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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background

During the 1970s and 1980s, the need for administrators grew noticeably at the university level where the primary business was education. Within this environment lies an administration or management core that employs a well-educated group of professionals who were asked to work in demanding areas, whose efforts were frequently not recognized (Johnsrd & Rosser, 1999). Probably because those who depend on their services did not recognize their function of administration, nor the significance of training, depth of expertise required or needed to be a successful administrator. In essence, the leadership of colleges and universities hinges upon their administration, for they shape a collective personality and a shared mission or ethos of the institution.

Consequently, higher education administrators, compared to corporate America management, had to find their own way through the interstices of the bureaucracy and the trickle-down of resources. Within the last 20 years, American business and industry leaders have faced a similar dilemma, under pressure to reduce costs, maintain profit margins, and compete successfully for market shares in a global economy.

More Flexible Administrators in the 21st Century

As the nation entered the threshold of the 21st century, the objectives of the administrative personnel function of educational entities was to attract, develop, retain, and motivate staff in order to: (a) achieve the institution's mission statement; (b) maximize the
career development of personnel, and; (c) reconcile individual and institutional objectives (Ali & Karim, 1992). These challenges forced higher education entities to find more flexible and adaptable administrators who understood the realities of the 21st century to compete successfully in a global economy. In addition, institutions had to value employee morale and acknowledge that motivation was needed to enhance individual job performance.

Successful administrative personnel were those who instilled motivation and creativity for the needs of their employees to compete in a dynamic society. In addition, successful administrations fostered employee development and created a climate conducive to maximizing employee potential. Human beings' needs and desires should receive periodic feedback and be challenged by constructive criticism to improve performance. Feedback is essential to the well-being of both the individuals involved as well as the colleges and universities they serve.

Marcia J. Belcher's (1992) study, "A Performance Feedback System for Administrations Excellence," developed a survey to assess administrative performance in five areas. Her study deemed that there were five most important characteristics of a successful administrator:

1. General Administrator Competence: The person must be creative in terms of solving problems, fulfilling duties on time and making informed decisions.

2. Interpersonal Skills: The administrator is approachable, listens actively, treats all individuals with respect, and is receptive to feedback.
3. **Support of College Mission:** Employee places important emphasis on student achievement.

4. **Knowledge Base:** A person is knowledgeable about institutional policies and procedures.

5. **Motivation:** An administrator develops a climate that rewards initiative and responsible risk taking.

Belcher’s study suggested that administrators had to be competent to manage their highly educated and skilled employees and human resources — intensive operations, and must be adaptable to environmental realities to achieve success. These administrative functions must be genuine, bare unique specialization, and have broad interdisciplinary knowledge appropriate for cultivating roles and responsibilities. In order for educational leaders to adhere to the challenges put before them, they must be able to recognize symptoms of encouraging enthusiasm among their subordinates and responding with appropriate motivational strategies.

Thus, institutional leaders should avail themselves of the insight and wisdom of faculty, administrators, staff, students, parents, legislators, and the surrounding communities as they prepare for the institution’s strategic mission. Understanding the culture of the collegial landscape is vital for colleges and universities in this highly competitive society. Furthermore, innovative administrations tend to foster positive attitudes among the student populations, faculty and staff, thereby enhancing the university community.
Barriers that Impede Non-Tenure Administrators

Austin and Gamon (1983) stated that faculty showed little respect for administrators, and resisted accepting them as full members of the academic community. During the growth period of 1970s and 80s, colleges and universities hired more than twice as many administrators as faculty. That accounts for a 62% increase in non-faculty administrator positions than faculty over a 10 year period (Grassmuck, 1990, 1991). Knowing this fact, faculty, at times, were more likely to criticize the increased number of administrators than give credit to those who spent much of their time directly interacting with students and external constituents.

Literature indicates that non-faculty administrators lacking tenure were subject to immediate termination with minimal recourse than those with tenure (Ali & Karim, 1992). Thus, leadership must create better conditions and climates conducive to non-tenure employees, because their contributions are equally vital to the higher education enterprise. Lindgren (1982) argued that administrators increase their effectiveness when they are personally affirmed, although they were non-tenure. Hence, a positive environment provides opportunities for its members to bring initiative and creativity to their tasks, and allows individual satisfaction and effective performance. When there is such an environment, it resonates a functional level of administrative motivation, job selection, and enhanced performance within the institution itself. For it seems that the higher the morale, the higher the performance. However, many administrators and employees have witnessed rightsizing, downsizing, or plain outright cruelty from the university, although little empirical data have been collected to verify this fact.
Changing to a More Diverse Workforce

As we usher into this millennium, an increasing number of colleges and universities have to recruit a more diverse workforce; one that is vastly different from the traditional makeup of the university of 20 years ago. This new workforce will be more diverse in terms of culture, race/ethnicity, gender, disabilities, family/work life, and sexual orientation (White, 1997). Therefore, a diverse workforce is no longer theoretical, it is a reality. Naisbitt and Aburdene (1980) drew attention to anticipated demographic changes in the workforce for the 21st century in their Megatrends report. However, diversity in the workforce did not gain momentum until the Workforce 2000 report was released (Hudson Institute, 1988b). This study by the Hudson Institute indicated that women, minorities, and immigrants will constitute about 85% of the United States workforce by the year 2000 (Johnson & Packer, 1987).

In his book, Beyond Race and Gender, Thomas (1991) concluded that “the notion of going beyond race and gender does not call for ignoring these factors, but recognizes them as part of a larger, even more complex picture” (p. xv). That is, when managers considered race and gender as part of a more complex entity, they had the potential to unleash the power of their total workforce by managing diversity (Rosado, 1992; Thomas, 1991). Because most corporations/institutions want to retain their competitive edge and profitability margin, many managers have broadened their administrative core to address not only racial/ethnic and gender concerns but also issues of competitive advantage and basic workplace skills. It has been found that, by including the issue of competitive advantage, diversity promotes not only fairness but also perceptions of being profitable in
the following ways: gaining and keeping market shares, cutting costs, increasing productivity, reducing turnover and absenteeism, improving employee morale, and increasing general managerial competence (Morrison, 1992).

Carnevale, Gainer, and Meltzer (1990) further suggested, that basic workplace skills are categorized into the following seven groups: (a) learning to learn—competence; (b) reading, writing, and computation—communication skills; (c) oral communication and listening—adaptability; (d) creative thinking and problem solving—personal management; (e) self-esteem, motivation/goal setting, employability/career development—group effectiveness; (f) interpersonal skills, negotiation, and teamwork—influence; and (g) organizational effectiveness and leadership.

Furthermore, Gardenswartz and Rowe (1998) gave five important reasons why diversity in the administrative core was critical to an organization's success. These include (a) gaining access to a changing marketplace, (b) getting a healthy return on investing in your human capital, (c) recruiting and retaining the best talent, (d) expanding creativity, and (e) ensuring survival through resilience and flexibility, all of which are vital to ensure success in the competitive and global markets of the 21st century.

Nature of the Problem

One aspect of organizational change from which academic institutions have not been exempt is downsizing. Budget cuts and restructuring have been necessitated by external circumstances and have resulted in the reduction and/or elimination of academic departments and programs. These changes have an impact on all personnel whether or not
they are directly affected. Questions of motivation, security, adaptability, and stress invariably arise among the vast segment of the workforce who were not tenured. Given the current budget cuts in higher education, universities and colleges have had to downsize causing a reduction and elimination of academic programs and departments (Graf, L.A., Hemmasi, M., Newgren, K.E. & Nelson, W.R., 1994).

According to Gilliland (1997), an environment of rapid change and long-range planning was not the useful strategy it once was. Flexibility was now essential to allowing organizations to respond to changes and to new information by reorganizing and shifting priorities. Therefore, for real solutions to be realized, institutions must foster a strong systemic interconnectedness and sense of community on their campuses, among faculty, non-tenure administrators, students, and community members. Simply stated, if higher administration and non tenure faculty, do not value, appreciate, or understand non-faculty administrators while they are junior faculty members, they probably will not value, appreciate, or understand non-faculty administrators after they matriculate into higher administration.

An understanding of factors of non-faculty administrators was essential to higher administration knowing what affected or influenced their performance. Non-faculty administrators were potential leaders of institutions of higher education. Tenure faculty and administration must learn how organizational contexts affect individuals, their perceptions, and their subsequent behavior. As institutions seek to understood the realities of the 21st century to compete successfully, institutions have to value employee morale and acknowledge that motivation is needed to enhance individual job performance. Successful
administrative personnel were those who fostered employee development and created a climate conducive to maximizing employee potential.

Researchers who have studied how organizational contexts affect individuals, their perceptions, and their subsequent behavior have suggested that factors of non-faculty administrators are influenced by organizational design, employee development, performance appraisal, rewards and incentives, and clear Human Resource Management strategies. Therefore, understanding the influence of these characteristics on non-faculty administrators was necessary to ensure maximum performance from non-tenure administrators. In this study, the researcher assessed the factors of non-faculty administrators of two New Jersey universities; Institution A and Institution B during academic year 1999-00. The information gathered in this research will be useful in efforts to help faculty and administration, in private and public colleges and universities, develop a broader perspective toward factors of non-faculty administrators and their subsequent behavior.

*Purpose of the Study*

The researcher's primary purpose, in this study, was to determine factors of non-faculty administrators that were perceived to influence their performance. Specifically, subjects for the study included selected non-faculty from two New Jersey universities; Institution A and Institution B. These institutions was chosen due to their similarities and the fact that they are non-unionized, whereas, public institutions has various union components that may lead to contractual tenure.
Specific Research Questions of the Study

To accomplish the primary purpose of this study, the researcher established the following question:

1. Is there a difference between the perceptions of performance of Institution A and Institution B University non-faculty administrators?

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The following research questions and hypotheses were formulated to analyze the data collected in this study:

Research Question 1. Are there differences in how non-faculty administrators differ in their perceptions of their institution, based on their individual knowledge and experiences?

Research Question 2. Are there differences in how non-faculty administrators differ in their perceptions regarding: (a) environmental conditions for able performance within a departmental climate, (b) one’s opportunities for training/development at their institutions, and (c) satisfactions at their institutions.

The following research hypotheses were identified to answer research question 2.

Hypothesis 1. There will be significant differences in how non-faculty administrators differ in their perceptions regarding environmental conditions for able performance within a departmental climate, based on gender, race, years in services, and age.
Hypothesis 2. There will be significant differences in how non-faculty administrators differ in their perceptions regarding one’s opportunities for training/development at their institutions, based on gender, race, years in services, and age.

Hypothesis 3. There will be significant differences in how non-faculty administrators differ in their perceptions of satisfactions at their institutions, based on gender, race, years in services, and age.

Importance of the Study

Higher education entities were challenged to find more flexible and adaptable administrators who understood the realities of the 21st century, to compete successfully in a dynamic society. Many institutions have made several efforts to address valuing their employees’ morale and create a climate conducive to maximizing employee potential. However, there still was a need to develop a research base on factors that affected non-faculty administrators’ job performance. A preliminary step for developing such a research base was understanding the influence of factors of non-faculty administrators of two New Jersey universities; Institution A and Institution B. Understanding factors that affected non-faculty administrators’ job performance was imperative. To benefit from such an understanding, faculty and higher administration needed to view non-faculty administrators’ job performance as an important ingredient to attract, develop, retain, and motivate their staff. By focusing on the aforementioned, faculty and higher administration achieved the institution’s mission, foster employee development and created a climate conducive to maximizing employee potential.
The findings from this study were useful in developing a research database on factors of non-faculty administrators’ job performance. Using the information gained from this study, academicians and Top-Level administration will be able to assist others in understanding factors of non-faculty administrators job performance; improving intercultural communication, strategies, and projects; and developing a more conducive environment for non-faculty administrators. The findings from this study also contributed to the general body of knowledge concerning Human Resource Management of private and public universities’ factors of non-faculty administrators job performance.

_Assumptions_

Good (1959) stated that an assumption was “the proposition that an apparent fact or principle was true in the light of the available evidence” (p. 1). Therefore, the researcher made the following assumptions in undertaking this study:

1. The respondents were capable of responding accurately to questions included in the questionnaire.

2. The respondents gave reliable answers and they were sincere in expressing their beliefs and opinions.

_Limitations_

This study was conducted to gain an understanding of the determining factors of non-faculty administrators that is perceived to influence their performance at two New Jersey universities; Institution A and Institution B.
In carrying out the research, the following delimitations and limitations were taken into consideration:

1. The researcher depended solely on data supplied by the participants.

2. Some respondents might have found it difficult to capture their genuine attitudes and beliefs when responding to the survey questions. This can happen in any research involving survey methodology.

3. The study population was limited to non-faculty administrators at Institution A and Institution B University who were employed during academic year of 1999-00.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms were defined in the context in which they were used in this dissertation.


Attitude. "(a) affect for or against, (b) evaluation of, (c) like or dislike of, or (d) positiveness or negativeness toward a psychological object" (Remmer, Gaga, & Rummel, 1965, p. 308).

Beliefs. The information one has about a certain object, which might be a person, a group of people, a behavior, a policy, or an event. For the purpose of this study, the cognitive component of attitude measurement indicates an individual’s knowledge, opinions, thoughts, or stereotypes about an object (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).

Behavioral intention. An aspect of attitude measurement that refers to an individual’s actions with respect to an object. The term is used in this study as it relates to
attitudes and beliefs that are linked to a behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).

*Diversity.* Differences among people with respect to age, class, gender, language, race, ethnicity, physical and mental ability, sexual orientation, spiritual practices, and place of residence.

*Managing diversity.* An on-going process that unleashes the various talents and capabilities that a diverse population brings to an organization, community, or society so as to create a wholesome, inclusive environment that is safe for differences, enables people to reflect, celebrates diversity, and maximizes the full potentials of all, in a cultural context in which everyone benefits (Rosado, 1992).

*Morale.* An intuitive sense of the quality of life, well being of individuals or groups of people in an organizational setting.

*Motivation.* An inner state that energizes, activates or moves and directs human behavior.

*Non-faculty administrator.* Non-teaching personnel of a university or college that have authority and responsibility to make decisions for management and direction of a particular division or department.

*Standard of review.* A measure of performance linked to the uniformity of the university goals and objectives.

*Tenure.* The status of a faculty member of a university or college that protects their academic freedom and provides job security.
Overview of the Remainder of the Dissertation

Chapter II contains a review of literature and research pertinent to the study. The following topics are discussed: an understanding of organizational structure, employment development, performance appraisal, rewards and incentives, issues and grievance, collective bargaining in the academic setting, and interest-based bargaining. Research design, as well as methods and procedures followed in carrying out the study, is explained in Chapter III. Included in this chapter are a description of the study population, the independent and dependent variables, development of the instrument, validity and reliability, and data-collection and data-analysis procedures.

Furthermore, results of the data analysis are presented in Chapter IV. Chapter V contains a summary of the study findings, conclusions drawn from the findings, implications, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter contains a synthesis of selected research and literature that is applicable to the study. Information concerning previous studies was obtained by reviewing Human Resources Management, the Current Index of Journals in Education, Education Index, Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) documents, Dissertation Abstracts, and the Wilson Select Website database. A few investigations of non-tenure administrative personnel were found, which appeared to be applicable to this study. Those studies were reviewed in this chapter. Chapter II contains a review of literature and research pertinent to the study. The following topics are discussed: an understanding of organizational structure, employment development, performance appraisal, rewards and incentives, issues and grievances, collective bargaining in the academic setting, and interest-based bargaining.

Literature begins with an overview of the organizational structure and issues of management and employee participation that are unique to the academic setting. A description of the university structure is presented that emphasizes the distinction between the typical collegial structure and the effective business organization. This distinction cannot be addressed without bringing up the issue of tenure, which has become a matter of controversy amongst some college and university campuses. It is particularly pertinent to the present study because the non-faculty support staff work side by side with a classification of employees whose jobs are virtually guaranteed while their own jobs are not. A question addressed by this study is whether the daily interaction with tenured employees has any
impact or influence on the job performance of the non-tenured staff.

Organizational Structure

In an astute analysis of the state of the university, David (1997) asks the question, "Is not a university much like any other institution: bounded in a physical perimeter, administered by professional managers and staffed by a people who know more or less what their job is?" (p.20-22). To this, his answer is "Actually, no." Some universities might fit the description but most, especially the big research universities, do not. According to David:

Professional managers for a start, seldom run them, even if they employ them. Universities still subscribe to the twin notions of academic self-government and departmental independence, which, according to a recent study by the RAND organization, has turned them into a "maze of hierarchical structures operating independently of one another." Their employees are seldom clear about the university's prime mission or about their own role within the organization. (p. S20)

This description of university structure runs counter to the type of organization described in the business literature as promoting high productivity and performance. The elements of an efficient organization as defined by experts in Human Resource Management (HRM) include strategic fit and coherence, linkage of individual goals with organizational goals, strong culture and values, role clarity, and open communication. It is the task of management, from the top down, to ensure that all employees have a clear idea of the
organization's prime mission (Armstrong, 1992). Support for employee involvement in decision-making is high (Bassi & Van Buren, 1997; McAllen, P. & Nel, 1995), and rewards are tied to measurable outcomes (Armitage, 1997; Kessler, 1995). In effect, the organizations of higher learning bear little resemblance to the HRM model of the learning organization: the organization that involves and motivates its people.

One factor that separates universities from private sector organizations is tenure, which has come increasingly under attack. Many sources regard tenure as the "single biggest impediment to change in the universities" (Gilliland, 1997, p. 31). Furthermore, the level of job security enjoyed by tenured faculty is considered unjustified compared to other sectors of the economy. C. Peter Magrath (cited in Finkin, 1997) president of a major association of public universities, argues that, "People outside the academy, people whose jobs are in jeopardy, resent faculty members whose jobs carry special protection" (p. 19). Non-faculty administrators are not outside the academy. They are exempt from special protection yet their jobs are a vital part of the organizations they serve.

Gilliland (1997) does not believe that abolishing tenure will solve the problems facing today's universities, but she does believe that the private sector can serve as a valuable model for change:

The first step in this process requires that we, in universities, confront the fact that the environment in which all organizations, public or private, must succeed is now characterized by accelerating change, complexity, and uncertainty. Universities, like all organizations, thus function in an environment of unpredictability, in contrast to the past, in which change
occurred more incrementally, the interactions among the parts of a problem and organization were tractable, and external economic and political pressures were more predictable. (p. 31)

Terms like accelerating change, complexity, uncertainty, and unpredictability are rampant in HRM literature. Along with rising competition and new information technologies, these factors are driving more organizations to make innovations in how they operate, organize work, and manage employees (Bassi & Van Buren, 1997).

Daniel Seymour (1987) claims that success and motivation are products of an institution’s environment. He claims that the nature of the collegiate environment preserves the status quo, and does not allow administrators to transcend above it. Seymour is critical of the conservatism in academic institutions, because “inertia” permeates the climate, and as a result, stagnates creativity and risk-taking. The need for the entrepreneur leadership in a time when scarce resources demand “efficient management and clear thinking visionaries,” rather than conservatives or “protectionists for the organizational and operation status quo” (p.37-40).

McAllen and Nel (1995) advocate as a focal point for change, the "VLS Triad" (p. 10-15): values, leadership, and structure. They emphasize the importance of having a well-developed infrastructure to support and sustain high accountability participation by all stakeholders. By linking individual and organizational goals, top executives and staff alike are accountable for organizational performance. This is in sharp contrast to David's (1997) cynical portrait of universities whereby, "They have expanded hugely to give the middle classes the credentials they crave, while continuing to insist on their broader civilizing
mission and their right—no, their duty—to be accountable to nobody" (p. S22). In today's competitive environment, however, an organization that lacks accountability cannot survive. Gilliland (1997) acknowledges that universities are not exempt from environmental conditions. Successful organizations promote flexibility, information access and dialogue, and risk-taking, and the HRM practices that spell success in the private sector are equally valid for academic institutions.

Accelerating change and upheaval in all segments of society marked the 1960s. The late 1960s saw the start of collective bargaining for university faculty (Graf, Hemmasi, Newgren, & Nelsen, 1994). Faculty unionization sometimes followed organizing by non-teaching staff. For example, at Youngstown State University, the first public university in Ohio to bargain collectively, the Ohio Education Association (YSU-OEA) formed a chapter in 1970, becoming the second group of employees to enter union affiliation. Maintenance, custodial, and parking employees had unionized in 1969 (Carlton, 1995). Faculty unionization accelerated nationwide during the 1970s and 1980s, and has soared in the 1990s. Currently, more than 234,570 faculty members are covered by 467 collective bargaining agreements on 1,057 campuses (Villa & Blum, 1996). Demographically, an overwhelming 95% of all faculty represented for collective bargaining belong to public sector institutions and 80% of all unionized faculty come from 10 states: California, New York, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Florida, Massachusetts, Washington, and Illinois (Karim & Rassuli, 1996).

Predominance of unionized faculty in public sector institutions is related to the 1980 Supreme Court decision National Labor Relations Board v. Yeshiva University, which
effectively restricted organization at private universities. The court ruled that faculty members at Yeshiva were part of management and therefore ineligible for coverage under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) as amended. Collective bargaining by faculty at private institutions is still permitted under the NLRA, but since the Yeshiva decision, faculty at private institutions may be regarded as management if the amount of input they have in organizational decision-making is similar to that of the Yeshiva faculty. Organizing at public institutions is not covered by the NLRA and is therefore not affected by the decision.

In a recent move, the National Labor Relations Board (NRLB) announced that it is considering ruling that Yale University graduate students should be treated as employees. In the event of this precedent, private universities could be forced to treat graduate student associations as bona fide unions entitled to collective bargaining. With 40% of all faculty organized today, up from roughly one-third in 1982, higher education is regarded as a key growth area for white collar organizing (Joe Hill, 1996). In 1996, 3,700 laboratory workers and other researchers at the University of California joined the Communications Workers. Harvard Union of Clerical and Technical Workers, representing office, library, and laboratory support staff at the university, signed a 3 year agreement featuring changes in work and family provisions (Harvard pact, 1995). The settlement covers economic issues, which have been documented as a key factor in academic organizing (Ali & Karim, 1992; Dayal, 1992; Graf et al., 1994; Karim & Rassuli, 1996), and incorporates family policies, such as flexible schedules and work-sharing, which have been implemented by many large corporations, but which are lacking at most universities (Norrell & Norrell, 1996).
In effect, as unionization in American industry is on a downward trend, it is in an upward trend on college campuses, supported by diverse groups of employees. In the private sector, some corporate management representatives, as well as many union leaders, believe that employee participation programs are more likely to work effectively in a union environment (Thornburg, 1993). Participation programs are defined as programs "in which the support for employee involvement in decision making is basic to high performance, where open communications are real and continuous and where the system of rewards recognizes and reinforces the participative manager" (pp. 48-49). A recent study by the Work in America Institute (cited in Thornburg, 1993) found that those companies, which have chosen participative management have realized enormous benefits. These include improved communications and information sharing, improved business results, better customer relations and service, increased job satisfaction, improved labor-management relations, improved quality of work life, and continuous, responsive training. A keynote is win-win bargaining, which has been used to the advantage of faculty unions in higher education (Carlton, 1995) and community school districts (Henderson, 1993). With or without unionization, a review of the literature reveals a number of HRM strategies that enhance motivation and productivity among administrative employees. As Gilliland (1997) emphasizes, universities, like all other organizations, exist in an environment where traditional HRM practices no longer work, and universities can learn from the private sector's successes and failures.
Organizational Design

Bassi and Van Buren (1997) identify the seemingly conflicting policies of downsizing and increasing use of high performance work systems as two features of contemporary business practices. Research by the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) has found that downsizing has been detrimental to organizational efforts to implement and sustain high performance work systems. To succeed, such systems depend on mutual trust and respect between committed leaders and motivated, committed employees. People are considered the company’s most important asset, a keynote of strategic HRM practice (Armstrong, 1992). In downsizing, employees are considered a cost rather than an asset; not surprisingly, downsizing tends to lower employees’ morale and motivation, both crucial to high performance work systems.

Although there is no one accepted definition of a high performance work system, previous ASTD research identified the key feature as the “ability to create and maintain synergy” (p. 10): “Synergy is achieved when all parts of a system are aligned and fit together and when people are energized, committed, and impassioned about their work” (Bassi & Van Buren, 1997, p. 35). Alignment occurs in two ways. Strategic alignment focuses on creating a business strategy that is consistent with an organization’s work environment, vision and mission, beliefs, values, and organizational goals. Internal alignment happens when an organization’s structure, systems, processes, and practices are consistent with each other and with the company’s overall goals. As noted by David (1997) and Gilliland (1997), these features are not characteristic of most universities.
The ASTD study found that downsizing and high performance work systems occur infrequently in the same organizations (Bassi & Van Buren, 1997). Companies with the most extensive high performance work systems were nearly three times less likely to reduce their workforces between 1994 and 1995 than companies with the least extensive high performance work systems. This may be because the higher productivity of the high performance work systems reduced the risk of downsizing or it may be because the greater flexibility afforded by high performance work systems made it possible to deploy workers more effectively. Additionally, companies that maintained high levels of employee satisfaction tended not to offer early retirement. Instead, they enhanced motivation by identifying and retaining talented, high potential employees.

Current budget cuts in higher education have resulted in the downsizing of universities and colleges, with reduction and elimination of academic programs and departments (Graf et al., 1994). Yarmolinksy (1996) emphasizes that any assumption that the number and identity of academic departments will remain relatively constant over prolonged periods of time as they had in the past is unrealistic:

The fact is that the stability of the institutional structure is breaking down, as new programs appear needing positions and dollars, even if not canonized as departments. In a new era of shrinking or level budgets, existing departments may be cut back or merged to make room for new academic enterprises. At the same time, the proliferation of programs, centers, and institutes, often with limited life spans, has altered the pattern and rhythm of academic life (p. 18).
Administrative staff may be more flexible in their skill areas and therefore better able to deal with reassignment than faculty members may, but the environment itself hinders redesign. Gilliland (1997) defines several institutional factors which make reassignment difficult: (a) institutional priorities are not often clear; (b) administrators are not certain that difficult decisions about performance or reassignment of priorities, will be supported by the next level of administrators or by the board of governors; (c) faculty (and management) development programs supporting new priorities are rare; (d) department heads are often untrained in the proper procedures; and (e) there are few incentives or rewards available for the departments or individuals who do make the shifts. As for the last factor, the importance of linking rewards and incentives to strategic goals is a predominant theme in HRM literature.

Gilliland (1997) recognizes that in an environment of rapid change, long-range planning is not the useful strategy it once was. Flexibility is essential to allow organizations to respond to changes and to new information by reorganizing and shifting priorities. One important factor is information access, which is a relatively unrestricted in successful private sector organization. In contrast to the hierarchical structure that traditionally defined organizations, and the rigid boundaries of academic departments, the model of governance in which information flows most readily is the matrix design, which involves a partial abandonment of the principle of hierarchical organization (Robertson, Smith, & Cooper, 1992). The matrix structure is designed to facilitate the creation and coordination of project teams, committees, and semi-autonomous work groups. Communication is based on interacting with the person who has information relevant to the task or project rather than
upon whom reports to whom. People who operate in this model are forced into new behavior patterns; in short, flexibility is intrinsic to the design.

Middle managers play a pivotal role in the matrix model; they are in a position to orchestrate strategy development and create a high-trust motivational atmosphere. This role may afford greater job satisfaction by fulfilling the need for autonomy and self-realization. The matrix structure tends to be preferred by most managers as a theoretical method of organization because it is based on expertise and offers scope for people at all organizational levels to deploy their skills and carry responsibility (Robertson et al., 1992).

James Montgomery (1990), in his article “Leadership in Middle Administration,” presents a view of motivation and performance that suggest that for an institution to be best served, leadership must be given the opportunity to update their particular area of specialization, but also in theories and practices of management and leadership techniques. Montgomery contends that as long as mid-level managers understand their roles and expected interactions across the institution, the individual, his or her department, and the total organization should benefit.

Robertson et al. (1992) advocates Total Quality Management (TQM) systems for designing a motivating environment. In a TQM environment the first assumption is that everyone has valuable knowledge and experience to contribute to the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization. The insight and knowledge of all employees are used in the analysis, specification, and implementation of change. Not only does this mean that a key company resource is being used more fully but the use of this resource in the implementation of TQM has been shown to enhance the self-confidence, competence, and
autonomy of employees, leading to greater motivation and job satisfaction and ultimately to higher performance. TQM is regarded as a "behavioral intervention that builds up the awareness, understanding, motivation and commitment of employees at all levels" (Robertson et al., 1992, p. 151). Employees actively participate in goal setting and decision-making. Rewards are both intrinsic and extrinsic. Jobs are designed as much as possible to maximize skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback, and opportunities for learning and growth. Performing tasks, which fulfill individual goals, enhance employees' commitment to organizational goals.

Few institutions of higher learning employ TQM principles in their organizational design, ironically, even those business schools, which are preparing students to compete in the competitive global business environment of the future, are rare. Stern and Tseng (1993) conducted a survey to determine the awareness level of and attitudes toward TQM by a broad, representative group of business school deans. Secondly, they sought to determine if and how these schools were assisting in the development of faculty knowledge about TQM, using TQM in organizational design and processes, and incorporating TQM in school curricula. The deans who were most aware of TQM were those experiencing pressure from the business community. Schools that employed TQM had greater faculty awareness, and in keeping with the top-down design of TQM, there was a direct correlation between the dean's awareness and the development of faculty development programs, curriculum development efforts, and changes in operations.

Slightly more than one-quarter (27.6%) of the deans surveyed reported using TQM in their operations (Stern & Tseng, 1993). Those who utilize the process mainly began by
forming quality improvement teams or by changing operations in student service areas. In effect, the changes implemented by most of the deans were those that involved administrative staff. Stern and Tseng (1993) propose that the relative lack of awareness by business school faculty of TQM principles, despite the predominant trend in business toward the adoption of TQM, indicates that the faculty do not have enough interaction with trade publications or companies in their external environment. They suggest that business schools can remedy this situation through efforts such as educating faculty through workshops, seminars, reading materials, discussions with businesses, tours of businesses, and faculty internships.

While these suggestions are targeted specifically to business schools, a review of the literature indicates that colleges and universities cannot maintain an ivory tower to governance that ignores current business trends (David, 1997; Gilliland, 1997; Hill, 1996; Yarmolinsky, 1996). A key concept in the TQM process is identifying the goals, policies, and boundaries that can be defined and shared by all stakeholders. Goals are clearly stated, agreed upon, and measured. All stakeholders are involved as participants in decision-making. In the private sector, organizations which have implemented these principles are the highest performers (McAllen & Nel, 1995).

The importance of establishing a strong organizational culture is a predominant theme in HRM literature. Armstrong (1992) defines corporate culture as the pattern of shared beliefs, attitudes, assumptions, and values in an organization. They may be implicit rather than articulated, but they shape the way people act and interact and strongly influence the way things are done. Corporate culture is an essential element in the achievement of an organization's mission and strategies, the improvement of organizational effectiveness, and
the management of change. A recent multi-country university survey by the Carnegie Foundation (as cited in David, 1997) asked academics to rank the relative importance they attached to their affiliation with their institution, the department in which they worked, and to their academic discipline. In every country, the largest proportion of respondents ranked their discipline first, their department second, and their institution third. This prevailing attitude not only makes institutional redesign especially difficult, but also in some institutions, promotes the idea that, "University `administrators,' even when chosen from the faculty, are a breed both pitied and reviled" (David, 1997, p. 820). In effect, there is no corporate culture beyond the confines of the discipline or department.

Watson (1986) believes that to achieve the type of integrated but flexible employee efforts that contribute to organizational effectiveness, managers need to recognize a *symbolic* element to their work. Creating the kind of culture that inspires people to commit themselves involves creating meanings for organizational members. Watson sees organizations as "small-scale and artificially constructed societies" (p.31-32), which require symbols, rituals, myths and other devices that are included in an anthropological approach to culture:

For them to function well, they will need a set of general meanings, a language, a history and a sense of belonging in the same way that society does. But since an organization is an especially focused or purposive miniature society, these have been all the more carefully and deliberately constructed to have the desired effect. (p. 31-32)

Academics have historically constructed such symbols around their disciplines and
their departments. If administrative staffs have similar loyalties to the departmental cultures in which they work, they too may have considerable resistance to change. One might surmise, however, that organizational change would validate the role of administrative staff within the organization, thereby enhancing their status as an integral part of the institution.

Lack of clarity about roles and goals is frequently cited as a significant impediment to motivation and productivity. Schaefer (1991) outlines a five-step program for upgrading expectations and generating improved results. Among the settings where Schaffer’s approach has proved successful are a large teaching hospital that radically shifted its mission and direction and several school systems where determined leaders promoted innovation despite the inertia of tradition. Clarity and focus are the central themes of the model:

Strategy for demanding better performance—and getting it—begins with a focus on one or two vital goals. Management assesses readiness and then defines the goal. The organization receives clearly stated demands and unequivocally stated expectations. Management assigns the responsibility for results to individuals, and work-planning discipline provides the means for self-control and assessment of progress. Management keeps wired in, tenaciously pushing the project forward. Early successes provide the reinforcement to shoot for more ambitious targets, which may be extensions of the first goal or additional goals (p. 149).

In keeping with the concept of goal-driven strategy, Schafer and Thomson (1992) decry the activity-centered programs that are often implemented by organizations despite the lack of documented results. Activity-focused efforts, state the authors, are not targeted to
specific results and are often too large and diffused to be organized effectively. In the results-driven approach, innovation is linked to short-term goals and both managers and employees are given concrete reports of success. The authors' state succinctly, "There is no motivator more powerful than frequent successes" (p. 86). Tangible evidence of success not only provides necessary reinforcement but also builds management's confidence and skill for continued incremental improvements. Programs is ultimately self-generating, as each new phase of the program evolves from the lessons of previous phases. In effect, from one single goal, employees become involved in an ongoing process of change. An approach of this type may be particularly well suited to transcending the traditional compartmentalization of university structure.

A survey conducted by Kepner-Tregoe (as cited in Middlebrook, 1996) as part of its redesign efforts found that cost-cutting, restructuring, and reengineering left workers feeling alienated, unappreciated, and vulnerable. These findings are not dissimilar to the attitudes of college faculty who have turned to collective bargaining in response to the cost-cutting, restructuring, and reengineering taking place on college campuses (Graf et al., 1994; Villa & Blum, 1996). In addition, the Kepner-Tregoe survey found several dichotomies between the perceptions of workers and managers. Managers perceived workers to be happier with their jobs than workers perceived their coworkers to be; more than 40% of the workers reported they did not feel valued by their companies while half the managers stated the companies value their employees. Less than half the workers reported they receive recognition from their supervisors for jobs well done, which supervisors corroborated, and both managers and workers reported that feedback was lacking. Particularly relevant to the
present study, only one-third of the workers believe their supervisors know what motivates them, and management supported this.

Despite the difference in organization between the company surveyed and a collegial environment, both appear to be experiencing the same symptom, which are associated with poor performance and job dissatisfaction. Middlebrook's (1996) model for improving job satisfaction and performance targets five factors: situation (how clear are the performance expectations and does the work environment support them); performer (how capable are employees of meeting performance expectations; response (what is the observed performance and how does it compare with expectations); consequences (how well do the consequences of meeting or not meeting expectations encourage the expected performance), and feedback (how appropriate is the feedback and is it used effectively). Middlebrook concludes that, "Training and rah-rah motivational efforts will not improve performance when the real culprit is unclear expectations or inadequate feedback" (p. 48).

Norrell and Norrell (1996) decry the lack of day care facilities for university employees. In one study, 57% of university faculty and staff reported having difficulties with the cost, hours, or location of childcare. Lack of childcare has been correlated with higher degrees of unproductively, absenteeism, and tardiness. Despite the increasing numbers of working parents with children under the age of 6, only 25% of the colleges and universities in the U.S. provide a pre-kindergarten program for children of staff, faculty, and students. When surveyed, 60% of those programs were already filled with waiting lists of over 60 children. The authors recommend that academic institutions learn from private sector corporations, which have implemented family friendly policies, employee retention
programs, and wellness programs. Sixty percent of large corporations currently offer family-oriented policies. Implementation of such policies would prove cost-effective for academic institutions by improving retention and productivity, while diminishing the costs of recruiting and training new employees.

_Employment Development_

One aspect of organizational change from which academic institutions have not been exempt is downsizing. Budget cuts and restructuring have been necessitated by external circumstances and have resulted in the reduction and/or elimination of academic departments and programs. These changes have an impact on all personnel whether or not they are directly affected. Questions of motivation, security, adaptability, and stress invariably arise among the vast segment of the workforce whom are not tenured.

Management development is a central feature of HRM. Formerly, the focus was on management training, which entails the development of skills needed to carry out managerial duties. As it is currently viewed, management development is a broad concept, encompassing development of the whole person rather than concentrating on the learning of set skills and techniques (Torrington & Hall, 1987). It is distinguished not only by its broader scope but also by its emphasis. Management development emphasizes the contribution of both formal and informal work experiences and delegates greater responsibility for self-development than most employee training programs. Doyle (1994) regards management development as the way to cultivate the strategic leadership that is demanded in a climate of continuous change. Management development is instrumental in
developing organizational effectiveness. Development is linked to the philosophies and strategic aims of the organization, while at the same time respecting individual needs, expectations, and aspirations. Integrating the duality of organizational and individual goals for the greater development of both is a recurrent theme in HRM literature.

Management development programs are viewed as keynotes in providing intrinsic rewards for motivation. The recent focus in HRM has been on the superiority of intrinsic motivation over extrinsic rewards. Extrinsic rewards are believed to hinder performance. However, an increasing number of experts assert that both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards are important, and that extrinsic rewards, appropriately used, have the power to significantly increase employee motivation and performance (Armitage, 1997; Cameron & Pierce, 1997).

*Performance Appraisal*

In accordance with the concept that individual goals must be linked with organizational goals, Weaver (1996) advocates a model of Continuous Improvement Reviews (CIR). The model is constructed to transcend departmental and divisional boundaries and allow managers to monitor individual and team performance: "The focus is on correcting system deficiencies, not just individual deficiencies" (p. 94). Feedback is results-focused and based on actual documented activities. Like the results-focused action strategies (Schaefer, 1991; Schaefer & Thomson, 1992), the CIR model shifts the focus to specific outcomes and documented activities that generate results.

Weaver (1996) emphasizes that an essential ingredient missing from traditional performance reviews is a link between actual productivity, quality results and tangible
rewards: compensation, promotion, and bonuses. With a clear focus from the onset and carefully monitored progress, the CIR model makes it easier for management to ensure that employees are compensated for making contributions to system improvements. Numerous sources stress the importance of linking rewards to performance (Armitage, 1997; Armstrong, 1992; Berver, Kurtz, & Orton, 1992; Kessler, 1995) as a way of establishing a strong organizational culture as well as enhancing work performance.

Perceived fairness is an important indicator of employee satisfaction with rewards; indeed, the question of fairness is a central theme in the current controversy over academic tenure (Finkin, 1997; Yarmolinksy, 1996). Greenberg (1986) examines the question of “What makes a performance evaluation perceived as being fair?” in a sample of 217 middle managers in three different industrial groups. Two perspectives have emerged from research on justice in organizational settings. The *distributive justice* perspective focuses on the fairness of the evaluations received relative to the work performed. The *procedural justice* perspective focuses on the fairness of the evaluation procedures used to determine the ratings.

Greenberg's (1986) findings supports several aspects of procedural justice, which have been identified. The ability to challenge evaluations and verify the consistency of application of standards was perceived by respondents as indicators of fairness. Soliciting input prior to evaluation and using it, as well as employing two-way communication during the appraisal interview were also perceived as important. Two distributive factors also emerged as significant indicators of fairness. These were a close relationship between performance and rating, and a relationship between rating and subsequent administrative
action (recommendation for salary increase or promotion). Findings from this study conform to the appraisal and reward systems recommended by HRM experts.

HRM literature is replete with descriptions of the way performance appraisals are used in a variety of situations, including financial rewards, recommendations for promotion, transfers, training, employee development, and performance feedback. Cleveland, Murphy, and Williams (1989) investigates the extent to which performance appraisals are actually used for these purposes in business organizations. Subjects were 106 industrial and organizational psychologists. Results indicated that information from performance appraisal had the greatest impact on salary administration, performance feedback and the identification of employee strengths and weaknesses. The authors noted that certain usages of appraisals, such as salary administration (between-individuals evaluation) and developmental feedback (within-individuals evaluation) can be construed as incompatible goals, and they surmise that many organizations use a single appraisal system to accomplish multiple, incompatible goals. HRM research suggests that many organizations have evolved a more sophisticated approach to employee evaluation. However, there is a dearth of literature on the use of performance appraisals in the university setting other than that related to faculty and tenure.

Gilliland (1997) notes the way in which information technology has revolutionized the way people do business. Vast quantities of information are available any time from anywhere in the world. Information is networked among multiple persons so a single person cannot understand it in its entirety:

For example, parts of the information that are useful to an organization's success reside with essentially everyone who works there. Every person or
department sees a different part of the future and understands a different set of interactions. In this environment, success requires information held by everyone and a culture that facilitates combining that knowledge. Creating such a culture must be the principal goal of human resources practice. (p. 32)

Building on this premise, Eccles (1991) outlines five areas of activity that needs to be addressed by organizations that desire to change their measurement systems. The five areas are: (a) developing an information architecture; (b) putting the technology in place to support this architecture; (c) aligning incentives with the new system; (d) drawing on outside resources; and (e) designing a process to ensure that the other four activities take place. Eccles uses the term information architecture as an umbrella term for the "categories of information needed to manage a company's businesses, the methods the company uses to generate this information, and the rules regulating its flow" (p. 133).

Eccles emphasizes that carrying out the five activities involves the cooperation of all organizational stakeholders from top management down. The design of the process has to take account of the integrative nature of the task; that is, the different departments and divisions involved in the organization's business. Eccles states that what is most effective for a given company will depend on its history, culture, and management style. This means that while academic institutions can learn from private sector organizations, they will need to evolve a framework uniquely suited to the college or university environment. Eccles's rationale for redesigning performance measurement systems is shifting the focus to customer service. For the university this means being accountable to the stakeholders in education, a requisite for most businesses that universities have historically managed to ignore (David,
Gilliland (1997) acknowledges the traditional ivory tower attitude of university faculty:

In contrast [to private sector businesses], most faculty in universities are well connected to the perception levels of their research communities but poorly connected to perceptions of students, parents, state taxpayers, the legislature, and those who employ their students . . . they have not adjusted their priorities to the perceptions of other external constituencies, and satisfaction there is low. They have not adjusted because they are largely unaware of the perceptions. When faculty have information and can seriously discuss the issues, they will develop creative and exciting responses. (p. 32)

The author advocates the private sector HRM practices that support information access and dialogue: training and development programs and incentive and reward programs. Advocates of TQM, Stern and Tseng (1993) believe that academic institutions need to think more in terms of a consumer focus. Regarding the constituents of education as customers to be satisfied has improved organizational, teaching, and student performance in elementary and secondary schools, and is needed to meet the challenges currently facing institutions of higher learning.

Rewards and Incentives

Pfeiffer and Davis-Blake (1992) investigated the influence of organizational salary distribution on turnover among 11,412 college administrators in 821 institutions. The
authors hypothesized that an individual's decision to leave or stay would be influenced by the individual's relative place in the organization's salary distribution, the amount of information he or she has about salary dispersion at that institution, and the presence of a well-developed external labor market for a job. One basic assumption was that those in academic positions, such as deans or directors of research, would compare themselves to others in academic positions, and that non-academics, such as directors of student services, would compare themselves only to others in non-academic positions.

The authors found support for their theory that high salary relative to others would be negatively correlated with the desire to leave, and low salary positively correlated with the desire to leave. As expected, information about where others stood on the salary distribution scale was a significant factor. In effect, "Individuals appear to be concerned about their relative rewards and about the magnitude of reward differentials" (Pfeiffer & Davis-Blake, 1992, p. 762). Although this effect did not disappear when subjects were analyzed in small groups, results suggested that people might find salary dispersion desirable when they are able to understand the reason for it. That is, when rewards are linked to merit, individuals conclude that good performance is rewarded. That is, in an atmosphere of perceived fairness, low earners may be motivated to improve performance and thus improve earning power rather than leave their employment.

The recommendation of Berver et al. (1992) for non-tenured faculty may be equally applicable for administrative staff. The authors advocate full and regular performance evaluation for non-tenured faculty, participation in the merit pay system, and opportunity for promotion within the non-tenured community. The authors state that one argument
commonly voiced against the use of non-tenure track faculty has been that they are seldom evaluated regularly. The lack of appraisal raises questions about their performance and makes it difficult to determine fair pay and promotions, as well as who should be laid off if necessary. These conditions are applicable to non-teaching staff as well, and support the use of regular performance evaluations with subsequent action by administration.

Armitage (1997) defines a reward system as an "ongoing process of continuous improvement and learning to improve performance" (p. 34). This understanding should be reflected in the design of a reward system. Using a behavioral approach, the author defines several key steps to the process, the first of which is to conduct an assessment using the six performance dimensions of rewards (focus, frequency, timing, control, direction, and significance). The next step is to develop a reward philosophy, which creates vision and sets guidelines for achievement. Once the framework is set, the next steps include defining strategic and tactical outcomes; defining critical tasks and behaviors; identifying required learning; and designing the system components. Armitage emphasizes that rewards must concur with what is meaningful to employees. To determine this, managers can ask employees directly, observe employees to determine the activities they appear to enjoy, and try different approaches to identify what kinds of reinforcement, recognition, or rewards actually improve performance. Recognition should be timed as closely to the performance as possible; ideally, reinforcement should be Positive, Immediate, and Certain (PIC).

Armitage (1997) stresses the importance of linking pay rewards to reinforcement and recognition systems. One sharp criticism of academic tenure is that it rewards research, not teaching; in effect, it permits bad teaching. Thomas Sowell of the Hoover Institute (as cited
in Premeaux & Mondy, 1997) states that, "even when good teaching occurs it is unlikely to be rewarded [with either financial incentives or tenure]" (p. 351). In particular, business schools accredited by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) are becoming highly critical of tenure. Although significant differences exist between tenured and non-tenured faculty, a majority of both groups agree that definite modifications of tenure are needed at AACSB schools. Perhaps the business focus of these schools makes faculty more aware of the driving competitive forces and the need for institutional change than their academic counterparts in other institutions.

For non-tenured administrative personnel, financial incentives are essential, and for peak performance they need to be linked to clearly defined expectations. To Kessler (1995), the way in which employees are rewarded is central to the regulation of the employment relationship. Monetary reward systems offer a number of options. The most systematic attempt to select a payment system is through the application of a contingency approach. In this model, the choice of payment system is based on recognition of the goals managers are pursuing and an appreciation of the internal and external organizational circumstances within which the system will function. The goals pursued through payment systems include the traditional HRM aims of recruitment, retention, and motivation, along with quality, increased output, greater employee commitment, and enhanced employee flexibility. In essence, the objective is a closer link between pay and performance.

In contrast to tenured academic positions, most jobs in the private sector are held at-will. Under the at-will rule, a private sector employee can be discharged summarily so long as no law is violated (Finkin, 1997). However, Rappaport (1997) notes that in the past,
employer-requested termination was relatively rare. The option of long-term employment was the rule; employees could expect regular promotions and often remained with one company until retirement. In the current market, assignments in some industries are often short-term, and in traditional companies, employees may be terminated for reasons of reorganization and downsizing as well as cause and performance. It seems no wonder tenure would fall under harsh criticism.

Rappaport (1997) describes 10 specific trends that help define the changing environment for financial security. First, both skill maintenance and knowledge will be critical in defining employability, and therefore financial security. In response to this trend, many organizations are investing in employee development through in-house programs, outside seminars, and support for graduate study. Employees are given responsibility for building their own skills, which in turn are expected to help achieve organizational goals. Second, Rappaport predicts that performance evaluation, as an element of a total reward system will become more valuable to both employers and employees. Performance measurement will help employees understand what is needed to advance between functions, increase flexibility and with it, job security. Third, the best partnerships with employees will promote greater understanding of both organizational and individual needs and goals and increase employees' stake in organizational success. This has been defined as a prime feature of HRM practice (Armstrong, 1992).

Rappaport (1997) also predicts that choice and flexibility in work schedules will be of increasing value to employees. The fact that flexible work schedules and alternative work arrangements, such as work sharing, were an integral part of the collective bargaining
agreement by the Harvard Union employees demonstrates the validity of this prediction for university personnel. The Harvard pact (1995) also designated the creation of a joint committee to review and recommend changes in health and retirement benefits. Rappaport emphasizes the importance of changes to benefits packages that reflect the growing concern with job security as well as people’s greater sophistication as consumers of health care and other insurance benefits.

Sigmund Ginsberg (1987), in his article “The Motivation Factor: How Leaders Inspire Administrative,” outlines the factors that have led some administrators to perceive they are second-class citizens compared with faculty and even support staff. Ginsberg believes monetary compensation is a major issue for college administrators, being that is often is dictated by budgetary needs of the institutions. For example, after budgetary needs have been met, carry-over may be used for administrative salaries. However, under budgetary distress, administrative positions are often the first to be eliminated in the process of downsizing. Due to the lack of third party representation of a union often available to faculty and support staff, these may occur more frequently with non-tenurable administrators.

Non-monetary rewards are equally important and administrators may feel lacking in this area due their perception of being excluded from complex university-wide problems. Ginsberg describes the role of administrators as “Narrow specialists in non-academic jobs” (Ginsberg, 1987, p.42). Ginsberg, in his analysis of how leaders can motivate administrators, offers several financial and non-financial initiatives, which are outlined. These financial motivator initiatives offered by Ginsberg were (a) use a merit system so that salary increase is tied to performance, (b) keep administrators’ salary pool consistent with that of faculty and
staff, (c) emphasize internal promotions, (d) recognize increased promotions, and (e) provide an equitable benefits package comparable to that of faculty. In addition to the non-financial initiatives, he outlined which were (a) share the credit for success by mentioning the contributions for others in publications, newsletters and meetings, (b) solicit ideas, suggestions and advice from administrators, (c) broaden the involvement of administrators by placing them on committees, planning groups and project teams, and (d) encourage participation in the academic, cultural, and athletic life of the institution.

Ginsberg stresses the importance of how effective leaders motivate and increase the morale of administrative employees whose strength, knowledge, and dedication are often overlooked. Ginsberg's work focuses on incentives and rewards; however, a fair amount of the literature seems to focus on the values of work that help to enhance administrators.

According to Robert W. Hall (as cited in Gleckman, 1994) director of new programs at the Association for Manufacturing Excellence, "Performance-based pay is growing like wildfire"(p. 62). Bonus or incentive pay is a catchword in many industries, but the way in which it is implemented can have a profound effect on employee morale. In one manufacturing plant, for example, an initial program linked pay to the plant's overall success. The workers hated it because they had no control over what happened in another production line. A program designed to empower workers, left them feeling powerless and resentful. The plant found a successful arrangement when it finally tied most of the bonus to results at individual units. One management professor notes, "Incentive plans attached to smaller groups, be it departments instead of divisions, or divisions instead of entire corporations, tend to be more successful" (p. 63).
Despite its shortcomings, the typical university structure may lend itself to the implementation of performance-based pay. Clarification of objectives and roles, however, is essential to program success. Goals need to be clearly defined as well as attainable. Plans work best when employees have input in developing performance measures and implementing change. Experts emphasize that managers have to be aware of the message they want to send (Gleckman, 1994). For example, linking rewards to the number of students placed in jobs might impede rather than enhance the quality of student placement services. The critical factor is that employees feel that they are valued stakeholders; in effect, that the risk involved is worth the reward.

Drawing on more than 25 years of research on intrinsic and extrinsic rewards and motivation, Cameron and Pierce (1997) identify the criteria in which rewards successfully increase employee performance and interest. Along with Armitage (1997), the authors criticize the current focus on intrinsic rewards and the assertion that extrinsic rewards actually undermine motivation. The body of research indicates that extrinsic rewards increase motivation and performance when: (a) rewards are contingent on quality of performance or are awarded for meeting clear standards of performance; (b) rewards are contingent on challenging activities; (c) rewards are given for mastering each component of a complex skill; and (d) rewards are delivered for high effort and creativity. To be fully effective, rewards should be timed to closely follow the designated behavior. In conclusion the authors state:

Rewards are not inherently bad or good for people. Rewards can have negative effects, but these effects are circumscribed, limited and easily
prevented. Careful arrangement of rewards in the work environment can enhance employees' interest and performance. This occurs when rewards are closely tied to the attainment of performance standards and to the personal accomplishment of challenging tasks. (Cameron & Pierce, 1997, p. 14)

One approach to rewards that is becoming increasingly common in the hectic and unpredictable business environment is scenario-based rewards planning (Greene, 1997). This approach is an offshoot of just-in-time management, where behaviors or skills may have to be learned on short notice or goals unexpectedly amended. Two crucial factors to the success of scenario-based planning are having a clear vision or mission and a strong, adaptable corporate culture. Keynotes to implementation are keen awareness of the internal and external forces governing change, and anticipation of what is likely and what will be done about it.

Overall, the most successful HRM strategies are those that are geared to an environment characterized by rapid change and unpredictability. As Gilliland (1997) states, the practices needed by universities are those, which promote information, access, dialogue, risk-taking, and above all, flexibility.

**Collective Bargaining in the Academic Setting**

This section is devoted to Collective Bargaining in the Academic Setting, which is becoming a topic of increasing focus for faculty, support staff, and service staff alike. The Collective Bargaining Section, also, presents a brief history of the union movement in colleges and universities from the beginning in the 1960s. Most of the literature on
collective bargaining in academic institutions focuses on the organization of faculty into unions. Possibly this focus is due to the premise that academic unions are the quintessential white-collar union. If this is so, then at least part of the findings from these studies can be generalized to other segments of white-collar employees involved in union bargaining. Studies of non-academic unionized professionals have found that the scope of bargaining typically encompasses professional as well as economic concerns (Dayal, 1992).

**Issues and Grievances**

A comprehensive review is presented on the Issues and Grievances that predominate in collective bargaining at academic institutions, detailing the issues themselves and their similarities and differences to union organizing and bargaining in industry. Dayal (1992) examined the question of whether the focus of bargaining by academic unions was motivated primarily by economic or academic concerns. Research was conducted over an eight-year period using unionized professors from a leading state-supported Mid-western college, one of the first 4-year institutions to embrace collective bargaining. Faculty salary was identified as the single most important bargaining goal throughout the 1980s. Over two-thirds of respondents cited salary as the most important goal. The professors rated their top economic concern slightly higher than the most important professional goal, academic freedom. Interestingly, although a significant majority of the respondents were tenured, they expressed a strong concern for criteria and procedures for reappointment. These were perceived to be key elements contributing to high professional standards.
Overall, findings indicated that an important fact distinguishing academic unions from blue-collar unions is that in general, professionals give greater importance to issues of professional autonomy, standards, procedures, and the freedom to define work quality than do blue-collar workers (Dayal, 1992). Data from HRM literature suggest that blue-collar employees are increasingly pushing for more input in procedures and participatory decision-making (Thornburg, 1993). It appears likely that the issues concerning the professors in this study are applicable to members of the administrative staff in the academic environment.

Dayal (1992) concluded with a statement made at a 1991 conference on faculty collective bargaining: "Financial belt tightening on college campuses may lead to more cooperation between leaders of faculty unions and university administrators" (p. 248). Some administrators disagree. Nils Hasselmo (as cited in Joe Hill, 1996), president of the University of Minnesota, believes that whether on public or private campuses, union organizing can lead to more adversarial relationships in the university community and "a singling out of compensation and working conditions somewhat to the exclusion of the education and scholarly agendas" (p. 60). There is some evidence that into the 1990s, economic issues are taking on greater importance.

Ali and Karim (1992) explored the determinants of faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining at a public non-doctoral regional university in Indiana. The authors note that most research on the topic deals with compensation issues. One important finding by previous research was that favorable attitudes toward unionization are fostered by what faculty members perceive to be inadequacies in their salary level. Interestingly, if faculty members deemed their salary inadequate, regardless of whether the salary was commensurate with
similarly ranked academicians at other institutions, the motivation to join a union was strong. The issue of inter-organizational salaries was not addressed by Pfeiffer and Davis-Blake (1992), who found that perceived inadequacies in salary when compared to others performing a similar role in the same institution was correlated with job dissatisfaction.

Survey sample consisted of 222 faculty members at a campus that had no union at the time of the study (Ali & Karim, 1992). Slightly more than half were tenured, with an additional 17.4% awaiting tenure. Nearly all of the faculty in the non-tenure track were part-time, and made up 31.5% of the respondents. Eighty-seven subjects reported holding union membership at some time, and 48 of these felt that the membership was beneficial, although only 12 had belonged to a union in a university setting. A remarkable 80.7% of the respondents felt that unionization would not come to their campus, but in the event that it should, the sample was equally divided (50%) over whether they would join a union. Three-quarters of the faculty stated that the basic reason for joining a union would be economic.

With regard to the growth of collective bargaining on college campuses, 79.3% supported the idea that desire by faculty for better pay and fringe benefits was the predominant influence in the growth of collective bargaining activity. More than 60% felt that collective bargaining would bring higher salaries and improved benefits. Regarding personnel concerns, an overwhelming 86% concurred that a faculty union would provide a channel for grievances. Nearly 70% of subjects felt that grievance procedures under collective bargaining would protect faculty from arbitrary decisions by the administrators. Relating to governance issues, 64.7% of the sample believed that the desire to gain control over administrators has influenced the growth of academic unions. More than half (55%)
believed that collective bargaining would result in overemphasis on rules and regulations, and 55% felt that collective bargaining reduces collegiality between administrators and faculty.

It must be noted that the majority of respondents reported being satisfied with their work and felt that the relationship between administrators and faculty was amenable. Additionally, unlike the neighboring states of Ohio, Michigan, and Illinois, Indiana has no existing faculty unions. These factors influenced the respondents' belief that unionization would not come to their campus, despite the fact that remuneration at this campus are relatively low, and most subjects believed that collective bargaining would bring both better pay and fringe benefits. This latter finding confirms earlier findings that compensation is the primary reason why faculty unionizes (Ali & Karim, 1992). Overall, the key issues facilitating interest in joining a union were compensation, governance, and personnel issues. The "traditional safety and security tend to bread and butter issues" (p. 88).

Graf et al. (1994) addressed the questions of which groups of faculty (e.g., in which disciplines, in which ranks, at what pay levels) are more likely to support or oppose collective bargaining and what factors influence faculty to vote for or against unionization at their institution. Interestingly, union sentiment was remarkably consistent across ranks. Age and longevity were positively correlated with pro-union sentiment; overall, senior faculty was the most supportive of unions. Not surprisingly, self-identified Democrats were the strongest supporters of unionization, and equally expected, the highest earners expressed the strongest opposition to unions. Faculty in the social sciences, humanities, and education were the most supportive of unions.
Concurring with previous studies, compensation issues had the greatest weight in facilitating pro-union sentiment. In this sample, socioeconomic and political attitudes were also strongly linked to union support or opposition. One dimension of a favorable attitude was union instrumentality, or the belief that a union would be effective. Graf et al. (1994) emphasize that regardless of favorable support, the extent to which the union option is exercised also depends on how well campus administration manages personnel, governance, and administrative issues. The correlation between longevity and union support contradicts some previous studies. The authors propose that their findings may reflect the increased salary compression across college campuses, or alternatively, it may be a reflection of senior faculty's dissatisfaction with changing expectations that place increasing emphasis on research and publication over teaching.

Noting that the vast majority of all unionized faculties come from 10 states, Karim and Rassuli (1996) examined the faculty attitudes toward unionization at a residential non-doctoral university campus in the Southwest. A total of 244 faculty members participated. Only one-third of the sample had a positive attitude toward collective bargaining, which is consistent with the finding that only 22% had adversarial relations with the administrators. Similar to the study of Ali and Karim (1992), 80% of respondents believed that a union would not be organized on their campus despite relatively low salaries. Further similarities exist in that the findings of both studies run counter to the traditional belief that non-research institutions are more receptive to unions, and the probable link between location in a state with low union organizing, and in an environment where relations between faculty and administrators is non-adversarial.
In this sample, a higher proportion (82%) of respondents agreed with the idea that a union provides a channel for grievances that the proportion agreeing that the growth of faculty unions was influenced by a desire by faculty for better pay and fringe benefits (79%). Only 57% believed that collective bargaining was likely to bring higher salaries and improved benefits to their institution. Job security emerged as an important issue, with 70% agreeing that collective bargaining protects faculty members from arbitrary action by administrators. Overall, the key issues identified by the respondents as instrumental in union organizing were wages and benefits, personnel issues, and job security: the overriding concerns for employees in all segments of the workforce addressed by this literature review.

Villa and Blum (1996) examined the body of existing research on collective bargaining in academic institutions with the objective of identifying future trends in campus organizing. They reiterate dissatisfaction with pay and working conditions and the perception that a union can improve one’s situation strongly influence pro-union voting. Faculty is more likely to vote in favor of union representation if they are dissatisfied with pay and benefits, job demands, facilities, and support services (travel, graduate assistants, supplies and clerical support), and the degree of professional satisfaction awarded by the job. Trust in the administration, satisfaction with governance and with tenure, evaluation, and promotion decisions were negatively correlated with pro-union sentiments and the desire to join a union. Authors note that the positive correlation between pay level and job satisfaction and commitment is significant for union outcomes. Dissatisfied workers are most likely to join a union; however, once organized, it is in the union’s best interest to improve job
satisfaction by negotiating improved working conditions and economic outcomes for its members.

Villa and Blum (1996) state those faculty unions have been shown to have beneficial effects on salary and working conditions. They have also been successful in bargaining for fairer grievance procedures and more open personnel practices. They note that a significant indication of union effectiveness is the fact that once organized, unions are not often decertified. Additionally:

Lobbying power of faculty unions has also given the faculty a greater voice in the political system, which can affect the level of resources available to the institution. Unions have given faculty a greater voice within the university and can thus affect how those resources are distributed. These factors increase union instrumentality and thereby the chance a union will be certified if a vote is taken (p. 166).

Other sources have characterized faculty as essentially passive, stating that most do not usually take action unless they perceive themselves the victim of an administrative "atrocities." Villa and Blum (1996) propose that "atrocities" (read: catalysts) might include such events as a salary freeze, tenure quotas, or cutbacks in research or travel allocations occurring simultaneously with administrative excesses such as extravagant office renovation or allowing the library to go under-funded while athletic coaches are hired at exorbitant salaries. Such events might also provoke non-teaching support staff to organize, in addition to the issues of compensation, personnel decisions, and job security, which appear to act as a catalyst for change in all organizational environments.
Success of the Harvard Union in achieving employee objectives supports the notion of union instrumentality. The family-friendly policies negotiated in the settlement appear on relatively few campuses (Norrell & Norrell, 1996). In the area of wages, the settlement instituted a new job title suffix, "Specialist," which advances employees one step on their wage progression (Harvard pact, 1995). Other terms increase personal leave days, increase the university's contribution to the education reimbursement fund, and create a joint committee to make changes in health and retirement benefits, two critical HRM areas. The pact negotiated by the union demonstrates that white-collar issues do not differ significantly from the bread and butter issues that form the core of blue-collar collective bargaining.

**Interest-Based Bargaining**

This special section is devoted to Interest-Based Bargaining, which is based on the win-win paradigm and proposed as a constructive alternative to the traditional model of collective bargaining that frequently divides management and employees and leads to antagonistic feelings within the organization. Virtually all sources addressing unionization cite the potentially adversarial effects of unions on relations between faculty and administration. An alternative to the typical adversarial approach to collective bargaining is interest-based or win-win bargaining. This strategy was employed successfully in Montgomery, New Jersey, in a dispute between the Montgomery Township Education Association and the Montgomery Township Board of Education. The win-win approach was selected after it was deemed to be more effective and less expensive than "old-fashioned negotiations" (Henderson, 1993). In the win-win approach, energies and resources are used
to solve common problems. Therefore, needs of both sides are determined, and both sides try to come up with solutions together. Many of the problems resulted from budget cuts. Most of the issues were those already addressed in this literature review: salary, benefits, employee involvement, personal leave, and personnel issues. The win-win strategy enables both parties to settle several previously contentious issues and problems by means of negotiations.

Win-win bargaining was also employed successfully at Youngstown State University (Carlton, 1995). The YSU-OEA was created in 1970, amid the prevailing environment of campus unrest and with considerable hostility between unionized faculty and administration. Between 1972, when the YSU-OEA was officially designated the exclusive faculty bargaining representative, and 1992, the union met with successes and failures, while relationships between faculty and administration became more adversarial. In mid-1992, Dr. Leslie H. Cochran became the president of the university. Using a "Take What's Available" (TWA) approach to leadership, and marshaling available university resources, he became a formidable change agent for forging a collaborative relationship with the diverse groups making up the university community. He initially labeled his approach "continuous improvement bargaining," a euphemism soon dropped in favor of the more widely used "interest-based bargaining." The groups identified issues and standards. Common standards include such things as market value, the law, equal treatment, costs, precedent and tradition, efficiency, reciprocity, or "what a court would decide." In short, "A standard is an intellectual measuring device that allows the teams to judge just what constitutes a fair and acceptable solution" (p. 351).
Thornburg (1993) finds that those employee participation programs work best in a union environment. The most significant change derived from the YSU-OEA negotiations was a move toward participative governance (Carlton, 1995). To institutionalize the process of participatory decision making at all levels of academic governance, specific language was built into the agreement. Training for faculty members was conducted by a team of personnel from the union and for administrators a group designated from within management ranks. The training consisted of providing information and practical exercises in the use of group problem-solving techniques, communication skills, active listening techniques, brainstorming, and consensus building. These strategies have been employed successfully in private sector corporations, resulting in a stronger organizational culture, higher motivation and performance, and stronger linkage of organizational and individual goals.

Findings

In view of the dearth of literature dealing specifically with non-faculty administrative personnel in colleges and universities, implications must be extrapolated from the private sector HRM literature and from studies of college faculty. All sources emphasize the need for organizations to adapt to an environment characterized by rapid change, uncertainty, complexity, and tightening budgets. Traditional compartmentalized university structure was not designed to accommodate the need for information sharing, cross-functional work groups, and reassignment that have become a keynote of private sector organizations. Time is past when university administrators can stand apart from the community they serve, and
maintain the rigid traditions of the past. Intrinsic rewards of employee involvement and decision-making, and employee development programs and the extrinsic rewards of performance-based pay and incentive have been used successfully to motivate private sector employees. It seems fair to assume that these same strategies will work for university staff, in addition, to the obstacle to success is the university structure itself.

Academic unions have been characterized as the prototype white-collar union. Contrary to some expectations, the issues that motivate faculty members to organize are almost identical to those of blue-collar workers. Compensation issues, specifically salary and benefits, personnel issues, and job security are the three primary concerns. Because they are not tenured, and because of the downsizing, restructuring, and re-engineering that is taking place on college campuses, job security may be even more important for administrative staff. The fact that they work side by side with tenured faculty may make their own job situation seem even more precarious.

Linking rewards closely to performance has been identified in the HRM literature as an excellent way to involve and motivate employees. The design of the rewards system is a critical factor in program success. Clear goals and expectations are central to enhancing employee performance and commitment to organizational objectives. Implementations of family-friendly policies, academic institutions lag behind private sector corporations. This situation marks a crucial area for change. In the case of Harvard University, collective bargaining efforts successfully negotiated flexible scheduling and alternative work arrangements. Other universities, such as the University of Kentucky, have designed their own innovative approach to family care, often linking family care programs to the
organization's mission. This review of the literature supports Gilliland's (1997) assertion that, "organizations that succeed in an environment of change and unpredictability promote flexibility, information access and dialogue, and risk-taking" (p. 33). These are the organizations that motivate their employees to peak performance and maintain their competitive edge.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

In this study the researcher's purpose was to determine the effects of non-faculty university administrator's perception of their job performance at two northern New Jersey universities. Several factors such as organizational design, employee development, performance appraisal, rewards and incentives, and clear Human Resource Management (HRM) strategies enhance employee performance and satisfaction. However, traditional university structure does not allow to incorporate these factors of employee performance and satisfaction. Some universities have made significant improvements in the employees' incentive plans by linking employees professional development goals with the university's overall mission. Other incentive plans also include both financial as well as non-financial programs. This study seeks to identify the perceived factors among the non-tenure university administrators that will help enhance their job performance. Research questions addressed by this study are derived from HRM practices and the unique way in which they are perceived by non-faculty administrators (NFA) in the university settings.

Descriptive case study research method was used in conducting the study, which descriptive case study method includes; (a) administering a survey, (b) conducting interviews, and (c) through analysis of existing data. In this chapter, the study design and methodology are explained, which the conceptual design is set forth first, followed by a discussion of the study population. Secondly, the independent and dependent variables and the instrumentation used in collecting the data are also described, as are issues of validity and
reliability. Finally, the data-collection and data-analysis procedures are presented.

Conceptual Design of the Study

This qualitative inquiry seeks to identify the perceived factors among the non-faculty university administrators that may enhance their job performance. To frame this process the researcher set parameters of inquiry within the context of a descriptive model. According to Lijphart (1971) this gathering of evidence is a more straight account of events. Collins and Noblit (1978) note that descriptive research has proved to be useful in studying educational innovations for evaluating programs and for creating information policy. Given that today's environment demands institutions that are extremely flexible and adaptable, and demands that institutions deliver high quality goods and services... institutions must be responsive to their customers and employees, offering choices of non-standardized services.... institutions empower citizens rather than simply serving them. Some institutions react actively, and some react passively, however all institutions must be competitive.

According to Osborne and Gaebler (1993) educational institutions perform increasingly complex tasks, in competitive, rapidly changing environments, with customers/employees who want quality and choice. These new realities have made life very laborious for public and private institutions, for the education system, health care programs, housing authorities, and for virtually every large bureaucratic program created by American governments before 1970. Most universities look for ways to adequately train their work force to enable the university to achieve their mission, as they are required to be more competitive on decreasing revenues. There is no longer any question that a successful organization must have a close working relationship with those it serves and employ. Many
journals describe enormous successes achieved by organizations committed to customer satisfaction.

Desatnik (1990) declares an organization cannot achieve total customer focus unless its management actively supports the idea that the voice of the customer should be a driver of everything the organization does. This often requires a shift in management approach. Instead of seeing themselves as the ultimate managers and supervisors, they have to see themselves as suppliers to the work force. Furthermore, they need to empower their work force, giving individuals the responsibility, the authority, and the support to act in the customer's best interest. The research question addressed by this study is derived from Human Resource Management Practices and The Organizational Dynamics, Incorporated, "Employee Survey: Managing and Supporting Customer Focus."

The Study Design

Study design chosen for this study is according to terminology used by researchers in the field of Education (Borg & Gall, 1979; Merriam & Simpson, 1984) and Sociology (Babbie, 1986), can be categorized as a descriptive survey methodology in the form of a survey questionnaire. If properly employed and cautiously interpreted, the descriptive survey can be a useful methodology for the development of knowledge (Best, 1981). Data obtained from the completed questionnaires are used to describe how the study population distributed itself for different variables. One of the goals of this study was to provide data, draw conclusions, and generate knowledge that could contribute toward the development of a research database on the effects of non-faculty university administrator's perception of their job performance. This survey method of research is an established strategy that offers many advantages. According to Babbie:
Survey research is probably the best method available to the social scientist interested in collecting original data for describing a population too large to observe directly. Surveys are also excellent vehicles for measuring attitudes and orientations in a large population (p.209).

This study followed a descriptive survey methodology to collect information to ascertain, the effects of non-faculty university administrator's perception of their job performance. This research followed the guidelines set forward by John Best (1981) as he described the characteristics of descriptive survey research studies:

1. They are non-experimental, for they deal with the relationships between non-manipulated variables in a natural, rather artificial setting. Since the events or conditions have already occurred or exist, the researcher selects the relevant variables for an analysis of their relationships.

2. They involve hypothesis formulation and testing.

3. They use the logical methods of inductive-deductive reasoning to arrive at generalizations.

4. They often employ methods of randomization so that errors may be estimated when inferring population characteristics from observations of samples.

5. The variables and procedures are described as accurately and completely as possible so that the study can be replicated by other researchers.

Researchers, however, must be cognizant of the limitations to descriptive survey research. Borg and Gall (1979) listed several frequently made errors by researchers in survey research: (a) not formulating clear, specific objectives for their research, (b) relating data gathering procedures to objectives in only a general way and thereby failing to get quantitative data specific to the problem, (c) selecting the sample on the basis of
convenience, and (d) analyzing survey data one variable at a time instead of analyzing relationships, longitudinal changes, and comparisons between groups. The researcher made every effort in this study to minimize these limitations.

The Study Population

Identification of the population is a critical step in the research process. Two types of population are generally described in the research literature: the “target” population and the “survey” population. According to Rossi (1983), the target population is the collection of elements that the researcher would like to study. The survey population is the population that is actually sampled and for which data may be obtained. Targeted population for this study was comprised of non-faculty university administrator’s at two northern New Jersey universities, and the survey population was the same. Due to there were more than eight hundred non-faculty university administrator’s at the two northern New Jersey universities during academic year 1999-00, a purposive sampling was drawn of two hundred subjects from each university. This was done to ensure that the researcher obtained a representative sample of non-faculty administrator’s based on the characteristics of gender, race, years in services, position and age. Permission was obtained from the departments of Human Resources of two New Jersey universities; Institution A and Institution B to conduct the study involving their non-faculty administrators. Knowingly, that the major disadvantage of this type of sampling is the researcher ‘s judgement may be in error, the researcher over sample both universities to adjust for this limitation.
The Independent and Dependent Variables

In descriptive research, the selection and measurement of variables are significant responsibilities. Each research hypothesis embodies, at the outset, two meaningful ambient factors: an independent variable and a dependent variable. An independent variable has a component that is manipulated, measured, or selected by the investigator in order to observe its relation to the subject’s “response”, were as the dependent variable is observed and measured in response to an independent variable. Independent variables in this study were selected demographic characteristics (gender, race, years in services, position and age) of non-faculty university administrators participants. The dependent variable was the four attitudinal variables regarding differences in how non-faculty administrators differ in their perceptions.

Instrumentation

Instrumentation used in this study was developed from similar instruments used in the Organizational Dynamics Incorporated (1996) study, that consisted of two parts. In Part I, respondents were asked to give responses to 24 statements relative to perceptions of performance of Institution A and Institution B non-faculty administrators. Respondents indicated their agreement or disagreement with each statement concerning perceptions using a 10-point Likert scale ranging from 0-3 (strongly disagree); 4-6 (neutral); and 7-10 (strongly agree). Institution A and Institution B non-faculty administrators’ responses were analyzed collectively. For analysis purposes, items were grouped into the following categories: (a) standards of reviews of their institutions, (b) conditions necessary for optimal performance
within a departmental climate, (c) opportunities for training/development at their institutions, and (d) satisfactions and productivity at their institutions.

Validity and Reliability

Babbie (1986) defined validity as "a descriptive term used for a measure that accurately reflects the concept that it is intended to measure" (p. 56). Oppenheim (1966) suggested that a panel of experts should be selected to agree on the content validity of the statements in a questionnaire. He asserted that content validity is an essential quality and is fundamentally based on experts' judgment. A panel of experts from the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at Institution A was used to establish the content validity of the instrument used in the study (see Appendix B). Based on feedback, comments, and suggestions from the panel members, the researcher modified or reworded some statements for clarity.

The original instrument was validated by a panel of experts consisting of university administrators and education faculty (IRB). The researcher entered the resulting data into a computer and used the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS/IBM Version 10.0) to calculate Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients. Survey questions with a reliability coefficient greater than or equal to .89 were included in the final instrument. Although Borg and Gall (1979) indicated that some studies can be conducted satisfactorily with an instrument reliability of .75, Borg (1981) concluded that attitude scales with a reliability coefficient of .79 are considered to be in the medium reliability range, and those with a coefficient higher than .79 are considered to have high reliability.
Researchers in the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at Institution B edited and revised the survey. The final draft of the survey instrument contained 24 questions: pertaining to perceptions of performance of Institution A and Institution B non-faculty administrators (see Appendix B).

*Item Analysis*

Frary (1977) suggested conducting an item analysis to determine the merit of items to be included in the attitudinal scale is highly recommended. The researcher consulted experts to determine which items should be included in the final draft of the instrument. These experts included the researcher's doctoral committee members from the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision and Graduate Communication. These professors were chosen because of their expertise in questionnaire item analysis. Final version of the instrument was revised on the basis of reliability data, item analysis, and comments and suggestions from the panel of experts.

*Human Subjects Approval*

Before initiating this study, the researcher forwarded a copy of the final draft of the survey instrument, a statement regarding purpose, and a description of the research methods to the Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research (IRB) for approval. All research conducted at the university involving human subjects must be approved by this board. Approval to conduct the research was granted (see Appendix D), and the researcher proceeded to initiate the procedures involved in collecting the data for the study.
Generalizability

Borg (1981) indicated that a minimum response rate of 70% be attained in order to place confidence in the findings. Babbie (1986) confirmed that a response rate of 70% or above is excellent to place confidence in the research findings. Kerlinger (1973) concluded that a minimum response rate of 80% should be attained for the researcher to be able to generalize the findings. Researcher results of the study can only be generalized to the survey population, and not the target population.

Data-Collection Techniques

The researcher obtained permission from the departments of Human Resources of two northern New Jersey universities, to administer the survey non-faculty administrators. Since the number of non-faculty administrators was relatively small as compared to other employees in the university, mailed surveys was applicable, for this method has a tendency of rendering results (Dillman, 1978; Frey, 1989; Goyder, 1897; and Groves, et. al., 1988). Cover letter also gave directions for completing and returning the two-part questionnaire and stated that participation in the study was strictly voluntary. Each survey instrument contained a code number at the bottom of the first page for follow-up purposes only. Participants were not asked to placed their names on the questionnaire. After non-faculty administrators completed the surveys, they were mailed backed to the researcher and prepared for data analysis.
Data-Analysis Procedures

The researcher coded the data before entering them into a computer for analysis, using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (10.0 Version; SPSS/PC+) computer program was used to process and analyze the data. Descriptive statistics, frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations of item responses were used in analyzing the descriptive data. T-tests and one-way analyses of variances (ANOVAs) were performed to determine whether there were significant differences that exist in non-faculty university administrator’s perception of their job performance at two northern New Jersey universities based on gender, race and years in service, and other independent variables. A .05 probability level and a 95% confidence level were the criteria for rejecting or failing to reject each null hypothesis.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The researcher’s primary purpose, in this study, was to determine factors of non-faculty administrators that were perceived to influence their performance. Specifically, subjects for this study included selected non-faculty from two New Jersey universities; Institution A (Florham Park/Madison and Teaneck/Hackensack campuses) and Institution B (South Orange, New Jersey). This study population was comprised of 200 non-faculty university administrators from each of the two northern New Jersey universities, Institution A and Institution B during the 1999-00 academic year, which made the survey population total 400. Because the total population was surveyed, no sample selection were necessary. Demographic characteristics of the non-faculty university administrators who voluntarily completed the survey instrument are presented in the first section of this dissertation. Section two contains findings germane to non-faculty administrators’ attitudes regarding factors perceived to influence their performance. Finally, section three, included reports on test results of the stated hypotheses.

Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Researchers conducting descriptive inquiries often seek to ascertain the demographic characteristics of their populations. White and Tisher (1986) noted that “social context” influences education and education research. Ary (1990) suggested that demographic variables used in survey research often provide tangible information about populations under
study. In administration education, researchers have used a variety of demographic variables in conducting research on students/non-faculty university administrators (Harbstreit & Welton, 1992; Rollins & Miller, 1989). Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) noted in their theory of reasoned action that behavior depend on attitudes. Therefore, attitudes are a determinant of behavior and attitudes are determined to a large extent by their personal characteristics. Thus, the researcher assumed that the group of selected non-faculty university administrators at the two northern New Jersey universities, Institution A and Institution B, would be influenced by their demographic characteristics. Four demographic characteristics were identified and examined, in an attempt to determine if the factors that were perceived, influenced their performance. The characteristics included institution, gender, race, and years of service, were presented in the following pages.

Institution

Distribution of non-faculty university administrators at two northern New Jersey universities is shown in (see Table 1). There were 76 or (47.2%) respondents from Institution A and Institution B, had 85 or (52.8%) respondents, respectively.

<p>| Table 1 |
| Distribution of respondents by Institutions (N = 161). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution A (n = 76)/%</th>
<th>Institution B (n = 85)/%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender

Distribution of gender for non-faculty university administrators is shown in Table 2.

The majority of Institution A respondents (53%) and Institution B respondents (52%) were females, that accounted for 105 respondents or 65.2% of the study. Whereas, 23% of Institution A respondents and 33% of Institution B respondents were males, that accounted for 56 or 34.8%.

Table 2

Distribution of respondents by gender ($N = 161$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution A</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count % of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution B</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count % of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count % of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Race

Distribution of respondents by race is shown in Table 3. The majority of non-faculty university administrators for Institution A were 60 or 37.3% Caucasian and 65 or 40.4% for Institution B, respectively. African-Americans were second, with 11 (6.8%) of the respondents from Institution A and 10 (6.2%) of the respondents from Institution B. Whereas, Asians of Institution A had only 2 (1.2%) and 0 (0.0%) of Institution B, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afr.-Amer.</td>
<td>Caucas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count % of Total</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count % of Total</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count % of Total</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years of Services

Distribution of respondents by years of services are presented in Table 4. The
majority of non-faculty university administrators for Institution A with 6-10 years of service were 35 (21.7%), whereas the majority of Institution B respondents were 41 (25.5%). Employees with 0-5 years of service placed second with 23 (14.3%) at Institution A, and 28 (17.4%) at Institution B, respectively. Furthermore, those with 21-25 years of services had the least amount of respondents, with 1 (0.6%) from Institution A and 1 (0.6%) for Institution B.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count % of Total</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution B</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count % of Total</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count % of Total</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beliefs and Attitudes Regarding Influence to Performance

Part II of the questionnaire concerned respondents’ beliefs and attitudes toward factors perceived to influence their performance. Non-faculty university administrators
responded to the items in this section using the following 3-point Likert-type scale: 8-10 = strongly agree, 4-7 = Neutral, and 0-3 = strongly disagree.

Rank, means and standard deviations for Institution A and Institution B Universities, showed items receiving the strongest agreement in Table 5. In reviewing these items, it can be seen that both groups of respondents agreed most strongly on items related to having the expertise to satisfy the scope of their job, ensuring that each person they interfaced with was satisfied, responded quickly to resolve complaints, knew what their manager/supervisor expected, and they were motivated to do whatever it took to excel at their job. The means and standard deviations for all items in this section of the questionnaire are shown in Appendix E, Table E1, E2, and E3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief/Attitude</th>
<th>Institution B</th>
<th>Institution A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the expertise to satisfy the scope of my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take personal responsibility for ensuring that each person I interface with is satisfied.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I respond quickly to resolve complaints.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what my manager/supervisor expects me to do and not to do to satisfy the job.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (continued)

Rank, means and standard deviation of items concerning beliefs and attitudes of factors that influence performance, which respondent most strongly agreed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief/Attitude</th>
<th>Institution B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Institution A</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am motivated to do whatever it takes to</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excel at my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what I need to do to improve my job</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am authorized to use my judgement in</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doing whatever it takes to achieve optimal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university's primary goal is to be the</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preferred university in the northeast region.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how my manager/supervisor feels</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about my contributions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager/supervisor sets work standards high.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rank based on percentages

In Table 6, respondents who answered strongly disagree to items, were shown by their rank, means and standard deviations for Institution A and Institution B Universities. In reviewing these items, it can be seen that both groups of respondents answered strongly agreed on items related to having the expertise to satisfy the scope of their job, responded.
quickly to resolve complaints, ensured that each person they interfaced with was satisfied, knew what was needed to improve their job satisfaction, and was authorized to use their judgement to achieve optimal job performance. The means and standard deviations for all items in this section of the questionnaire are shown in Appendix E, Table E1, E2, and E3.

Table 6

Rank, means and standard deviation of items concerning beliefs and attitude of factors that influence their performance, which respondent most strongly disagreed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude/Belief</th>
<th>Institution B</th>
<th>Institution A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the expertise to satisfy the scope of my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I respond quickly to resolve complaints.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take personal responsibility for ensuring that each person I interface with is satisfied.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what I need to do to improve my job satisfaction.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am authorized to use my judgement in doing whatever it takes to achieve optimal performance.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what my manager/supervisor expects me to do and not to do to satisfy the job.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am motivated to do whatever it takes to excel at my job.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 (continued)

Rank, means and standard deviation of items concerning beliefs and attitude of factors that influence their performance, which respondent most strongly disagreed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude/Belief</th>
<th>Institution B</th>
<th>Institution A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My manager/supervisor sets work standards high.</td>
<td>Rank Mean SD</td>
<td>Rank Mean SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university's primary goal is to be the preferred university in the northeast region.</td>
<td>8 2.6 .64</td>
<td>10 2.6 .60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager/supervisor gives me the information necessary to satisfy my responsibility.</td>
<td>9 2.6 .60</td>
<td>9 2.5 .65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 2.5 .72</td>
<td>13 2.5 .68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 7, items receiving at least 30% of respondents for the neutral category were shown by their rank, means and standard deviations for Institution A and Institution B Universities. Reviewing these items, it can be seen that both groups of respondents answered neutral on items related to having the expertise to satisfy the scope of their job, responded quickly to resolve complaints, ensured that each person they interfaced with was satisfied, knew what was needed to improve their job satisfaction, and was authorized to use their judgement to achieve optimal job performance. The means and standard deviations for all items in this section of the questionnaire were shown in Appendix E, Table E1, E2, and E3.
Table 7

Rank, means and standard deviation of items concerning beliefs and attitude of factors that influence their performance, of respondents who responded neutral.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude/Belief</th>
<th>Institution B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Institution A</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the expertise to satisfy the scope of my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I respond quickly to resolve complaints.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take personal responsibility for ensuring that each person I interface with is satisfied.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what I need to do to improve my job satisfaction.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am authorized to use my judgement in doing whatever it takes to achieve optimal performance.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what my manager/supervisor expects me to do and not to do to satisfy the job.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am motivated to do whatever it takes to excel at my job.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager and/or supervisor sets work standards high.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university's primary goal is to be the preferred university in the northeast region.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 (continued)

Rank, means and standard deviation of items concerning beliefs and attitude of factors that influence their performance, of respondents who responded neutral.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude/Belief</th>
<th>Institution B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Institution A</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager/supervisor gives me the information</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessary to satisfy my responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rank based on percentages

Individual items in the "Beliefs and Attitudes Regarding Influence to Performance" of the questionnaire were grouped into four scales, which dealt with the following specific aspects of influence: (a) standards of reviews, (b) optimal performance within a departmental climate, (c) opportunities for training/development, and (d) satisfaction and productivity at one's institution. Although, there are instances in the four aspects of influence where the standard deviation is less than one, indicating that the central tendency of its mean for a particular question in that section is not significant enough to draw any conclusion, the researcher acknowledge that the questionnaire should be tested for internal validity and then modified prior to future usage.

Means of respondents' agreement ratings for the items in each section were calculated and reported, in rank order, in Table 8. As seen in the table, statements concerning satisfaction and productivity, opportunities for training/development, and optimal performance of departmental climate received the strongest agreement from Institution B
respondents. Institution A respondents agreed most strongly with statements concerning optimal performance of departmental climate, opportunities for training/development, and satisfaction and productivity, in that order.

Table 8

Mean Scores for Scales in the Beliefs and Attitudes Toward Factors to Influence Their Performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Institution B (n=85)</th>
<th>Institution A (n=76)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactions and Productivity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal Performance of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Climate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards of Reviews</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard of Review

As evident by the data, 36.6% of Institution B respondents believed that they knew what their manager/supervisor expected of them to satisfy their job responsibility, and 36.0% "felt that their superior set high work standards." In contrast, relatively few (6.8%) agreed that their university "had a strategy that specified their professional development," and just 8.7% believed their expectations were limited by their employer" (see Table 9). Whereas, Institution A respondents had similar beliefs. That is, 32.3% believed that they knew what their manager/supervisor expected of them to satisfy their job responsibility, and 28.0%
“indicated their superior set high work standards”. Although, 6.2% concurred that their university “had a strategy that specified their professional development,” and just 3.0% believed their expectations were limited by their employer.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of respondents who strongly agreed and strongly disagreed, and answered neutral with Standards of Review statements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Institution B (n=85)</th>
<th>Institution A (n=76)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The university has a strategy that specifies how I will professionally develop.</td>
<td>6.8 24.2 21.7</td>
<td>6.2 16.1 24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how my manager and/or supervisor feels about my contributions.</td>
<td>30.4 18.0 4.3</td>
<td>26.7 15.5 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My expectations are limited by my supervisor/manager.</td>
<td>8.7 19.3 24.8</td>
<td>13.0 14.3 19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager and/or supervisor sets work standards high.</td>
<td>36.0 12.4 4.3</td>
<td>28.0 14.9 4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 (continued)

Percentage of respondents who strongly agreed and strongly disagreed, and answered neutral with Standards of Review statements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Institution B (n=85)</th>
<th>Institution A (n=76)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA (%)</td>
<td>N(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what my manager/supervisor expects me to do and not to do to satisfy the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  
SA = Strongly agree  
N = Neutral  
SD = Strongly disagree

Condition Necessary for Optimal Performance within a Departmental Climate

As proof, by way of data, respondents were somewhat less positive towards conditions necessary for optimal performance within a departmental climate. As shown in Table 10, 36.6% of Institution B and 31.1% of Institution A respondents believed that they were authorized to use their own judgement to accomplish optimal performance. Whereas, 31.7% of Institution B thought their administrators gave information necessary to satisfy their responsibility, 28.6% of Institution A respondents stated their superior wanted their feedback. Conversely, only 1.9% of Institution B and 6.2% of Institution A respondents believed that they were authorized to use their own judgement to accomplish optimal performance. In addition, 6.8% of Institution B respondents articulated that they disagreed with the information given to them to satisfy their job responsibilities, and 7.5% of Institution A stated their superior wanted their feedback. Although, only 6.8% of Institution B and 8.1% of Institution A respondents articulated that their administrator communicated up-to-date information to them.
Table 10

Percentage of respondents who strongly agreed and strongly disagreed, and answered neutral with Condition Necessary for Optimal Performance within a Departmental Climate statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Institution B (n=85)</th>
<th>Institution A (n=76)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA (%)</td>
<td>N(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager and/or supervisor communicates to me up-to-date information.</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am authorized to use my judgement in doing whatever it takes to achieve optimal performance.</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 (continued)

Percentage of respondents who strongly agreed and strongly disagreed, and answered neutral with Condition Necessary for Optimal Performance within a Departmental Climate statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Institution B (n=85)</th>
<th>Institution A (n=76)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA (%)</td>
<td>N(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management regularly communicates face-to-face with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager and/or supervisor gives me information necessary to satisfy my responsibility.</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager and/or supervisor wants my feedback.</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SA = Strongly agree  
N = Neutral  
SD = Strongly disagree
Opportunities for Training/Development

Overall, the Institution B and Institution A respondents held positive attitudes regarding opportunities for training/development at their institutions (see Table 11). The majority of Institution B respondents (46.0%) acknowledged that they had "the expertise to satisfy the scope of their jobs," and 26.7% thought that "their superior actively sought their input for the best approaches." Likewise, 26.7% believed their administrator employed individuals for key positions based upon the job focus, and 23.6% believed their superior implored their input on best approaches. Institution A respondents made similar choices. That is, 38.5% thought they had the expertise to satisfy the scope of their jobs, and 26.7% believed "their superior actively sought their input on best approaches." Although 25.5% concurred their administrator employed individuals for key positions based upon the job focus, and 23.6% thought that their superior clearly informed them of their job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Institution B (n=85)</th>
<th>Institution A (n=76)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA (%)</td>
<td>N(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager and/or supervisor personally spends time helping me develop my expertise.</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 (continued)

Percentage of respondents who strongly agreed and strongly disagreed, and answered neutral with Opportunities for Training/Development statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Institution B (n=85)</th>
<th>Institution A (n=76)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA (%)</td>
<td>N(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager and/or supervisor clearly informs me of my job satisfaction.</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager and/or supervisor actively seeks my input on the best approaches.</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager and/or supervisor elects individuals for key jobs based upon their focus.</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 (continued)

Percentage of respondents who strongly agreed and strongly disagreed, and answered neutral with Opportunities for Training/Development statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Institution B (n=85)</th>
<th>Institution A (n=76)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA (%)</td>
<td>N(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager and/or supervisor provides me with time and support to develop and continuously improve my skills.</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the expertise to satisfy the scope of my job.</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SA = Strongly agree  
N = Neutral  
SD = Strongly disagree

Satisfactions and Productivity

Distribution of respondents who responded to the satisfaction and productivity statement was shown in Table 12. The largest percentage of Institution B respondents (47.8%) agreed that they responded quickly to complaints; and 43.5% agreed with the statement that they "took personal responsibility for ensuring the satisfaction of persons they interfaced with." Likewise, 37.3% stated that they had the expertise to satisfy the scope of
their jobs, and 35.4% agreed that their university primary goal was to promote their institution as the preferred northeastern institution of the region. This same pattern occurred with Institution A respondents. That is, 36.0% agreed that they responded quickly to complaints; and (32.3%) agreed they “took personal responsibility for ensuring the satisfaction of person they interface with.” Furthermore, 30.4% indicated they are motivated to do whatever it takes to excel in their job, and 26.7% acknowledged that their university primary goal was to promote their institution as the preferred northeastern institution of the region.

Table 12:

Percentage of respondents who strongly agreed and strongly disagreed, and answered neutral with Satisfactions and Productivity statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Institution B (n=85)</th>
<th>Institution A (n=76)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA (%)</td>
<td>N(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externally the university is respected for its work in satisfying the student.</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 (continued)

Percentage of respondents who strongly agreed and strongly disagreed, and answered neutral with Satisfactions and Productivity statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Institution B (n=85)</th>
<th>Institution A (n=76)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA (%)</td>
<td>N(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager and/or supervisor treats me the same way he/she would like to treat faculty.</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am rewarded and recognized primarily for my contributions.</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I respond quickly to complaints.</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am motivated to do whatever it takes to excel at my job.</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take personal responsibility for ensuring that each person I interfere with is satisfied.</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 (continued)

Percentage of respondents who strongly agreed and strongly disagreed, and answered neutral with Satisfactions and Productivity statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Institution B (n=85)</th>
<th>Institution A (n=76)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA (%)</td>
<td>N(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university's primary goal is to be the preferred university in the northeast region.</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the expertise to satisfy the scope of my job.</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SA = Strongly agree  
N = Neutral  
SD = Strongly disagree

Results of Research Questions and Hypothesis Testing

Seven hypotheses were tested in this investigation, for the purpose of these hypotheses was to test for significant differences between certain independent and dependent variables. Independent variables for the study were (a) gender, (b) race, (c) institution, and (d) years in service for respondents. The dependent variables for the study were the respondents' attitudes toward (a) standard of reviews, (b) conditions necessary for optimal performance within a departmental climate, (c) opportunities for
training/development, and (d) satisfaction and productivity. Statistics used for testing Hypotheses 1 to 4 were the t-test and ANOVA. T-test was employed to determine whether any statistically significant differences existed between group means, with the assumption that the population variances of the two categories were equal. The researcher used Levene’s test for equality of variances and the t-test for equality of means to determine whether there were significant differences.

One-way ANOVAs were used to compare the means of two or more categories, and was limited to analyzing categorical independent variables. Therefore, it was more expedient to use one-way ANOVA than analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) or regression analysis. Because ANOVA was based on squared deviations from means, and better showed the distributions that were approximately symmetrical. That is, its results depended on the assumption that the dependent variable had not just symmetrical but normal distributions as well, with equal variances within each category of the independent variable.

Initially, the researcher examined the research question:

1. Are there differences in perceptions of performance between Institution A University and Institution B University non-faculty administrators in their perceptions regarding: (a) standard of reviews, (b) conditions necessary for optimal performance within a departmental climate, (c) opportunities for training/development, and (d) satisfactions and productivity.

Based on the researcher’s objectives and review of the literature, the following hypotheses were established and tested:

_Hypothesis 1_. There will be significant differences in how non-faculty
administrators differ in their perceptions regarding standards of reviews, based on institutions, gender, race, and years in service.

*Hypothesis 2.* There will be significant differences in how non-faculty administrators differ in their perceptions regarding conditions necessary for optimal performance within a departmental climate, based on institution, gender, race, and years in service.

*Hypothesis 3.* There will be significant differences in how non-faculty administrators differ in their perceptions regarding opportunities for training/development, based on institution, gender, race and years in service.

*Hypothesis 4.* There will be significant differences in how non-faculty administrators differ in their perceptions regarding satisfaction and productivity, based on institution, gender, race, and years in service.

*Research Question 1

*Hypothesis 1*

There will be significant differences in how non-faculty administrators differ in their perceptions regarding standards of reviews of their institutions, based on gender, race, and years in service.

*Results of testing hypothesis 1.* This hypothesis was supported only for the variable of gender, according to the data collected. That is, there were significant differences on how non-faculty administrators differ in their perceptions regarding standards of reviews, based on gender, but not institution. *T*-test indicated that there was a significant difference in their perceptions, based on gender. As shown in Table 13, there were no significant differences
at the .05 level that were observed in their perceptions, based on race and years of service. Pooled variances (2-tailed probability) for gender was .023, which is less than $p < .05$ (see Appendix G). In addition, the least significant difference-multiple comparison table (LSD) showed no interaction for race and years of service, that had a probability of .260 for race, and .880 for years in service, which was greater than $p > .05$ (see Table 25). The $t$-test results (Appendix G) suggested that Institution B and male respondents tended to have a higher mean score on several attitudinal variables than Institution A and female respondents. These variables were standards of reviews, conditions necessary for optimal performance within a departmental climate, opportunities for training/development, and satisfactions and productivity. Data also indicated that Institution A respondents seemed to have a more positive perceptions regarding standards of review of their institutions than Institution B respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>$f$ Ratio</th>
<th>$f$ Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.1350</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>19.83</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20.34</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 2**

There will be significant differences in how non-faculty administrators differ in their perceptions regarding conditions necessary for optimal performance within a departmental
climate, based on gender, race, and years in service. Results of testing hypothesis 2. This hypothesis was not supported by data collected. That is, the $t$-test indicated that there were no significant difference in their perceptions, based on gender and institution. As shown in Table 14, the ANOVA showed that there were no significant differences at the .05 level that were observed in their perceptions, based on race and years of service. Pooled variances (2-tailed probability) for gender was greater than $p > .05$; therefore, the hypothesis was not supported (see Appendix F). Data also indicated that Institution B respondents seemed to have a more positive perceptions regarding conditions necessary for optimal performance within a departmental climate than Institution A respondents. In addition, the $t$-test results also indicated that Institution B and males respondents tended to have a higher mean score on several attitudinal variables than Institution A and female respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>$f$ Ratio</th>
<th>$f$ Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>44.18</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44.97</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 3

There will be significant differences in how non-faculty administrators differ in their perceptions regarding opportunities for training/development, based on gender, race, and years in service.

Results of testing hypothesis 3. This hypothesis was not supported by data collected. That is, the t-test indicated that there were no significant difference in their perceptions, based on gender and institution. As shown in Table 15, the ANOVA showed that there were no significant differences at the .05 level that were observed in their perceptions, based on race and years of service. Pooled variances (2-tailed probability) for gender was greater than \( p > .05 \); therefore, the hypothesis was not supported (see Appendix F). Data also indicated that Institution B respondents seemed to have a more positive perceptions regarding opportunities for training/development at their institutions, than Institution A respondents. In addition, the t-test results also indicated that Institution B and males respondents tended to have a higher mean score on several attitudinal variables than Institution A and female respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA test results for opportunities for training/development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 4

There will be significant differences in how non-faculty administrators differ in their perceptions regarding satisfactions and productivity, based on gender, race, and years in service.

Results of testing hypothesis 4. This hypothesis was supported only for the variable of institution, according to the data collected. That is, there were significant differences on how non-faculty administrators differ in their perceptions regarding satisfactions and productivity at their institutions, based on institution, but not gender. The t-test indicated that there was a significant difference in their perceptions, based on institution. As shown in Table 16, there were no significant differences at the .05 level that were observed in their perceptions, based on race and years of service. Pooled variances (2-tailed probability) for institution was .037, which is less than p < .05 (see Appendix G). In addition, the least significant difference-multiple comparison table (LSD) showed no interaction for race and years of service, that had a probability of .130 for race, and .688 for years in service, which was greater p > .05 (see Table 25). The t-test results (see Appendix F) suggested that Institution B and male respondents tended to have a higher mean score on several attitudinal variables than Institution A and female respondents. These variables were standards of reviews, conditions necessary for optimal performance within a departmental climate, opportunities for training/ development, and satisfactions and productivity. The data also indicated that Institution B respondents seemed to have a more positive perceptions regarding satisfactions and productivity at their institutions than Institution A respondents.
Table 16

ANOVA test results for satisfactions and productivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>f-Ratio</th>
<th>f-Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>1.912</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>19.34</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20.04</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limitations and the Possible Effects on the Results

The researcher delimited the study to selected non-faculty from the two New Jersey universities; Institution A (Florham Park/Madison and Teaneck/Hackensack campuses) and Institution B (South Orange, New Jersey). Although, random sampling is the preferred method of sampling technique used for this type of study, the researcher felt that doing a clustered sampling might have influenced the results. Seeing that the surveyed population was highly homogeneous, this gives credence to suggesting a cluster sampling might have yielded more non-faculty of African-American or other racial/ethnic minorities in the population which probably would have affected the results.

Summary

Results of the data analyses for the study were reported in this chapter. The results were presented in six sections. Demographic characteristics of the non-faculty university administrators who voluntarily completed the survey instrument are presented in the first section of this dissertation. Section two contains findings germane to non-faculty administrators' attitudes regarding factors perceived to influence their performance. The
final section included results of the statistical analyses (t-tests and ANOVAs) of the stated hypotheses. Chapter V contains a summary of the study, conclusions and recommendations, implications, and the researcher's reflections.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND REFLECTIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to review the nature of the inquiry and present the findings, conclusions, implications, recommendations for further research, and reflections.

Summary

Researchers have shown, that in the past 20 years, non-faculty university administrators has had a significant impact on higher education. Non-faculty administrators significantly influence the industry labor pool, the way policy is constructed. In addition non-faculty administrators emphasize the need for universities to adapt to an environment characterized by rapid change, uncertainty, complexity, and tightening budgets (Bassi & Van Buren, 1997; Berver et al., 1992; Monsanto, 1997; and Seymour, 1989). A majority of respondents at both institutions reported that their supervisors communicated timely and relevant information, treated them with the same respect as awarded faculty, selected individuals for specific job based on their competencies, provided opportunities for skilled development and enhancement, and set high performance standards.

David (1997) described the typical university as a "maze of hierarchical structures operating independently of one another," where "employees are seldom clear about the university's prime mission, or about their own role within the organization" (p. S20). Similarly, Gilliland (1997) notes several factors that impede organizational redesign: among them are hazy institutional priorities; lack of certainty among administrators that makes
complex decisions about performance, reassignment of priorities being supported at the next level or by the board of governors; a scarcity of faculty and management development programs that support new priorities; and few incentives or rewards for departments or individuals who make the shifts. It appears that the obstacle to success is the university structure itself. All of these set the stage for expanding the traditional role of non-faculty administrators to become more of an integral part of a pluralistic environment at the university level. Nevertheless, it seems that knowledge of perceptions regarding factors of non-faculty administrators does influence their job performance and their decision on whether to perpetuate the perceptions they perceived.

It is the belief of the researcher that the idiosyncratic understanding of an efficient business organization will help facilitate answers and/or suggestions as to how what factors influence non-faculty administrators job performance. In particular, the researcher desires that top level administrators looks at the definition of a productive organization. A productive organization is characterized by its strategic fit, coherence and the linking of individual with its organizational goals; strong culture; role clarity; open channels of communications; well-defined mission that’s understood and supported by its employees; support for employee involvement in decision making; and rewards tied to measurable outcomes (Armstrong, 1992; Armitage, 1997; Bassi & Van Buren, 1997; McAllen & Nel, 1995; Kessler, 1995). There seems to be a need for research on assessing and identifying what factors influence non-faculty administrators job performance and the relationship between certain variables (i.e. gender, race), since many non-faculty administrators are not viewed as equals to tenured faculty members. Research questions regarding perceptions
toward non-faculty administrators have been proposed and suggested by several writers. However, it appears that few have pursued the answers. Many researchers strongly recommend that universities turn to private sector organizations as the models for change, to focus on creating a work environment conducive to motivate, foster high performance, and affirm personal value to enhance the effectiveness of administrators in the university setting as it does in the business sector (Gilliland, 1997; Lindgren, 1982). If America is to remain a dominant force, institutions of higher learning and their communities have to facilitate cultural awareness and change for the 21st century. In addition, “gender and ethnic diversity must be emphasized more aggressively if educators wish to maintain their relevancy in America’s educational enterprise during the next decade” Bowen (1994, p.8).

This investigation can provide a means by which a research data base on issues regarding factors that influence non-faculty administrators job performance can be established in higher education. It also can provide information about the relationship between non-faculty and tenured faculty administrators, gender differences within the institution and perceived factors influencing their job performance. The concept of perceptions is being studied and implemented in various forms and contexts across the nation. Many institutions, companies, and other entities have taken the stance that promoting this concept with their commitment to maintain excellence, will provide leadership to their state, and international communities they serve. Furthermore, it is hoped that this investigation will provide new directions for additional research in the field of human resources as it relates to job performance.
One goal of this study was to develop a comprehensive database to foster an awareness and understanding of perceptions and factors that influence non-faculty administrators job performance. It is hoped that this investigation can provide an objective means of assessing perceptions, which may contribute to the goal of understanding factors that influence non-faculty administrators job performance. In addition, provide new directions for additional research in the field of higher education administration and supervision as it relates to perceptions of non-faculty administrators.

Purpose of the Study

The researcher’s primary purpose, in this study, was to determine factors of non-faculty administrators that were perceived to influence their performance. Specifically, subjects for the study included selected non-faculty from two New Jersey universities; Institution A (Florham Park/Madison and Teaneck/Hackensack campuses) and Institution B (South Orange, New Jersey). To accomplish the primary purpose of the study, the researcher established the following research questions:

1. Are there differences in how non-faculty administrators differ in their perceptions of their institution, based on their individual knowledge and experiences?

2. Are there differences in how non-faculty administrators differ in their perceptions regarding: (a) environmental conditions for able performance within a departmental climate, (b) one's opportunities for training/development at their institutions, and (c) satisfactions at their institutions.
Procedures Used To Conduct The Investigation

This section of the chapter will present the procedures followed in the investigation. They were: (a) data collection, (b) procedures for data processing, and (c) procedures for analyzing and interpreting the data.

Data Collection

This investigation was concerned with identifying and assessing differences of perceptions of performance and determining the relationships between selected variables that may influence University non-faculty administrators. One of the most important critical aspects of the study was the development of the instrument. A survey instrument containing 24 Likert-type items was developed to collect the data. Once the instrument was developed, a pilot test was conducted for the purpose of refining the instrument before using it to collect the data for the investigation. The targeted population for this study was comprised of non-faculty university administrator's at two northern New Jersey universities, and the survey population was 200 non-faculty university administrator's from the two northern New Jersey universities, bringing the survey population to 400. The researcher obtained permission from the departments of Human Resources of two New Jersey universities; Institution A and Institution B during academic year 1999-00, in order to solicit all their non-faculty administrators from both universities. Data were collected by means of a mail-out survey questionnaire that was returned to the researcher.
Procedures for Data Processing

Respondents indicated their agreement or disagreement with each statement concerning perceptions using a 10-point Likert scale ranging from 0-3 (strongly disagree); 4-6 (neutral); and 7-10 (strongly agree). Before administering the questionnaire, the researchers used a panel of experts for validation purposes and a sample of Institution A and Institution B non-faculty administrators to assist in the development of a reliable instrument. The researcher established reliabilities of .87 for the overall coefficient alpha.

Returned questionnaires were processed by computer, using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, 1999), SPSS/PC+ version 10.0. The researcher used descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, and means) to summarize the data pertaining to demographic characteristics of the respondents. Combined descriptive analyses were run on items grouped according to issues or common themes, establishing mean scores for each topic/theme. T-tests and one-way analyses of variances (ANOVAs) were performed to determine whether there were significant differences that exist in non-faculty university administrator's perception of their job performance at two northern New Jersey universities based on gender, race and years in service, and other independent variables. A .05 probability level and a 95% confidence level were the criteria for rejecting or failing to reject each null hypothesis.

Major Findings

Major findings are discussed in the following subsections, according to the objectives established for the study. In general, many responses from Institution A and Institution B
University non-faculty administrators proved consistent with HRM recommendations for employee motivation and performance. Although this study focused exclusively on the perceptions of non-faculty administrators, findings indicated that on many measures, non-faculty administrators are consistent with current business practices.

**Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents**

Descriptive statistics (*frequencies, percentages, and means*) calculated on the personal data of the non-faculty administrators revealed that the study sample was relatively homogeneous. In terms of institution distinctions, there were 76 or (47.2%) respondents from Institution A and 85 or (52.8%) Institution B respondents, that total to 161 (40.3%) respondents from the two northern New Jersey universities. As it relates to gender distinctions between subjects, the majority of Institution A respondents (53%) and Institution B respondents (52%) were females, that accounted for 105 respondents or (65.2%) of the study. Whereas, 23% of Institution A respondents and 33% of Institution B respondents were males, that accounted for 56 or (34.8%).

Years of services for non-faculty university administrators was the following: Institution A with 6-10 years of service were 35 (21.7%), whereas the majority of Institution B respondents were 41 (25.5%). Employees with 0-5 years of service placed second with 23 (14.3%) for Institution A, and 28 (17.4%) for Institution B respectively. Furthermore, those with 21-25 years of services had the least amount of respondents, with 1 (0.6%) from Institution A and 1 (0.6%) for Institution B.
Significant Differences in Perceptions, Based on Demographic Characteristics

Pfeiffer & Davis-Blake (1983) contended that demographic variables are superior because they are easily measurable and produce parsimonious explanations. He further concludes that demography is an important casual variable that effects a number of intervening variables and processes, and through them, a number of organizational (institutions) outcomes can be measured. Lawrence (1994), points out that variance explanation presented by Pfeiffer & Davis-Blake, can be assumed that if the right demographic predictors are identified, they will consistently explain some percentage of the variation in organizational (institutions) outcomes.

This study demographic variables showed that there were a statistical differences found between how non-faculty administrators at the two institutions differ in their perceptions regarding standards of reviews, based on gender, but not institution. The t-test results suggested that Institution B and male respondents tended to have a higher mean score on several attitudinal variables than Institution A and female respondents. In addition, indicating Institution A respondents seemed to have a more positive perceptions regarding standards of review of their institutions than Institution B respondents.

A statistically significant difference was found between the differences on how non-faculty administrators differ in their perceptions regarding satisfactions and productivity at their institutions, based on institution, but not gender. The t-test results suggested that Institution B and male respondents tended to have a higher mean score on several attitudinal variables than Institution A and female respondents. These variables were standards of reviews, conditions necessary for optimal performance within a departmental climate,
opportunities for training/development, and satisfactions and productivity. This data also indicated that Institution B respondents seemed to have a more positive perceptions regarding satisfactions and productivity at their institutions than Institution A respondents.

**Non-Faculty Administrators Mean Interaction Composite Scores**

Non-faculty administrators mean interaction statements of the instrument included the number of times they answer a question concerning some aspect of influence. A comparison of group composite scores for the survey revealed that no item had a mean composite score higher than 2.6 or lower than 2.2. Respondents from Institution B had a mean score of 2.6 (standard deviation = .33) for statements concerning satisfaction and productivity than with standards of reviews whose mean score was 2.2 and a standard deviation of .35 respectively. As for Institution A respondents, their was a different pattern that occurred. That is, the mean score 2.4 and a (standard deviation = .56), indicating their was a tendency to agreed more strongly with statements of optimal performance within a departmental climate than with standards of reviews whose mean score was 2.2 and (standard deviation = .37).

**Differences in Beliefs and Attitudes of Factors that Influence Performance**

Pfeiffer & Davis-Blake (1992), Armitage(1992,1997), and Kessler (1995), suggests that extrinsic and intrinsic reward differentials within the institution have a significant impact on an individual’s decision to leave or stay. Especially, initiatives toward their professional development which are linked with their performance goals which, in turn, are linked with
financial rewards and recognition. Institution B and Institution A respondents in this study rated highly their expertise to satisfy the scope of their job, taking personal responsibility for ensuring that each person they interface with is satisfied, and their responding quickly to resolve complaints. The scale mean scores for the beliefs and attitudes toward factors to influence their performance section of the questionnaire, indicated that satisfaction and productivity and optimal performance within a departmental climate ranked highest among the four items (see Table 8).

Differences of Standard of Review

While the responses cannot be generalized, previous research shows that employees are most satisfied when performance evaluations are deemed fair in terms of both procedural justice and distributive justice. Procedural justice relates to the fairness of the evaluation procedures used to determine the ratings, and includes the bi-directional flow of information and feedback as well as consistent application of standards (Greenberg, 1986). Whereas, distributive factors relates to a close relationship between performance and rating subsequent action.

Numerous sources emphasize the importance of linking rewards to performance as a way of establishing a strong organizational culture as well as enhancing work performance (Armitage, 1997; Armstrong, 1992; Berver et al., 1992; Kessler, 1995). In the most strongly agree category, Institution B and Institution A seemed to strongly agree least with their manager/supervisor setting high work standard and knowing how their manager feel about their contributions to the institution. In contrast, respondents from both institution strongly
agreed that they knew what their manager/supervisor expected of them to successful perform their job duties. Although, respondents seemed to strongly disagree with their university having a strategy that specified how one would develop professionally (see Table 9).

Differences of Condition Necessary for

Optimal Performance within a Departmental Climate

Stern and Tseng (1993) indicated that educational institutions, including business colleges, have lagged behind the corporate sector in the implementation of Total Quality Management (TQM). Advocates of this model believes that total quality management practices are ideal for constructing a motivating environment (Robertson et al., 1992). The prime assumption behind TQM is that all employees have valuable knowledge and experience to contribute to the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization. Creating an environment that promotes self-confidence, competence, and autonomy of employees, elicits greater motivation and job satisfaction, ultimately leading to higher performance.

Institution B and Institution A respondents articulated that their senior management did not regularly communicated face-to-face with them. Although, they strongly agreed they were authorized to use their own judgement to accomplish optimal performance, as well as their administrators giving information necessary to satisfy their responsibility and communicating up-to-date information to them (see Table 10). Therefore, respondents from both institution reported feeling rewarded and recognized for their contributions and motivated to excel at their jobs.
Differences of Opportunities for Training/Development

Rappaport (1997), reports that in a rapidly changing employment environment, acquisition and maintenance of skills and knowledge is as a key factor in financial security. Therefore, training and development programs, incentive and reward program are essential to counteracting this current environment of rapid change. As a result, many organizations are investing in employee development through in-house programs, outside seminars, and support for graduate study. The continuous advancement of employees’ knowledge and skills fosters the critical link between individual and organizational development (Doyle, 1994; Gilliland, 1997; and Torrington & Hall, 1987).

Overall, Institution B and Institution A respondents held positive attitudes regarding opportunities for training/development at their institutions. Given that the majority of both institutions respondents acknowledged that they had the expertise to satisfy the scope of their jobs, and believed their administrator employed individuals for key positions based upon the job focus (see Table 11).

Differences of Satisfactions and Productivity

Middlebrook (1996) asserts, that "Training and rah-rah motivational efforts won't improve performance when the real culprit is unclear expectations or inadequate feedback" (p. 48). The disparity between Institution A and Institution B responses on perceptions of supervisors' satisfaction suggests that feedback and/or clarity of expectations at Institution B requires improvement. However, an interesting paradox emerged in a second distinction between respondents at the two institutions. A majority of Institution B respondents agreed
that outsiders respected the university for satisfying students, while the reverse was true for
the administrators at Institution A (see Table 12). Advocates of TQM and other models of
participate management cite research in which increased job satisfaction is linked with
improved business results, better customer relations and improved labor-management
relations, among other benefits (Thornburg, 1993). Indeed, the perceived connection between
employee satisfaction and customer satisfaction is a key facet of the new organization.

Gilliland (1997) denotes that information technology has revolutionized the way
people do business, for information is no longer the domain of a select few executives but
is dispersed along multidirectional channels. For example, parts of the information that are
useful to an organization's success reside with essentially everyone who works there. Every
person or department sees a different part of the future and understands a different set of
interactions. In this environment, success requires the sharing of information held by
everyone and a culture that facilitates combining this knowledge.

Conclusions

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The majority of respondents from Institution A and Institution B were
females, that accounted for 50% are higher in the study. Whereas, males from both
institutions only accounted for 23-30% of respondents.

2. The majority of Institution A and Institution B university respondents
concerning years of services were within the 6-10 years bracket, and then the 0-5 years of service bracket. Although, those with 21-25 years of services had the least amount of respondents from both institutions.

3. Institution B respondents mean composite score for beliefs and attitudes toward factors to influence their performance, indicated they agreed more with satisfaction and productivity, and opportunities for training/development; whereas, Institution A University respondent indicated that they agreed more with optimal performance of departmental climate and opportunity for training/development.

4. A significant differences was establish on how non-faculty administrators differ in their perceptions regarding standards of reviews of their institutions, based on gender, from both institutions. In addition, to the t-test results suggesting that Institution B and male respondent tended to have a higher mean score on several attitudinal variables than Institution A and female respondents.

5. Both Institution B and Institution A respondents’ comments suggest a need for continual research to conducted in order to understand factors of non-faculty perceptions to influence their performance.

6. Perception is context-bound, which means it does not have a singular meaning for everyone and must be defined prior to its usage, although two of the four independent variables (gender and institution) tended to be a better predictor of factors of non-faculty perceptions that influence their performance.
Implications of the Study

The researcher conducting this investigation may have achieved a new direction in identifying and assessing knowledge about factors of non-faculty administrators perceptions. Although, this investigation has only provided a new approach to ascertaining and evaluating non-faculty administrators perceptions, it has nevertheless set forth some objectives and theoretical foundations which can be used for further studies in the area of human resources. Implications based on the findings are as follows:

1. Non-faculty administrator perceptions that influence their performance can be assessed and identified, which offers a different outlook for human resources programs. An assessment of their perceptions that influence their performance may be used as a basis to modify or develop new programs, (i.e. non-monetary rewards), address non-faculty administrator developmental needs, develop counseling programs, and/or aid other scholars who are concerned with understanding non-faculty administrator perceptions that influence their performance (Ginsberg, 1987; and Doyle 1994).

2. The study’s findings mirror that of other studies across the nation (Robertson, 1992; Seymour, 1989; and Thornburg, 1993) which report that increase in job satisfaction is linked with improved business results, better customer relations, improved labor-management relations, and enhanced self-confidence that are contributors to employee performance. Such findings suggests that non-faculty administrators need to receive clearly stated goals and articulated expectations from senior level management, so as to assist them in achieving success and incorporate concepts of cultural diversity that is needed for this challenging 21st century Schaefer, 1991).
3. Respondents in this study indicated that the help received from their supervisors and the amount of communication between non-tenured administrators and senior management are areas in need of improvement. This finding solidify that higher education entities need to develop a framework uniquely suited to their environment, where there is cooperation between all organizational stakeholders from top management down (Eccles, 1991).

4. Researcher Middlebrook (1996) identified five factors essential to improving job satisfaction and performance: (a) situation-how clear are the performance expectations and does the work environment support them; (b) performer-capability of employees in meeting performance expectations; (c) response-what is the observed performance and how does it compare with expectations; (d) consequences-how well do the consequences of meeting or not meeting expectations encourage the expected performance; and (e) feedback-how appropriate is feedback and how effectively is it used. Thus, eliminating the myth of the rah-rah motivational effort to improve performance.

5. Researchers Gardenswartz and Rowe (1998) suggest five reasons why diversity is critical to an organization’s success: (a) gaining access to a changing marketplace, (b) getting a healthy return on investing in the organization’s human capital, (c) recruiting and retaining the best talent, (d) expanding creativity, and (e) ensuring survival through resilience and flexibility. Hence, given the need for diversity training as evidenced by this study.
Recommendations for Further Research

It is hoped that this study will serve as a building block for more meaningful research to be conducted in the future. As a result of this investigation, it is the researcher’s opinion that several valuable and challenging subjects are worthy of further investigation. These are:

1. A study of this kind should be replicated with a stratified random sample of Non-faculty administrators in relation to selected demographic variables.

2. A study should be conducted to determine the extent to which non-faculty administrators are aware of current trends in the higher education, and how this trend affects their future marketability in the global job market.

3. A study should be undertaken to identify the relationship of attitudes regarding non-faculty administrators’ vocational choice and preference, and how it increase one’s occupational mobility in the global workforce.

4. A study should be undertaken to identify attitudes regarding perceptions of non-faculty administrators at similar institutions nationally.

5. A study should be develop to explore experience, education, training, credentials, aptitudes, and attitudes should an institutions seek to fill out their management positions.

Reflections

In conducting this study, the researcher has learned that higher education institutions need to broaden their understanding of the talent and experience of those non-faculty administrators that assume managerial roles. The very notion of an administrator in higher
education has traditionally has a pejorative cast; for administrators are those who oversee functional tasks or execute the designs of their superiors. Non-faculty administrators are also denoted as the grease in the wheels that help to fulfill the mission of the institution. Weaver’s (1996) concludes that one has to transcend departmental and divisional boundaries and “allow managers to monitor individual and team performance. In order to focus on correcting system deficiencies, not just individual deficiencies” (p. 94).

Just as new technologies, new markets, and new demands for service and accountability are reshaping American higher education; college and universities are clinging on to old mind-set of job descriptions and skill sets of the past. To avert this skill gap require changes in the cultures and ultimately in the practices of many higher education institutions and their non-administrators. Motivations and skills ideally of non-faculty administrators inside the academy do not differ from those in other professional settings.

Therefore, a key step in this transformation is to redefine the role of non-faculty administrators and the work they perform, for an environment that encourages managers to think critically by providing incentives and defining career paths that attract and retain talented people. Furthermore, the challenge of educating a population that has grown larger, more complex, more diverse, demands more greater flexibility and a willingness to move beyond traditional managerial functions, constantly moves the decisions making outside the institution. Thus, becomes increasingly difficult to sustain their perceived environment that allowed the institution to feel effective in its mission or exhibit a sense of pride in its own identify. For example, Barneby and Kelly (1997) highlighted the 1995 federal Glass Ceiling Commission reports by indicating that a “glass ceiling” blocking the career
progression of women and people of color does exist, due to exclusionary corporate practices that are perpetuated via stereotypes, primary by white male middle management.

As indicated in the literature review, men and women appear to perceive issues related to diversity differently. Thus, organizations and companies that place little to no value on diversity may soon find themselves unable to thrive in this challenging and changing 21st century, because they would not have maximized the full potential of its employees. Seeing how many colleges and universities have already targeted diversity as part of their schools mission, it is imperative that researchers and educators continue to identify and attend to factors of non-faculty administrators’ perception that influence their performance.

Finally, if America is to uphold the principle of the Declaration of Independence that states “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness”; there must be concerted efforts at all levels of society, but especially within institutions of higher learning to bring about equality to those who contribute to the running of the institution.
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Appendix B

Survey Instrument
Employee Survey
Managing and Supporting Customer Focus

This survey is designed to find out what support you need in order to address your employers' needs. There are no right or wrong answers. Your responses will be combined with the responses of others to create a group score. Express your true beliefs about your management/supervisor and your work environment.

_Do not write your name on this survey. Your responses will remain anonymous._

Directions: Step 1. Read the numbered statements.

Step 2. Rate your level of agreement with each statement by circling the number that corresponds to your response. Use a 0-to-10 scale, with 0 indicating that you strongly disagree and 10 indicating that you strongly agree. Do not skip any items. If you feel that a statement does not directly apply to you, use your judgment and respond in a way that best reflects the environment in which your work.

Step 3. Return the completed survey, in the envelope provided, within two weeks.

Strongly Disagree (0-3) Neutral (4-7) Strongly Agree (8-10)

1. My manager/supervisor communicates to me up-to-date information. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

2. My manager/supervisor personally spends time helping me develop my expertise. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

3. The university has a strategy that specifies how I will professionally develop. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

4. I am authorized to use my judgement in doing whatever it takes to achieve optimal performance. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

5. Externally the university is respected for its work in satisfying the student. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

6. Senior management regularly communicates face-to-face with me. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

7. My manager/supervisor treats me the same way he or she would like me to treat faculty. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

8. My manager/supervisor gives me the information necessary to satisfy my responsibility. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
9. I am rewarded and recognized primarily for my contributions.

10. My manager/supervisor clearly informs me of my job satisfaction.

11. I respond quickly to resolve complaints.

12. My manager/supervisor actively seeks my input on the best approaches.

13. My manager/supervisor selects individuals for key jobs based on their focus.

14. I know how my manager/supervisor feels about my contributions.

15. My expectations are limited by my supervisor/manager.

16. I am motivated to do whatever it takes to excel at my job.

17. My manager/supervisor provides me with time and support to develop and continuously improve my skills.

18. I take personal responsibility for ensuring that each person I interface with is satisfied.

19. My manager/supervisor sets work standards high.

20. My manager/supervisor wants my feedback.

21. The university's primary goal is to be the preferred university in the northeast region.

22. I have the expertise to satisfy the scope of my job.

23. I know what my manager/supervisor expects me to do and not to do to satisfy the job.

24. I know what I need to do to improve my job satisfaction.
Employee Survey
Managing and Supporting Customers Focus (Demographics)

Please respond to the following questions, for it will better assist the researcher in interpreting the data collected from the Employee Survey above. Please know that this information will remain anonymous.

Directions:

Step 1. Read the numbered statements.

Step 2. Please respond to each statement by circling the correct answer that best corresponds to your response.

(Demographic Questions)

1. **Institution affiliation**
   a. Seton Hall
   b. Fairleigh Dickinson

2. **Gender**
   a. Male
   b. Female

3. **Years of Services**
   a. 0-5 yrs.;
   b. 6-10 yrs.;
   c. 11-15 yrs.;
   d. 16-20 yrs.;
   e. 21-25 yrs.;
   f. 26-30 yrs.

4. **Race**
   a. African-American
   b. Caucasian
   c. Native-American
   d. Hispanic/Latino-American
   e. Asian-American
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Dear Mr. Butler:

Congratulations! This letter is to certify that you have passed the Fall 1998 doctoral comprehensive examination given on Friday, September 25, 1998.

Again congratulations, and best wishes for your continued success.
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Dear Mr. Butler:

The Institutional Review Board For Human Subject Research at Seton Hall University reviewed your proposal entitled "Factors Non-Faculty Administrators Perceive to Influence Their Performance: A Comparative Analysis of Two Universities." Your project has been approved as amended by the revisions submitted to the Chair of the IRB. Enclosed please find the signed Request for Approval form for your records.

The Institutional Review Board approval of the project is valid for a one-year period from the date of this letter. Any changes to the research protocol must again be reviewed and approved by the committee prior to implementation. Thank you for your cooperation. Best wishes for the success of your research.

Sincerely,

Robert C. Halissy, Ph.D.
Acting Chair
Institutional Review Board

cc: Joseph Stetar
Appendix E

Supplemental Tables
Table E1: Institution B and Institution A University Total respondents’ ranking of factors of non-faculty administrators’ perceptions to Influence Their Behaviors toward.

* If the Means are the same, the ranking is determined by the Standard Deviation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. I have the expertise to satisfy the scope of my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I respond quickly to resolve complaints.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I take personal responsibility for ensuring that each person I interface with is satisfied.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I know what I need to do to improve my job satisfaction.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My manager/supervisor sets work standard high.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I am motivated to do whatever it takes to excel at my job.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am authorized to use my judgement in doing whatever it takes to achieve optimal performance.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I know what my manager/supervisor expects me to do and not to satisfy the job.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My manager/supervisor wants my feedback.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My manager/supervisor gives me the information necessary to satisfy my responsibility.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I know how my manager/supervisor feels about my contributions.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The university’s primary goal is to be the preferred university in the northeast region.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My manager/supervisor treats me the same way he or she would like me to treat faculty.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My manager/supervisor communicates to me up-to-date information.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>My manager/supervisor selects individuals for key jobs based on their focus.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My manager/supervisor clearly informs me of my job satisfaction.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>My manager/supervisor actively seeks my input on the best approaches.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>My manager/supervisor provides me with time and support to develop and continuously improve my skills.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Externally the university is respected for its work in satisfying the student.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I am rewarded and recognized primarily for my contributions.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My manager/supervisor personally spends time helping me develop my expertise.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Senior management regularly communicates face-to-face with me.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>My expectations are limited by my supervisor/manager.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The university has a strategy that specifies how I will professionally develop.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key.**

8-10 = Strongly Agree  
4-7  = Neutral  
0-3  = Strongly Disagree
Table E2: Institution A University respondents’ ranking of factors of non-faculty administrators’ perceptions to influence their behaviors toward.

* If the means are the same, the ranking is determined by the standard deviation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. I have the expertise to satisfy the scope of my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I take personal responsibility for ensuring that each person I interface with is satisfied.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I respond quickly to resolve complaints.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I know what my manager/supervisor expects me to do and not to satisfy the job.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I am motivated to do whatever it takes to excel at my job.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I know what I need to do to improve my job satisfaction.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am authorized to use my judgement in doing whatever it takes to achieve optimal performance.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The university’s primary goal is to be the preferred university in the northeast region.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I know how my manager/supervisor feels about my contributions.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My manager/supervisor sets work standard high.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My manager/supervisor actively seeks my input on the best approaches.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My manager/supervisor wants my feedback.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My manager/supervisor selects individuals for key jobs based on their focus.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My manager/supervisor gives me the information necessary to satisfy my responsibility.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. My manager/supervisor communicates to me up-to-date information</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E2. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. My manager/supervisor provides me with time and</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support to develop and continuously improve my skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My manager/supervisor clearly informs me of my job satisfaction.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My manager/supervisor treats me the same way he or she would like</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me to treat faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am rewarded and recognized primarily for my contributions.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Senior management regularly communicates face-to-face with me.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My manager/supervisor personally spends time helping me developed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my expertise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Externally the university is respected for its work in satisfying</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the student.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My expectations are limited by my supervisor/manager.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The university has a strategy that specifies how I will professionally develop.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key.  
8-10 = Strongly Agree  
4-7 = Neutral  
0-3 = Strongly Disagree
Table E3: Institution B University respondents’ ranking of factors of non-faculty administrators’ perceptions to influence their behaviors toward.

* If the Means are the same, the ranking is determined by the Standard Deviation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. I have the expertise to satisfy the scope of my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I respond quickly to resolve complaints.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I take personal responsibility for ensuring that each person I interface with is satisfied.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I know what I need to do to improve my job satisfaction.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am authorized to use my judgement in doing whatever it takes to achieve optimal performance.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I know what my manager/supervisor expects me to do and not to satisfy the job.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I am motivated to do whatever it takes to excel at my job.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My manager/supervisor sets work standard high.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The university’s primary goal is to be the preferred university in the northeast region.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My manager/supervisor gives me the information necessary to satisfy my responsibility.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I know how my manager/supervisor feels about my contributions.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My manager/supervisor actively seeks my input on the best approaches.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. My manager/supervisor communicates to me up-to-date information.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My manager/supervisor selects individuals for key jobs based on their focus.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My manager/supervisor wants my feedback.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My manager/supervisor provides me with time and support to develop and continuously improve my skills.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am rewarded and recognized primarily for my contributions.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My manager/supervisor treats me the same way he/she would like me to treat faculty.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My manager/supervisor clearly informs me of my job satisfaction.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Externally, the university is respected for its work in satisfying the student.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My manager/supervisor personally spends time helping me develop my expertise.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Senior management regularly communicates face-to-face with me.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My expectations are limited by my supervisor/manager</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The university has a strategy that specifies how I will professionally develop.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

T-Test Results For Gender and Institutions
Table F1: T-Test Results for Gender of Institution A and Institution B University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>1.00 = Males</th>
<th>2.00 = Females</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tail)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard of Review</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>-2.298</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal Performance within</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>-1.812</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Departmental Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>-1.884</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for Training and</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>-.776</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>-.900</td>
<td>.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction and Productivity</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>-.987</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>-.992</td>
<td>.324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F2: T-Test Results for Institution A and Institution B University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard of Review</th>
<th>Institution B University = 1.00</th>
<th>Institution A University = 2.00</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tail)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal Performance within a Departmental Climate</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for Training and Development</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction and Productivity</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.103</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.086</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>