



LANGSTON
UNIVERSITY



Faculty and Staff Survey

2010

Langston University
Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page Hall Room 309
Langston, OK 73050
Tel: (405) 466-6012
Fax: (405) 466-6014
Email: mbmcclendon@lunet.edu

Mark McClendon
Director

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

A total of 93 surveys were submitted of which 95% were full time employees which represents about 28% of the total number of full time employees. The sample is mostly female (71%), from the main campus (86%), and African American (69%).

Overall results of the survey showed fairly evenly distributed scores across the individual items and average ratings for the items between 3.0 and 4.0. This is due to a fairly high proportion of employees (10% – 20%) endorsing positively worded items with Strongly Disagree and Disagree indicating their lack of satisfaction with elements of their job and the university. A more satisfied employee group would have scores that tended to be closer to 4.0 or above.

The single item that received the lowest score by far was item 44 staff salary levels (2.29 average and 70% negative endorsement). This is consistent with most public jobs and one that the administration is aware of. The dimension that received the lowest average scores was for Recognition and Rewards. The average score for the items were 2.65 to 2.92 for the 3 items and items were endorsed negatively more than they were positively.

Communication received the highest scores with 2 of the 5 items having an average score of 4.00 or better and all being above 3.5. This indicates that employees generally are satisfied with level of communication circulated through the departments and overall university, but may have concerns about other aspects of their work and the university.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	ii
Introduction	4
Methodology.....	4
Item Responses	4
Results	4
Item Responses	4
Demographics	5
Communication (1-6)	5
Training and Development (7-12).....	5
Recognition and Rewards (12-14).....	5
Performance Evaluation (15-17).....	5
Supervision/Management (18-29).....	5
Physical Work Environment (30-32)	6
Position Satisfaction (33-37).....	6
Overall Satisfaction (38-50).....	6
Regression Predicting Global Job Satisfaction with Dimensions.....	6
Factor Analysis	6
Discussion.....	7

INTRODUCTION

This report discusses the results of the Spring 2010 Langston University Faculty & Staff survey which was administered online. A total of 93 surveys were returned which represents roughly 28% of the faculty & staff at Langston University. The participation by full-time employees (82%) was significantly higher than part-time (4%). The report is organized into four main sections (Introduction, Methodology, Results, and Discussion) with the methodology and results sections organized by the statistical analyses performed on the data.

METHODOLOGY

The survey was administered online April 14th thru May15th 2010 through the use of employees' lunet.edu e-mail accounts via the lu announcements mechanism. Several follow up e-mails were sent to encourage participation. The survey consisted of 50 items that were broken up into two parts. The first part asked employees to rate 37 items related to as to their agreement with various statements about various aspects of Langston University and their departments and jobs specifically. They indicated their responses on a 5 point Likert scale that ranged from Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (4), or Strongly Agree (5). The second part consisted of 14 items that assessed employees satisfaction with specific items related to work. Employees indicated their responses on a 5 point Likert scale ranging from Very Dissatisfied (1), Dissatisfied (2), Satisfied (4), or Very Satisfied (5). The 50 items were broken down into 8 main sections:

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

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

Item Responses

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

RESULTS

Item Responses

For each item the average (mean), number of responses (N), frequency and percent of selection for each Likert choice were computed for items 1-50. The overall results (Appendix A) showed that many of the items had an average rating (mean) between 3.0 and 4.0, with a few below 3.0 (items 12, 13, 14, 50) and a couple above 4.2 (items 2 and 3). This is due to a couple of factors. For each item, there were a large number of neutral responses (20%-30%) that pulled the average closer to 3.0. Secondly, there were a fairly consistent (15% - 30%) number of respondents who endorsed the items in a

negative fashion. This has the effect of canceling out the positive scores and pulling the mean closer to 3.0. The items responses for each survey dimension are presented below.

Demographics

- Survey Respondents were mostly female 69%
- 100% were full-time employees
- 86% of respondents work at LU main campus
- 58% were Black/African American
- 49% were staff
- # of years respondents have worked here 0 to 5 (40%), 6 to10 (21%), 11 to 15 13% 16 to 20 (18%), 21 to 25 (4%), 26 to 30 (4%), 30+ (0%), and 7% unknown.

Communication (1-6)

Overall scores for this dimension ranged 3.50 (item 1) to a high of 4.27 (item 3). Employees rated communication rather favorable as far as understanding departmental goals and mission (Item 3 positive rating of 93%). All items had an approval rating over 70%.

Training and Development (7-12)

Overall scores ranged from a low of 3.05 (item 6) to a high of 3.76 (item 8). Employees have mixed feelings on training and development. About 78% feel their supervisor lets them adjust their schedule so they can participate in training opportunities (item 8). But only 54% feel training and career development opportunities are allocated fairly (item 6).

Recognition and Rewards (12-14)

This scale represented the lowest overall scores for any dimension on the survey. Overall scores ranged from a low of 2.53 (item 13) to a high of 2.92 (item 14). Employees express a rather high dissatisfaction in regards to rewards and recognition. Item 12 “*I am satisfied with the recognition I receive for doing a good job*” had a negative rating of 56%. Item 13 “*Outstanding service to customers is recognized and rewarded*” had a negative rating of 63%. Item 15 “*Quality work is valued by the university*” received a negative rating of 48%.

Performance Evaluation (15-17)

Overall scores ranged from a low of 3.14 (item 16) to a high of 3.30 (item 15). The responses for this section were fairly well distributed with nearly equal numbers on people endorsing the *Strongly Disagree* as *Strongly Agree*.

Supervision/Management (18-29)

This dimension consisted of the most items (12), but the overall tended to be very similar and were ranged from a low of 3.45 (item 26) to a high of 3.84 (item 23). The majority of employees are satisfied with their supervisors, although not overwhelmingly so. Over 75% of employees agree their supervisor possesses the training and experience needed for his/or her position (item 18) and has the necessary skills to be a supervisor (item 19). However, fewer people (69%) feel their supervisor recognizes the contribution of individuals on a regular basis (item 26).

Physical Work Environment (30-32)

Overall scores ranged from a low of 3.18 (item 30) to a high of 3.56 (item 31). Employees indicated slight concern of satisfaction with respect to physical work environment with an approval rating of only 58% (item 30) and over 70% feel office space is sufficient to perform their job (item 31), but only 65% feel they have necessary equipment to perform their job successfully (item 32).

Position Satisfaction (33-37)

Overall scores ranged from a low of 3.32 (item 36) to a high of 3.80 (item 34). Over 85% of employees enjoy the work they do (item 33), Over 90% feel a sense of personal satisfaction for doing a good job (item 33), and over 85% feel their job is challenging enough (item 35). Although scores were fairly positive, 0% strongly agreed with these statements.

Overall Satisfaction (38-50)

The last section of the survey asked individuals to rate their level of satisfaction with several factors including benefits and global job satisfaction (item 38). Overall scores ranged from a low of 2.29 (item 44: salary levels) to a high of 3.85 (item 47: retirement benefits). Employees indicated a moderate level of overall satisfaction (72%), but just less than 30% indicated dissatisfaction. The highest concerns were items 41, 42, and 44: Item 41 *“The identity and sense of community at Langston University.”* (51% satisfied); item 42 *“Moral in my department”*. (53% satisfied) and item 44 *“Staff Salary levels”* by far the largest concern with a 70% disapproval rating.

Regression Predicting Global Job Satisfaction with Dimensions

A multiple linear regression analysis using a forward selection methodology was utilized to determine which dimensions sections 1-8 were most predictive of overall job satisfaction (item 38). The results of the analysis are presented in Appendix B and show that 2 dimensions contribute significantly to the prediction of overall job satisfaction. The dimensions are:

Section 6: Physical Work Environment

Section 5: Supervision/Management

These dimensions make intuitive sense for predicting job satisfaction since they represent dimensions that impact a person’s day to day work. They accounted for 67% of the variance in overall job satisfaction (adjusted R-square = .668), which is quite high, but again, the results might be impacted by the high degree of multicollinearity of the predictors.

Factor Analysis

An exploratory factor analysis was performed on items 1-50 to see how many distinct factors were present in the survey and to test the functioning of the survey instrument. If too few factors are present then it shows that the survey instrument is really only assessing one or two factors such as general satisfaction or mood.

The results of the factor analysis show the presence of 9 distinct factors and that they disambiguate themselves from the other items pretty well. When examining the rotated factor matrix, a more liberal criterion of factor loadings above 0.6 on the main factor and below 0.4 on all other factors was used to determine the factors. The items that met this criterion are in bold and when they are examined, they seem to group fairly well along the pre determined dimensions. For example, the first factor extracted from the factor analysis shows that items 20-31 all meet the criteria for inclusion on the factor and

they correspond to the survey dimension of Supervision /Management. The second factor represents items 8-12 which corresponds to the Training and Development dimension of the survey instrument. This is not a perfect system for determining the functioning of the survey instrument due to sample size, but it does lend some support for the function of the instrument by indicating that an underlying factor was captured by each dimension and not just a global level of affect.

DISCUSSION

The results of the survey were mixed. Overall there tended to be a fairly consistent 15-20% of people who endorsed the items in a negative way which is pretty high for this type of survey. There also seemed to be a lack of enthusiasm among the respondents because there were a small percentage of *Strongly Agree* endorsements for the items. Generally with this type of survey where the responses are positively worded, you would expect scores to be closer to 4.0 where most people would at least agree with the items. The spread of score for this survey indicate that there is a fairly large group of generally dissatisfied people (about 15-20%), a large number of not very enthusiastic people who were happy enough, and about 20% who really enjoy their job.

Communication received the highest scores with 2 of the 5 items having an average score of 4.00 or better and all being above 3.5. This indicates that employees generally approve of the level of communication they receive in aspect to their job, but may have concerns about other aspects of their work and the university. There were still some negative endorsements for these items, but there were the highest numbers of strong positive endorsements for these items.

The single item that received the lowest score by far was item 44 staff salary levels (2.29 average and 70% negative endorsement). This is consistent with most public jobs and when coupled with *Item 32: I have the necessary equipment to perform my job successfully* (34% disagree) shows that inadequate state funding does have an impact on people. This is an issue the administration is aware of. Surprisingly, although salary level was correlated ($r = .318$) with overall satisfaction (item 40), the magnitude of the correlations was not that high in relation to other items in the survey.

The dimension that received the lowest average scores was for Recognition and Rewards. The average score for the items were 2.5 to 2.85 for the 3 items and items were endorsed negatively more than they were positively. This mirrors the results of the 2007 Faculty Survey where Rewards and Recognition was the most predictive of faculty satisfaction, but also endorsed most negatively. This indicates that individuals do not feel appreciated for the work they do. This could be impacted by the fact that 47% of the respondents were faculty, but there was no significant difference in the responses for these items based on employment category, so the problem does not seem to be confined to just faculty. It appears to be a more systemic problem, but one that is also one of the easier to correct.

Overall this survey will set the baseline for subsequent yearly surveys in order to track employee satisfaction and try and improve it. A few goals for next year's administration will be to increase the participation rate among full time employees and especially among part time employees. Also, in order to eliminate the high number of neutral responses, a forced choice format may be implemented by eliminating neutral as a response choice. This will force the respondent to choose either a negative or positive response.

APPENDIX A

Section 1. Communication								
	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	2010 Average	2009 Average	2008 Average
1. I am satisfied with the amount of information I receive about what is going on in my department.	93	12%	20%	47%	20%	3.44	3.5	3.43
2. I understand the connection between my work and the goals of my department.	93	6%	5%	44%	44%	4.14	4.24	4.1
3. I have a good understanding of my department's mission.	93	9%	8%	38%	46%	4.05	4.27	4.23
4. The administration keeps me informed about university events.	93	12%	20%	47%	20%	3.44	3.51	3.37
5. My department has good working relationships with other departments in the university.	93	11%	20%	46%	23%	3.49	3.6	3.79
Section 2. Training and Development								
	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	2010 Average	2009 Average	2008 Average
1. Training and career development opportunities are allocated fairly.	85	18%	22%	42%	18%	3.2	3.05	3.06
2. I am satisfied with the kinds of training currently available to me.	85	14%	25%	46%	15%	3.24	3.18	3.21
3. My supervisor lets me adjust my schedule so that I can participate in training opportunities.	86	12%	9%	49%	30%	3.77	3.76	3.88
4. Overall, the training I have attended for my present job has helped me perform my job better.	84	13%	13%	48%	26%	3.61	3.55	3.7
5. Overall, the training I have attended for my present job has contributed to my personal development.	84	14%	17%	44%	25%	3.49	3.4	3.6
6. I have training opportunities available to me that are useful for my future career and my personal development.	85	16%	16%	46%	21%	3.39	3.4	3.48

APPENDIX A Continued

Section 3. Recognition and Rewards								
	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	2010 Average	2009 Average	2008 Average
1. I am satisfied with the recognition I receive for doing a good job.	86	21%	30%	38%	10%	2.87	2.65	2.65
2. Outstanding service to customers is recognized or rewarded.	85	18%	36%	35%	11%	2.85	2.53	2.5
3. Quality work is valued by the university.	86	21%	29%	36%	14%	2.93	2.92	2.85

Section 4. Performance Evaluation								
	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	2010 Average	2009 Average	2008 Average
1. I am satisfied with how performance evaluations are conducted in my department.	81	21%	22%	43%	14%	3.06	3.3	3.09
2. My last performance evaluation provided me with information I could use to improve my performance.	80	21%	21%	44%	14%	3.08	3.14	3.19
3. My supervisor provides feedback and coaching to me on a consistent basis.	84	18%	24%	38%	20%	3.19	3.19	3.2

Section 5. Supervision/Management								
	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	2010 Average	2009 Average	2008 Average
1. My supervisor has the training and experience needed for his/her position as a supervisor.	82	11%	12%	44%	33%	3.76	3.77	3.61
2. My supervisor has the supervisory skills needed in his/her position as a supervisor.	82	12%	15%	44%	29%	3.63	3.63	3.61
3. My supervisor distributes the workload fairly among staff in my unit.	80	13%	24%	39%	25%	3.4	3.5	3.31
4. My supervisor bases decisions primarily on facts and data rather than on opinions and feelings.	80	14%	18%	46%	23%	3.46	3.54	3.36
5. My supervisor supports free exchanges of opinions and ideas related to work.	80	11%	13%	45%	31%	3.73	3.78	3.67
6. My supervisor is open to new ways of doing things.	80	11%	13%	50%	26%	3.68	3.84	3.57

APPENDIX A Continued

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	2010 Average	2009 Average	2008 Average
7. My supervisor demonstrates that quality is important in his/her day-to-day activities (e.g., holding meetings to discuss quality issues, interacting with others).	80	10%	21%	41%	28%	3.55	3.61	3.64
8. My supervisor provides staff with constructive suggestions to improve their job performance.	80	11%	28%	36%	25%	3.36	3.55	3.54
9. My supervisor personally recognizes the contributions of individuals on a regular basis.	81	12%	28%	36%	23%	3.3	3.45	3.35
10. I receive adequate guidance from my supervisor to succeed in my job.	81	14%	19%	42%	26%	3.48	3.66	3.41
11. My supervisor is generally available to discuss issues related to my work.	81	11%	7%	51%	31%	3.83	3.79	3.72
12. My supervisor supports initiatives to continually improve processes in our unit.	78	12%	13%	42%	33%	3.73	3.78	3.61

Section 6. Physical Work Environment

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	2010 Average	2009 Average	2008 Average
1. I am satisfied with my physical work environment.	83	20%	14%	48%	17%	3.27	3.18	3.41
2. My office space is sufficient to perform my job.	83	16%	12%	48%	24%	3.53	3.56	3.67
3. I have the necessary equipment to perform my job successfully.	83	19%	14%	49%	17%	3.3	3.38	3.22

Section 7. Position Satisfaction

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	2010 Average	2009 Average	2008 Average
1. I like the work I do in my current position.	83	5%	5%	90%	0%	3.76	3.72	4.21
2. I feel a sense of personal satisfaction when I do my job well.	83	5%	4%	92%	0%	3.78	3.8	4.43
3. My job is challenging enough for me.	82	6%	5%	89%	0%	3.72	3.72	4.13
4. I am satisfied with my involvement in decisions that affect my work.	83	13%	16%	71%	0%	3.29	3.32	3.55
5. My job makes good use of my skills and abilities.	83	10%	10%	81%	0%	3.52	3.44	3.8

APPENDIX A Continued

Section 8. Overall Satisfaction								
	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	2010 Average	2009 Average	2008 Average
1. My overall job satisfaction.	83	10%	13%	58%	19%	3.64	3.57	3.65
2. The clarity of objectives and plans for the next few years in my department.	80	11%	24%	53%	13%	3.31	3.56	3.4
3. The clarity of objectives and plans for the next few years at Langston.	79	11%	34%	42%	13%	3.1	3.13	3.15
4. The identity and sense of community at Langston University.	79	19%	33%	39%	9%	2.86	2.97	2.93
5. Morale in my department.	81	22%	26%	42%	10%	2.91	2.96	3.01
6. The level of cooperation and teamwork in my department.	82	15%	22%	49%	15%	3.27	3.15	3.28
7. Staff salary levels.	80	35%	45%	18%	3%	2.08	2.29	2.11
8. Medical insurance benefits.	80	9%	16%	54%	21%	3.63	3.53	3.2
9. Dental insurance benefits.	80	9%	15%	55%	21%	3.65	3.62	3.3
10. Retirement benefits.	79	5%	11%	57%	27%	3.89	3.85	3.37
11. Paid time off benefits.	80	9%	15%	59%	18%	3.61	3.33	3.32
12. Staff development opportunities in my department.	80	14%	31%	41%	14%	3.1	3.18	3.13
13. Staff development opportunities at Langston University.	79	14%	37%	39%	10%	2.95	2.87	3.04

APPENDIX B: Regression Predicting Global Satisfaction

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Model Summary	
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	R	Adjusted R Square
1	(Constant)	-.292	.380		-.769	.444	.769	.585
	Work Environment	1.121	.106	.769	10.618	.000		
2	(Constant)	-3.14	.340		-.921	.360	.823	.668
	Work Environment	.707	.132	.485	5.376	.000		
	Supervision	.415	.092	.407	4.513	.000		
3	(Constant)	-.481	.338		-1.425	.158	.836	.688
	Work Environment	.512	.151	.351	3.377	.001		
	Supervision	.351	.093	.345	3.777	.000		
	Benefits Satisfaction	.334	.139	.238	2.403	.019		
4	(Constant)	-.643	.338		-1.901	.061	.847	.702
	Work Environment	.525	.148	.360	3.546	.001		
	Supervision	.500	.114	.492	4.385	.000		
	Benefits Satisfaction	.410	.140	.291	2.921	.005		
	Performance Evals	-.214	.099	-.235	-2.160	.034		

Dependent Variable: Q38

APPENDIX C: Demographics

1. GENDER		
	Response Rate	Response Count
Male	25%	23
Female	62%	58
Did not Respond	13%	12
Total	100%	93

2. EMPLOYMENT CATEGORY		
	Response Rate	Response Count
Administration	10%	9
Faculty	35%	33
Staff	42%	39
Total	87%	81

3. WORK STATUS (FT or PT)		
	Response Rate	Response Count
Full-time	83%	77
Part-time	4%	4
Total	87%	81

4. Primary Campus		
	Response Rate	Response Count
Main	75%	70
Tulsa	8%	7
OKC	4%	4
Total	87%	81

5. Race		
	Response Rate	Response Count
African American/Black	57%	53
Caucasian/White	17%	16
Other	9%	8
Total	73%	77

6. # of Years working at Langston University		
	Response Rate	Response Count
0-5	26%	24
6-10	16%	15
11-15	17%	16
16-20	11%	10
21-25	2%	2
26-30	8%	7
30+	0%	0
Total	80%	76