The Relationship Between Employee Satisfaction and the Financial Health of Kansas Independent Colleges and Universities

J. Dale Marrant
B.B.A., University of Missouri, 1994
M.B.A., University of Missouri, 2003

Submitted to the Graduate Department and Faculty of the School of Education of Baker University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in Leadership in Higher Education

Tes Mehring
_____
Tes Mehring, Ph.D.
Major Advisor

Arminda McCallum
_____
Arminda McCallum, Ed.D.

Gery Hochanadel
_____
Gery Hochanadel, Ph.D.

Date Defended: June 28, 2021

Abstract

Higher education serves as one of the fundamental societal mechanisms to advance knowledge and prepare individuals to think critically, act responsibly, and participate in the U.S. labor force in productive ways. Researchers have suggested that employee satisfaction is one of the factors that can contribute to the financial success of an organization (Carnegie, 2012; Gallup, 2013; Harvard Business Review Analytic Services, 2013). Understanding the existence and strength of the relationship between employee satisfaction and institutional financial health within private, nonprofit higher education institutions assists those entities in managing organizational outcomes and strengthening their position within the competitive educational environment. The purpose of the current study was to identify whether there is a difference in employee satisfaction as reported on the Abridged Job Descriptive Index (aJDI) and Abridged Job in General Scale (aJIG) among five Kansas private, nonprofit higher education institutions with varying levels of financial health as measured by a revised Higher Learning Commission Composite Financial Index (CFI). Institutions in the current study were classified as Low CFI [-1.0 to .9], Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], or High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]. The level of employee satisfaction at each institution was determined by an online survey (N = 334) using the aJDI which measures five distinct facet scores (People on Your Present Job, Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision), and the overall level of employee satisfaction at the same institutions using the aJIG. Of the five specific job facets measured by the aJDI and overall satisfaction as measured by the aJIG scores, only the mean score for Opportunities for Promotion reflected a difference in employee satisfaction. Employees from institutions in lower CFI categories

reflected higher satisfaction on the Opportunities for Promotion facet. Respondents from institutions in all CFI categories reported lower satisfaction with Opportunities for Promotion and Pay than other survey categories. Future research is needed to further explore the relationship between employee satisfaction and financial outcomes at private and public higher educational institutions.

Dedication

This work is dedicated with a full and grateful heart to my parents, Joyce and Henry, and those before them who prepared a path for me; to my wife Sara, who always supports and accompanies me down whatever path I wander; and to my children, Kendall, Caiti, and Cameron, who will forge their own paths, in part as a result of those of us who have helped prepare the way, but more so by their own talent, passion, and commitment. We are all capable of far more than we realize.

Acknowledgements

A decade ago I completed a marathon in under four hours, an accomplishment I never imagined possible as someone who had never run or participated in any sport. Yet in the weeks leading up to the marathon, I began to wonder what else might be possible. The completion of my marathon gave me the courage to pursue my doctorate degree, something I also never imagined possible as the grandson of an immigrant and the son of hard working, blue-collar, middle class parents. Yet neither of these accomplishments are mine alone. They both came to completion with much love and support from those around me; cheering, encouraging, and motivating me along the way.

I am forever grateful to my colleagues, mentors, and friends at Baker University. From my dissertation committee (Dr. Tes Mehring, Dr. Arminda McCallum, and Dr. Gery Hochanadel) who kept me focused when I simply wanted to bury my head in the sand, to instructors who challenged me to think differently and more critically, to my amazing cohort of friends who motivated and entertained me many evenings and still today… I offer each of you my sincere gratitude. I cannot imagine ever completing this journey without the wise counsel and encouragement of my major advisor, Dr. Tes Mehring and my research analyst, Dr. Peg Waterman. Your mentoring and leadership styles were the perfect fit for me at the perfect time. It is impossible to know the full extent of the impact each of you have had on higher education leaders throughout your distinguished careers; however, I am most grateful to be among the recipients. I also offer my heartfelt gratitude to my long serving and long suffering 'personal board of directors', Christy Hammond and Gretchen Heasty. I know your work has been challenging and the compensation inadequate; however, never doubt the impact you had

on my ability to complete this journey. I hope I have been able to offer even a fraction of the support to you that you have both offered to me.

Finally, I have been blessed with the support of so many amazing colleagues, friends, and family members who have impacted me in unimaginable ways. During my time in higher education at Cleveland University-Kansas City, I have been given many opportunities to learn and grow. I have met amazing people who mentored and motivated me and who, in so many instances, have become lifelong friends. I have been blessed with immediate and extended family who always support me and offer encouragement along whatever path I take who probably do not even view their support as anything extraordinary, yet it is. It has carried me through many instances when I have wanted to give up. A special acknowledgement and thank you to my Mars family, who came along at a time when I did not even realize there was anything missing in my life, who I now cannot imagine life without. And thank you to my many, many friends, some for a season and some for a lifetime. I am so grateful to have had your support during this journey.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

Higher education serves as one of the fundamental societal mechanisms to advance knowledge and prepare individuals to think critically, act responsibly, and participate in the U.S. labor force in productive ways. Despite dramatically different funding structures, both private and public colleges and universities are experiencing many challenges. As a result of various financial constraints, institutions of higher education make choices about how resources are used which can affect the overall financial health of the institution.

Private, nonprofit colleges and universities play a significant role in serving the educational needs of U.S. post-secondary students. According to Snyder, de Brey, and Dillow (2019), in 2017, private, nonprofit institutions enrolled 16.7% of all U.S. undergraduate students. Enrollment in private, nonprofit institutions increased by 6% between 2010 and 2017 while enrollment at public institutions declined by 4% and enrollment at private, for-profit institutions declined by 51% during the same period (McFarland et al., 2019). These trends reflect the vital role that private, nonprofit colleges and universities play in meeting the educational needs of U.S. students.

Several factors contribute to the financial health of an institution. Researchers have suggested that employee satisfaction is one of the factors that can contribute to the financial success of an organization (Carnegie, 2012; Gallup, 2013; Harvard Business Review Analytic Services, 2013). Understanding the existence and strength of the relationship between employee satisfaction and institutional financial health within private, nonprofit higher education institutions assists these institutions in managing

organizational outcomes and strengthening their position within the competitive educational environment.

Background

The impact of higher education on lifetime earnings in modern society is significant. Tamborini, Kim, and Sakamoto (2015) reported that women who hold bachelor's degrees earn on average $792,000 more over their lifetime as compared with those who do not hold bachelor's degrees and that men who hold bachelor's degrees earn on average $1.13 million more over their lifetime as compared with those who do not hold bachelor's degrees. Despite this impact, higher education institutions face significant financial challenges. A survey of 416 chief business officers indicated that 50% of respondents were confident about their institution's financial health over the upcoming 10-year period (Jaschik & Lederman, 2019). When the results of the same survey were reported by subgroup, chief business officers at private, nonprofit institutions were slightly less optimistic with 49% of respondents indicating they were confident about their institution's financial health over the upcoming 10-year period (Jaschik & Lederman, 2019).

Private, nonprofit colleges and universities account for a significant portion of the total U.S. institutions offering accredited degrees. The National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU, 2019) reported that in 2016-17 approximately 1,700 institutions throughout the United States were serving more than 5 million students with 66% of private, nonprofit students graduating within six years as compared to 60% of students graduating within six years at public institutions.

According to the 2019 report, private, nonprofit colleges and universities employed 750,000 employees nationwide (NAICU, 2019).

Carnegie (2012) reported that organizations with satisfied workforces demonstrate higher levels of performance than do organizations with less satisfied workforces. A 2013 *Harvard Business Review* article suggested that productivity and profitability increase as a result of more highly satisfied workforces (Harvard Business Review Analytic Services, 2013). Research conducted by Gallup (2013), which included a significant number of educational organizations, showed organizations that scored in the top quartile regarding employee engagement demonstrated higher outcomes in customer ratings, financial outcomes, and productivity by 10%, 22%, and 21% respectively. Additionally, Gallup found that employers with 9.3% engaged employees for every disengaged employee had 147% higher earnings per share than competitors. Gallup's results supported Kahn's (1990) suggestion that the level of connectedness of an individual to his or her role, specifically with respect to physical, cognitive, and emotional constructs, might affect role performance.

Regionally accredited higher education institutions are frequently mandated to ensure a prescribed level of employee satisfaction within the operation of the institution. The Higher Learning Commission (HLC), which accredits all 21 institutions that are part of the Kansas Independent College Association (KICA), requires institutions to demonstrate collaborative processes within the operation of the institutions that afford engagement opportunities to institutional staff, faculty, and administrators (HLC, 2019). These expectations further support the significance of studying employee satisfaction and

any relationship this variable might have to the financial or operational success of institutions.

Kansas private, nonprofit colleges and universities play an important economic and social role in the state of Kansas. The total combined enrollment at these 21 institutions for the 2019-2020 reporting period was 24,601 (KICA, 2020). In 2014, KICA member institutions employed 4,392 employees and contributed more than $971 million a year to the Kansas economy (Economic Modeling Specialists International, 2014). KICA member institutions during the 2018-2019 academic year awarded approximately 5,923 degrees (KICA, 2020). Additionally, 86% of KICA bachelor's degree graduates completed their undergraduate degrees within 4 years compared to 69% of bachelor's degree graduates at Kansas public 4-year institutions (KICA, 2020).

The competitive environment within higher education suggests that organizational effectiveness is a critical focus for institutions to survive and thrive (Gallup, 2013). A significant increase in the number of institutions, stagnant enrollment growth, and growing public concerns about the value of a college degree have contributed to institutional financial pressures. The total number of degree-granting institutions in the U.S. with first-year undergraduate students increased from 3,717 during the 2000-2001 academic year to 4,207 during the 2014-2015 academic year (McFarland et al., 2019). Hussar and Bailey (2014) in a National Center for Education Statistics report, indicated that full-time student enrollment grew by 54% between 1997 and 2011. Part-time student enrollment grew by 32% during the same period. The NCES projected that these enrollments will increase by only 12% and 16% respectively between 2011 and 2022 (Hussar & Bailey, 2014). Additionally, the average cost of tuition and fees at public

institutions increased from $2,387 in 1975 to $9,410 in 2015 while the average cost of tuition and fees at private institutions increased from $10,088 to $32,405 in the same period after costs were adjusted to reflect value in terms of 2015 values (Snyder et al., 2019).

May, Gilson, and Harter (2004) concluded from testing Kahn's (1990) model, in which engagement was described as an employee's psychological connectedness or disconnectedness from work, that psychological meaningfulness, as well as perceived safety, were positively correlated with the degree to which employees were engaged in their role. Rothbard and Patil (2011) further adapted Kahn's definition of engagement and described it in terms of an individual's psychologic presence within their job. The authors emphasized how the constructs of absorption or focus on work, as well as the availability of energy for devotion to a role, affected work role investment. Collectively, these concepts of feeling psychological meaningfulness and presence regarding one's work have formed much of the framework that is used to describe the concept of employee satisfaction. Harter, Schmidt, and Hayes (2002) described employee satisfaction as a component of the larger concept of employee engagement, which includes involvement and enthusiasm for work in addition to satisfaction with the work. In many instances, the concepts of employee engagement and employee satisfaction are described similarly (Bailey et al., 2017; Kahn, 1990). Despite the existence of significant research, few studies have focused specifically on employee satisfaction and its relationship with financial health in nonprofit, higher educational organizations.

Statement of the Problem

While researchers have suggested more highly satisfied workforces achieve higher organizational outcomes (Melián-González, Bulchand-Gidumal, & López-Valcárcel, 2015; Zhu, 2013), the KICA, which exists to advance the competitive standing of its member institutions (KICA, n.d), does not analyze employee satisfaction levels within member institutions and has not studied the relationship between employee satisfaction and the financial health of its member institutions. According to Matt Lindsey, President of KICA, four member surveys are conducted annually to address each institution's enrollment levels: student demographics and academic statistics and outcomes, institutional financial data and ratios, cost and method of funding education at each institution, and employee salaries and benefits (personal communication, August 17, 2020). Lindsey stated that conducting job satisfaction surveys is the purview of individual member institutions and that KICA does not conduct satisfaction surveys for KICA institutions. Conducting research on employee satisfaction at selected KICA higher education institutions and examining satisfaction differences among institutions with differing levels of overall financial health could provide KICA leaders with an additional opportunity to effectively advance the success of member institutions.

Purpose of the Study

Two purposes guided the current study. The first purpose was to identify the level of employee satisfaction at selected KICA institutions using the Abridged Job Descriptive Index (aJDI) which measures five distinct facet scores (People on Your Present Job, Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision), and the overall level of employee satisfaction at the same institutions using the Abridged

Job in General Scale (aJIG). The overall satisfaction reflected by the aJIG score is not an aggregation of the five specific satisfaction facets, but instead reflects how factors other than the five specific facets may be impacting overall employee satisfaction. The second purpose of the current study was to identify whether there is a difference in employee satisfaction as reported on the aJDI and aJIG based on the category of financial health of the selected Kansas private, nonprofit higher education institutions, as measured by the HLC Composite Financial Index (CFI) classification.

Significance of the Study

While Kansas private, nonprofit colleges and universities offer significant social and economic benefits within the state of Kansas, their relatively small size often places these institutions at a disadvantage regarding resources. With student enrollments ranging from 232 to 3,373 in the fall 2018 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System reporting period, KICA colleges and universities struggled to reap the benefits of economies of scale in the same way as larger institutions (Snyder et al., 2019). A clear understanding of the level of employee satisfaction and its relationship to financial outcomes can enable institutional and KICA leadership to devote appropriate resources to increase satisfaction for the purpose of driving organizational outcomes and increasing the competitiveness of KICA colleges and universities. Additionally, information from the current study may be of interest to nonprofit higher education institutions in other geographic locations as spending allocation decisions drive the strategic goals of those institutions.

Delimitations

Delimitations represent "self-imposed boundaries" (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 134) such as time, location, population, or environment that may influence a study. Only personnel at selected KICA institutions representing a range of CFI scores were invited to participate in the survey. All institutions were geographically located within the state of Kansas. All institutions were also private, non-profit colleges and universities.

Assumptions

Lunenburg and Irby (2008) described assumptions as the "postulates, premises, and propositions that are accepted as operational for the purpose of the research" (p. 135). It was assumed that survey respondents fully understood and truthfully answered items on the combined aJDI and aJIG instrument. It was further assumed that personnel from institutions included in the current study correctly reported data used to derive the CFI score and that the CFI score calculations were correctly performed.

Research Questions

Lunenburg and Irby (2008) posited that research questions are critical components and when combined with a well-designed theoretical framework, research questions, "become a directional beam for the study" (p. 126). Employee satisfaction scores as determined by seven research questions guided this study.

RQ1. What is the level of employee satisfaction, as measured by the five facet scores on the Abridged Job Descriptive Index (People on Your Present Job, Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision), and the score on the Abridged Job in General Index, at selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions?

RQ2. To what extent does employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index People on Your Present Job score, differ among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's Composite Financial Index classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9])?

RQ3. To what extent does employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Work on Present Job score, differ among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's Composite Financial Index classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9])?

RQ4. To what extent does employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Pay score, differ among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's Composite Financial Index classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9])?

RQ5. To what extent does employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Opportunities for Promotion score, differ among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's Composite Financial Index classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9])?

RQ6. To what extent does employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Supervision score, differ among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's Composite Financial Index

classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9])?

RQ7. To what extent does employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean Abridged Job in General score, differ among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's Composite Financial Index classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9])?

Definition of Terms

Lunenburg and Irby (2008) stressed the importance of defining all terms central to a study. This section includes definitions for a number of key terms and concepts that are central to this study.

Abridged Job Descriptive Index (aJDI). Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) explained that the original Job Descriptive Index (JDI) instrument assessed employee satisfaction within five specific facets (People on Your Present Job, Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision). According to Brodke et al. (2009), the original JDI was revised to reduce the number of responses required by respondents in each of the five facets to produce a valid and reliable measure of satisfaction.

Abridged Job in General (aJIG). The instrument is a streamlined version of the original Job in General scale (JIG) scale used to assess overall employee satisfaction (Brodke et al., 2009).

Composite Financial Index (CFI). According to the HLC (2020a), the composite financial index (CFI) is a single financial ratio created through the analysis of three core financial ratios that include the primary reserve ratio, the equity ratio, and the net income ratio (see Appendix A) (HLC, 2020b). The CFI is used to reflect an

institution's financial health (Tahey, Salluzzo, Prager, Mezzina, & Cowen, 2010). The HLC (2020b) classified a CFI score of 1.5 to 3.0 as Above the Zone, a CFI of 1.0 to 1.4 as In the Zone, and CFI of -1.0 to 0.9 as Below the Zone that would require additional monitoring. Institutions that accept Title IV financial aid funds are required to report their CFI score data annually to the Department of Education.

Employee satisfaction. According to Brodke et al. (2009), the term employee satisfaction reflects employees' feelings and assessments about their actual job duties and tasks, their broader work environment to include relationships with colleagues, direction received from organization leaders, and the degree of autonomy and professional development associated with their role.

Kansas Independent College Association (KICA). This organization is a 501 (c)(4) not-for-profit Kansas corporation which seeks to sustain and advance the competitive standings of its independent, nonprofit, regionally accredited, degree granting colleges and universities (KICA, n.d.).

Organization of the Study

This study is organized in five chapters. Chapter 1 provided an introduction, background related to the topic, the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, delimitations, assumptions, research questions, and definition of terms. Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature. This chapter describes process and content theories and models of employee satisfaction, definitions of employee satisfaction, and research related to job satisfaction and performance outcomes. Chapter 3 explains the research methods of the study including the research design, selection of participants, measurement, data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis

testing, and limitations of the study. Chapter 4 presents descriptive statistics and the results of the hypothesis testing. Chapter 5 provides the interpretation and recommendations of the study. Included within this chapter is the study summary, findings related to the literature, and conclusions.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

This chapter is organized into four sections and summarizes current literature related to employee satisfaction and organizational outcomes. The first section examines various theories and concepts of employee satisfaction and motivation. The second section explores definitions of employee satisfaction. The third section focuses on research related to employee satisfaction and performance outcomes. The final section focuses on meta-analysis studies and literature reviews related to employee satisfaction.

Theories, Models, and Concepts of Employee Satisfaction and Motivation

Academics and practitioners have sought for many years to identify and understand the circumstances that cause an employee to behave and perform in a certain manner. As a result, wide varieties of historical and contemporary theories have been developed in an effort to explain employee satisfaction, engagement, and motivation. These theories are generally classified into two primary categories, content theories or process theories. Content theories seek to explain this dynamic by understanding employees' needs while process theories seek to explain this dynamic by understanding impacts of motivation on behavioral actions. Content theories examined in this review include Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs theory, Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman's (1959) two factor theory, McGregor's (1960) theory X and Y, McClelland's (1961) need theory, and Alderfer's (1969) ERG theory that emphasized existence, relatedness, and growth (ERG). Process theories examined include Adam's (1963) equity theory, expectancy theories by Vroom (1964) and Lawler and Porter

(1967), Locke's (1968) goal-setting theory, and Hackman and Oldham's (1975) job characteristics theory.

Content theories. In 1943, Maslow described his hierarchy of needs theory, which stated that human behavior is in reaction to five basic needs. These needs are physiological, safety and security, social belongingness, esteem, and self-actualization. According to Maslow, individuals fulfill most basic needs prior to seeking to fulfill higher-level needs. Maslow's theory has often been criticized due to its simplicity and ability to be generalized to diverse populations (Bridgman, Cummings, & Ballard, 2019). Critics have questioned the basic premise of the model and offered examples of individuals in developing nations who find social belongingness, esteem, and self-actualization despite a deprivation of many basic needs (Bridgman et al., 2019). Despite these criticisms, Maslow's theory has served as the foundation from which many related theories have been built.

Herzberg et al. (1959) described what is today referred to as the two-factor theory. Herzberg et al. examined organizational motivation by identifying factors that most often offered employees satisfaction and factors that most often resulted in employee dissatisfaction. Motivating factors in Herzberg et al.'s theory included the opportunity for professional advancement, the actual work being performed, professional or personal growth, the presence of responsibility, and conditions that allow for achievement. Alshmemri, Shawan-Akl, and Maude (2017) stated that Herzberg's hygiene factors represented elements that do not directly lead to motivation but prevent dissatisfaction and included the nature of interpersonal relationships, compensation, organizational factors such as policy and administration, the nature of one's supervision, and the actual

working conditions. Herzberg (1959) explained that while hygiene factors prevent dissatisfaction, they are not sufficient to motivate additional effort absent other motivational factors. However, Ghazi, Shahzada, and Khan (2013) suggested not all empirical research supports this assertion.

McGregor (1960) introduced his X-Y theory of motivation in *The Human Side of Enterprise*. McGregor described two distinct approaches to human motivation in the workplace that he labeled theory X and theory Y. Mohamed and Nor (2013) described McGregor's theory X as an autocratic style of leadership that seeks to influence productivity by leveraging authority and responding to unfavorable performance through discipline and withholding of rewards. Mohamed and Nor (2013) described McGregor's theory Y as the intrinsic desire of workers to achieve and perform in the workplace where organizational leaders are tasked with growing employee commitment to organizational success through positive reinforcement. According to Kopelman, Prottas, and Davis (2008), practices that McGregor deemed essential to theory Y included a degree of participative leadership which afforded employees a voice in management matters, a degree of delegation where employees could be assigned increasing responsibilities and given the autonomy to perform those duties, as well as the opportunity for growth and development within one's existing role.

Robbins and Judge (2019) contrasted McClelland's (1961) theory of needs to Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs theory. According to Robbins and Judge (2019), unlike Maslow (1943), whose theory was broader in scope ranging from basic physical needs to higher level emotional needs, McClelland described higher level factors that impacted motivation related to one's need for achievement, power, and affiliation.

According to Royle and Hall (2012), the need for achievement may be motivated by internal or external factors but is achieved through the individual's realization of personal accomplishments over matters that they influence. The need for power manifests in both formal and informal channels and often those with high needs in this area will demonstrate competitive tendencies and seek roles or positions high in formal or informal status (Royle & Hall, 2012). The need for affiliation relates to the degree to which individuals feel connectedness or affiliation with others in the organization setting (Royle & Hall, 2012).

The existence, relatedness, and growth (ERG) theory advanced by Alderfer (1969) originated from Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory. According to Caulton (2012), ERG theory exists to explain the influences of employee morale and productivity. Caulton suggested that existence factors serve to address the individual's most basic physiological needs. Relatedness factors address an individual's needs for belonging, whereas growth factors fill an individual's need for higher-level fulfillment and personal development. Turabik and Baskan (2015) stated that while ERG theory has many similarities to Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory, Alderfer's model suggested the absence of satisfaction at the higher levels of needs results in individuals placing greater emphasis on lower levels needs within the model in an effort to achieve satisfaction.

Process theories. Adams advanced his equity theory in 1963, suggesting that employees who feel their contributions are greater than the rewards they receive become demotivated. Ramlall (2004) described three key principles that formed the construction of equity theory: employees develop opinions about perceived equity based on their own contributions, these perceptions are evaluated against the perceived contributions of those

around them, and the level of perceived equity determines or impacts the employee's behavior. Within equity theory, factors individuals use to judge equity may include compensation, status, work assignments, and one's treatment by supervisors and managers.

Robbins and Judge (2019) described Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory as a correlation between the behaviors of employees and the expectation of a particular outcome. According to Turabik and Baskan (2015), Vroom suggested that motivation is a factor of valence and expectancy where valence describes the desirability of a particular reward to an employee and expectancy relates to the required effort to achieve the reward. Turabik and Baskan (2015) indicated that Lawler and Porter's (1967) expectancy theory diverges from Vroom's (1964) in several areas. One such difference is that Lawler and Porter's model emphasized equity in terms of the employee's perceived reward in relation to the effort expended as compared to the level of rewards of others in relation to the level of perceived effort exerted by that individual. Lawler and Porter's model more directly addressed the notion of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, which relate more closely to the hierarchy of needs theory espoused by Maslow (Turabik & Baskan, 2015).

Khan, Khan, Nawaz, and Qureshi (2010) described Locke's (1968) goal theory and stated that Locke suggested that motivation and satisfaction are significantly impacted in a positive manner when aspirations are appropriately articulated into written goals and performance feedback is offered. Research conducted by Locke and Latham (2006) provided evidence that there is a positive correlation between goal difficulty and performance regarding the stated goals. Factors affecting goal-setting theory include the

individual's commitment to the goal, the difficulty or complexity of the goal, the environmental impacts of the goal, and the feedback received toward goal achievement (Locke & Latham, 2006).

Hackman and Oldham (1975) suggested in their job characteristics theory that the degree to which specific factors can be incorporated into a job influences an employee's psychological degree of motivation and satisfaction. These authors suggested that when employees experience the opportunity to use more skills in the performance of the job, can see the totality of the work being produced or completed, and view that accomplishment as significant, they will experience increased levels of meaningfulness, autonomy, and knowledge of results, which in turn increases job motivation and satisfaction (Ramlall, 2004).

Employee Satisfaction Defined

The basic insights offered by the various motivation theories inform much of what is understood today about employee satisfaction, motivation, and the relationship between employee satisfaction and individual or organizational performance. These theories serve as the foundation for many employee satisfaction surveys. While precise and agreed-upon definitions of employee satisfaction are elusive, many subject matter experts agree on common themes related to the concept (Shuck & Wollard, 2010). Significant academic research exists around the concept of employee satisfaction. However, the current vernacular within practitioner-focused articles and professional development is more focused around the concept of employee engagement (Bailey et al., 2017; Kahn, 1990).

The exploration of job satisfaction dates back to the early 1900s and is classified into two primary categories: job satisfaction as an affective reaction or as a cognitive process (Zhu, 2013). Researchers who have focused on affective approaches have suggested that job satisfaction is formed based on moods, emotions, and attitudes. Researchers who have focused on cognitive approaches to job satisfaction have suggested that employee satisfaction is formed as a result of a mental action or process based on evaluation and prior experiences.

Fisher and Hanna (1932) suggested that job satisfaction, which they referred to as vocational adjustment or maladjustment, is essentially a result of one's own emotional state and that emotional dissatisfaction is unconsciously attached to or associated with employment. A study of job satisfaction in sales professionals defined job satisfaction in terms of employees' feelings around five key factors which included supervisors, the work itself, colleagues, compensation, and advancement opportunities (Churchill, Ford, & Walker, 1976). According to Zhu (2013), Locke (1968) advanced the concept of job satisfaction as an affective state that is created because of an individual's feelings about his or her role.

According to Zhu (2013), researchers who have focused on the cognitive view of job satisfaction, however, have suggested that employee satisfaction is the result of employee assessment based on experiences and expectations rather than a purely emotional reaction that could be influenced by factors outside the workplace. Zhu (2013) cited Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) who suggested that one's perceptions about work need not be classified merely as emotional reactions, but might alternatively be understood through a psychological perspective because of analysis and evaluation of

work factors. Moorman (1993) tested the Smith et al. (1983) hypothesis in his study of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures and found that some instruments involved more employee analysis of work conditions while other instruments demonstrated a greater focus on employee feelings without regard to the analysis of workplace conditions. Harrison, Newman, and Roth (2006) suggested that job satisfaction may also be viewed as an indicator of employee attitude.

Bailey, Madden, Alfes, and Fletcher (2017) analyzed and synthesized 214 employee engagement related studies to identify common elements within the studies. They classified the engagement studies into one of six categories which included personal role engagement, work task or job engagement, multidimensional engagement, engagement as a composite attitudinal and behavioral construct, engagement as a management practice, or self-engagement with performance. The researchers described personal role engagement consistent with Kahn's (1990) explanation of engagement as, "the individual's cogitative, emotional and physical expression of the authentic self at work" (Bailey et al., 2017, p. 34) and classified 11 of the 214 studies into this category.

Bailey et al. (2017) described work task or job engagement as an employee's views or reflections regarding work tasks and 148 of the 214 surveys reviewed were classified in this category. Multidimensional engagement was described as behavioral elements associated with individual performance and included six of the 214 studies. Engagement as a composite attitudinal and behavioral construct included two studies, while engagement as a management practice related to employee relationships and communication and included three studies (Bailey et al., 2017). Finally, the self-

engagement with performance category included one study that focused on one's level of commitment toward personal performance (Bailey et al., 2017).

It is important to note that some of the earliest analysis of the contemporary concept of employee engagement dates back to Kahn's (1990) study of factors that influence an employee to be psychologically connected or disconnected from work. Kahn described employee engagement as, "the harnessing of organization members' selves to their work roles; in engagement, people express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performance" (p. 694), and employee disengagement as, "the uncoupling of selves from work roles" where "people withdraw and defend themselves physically, cognitively, or emotionally during role performance" (p. 694). Kahn characterized the psychological elements related to engagement as meaningfulness, safety, and availability that addressed many factors such as management style and process, interactions with colleagues, and cultural and external conditions impacting meaningful participation in the workplace.

In addition to academic research, proprietary and practitioner-focused organizations have advanced the concept of employee engagement. According to Lee et al. (2016), the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) was founded in 1948 and represents more than 275,000 members in over 160 countries. The SHRM serves to advance the interests of its members, the human resources management profession, and the organizations it represents (Lee et al., 2016). Lee et al. (2016) suggested that employee engagement is the outcome of the conditions of the employment environment, the employee's perceptions about their role and workplace, and the resulting behaviors of the employee. Lee et al. (2016) further stated that conditions of employment are

determined by such factors as relationships, meaningfulness, and the ability to use skills and abilities.

A commonality exists among the various concepts of employee engagement and employee satisfaction. Significant individual or organization performance involves not only the employee's feelings and assessments about their actual job duties and tasks, but also their broader work environment including relationships with colleagues, direction received from organization leaders, and the degree of autonomy and professional development associated with their role. While the current study referred to the concept of employee satisfaction, the more complex and intricate elements often described as employee engagement were well aligned with theories of employee satisfaction and were examined as part of the study.

Research on Employee Satisfaction and Performance Outcomes

A number of practitioner-focused professional organizations offer employee satisfaction services to support planning in organizations and higher education institutions. Many of these organizations conduct or cite published research to support the value of the services they offer and indicate linkages between employee satisfaction and organizational financial health. The Gallup organization, Quantum Workplace, and SHRM are among the organizations offering employee satisfaction survey instruments and data that are often used within higher education to understand and plan relative to employee satisfaction and employee engagement.

The Gallup organization, whose presence traces back to 1935, has published findings related to the reported connection between employee engagement and productivity. Using a 12-question Gallup survey, Harter, Schmidt, Agrawal, Plowman,

and Blue (2016) assessed employee engagement related to nine specific areas: customer loyalty/engagement, profitability, productivity, turnover, safety incidents, shrinkage, absenteeism, patient safety incidents, and quality. Harter et al. (2016) reported the following results.

> Median differences between top-quartile and bottom-quartile units were 10% in customer ratings, 21% in profitability, 20% in sales production, 17% in production records, 24% in turnover (high-turnover organizations), 59% in turnover (low-turnover organizations), 70% in safety incidents, 28% in shrinkage, 41% in absenteeism, 58% in patient safety incidents and 40% in quality (defects). (p. 2)

Lee et al. (2016) described a 2015 SHRM survey of 600 employees that assessed employee needs related to job satisfaction and engagement. The study categorized 43 aspects of satisfaction and 37 aspects of engagement into eight key areas of focus that included career development, benefits, work environment, engagement opinions, compensation, employee relationships with management, conditions for engagement, and engagement behaviors (Lee et al., 2016). According to Vance (2006), a 2006 SHRM report characterized employee engagement as "the degree to which employees fully occupy themselves in their work, as well as the strength of their commitment to the employer and role" (p. 2). Vance offered a number of examples of organizations that have directly linked employee satisfaction and engagement to key business outcomes. The SHRM further suggested that a number of job satisfaction factors are conditions for the higher-level condition of engagement currently being advanced in corporate and academic environments. Conditions for engagement identified by the SHRM that are

addressed in the current study included ones' relationship with co-workers, the work itself, ones' relationship with the immediate supervisor, the organization's financial stability, and career development opportunities.

Quantum Workplace provides employee engagement services and products to human resources practitioners and sponsors the Best Places to Work Employee Engagement Survey in 47 regional and national markets throughout the U.S. (Quantum Workplace, n.d.). As reported in Quantum Workplace's summary of the analysis of 21 publicly traded organizations completing the Best Places to Work employee engagement survey for three consecutive years between 2010 and 2013, there were a number of financial differences between highly engaged organizations when compared to organizations showing lower engagement levels (Brown & Wright, n.d.). According to Brown and Wright (n.d.), Quantum found that those companies with the highest engagement scores reported 16.29% higher revenue growth over the three years than those companies with lower engagement scores. Companies with positively trending engagement growth over the study period reported 6.8% greater revenue growth than companies without positively trending engagement growth during the study period (Brown & Wright, n.d.). Additionally, the organizations with the highest levels of engagement reported 26% greater growth in stock price than those with lower levels of engagement (Brown & Wright, n.d.).

While practitioner-focused professional organizations have reported a strong correlation between business results and employee satisfaction or employee engagement, several academic researchers have supported different conclusions. Dusing (2017) examined 12 facets of job satisfaction in a higher education setting using data from the

ModernThink Higher Education Insight Survey. The 12 facets of job satisfaction were collaborative governance, professional/career development programs, teaching environment, compensation and benefits, facilities, workspace, and security, job satisfaction, work/life balance, confidence in senior leadership, supervisor/department chair relationship, respect and appreciation, tenure clarity and process, and diversity (Dusing, 2017). Dusing (2017) found a statistically significant relationship between the compensation job satisfaction facet and organizational performance as measure but not the remaining 11 job satisfaction facets.

Many researchers have studied employee satisfaction in higher education, however, most did not link employee satisfaction to organizational outcomes. Els (2017) found a weak relationship between employee satisfaction and the amount of professional development programs attended. Mabaso and Dlamini (2021) concluded that compensation significantly impacted employee satisfaction. While these and other similar studies have added to the body of knowledge about employee satisfaction, they did not address the impact of satisfaction on overall organizational outcomes.

Reio and Kidd (2006) offered four concerns in their review of literature regarding employee job satisfaction and organizational performance. These concerns included prior meta-analysis studies that indicated a low correlation between satisfaction and individual performance, the lack of a consistent financial measure to compare outcomes, limited research regarding satisfaction and organizational outcomes, and extremely limited research regarding employee satisfaction and organizational performance in nonprofit organizations.

In an effort to improve the linkages between performance and organizational outcomes, Saari and Judge (2004) conducted a comprehensive review of literature to identify where the practices of human resource professionals might not be well aligned with data available through academic research. Saari and Judge (2004) subsequently identified three areas of concern. Specifically, they suggested that practitioners might benefit from greater understanding of factors that influence employee attitudes, outcomes that are impacted by job satisfaction, and measures and interventions related to employee attitudes. Saari and Judge (2004) posited that employee attitudes are influenced by three key factors. These factors are dispositional, cultural, and work influences. Staw and Ross (1985) found in their study of over 5,000 participants that employee disposition remained relatively constant over a 5-year period despite career and organizational changes. Hofstede (1980, 1985) supported the notion of cultural influences on employee attitudes and satisfaction and found that survey respondents in different countries showed similarity around four attitudinal constructs which he defined as individualism-collectivism, risk versus risk-aversion, power distribution, and achievement orientation. The final area of misunderstanding regarding employee attitudes is the manner in which work situations influence attitudes (Saari & Judge, 2004). Kovach (1995) found that managers often incorrectly presume to know which work related factors are most important to employees, often believing compensation to be the most influential factor when employees of the study actually ranked interesting work as the most important work-related factor.

Meta-Analysis Studies and Literature Reviews

Several key meta-analysis studies have offered additional insight regarding the relationship between employee satisfaction and individual or organizational performance outcomes. Brayfield and Crockett (1955) conducted an extensive literature review of existing studies regarding the relationship between employee satisfaction and employee performance, examining more than 50 prior employee satisfaction studies. Vroom (1964) examined 20 employee satisfaction related studies. Petty, McGee, and Cavender (1984) examined 15 employee satisfaction related studies. Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985) examined 74 published employee satisfaction studies. Judge, Thoresen, Bono, and Patton (2001) examined 254 published and unpublished employee satisfaction research studies. Harter et al. (2002) examined the employee satisfaction of 7,936 business units in 36 companies. Collectively these meta-analyses assist in explaining the body of knowledge related to the relationship between employee satisfaction and individual and organizational performance.

Meta-analysis studies and literature reviews conducted to examine the relationship between employee satisfaction and individual or organizational performance suggested that the relationship might be less than what one might intuitively expect. After reviewing over 50 prior studies in industrial or occupational settings, Brayfield and Crockett (1955) suggested that the correlation between job satisfaction and individual job performance was questionable. Petty et al. (1984) cited the study by Vroom (1964), who reported similar outcomes in his study of 20 prior works and found only a median correlation of .14 between employee satisfaction and performance. The findings from

Brayfield and Crockett's (1955) and from Petty's et al. (1984) meta-analysis studies slowed research in employee satisfaction.

Petty et al. (1984) reexamined the relationship between individual job satisfaction and individual job performance and found a stronger correlation between employee satisfaction and performance than previously reported in studies by Brayfield and Crockett (1955), Vroom (1964), and Organ (1977). Petty et al. (1984) analyzed the relationship between overall job satisfaction, as measured by the JDI, and individual performance and found an average correlation of .31 for professional employee groups and .15 for nonprofessional employee groups which, when adjusted for attenuation, resulted in a .41 and .20 average correlation, respectively. Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985) reported a similar level of correlation (r = .29) when examining overall job satisfaction and performance but reported no significant correlation when examining individual job satisfaction facets and performance.

Other meta-analysis studies continued to add insights to the debate over the relationship between job satisfaction and performance. A 2001 meta-analysis of 312 studies involving a sample size of 54,417 by Judge et al. (2001) provided evidence of the correlation between job satisfaction and job performance to be .30. Harter et al. (2002) examined the relationship between employee satisfaction and the business unit outcomes of customer satisfaction, productivity, profit, employee turnover, and accidents in 7,939 business units in 36 companies and reported that satisfaction was related to business level outcomes.

Summary

Research regarding the relationship between employee satisfaction and organizational outcomes continues to be a relevant topic of inquiry in the contemporary workplace. Prior research, when reviewed holistically, has provided support that there is a correlation between overall job satisfaction and individual or organizational outcomes, despite the less impressive results when overall job satisfaction is categorized into more specific factors such as compensation, development, or management. Despite a significant number of studies on this topic, no academic research has been identified that establishes a definitive relationship between the multiple facets of employee satisfaction and organizational outcomes at nonprofit, higher education institutions. Chapter 3 explains the research methods used in the current study including the research design, selection of participants, measurement, data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and study limitations.

Chapter 3

Methods

Two purposes guided the current study. The first purpose was to identify the level of employee satisfaction at selected KICA institutions using the aJDI which measures five distinct facet scores (People on Your Present Job, Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision), and the overall level of employee satisfaction at the same institutions using the aJIG. The overall satisfaction reflected by the aJIG score is not an aggregate of the five specific satisfaction facets, but instead reflects how factors other than the five specific facets may be impacting overall employee satisfaction. The second purpose of the current study was to identify whether there is a difference in employee satisfaction as reported on the aJDI and aJIG based on the category of financial health of selected Kansas private, non-profit higher education institutions, as measured by the institution's CFI classification.

Research Design

A quantitative descriptive survey research design was utilized for this research study. The CFI score of each selected institution was categorized using HLC classifications and represents the categorical variable of interest reflecting organizational outcomes. Written consent to include the institution in the current study was obtained from the president of each selected institution (see Appendix B). In the written consent request, the president of each institution was asked to confirm that the current CFI score was accurate. The variables of interest in addition to the CFI score were the aggregated employee satisfaction scores of staff and faculty at each study institution as measured by five specific job facets of the aJDI (People on Your Present Job, Work on Present Job,

Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision), and overall satisfaction as measured by the aJIG scores. Statistical analyses were used to test if the level of employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean aJDI and aJIG scores, differed among selected Kansas independent higher education institutions based on the institution's CFI classification.

Selection of Participants

Purposive sampling involves making research participant selections based on the researcher's specific knowledge and experience (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008). Institutions included in the study were all members of the KICA. CFI scores reported to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ending between 07/01/17 and 06/30/2018 were used in the selection of the survey participants. Five institutions participated in the study ensuring employee satisfaction scores from institutions representing a variety of CFI scores were included in the study. The researcher made personal contact with the presidents from each of the five institutions selected to participate in the study to seek approval to distribute the survey instrument to employees (see Appendix B). Faculty and staff employees at each participating institution (N = 1,126) were invited to participate in the survey.

Measurement

For the purposes of this study, employee satisfaction was defined using the five survey facets of the aJDI (People on Your Present Job, Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision), and an overall measure of satisfaction provided by the aJIG, both of which were included on a single survey instrument (Stanton et al., 2001). Approval to use the aJDI and aJIG was sought from the Job

Descriptive Index Research Group at Bowling Green State University and approval was granted by Lexi Hirvo, JDI Research Assistant (see Appendix C).

The descriptive and demographic items, and aJDI and aJIG surveys were included on a single instrument (see Appendix D). Survey participants were asked to respond to five descriptive and demographic items. The descriptive and demographic items included the following:

1. Please identify the college or university that employs you and from whom you received this survey invitation.

NOTE: If you are employed by multiple institutions and received this survey invitation from more than one school, select and respond in accordance with the school that best represents your primary employer.

2. Select the description below that best describes your primary role at your institution.

a. Faculty

b. Staff Member

c. Management or Supervisory Employee (This includes supervisors, department or functional managers and directors, deans, department chairs, and vice presidents.)

d. Graduate Assistant

3. Select the option that best describes your status.

a. Full-Time (40 hours per week)

b. Less than 40 hours per week

4. Select the range below that identifies the total number of years you have worked in higher education.

a. 0-4

b. 5-9

c. 10-14

d. 15-19

e. 20-24

f. 25-29

g. 30 or more.

5. Select the range below that identifies the total number of years you have worked at your primary institution.

a. 0-4

b. 5-9

c. 10-14

d. 15-19

e. 20-24

f. 25-29

g. 30 or more.

On the aDJI and aJIG survey items, participants were asked to consider their current employment role and circumstances in a number of different employment facets and to respond to a series of adjectives indicating a "Y" for yes if the adjective was descriptive of their current job, a "N" for no if the adjective was not descriptive of their current job, or a "?" if they could not decide if the adjective was descriptive of their

current job. The adjectives in the *People on Your Present Job* facet are related to participants' experiences in their position specifically regarding the people they interact with in their work role. The adjectives in the *Work on Your Present Job* survey category are related to participants' experiences in their position specifically regarding the intrinsic value their current position offers. The items in the *Pay* survey category are related to participants' feelings about their compensation for the work conducted. The *Opportunities for Promotion* survey category are related to participants' expectations that their current role prepares them for career advancement. The items in the *Supervision* survey category are related to the supervision participants receive on their job. The aJIG, which is included in the aJDI instrument, includes eight additional adjectives related to what participants' jobs in general are like most of the time. This survey category identifies if factors other than the five primary job satisfaction factors used in the aJDI are influencing satisfaction. The faculty and staff member scores from the aJDI and aJIG were used in the data analysis in the current study.

The survey instrument used in the current study was scored using a systematic process of assigning a value of 3 to "Y" survey responses that were highly descriptive of the work environment, a value of 0 to "N" survey responses that were not highly descriptive of the work environment. A value of 1 was assigned to "?" survey responses that indicate the survey participant could not decide (Brodke et al., 2009). Because the aJDI and aJIG instruments include both positively and negatively worded adjectives, the initial scoring of negatively phrased adjectives that were selected as descriptive of the work environment were reversed to reflect a value of 0 rather than 3. In addition, the value of negatively worded adjectives that were not descriptive of the work environment

were reversed to reflect a value of 3 rather than 0. The scores for each of the five aJDI facets were derived by summing the values of each individual response to the six adjectives listed for each aJDI facet. The score for the aJIG index is derived by summing the values of each individual response to the eight adjectives listed for the aJIG index. Individual respondent scores for each facet of the aJDI ranged from 0-18 and individual respondent scores on the aJIG scale ranged from 0-24.

A meta-analysis conducted by Kinicki, McKee-Ryan, Schriesheim, and Carson (2002) assessed the construct validity of the JDI, the forerunner of the aJDI, for the first time since its creation and initial validation in 1969. The authors reported the following:

> The construct validity of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) was investigated by using a meta-analysis to summarize previous empirical studies that examined antecedents, correlates, and consequences of job satisfaction. In total, 79 unique correlates with a combined 1,863 correlations were associated with the JDI sub dimensions. The construct validity of the JDI was supported by (a) acceptable estimates of internal consistency and test–retest reliability, (b) results that conform to a nomological network of job satisfaction relationships, and (c) demonstrated convergent and discriminant validity. Contrasting results with previous meta-analytic findings offered further support for the JDI's construct validity. (p. 14)

Stanton et al. (2001) described the task of creating and testing an abridged version of the JDI, as explained below.

> A systematic scale-reduction technique was employed with the first sample to decide which items to retain in each scale. The abridged subscales were then

> tested in the second sample. Results indicated that the relationships among the five abridged subscales and between the five abridged subscales and other measures were substantially preserved. (p. 1104)

In 2008, the JDI research group at Bowling Green State University reduced the aJDI instrument response items from 72 to 30 while preserving the integrity of the instrument. Lake, Gopalkrishnan, Sliter, and Withrow (2010) detailed the most recent update to the JDI family of scales which included the aJDI used for this study. However, detailed validity data on the most recent update were not published at the time of the current study.

Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, and Paul (1989) introduced the JIG scale, an overall measure of employee satisfaction and the forerunner of the aJIG scale, to accompany the JDI, and reported the following:

> We applied both traditional and item response theory procedures for item analysis to data from three large heterogeneous samples (N = 1,149, 3,566, and 4,490). Alpha was .91 and above for the resulting 18-item scale in successive samples. Convergent and discriminant validity and differential response to treatments were demonstrated. Global scales are contrasted with composite and with facet scales in psychological measurement. We show that global scales are not equivalent to summated facet scales. Both facet and global scales were useful in another organization (N = 648). Some principles are suggested for choosing specific (facet), composite, or global measures for practical and theoretical problems. The correlations between global and facet scales suggest that work may be the most important facet in relation to general job satisfaction. (p. 193)

The aJIG scale represents a shortened version of the original JIG scale and was the survey used for this study along with the aJDI survey. Russell et al. (2004) described the process for determining validity and the findings.

> The combinatorial approach developed by Stanton (2000) was applied in this case to preserve the known validity relations between a popular measure of overall job satisfaction and measures of other theoretically pertinent constructs. By relying on a technique that maximizes covariance with the original scale and fine-tuning the reduced pool of items using rational judgment, we trimmed the JIG scale to only eight items with minimal impact on its reliability or validity. This technique is preferred over strategies relying solely on maximizing an abridged scale's internal consistency reliability. The aJIG scale nevertheless yielded alpha coefficients no smaller than .85, appreciably larger than the proposed minimum estimated reliabilities for comparable single-item measures (ranging from .45 to .69, depending on certain empirical and theoretical assumptions). (p. 890)

Institutions of higher education are required to annually report financial information as a condition of participating in Title IV funding programs to the U.S. Department of Education. The reported financial information is used to determine the institution's CFI score.

> Section 498(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, requires for-profit and non-profit institutions to annually submit audited financial statements to the Department to demonstrate they are maintaining the standards of financial responsibility necessary to participate in the Title IV programs. One of many

> standards, which the Department [of Education] utilizes to gauge the financial responsibility of an institution, is a composite of three ratios derived from an institution's audited financial statements. The three ratios are a primary reserve ratio, an equity ratio, and a net income ratio. These ratios gauge the fundamental elements of the financial health of an institution, not the educational quality of an institution. The composite score reflects the overall relative financial health of institutions along a scale from negative 1.0 to positive 3.0. (U.S. Department of Education, 2020, para 1-2)

The CFI classification variable was categorical with three classifications described by the regional accrediting body, the Higher Learning Commission. A CFI of 1.5 to 3.0 was classified as Above the Zone, a CFI of 1.0 to 1.4 was classified as In the Zone, and a CFI of -1.0 to 0.9 was classified as Below the Zone (HLC, 2020a) that would require additional monitoring. The recognition of the CFI by multiple educational oversight agencies as a meaningful measure of outcomes coupled with the consistent annual reporting of this score made it an appropriate choice for this study.

Data Collection Procedures

Prior to data collection, a request to conduct the study was submitted to the Baker University Institutional Review Board on January 14, 2021. Approval to conduct the study was received on January 15, 2021 (see Appendix E). The researcher obtained the CFI score for each institution included in the study from publicly available information through the Department of Education for the fiscal year ending between 07/01/17 and 06/30/2018. The survey, relevant information about the study, and request for participation by the researcher were communicated to employees at each institution by

the institution's human resources representative. The survey and related communication (see Appendix F) were distributed by email to employees. Paper surveys were offered to each human resources representative for any employee without access to email. However, all human resource representatives indicated that all employees had email access. Additional prompts to complete the survey were sent to all participants after the initial request until the survey was closed on 03/30/21 (see Appendix G).

Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

This section includes seven research questions as well as the associated hypotheses and a description of the data analysis used to test each hypothesis.

RQ1. What is the level of employee satisfaction, as measured by the five facets scores on the Abridged Job Descriptive Index (People on Your Present Job, Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision), and the scores on the Abridged Job in General Index, at selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions?

The mean, median, standard deviation, minimum, maximum, and sample size for each CFI category were calculated for each of the five facets scores of the aJDI (People on Your Present Job, Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision), and the score of the aJIG index.

RQ2. To what extent does employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index People on Your Present Job score, differ among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's Composite Financial Index classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9])?

H1. A statistically significant difference exists in the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index People on Your Present Job score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's CFI classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9]).

A one-factor ANOVA was conducted to test H1. The categorical variable, the institution's CFI classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9]), was used to group the dependent variable, the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index People on Your Present Job score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions. The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

RQ3. To what extent does employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Work on Present Job score, differ among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's Composite Financial Index classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9])?

H2. A statistically significant difference exists in the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Work on Present Job score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's CFI classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9]).

A second ANOVA was conducted to test H2. The categorical variable, the institution's CFI classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or

Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9]), was used to group the dependent variable, the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Work on Present Job score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions. The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

RQ4. To what extent does employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Pay score, differ among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's Composite Financial Index classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9])?

***H3*.** A statistically significant difference exists in the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Pay score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's CFI classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9]).

A third ANOVA was conducted to test H3. The categorical variable, the institution's CFI classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9]), was used to group the dependent variable, the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Pay score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions. The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

RQ5. To what extent does employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Opportunities for Promotion score, differ among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's Composite Financial Index classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9])?

H4. A statistically significant difference exists in the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Opportunities for Promotion score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's CFI classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9]).

A fourth ANOVA was conducted to test H4. The categorical variable, the institution's CFI classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9]), was used to group the dependent variable, the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Opportunities for Promotion score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions. The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

RQ6. To what extent does employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Supervision score, differ among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's Composite Financial Index classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9])?

***H5*.** A statistically significant difference exists in the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Supervision score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's CFI classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9]).

A fifth ANOVA was conducted to test H5. The categorical variable, the institution's CFI classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9]), was used to group the dependent variable, the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Supervision score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions. The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

RQ7. To what extent does employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean Abridged Job in General score, differ among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's Composite Financial Index classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9])?

***H6*.** A statistically significant difference exists in the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Job in General score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's CFI classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9]).

A sixth ANOVA was conducted to test H6. The categorical variable, the institution's CFI classification (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9]), was used to group the dependent variable, the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Job in General score, among selected Kansas private,

nonprofit education institutions. The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

Limitations

Lunenburg and Irby (2008) described limitations as factors outside of the control of the researcher that could affect the outcomes of the research. Four limitations may have affected the results of the current study.

1. While every effort was made to ensure a strong survey return at the selected institutions, participation may have been impacted by the relative importance placed on participation by institutional leaders.
2. The survey was administered at multiple institutions, each with its own institutional culture. The degree to which survey participants felt safe to respond honestly to survey items may have impacted the survey results.
3. The design of the survey included five descriptive and demographic items. Some participants may have believed their anonymity could be compromised by responses on the descriptive demographic questions of the survey and those respondents may have been reluctant to complete the survey or offer honest information.
4. Finally, institutions routinely conduct surveys often resulting in what is referred to as survey fatigue (Sinickas, 2007). This may have limited survey response rates.

Summary

This chapter explained the research methods used in the study. The research design, selection of study participants, measurement, data collection procedures, data

analysis and hypothesis testing, and limitations of the study were included in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 reports descriptive statistics and the results of the hypothesis testing.

Chapter 4

Results

Chapter 4 contains the results of the data analysis. Descriptive statistics and the results of the hypothesis testing are provided. The chapter is organized with the descriptive statistics section first. Included is the response rate, the recoding of the CFI classification, and participant demographics. The section containing the hypothesis testing results follows the descriptive statistics section.

Descriptive Statistics

Five Kansas private, nonprofit institutions participated in the study. The survey was sent to 1,126 employees. A total of 415 responses were received. Incomplete responses, responses from employees at campuses outside the state of Kansas, and graduate assistant responses were not included, resulting in 334 total responses included in the data analysis which represented a 29.66% response rate.

The initial research design included Kansas private, nonprofit institutions from all three CFI classification as described by the HLC accrediting body (Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0], In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4], or Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9]). At the time of the study no KICA institutions were classified in the middle range (In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4]) by the Federal Study Aid Office of the U.S. Department of Education. For the purposes of data analysis, the upper limit of the middle range was increased to 1.7 to create three distinct groups for the data analysis. The original and recoded categories are summarized in Table 1. The titles of the categories were also changed to avoid any implication that the categories were exact matches to the HLC categories specified previously. The revised

category titles are High CFI Range [1.8 to 3.0], Middle CFI Range [1.0 to 1.7], and Low CFI Range [-1.0 to .9].

Of the 334 usable responses, 65% were from employees at schools in the High CFI [1.8 to 3.0] category, 18% were from employees in the Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7] category, and 17% were from employees in the Low CFI [-1.0 to .9] category. Table 1 summarizes the number and percentage of respondents using the original CFI classification and recoded classification.

Table 1

Categorical Variable of Interest Recoding

Classification	*N*	%
Original CFI Classification		
Below the Zone [-1.0 to .9]	56	17
In the Zone [1.0 to 1.4]	0	0
Above the Zone [1.5 to 3.0]	278	83
Recoded CFI Classification		
Low CFI [-1.0 to .9]	56	17
Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7]	60	18
High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]	218	65

Of the 334 responses used in the analysis, 37% were from staff members, 37% were from faculty members, 35% were from management employees, and 1% did not identify their role. In total, 90% of respondents were full-time employees, 9% were part-time employees, and 1% did not identify their employment category. Fifty percent of the

respondents had worked in higher education nine years or less, 27% had worked in higher education 10-19 years, and 23% had worked in higher education for 20 or more years.

Hypothesis Testing

Research questions one through seven and associated hypotheses for research questions two through seven are presented below. The type of analysis used and hypothesis testing results follow research question two through seven and reflect the recoded CFI classification ranges and labels.

RQ1. What is the level of employee satisfaction, as measured by the five facets scores on the Abridged Job Descriptive Index (People on Your Present Job, Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision), and the scores on the Abridged Job in General Index, at selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions?

The mean, median, standard deviation, minimum, maximum, and sample size for each CFI category were calculated for each of the five facets scores of the aJDI (People on Your Present Job, Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision), and the score of the aJIG index. The results of the analysis indicated that survey respondents reported a relatively high level of satisfaction in the facets of People on Your Present Job, Work on Present Job, Supervision and a relatively high overall level of satisfaction as measured by the aJIG scores with mean survey scores of 2.59, 2.42, 2.34 and 2.49 respectively. Respondents reported a lower level of satisfaction with Pay and Opportunity for Promotion with mean survey scores of only 1.62 and 1.06 respectively. Table 2 provides the complete descriptive analysis of survey responses in

each of the five satisfaction facets and the overall level of satisfaction as measured by the aJIG.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for the Results for RQ1 (N = 334)

Facet	*M*	*Mdn*	*SD*
People	2.59	2.83	0.55
Work	2.42	2.67	0.68
Pay	1.62	1.67	1.04
Opportunity	1.06	1.00	0.90
Supervisor	2.34	2.67	0.85
JIG	2.49	2.63	0.64

RQ2. To what extent does employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index People on Your Present Job score, differ among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's Composite Financial Index classification (High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]), Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], Low CFI [-1.0 to .9]?

***H1*.** A statistically significant difference exists in the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index People on Your Present Job score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's CFI classification (High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]), Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], Low CFI [-1.0 to .9].

A one-factor ANOVA was conducted to test H1. The categorical variable, the institution's CFI classification (High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]), Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], Low CFI [-1.0 to .9], was used to group the dependent variable, the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index People on Your Present Job score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit

education institutions. The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(2, 331) = 1.211$, $p = .299$. See Table 3 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. No difference exists in the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index People on Your Present Job score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the CFI classification. H1 was not supported.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H1

CFI Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Low CFI [-1.0 to .9]	2.54	0.54	56
Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7]	2.69	0.45	60
High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]	2.58	0.58	218

RQ3. To what extent does employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Work on Present Job score, differ among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's Composite Financial Index classification (High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]), Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], Low CFI [-1.0 to .9]?

***H2*.** A statistically significant difference exists in the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Work on Present Job score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit

education institutions based on the institution's CFI classification (High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]), Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], Low CFI [-1.0 to .9].

A second ANOVA was conducted to test H2. The categorical variable, the institution's CFI classification (High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]), Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], Low CFI [-1.0 to .9], was used to group the dependent variable, the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Work on Present Job score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions. The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(2, 331) = 2.512$, $p = .083$. See Table 4 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. No difference exists in the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Work on Your Present Job score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the CFI classification. H2 was not supported.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H2

CFI Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Low CFI [-1.0 to .9]	2.51	.53	56
Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7]	2.25	.81	60
High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]	2.45	.67	218

RQ4. To what extent does employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Pay score, differ among selected Kansas private,

nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's Composite Financial Index classification (High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]), Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], Low CFI [-1.0 to .9]?

H3. A statistically significant difference exists in the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Pay score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's CFI classification (High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]), Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], Low CFI [-1.0 to .9].

A third ANOVA was conducted to test H3. The categorical variable, the institution's CFI classification (High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]), Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], Low CFI [-1.0 to .9], was used to group the dependent variable, the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index *Pay* score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions. The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(2, 331) = 2.293$, $p = .103$. See Table 5 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. No difference exists in the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Pay score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the CFI classification. H3 was not supported.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H3

CFI Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Low CFI [-1.0 to .9]	1.43	1.05	56
Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7]	1.84	1.03	60
High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]	1.61	1.03	218

RQ5. To what extent does employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Opportunities for Promotion score, differ among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's Composite Financial Index classification (High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]), Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], Low CFI [-1.0 to .9]?

H4. A statistically significant difference exists in the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Opportunities for Promotion score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's CFI classification (High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]), Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], Low CFI [-1.0 to .9].

A fourth ANOVA was conducted to test H4. The categorical variable, the institution's CFI classification (High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]), Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], Low CFI [-1.0 to .9], was used to group the dependent variable, the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Opportunities for Promotion score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions. The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

The results of the analysis indicated a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(2, 331) = 5.342$, $p = .005$, $\eta^2 = .031$. See Table 6 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A follow up post hoc was conducted to determine which pairs of means were different. The Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) post hoc was conducted at $\alpha = .05$. Two of the differences were significant. The Low CFI [-1.0 to .9] category mean ($M = 1.41$) was higher than the

Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7] category mean (*M* = 1.00). The Low CFI [-1.0 to .9] category mean (*M* = 1.41) was higher than the High CFI [1.8 to 3.0] category (*M* = 0.98). H4 was supported. The effect size indicated a small effect.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H4

CFI Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Low CFI [-1.0 to .9]	1.41	1.01	56
Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7]	1.00	0.87	60
High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]	0.98	0.87	218

RQ6. To what extent does employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Supervision score, differ among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's Composite Financial Index classification (High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]), Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], Low CFI [-1.0 to .9]?

***H5*.** A statistically significant difference exists in the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Supervision score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's CFI classification (High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]), Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], Low CFI [-1.0 to .9].

A fifth ANOVA was conducted to test H5. The categorical variable, the institution's CFI classification (High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]), Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], Low CFI [-1.0 to .9], was used to group the dependent variable, the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index *Supervision* score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions. The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for

a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(2, 331) = .242$, $p = .785$. See Table 7 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. No difference exists in the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Supervision score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the CFI classification. H5 was not supported.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H5

CFI Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Low CFI [-1.0 to .9]	2.29	.92	56
Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7]	2.40	.83	60
High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]	2.33	.84	218

RQ7. To what extent does employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean Abridged Job in General score, differ among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's Composite Financial Index classification (High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]), Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], Low CFI [-1.0 to .9]?

H6. A statistically significant difference exists in the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Job in General score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the institution's CFI classification (High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]), Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], Low CFI [-1.0 to .9].

A sixth ANOVA was conducted to test H6. The categorical variable, the institution's CFI classification (High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]), Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], Low CFI

[-1.0 to .9], was used to group the dependent variable, the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Job in General score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions. The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(2, 331) = .994$, $p = .371$. See Table 8 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. No difference exists in the mean Abridged Job Descriptive Index Job in General score, among selected Kansas private, nonprofit education institutions based on the CFI classification. H6 was not supported.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H6

CFI Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Low CFI [-1.0 to .9]	2.47	.66	56
Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7]	2.39	.70	60
High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]	2.52	.62	218

Summary

Chapter 4 included descriptive statistics describing characteristics of study respondents and the data analysis and the hypothesis testing for six research questions that guided the study. Chapter 5 contains a summary of the study, which includes a review of the problem and methodology, and presents the major findings. Chapter 5 also contains findings related to the literature, recommendations for future research, and concluding remarks.

Chapter 5

Interpretation and Recommendations

The intent of this study was to examine the relationship between employee job satisfaction and the financial health of Kansas independent colleges and universities. Chapter 5 begins with a summary of the study. The chapter concludes with findings related to the literature, conclusions, implications for future actions, recommendations for further research, and concluding remarks.

Study Summary

Researchers have suggested more highly satisfied workforces achieve greater organizational outcomes (Melián-González et al., 2015; Zhu, 2013). Despite the existence of significant research, few studies have focused specifically on employee satisfaction and its relationship to financial health in nonprofit or higher educational organizations. The next sections include an overview of the problem, the purpose statement and research questions, review of the research methodology, and major findings.

Overview of the problem. Kansas private, nonprofit colleges and universities play a significant role in serving the educational needs of U.S. post-secondary students and serve an important economic and social role in the state. The KICA, which exists to advance the competitive standing of its member institutions, does not analyze employee satisfaction levels (KICA, n.d.) within member institutions and has not studied the relationship between employee satisfaction and the financial health of its member institutions (personal communication, August 17, 2020). Many individual institutions

have not, or are unable, to devote resources to studying employee satisfaction and any relationship it might have to financial outcomes.

Purpose statement and research questions. Two purposes guided the current study. The first purpose was to identify the level of employee satisfaction at selected KICA institutions using the Abridged Job Descriptive Index (aJDI) which measures five distinct facet scores (People on Your Present Job, Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision), and the overall level of employee satisfaction at the same institutions using the Abridged Job in General Scale (aJIG). The overall satisfaction reflected by the aJIG score is not an aggregate of the five specific satisfaction facets, but instead reflects how factors other than the five specific facets may be impacting overall employee satisfaction. The second purpose of the current study was to identify whether there is a difference in employee satisfaction as reported on the aJDI and aJIG based on the category of financial health of the selected Kansas independent higher education institutions, as measured by the Composite Financial Index (CFI) classification.

Review of the methodology. A quantitative descriptive survey research design was utilized for this research study. The CFI score of each selected institution was categorized using revised CFI classifications and represents the categorical variable of interest reflecting organizational outcomes. The variables of interest in addition to the institution's CFI score were the aggregated employee satisfaction scores of staff and faculty at each study institution as measured by five specific job facets of the aJDI (People on Your Present Job, Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision), and overall satisfaction as measured by the aJIG scores. The aJDI and

aJIG survey was replicated in an identical format using the survey development software Survey Monkey which also included five descriptive and demographic items. Survey invitations were sent out by the designated human resources representative at each institution using the institutions' email system. Survey data were retrieved and processed using Microsoft Excel and SPSS programs. Statistical analyses were performed in SPSS to test if the level of employee satisfaction, as measured by the mean aJDI and aJIG scores, differed among selected Kansas independent higher education institutions based on the institution's revised CFI classification (High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]), Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], Low CFI [-1.0 to .9]. To conduct the study, employees from five Kansas private, nonprofit higher education institutions were surveyed regarding five distinct employment satisfaction facets and overall employment satisfaction. An ANOVA was conducted for each employment satisfaction facet and overall employment satisfaction using the institution's CFI classification (Low CFI [-1.0 to .9], Middle CFI [1.0 to 1.7], High CFI [1.8 to 3.0]) as the categorical variable.

Major findings. As shown in Table 2, the results of the descriptive analysis indicated that survey respondents reported a relatively high level of satisfaction for the facets of People on Your Present Job, Work on Present Job, Supervision and a relatively high overall level of satisfaction as measured by the aJIG scores. Respondents reported a much lower level of satisfaction with Pay and Opportunity for Promotion. Of the five specific job facets measured by the aJDI (People on Your Present Job, Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision), and overall satisfaction as measured by the aJIG scores, the mean score for Opportunities for Promotion reflected a difference based on the revised CFI classification. Employees from institutions in the

lowest CFI category reflected higher satisfaction on the Opportunities for Promotion facet despite respondents from institutions in all categories rating this satisfaction facet lower than most other satisfaction facets.

Findings Related to the Literature

A positive relationship between employee satisfaction and individual and organizational outcomes has been suggested by several researchers (Carnegie, 2012; Gallup, 2013; Harvard Business Review Analytic Services, 2013) though the exact nature of the relationship remains a matter of debate. Prior research, when reviewed holistically, has provided support that there is a positive correlation between overall job satisfaction and individual or organizational outcomes (Petty et al., 1984; Judge et al., 2001; Harter et al., 2002). However, other researchers (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955; Vroom, 1964) have reported less impressive results when overall job satisfaction is categorized into more specific factors of satisfaction such as compensation, development, or management.

Other than the Opportunities for Promotion employee satisfaction facet, the examination of the relationship between employee satisfaction and the financial health of Kansas private, nonprofit colleges and universities indicated that financial health as measured by the institution's CFI score as an indication of organizational outcomes did not significantly impact satisfaction in any satisfaction facets, including overall satisfaction. This finding in the current study differs from studies conducted by Carnegie (2012), Gallup (2013), Harvard Business Review Analytic Services (2013), Harter et al. (2002), Judge et al. (2001), and Petty et al. (1984). In the current study there was not a significant difference in employee satisfaction with pay among employees from institutions with different CFI score classifications as found by Dusing (2017). Findings

from the current study indicated that employees from institutions in the lowest CFI category experienced higher satisfaction with Opportunities for Promotion despite respondents from institutions in all CFI categories rating this satisfaction facet lower than other satisfaction facets. This finding is more aligned with the suggestions of Brayfield and Crockett (1955) and Vroom (1964) that reported less impressive results when overall job satisfaction is categorized into more specific factors of satisfaction such as compensation, development, or management than with the findings of Carnegie (2012), Gallup (2013), and Harvard Business Review Analytic Services (2013) which found positive relationships between employee satisfaction and individual and organizational outcomes.

Conclusions

The current study was designed to analyze the relationship between employee satisfaction and the financial health of Kansas independent colleges and universities as measured by the institutional CFI score. The results of the study have implications for human resource practitioners within higher education and future researchers studying employee satisfaction and institutional outcomes in higher education. The current research represents one of the few attempts to understand employee satisfaction in higher education at the organizational level using a common measure of organizational outcomes. The findings of this study, which demonstrated an inverse relationship between Opportunities for Promotion and CFI classification, present opportunities to understand any specific actions that might have been taken by study institutions in the lowest CFI classification category that might have increased satisfaction with the Opportunities for Promotion facet.

Implications for action. Three actions are recommended based on the findings of the current study:

1. The researcher will share the results of this study with the KICA presidents and human resources professionals who participated in the study.
2. An executive summary that includes the respective aggregate responses for each of the aJIG facets and the aJDI overall satisfaction score will be provided to the human resources director and president of each participating institution by the researcher. The mean sores across institutions participating in the study will be included in the executive summary for comparison purposes. Having results specific to the institution as well as aggregate comparative data may promote strategic planning focused on job satisfaction and employee retention.
3. Study institutions should repeat the survey at appropriate intervals to assess the impact of any planning actions that are implemented on employee satisfaction.

Recommendations for future research. This study contributed to the body of knowledge about employee satisfaction, specifically at Kansas private, nonprofit institutions of higher education. Five recommendations for future research include the following:

1. The study included only five private, nonprofit institutions within a single state. Future research should replicate this study including more institutions in the Midwest or other geographic locations throughout the U.S.
2. The current study included only small private, nonprofit institutions. Future research should be conducted utilizing institutions with larger employee populations.

3. All participating institutions were private, nonprofit institutions. Future research should be conducted with employees of public higher education institutions.
4. The current study included institutions in rural and urban geographic locations. Future research should seek to understand the impact that economic differences may have on satisfaction based on the geographic location of the survey institutions.
5. The current study used a quantitative research design in the analysis of satisfaction. Future qualitative research studies may advance understanding about employee satisfaction.

Concluding remarks. Despite not showing a relationship between the financial health of the institution and four of the five employee satisfaction facets of the aJDI or overall satisfaction as measured by the aJIG, the current study expanded the knowledge of the relationship between employee satisfaction and overall financial outcomes at private, nonprofit higher education institutions. The study findings provide valuable information to the leaders of participating institutions regarding the level of employee satisfaction at their respective institutions which can aid in employee retention. Future researchers may wish to alter the design or specific variables of this study to further explore the relationship of employee satisfaction with overall financial health and outcomes at private, nonprofit educational institutions.

References

Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *67*(5), 422-436.

Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *4*(2), 142-175.

Alshmemri, M., Shahwan-Akl, L., & Maude, P. (2017). Herzberg's two-factor theory. *Life Science Journal*, *14*(5), 12-16.

Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K., & Fletcher, L. (2017). The meaning, antecedents, and outcomes of employee engagement: A narrative synthesis. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *19*(1), 31-53.

Brayfield, A. H., & Crockett, W. H. (1955). Employee attitudes and employee performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, *52*(5), 396.

Bridgman, T., Cummings, S., & Ballard, J. (2019). Who built Maslow's pyramid? A history of the creation of management studies' most famous symbol and its implications for management education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *18*(1), 81-98.

Brodke, M. R., Sliter, M. T., Balzer, W. K., Gillespie, J. Z., Gillespie, M. A., Gopalkrishnan, P., & Yankelevich, M. (2009). *The Job Descriptive Index and Job in General: 2009 revision quick reference guide*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.

Brown, A., & Wright, H. (n.d.). *Let us help turn human capital into cash* [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from http://marketing.quantumworkplace.com/hubfs/Website/Resources/PDFs/11-Reasons-to-Be-Bullish-About-Employee-Engagement-Impacting-Financial-Success.pdf?hsCtaTracking=6cd53eaf-661d-478e-912e-42b401f262d0%7C4fbd2892-e3b5-48f6-80fe-0618998f83a9

Carnegie, D. (2012). *What drives employee engagement and why it matters* [White paper]. Retrieved from https://www.ascensionbenefits.com/news/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Why-Employee-Engagement-Matters.pdf

Caulton, J. R. (2012). The development and use of the theory of ERG: A literature review. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, *5*(1), 2-8.

Churchill, G. A., Jr. Ford, N. M., & Walker O. C., Jr. (1976). Organizational climate and job satisfaction in the salesforce. *Journal of Marketing Research, 13*(4), 323-332.

Dusing, R. P. (2017). *Examining the relationship between employee satisfaction and organizational performance in higher education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest (10690932.)

Economic Modeling Specialists International. (2014, April). *Demonstrating the economic value of the Kansas Independent College Association.* Retrieved from http://www.kscolleges.org/_assets/docs/economic-impact/Main-Report.pdf

Els, J. J. (2017). The Relationship between Professional Development and Employee Satisfaction at a Higher Education Institution [Doctoral dissertation, Baker University]. http://www.bakeru.edu/images/pdf/SOE/EdD_Theses/ElsJamie.pdf .

Fisher, V. E., & Hanna, V. J. (1932). The dissatisfied worker. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 75*(5), 589.

Gallup, I. (2013). *State of the American workplace: Employee engagement insights for US business leaders*. Retrieved from http://www. gallup.com

Ghazi, S. R., Shahzada, G., & Khan, M. S. (2013). Resurrecting Herzberg's two factor theory: An implication to the university teachers. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, *3*(2), 445.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *60*(2), 159.

Harrison, D. A., Newman, D. A., & Roth, P. L. (2006). How important are job attitudes? Meta-analytic comparisons of integrative behavioral outcomes and time sequences. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*(2), 305-325.

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., Agrawal, S., Plowman, S. K., & Blue, A. (2016). *The relationship between engagement at work and organizational outcomes*. Washington, DC: Gallup Poll Consulting University Press.

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(2), 268.

Harvard Business Review Analytic Services. (2013, April 20). The impact of employee engagement on performance. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from https://hbr.org/sponsored/2016/04/the-impact-of-employee-engagement-on-performance

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

Higher Learning Commission. (2019). *Criteria for accreditation*. Retrieved from http://download.hlcommission.org/policy/updates/AdoptedCriteriaRevision_2019_INF.pdf

Higher Learning Commission. (2020a). *Accreditation: Indicators*. Retrieved from https://www.hlcommission.org/Accreditation/indicators.html

Higher Learning Commission. (2020b). *Accreditation: Institutional update*. Retrieved from https://www.hlcommission.org/Accreditation/institutional-update.html

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Vol. 5). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1985). The interaction between national and organizational value systems *Journal of Management Studies*, *22*(4), 347-357.

Hussar, W. J., & Bailey, T. M. (2014). *Projections of educational statistics to 2022* (NCES 2014-051). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics

Iaffaldano, M. T., & Muchinsky, P. M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *97*(2), 251.

Ironson, G. H., Smith, P. C., Brannick, M. T., Gibson, W. M., & Paul, K. B. (1989). Construction of a Job in General scale: A comparison of global, composite, and specific measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(2), 193.

Jaschik, S., & Lederman, D. (2019). The 2019 Inside Higher Ed survey of college and university business officers. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/booklet/2019-survey-college-and-university-business-officers

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *127*(3), 376.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, *33*(4), 692-724.

Kansas Independent College Association. (n.d.). *Welcome to KICA.* Retrieved May 18, 2020, from http://www.kscolleges.org/

Kansas Independent College Association. (2020). *2020 legislative factbook*. Retrieved May 19, 2020, from https://www.dropbox.com/s/vjdolrylmmc2ynv/2020%20FB%20PDF.pdf?dl=0

Khan, A. S., Khan, S., Nawaz, A., & Qureshi, Q. A. (2010). Theories of job satisfaction: Global applications and limitations. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, *26*(2), 45-62.

Kinicki, A. J., McKee-Ryan, F. M., Schriesheim, C. A., & Carson, K. P. (2002). Assessing the construct validity of the Job Descriptive Index: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(1), 14.

Kopelman, R. E., Prottas, D. J., & Davis, A. L. (2008). Douglas McGregor's theory X and Y: Toward a construct-valid measure. *Journal of Managerial Issues, XX*(2), 255-271.

Kovach, K. A. (1995). Employee motivation: Addressing a crucial factor in your organization's performance. *Employment Relations Today, 22*(2), 93-107.

Lake, C. J., Gopalkrishnan, P., Sliter, M. T., & Withrow, S. (2010). The Job Descriptive Index: Newly updated and available for download. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist, 48*(1), 47-49.

Lawler, E. E., III & Porter, L. W. (1967). Antecedent attitudes of effective managerial performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 2*(2), 122-142.

Lee, C., Alonso, A., Esen, E., Coombs, J., Mulvey, T., Victor, J., & Ng, H. (2016). *Employee job satisfaction and engagement: Revitalizing a changing workforce*. Retrieved August 18, 2020, https://www.shrm.org/hr-today/trends-and-forecasting/research-and-surveys/Documents/2016-Employee-Job-Satisfaction-and-Engagement-Report.pdf

Locke, E. A. (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 3*(2), 157-189.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2006). New directions in goal-setting theory. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 15*(5), 265-268.

Lunenburg, F. C., & Irby, B. J. (2008). *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation: Tips and strategies for students in the social and behavioral sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Mabaso, C. M. ., & Dlamini, B. I. . (2021). Recent study on the impact of compensation and benefits on job satisfaction. *Insights into Economics and Management* 7, 55–68. https://doi.org/10.9734/bpi/ieam/v7/1575C

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, *50*(4), 370 - 396.

May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *77*(1), 11-37.

McClelland, D. C. (1961). *Achieving society* (No. 15). New York, NY: The Free Press.

McFarland, J., Hussar, B., Zhang, J., Wang, X., Wang, K., Hein, S.,… Purcell, S. (2019). *The condition of education 2019* (NCES 2019-144). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Melián-González, S., Bulchand-Gidumal, J., & López-Valcárcel, B. (2015). New evidence of the relationship between employee satisfaction and firm economic performance. *Personnel Review*, *44*, 906-929. doi:10.1108/PR-01-2014-0023

Mohamed, R. K. M. H., & Nor, C. S. M. (2013). The relationship between McGregor's XY theory management style and fulfillment of psychological contract: A literature review. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *3*(5), 715.

Moorman, R. H. (1993). The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Relations*, *46*(6), 759-776.

National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities. (2019). *Private colleges: FactFile 2019.* Retrieved June 20, 2020, from https://www.naicu.edu/research-resources/private-college-factfile-2019

Organ, D. W. (1977). A reappraisal and reinterpretation of the satisfaction-causes-performance hypothesis. *Academy of Management Review*, 2(1), 46-53.

Petty, M. M., McGee, G. W., & Cavender, J. W. (1984). A meta-analysis of the relationships between individual job satisfaction and individual performance. *Academy of Management Review*, *9*(4), 712-721.

Quantum Workplace. (n.d.). Retrieved August 17, 2020, from https://www.quantumworkplace.com/best-places-to-work

Ramlall, S. (2004). A review of employee motivation theories and their implications for employee retention within organizations. *Journal of American Academy of Business, 5*(1/2), 52-63.

Reio, T. G., Jr., & Kidd, C. A. (2006). *An exploration of the impact of employee job satisfaction, affect, job performance, and organizational financial performance: A review of the literature*. Louisville, KY: University of Louisville.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. (2019). *Organizational behavior*. New York, NY: Pearson.

Rothbard, N. P., & Patil, S. V. (2011). Being there: Work engagement and positive organizational scholarship. In G. M. Spreitzer & K. S. Cameron (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of positive organizational scholarship*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press

Royle, M. T., & Hall, A. T. (2012). The relationship between McClelland's theory of needs, feeling individually accountable, and informal accountability for others. *International Journal of Management and Marketing Research*, *5*(1), 21-42.

Russell, S. S., Spitzmüller, C., Lin, L. F., Stanton, J. M., Smith, P. C., & Ironson, G. H. (2004). Shorter can also be better: The Abridged Job in General scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *64*(5), 878-893.

Saari, L. M., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management, 43*(4), 395-407.

Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2010). Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. *Human Resource Development Review, 9*(1), 89-110.

Sinickas, A. (2007). Finding a cure for survey fatigue. *Strategic Communication Management, 11*(2), 11.

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*(4), 653.

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

Snyder, T. D., de Brey, C., & Dillow, S. A. (2019). *Digest of education statistics 2018*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Stanton, J. M. (2000). Empirical distributions of correlations as a tool for scale reduction. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, *32*(3), 403-406.

Stanton, J. M., Sinar, E. F., Balzer, W. K., Julian, A. L., Thorensen, P., Aziz, S.,… Smith, P. C. (2001). Development of a compact measure of job satisfaction: The abridged Job Descriptive Index. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *61*(6), 1104-1122.

Staw, B. M., & Ross, J. (1985). Stability in the midst of change: A dispositional approach to job attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 70*(3), 469.

Tahey, P., Salluzzo, R., Prager, F., Mezzina, L., & Cowen, C. (2010). *Strategic financial analysis for higher education: Identifying, measuring & reporting financial risks*. New York, NY: Prager, Sealy, & Co.; KPMG; and Attain.

Tamborini, C. R., Kim, C., & Sakamoto, A. (2015). Education and lifetime earnings in the United States. *Demography*, *52*(4), 1383-1407.

Turabik, T., & Baskan, G. A. (2015). The importance of motivation theories in terms of education systems. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *186*, 1055-1063.

U.S. Department of Education. (2020, February 1). *Financial responsibility composite scores*. Retrieved February 21, 2020, from https://studentaid.gov/data-center/school/composite-scores

Vance, R. J. (2006). *Effective practice guidelines: Employee engagement and commitment*. Retrieved February 10, 2021, from https://www.shrm.org/foundation/ourwork/initiatives/resources-from-past-initiatives/Documents/Employee%20Engagement%20and%20Commitment.pdf

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

Zhu, Y. (2013). A review of job satisfaction. *Asian Social Science*, *9*(1), 293.

Appendices

Appendix A: Composite Financial Index

HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION

2020 Institutional Update Report

Financial Data Worksheet for Private NFP Institutions

Financial Ratios					
Primary Reserve Ratio Calculation:		**Data**	**Strength**	**Weight**	**CFI**
Net assets with donor restrictions	+	0.0			
Net assets without donor restrictions	+	0.0			
Annuities, term endowments & life income funds with donor restrictions	-	0.0			
Intangible assets	-	0.0			
Net property, plant and equipment (PP&E)	-	0.0			
All debt obtained for long-term purposes (not to exceed total PP&E)	+	0.0			
Post-employment and defined benefit pension liabilities	+	0.0			
Unsecured related-party receivables	-	0.0			
Expendable Net Assets		0.0			
Total Expenses and Losses Without Donor Restrictions		0.0			
Primary Reserve Ratio =	÷	**#DIV/0!**	**#DIV/0!**	**0.40**	**#DIV/0!**
Equity Ratio Calculation:					
Net assets with and without donor restrictions	+	0.0			
Intangible assets	-	0.0			
Unsecured related-party receivables	-	0.0			
Modified Net Assets		0.0			
Total assets	+	0.0			
Unsecured related-party receivables	-	0.0			
Intangible assets	-	0.0			
Modified Assets		0.0			
Equity Ratio =	÷	**#DIV/0!**	**#DIV/0!**	**0.40**	**#DIV/0!**
Net Income Ratio Calculation:					
Change in net assets without donor restrictions		0.0			
Total unrestricted revenue		0.0			
Net Income Ratio =	÷	**#DIV/0!**	**#DIV/0!**	**0.20**	**#DIV/0!**
COMPOSITE FINANCIAL INDICATOR SCORE (CFI)					**#DIV/0!**

Notes:

Data used to complete ratios should be based on the most current audited financial statements.

For further details on each line item in this section and a crosswalk from the previous model to the current model, refer to:
https://www.nacubo.org/Publications/Advisories/AR-19-04-Financial-Responsibility-Standards

If the strength factor score for ANY ratio is greater than or equal to 3, the strength factor score for that ratio is 3. If the strength factor score for ANY ratio is less than or equal to -1, the strength factor score is -1.

Income and capital gains and losses from Restricted investments should be recorded as changes to restricted assets.

Appendix B: Institution President Request for Consent

Dear Dr. _____,

I am writing to you at the recommendation of Matt Lindsey, KICA President, in hopes of gaining consent for employees of your institution to participate in a short employee survey I am conducting as part of my doctoral dissertation at Baker University. The survey being used is the combined Abridged Job Descriptive Index and Abridged Job in General Survey. The survey is attached along with the accompanying descriptive and demographic questions to be asked.

Participation is being requested of select KICA member institutions representing various Composite Financial Index (CFI) score ranges as identified by the Department of Education and the Higher Learning Commission with the hope of gaining greater understanding of the relationship between employee satisfaction and institutional financial outcomes, if any. Individual institutions will not be identified in the study. However, summary data from the survey for your institution and aggregated data for all participating institutions will be provided to you to assist in future planning regarding employee satisfaction.

I am confident participation will not only advance the body of knowledge in this area of study, but also help inform KICA and each participating institution about areas of strength and opportunity. Please respond to this email with your consent to have employees complete the survey instrument and your school's CFI score for the fiscal year ending between 07/01/2018 and 06/30/2019 as reported to the Department of Education.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of my request. Upon approval, I will work with your human resource office or other designated individual to coordinate the

administration of the survey. I can be reached at jeredmarrant@stu.bakeru.edu or (816) 591-1854. Dr. Tes Mehring serves as the Major Advisor on this study and can also be reached for questions at tes.mehring@bakeru.edu.

Appendix C: Instrument Approval

From: JDI Research Assistance [mailto:jdi_ra@bgsu.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 5, 2020 6:27 AM
To: Dale Marrant <dale.marrant@cleveland.edu>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] AJDI and AJIG Permission Letter

Hi Dale,

Thank you for reaching out. You have our permission to use the AJDI and AJIG. Please let us know if you have any questions.

Best,
Lexi

Lexi Hirvo
JDI Research Assistant
Bowling Green State University
Email: jdi_ra@bgsu.edu
Tel: (419) 372-2693
http://www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/psychology/services/job-descriptive-index.html

From: Dale Marrant <dale.marrant@cleveland.edu>
Sent: Saturday, October 3, 2020 11:00 AM
To: JDI Research Assistance <jdi_ra@bgsu.edu>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] AJDI and AJIG Permission Letter
Importance: High

I am preparing to request IRB approval for my dissertation at Baker University in Overland Park, KS. My study involves completing an analysis of variation using data from select independent higher education institutions in the state of Kansas to determine if employee satisfaction scores as measured by the AJDI and AJIG scales correlate in any way with the institution's Composite Financial Index (CFI) classification as reported to the Department of Education annually.

Please let me know of any additional steps to obtain this formal approval. Thank you for your consideration.

Dale

J. Dale Marrant, MBA, SPHR, SHRM-SCP
Vice President of Human Resources and Organizational Development
Cleveland University-Kansas City
Chiropractic and Health Sciences

direct: 913.234.0612
main: 913.234.0600
10850 Lowell Avenue, Overland Park, Kansas 66210
www.cleveland.edu

Appendix D: Survey Instrument

Welcome to My Survey

I am currently a doctoral student at Baker University, working to complete my dissertation. As part of this study I am investigating the relationship of employee satisfaction and financial health at select schools within the Kansas Independent Colleges Association. I kindly ask for your participation in this survey. Bearing in mind the value of your time, the entire survey should take no longer than 15 minutes for you to complete. The multiple choice instrument being used in this study is the 2009 revision of the *Abridged Job Descriptive Index including Abridged Job in General Scale*. There are no risks or discomforts associated with participating in this study. More information about this survey instrument can be found at:

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

Please rest assured all responses will be kept confidential and combined with responses from other participants in summary form, ensuring that your individual responses will not be identifiable. The completion of the survey will indicate your consent to participate. Finally, please know you can skip any question(s) on the survey that cause you concern. Likewise, you may discontinue participation at any point during the survey.

Thank you in advance for your time and participation in the study. I sincerely appreciate your willingness to support this work. Please do not hesitate to let me know if you have any questions or concerns regarding the survey or if you would like a copy of the results. I can be reached anytime at jeredmarrant@stu.bakeru.edu or you are welcome to call me personally at (816) 591-1854. Dr. Tes Mehring is the major advisor on my study and can be reached at tmehring@bakeru.edu.

At the end of the survey you have the option to enter a drawing for a $100 Amazon Gift card. Once the survey has concluded I will communicate with the winner via the email provided.

Informational Questions

1. Please identify the college or university that employs you and from whom you received this survey invitation.

NOTE: If you are employed by multiple institutions and received this survey invitation from more than one school, select and respond in accordance with the institution you consider to be your primary employer.

- ◯ Baker University
- ◯ Barclay College
- ◯ Benedictine College
- ◯ Bethany College
- ◯ Bethel College
- ◯ Central Christian College of Kansas
- ◯ Cleveland University-Kansas City
- ◯ Donnelly College
- ◯ Friends University
- ◯ Hesston College
- ◯ Kansas Wesleyan University
- ◯ Manhattan Christian College
- ◯ McPherson College
- ◯ MidAmerica Nazarene University
- ◯ Newman University
- ◯ Ottawa University (Kansas)
- ◯ Ottawa University (Arizona or Wisconsin)
- ◯ Southwestern College
- ◯ Sterling College
- ◯ Tabor College
- ◯ University of Saint Mary
- ◯ I am not an employee of any of these colleges or universities.

2. Select the description below that best describes your primary role at your institution.

- ◯ Faculty
- ◯ Staff Member
- ◯ Management or Supervisory Employee (This includes supervisors, department or functional managers and directors, deans, department chairs, and vice presidents.)
- ◯ Graduate Assistant

3. Select the option that best describes your employment status.

- ◯ Full-Time (40 hours per week)
- ◯ Less than 40 hours per week.

4. Select the range below that identifies the total number of years you have worked in higher education.

- ◯ 0-4 years
- ◯ 5-9 years
- ◯ 10-14 years
- ◯ 15-19 years
- ◯ 20-24 years
- ◯ 25-29 years
- ◯ 30 or more years

5. Select the range below that identifies the total number of years you have worked at your primary institution.

- ◯ 0-4 years
- ◯ 5-9 years
- ◯ 10-14 years
- ◯ 15-19 years
- ◯ 20-24 years
- ◯ 25-29 years
- ◯ 30 or more years

People on Your Present Job

Think of the majority of people with whom you work or meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these people? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, select

Y for "Yes" if it describes the people with whom you work
N for "No" if it does not describe them
? for "?" if you cannot decide

6. Boring
   - Y
   - N
   - ?

7. Slow
   - Y
   - N
   - ?

8. Responsible
   - Y
   - N
   - ?

9. Smart
   - Y
   - N
   - ?

10. Lazy
    - Y
    - N
    - ?

11. Frustrating
    - Y
    - N
    - ?

Work on Present Job

Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, select

Y for "Yes" if it describes your work
N for "No" if it does not describe it
? for "?" if you cannot decide

12. Fascinating
- Y
- N
- ?

13. Satisfying
- Y
- N
- ?

14. Good
- Y
- N
- ?

15. Exciting
- Y
- N
- ?

16. Rewarding
- Y
- N
- ?

17. Uninteresting
- Y
- N
- ?

Pay

Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your present pay? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, select

Y for "Yes" if it describes your pay
N for "No" if it does not describe it
? for "?" if you cannot decide

18. Barely live on income
- Y
- N
- ?

19. Bad
- Y
- N
- ?

20. Well paid
- Y
- N
- ?

21. Underpaid
- Y
- N
- ?

22. Comfortable
- Y
- N
- ?

23. Enough to live on
- Y
- N
- ?

Opportunities for Promotion

Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, select

Y for "Yes" if it describes your opportunities for promotion
N for "No" if it does not describe them
? for "?" if you cannot decide

24. Good opportunities for promotion
- Y
- N
- ?

25. Opportunities somewhat limited
- Y
- N
- ?

26. Dead-end job
- Y
- N
- ?

27. Good chance for promotion
- Y
- N
- ?

28. Fairly good chance for promotion
- Y
- N
- ?

29. Regular promotions
- Y
- N
- ?

Supervision

Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe this? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, select

Y for "Yes" if it describes the supervision you get on the job
N for "No" if it does not describe it
? for "?" if you cannot decide

30. Praises good work
- Y
- N
- ?

31. Tactful
- Y
- N
- ?

32. Influential
- Y
- N
- ?

33. Up to date
- Y
- N
- ?

34. Annoying
- Y
- N
- ?

35. Knows job well
- Y
- N
- ?

Job in General

Think of your job in general. All in all, what is it like most of the time? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, select

Y for "Yes" if it describes your job
N for "No" if it does not describe it
? for "?" if you cannot decide

36. Good
- Y
- N
- ?

37. Undesirable
- Y
- N
- ?

38. Better than most
- Y
- N
- ?

39. Disagreeable
- Y
- N
- ?

40. Makes me content
- Y
- N
- ?

41. Excellent
- Y
- N
- ?

42. Enjoyable
- Y
- N
- ?

43. Poor

- Y
- N
- ?

Appendix E: Baker University IRB Approval

Baker University Institutional Review Board

January 15th, 2021

Dear Dale Marrant and Tes Mehring,

The Baker University IRB has reviewed your project application and approved this project under Expedited Status Review. As described, the project complies with all the requirements and policies established by the University for protection of human subjects in research. Unless renewed, approval lapses one year after approval date.

Please be aware of the following:

1. Any significant change in the research protocol as described should be reviewed by this Committee prior to altering the project.
2. Notify the IRB about any new investigators not named in original application.
3. When signed consent documents are required, the primary investigator must retain the signed consent documents of the research activity.
4. If this is a funded project, keep a copy of this approval letter with your proposal/grant file.
5. If the results of the research are used to prepare papers for publication or oral presentation at professional conferences, manuscripts or abstracts are requested for IRB as part of the project record.
6. If this project is not completed within a year, you must renew IRB approval.

If you have any questions, please contact me at npoell@bakeru.edu or 785.594.4582.

Sincerely,

Nathan Poell, MLS
Chair, Baker University IRB

Baker University IRB Committee
Sara Crump, PhD
Nick Harris, MS
Christa Manson, PhD
Susan Rogers, PhD

Appendix F: Initial Invitation to Participate and Informed Consent

To: All XXXX Employees

From: J. Dale Marrant – Ed.D. Candidate – Baker University

Date: XX/XX/XXXX

Subject: Doctoral Dissertation Study

Dear XXXX Employees:

I am currently a doctoral student at Baker University, working to complete my dissertation. My study is focusing on the relationship between employee satisfaction and the Composite Financial Index score at select private, non-profit higher education institutions that are members of the Kansas Independent Colleges Association. I kindly ask for your participation in a survey, which can be found by clicking on the following link: XXXX. The survey includes 5 background information questions and 38 yes or no questions. Completion of the survey should take only 15-20 minutes for you to complete.

Please know that your answers will be kept confidential and anonymous. Only group data will be summarized in the results of this study. Summary data from the survey for your institution and aggregated data for all participating institutions will be provided to the president of each institution to assist in future planning. There are no risks or discomfort associated with participation in the study. The completion of the survey will indicate your consent to participate in the study. You have the option to opt out of answering any questions. You may discontinue participation at any point during the survey.

Thank you in advance for your time and participation in the study. The results of this study will add to the body of knowledge about employee satisfaction and its relationship to the Financial Index Scores of the six institutions included in the study. I

sincerely appreciate your willingness to support this study. Please do not hesitate to let me know if you have any questions or concerns regarding the survey or if you would like a copy of the results. I can be reached anytime at jeredmarrant@stu.bakeru.edu or you are welcome to call me at (816) 591-1854. At the end of the survey there will be a separate link you can use to enter into a drawing for a $100 Amazon Gift card if you wish to provide your contact information. Once the survey has concluded I will communicate with the winner via the email provided. Thank you for participating in the survey.

Appendix G: Suggested Institutional Communication

Good morning….

I am pleased to share with you that _____ (University or College), with the support of Dr. _____, is participating in an employee satisfaction survey that is part of the research of Dale Marrant. Dale is a doctoral student at Baker University and the VP of Human Resources at Cleveland University-Kansas City. Both schools are members of the Kansas Independent Collage Association along with _____ (University or College) and we are pleased to support his efforts. Several other KICA schools will also be participating in the survey. Please know all responses are anonymous and will be aggregated with other response to obtain summary data. _____ University will receive our summary result to use in future planning regarding employee satisfaction. More detail regarding the study is contained in the attached document as well as at the beginning of the survey. The survey should not take more than 15 minutes to complete. The survey can be accessed using the link below.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/CRPBGDM

Thank you for your participation.

(Institutional HR Contact and Title)

Thank you to all who have taken a moment to complete the employee satisfaction survey. Your feedback is important to the study but also important to our university as we continue to explore how to make _____ an even better place to work and learn! Again the survey only takes a few moments and all responses are confidential. If you have not yet completed the survey, please consider doing so at your earliest convenience.

Thank you for your participation.

(Institutional HR Contact and Title)

Thank you to all who have taken a moment to complete the employee satisfaction survey. Your feedback is important to the study but also important to our university as we continue to explore how to make _____ an even better place to work and learn! **The last day to complete the survey will be Tuesday, March 30th.** Again the survey only takes a few moments and all responses are confidential. If you have not yet completed the survey, please consider doing so at your earliest convenience.

Thank you for your participation.

(Institutional HR Contact and Title)