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Introduction: why staff satisfaction matters?

- Majority of university employee population
- Indicator of organizational productivity
- Increasing professionalization
Majority of university employees

- Approximately 4/5 of total employee population

Employee distribution

- Faculty (FA): 20.5%
- Non-faculty employee: 79.5%

Non-faculty employee distribution

- Academic Administrator (AA): 15.0%
- Academic Professional (AP): 14.8%
- Bargaining Unit (BU): 33.3%
- Civil Service (CS): 31.5%
- Instructional Professional and Administrator (IPA): 5.4%
Employee satisfaction and organizational productivity

• Mayo (1933): Human Relations theory
  - Satisfied workers are productive.

• Campbell (1977):
  Organizational Effectiveness category
  - Job satisfaction, productivity, motivation, growth, quality, turnover, morale, internalization of organizational goals, etc.
Increasing professionalization
Literature review

Work satisfaction from classics

- Herzberg (1966): The Motivation-Hygiene theory
- Maslow (1959): Hierarchy of Needs
Pulse survey background

- Biennial survey since 2004 (4th iteration in 2010)
- Total response rate: 45.6% (8,539 completed out of 18,717)
- A single online questionnaire for all university employees
- System-wide staff response rate: 47.3% in 2010
- System-wide faculty response rate: 39.3% in 2010
Response rate by job category & gender

- AA: Academic Administrator
- AP: Academic Professional
- BU: Bargaining Unit
- CS: Civil Service
- IPA: Instructional Professional and Administrator

Staff average: 47.3%

- AA: 64.4%
- AP: 45.8%
- BU: 36.1%
- CS: 54.6%
- IPA: 24.2%
## Response rate by gender in job groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Group</th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Administrator</strong></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Professional &amp; Administrator</strong></td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bargaining Unit</strong></td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civil Service</strong></td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The percentages indicate the response rate for female and male participants in different job categories.*
Method

- Exploratory study
- Step wise linear regression
- Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent variable</td>
<td>Overall satisfaction with employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variables</td>
<td>Satisfaction with work/advancement opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding of job importance/responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of support for innovative/high quality work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation factor</td>
<td>Satisfaction with supervisor/coworkers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with pay level/raise/benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Age, Gender (female: 1, male: 0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>BU</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>IPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Included       | Satisfaction with Work***  
Satisfaction with Pay Level***  
Understanding of Job Responsibilities***  
Perception of Job Security***  
Satisfaction with Supervisor***  
Satisfaction with Coworkers***  
Support for Innovative Work**  
Gender*  
Age**  
Satisfaction with Advancement Opportunities*  
Understanding of Job Importance*  
Support for High Quality Work***  
Support for Innovation Work*** | Satisfaction with Work***  
Satisfaction with Pay Level***  
Understanding of Job Responsibilities***  
Perception of Job Security***  
Satisfaction with Supervisor***  
Satisfaction with Coworkers***  
Understanding of Job Responsibilities***  
Support for High Quality Work***  
Support for Innovation Work***  
Support for High Quality Work***  
Satisfaction with Pay Level***  
Understanding of Job Responsibilities***  
Perception of Job Security***  
Satisfaction with Supervisor***  
Satisfaction with Coworkers***  
Age**  
Satisfaction with Advancement Opportunities***  
Understanding of Job Importance*** | Satisfaction with Work***  
Satisfaction with Pay Level***  
Understanding of Job Responsibilities***  
Perception of Job Security***  
Satisfaction with Supervisor***  
Satisfaction with Coworkers***  
Age***  
Satisfaction with Pay Raise*  
Understanding of Job Importance*** | Satisfaction with Work***  
Satisfaction with Pay Level***  
Understanding of Job Responsibilities***  
Perception of Job Security***  
Satisfaction with Supervisor***  
Satisfaction with Coworkers***  
Age***  
Satisfaction with Pay Raise*  
Understanding of Job Importance*** | Support for High Quality Work***  
Satisfaction with Pay Level***  
Understanding of Job Responsibilities***  
Perception of Job Security***  
Satisfaction with Supervisor***  
Satisfaction with Coworkers***  
Age***  
Satisfaction with Pay Raise*  
Understanding of Job Importance*** | Support for High Quality Work***  
Satisfaction with Pay Level***  
Understanding of Job Responsibilities***  
Perception of Job Security***  
Satisfaction with Supervisor***  
Satisfaction with Coworkers***  
Age***  
Satisfaction with Pay Raise*  
Understanding of Job Importance*** | Support for High Quality Work***  
Satisfaction with Pay Level***  
Understanding of Job Responsibilities***  
Perception of Job Security***  
Satisfaction with Supervisor***  
Satisfaction with Coworkers***  
Age***  
Satisfaction with Pay Raise*  
Understanding of Job Importance*** | Support for High Quality Work***  
Satisfaction with Pay Level***  
Understanding of Job Responsibilities***  
Perception of Job Security***  
Satisfaction with Supervisor***  
Satisfaction with Coworkers***  
Age***  
Satisfaction with Pay Raise*  
Understanding of Job Importance*** |
| Excluded       | Satisfaction with Pay Raise  
Satisfaction with benefits  
Age  
Gender | Satisfaction with Pay Raise  
Satisfaction with benefits  
Age  
Gender | Understanding of Job Importance  
Satisfaction with Pay Raise  
Gender | Satisfaction with Pay Raise  
Gender | Satisfaction with Pay Raise  
Gender | Satisfaction with Pay Raise  
Gender |

---

P < .001 ***  
< .01 **  
< .05 *  
AA: Academic Administrator  
AP: Academic Professional  
BU: Bargaining Unit  
CS: Civil Service  
IPA: Instructional Professional and Administrator
Implications

• Different job characteristics require that differentiated attention be paid to HR policies. (e.g. AP: support for innovative work IPA: support for high quality work)

• Gender: not as significant as other work-related factors in all groups but AA

• Age: not as significant as other work-related factors in AP and IPA
Future study

- 2nd stage studies on satisfaction of employees by each job category & campus
- Focus group interviews for insider’s voice & suggestions
- Consideration of measuring organizational intervention (e.g. decision making process)
- Consideration of response rate by job group
- Consideration of graduate teaching assistants’ work
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