is examined through the lens of historically Black colleges and universities.

The Emancipation Proclamation that ended slavery meant that Blacks finally had an opportunity to obtain a formal education. Before the Emancipation Proclamation, educating Blacks was prohibited at historically white institutions (Anderson, 1988; Brown et al., 2001; Drewry & Doermann, 2001; Lucas, 2006; Pifer; 1973; Thelin, 2004). While educating Blacks was prohibited at historically White institutions (PWIs) during the late 19th and early 20th century, things began to change. Religious organizations including Catholic, American Missionary Association, African Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian churches played critical roles in the establishment of Black higher education (Drewery & Dorman, 2001;
Williams & Ashely, 2007). Both Black and White clergy took the lead in providing educational opportunities for freed Blacks (Dorermann & Drewry, 2001; Williams & Ashley, 2007). For instance, White clergy from the North would also travel South and open schools to help educate former slaves (HBCUs) (Anderson, 1988; Brown et. al., 2001; Drewry & Dorman, 2001; Lucas, 2006; Pifer; 1973; Thelin, 2004; Williams & Ashley, 2007). Additionally, the Freedman’s Bureau would eventually offer support to these organizations.

On March 3, 1865, the Freedman’s Bureau was established to help refugees and freedmen in southern states during the Reconstruction Era (Drewery & Dorman, 2001; Lucas, 2006; Thelin, 2005; Williams & Ashley, 2007). After the death of President Abraham Lincoln, President Andrew Johnson would turn the bureau into an effort to assist Blacks and Whites, who suffered during the war. Beginning in 1866, the Freedman’s Bureau would support the growth and expansion of education by offering financial assistance to private organizations including churches, missionary groups, benevolent societies, and Black communities. As a result of such funding, Black institutions who were offering preparatory, secondary, and normal trainings would go on to add college-level courses (Drewery & Dorman, 2001; Williams & Ashley, 2007).

While a number of HBCUs began to take shape in 1865, the first HBCU, Cheney University, was established in 1837. After 20 years, HBCUs such as Lincoln University founded in 1854 in Pennsylvania and Wilberforce University founded in Ohio in 1856 were established. Cheney, Lincoln, and Wilberforce Universities were established in northern states, thus leaving the first institution
to provide education to freed slaves in the south to Shaw University which was established in Raleigh, North Carolina in 1865 (Anderson, 1988; Drewry & Doermann, 2001; Lucas, 2006; Williams & Ashley, 2007). From 1865 and 1872, all HBCUs received funding from the Freedman’s Bureau (Drewry & Doermann, 2001; Williams & Ashley, 2007). Eighty-three of over 100 colleges would be opened by the turn of the century with fifty of HBCUs being chartered before the end of the Freedman’s Bureau. For many years, Black institutions operated privately because they lacked government support. Initially, the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 (commonly known as the Land Grant Act) was established to help create public institutions that would provide education in the areas of agriculture, home economics, mechanical, and practical skills for professions in the area in each state. As Blacks, especially in places such as the South, were excluded from attending HWIs, in 1890 the Second Morrill Land Grant Act was created to encourage states with racially-segregated public systems of higher education to provide land-grant institutions for Blacks to balance the land-grant schools specifically for Whites. The Morrill Land Grant Act of 1890 resulted in the establishment of more than 16 institutions for Blacks in the southern United States that offered courses in agriculture, mechanical, and industrial subjects (Anderson, 1988; Brown, 2013; Drewry & Doermann, 2001; Lucas, 2006; Pifer; 1973; Thelin, 2004; Williams & Ashley, 2007). The Great Depression of the 1920s presented challenges for HBCUs. During this time, HBCUs were faced with the challenge of keeping their doors open to educate students because of low enrollment (Drewry & Doermann, 2001; Williams & Ashley, 2007).
Since the Civil Rights Movement granted access to PWIs for minority students, some policy makers have continued to challenge the existence of HBCUs by arguing that they have no purpose in an integrated society. As stated by Brown and Davis (2001), “The one commonality across HBCUs is their historic responsibility as the primary providers of postsecondary education for Blacks in a social environment of racial discrimination” (p. 32). To date, HBCUs continue to be places of racial uplift for Black citizens (Awokoya & Mann, 2011; Gasman & Palmer, 2008). Additionally, these institutions continue to thrive as establishments of higher learning that continue to provide opportunities for the academic advancement of diverse students from across the world (Brown, 2013).

Current State of Historically Black Colleges and Universities

HBCUs were established with the distinct mission to position, prepare, and empower Black students to succeed in a racially hostile society (Drewry & Doermann, 2001; Williams & Ashley, 2007). Currently, there are more than 100 historically Black colleges and universities (Evans, Evans, & Evans, 2002). Within the system of HBCUs, there are different institutions types that exist. Students have the choice of attending public, private, 4-year or 2-year HBCUs (Brown & Davis, 2001). More specifically, a majority of HBCUs can be found in 19 southern and border states that include Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia, Michigan, and the District of Columbia (Brown et al., 2001). At these institutions, enrollments can be small with less than 1000
students and as large as 8000 students (United Negro College Fund [UNCF], 2008; Wenglinsky, 1999). HBCUs make up about 3% of institutions in the United States and enroll 14% of all college students that are Black (Hubbard, 2006; UNCF, 2008).

Although students who attend HBCUs generally have lower SAT scores than their White counterparts (Hirt, 2006), a study by Kim & Conrad (2006) found that for Black students, good grades are a more powerful indicator of graduating from college than high SAT scores. In fact, according to Brown and Davis (2001), compared to all degree-granting institutions in the United States, HBCUs are responsible for awarding more than 28% of bachelor's degrees, 16% of professional degrees, 15% of master's degrees, and 9% percent of doctoral degrees to Blacks. Additionally, over 50% of all Black public school teachers and over 35% percent of all Black attorneys are graduates of HBCUs (UNCF, 2008). More than 35% of Black students who receive bachelor's degrees come from HBCUs in Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Virginia (LeBlanc, 2001).

More than 70% of the nation’s Black physicians and over 50% of all Black engineers are graduates of HBCUs (UNCF, 2008; Williams & Ashley, 2007). In fact, six of the top ten institutions responsible for graduating Black engineers are HBCUs: The institutions include North Carolina A&T University, Florida A&M University, Tuskegee University, Prairie View A&M University, Southern University of Baton Rouge, and Morgan State University (LeBlanc, 2001). Because HBCUs have lower rates of enrollment and lower student-faculty ratios
when compared to PWIs, there is a higher student-faculty interaction that contributes to their academic success (Kim & Conrad, 2006). To date, HBCUs continue to be a better social fit for many Black students. For example, at HBCUs Black students generally have more emotional support and create better relationships with faculty members and their peers (Awokoya & Mann, 2011; Gasman & Palmer, 2008; Outcalt & Cox, 2002). Additionally, it is not uncommon for HBCUs to foster both a greater self-esteem and ethnic pride within their students when compared to their counterparts at PWIs (Outcalt & Cox, 2002).

History of Residence Life

Housing has been an important aspect of American higher education since the beginning. Ivy League institutions such as Harvard, Princeton, and Yale were among the first with housing facilities for men studying at their institutions. In 1636, Harvard University was the very first of institutions with housing facilities (Frederikensen, 1993). The model for housing in American higher education was inspired by the British educational system (Frederikensen, 1993; Powell, Plyer, Dickson, & McClellan, 1969). The American residence life systems started as replicas of Cambridge and Oxford housing models (Dammen, 1950; Frederikensen, 1993) where students had the opportunity to study and live at the same place (Frederikensen, 1993; Powell et al., 1969).

To oversee conduct and wellbeing of students, tutors who were members of the faculty or graduates of the institutions were placed in living facilities with students during the Colonial Era (Frederikensen, 1993; Powell et al., 1969). These individuals were needed during this time because students were admitted
to institutions of higher learning as young as fourteen years old. Living
arrangements for students were similar to that of being at home—students during
this time not only attended classes, but were tasked with specific chores (Powell
et al., 1969). For many years to come, residence life departments were
challenged to accommodate a very diverse group of students who would begin to
enter the doors of institutions across the nation (Chickering, 1974;
Frederikensen, 1993; Educational Facilities Laboratories [EFL], 1972, 1977;
Powell et al., 1969).

In American higher education, the 1970s was the decade with greatest
influence on the future direction of residence life as the most change for students
was evident in higher education. A greater demand for on campus housing came
about because of students’ dissatisfaction with living off campus. To begin,
students found it to be cheaper and more convenient to live on campus. When
students did not have to commute to campus, they had fewer issues with
transportation. Students felt much safer living on campus than in neighborhoods
where they felt that their security was compromised (Educational Facilities
Laboratories [EFL], 1972, 1977).

During the 1970s, enrollments of diverse students in higher education
pushed college and universities’ housing professionals to promote student
development. New student populations appearing on-campus during this time
included those such as disabled, foreign, graduate, married with families, adult,
women, early admitted, and veteran students (Chickering, 1974; EFL, 1977).
Thus, campus housing was no longer a place for maturing teenagers to live, but
a space where all students were welcomed and could find shelter (EFL, 1977). Historically, the role of student housing and personnel administrations was to help students to have a well-rounded collegiate experience (EFL, 1972, 1977). Three categories of student housing professionals existed to ensure that this task was accomplished: administrative, management, and personnel. Within housing, administrators were those held responsible for the general supervision of the department. Management consists of individuals who were responsible for overseeing housekeeping, clerical duties, maintenance, dining operations, and finances. Lastly, full-time professionals working at institutions referred to as personnel staff were responsible for providing students with educational and social programs as it related to life as a student (Riker, 1965).

To date, the area of residence life is a unique place for professionals who work in this area as these individuals are tasked with the job of providing around-the-clock supervision of college students. In addition to this supervision, the area of residence life has the responsibility as a department within the division of student affairs to create spaces for students, that are safe and enable them to live, learn, and grow throughout their collegiate experience (Riker, 1965; Jennings, 2005; Messer-Roy, 2006; Morris, 2006; Onofrietti, 2000; Weaver, 2005). Residence life professionals are responsible for creating environments for students to be engaged, become well acquainted with university culture, and enhance students’ intellectual activities outside of the classroom (Banning & Kuk, 2011; Riker, 1965).
History of Residence Life Administration

Historically, the role of student housing and personnel administration was to help students to have a more well-rounded collegiate experience (Borreson, 1950; Chandler, 1973; Dammen, 1950; Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1972; EFL 1977) and serve as a supplement to the classroom by keeping students intellectually engaged (Borreson, 1950; Chandler, 1973; Dammen, 1950; Schuh, 1996). In order to provide students with the ideal collegiate experiences, individuals have been placed in positions to see that this task was carried out (Borreson, 1950; Chandler, 1973; Dammen, 1950; Lloyd-Jones & Smith, 1938; Riker, 1965). To date, there are three primary levels of administration that are most commonly noted in residence life, which are senior-level administration, middle-level (or mid-level) administration, and entry-level administration. The entry-level position is commonly identified by titles such as Residence Life Coordinator (RLC), Resident Director (RD) (Jennings, 2005), Hall Director (HD) (Onofrietti, 2000; Morris, 2006), and Community Director (CD).

Within the area of residence life, administrators were those individuals who were held responsible for the general supervision of the department (Borreson, 1950; Chandler, 1973; Dammen, 1950; Lloyd-Jones & Smith, 1938; Riker, 1965). Individuals responsible for overseeing housekeeping, clerical duties, maintenance, feeding operation, and finances are characterized as management. As a result of the student enrollment trends of the 1970s, administrators found themselves in a position in which the living facilities were overcrowded for the first time in the history of residence life. As a result of this, a
more developed system of administration within residence life was developed (Moore & Bishop, 1975).

Historically, it was suggested that the persons responsible for overseeing housing were social directors, heads of residence, or directors of personnel who were trained and could connect students with all functional areas of personnel (Lloyd-Jones & Smith, 1983). Today, these individuals are known as senior-level/chief housing officers (Bailey, 1997). In their position, these individuals are generally responsible for overseeing the entire residence life programs. Generally, the individual in this post typically holds a terminal degree in education, business, human behavior, or a related field. Depending on the institution, the person assigned as the director of residence life may hold a master’s degree as well as significant experience (Bailey, 1997). Responsibilities of a director of residence life include providing the department with leadership, developing the housing programming, seeing that residential facilities can support diverse student needs, striving for multicultural development, overseeing community and individual management, building new facilities, overseeing maintenance, and continuously seeking to make improvements within the department (Bailey, 1997).

In residence life, middle-level (or mid-level) administration takes on duties similar to that of any mid-level student affairs administrator. According to Mills (1993), middle-level administrators function just as their title suggests—in the middle. Young (as cited in Mills, 1993) suggests that in this role mid-level administrators have two roles: one to work vertically—working with executive-
level (senior-level) and entry-level administrators, and; two, working horizontally with other mid-level student affairs professionals to achieve goals of the department. Unlike executive-level administrators, mid-level administrators do not create policies but interpret and implement them in the workplace (Mills, 1993). Typically, middle-level managers are responsible for providing leadership by overseeing the day-to-day function of their areas, communication, and decision-making. Additionally, mid-level administrators are responsible for overseeing budget and influencing the overall culture of an area (Mills, 1993). Challenges that mid-level administrators must face include having the ability to successfully supervise a staff, being responsible for development of their staff, and understanding their scope of authority. The relationships that they maintain with both their staff and supervisor are equally important (Mills, 1993).

The role of an entry-level housing professional is best described by Lloyd-Jones and Smith (1938):

Each house has an assigned leader who is a young graduate not too removed from the students in experience and point of view. Being contemporary in age and interests, he and his [sic] students can share more common interests. He is host, counselor, and friend to men. We call him Fellow because this word best fits the role he plays: he is more than a counselor and certainly not a proctor . . . the Fellow is chosen by the residence halls and faculty committee for qualities of character, leadership, culture, and special abilities. (pp. 254-255)
Weaver (2005) suggests that the experiences of live-in professionals are dissimilar to other student affairs professionals because these individuals work and reside in the same space. Entry-level residence life professionals are full-time student affairs staff members who live in college or university residence halls. In their position, they provide supervision, advise students, provide guidance, oversee programming, enforce policies, and see to emergency response for residents (Jennings, 2005; Weaver, 2005). A large part of the credit for the success of residence life program is given to the entry-level housing professional as their leadership occurs within the residence halls (Jennings, 2005; Lloyd-Jones, 1938; Weaver, 2005).

Resident Assistants (RAs) are usually undergraduate students who work as paraprofessionals in residence life programs (Casey, 2009; Morris, 2009). Lloyd-Jones and Smith (1938) state that these individuals are a group of students charged to work closely together to create a harmonious living environment. To date, RAs are still responsible for building community and have the most contact with residents. In fact, when events take place in the hall, RAs are the first to respond (Casey, 2009; Morris, 2009; Onofretti, 2000). Within residence life departments, RAs work under the supervision of entry-level housing professionals (Casey, 2009; Morris, 2009; Onofretti, 2000).

Entry-level residence life professionals are generally full-time student affairs staff members who live in a college or university residence hall, provide supervision, advise students, provide guidance, oversee programming, enforce policies, and see to emergency response for residents (Weaver, 2005). The
duties and responsibilities of these housing professionals, however, are contingent on the type of institutions where they are employed. Unlike many student affairs professionals, entry-level positions within residence life are the most unique position among all student affairs professionals because of their living arrangements (Jennings, 2005; Weaver, 2005).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a complex concept. On the one hand, some research suggests that job satisfaction is psychological and is best determined by one’s emotional response to their work and perceived feelings of fulfillment in their career (Henne & Locke, 2000; Locke, 1969; Locke, 1970; Locke, 1976). On the other hand, some scholars believe that job satisfaction is behavioral and influenced by external factors (Herzberg et al., 1959; Herzberg, 1966, 1976a, 1976b; Kalleberg, 1977; Spector, 1985; Spector, 1997). However, all scholars agree understanding job satisfaction is done by gaining greater insight to the response of an employee to their work and the various aspects of their job (Henne & Locke, 2000; Herzberg et al., 1959; Herzberg, 1966, 1976a, 1976b; Kalleberg, 1977; Locke, 1969; Locke, 1970; Locke, 1976; Perry, 1990; Spector, 1985, Spector, 1997). Job satisfaction is important for a number of reasons. Satisfied employees are more productive and can be used as a means to uphold employee motivation, job longevity, and organizational efficiency (Bender, 1980; Henne & Locke, 1985; Lombardi, 2013). Kuh (1983) suggests that satisfaction is favorable and increases an individual’s loyalty to and investment in an institution, while lowering the rate of turnover. The ability to understand job satisfaction in
the workplace can help an employer predict one’s intent to leave an organization (Bailey, 1997; Bender, 1980; Henne & Locke, 2000; Messer-Roy, 2006; Lombardi, 2013). In the area of student affairs, there is research that suggests a relationship between job satisfaction and overall life satisfaction. Thus, job satisfaction has the ability to influence SAPs overall life satisfaction (Anderson, 1998; Anderson, Guido-Brito, & Morrell, 2000). As job satisfaction can have an impact on both the personal and professional lives of those in the field of student affairs, it is becoming increasingly important to understand this phenomenon.

*Job Satisfaction and Student Affairs*

Within higher education, the division of student affairs is held responsible for student development (Bliming & Whitt, 1999; Hirt, 2006, 2009; Parker, 1974; Rhagitan, 2009; Rippey, 1981). Student affairs professionals, no matter where they are employed, play a vital part in contributing to the success of college students and institutions (Bliming & Whitt, 1999; Hirt, 2006, 2009; Weaver, 2005). Several departments fall under the umbrella of student affairs such as first-year experience, Greek life, student activities and residence life (Hirt, 2009; Hirt, Strayhorn, Amelink, & Bennett, 2006). Studies have been conducted on the job satisfaction of student affairs professionals (e.g., Blank, 1993; Cook, 2006; Davidson, 2009; Lombardi, 2013; Taylor; 2000; Thompson, 2001; Tseng, 2002; Tull, 2004). Research regarding job satisfaction has emerged in the literature on student affairs professionals (SAPs) as a result of high employee turnover (Bender, 1980; Jennings, 2005; Lombardi, 2013; Messer-Roy, 2006). The problem with turnover in an area such as student affairs is the negative influence
that it has on an organization as a whole. When SAPs leave their job, there are a number of things that happen: Decrease in the services offered to students, staff left behind have to take on more work, and ultimately the area from which the person left may have low performance and may be less effective (Lombardi, 2013). As SAPs continue to play a very important role in any institutional setting, it is important to understand how to hire, supervise, train, motivate, and support such individuals in order to retain them while caring for their personal and professional well-being (Winston & Creamer, 1997; Jennings, 2005; Lombardi, 2013). Research about job satisfaction and student affairs professionals has failed to take into account the varying responsibilities of SAPs—most research on student affairs professionals suggests that all SAPs have the same basic work function and job expectations (Lombardi, 2013); however, the work of all SAPs is not the same.

Job Satisfaction and Residence Life

Unlike other departments in student affairs, residence life differs because professionals in this area are responsible for the around-the-clock supervision of college students (Weaver, 2005). When compared to many areas of student affairs, housing has the highest rate of employee turnover compared to other segments (Bailey, 1997; Messer-Roy, 2006; Weaver, 2005). Research shows that there are a number of reasons for job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction for residence life professionals. Residence life professionals have reported feelings of dissatisfaction with supervision at work, a lack of personal space, and the expectation to be available for work-related situations around the clock (Bailey,
job satisfaction of these individuals is important for the institutions of higher learning because these organizations need to retain their employees (Bailey, 1997; Kuh, 1983; Jennings, 2005; Lombardi, 2013; Messer-Roy, 2006; Weaver, 2005; Winston & Creamer, 1997).

Researchers have studied job satisfaction specific to residence life. In fact, Kieffer (2003), Morris (2009), Onofrietti (2000) explore the satisfaction of resident assistants. Research on job satisfaction of housing professionals at PWIs has also been conducted (Bailey, 1997; Messer-Roy, 2006; Weaver, 2005). Studies on residence life professionals include Bailey’s study (1997) that examined the job satisfaction of chief housing officers, Messer-Roy’s study (2006) that explored the job satisfaction of mid-level housing officers, and, Weaver (2005) and Jennings’ (2005) studies that researched entry-level housing professionals.

Bailey’s (1997) found that the most important factors leading to job satisfaction included the work itself, interpersonal relations with peers, students and subordinates, achievement, and responsibility. Additionally, organizational policy and administration, recognition, salary, and advancement were the most important factors that led to job dissatisfaction. Messer-Roy (2006) found that the leading motivating factors for job satisfaction among mid-level housing administrators include achievement, job security, the work itself, responsibility, status, supervision, and recognition. Yet, the achievement, job security, the work itself, responsibility, status, supervision, and recognition were also reasons mid-level administrators expressed dissatisfaction with their jobs. Additionally, factors
with the strongest correlation for retaining mid-level administrators include the work itself, opportunities for advancement, and growth. The reasons individuals within housing administration leave vary. The main reasons mid-level housing professionals choose not to stay in their position is because of opportunities for advancement, reasons relating to family, and others seek careers outside of residence life.

Issues with being a live-in professional have greatly influenced levels of job satisfaction. Weaver (2005) found that entry-level residence life professionals must have the capacity to be patient, dedicated to their roles, and always be willing to go above and beyond at work. For instance, work often crosses over into one’s personal life—undergraduates typically do not understand where to draw the line between work and personal space. However, reasons for job satisfaction include being able to help students, serve as a positive role model, feeling proud of students’ accomplishments, and the convenience of one’s living arrangements. Factors that contribute to job dissatisfaction include the lack of privacy, difficulties adjusting to the position itself, disappointment with apartment amenities and space, and feeling of being on-call around the clock every day of the week.

Jennings (2005) discovered that entry-level residence life professionals’ top reasons for wanting to stay in their position include students, colleagues, and being unwilling or an inability to relocate. Further, entry-level residence life professionals state that their intent to stay in residence life in general include task significance, influencing students, passion and/or enjoyment for their position,
and opportunities to advance in their career. Conversely, these individuals indicated that feeling a lack of support from their supervisors, feeling hindered in the department while attempting to pursue graduate studies, wanting to seek new careers, low compensation, and challenges with living in the residence halls are top reasons for wanting to leave their position.

Research about the job satisfaction and job dissatisfactions in residence life at private and public institutions has been conducted; however, none of the studies have examined housing professionals working at HBCUs. Additionally, none of the research on job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction in residence life has examined differences in job satisfaction based on gender and/or public or private HBCU.

**Job Satisfaction and Gender**

None of the research conducted on job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction of residence life professional take into account gender. However, previous studies on job satisfaction and student affairs professionals that considers gender suggests that there are differences between the two groups (Anderson, 1998; Cook, 2006; Lombardi, 2013). Levels of job satisfaction are greater for women in regard to their feelings about the work environment (Cook, 2006; Lombardi, 2013) and employee benefits (Lombardi, 2013). Men, however, indicate greater level of satisfaction with rewards in the work place (Lombardi, 2013). According to Benjamin (1997), Black women in administrative roles at HBCUs have reported feelings of being often overlooked and underestimated in their professional abilities as they work in a male-dominated environment. For
example, some Black women at HBCUs report feeling held back by predominantly male boards of trustees. Also, as faculty, Black women are often paid less, and seldom are the given opportunities to advance. Lastly, it is reported that Black women working for women’s colleges often feel challenged because of dealing with other women and the competition to be the best.

**Job Satisfaction and Institution Type**

Research suggests that the type of institution where a student affairs professional is employed also plays a major role in influencing their level of job satisfaction in the work place (Anderson, 1998; Hirt, 2006; Lombardi, 2013). To be specific, when an individual’s learning and working styles do not align with that of the institution, they are generally less satisfied with their work (Hirt, 2006). However, research on student affairs professionals and levels of job satisfaction indicates that levels of satisfaction differ based on public or private status (Anderson, 1998; Lombardi, 2013). While Anderson’s (1998) research indicates that student affairs professionals at public institutions are overall more satisfied with their jobs compared to individuals employed at private institutions, Lombardi (2013) found that SAPs in general experience higher level of satisfaction with their work environment at public institutions when compared to those at private four-year institutions. The levels of job satisfaction for rewards and benefits are higher for those working at private-four year institutions. While there are distinct differences in the foundations and missions of institutions of higher learning, none of the research conducted on job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction of
residence life examine levels of satisfaction based on the status of an institution as public or private.

Theoretical Framework

In the 1950s and 1960s Frederick Herzberg sought to understand employee satisfaction and motivation in the workplace. The development of the Motivator-Hygiene theory came as a result of disagreeing with Maslow’s hierarchy of basic human need: psychological needs, safety, belonging and love, esteem, and self-actualization (Herzberg, 1966; 1976a; 1976b; 1990; Herzberg et al., 1993; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). Herzberg found that Maslow considered only the material aspects of motivation and moral motives; therefore, he thought that Maslow’s theory was not applicable in the workplace. Herzberg sought to understand how both material and moral motives would motivate an individual within the workplace (Herzberg, 1966, 1976a, 1976b; Herzberg, 1990; Herzberg et al., 1993; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). First, he thought that humans have two sets of needs: one, as an animal, humans wish to avoid pain. Second, as a human, there is a need to grow psychologically (Herzberg et al., 1959; Herzberg 1966; Herzberg, 1976).

Herzberg sought to examine these concepts within the workplace. Herzberg examined the job attitudes of 200 accountants and engineers to determine whether they felt positively or negatively while at work and sought the reasons. In this study, Herzberg used two levels of analysis, primary and secondary. The primary level analysis was used to determine the actual events that took place leading to job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction. The second level
of analysis was used for employees to interpret the meaning of events that took place. As a result of this, Herzberg discovered that individuals who express greater satisfaction for their jobs responded differently to their work environment; hence, the Herzberg devised the motivator-hygiene theory (or Herzberg's two factor theory) (Herzberg et al., 1959; Herzberg, 1966, 1976a, 1976b; Herzberg, 1990; Herzberg et al., 1993).

Herzberg’s motivator-hygiene theory is centered around understanding the attitudes of individuals toward their jobs; seeking to gain insight to the reasons that people felt a certain way about their jobs; and, establishing possible drawbacks of such attitudes toward their jobs (Herzberg et al., 1959; Herzberg, 1966, 1976a, 1976b; Herzberg, 1990; Herzberg et al., 1993). According to this theory, there are two sets of variables that are responsible for contributing to job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction—satisfaction variables and dissatisfaction variables. Job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction, however, are not opposites—the two are separate and distinct from each other. For satisfaction, the opposite is no satisfaction; for dissatisfaction, the opposite is that one experiences no dissatisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959; Herzberg, 1966, 1976a, 1976b; Herzberg, 1990; Herzberg et al., 1993). Therefore, Herzberg suggests that seeking to find a solution for job dissatisfaction will not create job satisfaction. Additionally, Herzberg states that simply adding factors that suggest job satisfaction will not eliminate job dissatisfaction. Hence, an employer may strive to decrease the amount of dissatisfying job factors; however, this does not imply that the performance of the employee will increase (Herzberg, 1966). A total of fourteen
factors contribute to job satisfaction (motivator factors) or dissatisfaction (hygiene factors).

Motivator factors are those things that contribute to a positive, more satisfied, response to the work place. Additionally, motivators are intrinsic and associated most with the relationship to what an individual does at work and have long-term impacts on a person’s attitude toward their job (Herzberg, 1966, 1976a, 1976b; Herzberg, 1990; Herzberg et al., 1993). For supervisors, motivations are concerned with how efficiently they are able to use their employees (Herzberg, 1966, 1976a, 1976b). The motivator factors, or satisfiers, include achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement.

Hygiene factors are typically those things that contribute to employee dissatisfaction and are thought to have a short-term influence on one’s attitude toward their job. Hygiene factors are extrinsic and are most commonly associated with those things that make up the context of one’s work environment (Herzberg, 1966; Herzberg, 1976a; Herzberg, 1990; Herzberg et al., 1993). Additionally, for a supervisor, hygiene factors are related to the way they treat their employees (Herzberg, 1976; Herzberg et al., 1993). Also known as dissatisfiers, hygiene factors include company policies, supervision, relationship with supervisor and peers, work conditions, salary, status, and security (Herzberg et al., 1959; Herzberg, 1966; Herzberg et al., 1993). In the workplace, motivators or satisfiers are those things that are commonly used to build motivation and/or job satisfaction with employees (Herzberg, 1966).
Several studies have been conducted across race, gender, and professional occupations to test this theory (Herzberg et al., 1959; Herzberg, 1966, 1976a, 1976b; 1990; Herzberg et al., 1993). Based on Herzberg’s theory, one of the important things for employers to understand is that there are a number of ways in which employees can be motivated. Reducing the number of hours an employee works, increasing salary, greater access to fringe benefits, training specific to human relations, improved communication, active leadership, and increased fringe benefits, human relations and sensitivity training, better forms of communication, participative leadership, and counseling for employees are example of things that can be done to motivate employees. Herzberg recommends that training and continued education is enough to keep employees motivated to work (Herzberg, 1966, 1976; Herzberg et al., 1993). For this study, this theory was used as a guide for examining job satisfaction of entry-level residence life professionals at historically Black colleges and university. This theory provides groundwork for understanding leading factors that contribute to job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction in the workplace.

In conjunction with Herzberg’s two-factor theory, the Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) by Paul E. Spector (1994) was used to measure job satisfaction. Based on an evaluation of means scores, the JSS indicated job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction—similar to Herzberg’s two-factor theory that suggests motivators and hygiene factors as indicators of job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction. Previous research, such as Vasiliki and Efthymios’ (2013) study on
job satisfaction of administrative personnel, has used both Spector’s (1994) Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) and Herzberg’s two-factor theory.

Summary

Historically, and still today, there has been a lack of attention given to minority serving institutions, especially historically Black colleges and universities; however, there has been a continued need to better understand these institutions and recognize their contributions to society and the advanced education. Even more, in the area of higher education, there has been a need to understand how these institutions professionally contribute to the field of student affairs as the people who hold these positions are often at the forefront of serving students. More specifically, there has been an ongoing need to look in more detail at specific area of students affairs as the different areas provide a variety of services to both institutions and students. Residence life, an area of student affairs that has been around since the creation of institutions of higher learning, and has continued to be one area that has needed more attention in the higher education literature. Thus, this study looked specifically at residence life professionals.

The need to have a better understanding of residence life professional, especially when many of them are live-in housing administrators, is vital to any college or university (Weaver, 2005) because they provide around the clock support to both the institution and the student. Hence, there has been a critical need to understand these professionals for purposes of recruiting, training, and retaining these employees (Jennings, 2005; Weavers, 2005). While there is
research on residence life professionals at predominately White institutions, the need to understand this group of individuals has been equally important for HBCU counterparts. As a critical lens to guide this study and understand employees feelings toward job satisfaction, Herzberg's two-factor theory was employed to determine factors that contributed to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Research on college and university housing, today more commonly known as residence life, is lacking in the literature on higher education. Of the few studies conducted about residence life professionals at institutions of higher learning, few studies have examined job satisfaction. However, all of the studies have failed to take into account the diversity of institutions. Hence, the purpose of this research was to examine job satisfaction of entry-level residence life professionals at HBCUs. More specifically, this research sought to examine individual characteristics of these individuals that may influence job satisfaction including gender and public or private HBCU. The following questions were used to guide this study:

1. What are the feelings of entry-level residence life professionals at historically Black colleges and universities toward job satisfaction?
2. Are there differences in job satisfaction based on gender and/or public or private HBCU?

Participants

For this study, the sample population is comprised of 88 entry-level residence life professionals who were at least 18 years of age or older. The participants were both men and women employed at two-year or four-year institutions. The institutions where the individuals worked were either public or private. More specifically, each of the participants were employed at a historically Black college or university located in the United States.
Procedures

Upon receiving Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, the researcher electronically distributed both a letter of consent (attachment A) and questionnaire (attachment B). A letter of consent that preceded the questionnaire explained that the purpose for the study was to examine job satisfaction of entry-level housing professionals at HBCUs. The letter of consent ensured participants that the study was completely voluntary, and participants could decline or discontinue participation at any time without concern of penalty, prejudice or negative consequences. The participants were informed in the consent form that all of the data collected were anonymous, and they were asked not to include their names or any other identifying information on the questionnaire.

Instrumentation

As previous job satisfaction surveys were focused mainly on industrial fields, the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) was created to evaluate job satisfaction in other professions. The 36-item scale created by Paul E. Spector (1994) was designed specifically for conducting research in areas such as human services, public, and nonprofit organizations. The JSS was designed with the thought that job satisfaction is in fact an affective or attitudinal reaction to one's job. By attitudinal, a person is willing to remain employed (or approach) at a job that is satisfying rather than quit (or avoid) a job that they find to be dissatisfying. Also, rather than evaluating job satisfaction as a whole, the JSS was created to assess individual factors of job satisfaction while providing an overall attitudinal score (Spector, 1985). The JSS was used for this study in conjunction with Herzberg’s
two-factor theory because it measures job satisfaction. Hence, an evaluation of means scores based on the JSS indicated job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction, which in turn would suggest consistencies or inconsistencies with Herzberg’s two-factor theory.

The JSS measures nine subscales, or individual aspects, of employee job satisfaction. The nine subscales (Table 1) of the 36-item instrument include: pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, coworkers, nature of work, and communication. Each item was numbered on a Likert-scale of 1 to 6. One (1) represented the strongest disagreement and six (6) was representative of the strongest agreement with each item. Based on alpha coefficients, the internal consistencies of reliabilities are .75, .73, .82, .73, .76, .62, .60, .78, and .71, respectively. The overall internal consistency reliability is .91 (Spector, 1994). The JSS has been used to conduct research in a number of studies across various disciplines included, but were not limited to, higher education (e.g., Anderson, 1998; Hitt, 2003), leadership (e.g., Hitt, 2003; Mulki, Jaramillo, & Locander, 2008), and business (e.g., Franek & Vecera, 2008; Mulki et al., 2008).

In postsecondary education, Anderson (1998) used the JSS to understand the differences between the senior-level male and female student affairs professionals’ levels of job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and inter-conflict. In this 218 participant study, a panel of experts confirmed the validity of the instrument used. The total reliability was reported with an overall Cronbach alpha of .92. One of the subscales was reported with a Cronbach alpha of .5. In 2003, Hitt
used the JSS to examine the relationships between multiple leadership frames and job satisfaction of 345 participants working in student services. For this study, reliability and validity were not reported.

Table 1

*Description of Nine Job Satisfaction Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>Pay and remuneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Promotion opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Immediate supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>Monetary and nonmonetary fringe benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Rewards</td>
<td>Appreciation, recognition, and rewards for good work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Procedures</td>
<td>Operating policies and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>People you work with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Work</td>
<td>Job tasks themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communication within the organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mulki, Jaramillo, and Locander (2008), collected data from 333 participants using the JSS to better understand the role of leadership on influencing the ethical climate in a workplace and thus influencing job satisfaction. For this study, the authors reported all reliability indices above 0.6 and all constructs had Cronbach alphas above 0.7. The validity of the JSS was not reported in this study. Franeka and Vecera’s (2008) 659 participant study was conducted using the JSS to better understand relationship of personal characteristics on job satisfaction across various business settings (e.g., managers, accountants, teachers, manual workers, health service, and marketing). Total reliability was reported with a Cronbach alpha of .92. The reliability of each subscale was reported as follows: pay (α=.84), promotion (α = .78), supervision (α=.78), fringe benefits (α=.74), contingent rewards (α=.60), coworkers (α=.71), nature of work (α=. 76), and communication (α=.76). For this study, a low reliability was reported for operating procedures (α=.47) which is consistent with Anderson’s (1998) findings of the same subscale.

Data Collection

Data were collected anonymously from participants employed at historically Black colleges and universities from across the United States (Table 2). Most HBCUs are located in the South.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alabama A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alabama State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bishop State Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Concordia College, Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gadsden State CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>J. F. Drake State TC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lawson State Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Miles College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oakwood University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Selma University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shelton State Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stillman College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Talladega College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Trenholm State Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tuskegee University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Univ. of Arkansas at Pine Bluff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Arkansas Baptist College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Philander Smith College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shorter College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Delaware State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>University of the D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Howard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bethune-Cookman University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Edward Waters College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Florida A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Florida Memorial University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Albany State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clark Atlanta University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fort Valley State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Interdenominational Theological Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Morehouse College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Morehouse School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Morris Brown College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Paine College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Savannah State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spelman College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kentucky State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dillard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Grambling State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Southern University at New Orleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southern University at Shreveport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Southern University and A&amp;M College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Xavier University of Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bowie State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Coppin State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>University of Maryland Eastern Shore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Morgan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alcorn State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coahoma Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hinds Community College at Utica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jackson State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mississippi Valley State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rust College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tougaloo College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Harris-Stowe State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lincoln University of Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Barber-Scotia College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bennett College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Elizabeth City State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fayetteville State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Johnson C. Smith University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Livingstone College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>North Carolina Agricultural &amp; Technical State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>North Carolina Central University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shaw University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>St. Augustine's University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Winston-Salem State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Central State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wilberforce University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Langston University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cheyney University of PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lincoln University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Allen University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Benedict College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Claflin University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clinton Junior College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Denmark Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Morris College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>South Carolina State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Voorhees College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>American Baptist College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fisk University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Knoxville College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lane College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>LeMoyne-Owen College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Meharry Medical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tennessee State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Huston-Tillotson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jarvis Christian College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Paul Quinn College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prairie View A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Southwestern Christian College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>St. Philip's College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Texas College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Texas Southern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wiley College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Virgin Islands</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>University of the Virgin Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hampton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Norfolk State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Virginia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Virginia Union University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Virginia University of Lynchburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bluefield State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>West Virginia State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Information retrieved from HBCU Lifestyle. Copyright 2015 by HBCU Lifestyle.
The Job Satisfaction Survey, a 36-item multiple choice questionnaire, was used to gather data online (see Appendix F). The questionnaire was uploaded into Qualtrics, a web-based survey tool, for participants to access. Using snowball sampling, a link was shared through public forums such as student affairs listserves, and residence life list serves that included faculty, staff, and administrators. The questionnaire was also shared through various public forums such as electronic university mail outs and open forums to enable access to the housing professionals. Data collection lasted for two and half months. The initial recruitment for participants was conducted May 20 through May 27, 2015. Follow-up correspondence and additional open forum posts were conducted every day from June 12 to June 19, 2015. The final correspondence and open forum posts took place each day from July 13 to July 19, 2015. On August 2, 2015 the link to access the questionnaire via Qualtrics was disabled by the researcher and thus data collection ended.

Data Analysis

The instrument used provided data for each participant via scores based on their responses. Data analyses were conducted using statistical analysis software (IBM SPSS Statistics 23.0, 2015). Before analyses were conducted, collected data were reviewed for missing data, errors, and additional issues. To account for the missing data, the researcher computed new variables using series means. As the instrument contained questions that were both positively and negatively worded, the researcher
recoded the values for reversed scored items—6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 to 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, respectively.

A test of Cronbach’s alphas was used to determine if the instrument was reliable and internally consistent for the 36-item instrument. A reliability analysis was then conducted on each of the nine subscales (Table 3). Based on the first reliability analysis, the alpha levels for only two of the subscales met the acceptable level of .7; therefore, an adjustment was made such that the Cronbach alpha’s level of acceptance for the subscales was .5.

Table 3

*Job Satisfaction Subscales and Corresponding Item Numbers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>1, 10, 19, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>2, 11, 20, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>3, 12, 21, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>4, 13, 22, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Rewards</td>
<td>5, 14, 23, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating procedures</td>
<td>6, 15, 24, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>7, 16, 25, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Work</td>
<td>8, 17, 27, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>9, 18, 26, 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To have a better understanding of the sample population’s profile, descriptive statistics were employed. Frequencies were used to gain insight about the seven following demographics: marital status, gender, race/ethnicity, salary, living arrangements, geographical location, campus size, education, public or private HBCU, and years of experience. To capture the feelings of all participants toward total job satisfaction and all nine subscales, the researcher used the reported means for the group. After having reversed the scoring of the negatively-worded items, means for both the 4-item subscales and the 36-item total score could be used to determine job satisfaction. The reported means of 4 or more represented job satisfaction, while mean responses of 3 or less represented job dissatisfaction and mean scores between 3 and 4 were ambivalent (Spector, 1994).

A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) test was then employed to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between job satisfaction based on the individual characteristics gender and/or public or private HBCU. For this study, the level of significance was set at .05 (Fields, 2009). The independent variables used for this study were gender (man or woman) and public or private HBCU. Originally, the dependent variables were the nine subscales pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, nature of work, coworkers, communication; however, as a result of low Cronbach alphas the subscales pay, promotion, and fringe benefits were not used for further
examination in the study. The results of the MANOVA test indicated no reasons for follow-up analyses to be performed.

Summary

Online and quantitative methods were used to conduct this study. The number of individuals who participated in this study was less than 100. Unlike previous studies using the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), the Cronbach’s alphas were significantly lower than thus leading the researcher to make adjustments to improve the level of reliability; therefore, the number of subscales measured in this study was less than the total number of subscales outlined by Spector’s JSS. It was likely that the items removed from the subscales promotion and operating procedures were misinterpreted by the participant when scoring this leading to issues with reliability. Descriptive statistics and multivariate analysis were used to examine the data. Results are discussed in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of the work experience and job satisfaction of student affairs professionals at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs). More specifically, as student affairs professionals, this study aimed to highlight those individuals who worked as entry-level residence life at HBCUs. A goal of this study was to examine job satisfaction. To be exact, this study sought to find out if the factors that contributed to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Additionally, an aim of the study was to explore differences in job satisfaction based on gender and/or public or private HBCU.

Demographics

Eighty-eight (88) entry-level residence life professionals employed at HBCUs participated in the study. The states represented were Alabama (n=4), Mississippi (n=6), Louisiana (n=4), North Carolina (n=21), South Carolina (n=4), Georgia (n=11), Florida (n=11), Virginia (n=6), Kentucky (n=1), Pennsylvania (n=2), Tennessee (n=2), and Other (n=15) (see Figure 1). Just over half of the sample population was presented by women 52.3% (n=46) while men represented 47.7% (n=42). A great majority of the participants reported their race and ethnicity as African American 92% (n=81). The remaining participants identified themselves as Caucasian/White 2.3% (n=2), Hispanic 2.3% (n=2), Multiracial 1.1% (n=1), and Other 2.3% (n=2). Most of the participants indicated t
their marital status was single 76.1% (n=67), participants being married 18.2% (n=16), divorced 3.4% (n=3), and widowed 2.3% (n=2).

Figure 1. Bar graph showing percentages and locations of entry-level residence life professionals at HBCUs.

As highlighted in Figure 2, more than half of the participants indicated that their yearly salary was between $30,000.00 and $39,000.00 (54.5%, n=48). The remaining participants reported salaries of $20,000.00 to $29,000.00 (21.6%, n=19), $40,000.00 to $49,000.00 (11.4%, n=10), $19,000.00 and below (10.2%, n=9), and more than $50,000.00 (2.3%, n=2).
The living arrangements reported for the participants showed that most lived on-campus and in a residence hall (65.9%, n=58). While the next largest group lived-off campus (6.8%, n=24), the smallest group lived on-campus but not in a residence hall (27.3%, n=6). The participants in the study reported having education representative of a high school diploma (1.1%, n=1), Bachelor’s degree (35.2%, n=31), Master's degree (72.5%, n=55), and Doctorate (1.1%, n=1). Additionally, most of the participants were employed at public institutions represented 72.7% (n=64) while those who represented private institutions made up 27.3% (n=24). Most of the participants were employed at institutions with a student population of 2001-3000 students (n=39) (see Table 4). As represented
in Table 5, the majority of the participants represented in the study had four to nine years of experience (n=42) followed by those with three year of experience (n=29) or less (see Figure 3).

Table 4

*Participants and Campus Size by Student Population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Size</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Number of Students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-500</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001-2000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-3000</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001-4000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 or More</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

*Participants and Years of Residence Life Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Years or Less</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9 Years</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 Years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Years or More</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

*Job Satisfaction Subscales and Descriptive Statistics by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Rewards</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Procedures</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Work</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A test of Cronbach’s alphas would be used to determine if the instrument was reliable and internally consistent for the 36-item instrument. Two reliability analyses were conducted. Based on the first reliability analysis, the alpha levels were: pay ($\alpha = .30$), promotion ($\alpha = .56$), supervision ($\alpha = .71$), fringe benefits ($\alpha = .18$), contingent rewards ($\alpha = .57$), operating procedures ($\alpha = .46$), coworkers ($\alpha = .67$), nature of work ($\alpha = .49$), and communication ($\alpha = .39$), total scale ($\alpha = .80$). Based on the results, an adjustment was made such that the Cronbach alpha’s level of acceptance was changed from .7 to .5. The subscales meeting .5 level of
acceptance criteria was: promotion ($\alpha = .56$), supervision ($\alpha = .71$), contingent rewards ($\alpha = .57$), and coworkers ($\alpha = .67$).

To meet the .5 level of acceptance criteria and strengthen overall reliability, two of the subscales were adjusted. Promotion, based on the first reliability analysis, was .56. The statement for item 2 per the questionnaire, “There is really too little chance for promotion on my job” was removed. A second reliability test was conducted and yield a new Cronbach alpha for promotion ($\alpha = .71$). Operating procedures, for the first reliability analysis, yielded a Cronbach alpha of .46. As a result of this, item 15, per the questionnaire, “My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape” was removed from the subscale. A second reliability test was conducted and yield a new Cronbach alpha for operating procedures ($\alpha = .50$). Out of the nine subscales, three of the subscales (pay, fringe benefits, and communication) could not be adjusted to meet the criteria of .5 and therefore were not considered for further examination. Thus, the Cronbach’s alphas for the subscales examined in this study were: promotion ($\alpha = .71$), supervision ($\alpha = .71$), contingent rewards ($\alpha = .57$), operating procedures ($\alpha = .50$), coworkers ($\alpha = .67$), and nature of work ($\alpha = .49$). The total scale ($\alpha = .81$). The issues of reliability may have been due to a low response rate and homogenous population.

Job Satisfaction
Entry-level residence life professionals at historically Black colleges and universities, on average (M=3.61), had moderate feelings toward job satisfaction. More specifically, participants were overall satisfied with both supervision (M=4.15, SD=1.31) and nature of work (M=4.00, SD=1.24); however, they had feelings of dissatisfaction about promotions (M=2.88, SD=1.35). Additionally, participants indicated moderate feelings toward contingent rewards (M=3.54, SD=1.15), operating procedures (M=3.37, SD=1.12), and coworkers (M=3.69, SD=1.19). As pay, fringe benefits, and communication were the subscales removed from further examination, there is no data to represent the participants’ feelings toward these factors.

**Gender and Job Satisfaction**

There was no statistically significant difference found between men and women on the combined job satisfaction dependent variables: $F(6, 79) = .946, p = .47$; Wilks’ Lambda = .93. Additionally, there were no statistically significant difference between genders in terms of promotion ($p = .71$), supervision ($p = .83$), contingent rewards ($p = .379$), operating procedures ($p = .211$), coworkers ($p = .23$), and nature of work ($p = .83$). An inspection of mean scores, as represented in Table 6, indicated that men were more satisfied with supervision (M=4.16, SD=1.37) and contingent rewards (M=3.63, SD=1.13) while women were more satisfied with operating procedures (M=3.52, SD=1.13), coworkers (M=3.80, SD=1.22), nature of work (M=4.03, SD=1.21), and promotion (M=3.05, SD=1.42).

**Public or Private HBCU and Job Satisfaction**
No statistically significant difference was found between public or private HBCU and the combined job satisfaction dependent variables: $F(6, 79)= 1.49$, $p=.19$; Wilks' Lambda=.90. Further, no statistically significant difference was found between public or private HBCUs on promotion ($p=.96$), supervision ($p=.55$), contingent rewards ($p=.28$), operating procedures ($p=.07$), coworkers ($p=.08$), and nature of work ($p=.09$). An inspection of the mean scores (Table 7) indicated that those at private institutions were more satisfied with contingent rewards ($M=3.75$, $SD=1.20$), operating procedures ($M=3.74$, $SD=1.22$), coworkers ($M=4.07$, $SD=1.30$), and nature of work ($M=4.36$, $SD=1.30$).

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Rewards</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Procedures</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 (continued).
Gender, Public or private HBCU, and Job Satisfaction

No statistically significant difference was found between gender and public or private HBCU on the combined job satisfaction dependent variables: \( F (6, 79) = .324, p = .923; \) Wilks' Lambda = .98. Additionally, no statistically significant differences were found between gender and public or private HBCUs on promotion \((p=.49)\), supervision \((p=.70)\), contingent rewards \((p=.53)\), operating procedures \((p=.78)\), coworkers \((p=.73)\), and nature of work \((p=.96)\). An inspection of the mean scores (see Table 8) indicated that women at private institutions were most satisfied with nature of work \((M=4.39, SD=1.3)\), promotion \((M=3.05, SD=1.42)\), coworkers \((M=4.27, SD=1.37)\), and operating procedures \((M=3.92, SD=1.13)\). Men at private institutions were most satisfied with contingent rewards \((M=3.98, SD=.81)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Work</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8
Jobs Satisfaction Subscales and Descriptive Statistics for Gender and Institution
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Rewards</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Procedures</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 (continued).
Summary

There were 88 participants who represented at least 11 states in the United States of America. Most of the participants were women who held a master’s degree, were single, and had at least four years of residence life experience. Overall, the group expressed moderate job satisfaction. While public institutions had more representation than private institutions, those individuals who represented private institutions indicated in general more job satisfaction. In general, entry-level women at private institutions were the most satisfied group represented in the study.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY

Unlike a number of studies regarding student affairs that place emphasis on the students, this study focused on student affairs professionals as primary subjects of interest. This research went beyond having a general understanding of student affairs administration and examined a specific department within the area of student affairs: residence life. In higher education, student affairs, specifically in residence life literature, research on historically Black colleges and universities is limited. The literature on student affairs professionals is often limited to the perspective of those working at PWIs; therefore, this study aimed to increase awareness of HBCUs as minority-serving institutions in the fields of higher education and student affairs. As there is a need to recognize that there are cultural differences in the workplace amongst higher education institutions (Hirt, 2006; Lombardi, 2013), this research is important to strengthen the practice and professionalization of student affairs employees at HBCUs (Hirt, 2009).

More specifically, the goal of this study was to provide insight about professionals in college and university housing settings at HBCUs. This study sought to examine job satisfaction of entry-level residence life professionals at historically Black colleges and universities. Moreover, this study was intended to draw insight about overall job satisfaction, and job satisfaction as influenced by gender and/or public or private HBCU. To best guide this study, the researcher posed the following questions:
1. What are the feelings of entry-level residence life professionals at historically Black colleges and universities toward job satisfaction?

2. Are there differences in job satisfaction based on gender and/or public or private HBCU?

Discussion and Implications

Most of the participants in this study resided in states considered to be the American South, and a majority of HBCUs are located there. North Carolina is home to the most HBCUs (Evans, Evans, & Evans, 2002), as such, the number of participants with the most representation in the study was from that state. The findings for this study are consistent with previous studies on residence life professionals suggesting that the nature of one’s work (e.g., Bailey, 1997; Jennings, 2005; Messer-Roy, 2006; Weaver, 2005) and working with colleagues (e.g., Jennings, 2005) contribute to job satisfaction. The results of this study indicate consistency with Weaver’s (2005) study suggesting that the lack of opportunities to advance contributes to job dissatisfaction; however, on the contrary, participants in this study did not agree that supervision is a factor that led to job dissatisfaction.

None of the identified residence life and job satisfaction studies examined gender. Research indicates differences in the experiences of men and women that hold top leadership roles at HBCUs (Evans, 2007); hence, this research sought to examine if there were differences in job satisfaction based gender in an entry-level role. While this study did not find statistically significant differences for gender on overall job satisfaction, an evaluation of means suggests that men and
women display different feelings toward job satisfaction. The results of this study supports previous research on student affairs professionals (e.g., Cook, 2006; Lombardi, 2006), indicating that women are more satisfied with the work environment when compared to men. Unlike Benjamin’s (1997) research, this study suggests that women working at HBCUs as entry-level residence life professionals are positive about their roles as administrators and lean toward satisfaction regarding promotions.

Previous studies on residence life professionals and job satisfaction do not take into consideration the role of public or private HBCU on job satisfaction of residence life professionals. Statistically, there was no difference in public or private HBCU on overall job satisfaction. However, an examination of mean scores suggests that feelings toward job satisfaction vary for entry-level residence professionals at HBCUs. Unlike Anderson (1998) and Lombardi (2013) who examined job satisfaction for student affairs professionals in general, this study suggested there was more job satisfaction for those individuals working for private institutions when compared to those working at public institutions. However, the results of this study are consistent with Lombardi’s study (2013) indicating that satisfaction with fringe benefits is higher for those employed at private institutions. The results of this study suggest that overall feelings of job satisfaction of entry-level residence life professionals were ambivalent, which is inconsistent with previous studies conducted on job satisfaction of student affairs professionals (e.g., Blank, 1993; Cook, 2006; Davidson, 2009; Lombardi, 2013; Taylor, 2000; Thompson, 2001; Tseng, 2002; Tull, 2004) and residence life
professionals (e.g., Bailey, 1997; Jennings, 2005; Kieffer, 2003; Messer-Roy, 2006; Morris, 2009; Onofrietti, 2000; Weaver, 2005).

Herzberg’s motivator-hygiene theory indicates that there are fourteen factors that contribute to either job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction. The motivator factors, or satisfiers, include achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement. The hygiene factors include company policies, supervision, relationship with supervisor and peers, work conditions, salary, status, and security (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; Herzberg, 1966, 1976a, 1976b; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). The results of this study indicate two inconsistencies with the theory: one, supervision was not a factor that contributed to job dissatisfaction; two, promotion was not a factor that contributed to job satisfaction.

Recommendations for Future Research

The findings for this research can be used as groundwork for further investigation of job satisfaction of entry-level residence life professionals at HBCUs and there are a number of research avenues that can be pursued. Foremost, additional research should be conducted to re-examine job satisfaction of entry-level residence life professionals at HBCUs. A qualitative approach to this research might provide a better understanding of the experiences of individuals in these roles. Future studies should examine the role of race, age, marital status, years of residence life experience, geographic location, level of education, salary, and/or sexual orientation on job satisfaction of residence life professionals at HBCUs. Examining institution type (i.e., public or
private) on job satisfaction can be further examined by taking into account if an institution is 2-year or 4-year. Research on job satisfaction of both middle-level and senior-level residence life professionals at HBCUs also needed. Comparative research of entry-level, middle-level, and/or upper-level residence life professionals should be conducted. A qualitative study might explore reasons that women, overall, experience more job satisfaction in entry-level residence life positions when compared to men at HBCUs.

Research should be conducted to gain insight about intentions of those individuals to leave their position for all entry-level residence life professionals at HBCUs, especially as these results were ambivalent. As research indicates a high level of turnover for residence life professionals, and identifies factors that lead to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, future studies should examine entry-level of housing professionals at HBCUs and PWIs to better understand reasons individuals pursue careers in housing. Additional research on job satisfaction of residence life professionals might be conducted at predominantly White institutions to explore if there are differences based on public or private HBCU.

Recommendations for Practitioners

As a result of this study, more attention should be paid to the ways that the daily operational practices can help to strengthen student affairs professionals at different institutions (Lombardi, 2013). For any institution, student affairs professionals are critical to providing student support and upholding the institutions’ missions (Hamrick, Evans, & Schuh, 2002; Hirt, 2006, 2009;). Effective programs within a department of student affairs, especially in
areas such as college and university housing, are important because of their contribution to the overall mission of the institution. It is important to understand job satisfaction of residence life professionals within college and university settings is because of their influence on student success. Most student affairs professionals are put in place out of need to help students learn, develop, and graduate from institutions higher learning (Gasman & Palmer, 2008; Hirt, 2009; Lombardi, 2013; Weaver, 2005). For administrators at HBCUs, this research can possibly help supervisors of entry-level housing professionals provide better leadership and make research-informed decision when working with their staffs.

As entry-level residence life professionals often live in residence halls, they experience a very high level of contact with students. As a result of this, housing professionals’ interactions with students are critical because of the influence they have on students’ experiences. As HBCUs are institutions that require high student contact (Hirt, 2006; Hirt et al., 2006), and relationships are found to have a positive influence on student experiences (Awokoya & Mann, 2011; Gasman & Palmer, 2008; Outcalt & Cox, 2002), supervisors of entry-level housing professionals should work to help increase job satisfaction of their employees so that students may be best served. During a time of economic hardships for many institutions of higher learning, it is important that administrators understand the need for fiscal benefits for satisfied staff. As an example, it costs much less to retain current employees than it does to recruit, hire, and train new staff (Lombardi, 2013; Messer-Roy, 2006).
Individuals acting as supervisors in student affairs can work to help new professionals to be leaders and grow within the field (Tull, 2004), and this study might be used to draw insights about things that can done for creating work environments that are nurturing, supportive, and developmental for entry-level housing professionals. Supervisors have the ability to target problem areas with their staff and work to resolve issues so that these professionals are retained (Bailey, 1997; Messer-Roy, 2006). Mid-level and senior-level housing professionals could take on leadership styles that include coaching and supporting. Entry-level professionals have a need for high-support behaviors from supervisors; hence, a coaching and supporting leadership styles are highly effective in nature (Guest, Hersey, & Blanchard, 1977; Hersey & Blanchard, 1969, 1972, 1982; Northouse, 2009). When entry-level professionals are first hired in positions, supervisors should take on a coaching leadership style because it is highly directive and highly supportive (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969, 1972, 1982; Northouse, 2009). As entry-level professionals share problems with adjusting, a coaching leadership style still will allow for them to share their needs (input), seek encouragement, and be guided through accomplishing goals (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969, 1972, 1982) until they have grown into the position.

The findings of this study suggest that the participants were dissatisfied with limited opportunities for promotions. While promotions may not be an option for departments of residence life, supervisors should encourage their staff in by helping them find ways to develop within their positions. For instance, supervisors should create opportunities and encourage staff to be a part of
projects outside of residence life. In these capacities, entry-level residence life staffs are provided opportunities to both serve residence life and gain additional experiences in other areas of higher education. While entry-level residence life professionals may not be promoted within the department, opportunities may arise for them to be promoted within the institution and they will be prepared. In this capacity, the benefit for residence life is having an established relationship with an individual who can partner with the department. Additionally, professional development opportunities can help make staff more marketable for higher level residence life jobs and/or other student affairs positions.

In general, student affairs employees at HBCUs are practical, highly professional, challenging, and work in highly stressful environments. Additionally, employees need to work as a team and be very student-centered (Hirt, 2009; Hirt et al., 2006); hence, it is important for mid-level and senior-level administrators to understand the need for entry-level residence life professionals to be especially satisfied with their nature of work, supervision, and coworkers—a strong sense of community is important for individuals who work in such a capacity. Administrators might take into account the factors that contribute the most to job dissatisfaction and reconsider policies and/or employee incentives within the department.

As private institutions indicate more satisfaction with contingent rewards operating conditions, and coworkers, individuals in positions of influence in departments of residence life at public institutions may want to incorporate some of policies and practices of private institutions. For instance, departments of
residence life at public and private HBCUs should come together for a retreat to exchange ideas. Women express more satisfaction toward operating procedures, and men express more satisfaction toward contingent rewards. Hence, individuals who supervise entry-level residence life professionals should create committees with a balance of both genders to provide feedback when modifying policies and practices.

By having knowledge about job satisfaction based on gender, potential employees can be more mindful of where they may be more satisfied with work when they are seeking professional positions. Additionally, this study can help supervisors have a better understanding of the challenges that individuals in a candidate pool may face before they are brought on to staff. As aspiring student affairs professionals continue to seek professional placements, they should be fully aware of the possible challenges and issues they will be faced with when entering diverse institutional work environments with an awareness of possible challenges and issues of entry-level housing professionals at HBCUs, individuals looking to pursue careers in this area of student affairs can take the initiative to work with their supervisors and colleagues to make their positions more desirable. Further, by being mindful of employee job satisfaction and working to see that employees are retained, the departments establish a more reputable brand. Subsequently, employers, especially in residence life, might recruit from a larger, more qualified, and highly interested pool of candidates when looking to hire.
Limitations

The researcher was faced with some limitations during the study. Statistically, the reliability of the overall instrument was acceptable; however, the subscales, when tested for Cronbach’s alphas, yielded low numbers. As items were removed from questions, and subscales (pay, fringe benefits, and communication) were removed from the overall study—the researcher did not factor in these data and was not able fully articulate how and/or if the factors contributed led to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. While G*Power suggested a sample size of 77 was needed to be effective, increased sample sizes generally result in increased power. Further, the sample population was homogenous as most of the participants identified as single, living in the southern United States, and having earned a master’s degree.

Data was collected during the summer months of 2015 which were during a time that many residence life and higher education professionals are on vacation and/or off for the summer months—thus yielding a low number of participants. More time would have created more opportunities to solicit participation and for individuals to respond. During the summer months, many institutions, especially in residence life in many institutions experience most of their turnover and are hiring new staff; hence, the number of participants not reached may have been a result of vacant positions. Additionally, during the summer months, there very few students live on-campus. As data was collected using an online survey method, this may have contributed to the low rate of responses.
Conclusion

The findings of this research suggest that entry-level residence life professional at historically Black colleges and universities have ambivalent feelings toward their job. The greatest contribution of this study to the literature is that it provides insight for higher education administrators, especially those at HBCUs. It is important for leaders in positions of influence to continue to understand the need for continued growth and professionalization of student affairs employees at their respective institutions. Job satisfaction matters most because student affairs professionals play a critical role in the retention, development, and satisfaction of college students.

The ability to retain satisfied professional staff is means these individuals are likely to be more invested in their institution and truly want to help retain and development students; and in turn, might contribute to a more satisfying college experience for the students. The need to keep professional staff, especially in an area such a residence life, where those individuals work around-the-clock to serve students, can have an influence on an institution’s ability to retain and graduate students. In the end, for both the institution and those who obtain degrees, there are academic, social, and financial benefits.

While the findings of this study suggest that feelings of job satisfaction were moderate, and individuals had feelings of dissatisfaction about promotions, a theme is consistent among those individuals who are employed at historically Black college and universities—the nature of their work is satisfying. The real success of any higher education professional more than loving the work that they
do, but enjoying what that they do because of who they serve—that’s the greatest satisfaction of all.
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Learner: Evingerlean D. Blakney (username: EveB87)
Institution: University of Southern Mississippi
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Department: Educational Studies and Research
Email: evingerlean.blakney@eagles.usm.edu

GRAD Students at The University of southern Mississippi (Common RCR Course): This course is for investigators, staff and students with an interest or focus in Biomedical Research. This course contains text, embedded case studies AND quizzes.

Stage 1. RCR Passed on 08/25/12 (Ref # 6539848)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Modules</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to the Responsible Conduct of Research</td>
<td>08/23/11</td>
<td>no quiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Misconduct 1-1215</td>
<td>08/23/11</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Plagiarism 1-1473</td>
<td>08/23/11</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Acquisition, Management, Sharing and Ownership 1-1308</td>
<td>08/25/12</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Practices and Responsible Authorship 1-1380</td>
<td>08/25/12</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor and Trainee Responsibilities 01234 1250</td>
<td>08/25/12</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts of Interest and Commitment 1-1622</td>
<td>08/25/12</td>
<td>5/6 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Research 1-1450</td>
<td>08/25/12</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Southern Mississippi</td>
<td>08/25/12</td>
<td>no quiz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this Completion Report to be valid, the learner listed above must be affiliated with a CITI participating institution. Falsified information and unauthorized use of the CITI course site is unethical, and may be considered scientific misconduct by your institution.

Paul Braunschweiger Ph.D.
Professor, University of Miami
Director Office of Research Education
CITI Course Coordinator
**CITI Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI)**

**SBR Faculty, Students and Staff at the University of Southern Mississippi (Basic Course) Curriculum Completion Report**

Printed on 10/28/2012

**Learner:** Evingerlean D. Blakney (username: EveB87)

**Institution:** University of Southern Mississippi

**Contact Information**

Department: Educational Studies and Research
Email: evingerlean.blakney@eagles.usm.edu

**SBR:** Faculty, Students and Staff at the University of Southern Mississippi (Basic Course)

**Stage 1. Stage 1 Passed on 10/25/12 (Ref # 6539850)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Modules</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Report and CITI Course Introduction</td>
<td>08/25/12</td>
<td>3/3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in Research</td>
<td>08/25/12</td>
<td>8/10 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Ethical Principles - SBR</td>
<td>08/26/12</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining Research with Human Subjects - SBR</td>
<td>08/26/12</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regulations and The Social and Behavioral Sciences - SBR</td>
<td>08/26/12</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Risk in Social and Behavioral Sciences - SBR</td>
<td>08/26/12</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed Consent - SBR</td>
<td>08/26/12</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy and Confidentiality - SBR</td>
<td>10/25/12</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Research - SBR</td>
<td>10/25/12</td>
<td>3/5 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Southern Mississippi</td>
<td>08/26/12</td>
<td>no quiz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this Completion Report to be valid, the learner listed above must be affiliated with a CITI participating institution. Falsified information and unauthorized use of the CITI course site is unethical, and may be considered scientific misconduct by your institution.

Paul Braunschweiger Ph.D.
Professor, University of Miami
Director Office of Research Education
CITI Course Coordinator
CITI Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI)

Researchers, Faculty, Students and IRB Member’s Curriculum Completion Report
Printed on 10/28/2012

Learner: Evingerlean D. Blakney (username: EveB87)
Institution: University of Southern Mississippi
Contact Information
Department: Educational Studies and Research
Email: evingerlean.blakney@eagles.usm.edu

Researchers, Faculty, Students and IRB Member’s Engaging in Research Involving Human Subjects RCR Co: Researchers, Faculty, Students

Stage 1. Stage 1 Passed on 08/26/12 (Ref # 6539849)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Modules</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Report and CITI Course Introduction</td>
<td>08/25/12</td>
<td>3/3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in Research</td>
<td>08/25/12</td>
<td>8/10 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Ethical Principles - SBR</td>
<td>08/26/12</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining Research with Human Subjects - SBR</td>
<td>08/26/12</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regulations and The Social and Behavioral Sciences - SBR</td>
<td>08/26/12</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Risk in Social and Behavioral Sciences - SBR</td>
<td>08/26/12</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed Consent - SBR</td>
<td>08/26/12</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Southern Mississippi</td>
<td>08/25/12</td>
<td>no quiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unanticipated Problems and Reporting Requirements in Social and Behavioral Research</td>
<td>08/26/12</td>
<td>3/3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this Completion Report to be valid, the learner listed above must be affiliated with a CITI participating institution. Falsified information and unauthorized use of the CITI course site is unethical, and may be considered scientific misconduct by your institution.

Paul Braunschweiger Ph.D.
Professor, University of Miami
Director Office of Research Education
CITI Course Coordinator
APPENDIX B

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD LETTER OF APPROVAL

NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Institutional Review Board in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:

- The risks to subjects are minimized.
- The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
- The selection of subjects is equitable.
- Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
- Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
- Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
- Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
- Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event. This should be reported to the IRB Office via the “Adverse Effect Report Form”.
- If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months. Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.

PROTOCOL NUMBER: 15050503
PROJECT TITLE: Examining Job Satisfaction of Entry-Level Residence Life Professionals at Historically Black Colleges and Universities
PROJECT TYPE: New Project
RESEARCHER(S): Evingerfean D. Blakney
COLLEGE/DIVISION: College of Education and Psychology
DEPARTMENT: Educational Studies and Research
FUNDING AGENCY/SPONSOR: N/A
IRB COMMITTEE ACTION: Expedited Review Approval
PERIOD OF APPROVAL: 05/20/2015 to 05/19/2016

Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.
Institutional Review Board
APPENDIX C

LETTER OF REQUEST FOR PERMISSION

February 8, 2015

Dr. Paul Spector
Department of Psychology
PCD 4138
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33620

Dr. Spector,

Greetings! I hope this letter finds you well. My name is Evingerlean D. Blakney and I am PhD candidate at The University of Southern Mississippi. I anticipate graduating December 2015, and for my dissertation I will be conducting research on job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction of entry-level college and university housing professional at historically black colleges and universities.

As a move forward with my research, I am reaching out to you to solicit permission to utilize the Job Satisfaction Scale for data collection. I will upload the scale to Qualtrics, an online survey tool, and generate a link to send out to participants. As I have shared my plan for use of the JSS, may I have your permission to use the JSS to collect data for my dissertation? Please note that I have read and fully understand the conditions for sharing results as indicated on your website (http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/jsspag.html).

I look forward to hearing from you in the near future. Thank you for your time and attention to this message.

Regards,

Evingerlean D. Blakney, M.Ed.
Doctoral Candidate
The University of Southern Mississippi
Dear Evingerlean Blakney,

You have my permission to use the JSS in your research. You can find copies of the scale in the original English and several other languages, as well as details about the scale's development and norms in the Scales section of my website http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~spector. I allow free use for noncommercial research and teaching purposes in return for sharing of results. This includes student theses and dissertations, as well as other student research projects. Copies of the scale can be reproduced in a thesis or dissertation as long as the copyright notice is included, “Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved.” Results can be shared by providing an e-copy of a published or unpublished research report (e.g., a dissertation). You also have permission to translate the JSS into another language under the same conditions in addition to sharing a copy of the translation with me. Be sure to include the copyright statement, as well as credit the person who did the translation with the year.

Thank you for your interest in the JSS, and good luck with your research.

Best,

Paul Spector, Distinguished Professor
Department of Psychology
PCD 4118
University of South Florida
Tampa, FL 33620
813-974-0357
pspector@usf.edu
http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~spector

From: Evingerlean D. Blakney [mailto:evingerlean.blakney@eagles.usm.edu]
Sent: Sunday, February 08, 2015 12:49 PM
To: Spector, Paul
Subject: Request: Job Satisfaction Scale

Dr. Spector,

Hello! Please see the attached a letter requesting permission to use the Job Satisfaction Scale.
RE: Permission to Reprint Charts

Spector, Paul <pspector@usf.edu>  
To: "Evingerlean D. B. Hudson" <evingerlean@gmail.com>  
Sat, Sep 26, 2015 at 8:07 AM

Dear Evingerlean:

You have my permission to reprint the charts.

Best,

Paul Spector, Distinguished Professor  
Department of Psychology  
PCD 4118  
University of South Florida  
Tampa, Fl. 33620  
813-974-0357  
pspector@usf.edu  
http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~spector

---

From: Evingerlean D. B. Hudson [mailto:evingerlean@gmail.com]  
Sent: Friday, September 25, 2015 3:16 PM  
To: Spector, Paul <pspector@usf.edu>  
Subject: Permission to Reprint Charts

Dr. Spector,

Hello again! I hope this message finds you well. Per your permission, I used the JSS to collect data for my research. At this moment, I am writing to find out if you will grant me permission to reprint charts as found on your website (http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/jsspag.html).
APPENDIX E

EMAIL AND ELECTRONIC LETTER OF CONSENT

Greetings,

You are being invited to participate in a survey to examine the job satisfaction of entry-level residence life professionals at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs). The purpose of this study was to find out what factors contribute most to the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction of entry-level housing professionals at HBCUs. Further, this study seeks to find out if there is a difference in satisfaction based on public or private HBCU and gender. The electronic survey consists of 36 questions that should take roughly 20-25 minutes to complete.

As a result of this study, you may become more aware of your experiences and levels of satisfaction in the workplace. Implications from this research were shared senior residence life professionals at HBCUs such that they can provide their staff with for services and support. There are no foreseeable risks for participants of this study and participation is completely voluntary. Participants may decline participation or to discontinue participation at any time without concern of penalty, prejudice or negative consequences.

All information shared with the researcher were kept private and confidential. Only the researcher will have access to the data. The transcripts may be kept up to two years to facilitate data analysis and then they will then be destroyed. No specific institution or school were identified in the reports. Any identifying information inadvertently obtained were kept confidential. Data collected were combined and reports were potentially submitted for journal publication and/or conference presentation.

If you have questions concerning this research, please contact Evingerlean D. Blakney at evingerlean.blakney@eagles.usm.edu. The Institutional Review Board of the University of Southern Mississippi, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations, has reviewed this project. Any questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820.

Thank you in advance for your participation and support.

Deepest regards,

Evingerlean D. Blakney, M.Ed.
Doctoral Candidate
Higher Education Administration
The University of Southern Mississippi
APPENDIX F

ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

Part One: Job Satisfaction Survey
For statements 1-36, please select a value that best describes your opinion about the statement.

Copyright © 1994, Paul E. Spector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree Very Much</th>
<th>Disagree Moderately</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Moderately</th>
<th>Agree Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am paid a fair amount to do work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is really too little chance for promotion on my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I do a good job, I receive recognition for it that I should receive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the people I work with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications seem good within this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raises are few and far in between.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Disagree Very Much</td>
<td>Disagree Moderately</td>
<td>Disagree Slightly</td>
<td>Agree Slightly</td>
<td>Agree Moderately</td>
<td>Agree Very Much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor is unfair to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like doing things I do at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goals of this organization are not clear to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of the subordinates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The benefit package we have is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equitable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are too few rewards for those who work here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have too much work to do at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy my coworkers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are benefits we do have which we should have.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like my supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have too much paperwork.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is too much bickering and fighting at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job is enjoyable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work assignments are not fully explained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part Two: General Information

For the following statements, please select a value that best describes your opinion about the statement.

Marital Status

- Single
- Married
- Divorced
- Widowed

What is your race/ethnicity?

- African American/Black
- Asian/ Pacific Islander
- Caucasian/White
- Hispanic
- Native American
- Other

Salary

- Below $19,000
- $20,000 - $29,000
- $30,000 - $39,000
- $40,000 - $49,000
- $50,000 or More

What are you living arrangements?

- I live in a residence hall
- I live on-campus, but not in a residence hall
- I do not live on campus
In which state is your institution located?

- Alabama
- Mississippi
- Louisiana
- North Carolina
- South Carolina
- Georgia
- Florida
- Virginia
- Kentucky
- Ohio
- Pennsylvania
- Tennessee
- Texas
- U.S. Virgin Islands
- West Virginia
- Other

How many students currently live on campus?

- 1-500
- 501-1000
- 1001-2000
- 2001-3000
- 3001-4000
- 4001-5000
- 5001 or Above

What is your gender?

- Male
• Female

What is your highest level of education?

• High School Diploma
• Associate’s Degree
• Bachelor’s Degree
• Master’s Degree
• Doctorate Degree

At what type of HBCU are you currently employed?

• Public
• Private

How many years of professional residence life experience do you have?

• 3 Years or Less
• 4-9 Years
• 10-14 Years
• 15-19 Years
• 20 Years or More
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