

UCLA

UCLA Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Examining the Influence of Campus Climate on Staff Job Satisfaction and Intent to Leave

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6fp753f8>

Author

Couch, Victoria

Publication Date

2022

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Los Angeles

Examining the Influence of Campus Climate on Staff Job Satisfaction and Intent to Leave

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy
in Education

by

Victoria Couch

2022

© Copyright by

Victoria Couch

2022

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Examining the Influence of Campus Climate on Staff Job Satisfaction and Intent to Leave

by

Victoria Couch

Doctor of Philosophy in Education

University of California, Los Angeles, 2022

Professor Mark Kevin Eagan, Chair

Professional and support staff provide the labor that enables the very function of the university, yet they are omitted from formal governance structures. Further, their perspectives are underrepresented in the campus climate body of literature despite growing calls to incorporate staff into campus climate studies (Hart & Fellabaum, 2008; Hurtado et al., 2008; Vaccaro, 2014). Meanwhile, studies that examine staff job satisfaction and turnover intent in higher education typically lack a race-conscious lens despite evidence that Faculty of Color experience differential outcomes from their peers based on negative experiences with the campus climate (Buttner et al., 2010; Jayakumar et al., 2009; Niemann & Dovidio, 1998).

The purpose of this study is to better understand the relationship between campus climate and employment outcomes for staff in higher education using a race-conscious lens. The study uses the 2020 Staff Climate Survey (Study Sample N= 2,945) from the Higher Education Research Institute to answer the guiding research questions. It adapts the Multicontextual Framework for Diversity Learning Environments (Hurtado et al., 2012) for staff application to

define various aspects of the campus climate and test if they can be connected to job satisfaction and intent to leave. Existence, Relatedness, and Growth theory (Alderfer, 1972) is also applied to describe staff needs that further predict outcomes. Finally, the Critical Quantitative Inquiry research paradigm (Stage, 2007) guides research design to ensure a race-conscious focus.

Descriptive and inferential results revealed key findings. Black staff had the most negative experiences across all climate measures when examining mean scores by race. They also had the lowest mean job satisfaction score. Meanwhile, White staff had the lowest levels of turnover intent compared to Staff of Color peers. While climate measures ultimately had weak associations with job satisfaction by the last step of the regression model, positive perceptions of and experiences with the psychological dimension of the campus climate was related to improved job satisfaction. None of the climate measures were significant by the final step of the turnover intent model. For both regressions, having ERG needs met mitigated the impact of climate on staff outcomes which were significant at earlier points in the models. Implications for practice include providing opportunities for staff to connect with peers and mentors and providing avenues for cultivating staff members' professional growth and autonomy. Such practices can also serve to improve the campus climate.

The dissertation of Victoria Couch is approved.

Mitchell J. Chang

Sylvia Hurtado

Vilma Ortiz

Mark Kevin Eagan, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2022

Table of Contents

<i>ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>LIST OF TABLES</i>	<i>viii</i>
<i>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>VITA</i>	<i>xii</i>
<i>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION</i>	<i>1</i>
Introduction	1
Background & Problem Statement	2
Purpose of the Study	3
Scope of the Study	4
Contributions of the Study	5
Significance of the Study	6
Conclusion	7
<i>CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW</i>	<i>8</i>
Introduction	8
Historical Overview of Professional and Support Staff in Higher Education and the Rise of Academic Capitalism	8
Generalist Job Satisfaction	10
Overview and Measurement	10
Job Satisfaction Predictors	12
Job Satisfaction and Organizational Effectiveness	14
Higher Education Job Satisfaction	15
Faculty Job Satisfaction	15
Professional and Support Staff Job Satisfaction	16
Generalist Turnover/Turnover Intent	18
Overview and Measurement	18
Turnover/Turnover Intent Predictors	19
Turnover/Turnover Intent and Organizational Effectiveness	20
Higher Education Turnover/Turnover Intent	22
Faculty Turnover/Turnover Intent	22
Professional and Support Staff Turnover/Turnover Intent	23
Campus Climate	24
Overview and Measurement	24
Campus Climate for Students	26
Campus Climate for Faculty	27
Campus Climate for Professional and Support Staff	28
Theoretical Framework	30
Multicontextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments (MMDLE)	30
Existence, Relatedness, and Growth Theory	34

Critical Quantitative Inquiry	36
Connecting Literature and Identifying Gaps	37
CHAPTER 3: METHODS.....	40
Introduction.....	40
Research Purpose and Questions	40
Research Design	41
Data and Sample	41
Validity	43
Variables	43
Analysis	47
Missing data.....	50
Limitations and Considerations	51
Positionality	52
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	54
Introduction.....	54
Sample and General Descriptive Statistics	54
Factor Analysis and Resulting Factors.....	56
Initial Descriptive Results for MMDLE Measures.....	58
Job Satisfaction Results	61
Turnover Intent Results	67
Summary of Findings	78
Research Question One- Job Satisfaction	78
Research Question Two- Intent to Leave.....	80
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	84
Introduction.....	84
Study Overview	84
Key Findings.....	85
Interpretation of Significant Findings	86
MMDLE.....	86
ERG.....	86
Critical Quantitative Inquiry	88
The Pervasiveness of Anti-Black Racism	89
Implications	91
Policy and Practice.....	91
Theory/Research	95
Closing Thoughts.....	98
APPENDICES	100
Appendix A.....	100

Appendix B.....	101
<i>REFERENCES</i>.....	102

LIST OF TABLES

Tables

Table 3.1	Variable Definitions and Coding Scheme
Table 3.2	Deviation Effect Coding Example A
Table 3.3	Deviation Effect Coding Example B
Table 4.1	Demographic Profile
Table 4.2	Descriptive Statistics for Remaining Independent Variables
Table 4.3	Factor Loadings and Reliability
Table 4.4	ANOVA Results for MMDLE Measures by Race
Table 4.5	Mean Scores for MMDLE Measures by Race
Table 4.6	ANOVA Results for Nominal Variables and Job Satisfaction
Table 4.7	Mean Scores for Job Satisfaction by Race and Staff Role
Table 4.8	Correlations for MMDLE Measures and Job Satisfaction by Race
Table 4.9	Multiple Regression Results for Job Satisfaction Model
Table 4.10	R ² Values by Conceptual Block for Job Satisfaction Regression
Table 4.11	Chi-Square Statistics & Crosstab Results for Intent to Leave Model
Table 4.12	Correlations for MMDLE Measures and Intent to Leave by Race
Table 4.13	Logistic Regression Intent to Leave Results (Penultimate Step)
Table 4.14	Logistic Regression Intent to Leave Results (Final)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without an amazing support system. To my advisor and committee chair, Dr. Kevin Eagan, thank you for choosing me as an advisee and for supporting me throughout my time in HEOC. Your quantitative expertise, along with your calm disposition, always made me feel secure and confident throughout this process. Thank you also to my other committee members, Dr. Mitch Chang, Dr. Sylvia Hurtado, and Dr. Vilma Ortiz. Your guidance has been crucial in helping me reach this point. Mitch, thank you for letting me join your RAC and for all the support you have provided. It's hard to believe that I've never taken a formal course with you, because you've been such a constant and wonderful presence during my time in HEOC. Sylvia, your campus climate course was one of my favorite courses I have ever taken and was instrumental in informing my approach to this dissertation. Thank you also for welcoming me to your RAC and giving me helpful feedback when I was carrying out my first ever qualitative research project. Vilma, thank you for your expertise as the external reviewer. Your course on race and ethnicity in the US was the first course I took outside of the Education department, and it inspired me.

HERI was also a huge part of my time in HEOC. I am grateful that I got to work with the brilliant staff and GSRs who carry out the important work here. You all helped me grow so much as a researcher, and I will always cherish that.

Thanks to my fellow HEOCers for their role in my success. Especially in the RACs I joined, the sense of community and support was one of my favorite aspects of this whole experience. Thank you all for helping me develop my work and for sharing your own brilliant research projects with the rest of us. To my fellow first-year co-advisees, Dr. Julio Fregoso and Elaine Jessica Tamargo, and my classroom pals, Dr. Sarayu Sundar and Dr. Annie Wofford: The

first year of a Ph.D. program is a shock to the system but having you all in my orbit made it feel doable.

Thank you as well to colleagues, professors, supervisors, classmates, and friends from my time at San Diego State University, UC San Diego, and the UCLA Career Center/Student Affairs. You all provided me with the foundation to succeed in my Ph.D. and beyond. Thank you to Dr. Kristen McKinney, Dr. Marilee Bresciani Ludvik, Dr. Frank Harris III, and Dr. Marlene Lowe for writing recommendation letters in support of my Ph.D. aspirations. I also want to show my appreciation for Susy Puente who I met through the UCLA Graduate-Undergraduate Mentorship Program. Susy, it has been amazing seeing your trajectory over these past few years. Thanks for hyping me up as I worked on this dissertation. I will always be here to hype you up too!

One of the biggest transitions during my time in HEOC was starting a full-time position at UC San Diego. I could not have reached this point without the support of an amazing director and stellar colleagues. To our department's director, Dr. Christine Hurley, thank you for supporting me in ways big and small as I finished this degree. I also have to recognize the person who was subjected to the majority of my moans and groans as I worked on this dissertation: Dr. Kristine Kilanski. Your support (and commiseration) as I navigated the highs and lows of dissertating meant a lot. Dr. Heidi Carty was also a constant source of encouragement and joy. Thank you, Heidi, for always lifting my spirits with a well-timed meme or wisecrack. Last but not least, to the distinguished HEOC alum who first encouraged me to pursue my Ph.D., thank you Dr. William Armstrong. It was you who first introduced me to HEOC and encouraged me to apply when I was just starting out in higher education, and I thank you for planting that seed.

Stepping outside of work and school, I of course I have to acknowledge my family, all of whom have been my biggest cheerleaders throughout this process. Thank you especially to my parents for instilling a love of learning from an early age. I always appreciated everyone's loving questions about the process, such as "Why do they call it a 'dissertation' when they could just call it a 'research project?'" and "How much longer until you graduate?" It was a valuable reminder that as intimidating as academia can feel, it's all a little silly when you pause to think about it.

I also have to highlight my friends outside of higher education. Our in-person hangs, video chats, text threads, and DMs have kept me going. I'm so thankful to have people to turn to when I need to talk about things like the latest stunt that Julia Fox pulled or Keke Palmer's adorable SNL pregnancy announcement.

Finally, thank you to my partner, Robert. You have been with me from the very beginning, when my Ph.D. plans were just a daydream, and here we are now. This whole thing wouldn't have been nearly as fun without your companionship (alongside Yimmy and Dennis). Thank goodness I found someone who prioritizes relaxation time as much as I do, because it would have been lonely watching *Real Housewives* on my own.

VITA

Education

- 2015 M.A. Postsecondary Educational Leadership/Student Affairs
San Diego State University
- 2012 B.S. Elementary and Kindergarten Education
Penn State University

Experience

- 2021- Present Institutional Research Analyst
University of California, San Diego
- 2017-2021 Graduate Student Research Analyst
Higher Education Research Institute
University of California, Los Angeles
- 2015-2017 Career Center Research Analyst
University of California, Los Angeles

Publications

- 2021 **Couch, V.** *Findings from the 2020 Administration of the Staff Climate Survey (SCS)*. Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.
- 2020 Stolzenberg, E. B., Aragon, M. C., Romo, E., **Couch, V.**, McLennan, D., Eagan, M. K., & Kang, N. *The American Freshman: National Norms Fall 2019*. Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.
- 2019 **Couch, V.** *Findings from the 2019 Administration of the Staff Climate Survey (SCS)*. Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.
- 2019 **Couch, V.** *The HERI Faculty Survey 2016-2017*. Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.
- 2019 **Couch, V.** *Findings from the 2018 Administration of the Your First College Year (YFCY) Survey*. Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.
- 2018 **Couch, V.** *Findings from the 2017 Administration of the Your First College Year (YFCY) Survey*. Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

It's an institutional problem when it comes to the value of Black and brown bodies. For many, many hundreds of years in this country and on this continent, Black people and brown people were subjected to the servile jobs of cooking and cleaning and other types of work that would sustain the upper class (Burke, 2020, p. 43).

In this quote for an *Inside Higher Education* report examining the experiences of Black workers in higher education, Josh Armstead, Vice President of UNITE HERE Local 23 and dining hall worker at Georgetown University, succinctly describes the present-day racialized and racist nature of higher education labor by comparing it to its very founding, as the early success of higher education institutions largely depended upon enslaved Black service work (Dancy et al., 2018; Wilder, 2013). The piece further details the far-reaching impact of anti-Black racism in this employment context, such as low pay and a lack of workplace safety measures, many of which have become even more severe since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic (Burke, 2020). It is notable that after a summer of historic protests against anti-Black racism in 2020, which found many colleges and universities releasing statements about challenging anti-Black racism on campus and better supporting Black students, some of the Black staff who were interviewed for the piece conveyed the sense that they were often largely overlooked in their institution's strategies to combat anti-Black racism (Burke, 2020). Yet this report demonstrates that Black service workers have numerous insights to provide on the conditions they face and how the campus and institutional climate shape their experiences, if only given the opportunity to speak on these matters. This raises the question: what else might campuses be missing when they fail to systematically examine the racial campus climate for staff?

Background & Problem Statement

Professional and support staff, those whose labor supports the function of the university or college outside of professorial teaching and research (Bossu et al., 2018), compose a substantial proportion of the campus community. In fact, postsecondary institutions in the U.S. employed more than two million full-time, non-instructional staff as of Fall, 2019 (U.S. Department of Education, 2019). Yet despite their substantial presence on college campuses, the concerns and needs of professional and support staff are often overlooked in both higher education research literature and in higher education organizational functions (Burke, 2020; Eckel & Kezar, 2016; Hart & Fellabaum, 2008). Staff themselves highlight this gap in their responses to the Higher Education Research Institute's 2020 administration of the Staff Climate Survey, in which more than half of staff (52.5%) shared that they do not believe that staff concerns are considered when making policy at their institution (HERI, personal communication, May 23, 2021).

This omission is especially concerning as it relates to the study of campus climate. Campus climate research, whether multi-institutional empirical studies or single-institution assessments, are a critical mechanism for understanding the experiences of students, staff, and faculty and identifying ways to create a positive climate for diversity. Given that staff are the group who are most often omitted from climate studies (Hart & Fellabaum, 2008), examinations that have excluded the perspectives from professional and support staff have provided an incomplete portrait of the climate for diversity. The perpetual absence of staff members' experiences with and perceptions of campus climate from supposedly campus-wide assessments has several concerning implications. In regard to the research literature, it means the scholarly community currently has an underdeveloped understanding of staff needs and concerns related to

the campus climate. In terms of applied research, it means that senior administrators and other key decision-makers on-campus are not sufficiently considering if and how staff perceptions of the campus climate and related needs may differ from those of students and faculty and, as a result, are not taking measures to cultivate a positive campus climate for staff.

Given that research examining connections between perceptions of and experiences with climate in the workplace routinely finds that employees who hold a negative view of the climate of their work environment also have a greater likelihood of leaving their job and/or organization, the exclusion of staff members from climate studies also has important implications for research related to job satisfaction and turnover/turnover intent in higher education. Relatively few studies have examined higher education job satisfaction and employees' intentions to leave their positions. Further, most of these studies exclusively examine data on faculty and are race-neutral in focus, not explicitly accounting for the role of race and racism in potentially shaping higher education employees' experiences related to these outcomes.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to extend our understanding of campus climate by centering staff experiences using a race-conscious approach to examine how these experiences relate to job satisfaction and intent to leave. This study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. How do staff members' perceptions of campus climate relate to overall job satisfaction? What additional considerations related to staff job needs contribute to overall job satisfaction?
 - i. How do these relationships vary by racial/ethnic identity?

2. How do staff members' perceptions of campus climate relate to whether they intend to leave their current position? What additional considerations related to staff job needs contribute to this intention?
 - i. How do these relationships vary by racial/ethnic identity?

Scope of the Study

I use quantitative analyses to carry out the study. The data source is the 2019-2020 administration of the Staff Climate Survey, a secondary dataset encompassing multiple institutions from the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA. I use descriptive statistics, multiple regression, and logistic regression to answer my research questions.

The theoretical framework, composed of two theories and one paradigm, also strongly guides the study. The Multicontextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments (MMDLE) (Hurtado et al., 2012) connects distinct aspects of the campus climate to specific outcomes. It was originally developed for students, but I adapted the model for staff application. This framework enables me to study thoroughly defined components of the campus climate to understand if and how they relate to employment outcomes for staff. Meanwhile, Existence, Relatedness, and Growth (ERG) Theory (Alderfer, 1972), which segments employee job needs into three categories to understand how they relate to motivation, helps me identify and distinguish the numerous influences on staff job satisfaction and intent to leave outside of the campus climate. Finally, Critical Quantitative Inquiry, a research paradigm that resists conventional approaches to conducting quantitative research by challenging practices that are inequitable in nature (Stage & Wells, 2014), guides various aspects of my research design, which I detail further in Chapter 3.

Contributions of the Study

This study serves to bridge the gap between the lack of staff-focused campus climate studies and the lack of race-conscious studies in the higher education staff literature related to job satisfaction and intent to leave. In doing so, it contributes to a more well-rounded understanding of the campus climate for staff while also complicating scholarly understandings of higher education job satisfaction and turnover intent. In addition to these broader points, there are also more specific ways that the study is significant.

Related to the campus climate literature, the multi-institutional scope that endeavors to connect aspects of the campus climate to career-related outcomes responds to the need to expand campus climate literature beyond the dearth of single-institution studies and studies that only generally gauge the campus climate without attempting to connect aspects of the campus climate to outcomes (Hurtado et al., 2008). My close examination of how job satisfaction and intent to leave may differ by various racial/ethnic groups is also significant since many higher education studies in these areas tend to rely on a binary operationalization to represent race, categorizing research participants as either People of Color or White. This aggregation of multiple racial groups with differing histories and social contexts can serve to obscure meaningful differences across individual racial/ethnic groups (Xu, 2006). As a result, I am able to speak to potential differences with a greater degree of specificity than many other existing studies in this area.

The study's survey sample also contributes towards the study's significance. For one, it contains a more racially/ethnically diverse sample than many higher education-focused studies on these career-related outcomes. It also contains staff from diverse functional areas. This is notable because most staff-focused studies tend to examine only staff who work in student affairs. The study sample encompasses staff from a variety of units including not only student

affairs but also academic affairs, business/administrative services, and more. This, coupled with the multi-institutional focus, ensures that I can speak to a broader range of staff experiences.

Significance of the Study

Findings from this study serve a range of pressing matters in higher education organizational structure and function. For one, they provide insights on how best to support staff, particularly Black staff, for increased job satisfaction and decreased intent to leave. Supporting Black staff and Staff of Color more generally is especially important given that the racial diversity of professional and support staff has not kept pace with the increasing diversity of the student body (Dedman, 2019); therefore, institutions increasingly have an interest in retaining Staff of Color rather than having to regularly fill positions vacated by dissatisfied Staff of Color. Not only that, but a racially diverse staff is also beneficial for enhancing the campus climate for Students of Color (Smith, 2016). In this respect, efforts to cultivate a more positive climate for diversity for staff may also indirectly benefit students.

This study also provides guidance on how institutions can make efforts to systematically solicit staff input on matters related to the campus climate and other areas of institutional decision-making. HERI's findings that the majority of staff do not feel that staff perspectives are considered when crafting policy (personal communication, May 23, 2021) echo higher education organizational realities. Since staff are not incorporated into shared governance models, they do not have a unified voice via formal governance structures (Eckel & Kezar, 2016). Eckel and Kezar argue that institutions of higher education should shift to a "shared leadership" model of decision-making that more fully incorporates staff perspectives. Not only that, but a racially diverse staff who are given opportunities to provide their input in decision-making can lead to

more informed and democratic institutional decision-making that considers a wider range of perspectives (Smith, 2016).

The study serves to improve the financial stewardship of higher education institutions. Given the intertwined nature of job satisfaction, intent to leave, and actual turnover, a lack of engagement with these matters can have serious financial implications. A recent report estimated that the conservative cost of losing a US worker from turnover is \$15,000 per worker (Mahan et al., 2019). A failure to account for the complex reasons that professional and support staff may choose to leave their position may result in financial losses and inefficiency that otherwise might have been avoided. Not only that, but turnover also results in substantial knowledge loss for an organization (Droege & Hoobler, 2003).

Conclusion

While there is a scholarly understanding in higher education that it is not enough to recruit Students of Color without also cultivating a positive campus climate for diversity and ensuring they have the institutional supports necessary to thrive and retain (Kezar & Eckel, 2007), these same logics are largely overlooked for staff. This is especially concerning, given the numerous benefits to having a racially diverse staff outlined above. As such, a race-neutral approach to the study of higher education job satisfaction and turnover intention for professional and support staff is inherently lacking. This failure to systematically examine these matters with a race-conscious approach ensures that staff concerns, particularly those of Staff of Color, will continue to be overlooked. Given the numerous benefits of cultivating a positive campus climate for diversity in regard to students, it is short-sighted for institutions to not proactively engage with what this means for staff. Now that the scope and nature of the problem has been addressed, the following chapter will provide an in-depth examination of relevant literature.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter synthesizes relevant research literature for the study. I open with a historical overview of professional and support staff in higher education. From there, the core of the literature review is divided into three categories: job satisfaction, turnover/turnover intent, and campus climate. Because research on professional and support staff in higher education is sparse, I also include research on generalist job satisfaction and turnover/turnover intent. Similarly, my campus climate section includes not only studies focused on staff but also those focused on faculty and students. From there, I introduce the three theories contributing to my theoretical framework. I explain each of these theories with examples of how they have been applied in research. I end the chapter by identifying relevant gaps in these bodies of literature and demonstrating how my study responds to these gaps and extends scholarly knowledge on these topics.

Historical Overview of Professional and Support Staff in Higher Education and the Rise of Academic Capitalism

Professional and support staff provide the organizational knowledge and capabilities that ensure the function of colleges and universities (Graham, 2012), yet their role on campuses is largely overlooked in higher education research literature. They span a variety of roles, ranging from academic advisors to custodians to senior administrators and more. Though the history of professional and support staff has not been as extensively documented as that of faculty, a basic historical grounding is still valuable for understanding the current labor context of this population.

Labor histories of higher education typically focus on faculty and high-level administrators in the colonial era, but enslaved Black and, to a lesser extent, Indigenous peoples' stolen labor was present throughout all areas of the institution (Wilder, 2013). Enslaved Black laborers in particular were cooks, construction workers, groundskeepers, and cleaners, providing essential services needed to establish and successfully run early colleges and universities (Dancy et al., 2018). This exemplifies the racial stratification of higher education labor that persists today, as Black and Latinx staff tend to be more highly concentrated in service or sales roles while White staff comprise the majority of those in senior administration (Taylor et al., 2020). Even as the college student body has become increasingly diverse, the racial/ethnic representation of staff and administrators has not kept pace with this new demographic reality (Dedman, 2019).

As U.S. higher education continued to expand past the colonial era, universities adopted a corporate model of hierarchy for faculty and staff in the late 19th and early 20th century (Thelin, 2011). Alongside higher education's closer ties to industry, staffing needs sharply increased with the advent of college athletics, alumni offices, and foundations (Thelin). This is also the era in which the field of student affairs was first established to address emerging needs related to student unrest, housing administration, and related duties (Dungy & Gordon, 2011).

As the formal integration of professional and support staff into higher education continued through the 20th century, the professoriate experienced major shifts from the 1980s to the present (Altbach, 2016) Tenured and tenure-track faculty positions shrunk and were replaced with part-time, adjunct labor that offered fewer labor protections (Altbach). At the same time, a managerial class of professionals emerged to optimize university functions and generate revenue in an era of increasing corporatization (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2016). This shift has been

described as the advent of academic capitalism, a term that captures the increasing integration of free market logics into higher education organizational practices (Slaughter & Rhoades).

Academic capitalism as an analytical lens has mainly been applied to the professoriate, though there is a growing body that examines how these logics manifest in the work of student affairs. For one, student affairs offices now engage in cost-cutting measures like offloading full-time staff positions onto part-time graduate or undergraduate student workers, leading to increased workloads and stress for full-time and part-time staff alike (Lee & Helm, 2013). Staff protections are further undermined by universities contracting out student affairs work to external organizations to consolidate profits (McClure, 2016). In particular, universities have sought private/public partnerships when providing auxiliary services such as student housing, dining, and bookstores to generate more revenue (McClure et al., 2020). The boundaries of staff work and faculty work have also become increasingly porous as work functions that previously fell under the purview of full-time faculty are outsourced to administrative staff, such as teaching and coordinating research projects (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997), thus demonstrating the relationship between decreased faculty power and increased professional and support staff responsibilities under academic capitalism. With this foundational grounding established, the next section details literature related to generalist job satisfaction followed by higher education job satisfaction.

Generalist Job Satisfaction

Overview and Measurement

Job satisfaction refers to, “an evaluative state that expresses contentment with, and positive feelings about, one’s job” (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012, p. 347). The study of job

satisfaction originated in the field of organizational psychology. In their review of historical job satisfaction literature, Judge et al. (2020) outline four perspectives in this research area

Though these perspectives are segmented by chronological eras, various aspects of each of these perspectives are present in job satisfaction research throughout multiple periods.

The humanist perspective (1950s-1960s) frames job satisfaction as the extent to which a job fulfills worker needs (Judge et al.). Meanwhile, the cognitive perspective (1960s-1980s) examines how thought processes related to values and past experiences influence job satisfaction (Judge et al.). This perspective also began to consider how contextual factors influence job satisfaction (Judge et al.). The dispositional perspective took place in the 1980s and centered on the belief that job satisfaction is influenced by individual dispositions above all else (Judge et al.). Finally, the affective perspective (1990s-Present) examines the role of feelings and emotions as both antecedents of and outcomes to job satisfaction (Judge et al.).

Job satisfaction is typically measured via questionnaires. In a meta-analysis of commonly used job satisfaction questionnaires, van Saane et al. (2003) examined 29 instruments in total. These questionnaires included both generalist instruments and ones developed for specific career fields, particularly those in healthcare settings. They highlighted the Andrew and Withey Job Satisfaction Questionnaire as the one most frequently used in organizational science. Additional questionnaires that are often employed include the Job in General Scale, the Emergency Physician Job Satisfaction Scale, and the Human Services Job Satisfaction Scale.

As for job satisfaction measurement, there is ongoing debate on the utility of global measures compared to facet-level measures. Global measures examine job satisfaction more broadly (e.g., “Please rate your overall satisfaction with your job”) whereas facet-level measures examine multiple and specific aspects of workplace attitudes (e.g., satisfaction with salary, relationship

with coworkers). Global measures can refer to single-item outcomes or multiple item measures. While facet-level measures have historically been the preferred approach, there is an increasing understanding that these measures have their own set of limitations and are not universally better suited to the study of job satisfaction (Judge et al., 2020). Instead, job satisfaction researchers are urged to consider the measure that is best suited to their particular study (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012). Specifically, a measure of overall job satisfaction is most appropriate for researchers interested in examining job satisfaction more broadly while facet-level measures are best used for more narrowly defined studies, such as an investigation of how compensation practices influence employee attitudes (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller). Similarly, Wanous et al. (1997) examined whether single-item measures or multiple-item measures were better for examining job satisfaction. The authors concluded that although multiple-item measures have historically been preferred to single-item measures, single-item measures are nonetheless a legitimate way to study job satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction Predictors

Job satisfaction predictors can be broadly segmented into several categories. Dispositional antecedents refer to the personality characteristics and modes of thinking that influence job satisfaction (Judge et al., 2020). Specifically, those with a positive affect have higher levels of job satisfaction while those with a negative affect have lower levels of job satisfaction (Thoresen et al., 2003). Research on this area has also demonstrated the “Big 5” personality traits that are associated with job satisfaction: neuroticism (negatively associated), extraversion (positively associated), openness to experience (positively associated), agreeableness (positively associated), and conscientiousness (positively associated) (Judge et al., 2002).

Contextual antecedents describe factors related to the work environment that help or hinder job satisfaction (Judge et al., 2020). Schleicher et al. (2011) highlight a range of contextual antecedents that support increased job satisfaction including autonomy, feedback, job complexity, skill variety, task identity, task significance, supportive workplace, positive relationships with supervisor and coworkers, positive role perceptions, and positive perceptions related to justice and fairness in the workplace. Further accentuating the significance of workplace relationships, Morgeson et al. (2006) found that social support (which encompasses opportunities to receive advice and assistance from others) is more strongly associated with job satisfaction than motivational work characteristics such as autonomy and task variety. The authors drew their data from a sample of 540 survey respondents spanning 22 occupational categories (e.g., Computer and mathematical, legal, health care support). The sample was composed of individuals who had worked in their current job for 15 years, 58% of whom were men.

Workplace stressors are another component to the work environment that influence job satisfaction. Though stress typically has a negative connotation, several forms of stress actually support increased job satisfaction. Podsakoff et al. (2007) conducted a meta-analysis of 25 randomly selected articles for which they organized workplace stressors into hindrance stressors (those that employees perceive as obstacles) and challenge stressors (those that employees perceive as an opportunity for professional growth). They found that hindrance stressors were associated with lower levels of job satisfaction while challenge stressors were associated with higher levels of job satisfaction (Podsakoff et al.). The meta-analysis measured job satisfaction via a blend of global and facet-level measures including overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with supervisor.

There can also be some degree of overlap between dispositional antecedents and contextual antecedents. Applying person-environment theories to the study of job satisfaction, Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) found in their study of 997 employees from four water treatment agencies that person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit, and person-supervisor fit were related to increased job satisfaction. Relatedly, value congruence, the extent to which employees perceive that their organization's values are aligned with their own, is also positively associated with job satisfaction (Edwards & Cable, 2009). The authors measured values congruence using the Work Values Survey (Cable & Edwards, 2004) in which respondents are asked to rate the degree to which various values are of personal importance to them and the extent to which they believe these values are reflected at their workplace.

Job Satisfaction and Organizational Effectiveness

Organizational effectiveness describes the degree to which an organization achieves its mission, goals, and vision (Bartuševičienė & Šakalytė, 2013). Associated outcomes related to organizational effectiveness span an array of areas, but examples include sales, cost reduction, and organizational commitment (employees' identification with and commitment to their organization) (Bartuševičienė & Šakalytė). Cultivating a positive work environment for employees is an important strategy for increasing organizational effectiveness (Bartuševičienė & Šakalytė). With this in mind, job satisfaction is connected to a variety of workplace outcomes related to organizational effectiveness.

Job satisfaction studies often focus on the individual employee as the unit of analysis, but many of the studies that examine how job satisfaction relates to organizational effectiveness use business units within organizations as the unit of analysis. One such meta-analysis studied 7,939 business units across 36 companies and found that unit-level job satisfaction was related to

positive unit-level business outcomes such as decreased employee turnover and increased customer satisfaction, workplace safety, productivity, and profitability (Harter et al., 2002). Similarly, Whitman et al. (2010) conducted a meta-analysis composed of 5,849 business units and established a relationship between unit-level job satisfaction and unit-level productivity measures including increased customer satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors¹ and decreased turnover and absenteeism.

Shifting back to the individual employee as the unit of analysis, one meta-analysis totaling a sample of 43,914 people concluded that increased job satisfaction is also related to a decreased likelihood of engaging in unethical workplace behaviors (Kish-Gephart et al., 2010). Another study using this same unit of analysis found that the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness is stronger in workplaces where employees have more discretion and flexibility in how they approach their work (Bowling et al., 2015).

Higher Education Job Satisfaction

Faculty Job Satisfaction

There is a smaller body of literature that examines job satisfaction in the higher education sector, some of which focus on faculty. Recent literature on faculty job satisfaction has focused on non-tenure track, part-time, and contingent faculty. Kramer et al. (2014) found that despite dissatisfaction with salary and job security, part-time faculty in a community college system had relatively high levels of overall satisfaction, which they attribute to the deep motivation these faculty have for their work. Some of the specific predictors for higher levels of part-time faculty job satisfaction include autonomy, teaching schedule, pay, work preference, faculty support,

¹ Organizational citizenship behaviors refer to workplace behaviors that fall outside of the scope of routine task performance but that benefit the organization such as cooperating with colleagues and pitching in to complete tasks that may not formally be a part of an employee's job description (Borman, 2004)

recognition, status, class facilities, quality of students, and job security (Howell & Hoyt, 2007). Whether a part-time faculty member's status is voluntary or involuntary also affects job satisfaction. Specifically, involuntary part-time faculty have lower levels of job satisfaction compared to their voluntary part-time peers (Eagan et al., 2015). This is at least partially due to involuntary part-time faculty being less likely to report good working relationships with their institution's administration and decreased perceptions that full-time faculty respected part-time faculty (Eagan et al.). The literature in this area has also established that there are differing levels of job satisfaction related to various social identities, which I examine in more detail in the Campus Climate section.

Professional and Support Staff Job Satisfaction

As for more generalized higher education job satisfaction studies, Smerek and Peterson (2007) found that amongst non-academic employees, the work itself² was the top predictor of job satisfaction, along with having an effective supervisor and opportunities for advancement. Meanwhile, Volkwein & Zhou's 2003 study on administrative job satisfaction found that for managers, intrinsic job satisfaction (encompassing feelings of accomplishment, autonomy, creativity, initiative, and challenges) was the top predictor of overall satisfaction. This particular study also applied Herzberg's two-factor theory (1959), as detailed in footnote two for Smerek and Petersen's study. Once again, variables related to intrinsic motivation are the strongest predictor for job satisfaction. The next strongest predictors for the study were perceptions of job insecurity, which was negatively associated with job satisfaction, and feelings of interpersonal satisfaction (social and professional relationships with colleagues, administrative supervisors,

² This term comes from Herzberg et al.'s (1959) two-factor theory. The work itself, which describes the tasks that compose a person's job, is classified as one of the intrinsic motivators that predicts job satisfaction.

faculty, students, and social status and recognition), which was a positive predictor of overall job satisfaction.

Another study surveyed all staff in student affairs and academic affairs at a four-year public institution (Hermsen & Rosser, 2008). The top predictor for job satisfaction in this study was role fit, a factor composed of items related to how well-integrated a person's job is to their sense of self (Hermsen & Rosser). The next most prominent predictor was for a factor called recognition for competence, related to workplace recognition and autonomy (Hermsen & Rosser). This was followed by working conditions, a factor encompassing salary and the overall work environment. Once again, these findings demonstrate that while practical needs related to salary influence job satisfaction, the most substantial predictors tend to be related to higher-level fulfillment needs. Baur (2000) confirms this pattern in a literature overview of classified support staff detailing that rewards and recognition, work/life balance, opportunities for growth, opportunities for training and development, and positive perceptions of the work environment contribute to higher job satisfaction.

Much of the literature in this area focuses on staff who work in student affairs/student services. Mullen et al. (2018) found that job stress and burnout are associated with lower levels of job satisfaction for student affairs professionals. Brewer and Clippard (2002) also examine how burnout in a helping profession such as student affairs influences job satisfaction and found a negative relationship between emotional exhaustion and job satisfaction and a positive relationship between a sense of personal accomplishment and job satisfaction amongst staff in TRIO programs.

Generalist Turnover/Turnover Intent

Having reviewed the antecedents of job satisfaction, I now detail the consequences of job satisfaction. As noted above, job satisfaction can lead to greater worker productivity and improved organizational effectiveness. On the other hand, lack of job satisfaction or being dissatisfied in one's position can also result in turnover.

Overview and Measurement

Intent to leave, or turnover intention, refers to an employee's personal determination of whether they will leave their role or organization in the near future (Mowday et al., 1982). It more broadly falls under the umbrella of employee withdrawal behaviors, which include absenteeism, lateness, and turnover (Saari & Judge, 2004). Withdrawal behaviors are interrelated to each other since lateness moderately predicts absenteeism and absenteeism moderately predicts turnover (Berry et al., 2012).

Intent to leave is distinct from actual employee turnover. It is a common measure to use in turnover research for pragmatic reasons, since measuring actual turnover is more resource-intensive in nature (Cohen et al., 2016). Research focused on intent to leave typically measures this outcome via a single survey item (Brown & Yoshioka, 2003; Cho et al., 2009). There are not standardized survey instruments used in turnover research in the same way that exist for job satisfaction research. Griffeth et al. (2000) conducted a meta-analysis that examined studies focused on turnover intentions and actual turnover using individual employees as the unit of analysis. They determined that aside from job search methods, turnover intent was the best predictor of actual turnover with a correlation of 0.38. However, one study focused on federal agencies that used the organization as the unit of analysis to compare turnover intent to actual turnover found that that the two were not related (Cohen et al.).

Another consideration when studying turnover intent compared to actual turnover is time lag, the length of time in longitudinal studies between when turnover intentions are initially reported and when outcomes data is collected. Turning again to the Griffeth et al. (2000) meta-analysis, the authors examined outcomes for studies that collected follow up data less than 12 months from first phase data collection and studies that collected follow up data more than 12 months out. They concluded that increased time lag was not associated with improved predictive accuracy (Griffeth et al.). Similarly, Hausknecht and Trevor (2011) conducted a comprehensive review of studies examining aggregate levels of turnover at the group, unit, and organizational level. They concluded that cross-sectional studies and studies with a shorter time lag were a more precise measure of collective turnover (Hausknecht & Trevor).

Turnover/Turnover Intent Predictors

The body of literature focused on turnover antecedents can be broadly placed in two categories: those focused on individual-level attitudes and those focused on organizational/environmental influences. Employee attitudes, such as a negative attitude and lack of trust towards their workplace, contribute to expressing a stronger intent to leave (Chiaburu et al., 2013). Conversely higher levels of emotional attachment to an organization, perceived obligation to remain in an organization, and increased levels of understanding the perceived costs of leaving an organization are associated with lower levels of turnover (Meyer et al., 2002). Increased job satisfaction is also associated with lower turnover intentions as are positive shared perceptions of co-worker and supervisor relationships (Heavey et al., 2013).

At the organizational level, perceived organizational support for employee well-being and employee contributions is associated with lower intent to leave (Riggle et al., 2009). Human resources (HR) practices also play an important role in reducing turnover. Combs et al. (2006)

conducted a meta-analysis that established the role of HR strategies such as compensation, flextime, and job security in promoting retention. Similarly, opportunities for advancement are negatively associated with turnover while training is positively associated with turnover, possibly because skills training allows for more seamless transition to new job opportunities (Haines et al., 2010). As with job satisfaction, stressors also play a role in turnover and turnover intentions. Podsakoff et al. (2007) determined that hindrance stressors (those that constrain) are positively associated with turnover and turnover intentions while challenge stressors (those that are related to growth and achievement) are negatively associated with these outcomes. A meta-analysis by Heavey et al. (2013) found that age, length of tenure, proportion of unionized staff, and general union presence were related to lower turnover. Meanwhile, when specifically examining the reasons why employees choose to *stay* in their position, Hausknecht et al. (2009) found that job satisfaction, compensation packages, and relationships with supervisors and coworkers were the top reasons people specified for why they remained.

Turnover/Turnover Intent and Organizational Effectiveness

Employee turnover results in decreased organizational effectiveness in a range of areas. In their 2013 meta-analysis of the relationship between employee turnover and organizational performance, Park and Shaw established the negative impact of organization-level turnover on customer satisfaction and quality performance amongst other measures related to organizational effectiveness. They also found that the negative impact of turnover on aggregate organizational effectiveness was more pronounced for industries with a higher human capital emphasis (e.g., education) than for industries with lower human capital emphasis (e.g., manufacturing) (Park & Shaw). Further, the meta-analysis found that the negative impact of reduced aggregate organizational effectiveness was less severe for larger companies and organizations (Park &

Shaw). Similarly, Heavey et al. (2013) conducted a meta-analysis that identified decreased customer satisfaction, production efficiency, and sales efficiency and increased error rates related to turnover. Operational efficiency is further diminished since the cost of replacing a position for which an employee left is higher than if the employee had remained (Steel et al., 2002).

Not all turnover “costs” are financial in nature. Knowledge loss is one example of such an asset that is lost due to employee turnover. Droege and Hoobler (2003) outline the theoretical basis for this perspective and specify that employee knowledge can be divided into two categories: tacit knowledge and codified knowledge. Tacit knowledge refers to, “...the information about work processes and products that individuals hold above and beyond what the organization has documented” (Droege & Hoobler, p. 53). It is the type of knowledge that employees accumulate after substantial time in a position and is not readily transferred to others. Conversely, codified knowledge refers to information that is embedded into the organizational structure via resources such as internal documentation and employee handbooks (Droege & Hoobler). The authors specify that when an employee leaves an organization, the codified knowledge stays with the firm but the tacit knowledge leaves with the employee, ultimately contributing to decreased organizational effectiveness (Droege & Hoobler). One case study focused on two software companies used financial risk analysis and simulations to quantify the knowledge loss resulting from turnover (Cho et al., 2009). They operationalized “loss” as the number of file projects that were abandoned in a four-month period and found that knowledge loss due to turnover resulted in over three times the amount of expected loss at both companies (Cho et al.).

Higher Education Turnover/Turnover Intent

Faculty Turnover/Turnover Intent

As with higher education focused job satisfaction, the body of literature related to turnover and turnover intent is fairly small and tends to examine the experiences and perspectives of college and university faculty. Autonomy and support for innovation tend to motivate faculty to intend to stay (Daly & Dee, 2006; Dee, 2004). Such flexibility likely promotes creative thinking and exploration, encouraging faculty to continue to develop their knowledge base and skillset. While valuing “the work itself” reduces turnover intentions (Heckert & Farabee, 2006), echoing themes from job satisfaction research, pay is nonetheless a substantial influential in determining whether faculty stay in their position (Daly & Dee; Heckert & Farabee).

Faculty members are known for bearing heavy workloads related to research and teaching. However, the relationship between workload and intent to leave is not necessarily as straightforward as expected. While satisfaction with teaching/research load and positive perceptions of work/life balance are associated with reduced intent to leave (Heckert & Farabee, 2006; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002), increased scholarly productivity can lead to greater turnover intentions (Ryan et al., 2012). This may be because scholars who are producing more publications are considered more competitive on the job market (Ryan et al.).

There are additional considerations in this area as well. Xu (2008) found that there is variation across academic disciplines in terms of what motivates faculty to stay or leave in their positions. Younger faculty and faculty who have worked for fewer years at their institution are also more likely to turnover in pursuit of other professional opportunities (Dee, 2004; Ryan et al., 2012). As for faculty rank, full professors are less likely to leave their position (Johnsrud &

Rosser, 2002) and more generally, part-time faculty express higher turnover intentions compared to their full-time peers (Rosser & Townsend, 2006). Interestingly, other demographic characteristics such as those related to gender and race tend not to be significant in models examining faculty intent to leave, though Xu (2008) pointed out that this may be because many of these models examine race using a Faculty of Color/White binary that obscures more meaningful differences across individual racial/ethnic groups.

Professional and Support Staff Turnover/Turnover Intent

Much of the literature focused on higher education professional and support staff echoes similar themes to the generalist intent to leave research focused on the nonprofit sector. Figueron's 2015 review of the research on this topic summarized reasons for staff turnover including low work engagement, low organizational commitment, not feeling valued, a lack of growth opportunities and low compensation. As with higher education job satisfaction literature, much of this research is focused on student affairs professionals. Student affairs professionals are particularly vulnerable to the effects of job stress and burnout due to the emotionally taxing nature of their jobs, both of which contribute towards increased turnover (Mullen et al., 2018). Entry-level student affairs professionals have especially high attrition rates not just from their current role but from the entire field of student affairs (Lorden, 1998). To counteract this, hands-on supervisory support for young student affairs professionals is associated with decreased turnover intentions (Shupp & Arminio, 2012).

There is also a small subset of studies that examine retention and intent to leave for midlevel student affairs professionals. A 2016 study of such professionals found that values congruence with the profession, community connection, and career contentment contributed towards higher levels of career commitment and entrenchment (Wilson et al.). Further, number

of years in the field was also associated with increased commitment, echoing findings from the generalist literature on intent to leave (Rosser & Javinar, 2003; Wilson et al.). In addition, satisfaction with salary is negatively associated with intent to leave (Rosser & Javinar).

Campus Climate

Overview and Measurement

One of the primary gaps in the job satisfaction and turnover/turnover intent literature as it relates to my dissertation is the lack of race-conscious studies that critically examine if and how staff of various racial/ethnic backgrounds may experience differential effects related to the campus climate in these areas. To begin to make sense of what these differences might entail, I turn to the campus climate literature for guidance.

Campus climate refers to perceptions and attitudes of organizational life for members of the campus community (Peterson & Spencer, 1990). Peterson and Spencer further specify the following major features of the campus climate: “...(1) its primary emphasis on common participant views of a wide array of organizational phenomena that allow for comparison among groups or over time, (2) its focus on current patterns of beliefs and behaviors, and (3) its often ephemeral or malleable character” (p. 8). It describes the overall atmosphere of a campus and what the atmosphere evokes for individuals and groups (Renn & Patton, 2011). There are also numerous elements that influence the campus climate for diversity including the historical legacy of inclusion/exclusion, compositional diversity, psychological dimension, behavioral dimension, and the organizational/structural dimension (Hurtado et al., 1999), of which I further detail when outlining my conceptual framework.

Campus climate studies measure attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors related to diversity (Ryder & Mitchell, 2013). Hurtado et al. (2008) provide a thorough summary of the history of

climate assessments which emerged as a proactive effort to address issues affecting students with minoritized social identities. These studies may be situated at a single institution or multiple institutions with a national focus, with students typically serving as the unit of analysis (Hurtado et al.). Eventually these studies began to connect various elements of the campus climate to educational outcomes. Even so, many campus climate survey instruments in circulation do not assess outcomes but instead gather data for a snapshot of the campus climate for various groups (Hurtado et al.). The authors also specify that many climate studies and climate instruments do not extensively assess the multiple dimensions of the campus climate and can sometimes only possess a small number of items related to diversity (Hurtado et al.). Particularly for single-institution studies, one ongoing challenge is the tendency to treat climate assessments as self-contained data collection efforts that are not then used as a catalyst for change to improve the climate for diversity (Hurtado et al.).

Miller (2014) provides an overview of instruments and approaches that have been employed more recently in campus climate research. Particularly for single-institution studies, one option is to use a “home-grown” survey instrument strictly for in-house administration (Miller). Conversely, the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA offers a well-known and validated instrument called the Diverse Learning Environments (DLE) survey (Miller). The DLE assesses the campus climate across numerous dimensions and contains measures related to discrimination, cross-racial interactions, and sense of belonging (HERI, 2021). Another approach is the Equity Scorecard (Harris & Bensimon, 2007) which highlights racial/ethnic disparities in outcomes and then urges campuses to develop plans for eliminating disparities (Miller).

One content analysis of campus climate literature found that campus climate research has historically primarily focused on the racial campus climate (Hart & Fellabaum, 2008). Amongst

the studies the authors examined, they found that gender, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation were the most assessed characteristics in climate studies (Hart & Fellabaum). Most studies were either quantitative or mixed methods in nature, with only a small proportion of climate studies relying exclusive on a qualitative approach (Hart & Fellabaum). This echoes the findings from another review of the literature of which nearly three-quarters of the studies in the review were quantitative while only one was entirely qualitative (Harper & Hurtado, 2007). The review also found that staff were the group most likely to be omitted from climate studies (Hart & Fellabaum).

Campus Climate for Students

Campus climate research was founded upon examining the racial campus climate for students. Much of the literature in this area is focused on undergraduate students (Vaccaro, 2014). Harper and Hurtado's (2007) review of studies focused on the racial campus climate for students uncovered several notable themes in past climate research. They reported that studies in this area since 1992 typically fall into three categories: those studying differential perceptions of the climate by race, reports of prejudicial or racist treatment from Students of Color, and benefits of cross-racial interaction (Harper & Hurtado).

More recently, scholars have expanded the focus of campus climate research in a number of ways. Many climate studies now explore additional elements of the campus climate beyond the climate for race. In particular, research on the climate for disability (Harbour & Greensburg, 2017; Zehner & Soria, 2018) the climate for queer-spectrum students (Garvey et al., 2015, 2018, 2019; Hughes & Hurtado, 2018; Tetreault et al., 2013), the climate for socioeconomic class (Buckley & Park, 2019; Park et al., 2013), the climate for undocumented students (Muñoz & Virgil, 2018; Shelton, 2019), and the religious/spiritual climate (Mayhew et al., 2014;

Rockenbach & Bryant, 2014) has increased in recent years. Not only that, but more studies have come to examine the climate for multiple marginalized students, such as those who are both disabled and LGBTQIA+ (Miller et al., 2018) or students who are both Black and international (George Mwangi et al., 2019).

Campus Climate for Faculty

There is also a slowly expanding body of literature focused on the campus climate for faculty. In some cases, faculty are the sole focus of the climate study while in others, they are one of numerous groups whose climate views are assessed. One study focused on LGBT students, staff, and faculty found that each group reported heterosexism, homophobia, transphobia, and genderism as climate concerns, though these matters manifested in different ways for different groups (Vaccaro, 2012). Most of the climate issues that faculty highlighted were housed within departmental microclimates (Vaccaro). Faculty also raised troublesome interactions they have had with students as well as a lack of support and representation in curriculum and research focus (Vaccaro).

Climate studies focused entirely on faculty often highlight climate issues related to racism and sexism. One such study found that women and Faculty of Color feel less respected than their counterparts while men and Faculty of Color experience more workplace conflicts (Campbell-Whatley et al., 2015). Faculty of Color in particular report climate concerns about racist and sexist attitudes in the classroom from students, overloaded service duties related to their racial/ethnic identity and generalized racist attitudes (both individual and institutional) (Stanley, 2006). Even so, collegial relationships with colleagues and strong mentors helped support some of the Faculty of Color in these areas (Stanley).

Other faculty climate studies make explicit connections to employment-related issues. Fraser and Hodge (2000) found that men and women have differential influences for their job satisfaction. The main predictor for women's job satisfaction was quality of coworker ties, a predictor that was not significant for men. The authors conclude that gender becomes a salient predictor of job satisfaction because of gender norms and dynamics embedded into the organizational culture (Fraser & Hodge). Another study proposed a theoretical model that connects a chilly climate for LGBT faculty in science and engineering to negative workplace outcomes including bias in recruitment, exclusions from professional networks, and undermined career success (Bilimoria et al., 2009).

Examining job satisfaction by race and ethnicity also illuminates important findings. In general, Faculty of Color have lower levels of job satisfaction compared to their White counterparts (Niemann & Dovidio, 1998). Jayakumar et al. (2009) detailed that a welcoming campus climate increases job satisfaction across all racial groups but that Black and Latinx faculty are most negatively affected by a negative campus climate in relation to job satisfaction. Buttner et al. (2010) found in a study of business school faculty that Faculty of Color who perceive an unfulfilled diversity promise from their institution express lower organizational commitment. The cumulative message from these findings indicates that matters related to a negative campus climate for Faculty of Color can be explicitly connected to employment-related outcomes. With this in mind, it seems plausible that Staff of Color may experience a similar relationship in these areas.

Campus Climate for Professional and Support Staff

Professional and support staff are the group that is least represented in the campus climate literature (Hart et al., 2008). A 2006 study (Mayhew et al.) examined predictors for staff

perceptions of a positive climate for diversity at a public predominantly white university. The dependent variable was a factor composed of three survey items in which survey respondents indicated the extent to which they believed senior administrators were committed to promoting respect for group differences, that their university had achieved a positive climate for diversity, and that gay and lesbian staff were accepted and respected. The authors found that Staff of Color and women staff had more critical perspectives of whether their campus achieved a positive climate (Mayhew et al.). They also found that staff in classified, non-bargaining positions were less likely to perceive a positive climate for diversity, though older staff were more likely to perceive the climate positively (Mayhew et al.). Perceptions of a diversity-friendly departmental culture also led to increased perceptions of a positive climate for diversity (Mayhew et al.), as did perceptions of an institutional commitment to diversity (Mayhew et al.). Finally, campus experiences with diversity are also positively associated with perceptions of a positive climate for diversity (Mayhew et al.). A 2009 study from Carpenter also confirmed the importance of both departmental climate and institutional climate in influencing staff perceptions of the climate for diversity. Departmental indicators were variables that captured the compositional diversity of a respondent's department related to gender and race while institutional indicators focused on perceptions of institutional priorities and institutional support for diversity.

Examining staff perceptions of climate outside of the Person of Color/White binary, findings from the 2019 Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Staff Climate Survey showed differences across racial groups in their perceptions of racial tension on campus (Couch, 2019). Black and Asian staff report the highest perceptions of racial tension followed by Latinx and Multiracial staff (Couch). White staff and staff who indicated a different race perceived the lowest levels of racial tension (Couch). Similarly, findings from the 2018 HERI Staff Climate

Survey show that when examining staff satisfaction with the racial/ethnic diversity of the staff body, Black staff had the lowest levels of satisfaction at only 11.6% (McLennan, 2019). Asian, Latinx, White, Multiracial, and race Other staff satisfaction in this area hovered between approximately 44%-52%, with race Other staff indicating the highest levels of satisfaction (51.9%) (McLennan).

As with the faculty campus climate literature, some staff-focused studies explore connections to employment matters. One study focused on lesbian/gay/bisexual student affairs professionals found that they experienced discrimination related to their sexual orientation, though it did not affect their job satisfaction (Croteau & Lark, 2009). Amongst women student affairs professionals, White women have higher rates of satisfaction than their counterparts and that Women of Color also perceived higher levels of discrimination (Blackhurst, 2000). Another study used interviews to examine how Staff of Color concerns with a negative climate for diversity shaped their decisions to stay or leave their positions (Steele, 2018). The study found that Staff of Color grappled with considerations such as which option would be best for their mental health and whether leaving their position would mean that Staff of Color needs would no longer be considered at the institutional level (Steele).

Theoretical Framework

Multicontextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments (MMDLE)

The MMDLE weaves the interrelated individual and structural components of campus climate and links the campus climate for diversity to outcomes. The theory originates from a campus climate model first developed by Hurtado et al. focused on the racial campus climate (1998; 1999). This original model shifted the study of campus climate from its characterization as an amorphous concept eluding concrete study to an entity that can be thoroughly defined,

assessed, and acted upon in ways that improve the atmosphere for students (Hurtado et al., 1999). It highlighted the unique experiences of Black, Latinx, Asian American, and Native American students, linking group experiences to the racial contexts at an institution and examining how these contexts were influenced by broader sociohistorical contexts (Hurtado et al., 2012).

Moving to the current iteration of this model, the MMDLE updates and enhances this foundational climate model in several ways. For one, it extends the focus of the theory from one situated entirely in the racial campus climate to a model that can be applied to multiple social identity groups (Hurtado et al., 2012). Secondly, it takes into greater account the complex web of macrosystems and meso-level dynamics that shape the campus climate (Hurtado et al.). Finally, it explicitly links elements of the campus climate to student outcomes (Hurtado et al.).

I adapt the MMDLE to identify if there is a relationship between dimensions of the campus climate and staff intent to leave/job satisfaction. Further, I examine if and how staff are differentially impacted by these dimensions of the campus climate based on their racial/ethnic identity. Given that the MMDLE is still a student-focused model, I focus on the dimensions that are most well-suited to studying staff experiences and that align most closely with my data source: the compositional dimension, the organizational/structural dimension, and the psychological dimension.

Compositional diversity refers to the numerical representation of students, faculty, and staff of various social identities (Hurtado et al., 1999). A racially diverse student body is associated with positive outcomes including more cross-racial interactions amongst students, decreased incidences of Students of Color feeling “tokenized,” diversity in thought (Milem et al., 2005) and better overall perceptions of the campus climate (Hurtado et al., 2012). A

compositionally diverse faculty body is associated with a greater ability to hire and retain Faculty of Color as well as Students of Color (Turner et al., 2008). While increased compositional diversity has a range of benefits, there are also limits to how far numeric diversity can ultimately achieve aims to cultivate a positive campus climate (Hurtado et al., 1999). This demonstrates the value of the additional dimensions to the campus climate as described in the MMDLE.

The organizational/structural dimension describes the high-level mechanisms embedded in institutional processes that confer privileges to majoritarian groups and oppression to minoritized groups on campus (Hurtado et al., 2012; Milem et al., 2005). Concrete examples of this dimension include the diversity of the curriculum, tenure policies, organizational decision-making policies, budget allocations, and general policies (Milem et al.). My research in this area will focus on the policies and practices that shape the institutional commitment to diversity (Hurtado et al.).

The institutional commitment to diversity captures student, staff, and/or faculty perceptions about the extent to which formal communications and policies reflect a genuine effort to support a positive climate for diversity. The concept has been measured in the HERI Diverse Learning Environments Survey (DLE) and The Faculty Survey via constructs. In the student focused DLE, the construct is composed of four items that capture the extent to which students agree that their institution promotes the appreciation of cultural difference, has a long-standing commitment to diversity, accurately reflects the diversity of the student body in publications, and has campus administrators who regularly speak about the value of diversity (HERI, 2021). In the Faculty Survey, the construct has five items with a slightly different focus. The institutional commitment to diversity encompasses the extent to which faculty believe each of the following is a priority at their institution: recruiting more underrepresented students,

promoting gender diversity in the faculty and administration, promoting racial/ethnic diversity in the faculty and administration, and developing an appreciation for multiculturalism (HERI, 2021). One study used the HERI DLE to find that decreased perceptions of an institutional commitment to diversity correlated with greater civic engagement for students (Garcia & Cueller, 2018). Another used The Campus Life in America Student Survey and identified several items that captured institutional commitment to diversity including how much time the university spent focused on diversity issues and the extent to which the institution cultivated ethnic and religious networks for students (Harper & Yeung, 2013). The authors found that students who indicated their institution spent “too much” time focused on diversity commitments had decreased openness to diverse perspectives (Harper & Yeung).

Both the compositional dimension and the organizational/structural dimension are institutional-level dimensions of the climate. Each of these dimensions are connected rather than discrete entities (Hurtado et al., 1998). For example, staff dissatisfaction with the racial diversity of the staff body (compositional dimension) may be connected to poor diversity-related hiring practices (organizational/structural dimension).

In addition to institutional-level dimensions, I also incorporate an individual-level dimensions in my study. The psychological dimension refers to, “...individuals’ views of group relations, institutional responses to diversity, perceptions of discrimination or racial conflict, and attitudes held towards others from different racial/ethnic backgrounds (Hurtado et al., 1999). Research in this area echoes many of the themes I examined in the campus climate section of the literature review, such as the finding that Students of Color tend to perceive a negative racial campus climate and have more experiences with harassment than their White peers (Hawkins & Larabee, 2009; Quaye et al., 2009; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003). More

generally, students, faculty, and staff who possess minoritized social identities tend to perceive a chillier climate than their peers with majoritarian social identities.

Amongst studies that specifically use this framework, I was only able to find two that focus on staff. One study (Garcia, 2016) examines the experiences of student affairs professionals with the campus racial climate at a Hispanic Serving Institution. Garcia's single-institution study used staff interviews to uncover how the compositional diversity of a staff's department affects perceptions and behaviors related to the campus climate. Another study interviewed administrators across 19 institutions who worked on bias response teams to examine their philosophies and perspectives with a focus on the organizational/structural dimension of the model (Miller et al., 2018). Neither of these studies explicitly linked MMDLE dimensions to concrete outcomes.

Existence, Relatedness, and Growth Theory

I employ Alderfer's existence, relatedness, and growth (ERG) theory (1972) to control for the extent to which staff job needs are met. This theory was adapted from Maslow's hierarchy of needs to address how different elements of workplace needs relate to motivation (Alderfer, 1989). These needs are segmented into three categories: existence needs, relatedness needs, and growth needs (Alderfer, 1969). Existence needs relate to basic material and physiological desires, such as salary, benefits, and physical working conditions (Alderfer, 1969). Relatedness needs describe the desire for fulfilling and significant relationships in the workplace (Alderfer, 1969). Alderfer specifies that a lack relatedness needs contributes to feelings of distance and connectedness, not the occasional expression of conflict or other "negative" affects, which are in fact necessary for meaningful interpersonal relationships (Alderfer, 1969). Finally, growth needs cover higher-order desires related to self-fulfillment (Alderfer, 1969).

These needs can also be interrelated. For example, an employee seeking a promotion may simultaneously address existence needs related to obtaining a higher salary and growth needs related to utilizing their skills in a more challenging and personally fulfilling capacity (Alderfer, 1969). This is one of the primary distinctions between Maslow's hierarchy of needs and Alderfer's ERG theory, since it does not treat each of the three growth needs as a strictly ordered hierarchy (Alderfer). The theory further poses that the less that each of these categorizations of needs are met, the more they will be desired (Alderfer). Alderfer also notes that ERG needs are somewhat of a continuum since existence needs are the most concrete to understand and easier to widely apply while growth needs are the most abstract and subject to individual preferences. Relatedly, Alderfer coined the term frustration regression to describe when an employee's higher-level needs are not met, leading them to target the achievement of more concrete needs as consolation. For example, a person may desire a higher salary as a proxy for relatedness and growth needs connected to feeling valued by their supervisor and their organization (Alderfer). Conversely, satisfaction regression refers to a concept that is slightly more aligned with a hierarchical mode of thought (Alderfer). Satisfaction regression occurs when a person's concrete existence needs are met and so they direct more of their energy to achieving higher-level personal needs (Alderfer).

Caulton's (2012) review of ERG literature found that the theory has been employed over the years to study motivation/performance, job satisfaction, and advocacy to improve organizational conditions for workers and students. ERG has not been employed as much in higher education literature. One study adapted the theory to examine predictors of college students' intentions to donate and share information about university crowdfunding efforts (Cho et al., 2019). Another study more closely related to my dissertation topic used the theory to study

the policies and practices related to part-time faculty's job satisfaction (Eagan et al., 2015). The results found that part-time faculty dissatisfaction with relationships with administrators and colleagues (relatedness need) meant that respondents focused on the fulfillment of lower-order existence needs such as the desire for private office space and personal computers (Eagan et al.). In addition, sustained dissatisfaction with high-level growth needs could reach a point for part-time faculty such that even fulfillment of concrete existence needs was no longer a sufficient motivator (Eagan et al.).

Critical Quantitative Inquiry

Critical Quantitative Inquiry is a research paradigm resists traditional approaches to quantitative studies work and interrogates the aspects of these methods that are inequitable in nature (Stage & Wells, 2014). Specifically, it challenges positivist approaches to quantitative research in favor of an approach that considers how researchers' choices are influenced by social histories and temporal place, paying particular mind to how mainstream research practices reproduce oppression. (Kincheloe & McLaren, 1994). Stage and Wells outline three aims of quantitative criticalists: use data to reveal large-scale inequities, challenge conventional quantitative research practices to better capture the experiences of those who have been marginalized by such practices, and, "...conduct culturally relevant research by studying institutions and people in context" (p.3). I apply this approach primarily in my research design, which I detail in the following chapter.

Critical Quantitative Inquiry differs slightly in scope from QuantCrit. QuantCrit is an offshoot of Critical Race Theory (CRT) that examines how quantitative research can be adapted to achieve CRT aims (Garcia et al., 2018). It has a set of five tenants to guide researchers in challenging racist norms in quantitative research and using their work to advance social justice

(Gillborn et al., 2018). By contrast, critical quantitative inquiry is not overtly focused on race/racism and has been applied to research with numerous minoritized populations (Wells and Stage, 2015). The three aims of Critical Quantitative Inquiry are broader in scope than the tightly defined tenets of QuantCrit. Even so, there is often overlap between the two theories in terms of research focus and methodological choices. In fact, Wells and Stage highlighted in their overview of the past, present, and future of quantitative criticalist work that most of the published research in this area has focused on race.

Connecting Literature and Identifying Gaps

The bodies of literature I detailed illuminate areas for which further study is warranted to extend our collective understanding on these topics. Amongst students, faculty, and staff, staff are the group most often omitted from campus climate studies. This has led to explicit calls for staff to be more thoroughly incorporated into this body of literature (Hart & Fellabaum, 2008; Hurtado et al., 2008; Vaccaro, 2014). My study responds to this need with its in-depth examination of how staff experience the campus climate and related outcomes. It also contributes to the need for more multi-institution studies in the campus climate literature more generally (Hurtado et al.). While single-institution studies are valuable for understanding the climate of a specific site, a multi-institution approach allows me to identify and connect themes across multiple contexts.

Shifting to job satisfaction and turnover/turnover intent research, most of these studies are race-neutral in application and often contains samples that are all-White or majority-White. Of the studies that do explicitly examine the role of race and racialization in shaping staff experiences in this area, most are either focused on a single racial group, a single institution, or categorize staff in a White/People of Color binary that obscures the specific experiences of

individual racial/ethnic groups. Accounting for the role of race/racialization using a racially/ethnically diverse sample is crucial for better understanding these employment-related outcomes, particularly given that the handful of studies in this area have confirmed that Staff of Color have different considerations from their White peers as it relates to these matters. In addition, many of these studies are focused on student affairs professionals. While student affairs professionals do compose a substantial proportion of professional and support staff working in higher education, this focus omits the numerous other areas that higher education staff work such as academic affairs, administrative affairs, and more. My study addresses this omission by including staff from numerous functional areas outside of student affairs.

My theoretical framework is also valuable for addressing gaps in the literature. My use of the MMDLE (Hurtado et al., 2012) enables me to investigate specific and thoroughly defined aspects of the campus climate. This is notable since many studies that are considered part of the campus climate literature do not contain clearly articulated definitions of campus climate (Hart et al., 2008). The MMDLE also provides me with the framework for connecting aspects of the campus climate to staff outcomes. This aspect of the study responds to explicit calls for more outcomes-based campus climate research (Hurtado et al., 2008). The study also has implications for possible adaptations to the MMDLE to align more closely with campus climate realities for staff, since the model was developed with a student focus.

Relatedly, Alderfer's (1972) ERG theory provides a framework for incorporating considerations outside of the campus climate that influence job satisfaction and intent to leave. This ensures that I can systematically account for the numerous aspects of the work environment that affect these outcomes in a streamlined manner. It also provides me with the ability to articulate the complex ways that these varying types of workplace needs may relate to one

another. Ultimately, accounting for these job needs will help further crystallize our understanding of how campus climate influences staff job satisfaction and intent to leave.

My quantitative criticalist lens further assists me in carrying out the study. The first aim of critical quantitative inquiry, to use data to reveal large-scale inequities, is especially pertinent for explaining how my study extends existing literature. This aim guides my decision to bridge the gap between the lack of staff-focused campus climate studies and the lack of race-conscious studies on higher education staff employment-related outcomes to identify the extent and nature of disparate outcomes, if applicable.

In this chapter, I summarized and synthesized literature related to the history of professional and support staff in higher education, job satisfaction and turnover/turnover intent, and campus climate for various groups. From there, I outlined my theoretical framework and how the theories and paradigm I am using have been employed in previous studies. I concluded by identifying areas in which the literature needs to be extended and articulating how my study responds to these needs. In the next chapter, I discuss my research plan and methods for how I carried out the study to achieve these aims.

CHAPTER 3: METHODS

Introduction

The previous chapter established the need for more campus climate studies focused on staff and highlighted specific gaps in the literature related to job satisfaction, turnover/turnover intent, and perceptions of campus climate. This chapter details how I carried out my study. I begin with an overview of the research purpose and questions. From there, I explain the quantitative procedures I used to carry out the study. The chapter concludes by describing study limitations and a positionality statement. I highlight my application of Critical Quantitative Inquiry throughout my description of the study's research design.

Research Purpose and Questions

The purpose of this study is to extend our understanding of campus climate by centering staff experiences using a race-conscious approach to examine how these experiences relate to job satisfaction and intent to leave. The study seeks to answer the following research questions with accompanying sub-questions to examine racialized experiences of professional and support staff in higher education, responding to the Critical Quantitative Inquiry call to reveal inequities for various minoritized groups (Rios-Aguilar, 2014):

1. How do staff members' perceptions of campus climate relate to overall job satisfaction? What additional considerations related to staff job needs contribute to overall job satisfaction?
 - i. How do these relationships vary by racial/ethnic identity?
2. How do staff members' perceptions of campus climate relate to whether they intend to leave their current position? What additional considerations related to staff job needs contribute to this intention?

- i. How do these relationships vary by racial/ethnic identity?

In addition, my research sub-questions are crafted to examine racialized experiences of professional and support staff in higher education, responding to the Critical Quantitative Inquiry call to reveal inequities for various minoritized groups (Rios-Aguilar, 2014).

I also have several corresponding hypotheses. My first hypothesis is that more frequent negative experiences with the climate for diversity are expected to undermine staff members' job satisfaction and increase intent to leave. My application of the MMDLE framework (Hurtado et al., 2012) guides this hypothesis, since research using this framework has established that negative experiences with the campus climate area are a detriment to positive student outcomes. My second hypothesis is that my tentative factors and variables related to existence, relatedness, and growth needs will be associated with increased job satisfaction and decreased intent to leave. This second hypothesis is guided by my use of ERG theory (Alderfer, 1972), which poses that accounting for these needs are critical for understanding employee motivation and employees' relationship to and conception of their workplace. My third and final hypothesis is that reduction in job satisfaction as well as increased intent to leave due to negative experiences with the campus climate will be greater for Staff of Color than for White staff. I turn to the literature on campus climate for this hypothesis, which has established that those who have minoritized social identities tend to experience more adverse effects related to a negative campus climate.

Research Design

Data and Sample

The data source for the study is drawn from the 2019-20 administration of the Staff Climate Survey (SCS). The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) within the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA administers this survey annually.

Individual colleges and universities throughout the country register to administer the SCS to staff on their campuses. HERI then combines survey responses from staff respondents at each participating institution to create a multi-institutional dataset. I conducted this study using one of these national datasets.

The SCS measures the campus climate for diversity across several domains. Specific areas of inquiry include experiences related to discrimination, cross-racial interactions, and satisfaction with working conditions and compensation packages (HERI, 2020). This is also the newest survey developed by HERI, as the 2019-20 administration represented just the fourth time HERI has fielded the survey.

The total number of respondents for the 2019-2020 administration of the SCS was 4,402 staff across 14 institutions. From this starting point, I reduced the sample in alignment with my inclusion criteria for the quantitative portion of my study. First, I filtered to only include full-time, non-graduate student staff at four-year colleges and universities. My rationale for this decision is that I want to examine staff experiences for those who are more deeply embedded into the campus environment in a full-time capacity. I also removed responses from the only community college in the sample so that I could speak more specifically to how my research questions can be answered in the four-year context. As for staff race, I removed unknown responses and race Other responses because my study largely hinges on how staff experiences are racialized; therefore, without definitive information on a respondent's race, I am unable to examine this. I also removed Native American/Alaskan Native and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander staff respondents due to low cell counts that would render their inclusion in inferential statistical analyses irresponsible. Knowing that this decision can contribute towards Indigenous erasure (Coburn et al., 2013), I included a table in Appendix A that displays mean scores for

non-imputed climate measure items by race for all groups including Native American/Alaskan Native and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander staff. In alignment with my quant criticalist lens, I hope that this decision challenges the practice of omitting groups with low cell counts with no attempt at further representation. I also omitted respondents who were missing data for half or more of my variables of interest. This resulted in a final sample size of 2,945 staff respondents in the study.

Validity

The Staff Climate survey possesses both content validity and face validity. HERI consulted with several institutions when designing the survey instrument to get feedback on content areas that were missing in initial drafts and advice for adapting survey language to ensure that respondents across diverse work areas could understand what was being asked of them. In addition, much of the survey's foundational content was taken from other validated HERI instruments including The Faculty Survey and the Diverse Learning Environments Survey. Both reference instruments have established constructs and predictive validity. Further, their creation was also guided by the MMDLE (Hurtado et al., 2012).

Variables

The dependent variable for my first research question about predicting staff job satisfaction is an eight-item factor based on internal HERI factor analyses related to the SCS. The dependent variable for my second research question is a four-point single-item where respondents rate the likelihood that they will leave their current position in the next year, though I recoded the outcome to a dichotomous measure. Table 3.1 shows variable definitions and the coding scheme.

Table 3.1
Variable Definitions and Coding Scheme

Factor/Variable	Definition/Coding Scheme
Dependent Variables	
Job Satisfaction Factor	Eight-item factor (Table 4.3)
Intent to leave current position within the next year	1= Very Unlikely/Likely, 2= Very Likely/Likely
Demographics	
Race/ethnicity [effect-coded]	Asian, Black, Latinx, Multiracial, White
	Not included in overarching analyses due to small cell counts: Native American/Alaska Native Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (see Appendix A for non-imputed mean scores)
Gender	1= Man, 2= Woman, 3= Non-binary/Genderqueer/Gender non-conforming/Identity not listed
Staff rank [effect-coded]	1= Senior administrator (e.g., President, Chancellor, Vice-President, Dean), 2= Mid-level administrator/manager (e.g., Associate Dean, Assistant Dean, Director), 3= Staff (e.g., Administrative Assistant, Analyst, Skilled Craft Worker), 4= Other (e.g., Postdoctoral Researcher, Affiliate, Courtesy Staff)
Organizational unit [effect-coded]	1= Academic affairs, 2= Business/Administrative Services, 3= External Affairs, 4= Student Life/Services, 5= Leadership and Diversity, 6= Other
Age	1=103,...86= 17
Union status	1= No, 2= Yes
Pandemic flag	1= Responded to survey during pandemic, 2= Responded to survey before pandemic

Existence Needs

Stress: Physical work environment	1= No, 2= Yes
Satisfaction: Workload & Work/Life Balance	Two-item factor (Table 4.3)
My job duties are clearly defined	1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Agree, 4= Strongly Agree

Relatedness Needs

I feel a sense of belonging to this campus	1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Agree, 4= Strongly Agree
Feel respected	Four-item factor (Table 4.3)
I have at least one professional mentor I can turn to for guidance	1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Agree, 4= Strongly Agree
I feel I have to work harder than my colleagues to be perceived as a competent administrator/staff member	1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Agree, 4= Strongly Agree

Growth Needs

My professional skills are effectively but to use in this position	1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Agree, 4= Strongly Agree
My supervisor supports my professional development	1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Agree, 4= Strongly Agree

MMDLE*Compositional Dimension*

Satisfaction: Compositional Diversity	Three-item factor (Table 4.3)
---------------------------------------	-------------------------------

Organizational/Structural Dimension

Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor	Three-item factor (Table 4.3)
--	-------------------------------

Psychological Dimension

Stress: Discrimination (e.g., prejudice, racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia)	1= No, 2= Yes
Satisfaction: Atmosphere for Differences	Five-item factor (Table 4.3)

I segmented each of my models into conceptual blocks. The first block contained effect-coded race variables. The decision to include race/ethnicity is primarily related to my application of the MMDLE (Hurtado et al., 2012) although the importance of including this variable is also

related to findings from the higher education-focused research literature on job satisfaction and turnover/turnover intent which indicates Staff of Color often have unique considerations and experiences related to these outcomes (Blackhurst, 2000; Steele, 2018). The next block contains additional demographic characteristics, such as organizational unit, staff rank, and respondent age. Some of these variables serve to better contextualize potential variations across my study sample while others are more directly informed by prior literature.

The next three blocks contain variables related to ERG theory. Many of the variables most clearly related to existence needs are contained in my job satisfaction factor, including satisfaction related to salary/benefits and job security. The additional variables I included in the existence-needs block are stress related to the physical work environment, perceptions of a manageable workload, achieving a healthy balance between personal/professional life, and the belief that job duties are clearly defined (the last two items for which I created a factor). Relatedness needs are addressed through variables such as sense of belonging, having at least one professional mentor, feeling respected by faculty, students, other staff, and senior administrators, and the extent to which respondents believe they must work harder to be perceived as a competent administrator/staff member. As with existence needs, there are several variables that are also embedded within my tentative job satisfaction factor such as satisfaction with relationships with supervisors and colleagues. Meanwhile, I measured growth through survey items that ask if respondents feel their professional skills are effectively put to use in their position and feeling that their supervisor supports their professional development needs. Once again, there are several growth-related variables also included in the job satisfaction factor such as satisfaction with autonomy and support for professional advancement.

The final three blocks contain variables related to the campus climate as informed by the MMDLE. Items related to compositional diversity ask staff to rate their satisfaction with the racial/ethnic diversity of the student, staff, and faculty population at their institution. The organizational/structural dimension is represented by items in which respondents rate their agreement with the statements “This institution has campus administrators who regularly speak about the value of diversity,” “This institution provides the campus community with opportunities to share feelings about issues of concern,” and, “This institution promotes the appreciation of cultural differences.” I also conducted a factor analysis on these items, which were selected based on pre-existing constructs in both the HERI Diverse Learning Environments survey and The Faculty Survey. I examine the psychological dimension of the campus climate using a variable in which respondents rate how much discrimination has been a source of stress for them in the past year, which I recoded to be dichotomous, as well as a factor measuring the atmosphere for difference. The interaction terms I tested for were also included in these blocks.

Analysis

I employed a blend of descriptive and inferential statistics to answer my research questions. Frequencies and means helped me understand my study sample and the basic distributions for variables of interest. Crosstabs, correlations, and ANOVAs identified relationships between and amongst my independent variables and dependent variables. I also conducted factor analyses to identify close relationships between my independent variables to decrease multicollinearity and ensure a parsimonious model, the results of which are detailed in the following chapter.

I used nested linear regression to ultimately answer my first research question and nested logistic regression to answer my second research question. Grouping variables by conceptual

blocks guided by theory allowed me to better understand the relationship between each block and my dependent variable of interest (Astin & Antonio, 2012). Each model has a different dependent variable but near identical independent variables, aside from a few distinctions. The logistic regression includes my job satisfaction dependent variable as an independent variable.

My application of the second aim of critical quantitative inquiry, to challenge conventional approaches to quantitative research (Stage & Wells, 2014), manifests in several ways in my regression models and my approach to coding key demographic variables. Rather than utilizing a more traditional approach of representing racial/ethnic groups by a set of dummy variables with White as the reference or normed group, I instead employ deviation effect coding (UCLA Statistical Consulting Group, 2021) for race variables. Effect coding is an important component of a quantitative criticalist regression because it challenges the standard practice of designating a White reference group, which reinforces White as the norm against which all other racial groups are compared (Duran et al., 2020). By using a deviation effect coding approach, the analyses and the interpretation of results will not place greater emphasis on any individual racial group (Mayhew & Simonoff, 2015). Instead, results are interpreted by comparing, for example, Asian staff to their non-Asian peers rather than comparing Asian staff to White staff. This is achieved by using the following coding scheme detailed in Table 3.2:

Table 3.2
Deviation Effect Coding Example A

Racial Group	New Variable: Asian	New Variable: Black	New Variable: Latinx	New Variable: Multiracial
Asian	1	0	0	0
Black	0	1	0	0
Latinx	0	0	1	0
Multiracial	0	0	0	1
White	-1	-1	-1	-1

Adapted from UCLA Statistical Consulting Group, 2021

Similar to dummy coding, one variable must be chosen as the reference group to be excluded from the initial regression (in this example, White staff). After obtaining the regression coefficients for the newly created variables for Asian, Black, Latinx, and Multiracial, researchers create a new coding scheme with a difference reference group and rerun the regression to estimate the coefficient representing White staff. Table 3.3 is an example of what the revised coding scheme looks like:

Table 3.3
Deviation Effect Coding Example B

Racial Group	New Variable: Asian	New Variable: Black	New Variable: Latinx	New Variable: White
Asian	1	0	0	0
Black	0	1	0	0
Latinx	0	0	1	0
White	0	0	0	1
Multiracial	-1	-1	-1	-1

Adapted from UCLA Statistical Consulting Group, 2021

My use of interaction terms to examine the relationship between racial identity/job needs/climate components and my dependent variables also demonstrates a quantitative criticalist approach. Zuberi (2001) critiques the causal use of race as a variable in social science research by explaining that race must be placed within a social context. Essentially, differences in outcomes by race are not due to fixed biological realities but are dynamic and mediated by the outside environment (Gómez & López, 2013). As such, researchers who wish to examine the “effect” of race should not rely on race as a standalone variable but should create interaction terms that more specifically highlight the relationship between race/racialization and the focus of interest (Holland, 2008). To further complicate and enrich my analysis as it relates to race, I will also track changes in the beta coefficient as my models become more complex and highlight any

substantial reductions in my results chapter. In addition, I effect coded other nominal demographic variables that were used in the analyses including staff rank and work unit.

Missing data

As with any study using survey research, I needed to account for missing data. I first ran preliminary frequencies on non-demographic and non-dependent variables to examine the percent of missing cases per variable. If a variable had a 15% or greater proportion of missing cases, I removed it from my analyses (Association for Institutional Research, 2014). None of the non-demographic independent variables I examined met this threshold. Stress from discrimination had the highest percent of missing data at 11.8%, but more than half of my variables of interest had five percent or less missing data. Though Little's MCAR test did show that the data were not missing at random ($p < 0.05$), a closer investigation revealed that these missing data were clustered around individual variables that were thematically similar and for which I planned on converting to factors prior to conducting multiple imputation, thus minimizing bias.

After examining patterns of missingness, I used multiple imputation (MI=50) to address missing cases for my non-demographic independent variables. This aligns with Manly and Wells (2015) suggestion that higher education researchers use multiple imputation to address missing data in a more sophisticated and trustworthy manner than approaches that have commonly been used in the past. In this approach, initial values are created using existing data in the dataset (Cox et al., 2014). From there, a corresponding random error term is created for each new value (Cox et al.). The process then begins again, using the newly created values for the next iteration (Cox et al.). After the pre-defined number of iterations are complete, the imputed values are moved to a new dataset (Cox et al.). This process is also repeated a pre-defined number of times to create

multiple datasets (Cox et al.). These multiple datasets serve to better capture the natural variability that occurs in large datasets, which distinguishes multiple imputation from other imputation methods that artificially reduce variance (Cox et al.). In this respect, the method allows for more flexibility and better captures the uncertainty that is inherent in imputing values (Cox et al.). I used five imputations for my analysis, since three to five imputations is considered the standard for achieving trustworthy results (Sinharay et al., 2001).

Limitations and Considerations

This study has several limitations and considerations of which to be aware. The first is related to my primary data source, the HERI Staff Climate Survey. HERI survey data is valuable in its comprehensive scope of questions and national reach, though limitations related to the nature of conducting research using secondary data sources are still present. Researchers using HERI data are constrained by the questions the survey asks and are unable to refine questions to the extent that would be ideal for their study. I was fortunately able to offset this to some degree by requesting several survey items be added to the 2019-2020 administration of the survey.

Another challenge is that staff respondents may be hesitant to provide critical feedback for fear that their answers will be traced back to them. This was determined by a cursory examination of open-ended question data, where numerous respondents explicitly stated that they did not always answer questions about the climate as honestly as they could have due to concerns about professional repercussions. As such, individual responses may not always reflect the severity of climate perceptions that a respondent has.

A portion of the survey data collection also took place during an unusual period. Survey administration occurred from October 2019 to May 2020. The COVID-19 pandemic began within this time frame. The majority of responses (81.7%) were collected prior to March 11,

2020, when the World Health Organization first declared pandemic status. Still, this means that approximately one in five responses were collected during the pandemic, when the nature and scope of many staff jobs as well as their climate context changed dramatically. To account for this, I created a variable that designates whether a respondent took the survey before or during the pandemic to include in my models.

Finally, I wish to specify that results are specific to the survey respondents and in the sample. Though the study sample is larger than in most staff-oriented studies and the racial demographics are more closely aligned with national demographics of professional and support staff, my sample is nonetheless not nationally representative. Some of the findings may be applicable to other contexts, but broadly speaking, applying findings from this study to a different context should be done with caution and care.

Positionality

A researcher's positionality, or social location/identity, influences every aspect of their study from research design to framing of results and more (Ravitch & Carl, 2016). Quantitative criticalists have called for quantitative researchers to include positionality statements in their papers to account for this, a practice that up until recently was typically reserved for qualitative researchers. Acknowledging the, "...intersection of autobiography and research..." (p. 26) challenges the notion that quantitative research is objective and exempt from the individual and structural forces that ultimately shape all research (Carter & Hurtado, 2007). In that spirit, I share contextual information to highlight some of the ways that my identity and personal experiences influence my work.

My racial identity as a White person is something I often think about in my daily life, but particularly in my role as a researcher. Bonilla-Silva & Zuberi (2008) traced how "white logic"

and “white methods” in quantitative work have contributed towards the upholding of majoritarian stories that sustain racist and white supremacist views. I can look back on past research projects, before I was familiar with this history, and see how I unintentionally contributed to this in certain ways. With this in mind, I consider how I can disrupt this pattern in my work moving forward to ensure that I challenge these norms in quantitative research and engage in reflexive, critical self-examination of how I am approaching this work.

My professional experiences also inform my approach to this project. I am currently employed as an institutional research analyst specializing in equity, diversity, and inclusion projects and regularly engage critical quantitative inquiry while carrying out this work. Prior to my doctoral studies, I worked in student affairs for four years: two years as a part-time graduate assistant and two years as full-time staff. These experiences make me feel especially connected to the research focus of this dissertation. With that said, I am also aware of how my past professional experiences interact with my racial identity as a White person in a way that means I do not encounter many of the challenges that my Staff of Color peers experience. Even as my professional experiences guide me in key ways as I carry out this study, I am also aware of the limitations of my particular vantage point and hope that I am able to at least somewhat counteract them through a robust theoretical framework and engagement with literature.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter details the results from my study. I open with a descriptive overview of the general characteristics of the study sample. Next, I examine racial differences across MMDLE measures. From there, I divide the rest of the analysis by my two research questions. The first research question, focused on job satisfaction, includes descriptive results, initial inferential examinations of key variables, and results from the final multiple regression model. The second research question, examining factor and variables that influence turnover intent, follows the same general structure.

Sample and General Descriptive Statistics

The final imputed sample is composed of 2,945 staff respondents. Table 4.1 displays the demographic composition of the sample. The majority of survey respondents are women (63.3%), while one-third (32.3%) are men, and 4.4% are non-binary/genderqueer/gender non-conforming/identity not listed. As for race, most staff in the sample are White (63.6%), and 13.4% of the sample are Latinx. Multiracial staff (8.8%), Asian staff (7.6%), and Black staff (6.6%) have similar levels of representation.

Shifting to professional characteristics, most staff (63.6%) classify their role as “general staff” while other respondents identify as mid-level managers, senior administrators, or “other.” The majority of respondents (82.6%) fall into one of three broad functional areas: Academic Affairs (28.6%), Student Life/Student Services (28.1%), and Business/Administrative Services (25.9%). Meanwhile, approximately one in three staff respondents are in a union (34.4%). Most staff (83.7%) responded to the survey prior to the start of the pandemic.

Table 4.1
Demographic Profile (n=2,945)

Variables	Percent of Staff
Gender Identity	
Women	63.3
Men	32.3
Non-binary/Genderqueer/Gender Non-conforming/Identity Not Listed	4.4
Age	
Under 35 years old	24.0
35-44 years old	25.8
45-54 years old	24.0
55 years old or older	26.3
Race/Ethnicity	
Asian	7.6
Black	6.6
Latinx	13.4
Multiracial	8.8
White	63.6
Staff Role	
Senior Administrator	4.4
Mid-level Administrator	28.6
General Staff	63.6
Other	3.3
Unit	
Academic Affairs	28.6
Business/Admin. Services	25.9
External Affairs	8.5
Student Life/Student Services	28.1
Leadership & Diversity	2.6
Other	6.3
Union Member (Yes)	34.4
Responded to Survey During Pandemic (B=No)	83.7

Next, Table 4.2 shows descriptive statistics for each of the remaining variables I tested for each model. I further detail which variables had significant relationships with my dependent variables in subsequent sections.

Table 4.2*Descriptive Statistics for Remaining Independent Variables (n=2,945)*

Variables	Mean	S.D.	Min.	Max.
Existence Needs (ERG)				
Stress: Physical Work Environment	1.25	0.43	1	2
"My job duties are clearly defined"	2.91	0.80	1	4
Satisfaction: Workload & Work/Life Balance	0.00	0.89	2.17	1.37
Relatedness Needs (ERG)				
Sense of belonging	3.06	0.75	1	4
"I have at least one professional mentor I can turn to for guidance"	2.87	0.86	1	4
Must work harder than colleagues to be perceived as competent	2.44	0.84	1	4
Feel respected	-0.01	0.86	3.18	1.68
Growth Needs (ERG)				
Professional skills are effectively put to use	3.10	0.80	1	4
Supervisor supports professional development	3.20	0.81	1	4
MMDLE				
Satisfaction: Compositional Diversity	-0.01	0.93	2.17	1.55
Institutional Commitment to Diversity	-0.03	0.92	2.83	1.49
Satisfaction: Atmosphere for Differences	-0.02	0.94	3.12	1.63
Stress: Discrimination	1.19	0.36	1	2

The study sample spans 14 institutions: 5 public and nine private. By IPEDS Carnegie classification, the majority of institutions (9) in the sample are Master's Colleges and Universities. Doctoral Universities: High Research Activity and Baccalaureate Colleges both contain two institutions. Finally, one institution in the sample fell under the Doctoral/Professional Universities designation. As for IPEDS institutional size, one institution had under 1,000 students enrolled. Five institutions each were in the 1,000-4,999 and 5,000-9,999 categories. One institution enrolled between 10,000-19,999 students, and the remaining institution enrolled 20,000 or more students.

Factor Analysis and Resulting Factors

There are several factors used in the study. I combined thematically and statistically similar survey items to ensure a more parsimonious analysis. To do this, I conducted a factor

analysis using principal axis factoring with a promax rotation. My criteria for whether to use a factor was that the value for Cronbach's Alpha must be at least 0.7 (Nichols, 1999) and each of the factor loadings must be above 0.4 (Salkind, 2010). Table 4.3 below displays the factors I used in my analyses, their composite items, and the corresponding factor loadings.

Table 4.3

Factor Loadings and Reliability (n=2,945)

Factor Items	Loading
Job Satisfaction ($\alpha = 0.83$)	
Satisfaction: Relationship with my supervisor	0.70
Satisfaction: Support for career advancement	0.69
Satisfaction: Departmental support for work/life balance	0.66
Satisfaction: Professional relationships with coworkers	0.64
Satisfaction: Autonomy and independence	0.62
Satisfaction: Relative equity of salary and job benefits	0.60
Satisfaction: Workspace	0.57
Satisfaction: Job security	0.55
Satisfaction: Workload & Work/Life Balance- Existence Need ($\alpha = 0.79$)	
My workload is manageable given the hours I'm scheduled to work	0.81
I achieve a healthy balance between my personal and professional life	0.81
Feel Respected- Relatedness Need ($\alpha = 0.73$)	
I feel respected by other <u>staff members</u>	0.69
I feel respected by <u>senior administrators</u>	0.68
I feel respected by <u>faculty</u>	0.65
I feel respected by <u>students</u>	0.54
Satisfaction: Compositional Diversity ($\alpha = 0.85$)	
Satisfaction: Racial and ethnic diversity of the <u>staff</u>	0.92
Satisfaction: Racial and ethnic diversity of the <u>faculty</u>	0.85
Satisfaction: Racial and ethnic diversity of the <u>student body</u>	0.68
Institutional Commitment to Diversity ($\alpha = 0.84$)	
This institution:	
Promotes the appreciation of cultural difference	0.88
Has campus administrators who regularly speak about the value of diversity	0.83
Provides campus opportunities to share feelings about issues of concern	0.69
Satisfaction: Atmosphere for Differences ($\alpha = 0.87$)	
Satisfaction: Atmosphere for sexual orientation differences	0.87
Satisfaction: Atmosphere for political differences	0.81
Satisfaction: Atmosphere for religious differences	0.79

Satisfaction: Atmosphere for gender differences	0.67
Satisfaction: Atmosphere for individuals with disabilities	0.66

The first factor led to the formation of the job satisfaction dependent variable. The next two factors combined items related to ERG theory. Finally, the last three factors relate to key MMDLE concepts. All of the resulting factors exceed the factor analysis criteria I specified above, thus confirming that each factor is a robust representation of the individual survey items it represents.

Initial Descriptive Results for MMDLE Measures

Table 4.4 shows ANOVA results for MMDLE measures by race. In every case, there are significant differences between race groups for all measures.

Table 4.4

ANOVA Results for MMDLE Measures by Race (n=2,945)

Factor/Variable	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Satisfaction: Compositional Diversity**			
Between Groups	140.82	35.20	42.70
Within Groups	2,423.76	0.82	
Total	2,564.58		
Institutional Commitment to Diversity**			
Between Groups	58.55	14.64	17.76
Within Groups	2,422.81	0.82	
Total	2,481.36		
Satisfaction: Atmosphere for Differences**			
Between Groups	13.64	3.41	3.89
Within Groups	2,575.25	0.88	
Total	2,588.89		
Stress: Discrimination**			
Between Groups	17.37	4.34	
Within Groups	373.80	0.13	34.16
Total	391.17		

Note: *p≤0.05, **p≤0.01

The next table compares mean scores for MMDLE measures by race groups. The subscripts signify which mean scores are significantly different from others. Across all MMDLE measures, Black staff are the single group that consistently have a score that significantly differs from all other racial groups. Further, the mean scores for Black staff are always located at the most extreme and negative ends of a given climate measure.

Table 4.5
Mean Scores for MMDLE Measures by Race (n=2,945)

Factors/Variables	Asian ^a	Black ^b	Latinx ^c	Multi. ^d	White ^e
Satisfaction: Compositional Diversity	0.19 _b	-0.82 _{a, c, d, e}	0.00 _b	0.04 _b	0.05 _b
Institutional Commitment to Diversity	-0.04 _b	-0.52 _{a, c, d, e}	-0.12 _b	0.03 _b	0.04 _b
Satisfaction: Atmosphere for Differences	0.08 _b	-0.25 _{a, c, d, e}	-0.02 _b	0.00 _b	0.00 _b
Stress: Discrimination	1.28 _{b,d,e}	1.42 _{a, c, d, e}	1.24 _{b,e}	1.17 _{a,b}	1.15 _{a,b,c}

Note: Mean score subscripts corresponding to race groups differ significantly at $\alpha=0.05$ per Tukey's HSD

All measures except for stress due to subtle discrimination are scored as factors standardized with a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one. Thus, positive mean values indicate that the corresponding group have an above average factor score for that particular trait whereas negative values suggest below average scores. For satisfaction with compositional diversity, Black staff have the lowest mean score in this area at -0.82, suggesting that Black staff are nearly a full standard deviation below the mean for the sample regarding their overall satisfaction with compositional diversity on campus. This is also the score that is the furthest from the overall mean. Meanwhile, Asian staff have the highest satisfaction score at 0.19.

Shifting to the institutional commitment to diversity by race, Black staff once again have the lowest score at -0.52 and also have the score that deviates furthest from the overall sample mean. For this factor, White staff (0.04) and Multiracial staff (0.03) have the highest scores.

The remaining MMDLE area is the psychological dimension, composed here of one factor and one variable. The satisfaction with atmosphere for differences measure has an overall mean score of -0.02 for all staff in the sample. Black staff have the lowest score at -0.25 and Asian staff have the highest score at 0.08. The final measure is a dichotomous variable that captures whether staff experienced stress from discrimination (overall sample mean score: 20.19). White staff (0.15) followed closely by Latinx staff (1.17) have the fewest experiences with stress in this area while Black staff have the most experiences with stress from discrimination (1.42).

Taken in total, descriptive results from these tables show significant differences between race groups when examining matters related to the campus climate. Black staff consistently report the most frequent and negative experiences with the campus climate and tend to hold the most negative or skeptical views of the climate for diversity. Meanwhile, Multiracial staff and White staff consistently have more positive experiences with and perceptions of the climate compared to their peers. The other racial groups tend to have slightly more varied experiences, depending on the climate measure of interest. While Asian staff have the highest scores for positive experiences in their satisfaction with compositional diversity and the atmosphere for differences, they are also the group with the second greatest occurrences of experiencing stress from discrimination. As for Latinx staff, they typically trail behind Black staff regarding negative experiences with the campus climate, though their mean scores are closest to those of non-Black staff. These scores also demonstrate the value in examining the racial campus climate with greater specificity versus simply aggregating People of Color and comparing to White people, since the means scores above show differing scores across groups.

Job Satisfaction Results

Table 4.6 shows ANOVA results for nominal demographics against job satisfaction. As it relates to my corresponding research question, the finding that there are significant differences in job satisfaction by race is most salient. Differences amongst staff role are also significant. The remaining variables for which differences amongst groups are not significant were not included in the job satisfaction regression.

Table 4.6
ANOVA Results for Nominal Variables and Job Satisfaction (n=2,945)

Variable	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
<i>Demographics</i>			
Race/Ethnicity**			
Between Groups	12.49	3.12	3.71
Within Groups	2,473.68	0.84	
Total	2,486.17		
Gender Identity			
Between Groups	1.04	0.52	0.62
Within Groups	2,428.94	0.84	
Total	2,429.98		
Staff Role**			
Between Groups	29.52	9.84	11.77
Within Groups	2,447.66	0.84	
Total	2,477.18		
Work Unit			
Between Groups	5.54	1.11	1.13
Within Groups	2,455.65	0.85	
Total	2,461.19		

Note: * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$

Table 4.7 further examines the mean differences for significant variables in the ANOVA. As described previously, the overall mean job satisfaction score for total staff in the sample is 0.00 with a standard deviation of one, but the measure ranges from a minimum of -3.62 to a maximum of 1.64. For race, Black staff report significantly lower levels of overall job satisfaction compared to other racial groups in the sample. They have the lowest job satisfaction

mean score at -0.24, which is about one-quarter of a standard deviation below the sample average. As for staff role, senior administrators are the group with a meaningfully different score from other groups and are also the group with the highest job satisfaction score.

Table 4.7

Mean Scores for Job Satisfaction by Race & Staff Role (n=2,945)

Factor/Items	Job Sat. Mean Score
Race	
Black _a	-0.24
Asian _b	0.00
White _b	0.01
Latinx _b	0.03
Multiracial _b	0.05
Staff Role	
Senior Administrators _a	0.38
Mid-Level Administrators _b	0.07
General Staff _b	-0.06
Other _b	-0.06

Note: Means not sharing subscripts differ significantly at $\alpha=0.05$ per Tukey's HSD

Shifting to a three-way analysis, Table 4.8 shows correlations between MMDLE measures and the job satisfaction dependent variable segmented by race. Across all races, positive experiences with the campus climate are positively associated with job satisfaction while negative experiences (in the form of stress from discrimination) are connected to decreased job satisfaction. Asian staff show the strongest relationship between positive perceptions of the campus climate and increased job satisfaction. This is most pronounced when examining their satisfaction with the atmosphere for differences. Meanwhile, Black staff show the most extreme relationship between experiencing stress from discrimination and reduced job satisfaction. Black staff also show the weakest positive association between the institutional commitment to diversity and job satisfaction as well as satisfaction with the atmosphere for differences and job

satisfaction. Aside from the correlation for satisfaction with compositional diversity, in which Latinx staff show the second greatest score, Latinx, Multiracial, and White staff have similar scores to one another throughout. These results offer support my first hypothesis that more frequent negative experiences with the campus climate will undermine staff job satisfaction. It provides somewhat mixed support for the third hypothesis, that reduction in job satisfaction due to negative experiences with the campus climate will be more severe for Staff of Color than for White staff. Although there is not necessarily a staunch divide between Staff of Color and White staff in this area, results do once again show the value in disaggregating the People of Color designation for a more nuanced examination of how campus climate experiences may differ across groups, especially as this relates to Black staff.

Table 4.8

Correlations for MMDLE Measures and Job Satisfaction by Race (n=2,945)

	Job Satisfaction Pearson Correlations by Race				
	Asian	Black	Latinx	Multiracial	White
Satisfaction: Compositional Diversity	0.43**	0.32**	0.36**	0.20**	0.22**
Institutional Commitment to Diversity	0.46**	0.35**	0.43**	0.42**	0.40**
Satisfaction: Atmosphere for Differences	0.50**	0.24**	0.38**	0.37**	0.38**
Stress: Discrimination	-0.30**	-0.41**	-0.22**	-0.23**	-0.25**

Note: *p≤0.05, **p≤0.01

Table 4.9 displays regression results for the job satisfaction model. The R² value is 0.68. Based on the regression results, there is evidence to support the first hypothesis that more intense negative perceptions the climate for diversity will undermine staff job satisfaction. Increased stress from discrimination is related to decreased job satisfaction (β= -.03). By contrast, staff who report more satisfaction with the atmosphere for differences tend to have greater job satisfaction (β=0.06).

Table 4.9*Multiple Regression Results for Job Satisfaction Model (n=2,945)*

Items/Factors	Initial Pearson Correlation	Beta	B	SE
Race				
Race: Asian	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.03
Race: Black	-0.14**	0.01	0.02	0.04
Race: Latinx	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.03
Race: Multiracial	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.03
Race: White	0.03	-0.02	-0.03	0.02
Demographics				
Age	0.05*	0.03**	0.00	0.00
Staff Role: Senior Admins	0.30*	0.05**	0.18	0.04
Staff Role: Mid-Level Admins	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.02
Staff Role: General Staff	-0.14**	-0.07**	0.11	0.02
Staff Role: Other	-0.14*	-0.04	0.07	0.04
Existence Needs (ERG)				
Stress: Physical Work Environment	-0.31**	-0.11**	0.23	0.02
"My job duties are clearly defined"	0.50**	0.08**	0.09	0.02
Satisfaction: Workload & Work/Life Balance	0.48**	0.19**	0.20	0.01
Relatedness Needs (ERG) (Forward-Entry)				
Sense of belonging	0.54**	0.11**	0.13	0.02
Feel respected	0.55**	0.09**	0.10	0.02
"I have at least one professional mentor I can turn to for guidance"	0.46**	0.07**	0.07	0.01
Must work harder than colleagues to be perceived as competent	-0.33**	-0.05**	0.06	0.01
Growth Needs (ERG)				
Professional skills effectively put to use	0.55**	0.14**	0.16	0.02
Supervisor supports professional development	0.65**	0.36**	0.41	0.02
Compositional Diversity (MMDLE)				
Satisfaction: Compositional Diversity	0.27**	0.02	0.02	0.01
Structural Dimension (MMDLE)				
Institutional Commitment to Diversity	0.41**	0.02	0.02	0.01
Psychological Dimension (MMDLE)				
Satisfaction: Atmosphere for Differences	0.38**	0.06**	0.05	0.01
Stress: Discrimination	-0.27**	-0.03*	0.07	0.03

Note: *p≤0.05, **p≤0.01

Connecting these results back to my first research question, how do staff members' perceptions of campus climate relate to overall job satisfaction, the regression model shows that amongst MMDLE variables, positive perceptions of the atmosphere for differences is associated with increased job satisfaction while experiencing stress from discrimination undermines job satisfaction. Tracking other MMDLE measures more closely throughout the model, those who view compositional diversity favorably and those who have positive views towards the institutional commitment to diversity tend to express greater job satisfaction, though this relationship was mitigated by other psychological measures that entered the model in the final step. In the Pearson correlation column of the table, all four of the MMDLE measures have a significant relationship with job satisfaction though in each case, the strength of that relationship was diminished in the regression model when accounting for other job satisfaction influences. Of the four measures, the institutional commitment to diversity and satisfaction with the atmosphere for differences have the strongest initial relationships, though the former is no longer significant by the final step of the model.

The first research question also asked what additional considerations related to staff job needs contribute to overall job satisfaction. As mentioned previously, all ERG measures are significant in the final step of the model and for every block and measure, having these needs met was associated with increased job satisfaction. That said, there are substantial differences between the Pearson correlation values and the regression beta values for many of these measures. The introduction of relatedness measures resulted in sizable normal effects for existence measures, and then addition of growth needs resulted in the same for relatedness measures. This pattern aligns with Alderfer's explanation of satisfaction regression which poses

that as more concrete needs are met, employees will direct their focus on the achievement of higher-level needs (1969).

Staff who reported feeling that their supervisor supports their professional development was the strongest predictor of job satisfaction ($\beta=0.36$, growth need) beyond all other ERG measures. The second greatest predictor was for staff with manageable workloads ($\beta=0.19$, existence need). Contrasting against the initial Pearson correlation values, having a supervisor who supports professional development also had the strongest relationship with job satisfaction ($\beta=0.65$). This is unsurprising, given that the job satisfaction dependent variable factor contains items related to satisfaction with supervisor support and with professional development opportunities.

These findings support my second hypothesis, as all of the ERG-related measures significantly predicted higher levels of job satisfaction after controlling for other covariates. Every ERG measure is significant in the model and in every case, staff who have their ERG needs met tend to report significantly higher levels of overall job satisfaction. In fact, the three ERG-related blocks of the model are the ones related to the most dramatic increases in the explained variance for job satisfaction throughout the model. The largest jump was when existence-needs entered the model and the R^2 value increased from a mere 0.02 to 0.41. When growth needs are introduced, the R^2 value is 0.68.

Table 4.10

R² Values by Conceptual Block for Job Satisfaction Regression (n=2,945)

Blocks	R ²
Block 1: Race & Constant	0.00
Block 2: Demographics	0.02
Block 3: Existence Needs (ERG)	0.41
Block 4: Relatedness Needs (ERG) (Forward-Entry)	0.56
Block 5: Growth Needs (ERG)	0.68
Block 6 MMDLE	0.68

To test the study's third hypothesis related to differential effects of campus climate perceptions on overall job satisfaction by race/ethnicity, I included several interaction terms between staff members' race and the MMDLE predictors in the model. This third hypothesis did not hold in the regression, as none of the interaction terms are significant in the model.

That said, there are still notable findings throughout the model related to the research sub-question about how relationships vary by racial/ethnic identity. As indicated in the descriptive findings, Black staff members have significantly lower job satisfaction levels compared to other groups, and this difference remains significant in the early stages of the model. I was able to explain away racial differences in job satisfaction when relatedness measures were introduced to the model. When I changed the relatedness-needs block from forced-entry to forward-entry to more closely examine why this shift occurred, I found that the addition of the factor about feeling respected eliminated any significant difference in job satisfaction between Black and non-Black staff. In other words, once I accounted for the fact that Black staff tend to feel less respected at work compared to their non-Black colleagues, the job satisfaction gap between Black and non-Black staff disappeared. This critical finding is one that I explore in more detail in the following chapter.

Turnover Intent Results

This section details results for my second research question centered on if and how matters related to the campus climate and having job needs met influence turnover intent, especially how this may differ by race. Table 4.11 shows the results for chi-square statistics tests on nominal demographic variables. Race, work area/unit, and staff role were all significant. The remaining variables that were not significant were not included in the logistic regression. I also

ran pairwise z-tests for variables with a significant chi-square statistic. The subscripts next to each figure in the % Very Likely/Likely to Leave column indicate which groups have significantly different values from other groups.

Table 4.11

Chi-Square Statistics & Crosstab Results for Intent to Leave Model (n=2,945)

Variables	Chi-Square	% Very Likely/Likely to Leave
<i>Demographics</i>		
Race/Ethnicity	14.60**	
Asian		28.1 _a
Black		32.1 _a
Latinx		28.5 _a
Multiracial		31.5 _a
White		23.8 _b
Gender Identity	0.98	
Man		25.9
Woman		26.0
Non-Binary/Genderqueer/Non-Conforming/Identity Not Listed		29.9
Unit	21.47**	
Academic Affairs		29.6 _{a, b, c}
Business/Admin. Services		20.2 _d
External Affairs		27.0 _e
Student Life/Services		26.5 _e
Leadership & Diversity		34.2 _b
Other		26.4 _{a, c, e}
Staff Role	17.84**	
Senior Admins.		21.5 _a
Mid-level Admin/Manager		21.1 _a
General Staff		28.5 _b
Other		25.5 _b

Note: Each subscript letter denotes a subset of leave/job dv categories whose column proportions do not differ significantly from each other at the .05 level; *p≤0.05, **p≤0.01

Focusing on race, the subscripts show that White staff are the only group with meaningfully different levels of turnover intent compared to their peers. They are also the group the group with the lowest value for turnover intent (23.8%). Subscript results are more mixed for staff unit. Academic Affairs and Unit: Other share similarities with multiple other units. Staff in

Business/Admin. Services are the only group that are flagged as completely distinct from their peers. Staff who work in this unit also report the lowest levels of turnover intent (20.2%). As for staff role, senior administrators and mid-level administrators share a subscript and have nearly identical levels of turnover intent. The remaining subscript group is for general staff and staff role: other. One in four staff (25.6%) in the total sample indicated an intent to leave.

Table 4.12 shows a three-way analysis that examines the relationship between MMDLE measures and the intent to leave dependent variable by race. Positive perceptions of the institutional commitment to diversity and satisfaction the atmosphere for differences are significantly associated with decreased turnover intent across all racial groups. For both measures, Black and Latinx staff have the highest correlations though other racial groups are not far behind. Black and Latinx staff also have the highest Pearson correlations for decreased turnover intent related to satisfaction with their institution's compositional diversity. Meanwhile, Black and Latinx staff have the highest scores for increased intent to leave as a result of stress from discrimination. White staff are the only other racial group for whom the relationship between stress from discrimination and turnover intent is significant. Taken in total, these initial findings lend support to my first hypothesis that more frequent negative experiences with the campus climate relate to increased turnover intent. There is mixed evidence for the third hypothesis which states that increased turnover intent connected to the campus climate will be greater for Staff of Color than for White staff. The table shows that while there is not necessarily a staunch divide between Staff of Color scores and White staff scores, individual racial/ethnic groups, such as Black and Latinx staff, who fall within the Staff of Color designation tend to have more detrimental impacts from negative campus climate experiences.

Table 4.12*Correlations for MMDLE Measures and Intent to Leave by Race (n=2,945)*

	Intent to Leave Pearson Correlations by Race				
	Asian	Black	Latinx	Multiracial	White
Satisfaction: Compositional Diversity	-0.16*	-0.23**	-0.20**	-0.07	-0.06*
Inst. Commitment to Diversity	-0.20**	-0.25**	-0.22**	-0.18**	-0.16**
Satisfaction: Atmosphere for Differences	-0.14*	-0.17*	-0.18**	-0.14*	-0.14**
Stress: Discrimination	0.12	0.21**	0.20**	0.11	0.13**

Note: * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$

Results for the logistic regression model are below in Tables 4.13 and 4.14. Table 4.14 shows results from the final step of the model while Table 4.13 displays results for the penultimate step in the model. The reason I include a table with results from the penultimate step is that the final measure added to the model, the job satisfaction factor, has a such a strong relationship with turnover intention that it interrupts several patterns and themes that had been present throughout and which I parse out in further detail further below. In addition to displaying results from the formal model, the column labeled “Descriptive Odds Ratio” in both tables shows results from placing single measures into a simple logistic regression with the dependent variable to show initial relationships.

The final model correctly classifies 71.4% of cases with a Hosmer and Lemeshow significance value of 0.03. Assuming an alpha level set at 0.01, this indicates that the model is not a strong fit for the data. However, the Hosmer and Lemeshow significance value for the penultimate step of the model was 0.07 which suggests a more promising fit. This shift with the Hosmer and Lemeshow is a prime example of the unique effect the addition of the job satisfaction measure has on the model.

There are several other notable shifts in the model from the penultimate step to the final step. The two existence-need items that had significant relationships with turnover intent are no longer significant once the job satisfaction factor is added. Experiencing stress related to the physical work environment was connected with increased turnover intent while satisfaction with workload and work/life balance had been associated with decreased turnover intent. This shift can be attributed to some of the specific items that compose the job satisfaction factor. Stress related to the physical work environment relates to the factor item that captures satisfaction with the workspace while the workload factor relates to the job satisfaction item that captures satisfaction with departmental support for work/life balance.

Shifting to relatedness-needs, the respect factor is significant for the first time in the model in the final step when the job satisfaction factor is introduced. Further, the odds ratio shows that feeling respected is associated with increased turnover intent. This differs from the descriptive odds ratio figure for the respect factor, which tested as significant and showed that feeling respected was related to decreased intent to leave.

The final most meaningful change from the penultimate step to the final step relates to the growth-item about staff feeling that their supervisor supports their professional development. This item is significant at every point in the model, but the magnitude of the odds ratio decreases by 0.17 once the job satisfaction factor enters the model. As with the existence-need measures, this can also be explained by items in the job satisfaction factor that are thematically similar for this item including staff satisfaction with their relationship with their supervisor and their perceived support for career advancement.

Table 4.13*Logistic Regression Intent to Leave Results (Penultimate Step) (n=2,945)*

Items/Factors	Descriptive Odds Ratio	b	SE	Odds Ratio
Race				
Race: Asian	0.97	0.01	0.15	1.01
Race: Black	1.18	-0.08	0.17	0.93
Race: Latinx	0.99	0.00	0.12	1.00
Race: Multiracial	1.14	0.19	0.14	1.21
Race: White	0.77**	-0.12	0.09	0.89
Demographics				
Age	1.02**	0.02	0.00	1.02**
Responded Before Pandemic	1.14**	0.66	0.14	1.93**
Unit: Academic Affairs	1.13	0.12	0.10	1.13
Unit: Business/Admin. Services	0.68**	-0.43	0.11	0.65**
Unit: External Affairs	1.00	0.15	0.15	1.16
Unit: Student Life/Services	0.97	-0.18	0.11	0.83
Unit: Leadership & Diversity	1.4	0.47	0.25	1.60
Unit: Other	0.96	-0.13	0.17	0.88
Staff Role: Senior Admin.	0.87	0.07	0.20	1.07
Staff Role: Mid-Level Admin.	0.85	-0.24	0.12	0.79*
Staff Role: General Staff	1.26**	0.12	0.11	1.12
Staff Role: Other	1.08	0.06	0.22	1.06
Existence Needs (ERG)				
Stress: Physical Work Environment	1.95**	0.24	0.11	1.27*
"My job duties are clearly defined"	0.53**	-0.12	0.07	0.89
Satisfaction: Workload & Work/Life	0.61**	-0.23	0.06	0.80**
Balance				
Relatedness Needs (ERG)				
Sense of belonging	0.41**	-0.45	0.08	0.64**
"I have at least one professional mentor I can turn to for guidance"	0.67**	0.08	0.07	1.08
Have to work harder than colleagues to be perceived as competent	1.61**	0.21	0.07	1.24**
Feel respected	0.55**	0.15	0.08	1.16
Growth Needs (ERG)				
Professional skills are effectively put to use	0.42**	-0.48	0.07	0.62**
Supervisor supports professional development	0.49**	-0.38	0.07	0.69**
Compositional Diversity (MMDLE)				
Satisfaction: Compositional Diversity	0.77**	0.02	0.07	1.02

Structural Dimension (MMDLE)				
Institutional Commitment to Diversity	0.63**	-0.08	0.07	0.92
Psychological Dimension (MMDLE)				
Satisfaction: Atmosphere for Differences	0.70**	0.03	0.07	1.03
Stress: Discrimination	2.38**	0.16	0.15	1.17

Note: * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$

Now that key differences in the model related to the introduction of the job satisfaction factor have been identified, I shift focus to results from the final step of the model. The first hypothesis, that more frequent negative experiences with the campus climate will undermine staff retention, holds true in the more preliminary analyses for the dependent variable, but none of the MMDLE measures significantly predict departure plans in the final model. More substantive findings emerge when delving further into the first research question regarding how staff members' perceptions of the campus climate relate to whether they intend to stay or leave their current position.

Although MMDLE measures do not significantly predict turnover intentions in the final model, all of the measures are significant at baseline when tested individually in a series of simple logistic regressions. The greatest relationship between an MMDLE measure and intent to leave is for the stress from discrimination item, which shows that a one-point increase in experiencing stress from discrimination is associated with staff being 2.4 times as likely to leave their position. The descriptive odds ratio for all other MMDLE measures shows that positive experiences with the campus climate are related to decreased turnover intent.

Though logistic regression SPSS output does not include information on excluded variables, I used a proxy approach to better understand how the relationship between MMDLE measures and turnover intent shifted as other measures were added to the model. To

do this, I forced MMDLE measures into the model in the first step and then reviewed the corresponding output. This approach shows that MMDLE measures did, in fact, test significant at earlier steps in the model. Satisfaction with compositional diversity is connected to decreased turnover intent until existence needs enter the model. The same is true for satisfaction with the institutional commitment to diversity until relatedness needs enter and the measure is no longer significant. For psychological dimension variables, stress from discrimination is tied to increased turnover intent, and satisfaction with the atmosphere for differences decreased turnover intentions prior to the introduction of relatedness needs into the model. These findings suggest that the attainment of existence and relatedness needs can at least somewhat mitigate the impact of negative campus climate experiences on staff turnover intent.

Table 4.14
Logistic Regression Intent to Leave Results (Final) (n=2,945)

Items/Factors	Descriptive Odds Ratio	b	SE	Odds Ratio
Race				
Race: Asian	0.97	0.02	0.15	1.02
Race: Black	1.18	-0.08	0.17	0.92
Race: Latinx	0.99	0.00	0.12	1.00
Race: Multiracial	1.14	0.20	0.14	1.22
Race: White	0.77**	-0.14	0.09	0.87
Demographics				
Age	1.02**	0.02	0.00	1.02**
Responded Before Pandemic	1.14**	0.63	0.15	1.88**
Unit: Academic Affairs	1.13	0.13	0.10	1.14
Unit: Business/Admin. Services	0.68**	-0.43	0.11	0.65**
Unit: External Affairs	1.00	0.18	0.15	1.20
Unit: Student Life/Services	0.97	-0.20	0.11	0.82
Unit: Leadership & Diversity	1.4	0.46	0.25	1.58
Unit: Other	0.96	-0.13	0.17	0.87
Staff Role: Senior Admin.	0.87	0.17	0.21	1.19

Staff Role: Mid-Level Admin.	0.85	-0.24	0.12	0.79*
Staff Role: General Staff	1.26**	0.06	0.11	1.06
Staff Role: Other	1.08	0.01	0.22	1.01
Existence Needs (ERG)				
Stress: Physical Work Environment	1.95**	0.12	0.12	1.13
“My job duties are clearly defined”	0.53**	-0.07	0.07	0.93
Satisfaction: Workload & Work/Life Balance	0.61**	-0.12	0.07	0.88
Relatedness Needs (ERG)				
Sense of belonging	0.41**	-0.39	0.08	0.68**
“I have at least one professional mentor I can turn to for guidance”	0.67**	0.12	0.07	1.13
Must work harder than colleagues to be perceived as competent	1.61**	0.17	0.07	1.19**
Feel respected	0.55**	0.21	0.08	1.24**
Growth Needs (ERG)				
Professional skills effectively put to use	0.42**	-0.40	0.07	0.67**
Supervisor supports professional development	0.49**	-0.15	0.08	0.86
Compositional Diversity (MMDLE)				
Satisfaction: Compositional Diversity	0.77**	0.03	0.07	1.03
Structural Dimension (MMDLE)				
Institutional Commitment to Diversity	0.63**	-0.07	0.07	0.93
Psychological Dimension (MMDLE)				
Satisfaction: Atmosphere for Differences	0.70**	0.05	0.07	1.06
Stress: Discrimination	2.38**	0.12	0.15	1.13
Job Satisfaction				
Job Satisfaction Factor	0.37**	-0.55	0.19	0.58**

Note: * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$

My second hypothesis that having ERG needs met will be related to decreased turnover intent was largely supported. The descriptive odds ratio column shows that all ERG measures are significantly related to turnover intent. Specifically, staff who feel their needs are met within each of these measures are less likely to report an intent to leave. Not all of these relationships remained significant in the model, however. None of the existence needs are significant in the final though as noted in the previous paragraph, two of these three existence measures (stress from the physical work environment and satisfaction with workload and work/life balance) are

significant up to the penultimate step. Further, as shown in the models predicting job satisfaction, existence needs are strongly associated with job satisfaction, suggesting that existence needs are still important, albeit indirectly related, to supporting reduced turnover intent. The other existence need item about whether staff felt their job duties were clearly defined is significant at earlier steps in the model until the step in which growth needs are introduced. Another notable finding for the existence needs measures is that they all undergo substantial normal effects of 0.10 or more when relatedness needs are were introduced. This aligns with ERG theory literature, which poses that as higher-level needs are met the urgency of lower-order needs diminish (Alderfer, 1969). This happens again to existence measures when growth needs enter the model, though to a lesser degree.

As for relatedness needs, the positive achievement of having needs met with two of the four measures is connected to decreased turnover intent in the final step of the model. Meanwhile, the descriptive odds ratio column shows that all respect measures are initially tied to decreased turnover intent when tested individually without other covariates. Sense of belonging has a strong influence on turnover intent in the descriptive odds ratio column as well as in the final step of the model for which a one standard deviation increase in sense of belonging relates to staff being 1.5 times as likely to stay in their position in accordance with this hypothesis. Meanwhile, staff who feel they had to work harder to be perceived as competent unsurprisingly indicate higher levels of turnover intent ($\text{Exp}(B)=1.2$). The item about having a mentor to turn to is not significant at any point in the model, despite the descriptive odds ratio showing it is initially related to decreased turnover intent. As mentioned previously, the only relatedness measure that did not align with the hypothesis was the measure about feeling respected, which I detailed previously when comparing results from the penultimate step of the model.

As for growth needs, both of the growth variables are significant throughout the model until the final step when the job satisfaction factor is added, at which point only the item about staff who feel their professional skills are effectively put to use is significant ($\text{Exp}(B)=1.5$). As mentioned previously, since the job satisfaction measure encompasses growth needs, this shift does not diminish the pertinence of having growth needs met.

My second research question also asked about additional considerations related to staff job needs that contribute to intent to leave. During the 2020 SCS administration period, staff who responded before the pandemic were 1.9 times as likely to express an intent to leave. This item also experienced two suppressor effects throughout the model: once when relatedness needs are introduced (0.07 odds ratio increase) and once when growth needs are introduced (0.10 increase). This suggests that the positive effect of having relatedness and growth needs met would be even greater if it were not for the fact that some staff responded to the survey during the pandemic when the context for having job needs met dramatically shifted. The job satisfaction measure is also important for predicting intent to leave. It shows that staff with a job satisfaction level at one standard deviation above the mean are 1.7 times as likely to plan to stay in their position compared to staff with average levels of job satisfaction.

My third hypothesis, that increased negative experiences with the campus climate would result in increased turnover intent for Staff of Color compared to White staff did not hold true, given that none of my interaction terms were significant. However, turning to the corresponding sub-question that asks how key relationships may vary by race, early steps of the model show that White staff have decreased turnover intent compared to their Staff of Color peers. This is true until step seven of the model, when relatedness needs enter, signifying that decreased

turnover intent from White staff is ultimately connected to them having their relatedness needs met to a greater degree than their Staff of Color peers.

Summary of Findings

Research Question One- Job Satisfaction

The first research question asked how staff members' perceptions of campus climate relate to overall job satisfaction and what additional considerations related to staff job needs contribute to overall satisfaction. The three-way analysis examining correlations between MMDLE measures and the job satisfaction dependent variable by race shows that for all racial groups, positive experiences with the campus climate relate to increased job satisfaction while experiencing stress from discrimination leads to decreased job satisfaction. This supports my first hypothesis that more frequent negative experiences with campus climate will undermine job satisfaction.

My decision to disaggregate by individual racial groups rather than approach the analysis using a Staff of Color/White staff dichotomy also revealed insightful findings. For example, Asian staff have the strongest relationships between positive climate experiences and increased job satisfaction. Meanwhile, Black staff have the most extreme relationship between experiencing stress from discrimination and reduced job satisfaction. As for other racial groups, Latinx, Multiracial, and White staff tend to have similar scores to one another across most measures. These findings show mixed support for my third hypothesis that the reduction in job satisfaction due to negative experiences with the campus climate will be more severe for Staff of Color than for White staff.

While initial correlations show that positive experiences with all MMDLE measures are related to increased job satisfaction, results from the final step of the regression reveal that staff

who are satisfied with the atmosphere for differences have greater levels of job satisfaction and staff who experience stress from discrimination have lower levels of job satisfaction. These psychological measures ultimately mitigated the influence of other MMDLE measures that were previously significant in the model.

Shifting to the second part of this research question that asked what additional considerations influence job satisfaction, the positive achievement of all ERG measures is significantly related to increased job satisfaction in both initial correlations and in the final step of the regression model. In fact, staff who felt that their supervisor supports their professional development is the greatest predictor of job satisfaction in the model followed by satisfaction with workload and work/life balance. These findings support the second hypothesis, that the attainment of ERG needs will lead to improved job satisfaction.

As for the research sub-question asking how these relationships vary by racial/ethnic identity, several notable findings emerged. As detailed above, the three-way analysis between MMDLE measures and job satisfaction by race revealed important differences in experiences. Looking only at race and job satisfaction, an ANOVA shows that the differences between groups is significant. Specifically, Black staff have a mean job satisfaction score that is one-quarter of a standard deviation below the overall mean and significantly differs from their non-Black peers. Black staff also have significantly lower levels of job satisfaction in early steps of the regression until the factor about feeling respected entered the model, signifying that Black staff tend to feel less respected in the workplace than their peers.

The third hypothesis, that Staff of Color will experience more severe decreases in job satisfaction related to negative campus climate experiences than White staff was not supported by the findings. None of the interaction terms I tested were significant. Findings specific to race,

such as Black staff job satisfaction being more negatively affected by stress from discrimination and Asian staff being the greatest relationship between positive climate experiences and job satisfaction in the three-way analysis fall outside of the Staff of Color/White staff dichotomy.

Given the relationship between experiencing stress from discrimination and decreased job satisfaction as well as the unique influence that the factor about feeling respected had in this model (as well as the turnover intent model), Appendix B displays a table that further explores some of these relationships. In particular, I wanted to examine if there were distinctions between feeling disrespected by the different groups contained within the factor and an increased proportion of stress from discrimination by race. I used the non-imputed dataset for this exploratory analysis since the multiple imputation was run after factors were already created. This also allowed me to display results for Native American/Alaskan Native and Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander staff. The percentages in the table reflect the proportion of staff experiencing stress due to discrimination who also disagreed that they felt respected by different constituencies: other staff, students, faculty, and senior administrators. These percentages are disaggregated by respondents' race/ethnicity. Overall, the proportion of staff "disagreeing" that they feel respected by these constituencies tends to be two to five times higher among staff who report experiencing stress due to discrimination compared to their counterparts who do not experience this type of stress. Although no differences by race/ethnicity emerged in this additional analysis, the results suggest that staff perceive substantially less respect from faculty and senior administrators.

Research Question Two- Intent to Leave

The second research question in the study asked how staff perceptions of campus climate relate to whether they intend to leave their current position. The three-way analysis examining

MMDLE measures and the intent to leave dependent variable by race shows that across all racial groups, positive perceptions of the institutional commitment to diversity and the institution's atmosphere for differences relate to decreased turnover intent across all groups, though most substantially for Black and Latinx staff. Black, Latinx, and Asian staff also have decreased turnover intent related to satisfaction with the compositional diversity at their institution. Meanwhile, Black and Latinx staff have the highest scores in the relationship between experiencing stress from discrimination and increased turnover intent. These initial findings support the study's first hypothesis that negative experiences with the campus climate will be detrimental to staff retention and mixed support for the third hypothesis that these effects will be more extreme for Staff of Color compared to White staff.

The corresponding logistic regression for the second research question provides further insights on the relationship between different elements of the campus climate and intent to leave. Though all of the MMDLE measures in the initial odds ratio analyses show that positive experiences of the climate connect to decreased turnover intent, this relationship does not hold in the formal model in which none of the MMDLE measures are ultimately significant. Even so, my proxy analysis to examine the equivalent of excluded variable output shows that satisfaction with the compositional diversity and positive experiences with psychological dimension measures relate to decreased turnover intent until relatedness-needs enter the model rendering them no longer significant. Similarly, perceiving a stronger institutional commitment to diversity lends itself to decreased turnover intent until growth-needs enter the model. These findings dovetail into the latter portion of the second research question which asks about additional considerations related to staff turnover intent.

The initial odds ratio analyses show that the positive attainment of ERG needs relate to reduced turnover intent, though not all of the relationships for these measures hold by the end of the model. However, this shift in the significance and strength of ERG measures is primarily due to the addition of the job satisfaction factor in the final step of the model, which encompasses a variety of items that represent ERG needs. In this respect, although only four of the original nine ERG measures are significant by the final step, the job satisfaction factor still reinforces the importance of fulfilling staff job needs to reduce turnover intent. Thus, my second hypothesis that having ERG needs met will relate to decreased turnover intent is largely supported.

As for the sub-question, how do these relationships vary by racial/ethnic identity, none of the interaction terms were significant. An initial crosstab between race group and intent to leave as well as the descriptive odds ratio analysis did, however, show that White staff have significantly lower levels of turnover intent compared to Staff of Color peers. This remained true in the regression until relatedness needs entered the model, suggesting that White staff tend to have their relatedness needs met at higher rates than their Staff of Color peers. Taken together, along with results described in the three-way analysis, these findings provide mixed support for the third hypothesis that Staff of Color will be more severely impacted by negative experiences with the campus climate as it relates to turnover intent.

Conclusion

This chapter sought to answer my guiding research questions through a blend of descriptive and inferential statistics. The results provide a textured understanding of the varied workplace experiences and demographic characteristics that influence staff job satisfaction and turnover intent. In the next chapter, I conclude the study by more deeply engaging these results. This includes mapping findings back onto the theoretical framework and examining the ways

that findings speak to existing literature. I also provide implications for policy, practice, and future research.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Introduction

This final chapter opens with an overview of the study. From there, I summarize major findings. I further detail how findings align with literature and theories in my theoretical framework. From there, I highlight implications for policy, practice, and future research.

Study Overview

The study purpose was to extend our understanding of campus climate by centering staff experiences using a race-conscious approach to examine how these experiences relate to job satisfaction and intent to leave. In doing so, the study responds to the omission of staff in campus climate literature as well as a lack of race-conscious studies in higher education staff literature focused on job satisfaction and turnover intent.

My data source was survey responses from the 2020 administration of the HERI Staff Climate Survey. To answer these research questions and test the corresponding hypotheses, I used a blend of descriptive statistics, multiple regression, and logistic regression. The theoretical framework that guided my approach was composed of two theories and a paradigm. The Multicontextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments (MMDLE) framework (Hurtado et al., 2012) guided how I defined various elements of the campus climate and the endeavor to connect them to outcomes. Meanwhile, Existence, Relatedness, and Growth (ERG) Theory (Alderfer, 1972) informed how I conceptualized staff job needs. Finally, Critical Quantitative Inquiry, a research paradigm that resists conventional approaches to conducting quantitative research by challenging practices that are inequitable in nature (Stage & Wells, 2014), influenced how I approached various aspects of my quantitative research design.

Key Findings

Descriptive statistics revealed insightful findings about initial relationships between race, climate measures, and dependent variables. Mean scores between climate measures by race showed that Black staff had the most negative experiences across all measures. They also had the lowest mean scores for the job satisfaction dependent variable. As for intent to leave, White staff indicated the lowest levels of turnover intent.

Climate ultimately had weak associations with job satisfaction by the final step of the regression, though it showed that satisfaction with climate for differences positively affected job satisfaction and stress due to discrimination negatively affected it. ERG theory elements were more strongly related to job satisfaction, but as each successive component of ERG theory was controlled, lesser components became nonsignificant (i.e., existence needs like physical stress and satisfaction with work/life balance, became less salient once relatedness needs was added; Relatedness needs, which measure feelings like staff members' sense of belonging or believing they must work harder to be perceived as competent, became less salient once growth needs, which connect to perceptions that their supervisor supports their professional development, were added). Initial differences by race/ethnicity in job satisfaction detected by ANOVAs became non-significant after accounting for relatedness needs. No interactions between race/ethnicity and climate measures significantly predicted job satisfaction.

Shifting to the logistic regression model, findings suggest that climate did not significantly predict turnover intentions, as these measures became nonsignificant after accounting for ERG needs. Many ERG measures significantly predicted turnover intentions until job satisfaction entered the model, demonstrating the interrelated nature of job satisfaction and

turnover intent. As with the job satisfaction model, differences by race disappeared once relatedness needs entered the model, and no interaction terms tested significant.

Interpretation of Significant Findings

MMDLE

My engagement with the MMDLE had two overarching goals: [1] to test if application could reasonably be extended towards staff in a framework that was designed for students and [2] to see if aspects of the campus climate could be connected to staff outcomes. Findings from the study confirmed both points. Preliminary analyses, such as correlations and descriptive logistic regressions, showed significant relationships between positive climate perceptions and increased job satisfaction and decreased turnover intent across all MMDLE measures. Further examinations, such as three-way crosstabs examining correlations between MMDLE measures and dependent variables by race, also showed a number of significant relationships. These findings confirm that the MMDLE can be extended to apply to campus climate studies of college and university staff. The job satisfaction regression model also showed that two psychological dimension measures were related to job satisfaction, providing evidence of a link between climate measures and critical staff outcomes. That said, the majority of climate measures lost salience once ERG measures entered the model suggesting that in some respects, ERG-related considerations have stronger ties with these work-related outcomes. However, climate measures in the study also tended to be more distal whereas ERG measures were more proximal in nature which may have also played a role in the strength of these relationships.

ERG

Results from the study also reinforced the importance of considering staff needs in relation to critical staff outcomes that align with ERG theory. Preliminary correlations and descriptive odds ratios with job satisfaction and turnover intentions, respectively, showed that all

ERG measures were significantly connected to improved staff outcomes. For the job satisfaction regression, having each ERG need fulfilled independently predicted greater levels of job satisfaction. Though not every ERG measure remained significant in the turnover intent model, results still reinforced the importance of fulfilling job needs for reducing staff intent to leave. Both regressions also aligned with Alderfer's concept of satisfaction regression, which describes when staff direct attention to fulfilling higher level needs once concrete existence needs are met (1969). Each regression model captured reduced strength of existence-level needs as relatedness and growth needs entered the model. This aligns with job satisfaction literature, which highlights the importance of feeding professional and support staffs' intrinsic motivation for the work to support their job satisfaction (Hermesen & Rosser, 2008; Smerek & Peterson, 2007).

Outside of the race-neutral manner in which ERG theory is typically applied in literature, this study showed notable relationships between relatedness needs and race. In the job satisfaction regression, Black staff had lower levels of job satisfaction compared to their peers until the respect measure entered the model. This indicates that Black staff tend to feel less respected in the workplace than their peers. Considering the significance of psychological dimension climate measures in predicting job satisfaction in this model, this finding also raises questions about how feeling respected may relate to perceiving a positive climate for differences and experiences with discrimination given the descriptive finding that Black staff were the group that had the most negative perceptions of the climate and reported experiencing significantly greater stress from discrimination compared to other racial or ethnic groups. Meanwhile, White staff had significantly lower levels of turnover intent compared to Staff of Color until relatedness needs entered the model, suggesting that part of the reason white staff have a lower likelihood of planning to leave their jobs is partially due to their relatedness needs being met. Both examples

show how critical relatedness needs in particular seem to be for staff and how the importance of having these needs met presents itself across different racial groups. Further, both models also show the importance of how fulfilling staff ERG needs might offset or at least buffer the impact of negative climate experiences on staff outcomes. To be sure, campuses must still make efforts to improve the climate for diversity for staff, but fulfilling ERG needs can serve as an important supplemental avenue for increasing staff members' overall job satisfaction and reducing their turnover intentions

Critical Quantitative Inquiry

My application of the Critical Quantitative Inquiry also added a valuable dimension to the study and uncovered findings that might otherwise have been obscured. This research paradigm aims to use data to reveal large-scale inequities (Stage & Wells, 2014), which guides this study's central purpose to bridge the gap between the lack of staff-focused climate studies and the lack of race-conscious studies on higher education staff outcomes. Specifically, some of my choices with respect to effect coding racial identity and disaggregating racial/ethnic groups enhanced findings. My use of effect coding challenged the standard practice of designating a White reference group and ensured I could speak with more specificity to the experiences of staff from individual racial groups against all of their peers. Further, my decision to disaggregate all racial groups rather than focus on a Staff of Color/White staff binary also added texture and nuance to findings. For example, these analytical decisions revealed that Black staff had more negative perceptions of the climate in descriptive findings and lower levels of job satisfaction compared to non-Black peers in early steps of the job satisfaction regression. These findings would not have been revealed had I used an aggregate Staff of Color category in the study and if I had designated a single reference group in the regressions.

The decision to effect code race variables also allowed for more flexibility in interpreting findings. It is valuable to demonstrate that Black staff had lower levels of job satisfaction at early points in the model compared to all of their peers (not just a White reference group), though there are also cases where differential outcomes may be segmented by Staff of Color and White staff. This was the case for early steps in the intent to leave model, which showed that White staff had significantly lower levels of turnover intent than Staff of Color peers. These two examples embody the flexibility that effect coding race variables facilitates: I can both examine how staff outcomes from individual racial groups, particularly Staff of Color, may differ from their peers (not just a White reference group) and also examine possible differences in outcomes between Staff of Color and White staff via the white effect-coded race variable.

The Pervasiveness of Anti-Black Racism

Black staff consistently had the most extreme, negative experiences with the campus climate and outcomes covered in this study. They had the lowest mean score for job satisfaction that was situated nearly one-quarter of a standard deviation below the sample average. This concerning disparity continued in the early stages of the corresponding regression in which Black staff continued to have lower levels of job satisfaction compared to their non-Black peers. This changed only after the relatedness-need respect factor was introduced to the model, indicating that Black staff tend to feel less respected at work than non-Black peers. Research literature confirms that Black staff often feel less respected and do not receive proper recognition for their contributions (Beatty et al., 2020; Townsend, 2021). This pattern is echoed in campus climate literature focused on faculty, for whom Black (and Latinx) faculty are the most affected by a negative campus climate as it relates to job satisfaction (Jayakumar et al., 2009)

Descriptive analyses showed that Black staff also had significantly more negative perceptions of and experiences with the campus climate compared to non-Black peers. This may be because Black staff have to contend with anti-Black racism in the workplace from White staff and non-Black Staff of Color alike (Stewart et al., 2019). Further, results from a three-way analysis examining correlations between climate measures and job satisfaction by race showed that Black staff had the strongest relationship between experiencing stress from discrimination and reduced job satisfaction and weaker relationships between positive climate experiences and improved job satisfaction. These findings are also supported by research literature. Black staff from entry-level professionals to senior administrators contend with discrimination in the workplace (Beatty et al., 2020; Patitu & Hinton, 2003, Phelps-Ward & Kenney, 2019; Townsend, 2021). Further, peer efforts to facilitate a positive climate for Black people on campus can be draining for Black staff as exemplified in Cho & Brassfield's (2022) piece in which Black staff expressed frustration at their White peers' clumsy efforts to address anti-Black racism on campus in the wake of the 2020 protests against anti-Black racism. Black staff in this study also faced stress and strain from being called on to "educate" others on racism (Cho & Brassfield). This exemplifies how institutional and individual efforts to improve the climate for Black people can have the unintended effect of further alienating Black staff.

Shifting to turnover intent, correlations between climate measures and intent to leave by race show more encouraging results for Black staff. Across all climate measures, Black staff had the highest levels (along with Latinx staff, in some cases) of reduced turnover intent related to positive perceptions of the campus climate. Black staff have that even in the midst of negative climate experiences, retention efforts such as staff wellness offerings (Cho & Brassfield, 2022) and receiving recognition for their work (Townsend, 2021) make them feel more committed to

staying in their positions. Based on descriptive findings and research literature, cultivating a positive climate and engaging in staff retention efforts does appear to have a meaningful impact on reducing turnover intent for Black staff even if the interaction terms in the regression were not significant.

Implications

Policy and Practice

Enacting concrete policies and practices based on climate research is especially important, since an ongoing challenge of climate assessments is the failure, "... to convert the vast amount information we collect on campus diversity into institutional action..." (Hurtado et al., 2012, p. 218). With this critique in mind, I have endeavored to offer recommendations that provide clear guidance on next steps to enhance to campus climate for staff in support of improved outcomes.

Staff feeling that their supervisor supports their professional development was the top predictor of improved job satisfaction. The importance of this growth need suggests that departments and institutions as a whole should invest in staff professional development to support job satisfaction. This could include practices like providing money for staff conference travel and tuition discounts for staff to take courses that will build their skills. Investing in professional development opportunities such as these may be especially important as conferences and professional development meetings return to in-person formats. That said, supervisors should also consider other forms of professional development for staff who may be reluctant to travel due to concerns about the ongoing pandemic. Policies and practices such as these support the higher-order fulfillment needs that research has established supports increased job satisfaction (Baur, 2000; Hermsen & Rosser, 2008; Smerek & Peterson, 2007; Volkwein &

Zhou, 2003). Further, one study that applied ERG theory to examining part-time faculty's job satisfaction found that sustained dissatisfaction with having unmet growth needs could lead to a situation in which even the fulfillment of existence needs was no longer sufficient for supporting job satisfaction (Eagan et al., 2015), reinforcing the importance of targeting growth needs.

Having a sustainable workload and work/life balance was also important for supporting job satisfaction, a finding confirming by Baur's (2000) literature overview of the influences of higher education classified staff job satisfaction. This is especially salient for higher education, a sector known for staff burnout (Brewer & Clippard, 2002; Mullen et al., 2018). Institutions and departments should work to ensure equitable and manageable workloads for staff.

Given the importance of providing staff with flexibility in their work to support job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness (Bowling et al., 2015), new workplace norms that have emerged during the pandemic offer approaches in this area. The logistic regression for this study found that staff who responded before the pandemic were 1.9 times as likely to indicate an intent to leave. However, this finding must be placed in the context of when administration of the 2020 SCS took place in the pandemic. Administration occurred at the beginning of the pandemic during a great period of uncertainty. For this reason, it is understandable that staff who responded in these early-most months would have exercised caution and felt the need to stay in their current positions in the present moment. As the pandemic continued however, this trend shifted and higher education staff began not only leaving their current positions but leaving the field (Ellis, 2021). Whether at earlier points in the pandemic when staff were likelier to stay in positions or in ladder parts where they were more prone to exploring alternative roles and career paths, the pandemic in general has exerted a large influence on staff career decisions.

As for policy considerations, continuing to allow staff to work from home to the extent that their role allows is a benefit that offers staff flexibility and autonomy. In particular, working from home can be a respite from negative campus climate experiences for Staff of Color and Black staff in particular (Cho & Brassfield, 2022). This flows into the study finding that experiencing stress from discrimination can have adverse effects on staff outcomes, particularly for Black staff as noted in descriptive findings. In this respect, remote work policies not only support ERG needs related to autonomy but can also support Staff of Color by mitigating negative climate experiences. This example also demonstrates how policies and practices that target ERG needs can also lead to a more supportive racial campus climate for Staff of Color.

Considering that a supportive atmosphere for differences contributed towards increased job satisfaction and that stress from discrimination related to decreased job satisfaction in the regression, universities should also have infrastructure in place to review and scrutinize campus policies, strategic plans, and other initiatives to ensure equitable practices are institutionalized (Beatty et al., 2020). These efforts should be ongoing and not merely in response to momentary political pressure (Beatty et al.). Proposals and formal demands from students can serve as valuable guidance in this area. One example is the proposal *Towards a Better University* submitted by members of the Black Student Alliance at the University of Virginia in response to the violent arrest of Martese Johnson, a Black student at the university (2015). The Black Student Union offered a holistic and multi-pronged approach to improving the environment for Black students, faculty, and staff citing staff-specific recommendations such as offering skills training to temporary and part-time staff who are laid off in the summer and bolstering the staff senate (Black Student Alliance at the University of Virginia). Additionally, universities can tap

into institutional research offices to conduct salary equity and staff turnover studies to identify if there are equity gaps or patterns of concern in these areas.

Supporting staff relatedness needs is also an important mechanism for enhanced job satisfaction and intent to stay. Fulfilling workplace relationships are a vital influence on job satisfaction (Volkwein & Zhou, 2003) and reduced turnover intent (Heavey et al., 2013; Hausknecht et al., 2009) as supported in the literature as well as findings from this study. Supportive workplace relationships are especially important for Black staff considering the significantly lower levels of job satisfaction that Black survey respondents had in early steps of the model stopped when the factor about feeling respected was introduced. This shows the importance of feeling respected for Black staff while also highlighting that Black staff tend to feel less respected than their non-Black peers. This pattern can be disrupted to some degree by efforts that allow Black staff to build community, such as participation in affinity groups (Beatty et al.; Phelps-Ward & Kenney, 2019; Townsend, 2021) and mentoring opportunities (Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Stewart, 2019). Additionally, descriptive results from Appendix B suggest that it may be especially important for institutional leaders to ensure that staff feel valued and respected by faculty and senior administrators.

There should also be extensive training through HR that highlights the discriminatory behavior that Black staff in particular experience in the workplace. Supervisors especially should receive training to ensure they are not engaging in behaviors such as questioning the competence of Black staff reports or pressuring them to take on excessive, unpaid diversity work. Given the importance of building a culture in which staff are recognized for their competence has a positive effect on job satisfaction (Hermsen & Rosser, 2008) and intent to stay (Figueron, 2015), it is especially important to ensure that such a culture also accounts for the ways that Black staff are

historically and presently devalued in the workplace to ensure they too enjoy positive workplace outcomes.

This study had a multi-institutional scope, but campuses carrying out single-institution studies can also undertake measures to ensure that staff climate data is translated to actionable information. In terms of reporting, though aggregate figures are valuable for molding a high-level understanding of institutional climate, they can also obscure areas of concern within more granular contexts. For this reason, it is important to disaggregate not only by various social identities (e.g. Race, gender) but also by organizational contexts such as division and department. This type of reporting can be accompanied with a formal review structure in which institutional, divisional, and departmental leadership review disaggregated data to identify areas for further action.

Theory/Research

Findings also have implications for theory and research. One of the core aims of the study was testing if the MMDLE could be extended to a staff context. Descriptive findings indicated significant relationships between all of the MMDLE measures included in the study with study outcomes. In the regressions, the psychological dimension measures were significantly connected to job satisfaction in the final step of the model. In light of these results, the MMDLE could be further adapted to examine the campus climate for staff. One direction could be formally modifying the MMDLE to better match staff contexts. In particular, separately examining the roles of departmental and institutional contexts on influencing the campus climate for staff could be a valuable extension to the framework. Vaccaro's 2012 study examining campus climate for LGBT faculty, staff, and students found that staff perceptions of the climate were shaped by their "microclimates," such as home departments and offices, rather than the

campus macroclimate that undergraduate students described. Carpenter (2009) also found that departmental-level climate measures influenced staff perceptions of the overall climate more than institutional-level measures. A modified MMDLE model that adds one or more additional context layers that are more granular than the Institutional Context, such as Divisional Context and Departmental Context may better reflect where “climate” is forged for staff in their day-to-day. Further, incorporating a closer examination of departmental contexts may challenge the takeaway in this particular study that ERG needs tend to “mitigate” the impact of climate on staff outcomes. Rather, these measures may be more interrelated, particularly in the departmental context. Another direction for refining theory and extending research is using the MMDLE to test additional staff outcomes besides job satisfaction and turnover intent. While the strength and significance of climate measures diminished once ERG measures were introduced in this study, there may be staff outcomes, such as sense of belonging, for which climate experiences more strongly influence staff outcomes.

Outside of the MMDLE, there are topics for future research based on content areas that this study did not directly pinpoint. One such area is a closer examination of staff role by race. Though this study examined the role of race and staff role separately in predicting staff outcomes, it did not consider how these pieces might operate in tandem. This dynamic is especially important since Black and Latinx staff are concentrated in service roles while White staff are the majority of those in senior administration positions (Taylor et al., 2020). Future quantitative research in this area could use interaction terms to more closely examine these relationships. Another area for further exploration is the notion that staff with low satisfaction may choose to remain in their position for other reasons, such as benefits (i.e. salary, health insurance) or considerations related to upward mobility. A structural equation model using

turnover intent as a dependent variable and/or a qualitative study could be well-suited to parsing the complex reasons why dissatisfied staff may remain in their positions. Additionally, findings from descriptive and preliminary analyses on the relationship between race, campus climate, and outcomes could serve as a springboard for more in-depth study.

There are also implications for research regarding my use of the HERI Staff Climate Survey (SCS). Many of the climate-related survey items are focused on the institutional context (e.g. “Please rate your satisfaction with your institution in each area:”). To better match staff experiences of the climate, survey developers should consider incorporating climate and diversity items within the departmental context too. There are also aspects of the SCS structure that make studying job satisfaction more challenging. In particular, the presence of ERG-related items that use a satisfaction scale make it challenging to incorporate into a study that uses job satisfaction as an outcome due to concerns of inflated relationships between independent variables and the dependent variable. For this reason, survey developers might also consider using fewer satisfaction scales and more agreement-based scales. For example, the 2021 administration of the Staff Climate survey includes an agreement question, “My salary is sufficient considering the cost of living in this area.” This salary-themed survey item is better suited to studying job satisfaction than the item that asks respondents to rate their satisfaction with salary.

Finally, given the limited research literature focused specifically on Native American/Alaskan Native and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander staff, a critical area for further study is to better understand their climate experiences and needs in support of improved staff outcomes. Staff from these groups were omitted from the full study due to low cell counts, though Appendix A displays a table with their mean scores in key study variables. In the

meantime, there are several studies on these groups that still provide valuable insights. Tippeconnic Fox (2005) highlighted the lack of study on Native American staff and argued that hiring and retaining Native American staff is important to the success of Native American students. Vaughn et al. (2021) also make the connection between hiring Pacific Islander staff to better support Pacific Islander students. The authors also specify the importance of authentic engagement with and integration of Pacific Islander cultural practices in order for Pacific Islander students, faculty, and staff to feel supported.

Closing Thoughts

This study was motivated by the absence of staff-focused studies on campus climate. Results confirmed the importance of examining staff experiences with the campus climate as they relate to critical staff outcomes. In particular, Black staff tend to have more negative perceptions of the campus climate, an ongoing theme of the study that warrants consideration for institutions aiming to improve the climate for staff.

Tending to staff ERG needs is crucial for supporting improved job satisfaction and reduced turnover intent. Further, meeting ERG needs can mitigate the impact of campus climate on staff outcomes (though this does not mean that meeting ERG needs is a substitute for addressing a hostile campus climate). Policies and practices that support ERG needs can also serve to bolster the campus climate for Staff of Color, such as offering opportunities for staff to connect with colleagues around campus.

The lack of staff representation in formal governance structures as well as in higher education literature reveals a curious contradiction: The very people who support the core functions of the university that enable its existence are largely overlooked in policy and research, particularly as it relates to campus climate. This study sought to respond to these oversights and

offered a variety of implications for policy, practice, and research to better support staff outcomes through a race-conscious lens. While no single study could ever capture the varied experiences of staff, I hope this particular one can serve as a stepping stone on the path to cultivating an equitable and just higher education workplace.

MMLE Item Mean Scores, Non-Imputed (Including Native American/Alaska Native & Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Staff)

Item	Asian (n=224)	Black (n=193)	Latinx (n=396)	Native American/ Alaska Native (n=7)	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander (n=10)	Multi. (n=260)	White (n=1,872)
Compositional Dimension							
Sat. with racial/ethnic diversity of:							
Faculty	4.44	3.21	4.09	3.67	4.30	4.19	4.30
Staff	4.55	3.47	4.40	3.43	4.80	4.47	4.41
Student Body	4.76	3.48	4.68	4.29	5.30	4.66	4.59
Structural Dimension							
This institution:							
Promotes the appreciation of cultural difference	3.96	3.59	3.94	3.71	3.90	4.06	4.08
Has campus admins. who regularly speak about the value of diversity	3.94	3.52	3.82	3.71	3.70	4.03	4.01
Provides campus opportunities to share feelings about issues of concern	3.88	3.59	3.76	3.33	3.50	3.80	3.82
Psychological Dimension							
Stress: Discrimination							
Sat. with atmosphere for:	2.27	2.43	2.23	2.67	2.30	2.15	2.12
Sexual orientation differences	4.77	4.35	4.69	4.71	5.00	4.72	4.72
Political differences	4.47	4.29	4.42	4.00	5.20	4.38	4.36
Religious differences	4.70	4.40	4.62	4.43	5.20	4.63	4.73
Gender differences	4.71	4.36	4.64	4.57	4.90	4.70	4.62
Individuals with disabilities	4.65	4.38	4.54	3.71	4.56	4.50	4.50

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Appendix B

Percent Experienced Stress from Discrimination and Feel Disrespected, by Race

Racial/Ethnic Group	Students	Staff	Faculty	Senior Admin.
Asian	8.3	20.0	37.8	41.2
Black	9.7	27.4	45.5	62.0
Latinx	5.4	29.5	37.7	43.4
Multiracial	11.1	36.1	50.0	64.7
Native American/Alaskan Native		75.0	100.0	100.0
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander			100.0	66.7
White	8.8	22.0	52.8	61.1

REFERENCES

- Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4(2), 142–175. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(69\)90004-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(69)90004-X)
- Alderfer, C. P. (1972). Existence, relatedness, and growth; Human needs in organizational settings. Free Press.
- Alderfer, C. P. (1989). Theories reflecting my personal experience and life development. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 25(4), 351–365. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002188638902500404>
- Altbach, P. G. (2016). Harsh realities: The professoriate in the twenty-first century. In M. N. Bastedo, P. G. Altbach, & P. J. Gumpert, (Eds.), *American higher education in the 21st Century: Social, political, and economic challenges*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Association for Institutional Research. (2014). Overview of survey design. *Data & Decisions Academy*.
- Astin, A.W., & Antonio, A.L., (2012). Assessment for excellence: The philosophy & practice of assessment & evaluation in higher education.(2nd ed.). Rowan & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.
- Bartuševičienė, I., & Šakalytė, E. (2013). Organizational assessment: Effectiveness vs. efficiency. *Social Transformations in Contemporary Society*, 1(1), 45–53.
- Bauer, K. W. (2000). The front line: Satisfaction of classified employees. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2000(105), 87–97. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.10508>
- Beatty, C. C., Tevis, T., Acker, L., Blockett, R., & Parker, E. (2020). Addressing anti-black racism in higher education: Love letters to blackness and recommendations to those Who

- say they love us. *Journal Committed to Social Change on Race and Ethnicity (JCSCORE)*, 6(1), 7–27.
- Berry, C. M., Lelchook, A. M., & Clark, M. A. (2012). A meta-analysis of the interrelationships between employee lateness, absenteeism, and turnover: Implications for models of withdrawal behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(5), 678–699.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.778>
- Bilimoria, D., & Stewart, A. J. (2009). “Don’t ask, don’t tell”: The academic climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender faculty in science and engineering. *NWSA Journal*, 21(2), 85–103.
- Black Student Alliance. (2015). *Towards a better university*. University of Virginia.
- Blackhurst, A. E. (2000). Career satisfaction and perceptions of sex discrimination among women student affairs professionals. *NASPA Journal*, 37(2), 399–413.
<https://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.1104>
- Borman, W. C. (2004). The concept of organizational citizenship. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 13(6), 238–241. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0963-7214.2004.00316.x>
- Bossu, C., Brown, N., & Warren, V. (2018). Professional and support staff in higher education: An introduction. In C. Bossu & N. Brown (Eds.), *Professional and Support Staff in Higher Education* (pp. 1–8). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-6858-4_29
- Bowling, N. A., Khazon, S., Meyer, R. D., & Burrus, C. J. (2015). Satisfaction and job performance. A meta-analytic examination. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 30(1), 89–104.

- Brewer, E. W., & Clippard, L. F. (2002). Burnout and job satisfaction among student support services personnel. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *13*(2), 169–186.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.1022>
- Brown, W. A., & Yoshioka, C. F. (2003). Mission attachment and satisfaction as factors in employee retention. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, *14*(1), 5–18.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.18>
- Buckley, J. B., & Park, J. J. (2019). “When you don’t really focus on it”: Campus climate for social class diversity and identity awareness. *Journal of College Student Development*, *60*(3), 271–289. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2019.0026>
- Burke, L. (2020). Black workers and the university. *The black experience in higher education*. Inside Higher Ed.
- Buttner, E. H., Lowe, K. B., & Billings-Harris, L. (2010). The impact of diversity promise fulfillment on professionals of color outcomes in the usa. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *91*(4), 501–518. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0096-y>
- Cable, D. M., & Edwards, J. R. (2004). Complementary and supplementary fit: A theoretical and empirical integration. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 822–834.
- Campbell-Whatley, G. D., Wang, C., Toms, O., & Williams, N. (2015). Factors affecting campus climate: Creating a welcoming environment. *New Waves-Educational Research and Development Journal*, *18*(2), 40–52.
- Carpenter, R. L. (2009). All on the same page? Contrasting faculty and staff perceptions of university commitment to diversity. *Association for Institutional Research*.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED523632>

- Carter, D. F., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Bridging key research dilemmas: Quantitative research using a critical eye. *New Directions for Institutional Research* (Vol. 133, pp. 25–35). Jossey-Bass.
- Caulton, J. R. (2012). The development and use of the theory of erg: A literature review. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, 5(7).
- Cho, K. S., & Brassfield, L. (2022). An afterthought: Staff of color and campus wellness within higher education responses to covid-19. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 00027642221118254. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027642221118254>
- Cho, M., Lemon, L. L., Levenshus, A. B., & Childers, C. C. (2019). Current students as university donors?: Determinants in college students' intentions to donate and share information about university crowdfunding efforts. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, 16(1), 23–41. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12208-018-00217-9>
- Cho, S., Johanson, M. M., & Guchait, P. (2009). Employees intent to leave: A comparison of determinants of intent to leave versus intent to stay. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(3), 374–381. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.10.007>
- Chiaburu, D. S., Peng, A. C., Oh, I.-S., Banks, G. C., & Lomeli, L. C. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of employee organizational cynicism: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83(2), 181–197. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.03.007>
- Coburn, E., Moreton-Robinson, A., Sefa Dei, G., & Stewart-Harawira, M. (2013). Unspeakable things: Indigenous research and social science. *Socio. La Nouvelle Revue Des Sciences Sociales*, 2, 331–348. <https://doi.org/10.4000/socio.524>
- Cohen, G., Blake, R. S., & Goodman, D. (2016). Does turnover intention matter? Evaluating the usefulness of turnover intention rate as a predictor of actual turnover rate. *Review of*

Public Personnel Administration, 36(3), 240–263.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X15581850>

Combs, J., Liu, Y., Hall, A., & Ketchen, D. (2006). How much do high-performance work practices matter? A meta-analysis of their effects on organizational performance.

Personnel Psychology, 59(3), 501–528. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00045.x>

Couch, V. (2019). *2019 staff climate survey research brief*. HERI.

https://www.heri.ucla.edu/briefs/SCS/HERI_SCS_2019_Brief.pdf

Cox, B. E., McIntosh, K., Reason, R. D., & Terenzini, P. T. (2014). Working with missing data in higher education research: A primer and real-world example. *The Review of Higher Education*, 37(3), 377–402. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2014.0026>

Croteau, J. M., & Lark, J. S. (2009). On being lesbian, gay or bisexual in student affairs: A national survey of experiences on the job. *NASPA Journal*, 46(3), 382–394.

<https://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.5016>

Daly, C. J., & Dee, J. R. (2006). Greener pastures: Faculty turnover intent in urban public universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(5), 776–803.

<https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2006.0040>

Dancy, T. E., Edwards, K. T., & Davis, E. J. (2018). Historically white universities and plantation politics: Anti-Blackness and higher education in the black lives matter era.

Urban Education, 53(2), 176–195. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085918754328>

Dedman, B. (2019). *College students are more diverse than ever. Faculty and administrators are not*. Association of American Colleges & Universities. <https://www.aacu.org/aacu-news/newsletter/2019/march/facts-figures>

- Dee, J. R. (2004). Turnover intent in an urban community college: Strategies for faculty retention. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 28(7), 593–607.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10668920490467242>
- Droege, S. B., & Hoobler, J. M. (2003). Employee turnover and tacit knowledge diffusion: A network perspective. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 15(1), 50–64.
- Dungy, G., Gordon, S. A. (2011) The development of student affairs. In J. H. Schuh, J. H. Jones, & S. R. Harper (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (pp. 61-79). John Wiley & Sons.
- Duran, A., Dahl, L. S., Stipeck, C., & Mayhew, M. J. (2020). A critical quantitative analysis of students' sense of belonging: perspectives on race, generation status, and collegiate environments. *Journal of College Student Development*, 61(2), 133–153.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2020.0014>
- Eagan, M. K., Jaeger, A. J., & Grantham, A. (2015). Supporting the academic majority: Policies and practices related to part-time faculty's job satisfaction. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 86(3), 448–483. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2015.11777371>
- Eckel, P. D., & Kezar, A. (2016). The intersecting authoring of boards, presidents, and faculty: Toward shared leadership. In M. N. Bastedo, P. G. Altbach, & P. J. Gumport, (Eds.), *American higher education in the 21st Century: Social, political, and economic challenges*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Edwards, J. R., & Cable, D. M. (2009). The value of value congruence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(3), 654–677. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0014891>
- Ellis, L. (2021, August 25). The great disillusionment: College workers are burning out just when they'll be needed most. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

https://www.chronicle.com/article/the-great-disillusionment?bc_nonce=9lln6ee6y7bpzulurwzcv9&cid=reg_wall_signup

- Falcone, S. (1991). Self-assessments and job satisfaction in public and private organizations. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 14(4), 385-396.
- Figueron, O. (2015). The influences impacting staff turnover in higher education. *Journal of Management and Sustainability*, 5(4), 86–93.
- Fraser, J., & Hodge, M. (2000). Job satisfaction in higher education: Examining gender in professional work settings. *Sociological Inquiry*, 70(2), 172–178.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.2000.tb00904.x>
- Garcia, G. A. (2016). Exploring student affairs professionals' experiences with the campus racial climate at a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI). *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 9(1), 20–33. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039199>
- Garcia, G. A., & Cuellar, M. (2018). Exploring curricular and co-curricular effects on civic engagement at emerging hispanic serving institutions. *Teachers College Record*, 120(4), 1–36.
- Garcia, N. M., López, N., & Vélez, V. N. (2018). QuantCrit: rectifying quantitative methods through critical race theory. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 21(2), 149–157.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2017.1377675>
- Garvey, J. C., Taylor, J. L., & Rankin, S. (2015). An examination of campus climate for lgbtq community college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 39(6), 527–541. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2013.861374>

- Garvey, J. C., Squire, D. D., Stachler, B., & Rankin, S. (2018). The impact of campus climate on queer-spectrum student academic success. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 15*(2), 89–105.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2018.1429978>
- Garvey, J. C., Viray, S., Stango, K., Estep, C., & Jaeger, J. (2019). Emergence of third spaces: exploring trans students' campus climate perceptions within collegiate environments. *Sociology of Education, 92*(3), 229–246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040719839100>
- George Mwangi, C. A., Changamire, N., & Mosselson, J. (2019). An intersectional understanding of african international graduate students' experiences in u.s. higher education. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 12*(1), 52–64.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000076>
- Gillborn, D., Warmington, P., & Demack, S. (2018). QuantCrit: Education, policy, 'big data' and principles for a critical race theory of statistics. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 21*(2), 158–179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2017.1377417>
- Gómez, L. E., & López, N. (2013). *Mapping "race": Critical approaches to health disparities research*. Rutgers University Press.
- Graham, C. (2012). Transforming spaces and identities: The contributions of professional staff to learning spaces in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 34*(4), 437–452. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2012.696326>
- Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management, 26*(3), 463–488.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600305>

- Haines, V. Y., Jalette, P., & Larose, K. (2010). The influence of human resource management practices on employee voluntary turnover rates in the canadian non governmental sector. *ILR Review*, 63(2), 228–246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001979391006300203>
- Harbour, W. S., & Greenberg, D. (2017). *Campus Climate and Students with Disabilities* [Report]. National Center for College Students with Disabilities. <https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/handle/10919/86931>
- Harper, C. E., & Yeung, F. (2013). Perceptions of institutional commitment to diversity as a predictor of college students' openness to diverse perspectives. *The Review of Higher Education*, 37(1), 25–44. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2013.0065>
- Harper, S. R., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2007(120), 7–24. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.254>
- Harris, F., & Bensimon, E. M. (2007). The equity scorecard: A collaborative approach to assess and respond to racial/ethnic disparities in student outcomes. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2007(120), 77–84. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.259>
- Hart, J., & Fellabaum, J. (2008). Analyzing campus climate studies: Seeking to define and understand. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 222–234. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0013627>
- 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), 268–279. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268>

- Hausknecht, J. P., & Trevor, C. O. (2011). Collective turnover at the group, unit, and organizational levels: Evidence, issues, and implications. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 352–388. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310383910>
- Hawkins, V. M., & Larabee, H. J.. (2009). Engaging racial/ethnic minority students in out-of-class activities on predominantly white campuses. In S. R. Harper, & S. J. Quaye (Eds.), *Student engagement in higher education: Theoretical perspectives and practical approaches for diverse populations*. Taylor & Francis.
- Heavey, A. L., Holwerda, J. A., & Hausknecht, J. P. (2013). Causes and consequences of collective turnover: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(3), 412–453. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032380>
- Heckert, T. M., & Farabee, A. M. (2006). Turnover intentions of the faculty at a teaching-focused university. *Psychological Reports*, 99(1), 39–45. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.99.1.39-45>
- HERI. (2021). *Diverse Learning Environments Survey*. HERI. Retrieved May 14, 2021, from <https://heri.ucla.edu/diverse-learning-environments-survey/>
- HERI. (2021). *Diverse Learning Environments (DLE) Survey Appendix 2019*. HERI. Retrieved May 14, 2021, from https://www.heri.ucla.edu/PDFs/constructs/DLE_Factor_Appendix_2019.pdf
- HERI. (2021). *Faculty Survey Appendix 2016*. HERI. Retrieved May 14, 2021, from <https://www.heri.ucla.edu/PDFs/constructs/FAC2016Appendix.pdf>
- HERI. (2021). *Staff Climate Survey – HERI*. Retrieved May 17, 2021, from <https://heri.ucla.edu/staff-climate-survey/>

- Hermesen, J., & Rosser, V. (2008). Examining work engagement and job satisfaction of staff members in higher education. *CUPA-HR Journal*, 59(2), 10–18.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B.B. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Holland, P. (2008). Causation and race. In T. Zuberi, & E. Bonilla-Silva (Eds.), *White logic, white methods* (pp. 93-109). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Howell, S. L., & Hoyt, J. (2007). Part-time faculty job satisfaction in higher education: A literature review. In *Online Submission*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED499387>
- Hughes, B. E., & Hurtado, S. (2018). Thinking about sexual orientation: College Experiences that predict identity salience. *Journal of College Student Development*, 59(3), 309–326. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2018.0029>
- Hurtado, S., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., Allen, W. R., & Milem, J. F. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(3), 279–302. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.1998.0003>
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1999). Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education. *ASHE-ERIC High. Educ. Rep.* 26(8). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED430514>
- Hurtado, S., Griffin, K., Arellano, L., & Cuellar, M. (2008). Assessing the value of climate assessments: Progress and future directions. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1, 204–221. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014009>
- Hurtado, S., Alvarez, C. L., Guillermo-Wann, C., Cuellar, M., & Arellano, L. (2012). A model for diverse learning environments. In J. C. Smart & M. B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher*

Education: Handbook of Theory and Research: Volume 27 (pp. 41–122). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-2950-6_2

Jayakumar, U. M., Howard, T. C., Allen, W. R., & Han, J. C. (2009). Racial privilege in the professoriate: an exploration of campus climate, retention, and satisfaction. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80(5), 538–563. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2009.11779031>

Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave: A multilevel explanation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(4), 518–542.

Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 530–541. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.530>

Judge, T. A., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2012). Job attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63(1), 341–367. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100511>

Judge, T.A., Zhang, S.C., Glerum, D.R. (2020). Job satisfaction. IN V. I. Sessa & N. A. Bowling (Eds). *Essentials of Job Attitudes and Other Workplace Psychological Constructs*. Routledge.

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. (2007). Learning to ensure the success of students of color: A systemic approach to effecting change. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 39(4), 18–21. <https://doi.org/10.3200/CHNG.39.4.18-25>

Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. L. (1994). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 138-157). Sage Publications.

- Kish-Gephart, J. J., Harrison, D. A., & Treviño, L. K. (2010). Bad apples, bad cases, and bad barrels: Meta-analytic evidence about sources of unethical decisions at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(1), 1–31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017103>
- Kramer, A. L., Gloeckner, G. W., & Jacoby, D. (2014). Roads scholars: Part-Time faculty job satisfaction in community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 38*(4), 287–299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2010.485005>
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology, 58*(2), 281–342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00672.x>
- Lee, J. J., & Helm, M. (2013). Student affairs capitalism and early-career student affairs professionals. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 50*(3), 290–307. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jsarp-2013-0021>
- Lorden, L. P. (1998). Attrition in the student affairs profession. *NASPA Journal, 35*(3), 207–216. <https://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.1049>
- Mahan, T. F., Nelms D., Bearden, C. R., & Pearce, B. (2019). *2019 retention report*. Work Institute.
- Manly, C. A., & Wells, R. S. (2015). Reporting the use of multiple imputation for missing data in higher education research. *Research in Higher Education, 56*(4), 397–409. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-014-9344-9>
- Mayhew, M. J., Bowman, N. A., & Rockenbach, A. B. (2014). Silencing whom? Linking campus climates for religious, spiritual, and worldview diversity to student worldviews.

The Journal of Higher Education, 85(2), 219–245.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2014.11777325>

Mayhew, M. J., Grunwald, H. E., & Dey, E. L. (2006). Breaking the silence: Achieving a positive campus climate for diversity from the staff perspective. *Research in Higher Education*, 47(1), 63–88.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-004-8152-z>

Mayhew, M. J., & Simonoff, J. S. (2015). Non-White, no more: Effect coding as an alternative to dummy coding with implications for higher education researchers. *Journal of College Student Development*, 56(2), 170–175. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2015.0019>

McClure, K. R. (2016). Building the innovative and entrepreneurial university: An institutional case study of administrative academic capitalism. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 87(4), 516–543. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2016.11777412>

McClure, K. R., Barringer, S. N., & Brown, J. T. (2020). Privatization as the new normal in higher education: Synthesizing literature and reinvigorating research through a multilevel framework. In L. W. Perna (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (Vol. 35, pp. 589–666). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-31365-4_13

McLennan, D. (2019). *2018 Staff climate survey research brief*. HERI.

https://www.heri.ucla.edu/briefs/SCS/HERI_SCS_2018_Brief.pdf

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 20–52.

<https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842>

- Milem, J. F., Chang, M. J., & Antonio, A. L. (2005). *Making diversity work on campus: A research-based perspective*. Association American Colleges and Universities Washington, DC.
- Miller, R. A. (2014). An overview of campus climate: Dimensions of diversity in higher education. *Texas Education Review*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.15781/T2HT2GH3Q>
- Miller, R. A., & Dika, S. L. (2018). Perceptions of campus climate at the intersections of disability and lgbtqia+ identities. In K. M. Soria (Ed.), *Evaluating Campus Climate at US Research Universities: Opportunities for Diversity and Inclusion* (pp. 77–101). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-94836-2_4
- Miller, R. A., Guida, T., Smith, S., Ferguson, S. K., & Medina, E. (2018). A balancing act: Whose interests do bias response teams serve? *The Review of Higher Education*, 42(1), 313–337. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2018.0031>
- Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The work design questionnaire (wdq): Developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(6), 1321–1339. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1321>
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M., 1982. *Organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover*. Academic Press.
- Mullen, P. R., Malone, A., Denney, A., & Dietz, S. S. (2018). Job stress, burnout, job satisfaction, and turnover intention among student affairs professionals. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 36(1), 94–108. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csaj.2018.0006>
- Muñoz, S. M., & Vigil, D. (2018). Interrogating racist nativist microaggressions and campus climate: How undocumented and daca college students experience institutional legal

- violence in Colorado. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 11(4), 451–466.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000078>
- Nichols, D. P. (1999). My coefficient a is negative. *SPSS Keywords*, 68, 1–4.
- Niemann, Y. F., & Dovidio, J. F. (1998). Relationship of solo status, academic rank, and perceived distinctiveness to job satisfaction of racial/ethnic minorities. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(1), 55–71. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.1.55>
- Park, J. J., Denson, N., & Bowman, N. A. (2013). Does socioeconomic diversity make a difference? Examining the effects of racial and socioeconomic diversity on the campus climate for diversity. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(3), 466–496.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831212468290>
- Park, T.-Y., & Shaw, J. D. (2013). Turnover rates and organizational performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(2), 268–309.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030723>
- Patitu, C. L., & Hinton, K. G. (2003). The experiences of African American women faculty and administrators in higher education: Has anything changed? *New Directions for Student Services*, 2003(104), 79–93. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.109>
- Phelps-Ward, R. & Kenney, J. (2019). Surviving whiteness and white people: The coping strategies of black, entry-level student affairs professionals. *Journal of Student Affairs*, XXVIII, 121–134.
- Peterson, M. W., & Spencer, M. G. (1990). Understanding academic culture and climate. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 1990(68), 3–18.
- Podsakoff, N. P., LePine, J. A., & LePine, M. A. (2007). Differential challenge stressor-hindrance stressor relationships with job attitudes, turnover intentions, turnover, and

- withdrawal behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 438–454.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.438>
- Quaye, S. J., Tambascia, T. P., & Talesh, R. A. (2009). Engaging racial/ethnic minority students in predominantly white classroom environments. In S. R. Harper, & S. J. Quaye (Eds.), *Student engagement in higher education: Theoretical perspectives and practical approaches for diverse populations*. Taylor & Francis.
- Rankin, S. R., & Reason, R. D. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and white students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(1), 43–61. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2005.0008>
- Ravitch, S.M., & Carl, N.M. (2016). *Qualitative research: Bridging the conceptual, theoretical, and methodological*. Sage Publications.
- Reid, L. D., & Radhakrishnan, P. (2003). Race matters: The relation between race and general campus climate. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 9(3), 263–275.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.9.3.263>
- Renn, K. A., & Patton, L. D. (2011). Campus ecology and environments. In J. H. Schuh, S. R. Jones, & S. R. Harper (Eds.). *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (pp. 242-256). John Wiley & Sons.
- Riggle, R. J., Edmondson, D. R., & Hansen, J. D. (2009). A meta-analysis of the relationship between perceived organizational support and job outcomes: 20 years of research. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(10), 1027–1030.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.05.003>
- Rios-Aguilar, C. (2014). The changing context of critical quantitative inquiry. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2013(158), 95–107. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.20048>

- Rockenbach, A. B., & Mayhew, M. J. (2014). The campus spiritual climate: Predictors of satisfaction among students with diverse worldviews. *Journal of College Student Development, 55*(1), 41–62. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2014.0002>
- Rosser, V. J., & Javinar, J. M. (2003). Midlevel student affairs leaders' intentions to leave: Examining the quality of their professional and institutional work life. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*(6), 813–830. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2003.0076>
- Rosser, V. J., & Townsend, B. K. (2006). Determining public 2-year college faculty's intent to leave: An empirical model. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(1), 124–147. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2006.0006>
- Ryan, J. F., Healy, R., & Sullivan, J. (2012). Oh, won't you stay? Predictors of faculty intent to leave a public research university. *Higher Education, 63*, 421–437.
- Ryder, A. J., & Mitchell, J. J. (2013). Measuring campus climate for personal and social responsibility. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2013*(164), 31–48. <https://doi.org/10.1002/he.20074>
- Saari, L. M., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management, 43*(4), 395–407. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20032>
- Salkind, N. (2010). Factor Loadings. *Encyclopedia of Research Design*. SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412961288.n149>
- Schleicher, D. J., Hansen, S. D., & Fox, K. E. (2011). Job attitudes and work values. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbooks in psychology. APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Vol. 3. Maintaining, expanding, and contracting the organization* (pp. 137–189). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/12171-004>

- Shelton, L. J. (2019). Undocumented latinx college students' perceptions of campus climate. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 56(1), 92–104.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19496591.2018.1519438>
- Shupp, M. R., & Arminio, J. L. (2012). Synergistic supervision: A confirmed key to retaining entry-level student affairs professionals. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 49(2), 157–174. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jsarp-2012-6295>
- Sinharay, S., Stern, H. S., & Russell, D. (2001). The use of multiple imputation for the analysis of missing data. *Psychological Methods*, 6(4), 317–329.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.6.4.317>
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2016). State and markets in higher education: Trends in academic capitalism. In M. N. Bastedo, P. G. Altbach, & P. J. Gumport, (Eds.), *American higher education in the 21st Century: Social, political, and economic challenges*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smerek, R. E., & Peterson, M. (2007). Examining herzberg's theory: Improving job satisfaction among non-academic employees at a university. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(2), 229–250.
- Smith, D. G. (2016). The diversity imperative: Moving to the next generation. In M. N. Bastedo, P. G. Altbach, & P. J. Gumport, (Eds.), *American higher education in the 21st Century: Social, political, and economic challenges*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Stage, F. K., & Wells, R. S. (2014). Critical quantitative inquiry in context. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2013(158), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.20041>

- Stanley, C. A. (2006). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominantly white colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(4), 701–736. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312043004701>
- Steel, R. P., Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Lyons, D. M. (2002). Practical retention policy for the practical manager. *The Academy of Management Executive (1993-2005)*, 16(2), 149–164.
- Steele, T. (2018). Toxicity in the work environment: Retaining staff members of color at a predominantly white institution. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 36(1), 109–123. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csaj.2018.0007>
- Stewart, D-L. (2019). Ideologies of absence: Anti-blackness and inclusion rhetoric in student affairs practice. *Journal of Student Affairs*, XXVIII, 121–134.
- Stewart, T.J., Collier, J., & Lacy, M. (2019). Naming and claiming the reality of anti-blackness in student affairs. In M.G. Burke & U.M. Robinson. *No ways tired: The journey for professionals of color in student affairs* (pp. 165-175). IAP.
- Tabron, L. A. (2019). I pulled up a seat at the table: My journey engaging in critical quantitative inquiry. In K. K. Strunk & L. A. Locke (Eds.), *Research methods for social justice and equity in education* (pp. 275–282). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-05900-2_23
- Taylor, M., Turk, J. M., Chessman, H. M., & Espinosa, L.L. (2020). Postsecondary faculty and staff. *Race and ethnicity in higher education: 2020 supplement*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education. <https://1xfsu31b52d33idlp13twtos-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/REHE-2020-Chapter-6-individual.pdf>

- Tetreuault, P. A., Fette, R., Meidlinger, P. C., & Hope, D. (2013) Perceptions of campus climate by sexual minorities. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 60(7), 947-964, DOI: [10.1080/00918369.2013.774874](https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2013.774874)
- Thelin, J. R. (2011). *A History of American Higher Education*. JHU Press.
- Thoresen, C. J., Kaplan, S. A., Barsky, A. P., Warren, C. R., & de Chermont, K. (2003). The affective underpinnings of job perceptions and attitudes: A meta-analytic review and integration. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(6), 914–945.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.6.914>
- Tippeconnic Fox (Comanche), M. J. (2005). Voices from within: Native American faculty and staff on campus. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2005(109), 49–59.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.153>
- Townsend, C. V. (2021). Identity politics: Why African American women are missing in administrative leadership in public higher education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(4), 584–600.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220935455>
- Turner, C. S. V., González, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(3), 139–168.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0012837>
- UCLA Statistical Consulting Group. (2021). *Coding systems for categorical variables in regression analysis*. Retrieved May 17, 2021, from <https://stats.idre.ucla.edu/spss/faq/coding-systems-for-categorical-variables-in-regression-analysis/>

- U.S. Department of Education. *Employees and instructional staff – How many people are employed by postsecondary institutions*. National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Human Resources component final data (fall 2002 - 2018) and provisional data (fall 2019). Retrieved May 7, 2021, from <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/TrendGenerator/app/answer/5/30?f=41%3D23%7C22%7C15%7C14%7C13%7C12%7C21%7C11%7C10%7C20%7C9%7C8%7C7%7C6%7C5%7C4>
- Vaccaro, A. (2012). Campus microclimates for LGBT faculty, staff, and students: An exploration of the intersections of social identity and campus roles. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 49(4), 429–446. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jsarp-2012-6473>
- Vaccaro, A. (2014). Campus climate for diversity: Current realities and suggestions for the future. *Texas Education Review*, 2(1), 129-137. <https://doi.org/10.15781/T2F18SK8G>
- Valdez, Z., & Golash-Boza, T. (2020). Master status or intersectional identity? Undocumented students' sense of belonging on a college campus. *Identities*, 27(4), 481–499. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2018.1534452>
- van Saane, N., Sluiter, J. K., Verbeek, J. H. a. M., & Frings-Dresen, M. H. W. (2003). Reliability and validity of instruments measuring job satisfaction—A systematic review. *Occupational Medicine*, 53(3), 191–200. <https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqg038>
- Vaughn, K., Saelua, N., & Taione-Filihia, 'Asena. (2021). Cultivating a cultural kipuka: Pacific islander practitioner reflections. *About Campus*, 26(1), 30–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086482220953161>
- Volkwein, J. F., & Zhou, Y. (2003). Testing a model of administrative job satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 44(2), 149–171. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022099612036>

- Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., & Hudy, M. J. (1997). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single-item measures? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(2), 247-252.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.2.247>
- Wells, R. S., & Stage, F. K. (2015). Past, present, and future of critical quantitative research in higher education. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2014(163), 103–112.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.20089>
- Whitman, D. S., Rooy, D. L. V., & Viswesvaran, C. (2010). Satisfaction, citizenship behaviors, and performance in work units: A meta-analysis of collective construct relations. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(1), 41–81. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2009.01162.x>
- Wilder, C. S. (2013). *Ebony and ivy: Race, slavery, and the troubled history of america's universities*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.
- Wilson, M. E., Liddell, D. L., Hirschy, A. S., & Pasquesi, K. (2016). Professional identity, career commitment, and career entrenchment of midlevel student affairs professionals. *Journal of College Student Development*, 57(5), 557–572. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2016.0059>
- Xu, Y. J. (2008). Faculty turnover: Discipline-specific attention is warranted. *Research in Higher Education*, 49(1), 40–61.
- Zehner, A. L. (2018). Campus climate for students with disabilities. In K. M. Soria (Ed.), *Evaluating campus climate at us research universities: Opportunities for diversity and inclusion* (pp. 125–149). Springer International Publishing.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-94836-2_6
- Zuberi, T. (2001). Beyond racial statistics. *Thicker than blood: How racial statistics lie* (pp. 101-104). U of Minnesota Press.

Zuberi, T., & Bonilla-Silva, E. (Eds.). (2008). *White logic, white methods*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.