

LANGSTON UNIVERSITY

FACULTY & STAFF SURVEY — 2011

LANGSTON UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING
PAGE HALL ROOM 309
LANGSTON, OK 73050
TEL:(405)466-6012
FAX:(405)466-6014
EMAIL:mbmccclendon@lunet.edu



Mark McClendon
Director

(This page intentionally left blank)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Office of Institutional Research and Planning conducted an online Faculty and Staff Opinion Survey to assess employees' satisfaction with certain areas of their jobs and the University as a whole. The survey consisted of 50 Likert scale items divided into 8 major dimensions (see appendix A) and a demographics section. The survey was administered online through the use of employees' lunet.edu e-mail accounts via the lu_announcements mechanism and several follow up e-mails were sent to encourage participation.

A total of 101 surveys were submitted of which 99% were full time employees which represents about 25% of the total number of full time employees. The sample is mostly female (74%), from the main campus (89%), and African American (56%).

Overall the survey keeps the same levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction as the survey last year. The employees strongly agree with the good level of communication within the University, but at the same time strongly disagree with the levels of objectivity in supervision and management.

The single item that received the lowest score by far was item 44 *Staff salary levels* (2.29 average, and 70% negative endorsement). The same item last year received also the lowest score in the survey. The dimension that received the lowest average scores were for Recognition and Rewards (with averages of 2.63, 2.68 and 2.71 respectively) followed by the dimension of Performance Evaluation with the item number 15 "*I am satisfied with how performance evaluations are conducted in my department*" (2.97 average).

Communication received the highest scores, but with only 1 items above of 4.0 (item 3) having an average score of 3.69 and all being above 3.46. This indicates that employees generally are satisfied with level of communication circulated through the departments and overall university, but may have concerns about the way supervision and management is conducted.

(This page intentionally left blank)

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Introduction	1
Methodology.....	1
Item Responses	1
Results	1
Item Responses	1
Demographics	2
Communication (1-5)	2
Training and Development (6-11).....	2
Recognition and Rewards (12-14).....	2
Performance Evaluation (15-17).....	2
Supervision/Management (18-29).....	3
Physical Work Environment (30-32)	3
Position Satisfaction (33-37).....	3
Overall Satisfaction (48-50).....	3
Regression Predicting Global Job Satisfaction with Dimensions.....	3
Factor Analysis	4
Discussion.....	4
APPENDIX A: ITEM RESPONSES BY SCALE.....	7
APPENDIX B: REGRESSION PREDICTING GLOBAL JOB SATISFACTION.....	11
APPENDIX C: FACTOR ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES 2008-2011	13
APPENDIX D: DEMOGRAPHICS	15

(This page intentionally left blank)

INTRODUCTION

This report discusses the results of the Spring 2011 Langston University Faculty & Staff survey which was administered online. A total of 101 surveys were returned which represents roughly 25.2% of the faculty & staff at Langston University. The participation by full-time employees (99%) was significantly higher than part-time (1%). The report is organized into four main sections (Introduction, Methodology, Results, and Discussion) with the methodology and results sections organized by the statistical analyses performed on the data.

METHODOLOGY

The survey was administered online April 1st thru April 30th 2011 through the use of employees' lunet.edu e-mail accounts via the lu announcements mechanism. Several follow up e-mails were sent to encourage participation. The survey consisted of 53 items that were broken up into two parts. The first part asked employees to rate 39 items related to as to their agreement with various statements about various aspects of Langston University and their departments and jobs specifically. They indicated their responses on a 5 point Likert scale that ranged from Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (4), or Strongly Agree (5). The second part consisted of 14 items that assessed employees satisfaction with specific items related to work. Employees indicated their responses on a 5 point Likert scale ranging from Very Dissatisfied (1), Dissatisfied (2), Satisfied (4), or Very Satisfied (5). The 50 items were broken down into 8 main sections:

1. Communication (5 items)
2. Training and Development (6 items)
3. Recognition and Rewards (3 items)
4. Performance Evaluation (4 items)
5. Supervision/Management (12 items)
6. Physical Work Environment (3 items)
7. Position Satisfaction (5 items)
8. Overall Satisfaction (13 items)

The results were analyzed by performing a variety of statistical procedures to aid in the interpretation of the data. The specific analyses are detailed below.

Item Responses

The frequencies, mean, and percentage of people endorsing each item choice were calculated for each survey item. This provided a visual representation of the data and allowed for the calculation of the overall percentage of positively and negatively endorsed items.

RESULTS

Item Responses

For each item the average (mean), number of responses (N), frequency and percent of selection for each Likert choice were computed for items 1-50. The overall results (Appendix A) showed that many of the items had an average rating (mean) between 3.0 and 4.0, with a few below 3.0 (items 12, 13, 14, 15, 42, 44) and just one above 4.1 (items 3). For each item, there were a

number of neutral responses (10%-20%) that pulled the average closer to 3.0. Secondly, there was about a 20% of number of respondents who endorsed the items in a negative fashion. This has the effect of canceling out the positive scores and pulling the mean closer to 3.0. The items responses for each survey dimension are presented below.

*20% negative endorsement
on nearly all items!*

Demographics

- Survey Respondents were mostly female 74%
- 99% were full-time employees
- 89% of respondents work at LU main campus
- 56% were Black/African American
- 44% were faculty and 42% were staff.
- # of years respondents have worked here 0 to 5 (28%), 6 to 10 (20%), 11 to 15 (16%) 16 to 20 (6%), 21 to 25 (5%), 26 to 30 (2%), 30+ (0%), and 24% unknown.

Communication (1-5)

Overall scores for this dimension ranged 3.46 (item 1) to a high of 4.11 (item 3). Employees rated communication rather favorable as far as understanding departmental mission (Item 3 positive rating of 86%). All items had an approval rating over 65%. In general, this dimension still has a very good score over the other dimensions.

Training and Development (6-11)

Overall scores ranged from a low of 3.15 (item 7) to a high of 3.8 (item 8). Supervisor lets staffs adjust their schedule, so they can participate in training opportunities (item 8, 80%), but the employees are not completely satisfied with the kinds of training is currently available for them (item 7, 55%)

Recognition and Rewards (12-14)

This scale represented the lowest overall scores for any dimension on the survey. Overall scores ranged from a low of 2.63 (item 12) to a high of 2.71 (item 14). Employees express a rather high dissatisfaction in regards to rewards and recognition. Items 12 and 13 “*I am satisfied with the recognition I receive for doing a good job*” and “*Outstanding service to customer is recognized or rewarded*” had a negative rating of 61% and 62% respectively, even in 2010 the dissatisfaction also was showed in the survey, in 2011 still going down. Item 14 “*Quality work is valued by the university*” received a negative rating of 57%, lower than in 2010.

*57% feel the university
does not value quality
work!*

Performance Evaluation (15-17)

Overall scores ranged from a low of 2.97 (item 15) to a high of 3.16 (item 17). The numbers still low, and they didn’t improve in 2011. It show a lower number in item 15 “*I am satisfied with how performance evaluations are conducted in my department*”, just a 54% “Agree” and a 46% “Disagree” with an average of 2.97 instead of 3.06 in 2010.

Supervision/Management (18-29)

This dimension consisted of the most items (12), but the overall the survey results tended to be very similar and were ranged from a low of 3.19 (item 20) to a high of 3.76 (item 28). The majority of employees are satisfied with their supervisors, although not overwhelmingly so. Seventy-seven percent (77%) of employees agree their supervisor is generally available to discuss issues related to work (item 28) and over 70% of employees agree their supervisor has the training and experience needed for his/or her position (item 18) and has the necessary skills to be a supervisor (item 19). However, in some items (20, 21 and 26) the employees have a mixed feeling because only 60% of the employees think their supervisor distributes the workload fairly among staff in the department, bases decisions primarily on facts and data rather than on opinions and feelings, and recognizes the contributions of individuals on regular basis.

Physical Work Environment (30-32)

Overall scores ranged from a low of 3.22 (item 30) to a high of 3.53 (item 31). Employees indicated slight concern of satisfaction with respect to the necessary equipment to perform their job successfully. These items had an approval rating ranging from only 61% (item 32) to over 70% “*feel office space is sufficient to perform their job*” (item 31), but only 63% feel they are “*satisfied with their physical work environment (item 30).*” In general, this dimension is very similar in levels of satisfaction with respect to the past survey, 2010.

Position Satisfaction (33-37)

Overall scores ranged from a low of 3.24 (item 36) to a high of 3.88 (item 34). Over 95% of employees “*enjoy the work they do (item 33),*” and feel a “*sense of personal satisfaction for doing a good job (item 34),*” and 79% feel their job is “*challenging enough (item 35).*” Although scores were fairly positive, 0% strongly agreed with these statements.

95% enjoy the work they do.

Overall Satisfaction (48-50)

The last section of the survey asked individuals to rate their level of satisfaction with several factors including “*benefits and global job satisfaction (item 38).*” Overall scores ranged from a low of 2.29 (item 44: salary levels) to a high of 3.73 (item 38: Overall job satisfaction).

Employees indicated a good level of “*overall satisfaction (82%),*” but just less than 18% indicated dissatisfaction. The highest concerns were items 42, 44: Item 42 “*Morale in my department*”. (53% satisfied) and item 44 “*Staff Salary levels*” by far the largest concern with a 70% disapproval rating.

70% are dissatisfied with salary levels

Regression Predicting Global Job Satisfaction with Dimensions

A multiple linear regression analysis using a forward selection methodology was utilized to determine which dimensions sections 1-8 were most predictive of overall job satisfaction (item 38). The results of the analysis are presented in Appendix B and show that four (4) dimensions contribute significantly to the prediction of overall job satisfaction. The dimensions are:

Supervision most related to job satisfaction

- Section 5: Supervision/Management
- Section 7: Position Satisfaction
- Section 8: Benefits Satisfaction
- Section 2: Training and Development

These dimensions make intuitive sense for predicting job satisfaction since they represent dimensions that impact a person’s day to day work. They accounted for 59% of the variance in overall job satisfaction (adjusted R-square = .584), which is quite high, but again, the results might be impacted by the high degree of multicollinearity of the predictors.

Factor Analysis

An exploratory factor analysis was performed on items 1-50 (53 due to additional items on previous administrations) for all of the years (2008-2011) responses to see how many distinct factors were present in the survey and to test the functioning of the survey instrument. If too few factors are present then it shows that the survey instrument is really only assessing one or two factors such as general satisfaction and supervision.

The results of the factor analysis show the presence of 10 distinct factors, none of which disambiguate themselves from the other items. When examining the rotated factor matrix, a more liberal criterion of factor loadings above 0.6 on the main factor and below 0.4 on all other factors was used to determine the factors. The items that met this criterion are highlighted by color blocks when they are examined, they seem to group fairly well along the pre determined dimensions. For example, the first factor extracted from the factor analysis shows the items for the Dimension of Supervision and Management appeared to be the best functioning scale. The second factor corresponds to the Training and Development dimension of the survey instrument. This is not a perfect system for determining the functioning of the survey instrument due to sample size, but it does lend some support for the function of the instrument by indicating that an underlying factor was captured by each dimension and not just a global level of affect.

Analysis supported the functioning of the scale

DISCUSSION

The results of the survey indicate a relatively flat level of satisfaction among the employees. In general the dimension of Communication still has the highest positive response and Recognition and Rewards continues to be the lowest rated among employees. The item number 44 “*Staff salary levels*” was the lowest of the 50 items. The items about benefits (45, 46, 47, and 48) also show a little decrease compared to last year.

Satisfaction is flat and needs improvement

Communication received the highest scores with 1 of the 5 items having an average score of 4.11 being the item number 3, “*I have a good understanding of my department mission*”, and all being above 3.39. This indicates that employees generally approve of the level of communication they receive in aspect to their job, but may have concerns about other aspects of their work and the university. There were still some negative endorsements for these items, but there were the highest numbers of strong positive endorsements for this dimension. However, it is necessary to

keep in mind that although the scores in this dimension were the most positive, they were lower than the 2010 administration.

The single item that received the lowest score by far was item 44 staff salary levels (2.29 average and 70% negative endorsement). This is consistent with most public jobs and when coupled with *Item 21: "My Supervision bases decisions primarily on facts and data rather than on opinions and feelings. (38% disagree)* shows that supervision should be objective with the best utilization of time and resources. This is an issue the administration is aware of.

The dimension that received the lowest average scores was for Recognition and Rewards. The average score for the items were 2.63 to 2.71 for the 3 items and items were endorsed negatively more than they were positively. Also the scores were lowest that the score for the same dimension in last year survey. This indicates that individuals do not feel appreciated for the work they do. This is a systemic problem, but one that is also one of the easier to correct.

Need to recognize, reward, and appreciate quality work

The most disturbing item in the survey by far is "*Quality work is valued by the university.*" This item had an average of 2.71 and a 57% negative endorsement rate. This is consistent with prior administrations and indicates a much more problematic organizational culture problem. If employees feel that they are not appreciated, underpaid, and that quality work is not appreciated, it is very difficult to transform the university into a high performing organization. This is an area that needs to be addressed.

Need for a strategic compensation plan and supervisor training

Overall there continues to be a relatively high level of unsatisfied employees. The scores remain relatively stable with employees generally liking what they are doing in their specific positions, but feel that salary levels are poor and that supervision and management could be better. Most of the areas that can be improved upon deal with supervision and management issues. The responses indicate that employees do not feel appreciated for their efforts and that the school does not appreciate good work. These are areas that need to be addressed by having better supervisors and managers which should be addressed through training. Also, implementing a transparent and fair compensation system, or by implementing a strategic way of compensating employees should be considered. The current compensation plan, or lack of a plan, is not achieving the strategic goals of the university and should be revisited.

APPENDIX A: ITEM RESPONSES BY SCALE

Section 1. Communication									
	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	2011 Average	2010 Average	2009 Average	2008 Average
1. I am satisfied with the amount of information I receive about what is going on in my department.	101	16%	16%	44%	24%	3.46	3.44	3.5	3.43
2. I understand the connection between my work and the goals of my department.	101	9%	9%	39%	43%	3.99	4.14	4.24	4.1
3. I have a good understanding of my department's mission.	100	9%	5%	38%	48%	4.11	4.05	4.27	4.23
4. The administration keeps me informed about university events.	101	11%	24%	47%	18%	3.39	3.44	3.51	3.37
5. My department has good working relationships with other departments in the university.	101	11%	20%	46%	23%	3.5	3.49	3.6	3.79

Section 2. Training and Development									
	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	2011 Average	2010 Average	2009 Average	2008 Average
1. Training and career development opportunities are allocated fairly.	99	12%	29%	43%	16%	3.2	3.2	3.05	3.06
2. I am satisfied with the kinds of training currently available to me.	98	10%	35%	40%	15%	3.15	3.24	3.18	3.21
3. My supervisor lets me adjust my schedule so that I can participate in training opportunities.	97	7%	13%	51%	29%	3.8	3.77	3.76	3.88
4. Overall, the training I have attended for my present job has helped me perform my job better.	98	7%	19%	51%	23%	3.62	3.61	3.55	3.7
5. Overall, the training I have attended for my present job has contributed to my personal development.	98	6%	21%	53%	20%	3.58	3.49	3.4	3.6
6. I have training opportunities available to me that are useful for my future career and my personal development.	99	12%	27%	42%	19%	3.27	3.39	3.4	3.48

APPENDIX A: Continued

Section 3. Recognition and Rewards									
	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	2011 Average	2010 Average	2009 Average	2008 Average
1. I am satisfied with the recognition I receive for doing a good job.	98	28%	33%	29%	10%	2.63	2.87	2.65	2.65
2. Outstanding service to customers is recognized or rewarded.	96	22%	40%	26%	12%	2.68	2.85	2.53	2.5
3. Quality work is valued by the university.	97	29%	28%	30%	13%	2.71	2.93	2.92	2.85

Section 4. Performance Evaluation									
	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	2011 Average	2010 Average	2009 Average	2008 Average
1. I am satisfied with how performance evaluations are conducted in my department.	94	26%	20%	40%	14%	2.97	3.06	3.3	3.09
2. My last performance evaluation provided me with information I could use to improve my performance.	93	20%	22%	46%	12%	3.08	3.08	3.14	3.19
3. My supervisor provides feedback and coaching to me on a consistent basis.	94	22%	17%	44%	17%	3.16	3.19	3.19	3.2

Section 5. Supervision/Management									
	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	2011 Average	2010 Average	2009 Average	2008 Average
1. My supervisor has the training and experience needed for his/her position as a supervisor.	91	15%	10%	44%	31%	3.65	3.76	3.77	3.61
2. My supervisor has the supervisory skills needed in his/her position as a supervisor.	91	16%	14%	40%	30%	3.52	3.63	3.63	3.61
3. My supervisor distributes the workload fairly among staff in my unit.	89	20%	20%	39%	21%	3.19	3.4	3.5	3.31
4. My supervisor bases decisions primarily on facts and data rather than on opinions and feelings.	90	20%	18%	40%	22%	3.27	3.46	3.54	3.36
5. My supervisor supports free exchanges of opinions and ideas related to work.	90	16%	14%	42%	28%	3.52	3.73	3.78	3.67
6. My supervisor is open to new ways of doing things.	89	13%	21%	36%	30%	3.46	3.68	3.84	3.57

APPENDIX A: Continued

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	2011 Average	2010 Average	2009 Average	2008 Average
7. My supervisor demonstrates that quality is important in his/her day-to-day activities (e.g., holding meetings to discuss quality issues, interacting with others).	91	16%	12%	43%	29%	3.55	3.55	3.61	3.64
8. My supervisor provides staff with constructive suggestions to improve their job performance.	91	15%	14%	45%	26%	3.51	3.36	3.55	3.54
9. My supervisor personally recognizes the contributions of individuals on a regular basis.	90	17%	20%	41%	22%	3.32	3.3	3.45	3.35
10. I receive adequate guidance from my supervisor to succeed in my job.	89	13%	19%	44%	24%	3.45	3.48	3.66	3.41
11. My supervisor is generally available to discuss issues related to my work.	91	14%	9%	41%	36%	3.76	3.83	3.79	3.72
12. My supervisor supports initiatives to continually improve processes in our unit.	89	18%	12%	44%	26%	3.51	3.73	3.78	3.61

Section 6. Physical Work Environment

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	2011 Average	2010 Average	2009 Average	2008 Average
1. I am satisfied with my physical work environment.	91	18%	19%	52%	11%	3.22	3.27	3.18	3.41
2. My office space is sufficient to perform my job.	91	12%	16%	49%	23%	3.53	3.53	3.56	3.67
3. I have the necessary equipment to perform my job successfully.	92	14%	25%	41%	20%	3.27	3.3	3.38	3.22

Section 7. Position Satisfaction

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	2011 Average	2010 Average	2009 Average	2008 Average
1. I like the work I do in my current position.	88	3%	2%	95%	0%	3.85	3.76	3.72	4.21
2. I feel a sense of personal satisfaction when I do my job well.	88	3%	1%	96%	0%	3.88	3.78	3.8	4.43
3. My job is challenging enough for me.	88	7%	14%	79%	0%	3.52	3.72	3.72	4.13
4. I am satisfied with my involvement in decisions that affect my work.	88	13%	19%	68%	0%	3.24	3.29	3.32	3.55
5. My job makes good use of my skills and abilities.	88	13%	15%	72%	0%	3.33	3.52	3.44	3.8

APPENDIX A: Continued

Section 8. Overall Satisfaction									
	N	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	2011 Average	2010 Average	2009 Average	2008 Average
1. My overall job satisfaction.	81	7%	11%	64%	18%	3.73	3.64	3.57	3.65
2. The clarity of objectives and plans for the next few years in my department.	82	6%	23%	50%	21%	3.56	3.31	3.56	3.4
3. The clarity of objectives and plans for the next few years at Langston.	83	12%	24%	45%	19%	3.35	3.1	3.13	3.15
4. The identity and sense of community at Langston University.	83	14%	29%	42%	15%	3.13	2.86	2.97	2.93
5. Morale in my department.	83	22%	25%	40%	13%	2.98	2.91	2.96	3.01
6. The level of cooperation and teamwork in my department.	82	17%	16%	48%	19%	3.37	3.27	3.15	3.28
7. Staff salary levels.	84	37%	33%	24%	6%	2.29	2.08	2.29	2.11
8. Medical insurance benefits.	82	16%	16%	59%	9%	3.3	3.63	3.53	3.2
9. Dental insurance benefits.	81	10%	15%	68%	7%	3.48	3.65	3.62	3.3
10. Retirement benefits.	83	8%	14%	69%	9%	3.54	3.89	3.85	3.37
11. Paid time off benefits.	83	11%	17%	64%	8%	3.42	3.61	3.33	3.32
12. Staff development opportunities in my department.	82	15%	26%	52%	7%	3.12	3.1	3.18	3.13
13. Staff development opportunities at Langston University.	82	13%	28%	52%	7%	3.1	2.95	2.87	3.04

APPENDIX B: REGRESSION PREDICTING GLOBAL JOB SATISFACTION

Regression

Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Supervision	.	Forward (Criterion: Probability -of- F-to-enter <= .050)
2	PositionSat	.	Forward (Criterion: Probability -of- F-to-enter <= .050)
3	Overall Satisfaction	.	Forward (Criterion: Probability -of- F-to-enter <= .050)
4	Training	.	Forward (Criterion: Probability -of- F-to-enter <= .050)

a. Dependent Variable: My overall job satisfaction.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.658 ^a	.433	.431	.874
2	.730 ^b	.532	.529	.795
3	.761 ^c	.578	.575	.756
4	.764 ^d	.584	.579	.752

Model Summary

Model	Change Statistics				
	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.133	254.468	1	333	.000
2	.099	70.386	1	332	.000
3	.046	36.161	1	331	.000
4	.006	4.718	1	330	.031

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Supervision
- b. Predictors: (Constant), Supervision, PositionSat
- c. Predictors: (Constant), Supervision, PositionSat, OverallSatisfaction
- d. Predictors: (Constant), Supervision, PositionSat, OverallSatisfaction, Training

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	194.245	1	194.245	254.468	.000 ^a
	Residual	254.191	333	.763		
	Total	448.436	334			
2	Regression	238.708	2	119.354	188.938	.000 ^b
	Residual	209.728	332	.632		
	Total	448.436	334			
3	Regression	259.064	3	86.455	151.352	.000 ^c
	Residual	189.072	331	.571		
	Total	448.436	334			
4	Regression	262.029	4	65.507	115.969	.000 ^d
	Residual	186.407	330	.565		
	Total	448.436	334			

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Supervision
- b. Predictors: (Constant), Supervision, PositionSat
- c. Predictors: (Constant), Supervision, PositionSat, OverallSatisfaction
- d. Predictors: (Constant), Supervision, PositionSat, OverallSatisfaction, Training
- e. Dependent Variable: My overall job satisfaction.

APPENDIX C: FACTOR ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES 2008-2011

Rotated Component Matrix(a)										
	Component									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
I am satisfied with the amount of information I receive about what is going on in my department.	0.54	0.16	0.01	0.05	0.44	-0.07	-0.04	0.14	0.47	-0.14
I understand the connection between my work and the goals of my department.	0.26	0.19	0.21	0.14	0.08	0.10	0.15	0.02	0.80	0.08
I have a good understanding of my department's mission.	0.26	0.11	0.24	0.19	-0.01	0.11	0.11	-0.04	0.81	-0.05
The administration keeps me informed about issues affecting my department.	0.50	0.04	0.15	0.20	0.60	0.02	0.07	0.05	0.28	-0.03
The administration keeps me informed about university events.	0.17	0.15	0.11	0.11	0.79	0.12	0.11	0.02	0.07	-0.04
My department has good working relationships with other departments in the university.	0.08	0.26	0.09	0.19	0.06	-0.02	0.40	0.41	0.29	-0.07
Training and career development opportunities are allocated fairly.	0.16	0.57	-0.05	0.10	0.30	0.17	-0.08	0.24	0.42	-0.09
I am satisfied with the kinds of training currently available to me.	0.11	0.68	0.07	0.18	0.29	0.19	-0.01	0.21	0.25	-0.12
My supervisor lets me adjust my schedule so that I can participate in training opportunities.	0.44	0.69	0.15	-0.01	-0.08	0.16	0.08	-0.02	0.20	0.16
Overall, the training I have attended for my present job has helped me perform my job better.	0.27	0.82	0.09	0.08	0.07	-0.04	0.21	0.03	0.02	0.06
Overall, the training I have attended for my present job has contributed to my personal development.	0.28	0.81	0.14	0.13	0.04	0.04	0.21	0.07	0.02	0.03
I have training opportunities available to me that are useful for my future career and my personal development.	0.37	0.73	0.13	0.06	0.09	0.09	0.12	0.09	0.04	-0.09
I am satisfied with the recognition I receive for doing a good job.	0.53	0.38	0.12	0.06	0.35	0.25	-0.01	0.25	-0.01	0.01
Outstanding service to customers is recognized or rewarded.	0.41	0.34	0.10	0.19	0.43	0.36	0.11	0.24	-0.09	0.00
Quality work is valued by the university.	0.35	0.29	0.06	0.41	0.40	0.32	0.12	0.04	-0.08	0.30
I am satisfied with how performance evaluations are conducted in my department.	0.28	0.11	0.17	0.10	0.23	0.75	0.17	0.14	0.12	0.07
My last performance evaluation provided me with information I could use to improve my performance.	0.22	0.18	0.18	0.09	0.11	0.81	0.16	0.11	0.09	0.04
My supervisor provides feedback and coaching to me on a consistent basis.	0.62	0.19	0.00	0.16	0.02	0.52	0.22	0.08	0.10	-0.35
My supervisor provides feedback and coaching to me on a consistent basis.	0.61	0.23	0.00	0.15	0.01	0.54	0.19	0.08	0.07	-0.33
My supervisor has the training and experience needed for his/her position as a supervisor.	0.87	0.16	0.04	0.13	0.16	0.07	0.13	0.04	0.04	-0.05
My supervisor has the supervisory skills needed in his/her position as a supervisor.	0.88	0.16	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.04	0.12	0.10	0.04	-0.05
My supervisor distributes the workload fairly among staff in my unit.	0.69	0.35	0.12	-0.01	-0.02	0.22	0.06	0.26	0.05	0.28
My supervisor bases decisions primarily on facts and data rather than on opinions and feelings.	0.75	0.14	0.11	-0.02	0.20	0.16	0.15	0.25	0.10	0.23
My supervisor supports free exchanges of opinions and ideas related to work.	0.87	0.14	0.15	-0.02	0.11	0.04	0.08	0.08	0.16	0.10

APPENDIX C: FACTOR ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES 2008-2011

My supervisor is open to new ways of doing things.	0.81	0.13	0.20	0.06	0.11	0.09	0.05	0.03	0.10	0.08
My supervisor demonstrates that quality is important in his/her day-to-day activities (e.g., holding meetings to discuss quality issues, interacting with others).	0.82	0.10	0.15	0.09	0.09	0.17	0.08	0.01	0.15	-0.14
My supervisor provides staff with constructive suggestions to improve their job performance.	0.83	0.23	0.16	-0.01	0.12	0.16	0.06	0.15	0.14	-0.01
My supervisor personally recognizes the contributions of individuals on a regular basis.	0.77	0.16	0.11	0.07	0.23	0.06	0.07	0.17	-0.02	-0.16
I receive adequate guidance from my supervisor to succeed in my job.	0.83	0.26	0.09	0.02	0.04	0.17	0.18	0.07	0.16	-0.06
My supervisor is generally available to discuss issues related to my work.	0.83	0.23	0.18	0.04	0.10	0.02	0.08	0.11	0.03	0.08
My supervisor supports initiatives to continually improve processes in our unit.	0.80	0.25	0.21	0.08	0.13	0.13	0.10	0.01	0.11	0.08
I am satisfied with my physical work environment.	0.15	0.09	0.30	0.06	0.08	0.26	0.71	0.04	0.11	-0.13
My office space is sufficient to perform my job.	0.27	0.05	0.24	0.07	0.05	0.08	0.74	0.16	-0.01	-0.07
I have the necessary equipment to perform my job successfully.	0.09	0.27	0.14	0.13	0.19	0.13	0.74	-0.10	0.13	0.27
I like the work I do in my current position.	0.18	0.13	0.77	0.13	0.06	0.09	0.22	0.16	0.13	0.13
I feel a sense of personal satisfaction when I do my job well.	0.34	0.12	0.73	-0.04	-0.01	0.08	0.14	0.13	0.25	0.13
My job is challenging enough for me.	0.27	0.19	0.68	0.18	0.12	0.08	0.20	0.06	0.14	-0.34
I am satisfied with my involvement in decisions that affect my work.	0.57	0.40	0.33	0.16	0.19	0.08	0.23	-0.06	0.11	-0.13
My job makes good use of my skills and abilities.	0.29	0.17	0.62	0.18	0.33	0.14	0.26	-0.11	0.04	-0.16
My overall job satisfaction.	0.52	0.27	0.48	0.17	0.13	0.11	0.09	0.33	0.04	0.09
The clarity of objectives and plans for the next few years in my department.	0.48	0.17	0.41	0.08	0.35	0.17	0.28	0.18	0.19	0.05
The clarity of objectives and plans for the next few years at Langston.	0.25	0.25	0.42	0.20	0.51	0.17	0.35	0.20	0.01	0.25
The identity and sense of community at Langston University.	0.22	0.28	0.29	0.14	0.48	0.06	0.20	0.55	-0.07	0.18
Morale in my department.	0.59	0.12	0.19	0.13	0.07	0.13	-0.15	0.61	-0.02	-0.06
The level of cooperation and teamwork in my department.	0.49	0.02	0.17	0.19	-0.13	0.26	-0.04	0.58	0.11	-0.03
The level of cooperation and teamwork at Langston University.	0.24	0.28	0.07	0.17	0.33	0.15	0.36	0.61	-0.03	0.00
Staff salary levels.	0.15	0.18	-0.19	0.35	0.33	0.23	0.22	0.28	-0.17	-0.01
Medical insurance benefits.	0.07	0.12	0.23	0.79	0.13	-0.04	-0.12	0.15	0.16	-0.11
Dental insurance benefits.	-0.01	0.12	0.21	0.78	0.22	-0.15	0.07	0.16	0.14	-0.01
Retirement benefits.	0.10	0.07	-0.01	0.80	0.13	0.23	0.20	0.03	0.04	-0.08
Paid time off benefits.	0.03	0.17	-0.03	0.68	-0.16	0.35	0.16	-0.02	0.11	0.27
Staff development opportunities in my department.	0.44	0.56	0.24	0.21	0.27	0.27	-0.02	0.05	0.06	-0.01
Staff development opportunities at Langston University.	0.29	0.53	0.22	0.31	0.34	0.24	0.04	0.22	0.04	0.07

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 9 iterations.

APPENDIX D: DEMOGRAPHICS

1. GENDER		
	Response Rate	Response Count
Male	21%	21
Female	59%	60
Did not Respond	20%	20
Total	100%	101

2. EMPLOYMENT CATEGORY		
	Response Rate	Response Count
Administration	11%	11
Faculty	36%	36
Staff	34%	34
Did not Respond	20%	20
Total	100%	101

3. WORK STATUS (FT or PT)		
	Response Rate	Response Count
Full-time	80%	81
Part-time	1%	1
Did not Respond	19%	19
Total	100%	101

4. Primary Campus		
	Response Rate	Response Count
Main	69%	70
Tulsa	3%	3
OKC	6%	6
Did not Respond	22%	22
Total	100%	101

5. Race		
	Response Rate	Response Count
African American/Black	42%	42
Caucasian/White	19%	19
Other	14%	14
Did not Respond	26%	26
Total	100%	101

APPENDIX D: DEMOGRAPHICS Continued

6. # of Years working at Langston University		
	Response Rate	Response Count
0-5	28%	28
6-10	20%	20
11-15	16%	16
16-20	6%	6
21-25	5%	5
26-30	2%	2
30+	0%	0
Did not Respond	24%	24
Total	100%	101