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ABSTRACT

In this dissertation, I analyze the 2013-14 Faculty Survey data from Higher Education Research Institute (HERI), to observe whether faculty at striving and non-striving institutions have varying levels of faculty satisfaction. In addition, some of the individual-level factors such as demographic characteristics, tenure-status, STEM/non-STEM department, and career related stress are analyzed to see how these variables influence faculty satisfaction. I use a combination of OLS regression and multiple regression to present evidence, which provides support to my argument that faculty at striving and non-striving institutions have different levels of faculty satisfaction. The findings from my study show that faculty at striving, specifically at Stepper institution (institutions with increased research agenda), feel the lowest level of workplace satisfaction, but the highest level of satisfaction with compensation. My study also demonstrates that workplace satisfaction and satisfaction with compensation do not necessarily move in the same direction. Given the growing number of institutions that are expanding their research agenda and utilizing other measures to increase their prestige, additional research on the effects of institution’s striving efforts and individual-level factors on faculty satisfaction should be conducted in the future.
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INTRODUCTION

The goal of this dissertation is to clarify the relationship between an institution’s desire to increase its prestige, and the effects of such decision on faculty satisfaction. At its fundamental level, this research looks at whether faculty are happy when their workplace conditions change. The factors that surround this central question are two-fold: one, is the institution’s decision to pursue different avenues in hopes of increasing its prestige; and two, is the individual-level factors that are both controllable and uncontrollable by individual faculty. Before delving into the theories and methodology used to develop this study, I will first provide a brief example of what it means for an institution to strive, through the example of the University of Texas at Arlington, to provide greater context for this study.

The Case of The University of Texas at Arlington

The University of Texas at Arlington (UT Arlington) is one of the eight campuses that are part of the University of Texas System (UT System). The institution was first established in 1895 as Arlington College, and in 1971 it became a member of the UT System and was renamed as the University of Texas at Arlington (Saxon, 1995). For a long time, the school was unofficially known as a “commuter school” (Star-Telegram, 2016), due to the large percentage of students who commuted, rather than living on campus. Although 95% of the students still live off-campus (U.S. News and World Reports, 2018), the institution has experienced a rigorous branding change under the current leadership of President Karbharri. This rebranding resulted in two outcomes: first, UT Arlington became the second largest school in the UT System, with over 58,000 total global enrollment for 2017-18 academic year (UT Arlington Fast Facts, 2018); and second, it was designated as an R-1 institution. R-1 is the past designation used by the Carnegie Classification, which is equivalent to the current R1: Doctoral Universities – Very high research activity (R1) (The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, n. d.).

UT Arlington was able to earn the coveted R1 distinction by increasing its research and development expenditures and conferring a higher number of doctoral degrees. In its pursuit to meet the R1 requirements, UT Arlington was also able to become one of the Tier-One universities in Texas. The criteria for becoming a Tier-One institution “include easily measurable metrics such as an endowment of at least $400 million, at least 200 PhDs conferred in each academic year of the preceding biennium, and at least $45 million in expenditures of restricted research funds in each fiscal year of the preceding biennium” (Hamilton, 2011, par. 5). As evident from these requirements, both Carnegie Classification and Tier-One university designation necessitate any institution that wants to achieve these distinctions to increase its research expenditures and the number of doctoral degree recipients. Both of these activities demand substantial involvement of faculty in terms of both research productivity as well as teaching and mentoring doctoral students. However, it is not clear whether the faculty were consulted during this striving process, and it is unlikely that UT Arlington would have conducted an institution-wide study to understand how the faculty feel about the rebranding efforts put forth by the institution’s top-leadership.

In addition to these changes, UT Arlington’s strategic plan also demonstrates the institution’s desire to continue the path of growing its research agenda. For example, UT
Arlington’s Strategic Plan 2020 states that it is “rapidly becoming the model for what a 21st-century urban research university should [be]” (UT Arlington Strategic Plan, n.d.) with its four themes of: health and human condition, sustainable urban communities, global environmental impact, and data-driven discovery. Furthermore, by boasting its recently opened $125 million Science & Engineering Innovation & Research (SEIR) building, UT Arlington is making a clear statement of its commitment to expand its research capacity (UTA Forward, 2018). As demonstrated by these factors, UT Arlington has experienced a number of changes due to its rebranding efforts and these changes have helped it to reclassify itself from R2: Doctoral Universities – High research activity (R2) to R1. Although these transformations are beneficial for the institution as they help to increase the institution’s prestige, we do not know how these changes are affecting the faculty of the institution. While there has been some research that examines the impact of institutional striving on the faculty within institutions, this has been done via individual case studies (Gonzales, 2012; 2013; 2014; 2015) and therefore it is not clear to what extent the findings there will apply to other institutions. To fill in this gap in the literature, my dissertation will utilize a large national data set from Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) to address the impact of institutional striving on faculty satisfaction.

**Problems of Practice**

As mentioned above, researchers such as Leslie Gonzales (2012; 2013; 2014; 2015) and Arturo Pacheco (2012), conducted individual case studies exploring faculty satisfaction at striving institutions. Although these studies may not have been generalizable, they did provide information on the relationship between striving institution and faculty satisfaction. For example, Gonzales (2014) stated that when an institution strives, its faculty may respond in different ways, including: operationalizing, negotiating, and resisting. Nonetheless, a large-scale study has not been conducted yet to understand how striving can influence faculty satisfaction in general. This is an important issue to consider as the higher education sector continues to evolve into the future.

Current literature states that with the development of technology (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004) and the growing relationship between universities and society (Berman, 2008), higher education institutions are incentivized to expand their research agenda. Simply put, universities and society are benefitting from each other monetarily and intellectually, which is strengthening their relationship with one another. However, even though institutions and society benefit from this connection, it is difficult to say whether individual stakeholders, such as the faculty, would benefit from this developing relationship. The single case studies mentioned above seem to demonstrate an unfavorable relationship between striving efforts and faculty satisfaction: for example, Gonzales (2013) documented the faculty’s concern over: “1) accessibility; 2) faculty roles and evaluation; and 3) university-community connections” (p. 41). These concerns expressed by the faculty call into question the extent to which these institutional changes would be beneficial to a core constituent within these institutions.

As the relationship between higher education institutions and society grows closer, more and more aspects of institutional operation will become tied to the changes in society (Webber, 2018). Furthermore, as corporations and government increase their reliance on institutional research and innovation, and the institutions rely more on their external support, closer financial
and resource alliance will be developed (Leslie et al., 2012). These tendencies could, in turn, encourage more colleges and universities to focus their attention and allocate their resources to strengthen these relationships with the external entities of the institutions. This may lead to a larger number of schools attempting to establish more research-focused goals as well as provide more doctoral programs to attract doctoral students.

However, not all institutions began as research-universities and the variety of institution types available in the United States has been necessary to provide different types of education setting to the various types of students that have been pursuing higher education in America (Harris, 2013). For example, some students choose to attend small liberal arts college for the additional attention they receive as undergraduates, in comparison to those who attend large research universities. If more schools choose to take the route of increasing their prestige through research, which schools would be available to meet the needs of these students who wish to attend small liberal arts colleges? The push to become more competitive among the thousands of institutions is making striving institutions to become more like one another (Meyer & Rowan, 1977) and decrease accessibility (Gonzales, 2013), which results in loss of uniqueness that made some of these striving institutions appeal to different groups of students.

Student are not the only ones that benefit from the various types of schools. This diversity provides flexibility for faculty to pursue positions at schools that have qualities, which align with their personal values. If faculty chose their institution for its teaching-focused qualities, will they still express the same level of satisfaction if the institution chooses to shift its mission and start to emphasize research? Although the merits that come with having a larger research agenda cannot be ignored, understanding how faculty feel about striving efforts is crucial, as more and more institutions strive to become more prestigious.

**Research Question and Design of Study**

This dissertation will focus on answering the following research question: does faculty satisfaction vary between striving and non-striving institutions, and how do individual level factors, such as demographic characteristics and career-related stress influence faculty satisfaction at these different types of institutions? To answer this question, the 2013 HERI Faculty Survey data was used. HERI is based in University of California Los Angeles and it collects data from large variety of institutions across the nation. For the 2013 HERI Faculty Survey, a total 16,112 full-time undergraduate teaching faculty members from 269 four-year colleges and universities participated in the survey (Eagan et al., 2014). Using this data, comparisons will be made between faculty at striving institutions, defined as those that increased their Carnegie Classification between 2010 and 2015, to those at non-striving institutions to determine the extent to which faculty satisfaction is affected by whether or not the faculty member is at a striving institution or not.

**Significance of the Study**

As stated earlier, the current literature lacks large-scale study that looks at the relationship between institution’s decision to strive and its level of faculty satisfaction. Therefore, this analysis will be a valuable addition to the field because it will shed light on comparative faculty
satisfaction at striving and non-striving institutions. This goal will be achieved by analyzing a large dataset collected by a reliable higher education research group, Higher Education Research Institute (HERI). This study will also add more information on how individual-level factors, such as race, gender, and stress, can affect faculty satisfaction at different types of institutions. These are significant additions to the literature because as more and more institutions strategically move toward increasing their prestige, top administrators will need to be aware of the possible repercussions, including the changes to their faculty satisfaction, to make the striving process smoother. Understanding how striving efforts, as well as other individual-level factors could impact faculty satisfaction, will aid the administrators to develop more effective strategies to maintain or increase faculty satisfaction, while reaching the institution’s goals.

This study could be particularly useful for administrators and those that are in mid- to top-level leadership positions, at institutions that are currently in the process of increasing their prestige through research, because it could help them to understand how their faculty feels about the changes their institutions are undergoing. Given that faculty will play a large role in some of these striving tactics, such as expanding research agenda and mentoring Ph.D. students, it will be crucial for the institution’s leadership team to have full support of their faculty, and the way to do so would be to keep the faculty satisfied. In addition to the usefulness provided to the individual institutions, the results of this study could provide valuable insights to various external entities, such as: system of institutions, such as the University of Texas System; higher education governing boards, such as the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB); and non-profit organizations such as the American Association of University Professors (AAUP).

Outline of Chapters

The following outline of chapters will be followed to answer the research question, which centers around comparative faculty satisfaction at different types of institutions, and the impact of individual-level factors on faculty satisfaction at these institutions. Chapter 2 will provide a summary of relevant literature to ground the current study. Specifically, in this chapter I define the concept of striving university, discuss the four theories—prestige economy, resource dependency, academic capitalism, and neo-institutionalism—that are used to situate and evaluate this issue, and summarize the current literature on faculty satisfaction at striving universities. After summarizing this literature, I then outline the other factors that should influence faculty satisfaction, according to the literature, such as demographic characteristics and work stress.

Then, chapter 3 will provide information on data and methods. Here, the data section will include reasons why HERI was chosen over other surveys that provide similar information, why the survey results for 2013 were used, and the variables chosen. I will also provide detailed information on how the data was prepared for statistical analysis, as well as how some of the composite variables were calculated by HERI. In the methods section of chapter 3, detailed explanation of the statistical analysis conducted for each research question of this dissertation will be given. Furthermore, I will explain my concerns regarding missing data, and provide my reasons for using OLS regression and multiple regression, while acknowledging the benefits as well as potential weakness for using these analysis methods.
Following the data and methods in chapter 3, findings of the conducted statistical analyses will be explained in chapter 4, as well as whether the hypotheses mentioned in chapter 2 were proven to be true or false. Here, the reference group used for the second research group will be comprised of white, female, STEM faculty who are not on tenure-track, at non-striving institutions. Several tables and graphs will be used to highlight the key aspects of the findings and also explanation will be added for any unexpected outcomes of the study.

Finally, in chapter 5, the findings of the study will be discussed and analyzed at length, conclusion of the study will be provided, and implications of the results and recommendations for future study will be included as well. A thorough policy implication will be written for different levels of management, and these will vary based on the institution type as well. Furthermore, recommendations for future study will include measures to be taken to avoid limitations of this study, as well as suggestions on the next step to further research the relationship between institutions’ striving efforts and faculty satisfaction.
LITERATURE REVIEW

This dissertation focuses on answering whether faculty satisfaction varies between different types of schools and how do individual-level factors, such as demographic factors and career-related stress, influence faculty satisfaction at these different types of institutions. Numerous factors influence faculty satisfaction, including individual as well as institutional level factors. To understand why these differences may exist in faculty satisfaction among the individuals at striving and non-striving institutions, it is crucial to first define some of the key terms and conceptual frameworks related to the subject at hand. This chapter will provide the context for the research question of this study by first giving the definition of striving institutions as defined by researchers in the field (e.g., Doran, 2015; O’Meara, 2007), which will be followed by the reasons why universities strive, based on: theories of prestige economy, resource dependency, academic capitalism, and neo-institutionalism. Then, I will continue by outlining different methods that schools utilize to strive, as evidenced by various institutions across the nation, and the effects of institutional striving efforts on faculty satisfaction and how this differs by faculty role and across institution. Lastly, I will conclude the chapter by introducing other factors that are likely to influence faculty satisfaction based on existing literature.

What is a Striving University?

Striving universities are institutions that are looking for ways to increase their prestige and ranking. With the growing number of higher education institutions reaching over 4,000 (colleges and universities) in the nation (NCES, 2012), each school must constantly search for different ways to sustain itself (Hazelkorn, 2007). Furthermore, as the number of schools increase, so does the competition between the institutions to become “the best” among them all (Campbell, Jimenez, & Arrozal, 2018) by increasing their prestige. Much of the literature suggests that prestige in American higher education is connected to institution’s research productivity, student selectivity, and resource procurement (Campbell, Jimenez, & Arrozal, 2018). Since prestige attracts the attention of not only the parents and prospective students, but also the government and other agencies in the nation (Hazelkorn, 2007), institutions are searching for methods to increase their prestige. These methods could vary from shifting the institution’s mission (O’Meara & Bloomsgarden, 2010), to working diligently through a decade long strategic plan to increase the institution’s standing among research universities (Gonzales, 2014). In the case of O’Meara and Bloomsgarden (2010)’s study, a single prestigious liberal arts college’s faculty were interviewed to gain their account of how their institution was striving by changing from teaching- and community engagement-focused institution to research-focused institution. Gonzales (2014) used a land-grant university that was ranked as one of the top 50 public research universities by U.S. News and World Report to assess faculty’s reaction to the following striving efforts: implementing more rigorous admissions criteria, hiring faculty from major research universities, and offering grant writing opportunities for its faculty.

Existence of ranking publications such as U.S. News and World Report, and classification systems such as Carnegie Classification, inherently means that various methods of measuring prestige can be used as guidelines for institutions to follow in their pursuit of prestige. Even though having multiple ways to measure prestige may result in dispute over the accuracy of different ranking systems, currently no other metric exists that clears identifies which institutions
are the winners of this prestige race. Given this condition, various types of institutions will strive toward the same goal of increasing their prestige, through different avenues that are feasible for them. As for institutions that are hoping to increase their Carnegie Classification, since this classification system expects certain amount of institutional funding to be spent on research, these schools try to develop strategic plans that expand their research production. The University of Texas at Arlington (UT Arlington) is an example that successfully reclassified itself into R1 in 2015 by increasing its student graduation rate and research productivity, which is a very dramatic transformation from the days when the institution was unofficially known as a commuter school (Star-Telegram, 2016). Although such strategic move was feasible for UT Arlington, not all institutions have the same level of resources to make similar choices.

Another example of how schools respond to ranking is illustrated in Sauder and Espeland’s (2009) case study of law schools. Although the Sauder and Espeland (2009) stated that ranking in educational environment is a relatively recent trend, they acknowledged the undeniably significant role ranking plays in the actual practices within the institutions. Past studies (Elsbach & Kramer, 1996; Espeland & Sauder, 2007) have demonstrated how rankings have influenced institutional activities, such as “how actors make decisions, do their jobs and think about their schools” (Sauder & Espeland, 2009, p. 64). By applying Foucault’s concept of discipline to rankings, Sauder and Espeland (2009) explained that not all institutions react the same way to rankings and why rankings have been so influential. Depending on their rank, schools react differently, ranging from ignoring the numbers to looking for ways to manipulate the ranking system; the part that is highlighted in this study is that many schools do not attempt to control the influence of the pressure that comes from ranking, nor do they try to buffer the impact of these numbers on institutional decisions. Rankings provide a sense of normalcy and stratification (Sauder & Espeland, 2009) which could both help and hurt the institutions.

One way the public may be influenced by the result of such competition among the schools for prestige, is through the various university rankings that are published periodically, such as: the U.S. News and World Report, Times Higher Education and Academic Ranking of World Universities. Although some individuals express their skepticism of the college ranking publication, such as the U.S. News and World Report, for its questionable methodology of rating institutions across the nation (Stauss, 2018), a number of studies, such as the one conducted by Reback and Alter (2014) have shown that these publications, such as the U.S. News and World Report and Times Higher Education are still widely used by the public when making their decisions on which school to invest their time and money in pursuit of higher education degree. This is because these ranking publications, which measure the institutions’ prestige, are the only metrics that are available for the public; the reason for this goes back to how other than prestige, no other measurement can identify the winner of this race among the institutions. Since these publications may influence some of the potential students and other stakeholders’ decisions to become members of different schools, institutions strive to increase their standing within these commonly referenced rankings (Marginson, 2006), as well as other more specialized ranking publications.

In addition to these more widely used ranking publications, another system that categorizes higher education institutions is called Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (Carnegie Classification), published by the Indiana University Center for
Postsecondary Research. Carnegie Classification differs from the other publications in that it focuses more on elements related to the institution’s output, such as the number of Ph.D. degrees awarded, and the level of research activity measured by values such as expenditures in science and engineering fields (Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research, n.d.). This feature of Carnegie Classification is important to note, given that the factors Carnegie Classification focuses on are also closely connected to faculty role of teaching and research. The Carnegie Classification system first started with its original single-classification system, which was developed in the early 1970s. Following several revisions, the current system of six “schemes” classification system was introduced in 2005 (Pulley, 2005). From the current system of six “schemes”¹ I will use the Basic scheme for this dissertation which classifies the institutions into the 11 categories of schools listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Institution in Carnegie Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• R1: Doctoral Universities – Very high research activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• R2: Doctoral Universities – High research activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ¹D/PU: Doctoral/Professional Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M1: Master's Colleges and Universities – Larger programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M2: Master's Colleges and Universities – Medium programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M3: Master's Colleges and Universities – Smaller programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate &amp; Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Baccalaureate and Associate’s Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Associate’s Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Special Focus Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tribal Colleges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purposes of my study, I will only be looking at the institutions that are categorized under Doctoral Universities (R1, R2, D/PU) and Master’s Colleges and Universities (M1, M2, M3). I chose these two categories of schools because I believe that faculty employed by these types of institutions are more likely to experience changes to their faculty satisfaction resulting from their institutions’ push to increase their Carnegie Classification. The reasoning behind institution’s desire to increase its Carnegie Classification is similar to that of other institutions striving to increase their standing within ranking publications such as the *U.S. News and World Report*. Increasing its standing within Carnegie Classification would help to increase the institution’s prestige, which could draw in more external support and attract students and faculty of a higher caliber. Similar to how institutions implement different methods to increase their standing within rankings such as *U.S. News and World Report*, this pursuit of increase in Carnegie Classification may be executed through various measures.

Regardless of the category, all the institutions in this study will be grouped into striver and non-striver, based on their Carnegie Classification. More specifically, striving institutions are defined as those that have successfully moved up into a higher Carnegie Classification between 2010 and 2015; whereas non-striving institutions are those whose Carnegie Classification have stayed the same, and those who have moved down in their Carnegie Classification. This means

---

¹Basic (the traditional Carnegie Classification framework), Undergraduate Instructional Program, Graduate Instructional Program, Enrollment Profile, Undergraduate Profile, and Size and Setting
that the category of non-strivers can include institutions that have: (1) simply maintained their status; (2) those who may have tried to increase its Carnegie Classification, but were unsuccessful; or (3) those institutions that were not actively striving to increase their Carnegie Classification.

The fact that non-strivers could be characterized by any one of these three descriptions presents a limitation of this work. For example, I will not be able to interpret whether faculty are at non-striving institutions are showing lower levels of satisfaction because there are more participants from unsuccessful strivers, or if higher levels of satisfaction are expressed because there are more participants from institutions that are not striving or are merely maintaining their status. Despite this limitation, the goal of my research is to provide exploratory findings on the subject of comparative faculty satisfaction at striving and non-striving institutions, and this is still feasible based on the design of this study. To further clarify the categories of striving and non-striving institutions, UT Arlington and UT San Antonio will be used as examples.

The University of Texas at Arlington (UT Arlington) is defined as a striver based on my definition within the context of this dissertation, because it was classified as R1 in 2015 and R2 in 2010; and the University of Texas at San Antonio (UT San Antonio) is a non-striver, as it recently began its strategic move toward R1 (Doran, 2015), but has not been able to move up from its R2 category, as of 2015. Given the current method of measuring institutional prestige, which emphasizes an institution’s scope of research production and degree conferrals, the institutions’ efforts to push themselves into a higher level of the Carnegie Classification seem reasonable, with Carnegie Classification using similar measures of research and number of degrees to assess the school’s classification category. However, as stated by numerous researchers, this institutional shift toward greater prestige comes with a price: decrease in support for teaching and service (O’Meara & Bloomgarden, 2011), loss of funding for instruction (Morphew & Baker, 2004), and high faculty turnover due to unmet expectations from the faculty’s perspective (Gardner, 2010; O’Meara, 2007). Although an actual study has not been conducted to see if UT Arlington or UT San Antonio experienced any of these negative changes due to their pursuit of prestige, it is important to note that these negative consequences may have occurred at these institutions. With striving efforts potentially including shifts in institutional mission, the school’s pursuit of higher Carnegie Classification could result in negative consequences mentioned in the preceding sentence; given this, one begs the question, what is prestige and how is it measured? Is increasing prestige through expanding research agenda or even shifting the institution’s mission worth the consequences? Although some may argue that making such drastic changes to increase the institution’s prestige seems risky, especially given some of the possible negative consequences, with the competition among the schools expanding not only within the nation, but also worldwide (Hazeldorn, 2011), institutions may feel that they have no choice, but to follow the trend and compete for the top spot against each other.

**Why do Universities Strive?**

As society has changed, so has the sector of higher education and the role of higher education institutions (Adelman, 1999; Slaughter, 2004; Williams, 1961). Changes within the field of higher education and its surrounding environment led institutions to engage in adaptations. For example, during the colonial era, many institutions were established to train
ministers (Thelin, 2011), which means the factors that we consider to be essential today, such as science and technology, were not of great importance. Then, with the enactment of the Morrill Act in 1862, land-grant universities were established to provide more practical education, such as research on agricultural practices, science, and engineering as the society soon moved into the industrial age (Thelin, 2011). Recently, due to the development of technology, research in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) fields as well as developing “skilled workforce in STEM” (p. 442) have received greater attention from the public (Hossain & Robinson, 2012). For instance, during 1945-1980, “much scientific and engineering research depended on Department of Defense funding for weapons of mass destruction” (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004, p. 29), leading to university-industry-government partnerships with military contractors such as General Electric and Westinghouse.

As evident from this brief overview of higher education history in America, higher education institutions have continuously adapted to the transforming society by providing knowledge needed by the public. As varying levels of value were attached to different fields of study throughout the years, institutions also had to prioritize their goals while maintaining their intrinsic characteristics, leading to different striving methods based on: the type of institutions, availability of resources, the school’s current status within the sector, and other constraints.

In addition to the aforementioned positive impact resulting from the growing relationship between institutions and their surrounding environment, the opening of the higher education system has not been all positive. For example, Webber (2018) stated that economic downturn can bring a detrimental impact on funding and financial stability of higher education institutions. For example, during the Great Recession in 2012, “average state and local funding per enrolled student dropped to…a recent low of $6,441 per student” (Webber, 2018, p. 52), showing that financial difficulties of the nation can greatly impact students’ abilities to afford higher education. When governmental funding decreases, institutions feel the need to reduce their expenditures through various means, such as academic production reduction (Gumport, 1993). As seen from this connection between society and sustainability of higher education institutions, trends in the surrounding environment of higher education institutions exert great influence over decision-making practices within institutions (Boyer, 1990). Keeping this relationship between colleges and society in mind, the next step is to delve further into understanding how decision-making practices in higher education institutions are carried out.

**Prestige Economy**

As mentioned above, prestige plays a significant role in how schools make certain decisions and strategic plans (Hazelkorn, 2007; Taylor & Braddock, 2007). This is an important concept to understand because it can help to explain why so many institutions strive to increase their prestige; higher prestige means greater resources (Grunig, 1997), which equates to more opportunities that will lead to even more prestige (Ehrenberg & Hurst, 1996). At its most fundamental level, prestige is a value that is culturally and contextually defined, meaning the values attached to certain entities may change with place and time (Vigneron & Johnson, 1999). However, another crucial point to consider with prestige is that “prestige begets more prestige” (Campbell, Jimenez, & Arrozal, 2018, p. 4), which encourages institutions to continue their
pursuit for higher prestige. So, how does the idea of prestige influence decision-making process in universities? This can be explained through the theory of prestige economy.

According to Rosinger et al. (2016), higher education institutions have two types of departments: high-resource departments, such as science and engineering, and low-resource departments, such as the humanities. Rosinger et al. (2016) refer to using the concept of organizational segmentation, where departments, such as engineering, that generate greater research revenue are favored over their counterparts in low-resource departments such as history. Rosinger et al. (2016) attributed this trend to the prestige economy where profit-making activities are more highly appreciated than the activities that are merit-focused or to use the words of Burton Weisbrod and his coauthors revenue goods are valued over mission goods (Weisbrod et al. 2008). Rosinger et al. (2016) argued that due to the impact of prestige economy on higher education institutions, there seems to be a divide between what they label and high-resource and low-resource studies. Faculty in high-resource studies are treated as experts and can rely on outside funding, such as research grants, to strengthen their position within their institutions; whereas, faculty in low-resource studies must rely more heavily on internal funding allocated to them based on tenure, and teaching hours, as well as internal grants (Rosinger et al., 2016).

Since an institution’s financial viability is connected to the activities of the government and the society, having additional avenues to obtain resources, outside of what the institutions can provide from its own revenue, is important. This means that departments which are part of the high-resource fields may gain greater support from within and outside of the institution and this may be why these departments are considered to be more important. Other researchers also show how prestige economy plays a role in higher education sector, by outlining a steady increase in financial support of research and development (R&D) expenditures for academic research from early 1980s to early 2000s (Greenberg, 2001; Leslie et al., 1999; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2005). These studies suggest that greater prestige leads to greater funding for higher education institutions, which is consistent with Campbell, Jimenez, and Arrozal’s (2018) argument that prestige brings more prestige.

**Resource Dependency**

As evident from above, financial stability of an institution is necessary for the functional operation of an institution (Gumport, 1993), and this financial condition is influenced by governmental policies as well as the nation’s economic conditions (Webber, 2018). This relationship can be further explained by Pfeffer and Salancik’s (1978) notion of resource dependency theory, which posits that the way an organization behaves is largely influenced by the external stakeholders that provide the necessary resources the organization uses. In the case of higher education institution, the external stakeholders, such as governmental organizations and corporations, determine the magnitude and recipient of their support, based on the institution’s prestige. Due to this practice, institutions feel the need to strive for greater prestige, to ensure continuous support from external members of their environment.

Having numerous external entities that could potentially provide resources may be seen as a positive circumstance. Furthermore, as Cohn et al.’s (1989) stated, higher education institutions can be viewed as multi-product firms, which could give the institutions even more
flexibility in finding external resource (Cohn, et al., 1989). However, such conditions could present more challenges, since having multiple stakeholders with potentially differing priorities could mean that, “there is a growing possibility of conflict between aims of revenue providers and university allocation of resources” (Leslie et al., 2012, p. 616). For example, based on their study, Ehrenberg et al. (2007) concluded that it is possible for instructional resource allocation to decrease in general when compared to its counterpart for research. Such changes in resource allocation of an institution may be welcomed by those who value research productivity over instructional activities; however, for stakeholders who prioritize instructional duties over research projects, they may be dissatisfied with this shift in the allocation of resources. When universities produce multiple products, such as degrees and research outputs in forms of publications and patents, they come to rely on more external inputs. The National Science Foundation (NSF) is an example of external funding source invested in academic R&D whereas federal and state government are external resources that support degrees/human capital (Leslie et al., 2012). Since many of these external entities, such as government agencies, are supporting universities with hopes of benefiting from the instructional activities and academic innovations provided by the institutions (Neuman, 2009), all universities whether they are striving or non-striving, feel the pressure to meet the expectations of their internal and external stakeholders (Sauder & Espeland, 2009).

Tolbert (1985) also used the resource dependency theory to posit that higher education organizations will have strong incentives to do what is in their power to “ensure a stable flow of resources from external sources of support” (p.1). Such efforts to procure continuous sources of external resources can be challenging given how closely the higher education sector is intertwined with its surrounding environment; a variety of uncontrollable changes, such as decrease in state appropriations and increased focus on research related to defense mechanisms due to a war (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004), could influence the sector of higher education significantly at any given time. These important changes in the surrounding environment of the institutions, may force the members of institutions to feel the need to adjust to these changes. Such adjustments may include shifting the focus of the institution from teaching to research, in hopes of gaining financial support from companies or acquiring more government funding. These changes represent how academia’s pursuit for more resources lead to institutions seeking ideas and developments that would bring them closer to industry. For instance, Peterson (2007) stated that the “industry acts as an intermediary” (p. 167) connecting institutions to the larger society. The growing relationship between the academia and the industry could also be attributed to the pervasiveness of academic capitalism.

**Academic Capitalism**

What is academic capitalism? Münch (2016) defined academic capitalism as “a unique hybrid that unites the scientific search for truth and the economic maximization of profits” (p. 1). Slaughter (2004) stated that academic capitalism “focuses on networks…that link institutions as well as faculty, administrators, academic professionals and students to the new economy” (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004, p. 15). Slaughter (2004) also suggested that in today’s information society, knowledge is considered as a form of raw material that can be owned legally and traded as marketable goods or services, and that universities are the sites where such raw materials can be produced. Due to the changes in society resulting from the increased focus on information, as
well as the shift from a focus on theology to science-based disciplines within the higher education sector (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004), academic capitalism has received more attention in recent years.

As society’s values changed, so did institutional prioritization of disciplines, to meet the changes in society, which would lead to development of stronger relationship between institutions and their external entities, resulting in greater support for schools. To cultivate a smoother relationship between institutions and industry, between 1997-2002, nearly half of the states amended conflict of interest laws to promote institution-led research in their regions (Schmidt, 2002). With the steady increase in interest for university-led research, institutions that embrace the views of academic capitalism (Slaughter et al., 2004) by lending greater support for STEM fields started to receive greater merits in the forms of financial support and prestige (Münk, 2016). Such trends are shown in other studies as well. First, Berman (2012) stated, that due to the growing political concern over the potential impact the innovation has on the nation’s economy, the practice of investing in university-led research, which was not considered to be the norm, became more widely accepted. Berman’s (2012) argument can be supported by Colyvas’ (2007) study which emphasized how the practice of technology transfer became common, because of the growing popularity of academic capitalism and its ideals. Although concerns of using corporate funding for academic research cannot be ignored, given that current society rewards progress in knowledge by “recognition in the forms of attention, reception, citations…and awards” (Münk, 2016, p. 3), institutions feel the need to continue their pursuit of developing knowledge that could be transformed into forms of academic capitalism.

Institutions are not alone in their prioritization of research efforts; as stated by the College Board (2010) and Yamaner (2009), the federal government had spent nearly the equal amount on Pell grant and academic R&D in 2008. Despite this growing support for academic research, with the amount of overall governmental funding decreasing in the recent years (Webber, 2018), institutions are experiencing greater need to set themselves apart from their peers, by increasing their prestige, to procure the limited government funding. However, due to changes in society and in the field of higher education, the goals and the definition of prestige have changed continuously throughout the years.

The changes in society and their effects on the field of higher education can be evidenced by Slaughter (2004), who stated that “in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, universities integrated with the industrial economy” (p. 14) largely due to the enactment of Morrill Act of 1862. Following the industrialization period, the new economy needed universities to educate future workers that can operate businesses and consumers that are adept at using technology; this led to changing goals of universities, which included offering higher number of business classes to meet the needs of the changing society (Adelman, 1999). It is safe to assume that during this period, institutions that provided reputable business programs would have been at the top for prestige. As technology developed further and corporations grew bigger, a stronger relationship between universities and corporations grew, with universities beginning to “serve as test beds for new products, offering a milieu impossible to duplicate in a laboratory” (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004, p. 19). In other words, corporations began to benefit from testing its products and consuming knowledge from universities, exemplifying academic capitalism, while institutions
were able to benefit by being provided with financial support as well as other necessary resources.

Although the universities and corporations have developed symbiotic relationships, they still remained distinct figures (Slaughter, 2004). Corporations focused on their goals to be innovative and successful in their respective businesses, while institutions continued to endeavor to educate future generations and increase their research productivity (Brint & Carr, 2017). However, as institutions evolved, some common features started to appear among numerous schools. As mentioned earlier, the level of external monetary support is dependent upon the school’s prestige and ranking (Marginson, 2006), and as a result, institutions are striving to improve their status. Since these ranking systems reflect the values of society, and there are set guidelines used by these systems, soon it became unavoidable for institutions to resemble one another as they pursued their goals to become more prestigious. For example, even the institutions that may have been established with their unique qualities, such as a liberal arts college that focused on community service, may start to expand their research agenda to reflect the priorities of the society in their operational plans. These liberal arts school as well as other striving institutions are increasing their research productivity, in hopes of producing prominent research outcomes or providing “test bed” to corporations, in exchange for external funding. This means that institutions are now in competition with each other for two different goals: one, for prestige and two, for external funding. However, these two goals are currently connected because both prestige and external funding are tied to research productivity, particularly in STEM fields, due to the current needs of the society. To be deemed legitimate and to increase their status, more schools will start to emulate the characteristics held by their more prestigious peers; such trend will lead to more and more institutions becoming similar to one another, and researchers identify such progression as a form of neo-institutionalism.

**Neo-institutionalism**

Given that institutions are all fighting for the limited spots on the top within the same sector, as Meyer and Rowan (1977) stated, “organizations are driven to incorporate the practices and procedures defined by prevailing rationalized concepts of organizational work and institutionalized in society” (p. 340). This is similar to the notion that prestige is a culturally and contextually formed value (Vigneron & Johnson, 1999). Meyer and Rowan (1977) also postulated that institutions strive to embody the prestigious qualities of their peers to ensure their legitimacy and chances of continuing their existence. Like Meyer and Rowan (1977), DiMaggio and Powell (1983) argued that organizations, including higher education institutions are becoming more similar to one another, through bureaucratization rather than in hope of achieving greater level of efficiency. All these studies show that pursuit of prestige is connected to legitimacy, as well as survival and success of an institutions.

Expanding on the notion of legitimacy as it pertains to prestige and neo-institutionalism, Harris (2013) stated that institutions need to “operate within the guidelines and accepted notions” (p. 46) to be deemed as legitimate. Within these guidelines, three types of isomorphic processes exist: coercive, mimetic, and normative (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Based on the type of isomorphic process the institution is experiencing, their method of striving may differ. For example, those that are undergoing mimetic isomorphism may be attempting to emulate the
leading institution within their organizational field, by taking actions such as improving campus facilities (Harris, 2013). Another example of isomorphic process is normative isomorphism, where the values of best practices spread within the organization field, causing institutions to become more like one another (Harris, 2013). For example, some institutions, such as the ones that are pushing themselves to move from R2 (Doctoral Universities – High research activity) to R1 (Doctoral Universities – Very high research activity) may focus on strengthening their research agenda. Others may make more drastic changes, such as the ones who are in Master’s Colleges and Universities category in Carnegie Classification that strive to be part of the Doctoral Universities classification. Both mimetic and normative isomorphism are demonstrated when institutions strive to increase their standing in various ranking and classification systems.

Another study that further explains the relationship between neo-institutionalism and prestige-seeking behaviors is Gonzales and Núnez’s (2014) research, which stated that neo-institutionalism helps us to understand the ways in which institutions strive to acquire cultural resource, such as prestige. Gonzales and Núnez (2014) argued that institutions are becoming more similar to one another, in their pursuit for prestige, as the criteria for prestige becomes set more universally within the field of higher education. Such behavior is illustrated in the case of striving institutions that follow the criteria, such as the metric used by the Carnegie Classification, as their guideline for universally set definition of prestige. Since Carnegie Classification is accepted as a form of measuring prestige within the field of higher education, schools such as UT Arlington and UT San Antonio have pushed themselves to meet the criteria for the more prominent category within the Carnegie Classification. Even though neo-institutionalism does not always provide greater efficiency, Taylor and Cantwell (2015) stressed that institutions cannot help but to measure themselves against others, because they are all given similar opportunities as well as constraints to perpetuate their existence within the same field.

Another reason why universities are perpetually trapped in this competition is because universities spend as much as they can raise, hoping to see their expenditures return in maximization of excellence, prestige and quality (Bowen, 1980), which lead to institutions not knowing whether they have achieved their goals or not. Given this context, institutions need to find a model to strive toward and this position is usually filled by their more prestigious peers. This logic is evident in Taylor and Cantwell’s (2015) study in which the researchers stated that, “the environment in which similar organizations are embedded is described as the institutional field … and universities reflect the dominant norms and practices in their fields” (p. 412). In addition, one reason why institutions all strive to become similar to their prestigious competitors can be further explained by Toma’s (2012) argument that, “prestige is to higher education what profit is to corporations” (p. 118). Following this logic, neo-institutionalism, which argues that institutions are becoming more similar to one another, can help to explain how having a set definition of what prestige is, allows institutions to have a specific goal to achieve. This means that ranking systems can be used within sectors, in this case the field of higher education, because it provides a sense of organization and hierarchy through the notions of legitimacy and prestige (Gonzales & Núnez, 2014). In sum, given that institutions are becoming more similar to each other (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Taylor & Cantwell, 2015), and with specific goals to achieve in pursuit of prestige, one wonders; how do they strive?
Summary of Theories

All four theories mentioned above, prestige economy, academic capitalism, resource dependency, and neo-institutionalism all work together to provide the context for the research question that pertains to this study. Prestige economy explains how the value system formed within the realms of economics can be modified to apply to higher education’s valuation of its products (Rosinger et al., 2016), thereby helping higher education institutions maximize outcomes from their operation. However, this theory alone is not enough to explain how the external environment influences the institution’s decision-making related to prioritization of certain departments (high-resource departments) over others. This is because prestige economy explains the divide between high-resource and low-resource departments, but it does not provide enough information on the reasons behind this discrepancy.

This gap is filled by academic capitalism. Since knowledge is considered to be a form of valuable good (Slaughter, 2004), the more knowledge an institution has, the more valuable that school would be in the eyes of the public. In addition, current society emphasizes the importance of discovering more knowledge related to STEM fields. Given these reasons, it is understandable to observe more and more schools investing their resources in STEM research. With the principles of prestige economy and academic capitalism setting the context of how the external environment impacts the higher education sector in general, resource dependency is necessary to further explain the nature of the connections and interdependence of universities and their surrounding environment through the influential roles played by the external resource providers.

Although resource dependency helps to explain the close connection between institutions and the various external entities, it falls short in explaining how striving efforts impact each institution’s decision-making process. This limitation is supplanted by neo-institutionalism. When institutions rely more heavily on external resources, the competition among schools to be designated as the most prestigious school will be heightened. This is because the limited amount of funding will be allocated to the more prestigious institutions (Marginson, 2006). Within such context, institutions will mimic the qualities of their more prestigious peers, which will lead to many schools starting to resemble each other. This process of becoming more prestigious by becoming more like their esteemed peers is a form of striving effort; and when implementing such process, institution’s strategic plan and decision-making process will be impacted. When institution’s strategic plans and operational plans change, the work environment of faculty will change, which would affect faculty satisfaction. Even though the four theories listed above help to explain why the institutions strive, these theories do not address the individual-level factors that affect faculty satisfaction. This is why the following section will provide the relevant context for the individual-level factors, by analyzing the different roles that faculty play; how these roles differ based on institution types; and how they evolve as the external conditions change.

How does Striving Affect Faculty Satisfaction?

Regardless of the striving method implemented by the institution, an important aspect to consider is how the act of striving affects faculty, which is the topic of my study. The faculty plays a crucial role in a university via their responsibilities in teaching, research and service, as well as generating revenue from those activities (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). With the
multitude of responsibilities held by the faculty in institution’s pursuit of prestige, there are a number of responses to how the faculty may feel about their institution’s striving efforts. Some researchers, such as Hagedorn (2000) stated that if institutions maintain student selectivity during their pursuit of prestige, faculty will benefit from working with more talented students, meaning faculty satisfaction would increase. However, others such as O’Meara and Braskamp (2005) argued that faculty at 4-year institutions would feel added pressure to excel in multiple roles, which would lead to lower faculty satisfaction.

Diverse Roles of Faculty

In order to understand how an institution’s striving efforts, affect faculty satisfaction, the first step is to clarify the roles that faculty take on in general. Although faculty roles may vary depending on the type of institution, “faculty work has long been viewed as encompassing the academic triad of research, teaching, and service” (Rosser & Tabata, 2010, p. 449), which results in three distinct categories of responsibilities and workplace pressures to evaluate. Others (e.g., Boyer, 1990; Cummings, 1998; Macfarlane, 2011) support this notion of a triad of responsibilities by conceptualizing faculty work as “a blend of research, teaching, and service to the department, institution, discipline, and/or larger communities” (Rawn & Fox, 2018, p. 592). The following paragraph will clarify these three roles held by faculty across the institutions.

Historically, early European universities focused on teaching, and research initiatives were added afterwards, with Germany being one of leaders in incorporating research goals into higher education institutions (Gehrke & Kezar, 2015; Scott, 2006). Although teaching activities do not necessarily lead to tenure at certain types of institutions (Boice, 2000), given that this is an important part of faculty work, a number of studies have been developed to measure the effectiveness of teaching and to assess the value added to the universities as a result of the faculty’s work. Research is another important aspect of faculty work. Since pursuing research is a crucial part of promotion and tenure at 4-year colleges (Aguirre, 2000), many faculty members hold research to be more valuable than teaching (Fox, 1992); some faculty at research universities even express their wishes to allocate their teaching hours to research (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). The final category of faculty duty that rarely receives any accolade, represents all activities that fall under the umbrella of service, which includes activities that demonstrate faculty’s commitment to the academy (Kennedy, 1997), including unpaid committee work. Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) also supported this train of thought by describing service as the “catchall name for everything that is neither teaching, research, nor scholarship” (p. 222). Of the three domains of faculty role, service is the least researched (Neumann & Terosky, 2007), and given that there is no single definition of faculty service (Neumann & Terosky, 2007; Ward, 2003), it is challenging to analyze the impact of service-related matters on faculty satisfaction. Due to the inherent limitation of inconsistent faculty service valuation method, my study will focus on faculty work balance between teaching and research only, and if or how this is influenced by institution’s striving efforts and how all this affects faculty satisfaction at large, in striving and non-striving institutions.
Varying Faculty Roles at Different Institution Types

As mentioned previously, faculty roles may vary based on the type of institutions the faculty members work for. This is an important factor to acknowledge for my study because my research question is aimed at answering if faculty satisfaction differs between striver and non-striver. Faculty roles could vary based on the type of institution because the expectation that institutions have on its faculty vary; for example, faculty working at a small liberal arts college may be expected to allocate more of their time to teaching rather than research, which would be the opposite of what is expected of faculty at one of the top research universities in the country. Varying expectations due to the institution type could impact individual-level factors, such as career related stress, which could ultimately impact faculty satisfaction.

Leslie et al. (2012) also clarified, faculty at different institution types could be expected to have varying roles. The authors (2012) stated, “public higher education receives greater state subvention than private, and therefore is expected to spend more on instruction” (p. 617); whereas, “research universities produce at least two separate products, degrees and research” (p. 618) because their revenue does not depend as heavily on government funding. This means that faculty at research universities will be expected to spend more time in growing their research agenda, while faculty at private liberal arts schools will be required to focus on teaching students. Furthermore, as postulated by Ehrenberg et al. (2007), research universities are more likely to direct their efforts toward making research achievements because these institutions believe that such achievement would increase their prestige, through: the outcomes of higher ranking in U.S News & World Reports, increased classification within Carnegie Classification, and membership to Association of American Universities (AAU). These circumstances have an impact on faculty work, because institution’s priorities will be reflected on its promotion and tenure guideline (affecting faculty’s day-to-day activities), as well as its strategic mission (influencing the institution as a whole) (O’Meara, 2002). Some faculty may even show inclination to place a higher value on research because of the competitive nature of academic environment where faculty’s success is measured by their work, and their reputation based on their research, which could promote their career beyond their own institutions (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995). Furthermore, with evidence suggesting that a negative relationship may exist between teaching load and research productivity at research universities (Porter & Umbach, 2001), faculty may be compelled to either find a balance or choose one activity over the other between teaching and research.

However, some claim that faculty choose to allocate their time based on personal preferences (Fairweather, 2002; Teichler et al., 2013). One distinguishing factor to keep in mind is that faculty’s allocation of time varies greatly depending on discipline, country, and institution (Bentley & Kyvik, 2012), which could complicate the process of understanding the impact of numerous variables on faculty satisfaction. Regardless of individual preference, Terpstra and Honoree’s (2009) study showed that in the United States, 52% of faculty at larger schools, which are schools with greater than 10,000 students enrolled, perceived research as the primary way to obtain reward, which could mean that many faculty members may pursue research, because they are compelled to do so. This variation in faculty role is particularly important when analyzing faculty satisfaction at the institutions that have moved from Master’s Colleges and Universities
to Doctoral Universities, as these institutions may have exhibited some fundamental shift in their mission, consequently experiencing changes in faculty role and decrease in faculty satisfaction.

As the above three paragraphs suggested, employment at different institutional types could lead to varying levels of expectations that faculty must meet and these varying levels of expectations could influence faculty’s workplace satisfaction. To be specific, *I predict faculty at striving institutions to have lower level of workplace satisfaction than the faculty at non-striving institutions (Hypothesis 1)*. However, satisfaction with workplace is not the only way to measure faculty satisfaction; satisfaction with salary is also another way to measure faculty satisfaction.

Salary in general is a significant variable to consider because, “Salary levels can influence whether individuals decide to work in academe as faculty members, and if so, at which institutions” (Rippner & Toutkoushian, 2015, p.105). However, a notable factor of faculty salary is that sometimes, it may not be directly proportional to the amount of hours/work that each faculty member dedicates to the different aspects of their responsibilities. According to Melguizo and Strober (2007), “faculty members are financially rewarded for enhancing the prestige of their institutions” (p. 662). This is an important point to highlight for the purposes of this research, because striving universities are more likely to focus on the activities that both increase their prestige and increase their likelihood of moving into higher Carnegie Classification category. Meaning that faculty who spend more time on activities that help them develop their teaching skill may not receive salary that is a fair representation of the time they spent because teaching does not bring the kind of recognition nor prestige that the institutions are seeking for these days (Blackburn & Lawrence 1995).

In addition to making contributions that help to promote the institution’s priorities, numerous other factors, such as location, private vs. public, department and faculty rank, are considered when determining faculty salary (Rippner & Toutkoushian, 2015). Since there are so many factors that could influence compensation for faculty’s work, it seems more appropriate to observe the perception of salary rather than the actual numerical value of each faculty. With this in mind, *satisfaction with compensation will be used as another measure to assess faculty satisfaction, where different variables, such as gender, race and tenure status will influence its levels in various ways. In addition, similar to satisfaction with workplace, I predict faculty at striving institutions to have lower levels of satisfaction with their compensation (Hypothesis 2)*.

**Changing Nature of Faculty Work**

Striving efforts are not the only factors that influence the nature of faculty work. As the development of technological advancements led to more researchers questioning the faculty role of teaching, some began to emphasize how teaching is becoming more specialized (Coaldrake, 2000). For instance, the prevalence of online and distance learning has increased the demand for faculty to acquire the necessary skills that would enable them to teach in traditional classroom, as well as online or a hybrid class (Regan & Youn, 2008). In addition to technological advancements, growing concerns for institutional accountability (Coates, 2014) and increasing trend of professionalization of teaching around the world (Coaldrake, 2000; Finkelstein, 2003) has been pressuring faculty to “develop deeper understanding of the nature of student learning,
learning technologies, best practices in course design and evidence-based practices in teaching” (Rawn & Fox, 2018, p. 593).

In addition, more and more researchers are expressing concerns over the expanding trend of hiring contingent faculty (Teichler et al., 2013). Here, the term contingent faculty refers to faculty who are hired for non-tenure-track teaching positions, and they may be referred to as adjuncts or part-time faculty. Heavier reliance on contingent faculty could bring dangers of exploitation; exploitation could be in the forms of low status and lack of benefits (Kezar & Gehrke, 2014), low pay and little to no job security (Kezar & Maxey, 2014). All these factors inadvertently impact faculty role in teaching, and the resulting faculty satisfaction. Despite these changes and added complexities, Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) stated that teaching rarely brings national recognition, despite the praise faculty receives from their institution. In comparison, research and publishing result in greater value attributed to and appreciation shown to the faculty, far more than teaching, especially at doctoral/research universities and many of the 4-year institutions (Rice, 1986). In addition to the growing demands of their teaching responsibilities, many of the faculty members at prestige-seeking institutions are starting to feel the pressure to increase their research productivity.

Single institution case studies on the effects of institution’s pursuit of prestige have shown that faculty roles and expectations do change when institutions strive. One way to draw a connection between institutional characteristics of a striver and the satisfaction of its faculty is through Acker’s (1990) gendered organizations framework, as Gardner (2013) had done in her study of 11 female faculty at a land-grant university. After categorizing different organizational culture as “masculine and feminine values, ideas, and meanings” (Alvesson & Billing, 2009, p. 5), Gardner (2013) argued that the quest for status in the academic hierarchy is a tactic that inherently favors those with masculine qualities, which in turn leads to lower satisfaction of female faculty, as evidenced by the experience of the 11 individuals who participated in Gardner’s (2013) study. This analysis is supported by other studies, such as the one conducted by Wolf-Wendel and Ward (2005) where they stated that the environment at striving institutions are often more manageable for male faculty, due to the greater expectation for research production, which leads to difficulties in maintaining the balance between work and family life for female faculty (O’Meara & Bloomsarden, 2011). Such harsh environments that women faculty experience at striving institutions could exacerbate the problems of the nationally low female faculty retention rate (Ehrenberg, Kasper & Rees, 1991) and underrepresentation of female faculty in STEM fields (National Science Foundation, 2006). Nonetheless, with the current condition of limited resources and uncertain future, more and more universities will continue to strive toward increasing their prestige through numerous avenues, including demanding more of their faculty. Such increased pressure undoubtedly creates more stress for faculty, which also affects their satisfaction. Barnes, Agago, and Coombs (1998) focused their research on the effects of job-related stress on faculty’s decision to leave academia, highlighting some of the key aspects that lead to greater stress, lower satisfaction and ultimately the decision to leave the field. Based on these results, I expect female STEM faculty at striving institutions to feel greater stress and lower satisfaction.

As evidenced by the studies mentioned above and more (Dubrow, Moseley, & Dustin, 2006; Finnegan & Gamson 1996; Ryan, Healy & Sullivan, 2012; Vardi, 2008), the topic of
faculty satisfaction has garnered much interest through the years. However, my interest focused on the subject of faculty members working at striving universities, which lacks the significant empirical data that is readily available for other studies related to faculty satisfaction. For example, studies have shown that increasing the institution’s prestige could benefit its faculty with higher salaries and more resources for research (Fairweather, 1993; Sweitzer & Volkwein, 2005). However, others such as Wolf-Wendel and Ward (2005) and O’Meara and Braskamp (2005) focused on the harmful effects of institution’s pursuit of prestige. Given this, my study will add to this body of literature, by providing a larger scope of explanation for how institutional plans influence faculty roles and their job satisfaction.

Fortunately, the subject of faculty at striving institutions has been explored by Leslie Gonzales (2012; 2013; 2014; 2015) and through her joint research with Rincones (Gonzales & Rincones, 2011). First, Gonzales (2014) applied the definition of striving university as delineated by O’Meara (2007), where “striving represents a greater multidimensional shift in university behavior than academic mission creep” (p. 196). Using this definition, Gonzales continued by stating that when faced with an institutional environment that is different from what they had originally envisioned themselves to be part of, the faculty of striving institutions consider multiple factors, before deciding how to respond; these factors are accessibility, faculty roles and evaluation, university community connection (2013). After assessing these factors, the faculty who are part of the striving institutions react to changes within their schools by negotiating, critiquing, or resisting (Gonzales, 2015). These studies provide a glimpse into how faculty’s personal priority between research and teaching could influence their satisfaction and the decisions they make in response to their institution’s striving efforts.

Before I make my next hypothesis, it is important to note that my definition of striving is similar, yet different from the definition used Gonzales (2012; 2013; 2014; 2015). For the context of my study, the term “striving” refers specifically to successful striving institutions that were able to move from either a Master’s Colleges and Universities category in Carnegie Classification system to Doctoral Universities category; or institutions that have moved up to a different subcategory within the Doctoral Universities category of Carnegie Classification system. This an important distinction because it adds more specificity to the population I am working with for this study. With this distinction in mind, based on the findings of Gonzales’ (2012; 2013; 2014; 2015) body of work, as well as the current literature (Gonzales & Núñez, 2014; Gonzales & Pacheco, 2012, Gonzales & Rincones, 2016; Gonzales & Terosky, 2016; O’Meara, 2007), I hypothesize that: faculty satisfaction at striving institutions will be lower than faculty satisfaction at non-striving institutions. When evaluating this relationship, it is crucial to understand and control for the other factors that are likely, according to the literature, to influence faculty satisfaction. The next section outlines these factors.

Other Factors Influencing Faculty Satisfaction

Numerous studies have pointed to the following variables as factors that influence faculty satisfaction: race, gender, as well as personal and professional accomplishments (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Hagedorn, 2000; Kessler et al., 2004; Sabharwal & Corley, 2009; Xu, 2008). These factors are important to consider when looking at effects of various individual-level factors as well as the type of institution on faculty satisfaction. These varying levels of
expectations from institutions could influence workplace stress, which could in turn impact faculty satisfaction. Furthermore, it is crucial to understand the significance of these variabilities, in order to control for them as I endeavor to clarify my understanding of how working at a striving or non-striving institution could influence faculty satisfaction. All of the factors included below are included in the models to test the expectations I outline below.

**Individual Identifiers.** As Webber and Rogers (2018) mentioned in their study, when measuring work satisfaction, gender and race are closely intertwined; given this, these two variables will be part of the individual identifier category of variables that will be included in this study. In addition, tenure status and whether the faculty is part of STEM field or not, will also be included. Gender is an important factor to consider when looking at faculty satisfaction, given that recent studies (Denson, Szelenyi & Bresonis, 2018; Seifer & Umbach 2008; Webber & Rogers, 2018) demonstrate how being a female and a minority could negatively impact faculty satisfaction. Furthermore, faculty’s tenure status is a significant factor because as higher education sector changes, there are multiple roles that faculty are expected to play (Rawn & Fox, 2018); and among these roles, many “indicators suggest that teaching is seen as a lower-status task than research, which puts faculty who teach the most at greatest risk of feeling undervalued” (Rawn & Fox, 2018, p. 598). In addition, Rawn and Fox (2018) stated that, “people reported a sense of teaching-focused-faculty [TFF] being considered a second class of faculty, behind those who are primarily research focused” (p. 599). Such perception may be perpetuated if the institution’s promotion and tenure guidelines value research productivity more than teaching activities; and if such viewpoint becomes more prevalent, it could influence faculty satisfaction as well. Lastly, grouping faculty into STEM and non-STEM is important, given Rosinger et al. (2016) stated, that as prestige economy continues to influence higher education sector, such trend may motivate “decision-makers to disfavor low-cost, tuition-producing units (non-STEM) relative to high-cost, research-producing units (STEM)” (p. 48). The following will explain my predictions for how different variables would affect faculty satisfaction.

First, even though teaching is one of the core duties of a faculty, the duties connected to teaching are allocated disproportionately to female and ethnic minorities (Rosser & Tabata, 2010). For instance, female faculty spend more hours preparing for courses and advising students (Park, 1996); and ethnic minority faculty are more likely to be responsible for advising ethnic minority students in addition to other students, while having a heavier teaching load (Turner, 2002). In addition to teaching and advising responsibilities, research is another considerable duty of faculty. Given such emphasis placed on research, it is important to see what role race and gender plays within research productivity as well. For example, Park (1996) argued that female faculty in their pursuit for research recognition may experience more challenges partly because of the additional responsibilities, related to teaching and service, placed on them. Furthermore, studies show that ethnic minority faculty often need to make sacrifices in balancing their personal and professional life (Turner, 2002) and that they spend more hours on research and writing because personally they believe research is crucial to their success within the academia (Antonio, 2002). With these factors, I expect the following relationships to be present in my analysis:

1. **Hypothesis 3:** Ethnic minority faculty will exhibit higher level of satisfaction with workplace due to the value they personally place on research.
2. **Hypothesis 4**: Ethnic minority faculty will demonstrate lower level of satisfaction with their compensation.

3. **Hypothesis 5**: Female faculty will show lower levels of satisfaction than that of their male counterparts in both satisfaction with workplace and satisfaction with their compensation.

As for the relationship between tenure status and faculty satisfaction, given the significant influence tenure status has on faculty satisfaction (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011), especially at four-year institutions, I expect the faculty who are on tenure track, but not tenured would feel the lowest level of faculty satisfaction with workplace and with compensation (Hypothesis 6). Such prediction is made based on how Terpstra and Honoree’s (2009) study showed that the majority of faculty in the United States believe research as their primary means to secure tenure and other kinds of rewards. As is the case with most individuals who are on tenure-track, the faculty who are under the impression that research productivity is the determining factor for their tenure status will feel the added pressure to increase their research output; such stress may lead to decreased levels of job satisfaction for many individuals.

As for STEM or non-STEM variable, since different set of responsibilities are placed on STEM and non-STEM faculty (Rosinger et al., 2016), their satisfaction would vary depending on the support and reward they receive based on their performance. If a school is largely influenced by the values of prestige economy, the institution is more likely to provide greater support and reward for faculty in STEM departments. Given this, the faculty in STEM field may exhibit higher levels of faculty satisfaction with workplace and with compensation (Hypothesis 7). However, opposite result may be possible for workplace satisfaction, if the additional support comes with severe competition among STEM faculty, leading to more stress.

**Stress.** Similar to the group of variables under the category of satisfaction, HERI also accounts for various sources of stress that faculty may feel both within and outside of their institution, as those factors relate to their job. Sometimes the impact of these stress factors could lead to not only decrease in satisfaction but may ultimately lead to the faculty’s decision to leave the academia (Barnes, Agago, and Coombs, 1998). Stress is a significant yet complex variable to work with because it is a function of all the previously mentioned factors of faculty satisfaction. For example, as illustrated by Eagan and Garvey’s (2016) study, subtle discrimination experienced by minority could negatively impact faculty’s research productivity, which would lead to greater stress and ultimately result in decreased satisfaction. Such negative relationship may be more prevalent at striving institutions as they focus on increasing their research agenda. In addition, as explained by Berebitsky and Ellis (2018) both personal characteristics (race, gender, native language) and professional characteristics (rank, time at institution, teaching load) could greatly influence faculty stress, and this stress will have an impact on faculty satisfaction. Consequently, I expect that faculty with higher score for career related stress composite score to show lower faculty satisfaction with workplace and with compensation (Hypothesis 8). I expect career related stress to have greater impact on satisfaction with workplace (Hypothesis 9).

**Conclusion**

As outlined in this chapter, the current literature provides information on what a striving institution is, why they strive, how striving is related to satisfaction and the other factors that are
likely to influence faculty satisfaction. The theories of prestige economy, academic capitalism, resource dependency, and neo-institutionalism combined can explain the institutional level aspect of strivers and fills in the missing gap of each theory. As for the faculty satisfaction at striving institution, Gonzales (2012; 2013; 2014; 2015) as well as Gonzales and Núñez (2014), Gonzales and Pacheco (2012), Gonzales and Rincones (2016), and Gonzales and Terosky (2016) have provided single case studies demonstrating some of the changes that have occurred to faculty satisfaction at striving institutions. However, the current literature is limited in providing an overarching perspective of what happens to faculty satisfaction when institutions strive and how various individual-level factors could also be influenced by the institution’s desire to survive, thereby having an impact on faculty satisfaction. This analysis will add to the body of literature on faculty satisfaction by shedding light on whether faculty satisfaction varies across striving and non-striving institutions, and also by clarifying what kind of impact the individual level factors have on faculty satisfaction.
DATA AND METHODS

As mentioned in the literature review, the subject of faculty satisfaction at striving institutions has been explored only through a handful of single case studies (Gonzales, 2013a; 2013b; 2014, 2015). Thus, to gain a better understanding of the relationship between faculty satisfaction and prestige-seeking behaviors of various institutions, analyzing a large set of quantitative data is necessary. Analyzing a large dataset will be beneficial because the results from single case studies have low generalizability (Singleton & Straights, 2010). Furthermore, the American higher education sector is unique in that it has 16 accrediting agencies (6 regional and 10 national) with some of the regional accrediting agencies having been established over 100 years ago (Kristoffersen, 2012); these accrediting agencies have different criteria for institutions to follow, and these criteria could influence how institutions instigate certain changes.

Although there are multiple data collection methods, such as survey, field observation, and case study, the data collection method chosen for this study is using a pre-existing secondary dataset. Using a pre-existing dataset is not only time-efficient, but it also provides an opportunity to leverage and learn from how other researchers have used the same dataset to explain some of the relevant issues in higher education. Furthermore, as stated by Singleton and Straights (2010), using secondary data allow for the data to potentially come “from professional polling and research centers with the resources to obtain high-quality information for a large, national samples” (p. 270), which increases the external validity of the data.

Data

For the purposes of this study, I chose to use the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Faculty Survey. HERI is based at the University of California Los Angeles and oversees the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) (HERI, 2018). From 1989, over 1,100 higher education institutions (two- and four-year) have participated in the HERI Faculty Survey, through which the participating institutions have been provided with “a comprehensive, research-based picture of key aspects of the faculty experience” (“HERI Faculty Survey”, n.d.). Although the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE), which is operated by Harvard Graduate School of Education (“COACHE”, n.d.), also provides information related to faculty satisfaction, I chose to use this data because the HERI Faculty Survey includes the types of questions that would help to answer my research question. For example, my research question focuses on whether differences exist between faculty satisfaction at striving and non-striving institutions; with HERI, I had three different variables I could choose from and I chose to use two: Workplace Satisfaction (SATIS_WORKPLACE), and Satisfaction with Compensation (SATIS_COMPENSATION). I chose Workplace Satisfaction and Satisfaction with Compensation as my two dependent variables, and this gave me the opportunity to further analyze if differences existed between these two variables with the same group of participants.

Sample

The 2013-2014 wave of the HERI Faculty Survey was chosen because it represents the timeframe I am interested in for this study. I am interested in this timeframe because this is between the 2010 and 2015 Carnegie Classification publication, which is the metric I am using to
define which institutions are strivers and which are non-strivers.

Over 16,000 full-time undergraduate teaching faculty members at 269 four-year higher education institutions participated in the 2013-2014 HERI Faculty Survey, and the “data for full-time faculty were [are] weighted to provide a normative national profile” (Eagan et al., 2014, p. 2). To this HERI data, information from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Dataset (IPEDS) were incorporated to identify the Carnegie Classification of the institutions. From this data, only the Doctoral Universities and the Master’s Colleges and Universities were selected for this study. Only these institutions were selected for this study because based on the current literature mentioned in chapter 2, the faculty at these institutions are more likely to experience the striving efforts of institutions whether they are at striving or non-striving institutions.

These institutions were then further divided into three categories: Strivers with heightened research goals (Stepper), Strivers with mission drift (Jumper), and Non-Strivers. These groups were constructed based on each institution’s Carnegie Classification in 2010 and 2015. The institutions that successfully changed their Carnegie Classification from one category in 2010 to a higher category in 2015, are labeled as strivers. This move may have been from a Master’s Colleges and Universities to Doctoral Universities, or between the subcategories within Doctoral Universities, such as Doctoral/Professional University to R2: Doctoral University – high research activity. Per this definition, there are 69 strivers in total and this study will analyze the 19 strivers that participated in the 2013-14 HERI Faculty Survey. Non-strivers refer to institutions that meet any of the following characteristics: (1) the institutions remained in the same Carnegie Classification for 2010 and 2015; (2) the institutions dropped from a higher to a lower Carnegie Classification between 2010 and 2015; and (3) institutions that have moved from Baccalaureate/Associates Colleges in 2010 to Master’s Colleges and Universities in 2015.

Strivers

As mentioned above, institutions can fall under the strivers group for two reasons; one is because their Carnegie Classification moved up from one category (e.g., master’s colleges and universities to doctoral universities) to another (Jumper), and the other reason is because their Carnegie Classification had moved up from one subcategory to another (Stepper) (e.g., R2 to R1). The strivers are divided into these two groups because the faculty at these two types of striving institutions could demonstrate different levels of satisfaction due to various factors that distinctly influence each group. For instance, faculty at a Stepper may be expected to transition from a teaching-focused role to a more research-focused role as the institution moves toward doctoral university from master’s college or university.

Another way to distinguish the faculty at Jumpers from Steppers is by looking at what type of faculty are at each institution. To clarify, due to the professionalization of faculty role, there are now two types of faculty groups: cosmopolitan faculty and local faculty (Birnbaum, 1988; Riesman, 1956). Birnbaum (1988) argued that cosmopolitan faculty gain satisfaction from being acknowledged for their success by external groups, rather than by their department or

---

2 These institutions are not considered to be strivers because ultimately I am analyzing faculty who work at doctoral universities as they will be expected to increase their research productivity and work with Ph.D. students.
institution. In short, cosmopolitan faculty may be more agreeable to the shifts with the institutional mission, as long as these changes lead to greater external accolade for their work.

This distinction between the two faculty groups is important to note because other studies (Neave, 1979; Whitburn et al., 1976) showed that “tension exists between the expectations of faculty and the mission of their institutions” (Morphew, 2000, p. 60), since faculty are expected to be good teachers while meeting the institution’s growing expectation for research productivity (Henderson & Kane, 1991; Weathersby, 1983). This kind of tension may exist between local faculty and institutions that have moved up into a new category of Carnegie Classification, given Birnbaum’s (1988) argument of how local faculty differ from cosmopolitan faculty. For these reasons, strivers will be divided into two groups as explained in the paragraphs below.

Stepper: There are 9 institutions in this category. The schools in this category are ones that have remained within the Carnegie Classification of Doctoral Universities from 2010 to 2015 but have moved to another category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American University</th>
<th>Northeastern University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark Atlanta University</td>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University</td>
<td>University of North Carolina at Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carolina University</td>
<td>University of Northern Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jumper: There are 10 institutions in this category. The schools in this category are the ones that have switched their Carnegie Classifications from Master’s Colleges and Universities in 2010 to Doctoral Universities in 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>California State University – Fresno</th>
<th>Robert Morris University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California State University – Fullerton</td>
<td>San Francisco State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>Suffolk University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner-Webb University</td>
<td>Texas State University San Marcos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair State University</td>
<td>Villanova University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Strivers

There are 175 schools which are considered non-strivers. For the purposes of this study, the term non-striver refers to the institutions (Carnegie Classification = Master’s Colleges and Universities and Doctoral Universities) that have remained in the same Carnegie Classification from 2010 and 2015. There are three different types of institutions in the non-strivers group: (1) institutions that are satisfied with their classification, so they are focused on maintaining their classification rather than increasing it; (2) others that are in the process of reclassifying themselves, but have to date been unsuccessful in obtaining a re-classification; and (3) institutions whose Carnegie Classification had decreased between 2010 and 2015. Dividing each group, Master’s Colleges and Universities and Doctoral Universities, further into categories of M1, M2, M3 for Master’s Colleges and Universities, and R1, R2, D/PU for Doctoral Universities was considered, but it would have created too small of a population for each group. Furthermore,

---

3 This number decreased to 9 because one institution was dropped for having only one recorded response.
in order to maintain the anonymity of the data, the non-strivers were not further divided into more specific categories such as R1, R2, D/PU etc.

Following the division of the data into the faculty that reside at institutions in three categories, the sample population was further specified to focus only on the full-time faculty, whose priorities are teaching or research. This was executed by removing faculty that were designated as part-time, administrators, or those faculty that indicated within the survey that their primary activity as service or other. I chose to concentrate on full-time faculty that are focused on teaching or research only because I believe they are the individuals that will be impacted the most when institutions strive to increase their prestige. This belief is based on the responsibilities that fall on full-time faculty to balance teaching and research at many of the striving institutions. Furthermore, to analyze if tenure-status influences faculty satisfaction at striving institutions, contingent faculty and administrators who would not be on tenure-track were eliminated from the data.

Another reason why survey results from part-time faculty and administrators were eliminated was because the responsibilities as well as the compensation packages for part-time faculty differ significantly from those of a full-time faculty. For example, Tuckman and Caldwell (1979) stated that although in financial difficulties part-time faculty are more likely to be hired than full-time faculty, they are less likely to be hired once their salaries increase, alluding to the tendency of institutions to hire part-time faculty as a cost-saving measures only. Furthermore, since the market demands have such significant impact on the availability of part-time positions:

The question of which fringe benefits should be extended to part-timers, whether they should be allowed to teach the more advanced courses, what types of increments should be granted in recognition of publication or other scholarly activity, and what types of contracts should be extended. (Tuckman & Caldwell, 1979, p. 747)

have been raised continuously throughout the years. Given so many variabilities, incorporating survey results from part-time faculty at diverse institutions, all with their own set of contingent faculty policies, may not only create unnecessary outliers, but may also detract from the focus of the study.

As for administrators and the individuals that chose their primary activity as service or others on the survey, their daily activities, responsibilities at institutions, as well as the elements of their compensation, and the promotion and tenure procedure would vary significantly from each other, and from faculty (Klaff & Ehrenberg, 2003). Such inconsistencies can be attributed to how the changes in the higher education sector have diversified the missions of colleges and universities more than ever before, with the bulk of the responsibilities of engaging and promoting their contribution to society resting on the shoulders of non-teaching members of the institution (Baltaru & Nuhoglu Soysal, 2018; Ramirez & Tiplic 2014). With so many discrepancies to the roles and responsibilities of administrators and other non-teaching members of the institution, the answers from these groups would result in more diversions, rather than any substantial finding. For these reasons, the sample excluded data from contingent faculty, administrator, and individuals with service or other priorities.
Units of Analysis and Variables

My study focuses on analyzing institutional level variable of striving efforts at the individual level of faculty satisfaction. First, I looked at faculty satisfaction among Jumpers, Steppers and Non-Strivers at the institutional level, then I observed how individual factors influenced satisfaction at these different institutions.

Dependent Variables

The HERI faculty survey includes 20 variables measuring Satisfaction (SATIS01-SATIS20). HERI also provided two composite variables, which are SATIS_WORKPLACE (Workplace Satisfaction) and SATIS_COMPENSATION (Satisfaction with Compensation), based on those 20 items. Given the explanation in HERI’s Undergraduate teaching faculty: The 2013–2014 HERI Faculty Survey Monograph (Eagan et al., 2014) of how these composites were calculated, I chose these two variables as dependent variables. These composite scores were calculated by using Item Response Theory, which computes the score by “deriving a maximum likelihood score estimate based on the pattern of responses to the entire set of survey items for that construct” (Eagan et al., 2014, p. 163), and these values were “scored on a Z-score metric and rescaled for a mean of approximately 50 and standard deviation of 10” (Eagan et al., 2014, p. 163). Eagan et al.’s (2014) description of the two satisfaction composites (variables included and estimated weight per variable) is illustrated in the tables below, with the full text of the survey items included in Appendix B.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HERI Composite SATIS_WORKPLACE Variable and Weight by Eagan et al. (2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction: Workplace</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE EXTENT TO WHICH FACULTY ARE SATISFIED WITH THEIR WORKING ENVIRONMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER FACULTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCY OF COLLEAGUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTONOMY AND INDEPENDENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENTAL LEADERSHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURSE ASSIGNMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HERI Composite SATIS_COMPENSATION Variable and Weight by Eagan et al. (2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction: Compensation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE EXTENT TO WHICH FACULTY ARE SATISFIED WITH THEIR COMPENSATION PACKAGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPPORTUNITY FOR SCHOLARLY PURSUITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIREMENT BENEFITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING LOAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB SECURITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROSPECTS FOR CAREER ADVANCEMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Independent Variables**

HERI Faculty Survey provides a unique set of independent variables related to faculty satisfaction and they can be divided into the following 2 groups: individual identifiers and stress.

**Individual Identifiers.** Prior to conducting statistical analyses, some of the variables had to be recoded. Starting with the race variable, all the individuals that chose minority as their ethnic background were recoded as minority. Since participants are able to choose more than one answer, any faculty that categorized themselves as only White/Caucasian, were recoded as 1 (White); and everyone else, including the participants who chose a combination of White/Caucasian and a minority racial background, are categorized as minority and were recoded as 2. The gender variable was also recoded as female = 1 and male = 0. In addition, the STEM variable, which identifies whether faculty is part of STEM or non-STEM field, was recoded as STEM = 1 and non-STEM = 0.

The last variable left in this group, tenure status, required additional process to be used for analysis. With tenure status, four answer options were possible: tenured; on tenure track, but not tenured; not on tenure track, but institution has tenure system; institution has no tenure system. Since this study focused on full-time faculty at institutions with tenure system, the option of *institution has no tenure system*, was eliminated and the rest of the answer options were recoded using dummy variables: (1) tenured; (2) on tenure track, but not tenured and; (3) not on tenure track, but institution has tenure system. Of the three variables, ‘not on tenure track’ is categorized as the reference group.

**Stress.** According to Barnes, Agago and Coombs (1998), the two most important factors that could predict faculty’s decision to leave academia are, “sense of frustration due to time commitments and a lack of sense of community at one’s institution” (p. 466). With HERI providing nearly 20 variables measuring various factors of stress, ranging from work related matters to personal issues, rather than looking at these variables individually, I chose to use the composite variable of STRESS (Career Related Stress). I chose the STRESS variable because its value is represented numerically on a scale, rather than in ordinal values (1=not applicable, 2=not at all, 3=somewhat, 4=extensive). Furthermore, as the table below demonstrates, the composite value calculated by HERI incorporates a number of sources of stress that span over individual as well as institutional level factors; this makes the composite variable STRESS appropriate for this study. This composite variable was also calculated in the same way as the two dependent variables mentioned above, SATIS_WORKPLACE and SATIS_COMPENSATION, following Item Response Theory, and the full text of the survey items for this composite is also included in Appendix B.
Table 3
HERI Composite STRESS Variable and Weight by Eagan et al. (2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Related Stress</th>
<th>Weight Estimation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LACK OF PERSONAL TIME</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING LOAD</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMITTEE WORK</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL PROCEDURES/RED TAPE</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEAGUES</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH OR PUBLISHING DEMANDS</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-IMPOSED HIGH EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methods

To complete this study, I performed two different statistical analyses: OLS regression to compare satisfaction among Jumpers, Steppers and Non-Strivers; and a multiple regression analysis to analyze the individual-level factors related to faculty satisfaction. To clarify, the first part of the research question focused on whether faculty satisfaction varied across striving and non-striving institutions; and the second part of the research question focused on how individual-level factors such as individual identifier variables and career-related stress influence faculty satisfaction. Prior to performing these analyses, the data was prepared to exclude survey results from participants who did not meet the following requirements: full-time; teaching or research faculty, only; has been tenured, or is on tenure-track but not yet tenured, or not on tenure track. While preparing the data for the statistical analyses, one of the institutions that was part of the Jumper (strivers with mission drift) category was removed because the institution only had one recorded participant.

Research Question Part 1

The first research question for this study is: Do faculty at striving universities have different level of faculty satisfaction than faculty at non-striving universities? To answer this question, I used OLS regression to compare to look at the coefficients and p-values (significance) for Jumpers, Steppers and Non-Strivers. Since HERI provided the dataset with Striver variable, where strivers were coded as 2 and the rest were left blank, I first recoded strivers into Jumper (striver with mission drift) and Stepper (striver with heightened research activity). After performing the OLS regression on SATIS_WORKPLACE at 3 different types of institutions, I conducted the same analysis of 3 different types of institutions, by using the variable SATIS_COMPENSATION.

Research Question Part 2

The second part of the research question looks at how do individual-level factors such as individual identifiers and career-related stress influence faculty satisfaction across institutions such as Non-Strivers, Jumpers and Steppers? To answer this question, multiple regression was
used with SATIS_WORKPLACE as the dependent variable for the first regression model and SATIS_COMPENSATION as the dependent variable for the second regression model. The two groups of independent variables (Individual Identifiers and Stress) were used with the dependent variable in each regression model because the regression method gives the most detailed and meaningful answer to the second part of my research question. To be specific, multiple regression is used when making predictions and developing causal analysis (Allison, 1999); for the second research question of this dissertation, multiple regression was useful as there were multiple independent variables to each dependent variable (SATIS_WORKPLACE and SATIS_COMPENSATION), for each regression model.

As useful as regression was for my study, it is not perfect; as some researchers state, the ability to control for measured variables within regression analysis is not as effective as a randomized experiment (Allison, 1999). Despite this limitation, multiple regression is still the most appropriate statistical analysis for the second part of my research question, given the type of relationship I was hoping to answer with the variables included in this study. Another benefit of using multiple regression for the second part of the research question was that since regression “separates the effects of independent variables on the dependent variable” (Allison, 1999, p. 3), I was able to analyze the individual contribution made by each independent variable. Furthermore, regression function in SPSS provided me with R^2, which allowed me to see how good of a prediction can be made with the regression analysis. After these analyses were performed, the results of the two regression models were compared to see how these independent variables affect faculty satisfaction.
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The goal of this study was to answer the following research question: whether faculty satisfaction varies between different types of schools (Non-Striver, Jumper, and Stepper, as defined by the literature review in Chapter 2); and how individual level factors, such as individual identifying factors and career-related stress influence faculty satisfaction at these different types of institutions. To answer the research question on the varying levels of faculty satisfaction at striving and non-striving institutions, an OLS regression was used to compare the relative effects of being at a Jumper or Stepper institution (relative to Non-Strivers) on faculty satisfaction. This provided the coefficient value, standard error and the p-value of the regression analyses with SATIS_WORKPLACE as one dependent variable in one model, and SATIS_COMPENSATION as the other dependent variable in the second model. The coefficient value and the p-value were used to show whether the values in the regression analyses were statistically significant or not.

To address the second part of the research question, which focused on how individual-level factors such as race, gender, tenure status, STEM/non-STEM, as well as career related stress influenced faculty satisfaction, I conducted a multiple regression. In this regression analysis, I used female, white, STEM faculty at non-striving institutions that are not on tenure-track at their institutions, as the reference group. Two regression analyses were conducted and are presented here: one that uses workplace satisfaction as the outcome of interest; and the second that uses satisfaction with compensation as the outcome of interest. Before turning to these analyses, I will first provide some descriptive statistics to provide greater context for this data and the faculty that are being analyzed.

To be specific, below is the list of hypotheses, categorized under the relevant statistical analyses:

**OLS Regression with SATIS_WORKPLACE as dependent variable**
- Hypothesis 1: I predict faculty at striving institutions to have lower level of workplace satisfaction (SATIS_WORKPLACE) than the faculty at non-striving institutions
  - Hypothesis 1a: Faculty at Jumper institutions would demonstrate the lowest level of workplace satisfaction.
  - Hypothesis 1b: Faculty at Stepper institutions would demonstrate higher level of workplace satisfaction than faculty at Jumper institutions.

**OLS Regression with SATIS_COMPENSATION as dependent variable**
- Hypothesis 2: I predict faculty at striving institutions to have lower levels of satisfaction with their compensation.
  - Hypothesis 2a: Faculty at Jumper institutions would demonstrate the lowest level of satisfaction with their compensation.
  - Hypothesis 2b: Faculty at Stepper institutions would demonstrate higher level of satisfaction with their compensation than faculty at Jumper institutions.

---

4 Categorical variables were recoded as explained in Chapter 3 – Data and Methods
Multiple Regression with SATIS_WORKPLACE or SATIS_COMPENSATION as dependent variable

- Hypothesis 3: Ethnic minority faculty will exhibit higher level of satisfaction with workplace due to the value they personally place on research.
- Hypothesis 4: Ethnic minority faculty will demonstrate lower level of satisfaction with their compensation.
- Hypothesis 5: Female faculty will show lower levels of satisfaction than that of their male counterparts in both satisfaction with workplace and satisfaction with their compensation.
- Hypothesis 6: I expect the faculty who are on tenure track, but not tenured would feel the lowest level of faculty satisfaction with workplace and with compensation.
- Hypothesis 7: the faculty in STEM field may exhibit higher levels of faculty satisfaction with workplace and with compensation.
- Hypothesis 8: I expect that faculty with higher score for career related stress composite score to show lower faculty satisfaction with workplace and with compensation.
- Hypothesis 9: I expect career related stress to have greater impact on satisfaction with workplace.

Descriptive Statistics of Independent Variables

This section will provide descriptive information about each category of institution: Jumper, Stepper and Non-Striver. The information will be subdivided into groups of independent variables that were used in the statistical analyses for each research question. As evident from the tables below, Jumpers have the lowest number of participants (511), then Steppers (1,197), and Non-Strivers (12,857).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Descriptive Statistics of Jumpers, by Categorical Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure Status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Tenure-track but Not Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not on Tenure-track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEM or Non-STEM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Variable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As evident from Table 4, more male faculty than female faculty from Jumper institutions participated in the HERI 2013 Faculty Survey. More than half (57.1%) of the participants hold tenured positions and the largest race group represented by the participants is White/Caucasian at 65.9%. It is important to note that with the participants being able to choose more than one option for race variable, individuals who chose multiple minority race options or White and minority race option(s) are categorized under Minority. Also, given that 18.2% of participants, or 93 people, did not choose to share their racial background, it is possible that this percentage could be higher in reality. There are many more non-STEM participants (81.4%) than STEM participants (18.6%). As for the tenure status, 57.1% of the participants from Jumpers are tenured, and 18.8% of the participants are on tenure-track but have not been tenured yet. Although the 57.1% of participants in Jumpers translates to only 292 people, when comparing the percentage between striving and non-striving schools, Jumpers have the highest percentage of participants that are tenured, compared to 49% at Steppers and 42.2% at Non-Strivers.

As Table 5 shows, similar to the results from the Jumper institutions, there are more male participants from Stepper institutions than female participants, and the largest group of the racial background represented by the faculty participants is White/Caucasian. Stepper institutions demonstrate the largest percentage gap between the number of STEM (97.7%) and non-STEM (2.3%) faculty participants (95.4%), compared to the other two institution types (Jumper = 62.8% and Non-Striver = 73.2%). In addition, tenured participants also comprise the largest percentage of the group at 49%. When compared to the other two groups (Jumpers and Non-Strivers), Stepper groups had the largest percentage of faculty who are on tenure-track but have not been tenured yet, at 19.7%. In terms of race variable, what makes the Steppers group unique
is that unlike the Jumper and Non-striver group, the Stepper group does not have any faculty participant with Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Descriptive Statistics of Non-Strivers, by Categorical Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>12,857</td>
<td>5,423</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Tenure-track but Not Tenured</td>
<td>12,857</td>
<td>1,987</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not on Tenure-track</td>
<td>12,857</td>
<td>3,486</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Variable</td>
<td>12,857</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEM or Non-STEM</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>12,857</td>
<td>1,719</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-STEM</td>
<td>12,857</td>
<td>11,138</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12,857</td>
<td>6,801</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12,857</td>
<td>6,056</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>12,857</td>
<td>8,325</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>12,857</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Variable</td>
<td>12,857</td>
<td>2,987</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As evident from Table 6, the Non-Strivers group had the largest population at 12,857 participants. It had the lowest percentage of tenured faculty (42.2%) among the three institution types and the largest percentage of faculty not on the tenure-track (27.1%). 13.4% of participants from the Non-Strivers group are from one of the STEM departments. Similar to the other two groups (Jumpers and Steppers), the Non-Strivers group also had more male participants (52.9%) than female participants (47.1%). The largest race component was White/Caucasian at 67.1% and the lowest group is Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander at 0.2%.

Differences in Faculty Satisfaction at Striver and Non-Striver

Workplace Satisfaction

Table 7 below illustrates the descriptive statistics of workplace satisfaction for Jumpers, Steppers, and Non-Strivers.
Table 7: Descriptive Statistics for Workplace Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jumpers</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>49.24</td>
<td>9.0988</td>
<td>27.10</td>
<td>64.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steppers</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>48.21</td>
<td>8.9370</td>
<td>27.10</td>
<td>64.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Strivers</td>
<td>10,256</td>
<td>49.85</td>
<td>9.0758</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>64.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 illustrates the results of OLS regression on workplace satisfaction. Although Jumpers show -0.605 point lower level of workplace satisfaction compare to the Non-Striver, this coefficient is not considered to be statistically significant, because the p-value for Jumpers is 0.172, which is higher than 0.05. In comparison, Steppers’ coefficient of -1.641 means that faculty at Steppers exhibited 1.641 point lower level of workplace satisfaction than faculty at Non-Strivers and with p-value of 0.000, this regression model is statistically significant.

Table 8: OLS Regression Model for Workplace Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Types</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Significance (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jumper</td>
<td>-0.605</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepper</td>
<td>-1.641</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>49.849</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

In summary, the values indicate that faculty at Non-Striver institutions demonstrated higher levels of satisfaction in general. This supports hypotheses 1 (faculty at striving institutions will have lower level of workplace satisfaction (SATIS_WORKPLACE) than the faculty at non-striving institutions). However, the value of Jumper category was not considered to be statistically significant, and faculty at Stepper institutions showed the lowest mean value. Therefore, my hypothesis 1a, that faculty at Jumper institutions would demonstrate the lowest level of workplace satisfaction, was not supported.

Satisfaction with Compensation

Table 9 below illustrates the descriptive statistics of satisfaction with compensation for Jumpers, Steppers, and Non-Strivers.

5 List of hypotheses in Appendix A
Table 9: Descriptive Statistics for Satisfaction with Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jumpers</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>50.68</td>
<td>8.0028</td>
<td>32.27</td>
<td>72.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steppers</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>51.45</td>
<td>8.5427</td>
<td>21.39</td>
<td>72.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Strivers</td>
<td>10,261</td>
<td>49.37</td>
<td>9.1646</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td>72.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 below represents the results of OLS regression model for faculty satisfaction with compensation of Jumpers and Steppers groups to Non-Striver group. Table 10 indicates that faculty at Steppers have the highest satisfaction with compensation (coefficient = 2.074), and faculty at Jumpers comes next in their satisfaction with compensation (coefficient = 1.306). Both of these groups have p-value that is lower than 0.05 (Jumpers = 0.003 and Steppers = 0.000) meaning this regression model is representing a relationship that is statistically significant. These results prove my hypothesis 2 (I predict faculty at striving institutions to have lower levels of satisfaction with their compensation) to be unsupported.

Table 10: OLS Regression Model for Satisfaction with Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Types</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Significance (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jumper</td>
<td>1.306</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>0.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepper</td>
<td>2.074</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>49.374</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.004**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

In sum, Tables 8 and 10, indicate the following relationships. Between faculty satisfaction with workplace and institution types, Steppers showed the lowest level of satisfaction, then Jumpers, then Non-Strivers. Although the p-value of 0.172 for Jumpers indicated that this relationship between institution type and faculty satisfaction with workplace is not statistically significant, it is still helpful to see the relationship between school type and faculty satisfaction with workplace for Steppers and Non-Strivers. As for faculty satisfaction with compensation, Steppers showed the highest level of satisfaction (2.074), then Jumpers (1.306), then Non-Strivers. Given the p-values for Steppers (0.000) and Jumpers (0.003) are lower than 0.05, the relationship between institution type and faculty satisfaction with compensation was statistically significant. The subsequent paragraphs will provide results for the second research question.

Understanding What Influences Faculty Satisfaction

In order to understand those factors that influence faculty satisfaction, including which
type of institution faculty are at (i.e. Jumper, Stepper or Non-Striver), I estimated the two multiple regression models as described above. Each is shown below in Tables 11 and 12 and they are each discussed in turn.

**Workplace Satisfaction Regression Model**

The first model is shown in Table 11 below, it evaluated which factors influence faculty’s workplace satisfaction. I will discuss the variables in terms of the four groups in which they are organized: institution type, gender and race, tenure status and STEM, and career related stress. Faculty at both Jumper and Stepper had lower levels of satisfaction, relative to Non-Strivers, as evident from their coefficients of -0.688 for Jumper and -1.286 for Stepper. This means that on average, faculty members at Jumper institutions had a 0.688 points lower satisfaction level than those at Non-Strivers. In addition, faculty at Stepper institution have lower satisfaction with workplace by -1.286 points. These coefficient of -0.688 for Jumper and -1.286 for Stepper showed that my hypothesis (faculty at Jumper would be the least satisfied with their workplace) was unsupported. Although the p-value for Jumper is 0.106, meaning the regression is not statistically significant, the p-value for Stepper is 0.000 meaning the values for Stepper was still statistically significant.

As for gender, Table 11 indicated that male faculty satisfaction was 0.402 less than female faculty on average (p-value=0.014). As for the gender variable, my hypothesis was unsupported because the data demonstrated that female faculty were more satisfied than male faculty, which is the opposite of my prediction. Regarding race, Minority race expressed 1.030 points lower level of workplace satisfaction on average, compared to the White/Caucasian faculty. It is important to note that Minority includes all of the following: (1) participants who chose one of the minority options for their racial background; (2) participants who chose a combination of minority options; (3) participants who chose a combination of White and minority option for their racial background. Such decision was made because of the small size of population for some of the minority race option; and because of the independence issue created by participants being able to choose multiple race options.

As for tenure status, faculty that are on tenure-track but have not been tenured yet, expressed the highest level of workplace satisfaction, among the three groups of the category with an average satisfaction of 2.177 points higher, on average, than non-tenure-line faculty (p-value=0.000). Although I predicted that faculty who are tenured would be the most satisfied with their workplace, this hypothesis was unsupported because faculty who are on tenure-track that have not been tenured yet, showed higher level of workplace satisfaction (2.177), than tenured faculty (1.591). Next, faculty who are part of the non-STEM departments displayed lower levels of satisfaction with the coefficient of -1.016 (p-value=0.000), indicating that being a non-STEM faculty resulted in 1.016 point decrease on average, in satisfaction with workplace. This supported hypothesis 7 (the faculty in STEM field may exhibit higher levels of faculty satisfaction with workplace).

Lastly, for career related stress, hypothesis 8 (higher career related stress will result in lower faculty satisfaction with workplace) was supported by this regression model. A one-point increase in career related stress resulted in a 0.293 decrease in faculty satisfaction with
workplace, on average. The career related stress variable had a p-value of 0.000 indicating that this relationship was statistically significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11: Multiple Regression Model for Workplace Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution Types</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coefficient</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure Status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-track but not Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEM or Non-STEM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Related Stress</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Related Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R-squared</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, *p<0.05

In conclusion, some of the key factors that showed decrease in faculty’s satisfaction with workplace are as follows: (1) being a member of Stepper institution; (2) being a male faculty; (3) being a minority, whether it be a single minority racial background, or a combination of racial background that included minority race; (4) being a Non-STEM faculty; and (5) increase in career related stress. In contrast, faculty who has been tenured or is on tenure-track exhibit higher level of satisfaction. Even though these are important findings, as expressed by the R-squared value of 0.085, only 8.6% of the variance in the dependent variable of workplace satisfaction can be predicted by the independent values in this model; this means that around 91% of the factors that influence faculty’s workplace satisfaction are elements not included in this model.
Satisfaction with Compensation Regression Model

Next, multiple regression was performed with a dependent variable of satisfaction with compensation. Table 12 shows the results of this regression and evaluates which factors influence faculty’s satisfaction with compensation. Similar to the way I discussed the results in Table 11 above, I will explain the variables in terms of the following groups: institution type, gender and race, tenure status and STEM, and career related stress.

Starting with the institution type, on average, faculty at Stepper institutions expressed 1.668 point (p-value = 0.000) higher satisfaction with compensation compared to faculty at Non-Striver institutions. At Jumper institutions, faculty’s satisfaction with compensation by 0.178 (p-value = 0.665). This was the opposite of hypothesis 2, which stated that faculty at striving institutions would demonstrate lower level of satisfaction with compensation. However, similar to the results in Table 11, Jumper variable is deemed to be not statistically significant in this regression model, given that its p-value (0.665) is greater than 0.05.

Next, looking at gender and race showed that male faculty expressed higher levels of satisfaction with compensation than female faculty. Being a male faculty equated to 1.171 point higher satisfaction than being a female faculty on average, with a p-value of 0.000, indicating that this variable is statistically significant. This result supported part of hypothesis 5, which states that female faculty will demonstrate lower levels of satisfaction with compensation. As for race, Minority expressed 0.600 points lower satisfaction with compensation on average, compared to White/Caucasian faculty. This result supported hypothesis 4 (Ethnic minority faculty will demonstrate lower level of satisfaction with their compensation).

As for tenure status and STEM, faculty who were on the tenure track or have been tenured expressed higher levels of satisfaction with compensation. With the coefficient value of 7.401 (p-value = 0.000), tenured faculty expressed the highest level of satisfaction with compensation, as expected based on current literature. However, the next highest group was tenure-track but not tenured with the coefficient of 6.145 (p-value = 0.000), which unsupported hypothesis 6 (faculty on tenure-track that have not been tenured yet will have the lowest level of satisfaction with compensation). Next, with STEM variable, faculty who were in non-STEM departments expressed 0.876 points lower satisfaction with compensation on average, compared to faculty in STEM departments, which supports hypothesis 7 (the faculty in STEM field may exhibit higher levels of faculty satisfaction with compensation).

Lastly, career related stress has coefficient of -0.141 and a p-value of 0.000, indicating that one-point increase in career related stress leads to 0.141 point decrease in faculty’s satisfaction with compensation on average. This supports hypothesis 8 (I expect that faculty with higher score for career related stress composite score to show lower faculty satisfaction with workplace and with compensation), and since career related stress had a coefficient value of -0.293 in Table 11, hypothesis 9 (career related stress will have greater impact on satisfaction with workplace than satisfaction with compensation) is supported as well.
Table 12: Multiple Regression Model for Satisfaction with Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Significance (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution Types</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumper</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepper</td>
<td>1.668</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.171</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>-0.600</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>7.401</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-track but not Tenured</td>
<td>6.145</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEM or Non-STEM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-STEM</td>
<td>-0.876</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Related Stress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Related Stress</td>
<td>-0.141</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>52.475</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations** 11,640  
**R-squared** 0.151

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

In conclusion, some of the key variables that showed decrease in faculty’s satisfaction with compensation are: (1) being a Minority; and (2) working as a Non-STEM faculty. In contrast, faculty who has been tenured or is on tenure-track exhibited higher levels of satisfaction with compensation. Lastly, experiencing career related stress decreased all faculty’s satisfaction with compensation, but this variable had lower impact on faculty’s satisfaction with compensation than it did on faculty’s satisfaction with workplace. Compared to the previous regression model (R-squared = 0.085), the R-squared value of this regression is higher at 0.151, and this value demonstrates that 15.1% of the variances in satisfaction with compensation can be explained by the independent variables in this model.

Summary of Chapter 4

This chapter provided a detailed explanation of the results of the statistical analyses conducted to answer the research question of this dissertation: (1) does faculty satisfaction vary between different types of schools; and (2) how do individual level factors, such as individual
identifiers and career-related stress, influence faculty satisfaction at these different types of institutions. The results supported some of the hypotheses (hypothesis 1, 2b, 4, 5 (satisfaction with compensation), 7, 8, 9); while some finding were unexpected and unsupported some of the (hypothesis 1a, 1b, 2, 2a, 3, 5 (satisfaction with workplace), 6. In the next chapter, I provide a more thorough discussion of the results for each research question, limitations of this study, as well as recommendations for policy implementation and future research.
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this dissertation was to assess whether faculty satisfaction at striving and non-striving institutions differed from each other; and to understand the impact of individual-level factors on faculty satisfaction at these different types of schools. These questions were answered by analyzing a large set of faculty survey results collected by Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) in 2013. Below I summarize my research question and the findings relevant to answering that question. Following this is a discussion of the limitations of this study. I conclude with recommendations for (1) institutional, system-wide and statewide policies to address faculty satisfaction and (2) recommendations for possible future research.

Research Question Part 1 and Results

Faculty Satisfaction between Different Types of Institutions

The first part of the research question looked at if faculty satisfaction varied among different types of institutions (Non-Striver, Jumper, Stepper). To clarify, below is a list of definitions for each institution type:

1. Jumper: Schools that have switched their Carnegie Classifications from Master’s Colleges and Universities in 2010 to Doctoral Universities in 2015.
2. Stepper: Schools that have remained within the Carnegie Classification of Doctoral Universities from 2010 to 2015 but have moved to another sub-category.
3. Non-Striver: Schools (Carnegie Classification = Master’s Colleges and Universities or Doctoral Universities) that have remained in the same Carnegie Classification in 2010 and 2015, or schools that have moved down in Carnegie Classification from 2010 to 2015.

To answer this, I first selected two dependent variables to work with, which are Workplace Satisfaction (SATIS_WORKPLACE) and Satisfaction with Compensation (SATIS_COMPENSATION). I discuss the results for each in turn below.

Workplace Satisfaction. The statistical analysis in chapter 4 showed that faculty at Steppers had the lowest level of satisfaction among the three types of institutions. This is different from my original hypothesis that faculty at Jumpers would exhibit the lowest level of satisfaction. Although the faculty at Jumpers demonstrated workplace satisfaction that is higher than faculty at Steppers, because this value is not considered to be statistically significant, further studies would be needed to gain a more accurate level of faculty satisfaction at Jumper institutions. Or another possible answer could be that there is not significant relationship between faculty’s workplace satisfaction and the institution being a Jumper. However, this dissertation was able to shed light on the topic of faculty satisfaction at 2 different types of institutions, which were Non-Striver and Stepper. Results showed that faculty at Non-Strivers exhibited the highest level of faculty satisfaction and those at Steppers demonstrated the lowest, which matches my hypothesis 1 that faculty at Strivers would exhibit lower levels of satisfaction than those at Non-Strivers; when compared to the Non-Striver faculty, faculty at Stepper showed 1.286 lower level of workplace satisfaction. Some of the possible reasons why faculty at Stepper institutions may exhibit lower levels of workplace satisfaction are: (1) they are under constant
pressure to increase their research agenda; (2) they are experiencing greater competition among faculty; (3) they have the highest percentage of faculty who are on the tenure track that have not been tenured yet at 19.7%. These three possible reasons are related to each other: faculty who are at Steppers are expected to increase their research agenda, since they are employed by doctoral universities (reasoning 1); and because some institutions strive by hiring faculty from other major research universities in hopes of enhancing their research agenda (Gonzales, 2015), faculty will feel more pressure to compete against their peers (reasoning 2); and lastly, higher percentage of faculty who are on tenure-track but have not been tenured yet, means that more faculty would feel concerned over tenure process, since having “excellent teaching records and having published in regional or local outlets” (Gonzales, 2013b, p. 39) are not enough to guarantee tenure at striving institutions (reasoning 3).

**Satisfaction with Compensation.** OLS regression for SATIS_COMPENSATION variable showed the opposite results of the previous analyses on SATIS_WORKPLACE variable. Of the three types of institutions, the faculty at Steppers exhibited the highest level of satisfaction with compensation (51.45), then the faculty at Jumpers (50.68), and finally the faculty at Non-Strivers expressed the lowest level of satisfaction (49.37). This result also does not match my hypothesis 2; I expected faculty at Non-Strivers to show the highest level of satisfaction with their compensation and the faculty at Jumpers to exhibit the lowest level of satisfaction with their compensation. The faculty at Non-Strivers may have exhibited the lowest level of satisfaction because this group included unsuccessful strivers, meaning faculty who are expected to perform the workload of faculty at Jumper and Stepper, without comparable compensation. Another possible reason why faculty at Non-Strivers showed lower levels of satisfaction with compensation could be that perhaps the Non-Strivers do not have the financial capacity to compete with other types of institutions in how much they can offer their faculty, as evidenced by the discrepancy in average salary between faculty at different institutions (Flaherty, 2018).

When looking at the results of statistical analyses of SATIS_WORKPLACE and SATIS_COMPENSATION, the data seems to suggest that satisfaction with compensation and satisfaction with workplace do not necessarily go in the same direction. This may be partly because these two variables are composite variables that include weighted values of other variables (as explained in Chapter 3); however, it is still an unexpected result that satisfaction with compensation and satisfaction with workplace could demonstrate the opposite results.

**Research Question Part 2 and Results**

**Effects of Individual Level Factors on Faculty Satisfaction at Different Types of Institutions**

To answer this question, multiple regression analysis was performed on two different variables: once, with SATIS_WORKPLACE as the dependent variable; and another with SATIS_COMPENSATION as the dependent variable. For both SATIS_WORKPLACE regression and SATIS_COMPENSATION regression, the same reference group was used, which was female, white, STEM faculty, who was not on tenure-track at non-striving institution.
**Gender.** Although it is surprising that male faculty showed lower levels of workplace satisfaction (-0.402) than female faculty, they still exhibited greater satisfaction with their compensation (1.171) in comparison to female faculty. This means that part of hypothesis 5 (satisfaction with compensation) was correct, but the other part of the hypothesis (satisfaction with workplace) was incorrect. Such discrepancy may be due to the variables that comprise each of the composite variables that were used as dependent variables. For example, SATIS_COMPENSATION includes Salary, Teaching Load, and Prospects for Career Advancements which may all lead to decreased satisfaction for female faculty. This result suggests that perhaps male faculty need to more opportunities to develop collegiate working relationship with their peers, as this factor seems to have a large impact on SATIS_WORKPLACE variable. In addition, this study demonstrates that female faculty may still suffer from unequal workplace compensation in the higher education sector.

**Race.** Minority faculty showed lower level of satisfaction with both workplace (-1.030) and compensation (-0.600) in comparison to their White/Caucasian counterpart. This could mean that despite all the institutional efforts to increase diversity, minorities are still less satisfied with their working environment and perhaps feel that they are not being compensated enough for their work. Although the race groups had to be simplified to White/Caucasian and Minority due to (1) the population of some of the minority race groups and (2) independence issue due to possibility of one participant choosing multiple race options, the results from this study still provided valuable insight.

**Tenure Status.** The results related to tenure status category were surprising because faculty who were on tenure-track that had not been tenured yet exhibited the highest levels of workplace satisfaction, and higher level of satisfaction with compensation than that of Non-Striver faculty. This result was the exact opposite of hypothesis 6 and seems to suggest that faculty who are on tenure-track may enjoy the roles they play in their institutions and that they have better working relationship with their colleagues. It was expected that tenured faculty would demonstrate the highest level of satisfaction with their compensation, but it was surprising that this group was followed by the group of faculty who are on tenure-track but have not been tenured yet. The faculty who are not on tenure track may be showing the lowest level of satisfaction with both workplace and with their compensation, for a number problematic factors raised by studies on contingent faculty. For example, the faculty who are not on tenure-track may show lower level of workplace satisfaction because they do not have enough opportunities to develop professional relationship with other faculty, or they are unhappy with their course assignments. As for satisfaction with compensation, because faculty who are not on tenure track are less likely to have retirement benefits, suffer from lower sense of job security, and have fewer prospects for career advancement, they are likely to show the lowest satisfaction with their compensation as well. These are important factors to consider because they resemble the growing concerns that many higher education researchers have been voicing regarding the increased use of contingent faculty in universities (AAUP, 1993).

**STEM.** On average, faculty who are part of the Non-STEM departments expressed lower levels of satisfaction with workplace and with compensation, than faculty who are part of STEM departments, which matches hypothesis 7. The lower level of satisfaction with workplace may be a result of growing emphasis in research and support for STEM fields over non-STEM fields.
(Hossain & Robinson, 2012). As for satisfaction with compensation, given the discrepancy between STEM and non-STEM faculty’s salary in general (Jaschik, 2016), this lower sense of satisfaction with compensation is expected. This research will add to the current literature of working conditions of STEM and non-STEM faculty in higher education.

**Career Related Stress.** As expected, career related stress negatively affects both workplace satisfaction and satisfaction with compensation, which supports hypothesis 8. However, it had greater adverse effect on workplace satisfaction (which proves hypothesis 9 to be true), and I believe this is because both workplace satisfaction and career related stress include factors related to workplace environment and a certain level of collegiality between faculty members.

**Limitations**

Although this study does provide some remarkable findings, there are some limitations to that should be acknowledged. First, a natural weakness of secondary datasets is that researchers can only work with the questions included in the survey (Singleton & Straights, 2010). In addition, establishing a cause-and-effect relationship by using a secondary dataset is more challenging because unlike experiments, where independent variables can be manipulated to predetermine the criterion of directionality, secondary dataset analysis relies on how the results are interpreted (Singleton & Straights, 2010). Another weakness of using secondary dataset is that some of the participants in the survey may give “socially desirable answers to sensitive questions” (Singleton & Straights, 2010, p. 271); this could be more common given HERI’s faculty survey is paid for by the participating institutions, meaning even with the guaranteed anonymity, some participants may feel compelled to give answers that will please their institutions. Nonetheless, even with these limitations created by using a secondary dataset, utilizing a readily-available data is beneficial in terms of time and financial investment, as well as the quality and quantity of the data.

As for the issue of missing data, despite the best efforts to be as inclusive as possible, because HERI Faculty Survey is costly for institutions to engage in, I am limited to the data gathered from 19 striving institutions and 175 non-striving institutions. In addition, because participation is on a voluntary basis, there is not a guarantee that all faculty from participating institutions would have taken the survey. Furthermore, some of the answers in the data may be missing because the participants had the option to skip any of the questions they did not wish to answer. Missing data can be problematic because it could reduce the number of cases available for data analysis, could produce analysis results that are not statistically significant, and could even result in findings that are misleading (SPSS, n. d.). Allison (2001) stated that the “only really good solution to the missing data problem is not to have any” (p. 2). This is because of the listwise deletion method, where “if a case has any missing data for any of the variables in the analysis, then simply excluding it from the analysis” (Allison, 2001, p.1), is the most commonly accepted solution for missing data in the current research practices. However, this presents a problem, particularly for studies such as mine with only 511 participants in one group (Jumpers), because following listwise deletion will exclude a large percentage of my data for that group. Furthermore, even the two newer methods of handling missing data, maximum likelihood and multiple imputation, are not reliable because they depend on “easily violated assumptions for
their validity” (Allison, 2001, p. 2). Fortunately, most of the variables included in my study did not have significant amount of missing data. Despite these limitations, the data and method chosen for this study provides significant results related to faculty satisfaction at striving and non-striving institutions, as well as the influence of individual-level factors on faculty satisfaction.

Policy Recommendations

There are several policy recommendations that could be made based on the findings of this dissertation. In this section, I will outline these recommendation by: institution-level, system-level, then state-level.

Institution-level Policy Recommendation

First, looking at institution-level policies, it is important for senior leadership to acknowledge that when they develop strategic plans to help their institutions strive, their faculty’s satisfaction may decrease. Next, senior leadership, as well as mid-level management, could help to develop plans that could mitigate such adverse effects on faculty satisfaction. One way to lessen the decrease in faculty workplace satisfaction could be, to allow each department to create their own plans that meet the objectives of the institution’s striving efforts, rather than having it be a top-down approach. By allowing each department to develop its own plans, that is supported by the members of the department, the senior leadership are more likely to have faculty that are satisfied with the striving process of the institution. As for satisfaction with compensation, institutions will not be able to instantly increase everyone’s compensation; however, a tier system or a merit-based system could be implemented where when certain goals of the institution’s striving efforts are met by the department, compensation of that department’s faculty could be increased proportionally with the achievements.

In addition to these recommendations, the results from the second part of the research question led to following policy recommendations. First, I suggest developing a task force to assess the impact of racial background on faculty satisfaction. These assessments should be focused on (1) better assessing how coming from certain racial background could impact faculty satisfaction; and (2) provide solutions to balance the difference in faculty satisfaction, that results from racial factors. Next, an institution-wide study should be conducted to understand what faculty in STEM and non-STEM departments believe to be their responsibilities. Once this information is gathered, leadership in STEM and non-STEM departments should create a clear guideline of what is expected of their faculty; this guideline could differ between STEM and non-STEM departments, but a clear explanation should be provided as to why the differences exist, so all faculty would understand their position within the institution. Understanding how their duties differ from one another will make the faculty feel that they all play a unique role in achieving the common goal of the institution.

System-level Policy Recommendations

The following system-level policy recommendations could be particularly beneficial to institutions that are part of a large system, such as the University of Texas System or University
of California. For instance, UT Austin, UT Arlington and UT Dallas are categorized as R1 institutions; whereas, UT San Antonio is categorized as an R2 institution. UT San Antonio could observe the steps taken by UT Arlington and UT Dallas as it develops its own plans to increase its prestige. Given that UT Austin, as the flagship campus, would have different resources available at its disposal compared to that of UT San Antonio, it would be best for UT San Antonio to collaborate with other, similarly equipped campuses, such as UT Arlington or UT Dallas. To clarify, since UT San Antonio and UT Arlington offer similar academic programs, ranging from liberal arts majors to various engineering studies, the senior-leadership of colleges from the two campuses could share strategic plans to assist one another. However, this may be a challenge given that all these institutions are in one aspect competing with one another for prestige and limited funding, as postulated by the theories of academic capitalism and resource dependency. Despite such challenge, there are benefits to be gained for both R1 institution and its less prestigious peers within the system.

**State-level Policy Recommendations**

For state-level policy recommendations, I focus on two variables, which are tenure status and gender. With gender, the lower satisfaction expressed by the female faculty regarding their compensation demonstrates the need to address the gender pay gap in higher education sector. For this problem, a statewide study could enable the lawmakers and the state’s higher education coordinating board to understand the reasons behind the lower satisfaction rate of female faculty and create a task force to develop solutions that would fit each area. The issue of gender pay gap is a universal problem, and given that different states, and even cities, have varying levels of living expenses, resolving this issue would require a larger study, such as a statewide one, rather than an institution-specific solution.

As for tenure status, this dissertation showed that faculty who are not on tenure track have the lowest satisfaction rate for both workplace and their compensation. This low faculty satisfaction may be the result of a larger problem in the higher education field, such as the growing number of contingent faculty at colleges and universities. In such case, statewide plan must be enacted to gather information on the causes of low faculty satisfaction among non-tenure-track faculty; additional information should be gathered on whether this low satisfaction rate varies by race, gender or field of study as well. Following this step, policies that provide greater job security, autonomy, and more opportunities for professional development should be implemented to increase contingent faculty’s satisfaction rate. Since job security, autonomy, and professional development opportunities were part of the satisfaction variables in this study, developing policies that focus on these three aspects could help to increase non-tenure-track faculty’s satisfaction with workplace and compensation.

Finally, the results of this study is important for statewide policy recommendations because as more and more states incentivize their colleges and universities to increase their prestige, many more institutions will undergo changes which could impact faculty satisfaction. For example, for higher education institutions in Texas, the statewide 60x30 TX higher education strategic plan and the Tier One Universities bill (House Bill 51), are significant motivators for schools to increase their research productivity, number of graduates, as well as any other measures that will label them as one of the prestigious institutions in the nation.
Implications of Policy Recommendations

When looking at these three different levels of policy recommendations (institution-, system-, and state-level), it is crucial to consider the significance of using ranking and classification systems, such as Carnegie Classification to measure institutions against each other. Although in the current context, prestige is the only way to clearly define the “winners” and “losers” of competition among higher education institutions, it is not clear whether the repercussions of using such metric and setting institutions against each other is worth the outcome. Such reflection leads to the question, does meeting the requirements of ranking and classification system mean that schools are providing the best education possible to the students? Also, does it create the best work environment for the faculty and staff of higher education institutions? These are some important questions to consider as I continue to the following section of this study, future research.

Future Research

With this dissertation being an exploratory study on the relationship between faculty satisfaction and institutional desire to strive, there are a number of future research possibilities that could spring from this. First, despite having over 500 faculty participants, statistical analyses for faculty from Jumper institutions were interesting, yet not statistically significant. This limitation may have been avoided if I had combined Jumpers and Steppers into one group of strivers. However, I wanted to explore the differences between faculty at Jumper and Stepper first, before eliminating the possibility that these two groups would demonstrate statistically significant difference. It is possible that no significant relationship exists between faculty satisfaction and Jumper characteristics of an institution. With this in mind, a subsequent study could be conducted with the faculty from Jumper and Stepper institutions combined as one group.

Furthermore, similar problem emerged with some of the minority groups, as there were very few participants. Unfortunately, sample sizes cannot be controlled, particularly when using a secondary dataset. As for this limitation, it is important to acknowledge that this may be a bigger problem, lack of racially diverse faculty representation, within the field of higher education that cannot be fully avoided. However, perhaps institutions participating in future studies can encourage their minority faculties to participate in the survey to ensure that as many minority faculty contribute to the study as possible.

In addition to developing plans to avoid the limitations of current study, some other future research could entail developing a longitudinal study to see how faculty satisfaction changes at a striving institution from the beginning of the process to the end when the institution successfully strives into higher Carnegie Classification. It would be interesting to see if same participant’s faculty satisfaction changes throughout the years as the participant’s institution undergoes changes due to its striving efforts. Another method to consider could be using a different dataset, to have a larger number of both striving and non-striving institutions be part of the study. Lastly, since Non-Strivers included several different types of schools ranging from R1 institutions to those who dropped in their Carnegie Classification, it would be interesting to see if different findings could be gathered from dividing the Non-Strivers into different categories.
Conclusion

This dissertation provides a number of interesting outcomes related to faculty satisfaction and striving efforts of higher education institutions. Whether the institutions strive to increase their prestige as a result of natural competition for limited resources, or due to the statewide incentives, when institutions execute strategic moves to increase their standing among other schools, both the benefits and drawbacks of such actions will be felt by all members of the institution. As this study showed, faculty satisfaction with workplace and compensation is an important factor to consider in decision-making process. Based on some of the surprising outcomes of this study, further research should be conducted to better understand how the faculty are affected when institutions strive.
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Appendix A. List of Hypotheses

1. Hypothesis 1: I predict faculty at striving institutions to have lower level of workplace satisfaction (SATIS_WORKPLACE) than the faculty at non-striving institutions
   - Hypothesis 1a: Faculty at Jumper institutions would demonstrate the lowest level of workplace satisfaction.
   - Hypothesis 1b: Faculty at Stepper institutions would demonstrate higher level of workplace satisfaction than faculty at Jumper institutions.

2. Hypothesis 2: I predict faculty at striving institutions to have lower levels of satisfaction with their compensation.
   - Hypothesis 2a: Faculty at Jumper institutions would demonstrate the lowest level of satisfaction with their compensation.
   - Hypothesis 2b: Faculty at Stepper institutions would demonstrate higher level of satisfaction with their compensation than faculty at Jumper institutions.

3. Hypothesis 3: Ethnic minority faculty will exhibit higher level of satisfaction with workplace due to the value they personally place on research.

4. Hypothesis 4: Ethnic minority faculty will demonstrate lower level of satisfaction with their compensation.

5. Hypothesis 5: Female faculty will show lower levels of satisfaction than that of their male counterparts in both satisfaction with workplace and satisfaction with their compensation.

6. Hypothesis 6: I expect the faculty who are on tenure track, but not tenured would feel the lowest level of faculty satisfaction with workplace and with compensation.

7. Hypothesis 7: the faculty in STEM field may exhibit higher levels of faculty satisfaction with workplace and with compensation.

8. Hypothesis 8: I expect that faculty with higher score for career related stress composite score to show lower faculty satisfaction with workplace and with compensation.

9. Hypothesis 9: I expect career related stress to have greater impact on satisfaction with workplace.
### Table A4. List of HERI Faculty Survey Constructs
(including survey items and estimation 'weights')

**Student-Centered Pedagogy** measures the extent to which faculty use student-centered teaching and evaluation methods in their course instruction.

- Cooperative learning (small groups) (2.30)
- Student presentations (1.85)
- Group projects (1.82)
- Class discussions (1.70)
- Student evaluations of each others' work (1.53)

**Undergraduate Education Goal: Personal Development** measures the extent to which faculty believe that personal development is a central goal for undergraduate education.

- Reflective writing/journaling (1.37)
- Experiential learning/field studies (1.30)
- Using student inquiry to drive learning (1.26)
- Student-selected topics for course content (1.21)

**Undergraduate Education Goal: Development** measures the extent to which faculty believe that the development of students is a central goal for undergraduate students.

- Help students develop personal values (4.28)
- Provide for students' emotional development (2.15)
- Develop moral character (3.42)

**Scholarly Productivity** is a unified measure of the scholarly activity of faculty.

- Articles in academic and professional journals (3.09)
- How many of your professional writings have been published or accepted for publication in the last two years (2.53)
- Chapters in edited volumes (2.11)

**Civic Minded Practice** is a unified measure of faculty involvement in civic activities.

- Collaborated with the local community in research/teaching (2.17)
- Do you use your scholarship to address community needs? (1.81)
- Community service as part of coursework (1.53)
- Engaged in public service/professional consulting without pay? (1.24)
- Community or public service (1.33)
- Advised student groups involved in service/volunteer work (1.43)

**Civic Minded Values**—A unified measure of the extent to which faculty believe civic engagement is a central part of the college mission.

- Encourage students to become agents of social change (2.77)
- Instill in students a commitment to community service (2.69)
- Colleges have a responsibility to work with their surrounding communities to address local issues (1.25)

**Job Satisfaction: Workplace** is a unified measure of the extent to which faculty are satisfied with their working environment.

- Professional relationships with other faculty (3.11)
- Competency of colleagues (2.39)
- Autonomy and independence (1.55)
- Departmental leadership (1.40)
- Course assignments (1.27)

**Job Satisfaction: Compensation** is a unified measure of the extent to which faculty are satisfied with their compensation packages.

- Opportunity for scholarly pursuits (2.38)
- Retirement benefits (1.68)
- Salary (1.39)
- Teaching load (1.22)
- Job security (1.39)
- Prospects for career advancement (1.53)
Table A4. List of HERI Faculty Survey Constructs (continued)  
(including survey items and estimation ‘weights’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Related Stress</th>
<th>Institutional Priority: Commitment to Diversity</th>
<th>Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement</th>
<th>Institutional Priority: Increase Prestige</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures the amount of stress faculty experience related to their career.</td>
<td>Measures the extent to which faculty believe their institution is committed to creating a diverse multicultural campus environment.</td>
<td>Measures the extent to which faculty believe their institution is committed to facilitating civic engagement among students and faculty.</td>
<td>Measures the extent to which faculty believe their institution is committed to increasing its prestige.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate the extent to which each of the following has been a source of stress for you during the last two years:</td>
<td>Indicate how important you believe each priority listed below is at your college or university:</td>
<td>Indicate how important you believe each priority listed below is at your college or university:</td>
<td>Indicate how important you believe each priority listed below is at your college or university:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of personal time (1.96)</td>
<td>• To promote gender diversity in the faculty and administration (3.34)</td>
<td>• To provide resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching or research (2.08)</td>
<td>• To increase or maintain institutional prestige (3.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching load (1.51)</td>
<td>• To promote racial and ethnic diversity in the faculty and administration (5.72)</td>
<td>• To create and sustain partnerships with surrounding communities (2.84)</td>
<td>• To hire faculty “stars” (1.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Committee work (1.38)</td>
<td>• Colleagues (1.16)</td>
<td>• To facilitate student involvement in community service (1.56)</td>
<td>• To enhance the institution’s national image (3.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Institutional procedures/red tape (1.08)</td>
<td>• Research or publishing demands (1.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>