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Abstract

With the increase in the number of students with disabilities taking part in colleges and universities nationwide (U.S. Department of Education, 2003; Horn & Nevill, 2006; Schuh, 2000; Collins & Mowbray, 2005), the role of disability service providers is indispensable. The underlying principle of this study was to explore the working conditions of disability service providers, their roles as middle managers, and duties inherent to their position. The review of literature summarized the progression of disability services on the college or university campus, the application of organizational development theory, and the role of middle managers. This synopsis of the role of the middle managers was used as the basis of the conceptual framework.

A web-based survey was developed to identify the level of job satisfaction ratings of disability service providers with regards to managing information, overseeing funds, influencing culture, and building a career. The main purpose of this study was to achieve a greater understanding of how organizational factors influenced levels of job satisfaction among disability service providers and examine perceived responses that both restrict and support their satisfaction levels.

A web-based Service Provider Job Satisfaction Survey (SPJSS) was developed and distributed to 472 disability service providers at postsecondary institutions within the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE) states. Results of the study indicated that building a career was an important organizational factor and years in
the field had a significant impact on the level of job satisfaction. Outcomes from this study can be used as a means to identify the importance of various duties and responsibilities of disability service providers and organizational factors that could contribute to their satisfaction on the job. This study confirms the need for future research regarding organizational factors that could contribute to the level of job satisfaction of directors who provide services and supports for students at postsecondary institutions.
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Chapter One: Introduction

There have been several studies evaluating disability services from the perspective of students (Smith, 2007; Collins & Mowbray, 2005; Graham-Smith & Lafayette, 2004) and faculty (Paul, 2000). Legislation and policies such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 1990, and the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 have contributed to the awareness of disability services and civil rights of people with disabilities. With the increase in the number of students with disabilities attending colleges and universities nationwide (U.S. Department of Education, 2003; Horn & Nevill, 2006; Schuh, 2000; Collins & Mowbray, 2005; Cole & Cain, 1996), the role of disability service providers is indispensible.

According to C. S. Lerner (2004), the number of people with learning disabilities is soaring. As recently as 1976, only 750,000 American children and teenagers were said to suffer from learning disabilities, and eight years later that number had more than doubled (p. 1071). J. H. Schuh (2000) concurs that students with learning disabilities, who previously may not have been welcomed by institutions of higher education, are now enrolling and requiring special services. Lerner (2004) suggests that advocates for the learning disabled argue that learning disabilities are not over-diagnosed in wealthy areas, but may be under-diagnosed in poorer areas, which would mean that the percentage of
students nationwide diagnosed with learning disabilities and receiving accommodations is likely to rise to ten percent or higher.

E. El-Khawas (2003) indicated that students who have physical or other disabilities that affect their learning represent another growing campus constituency. She explained that since the 1970s, the percentage of freshmen who report having a disability has tripled; in 1998, about nine percent of entering freshmen reported a disability; and, in 1978, three percent did so. The trend could continue, given federal legislation upholding the rights of persons with disabilities (p. 52). W. E. Hitchings, M. Horvath, D. A. Luzzo, R. S. Ristow, and P. Retish (1998) explain that there had been unprecedented growth in the number of students with disabilities over the last two decades, primarily due to four factors: federal legislation that mandated services for those who qualify; better academic preparation in high school; students with disabilities are entering professions that require a postsecondary education; and, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 has increased opportunities for adults in higher education (p. 23).

This study focuses on the level of job satisfaction factors for disability service providers. To better identify the factors that lead to job dissatisfaction among disability service providers, college administrators will be able to address their needs to maintain quality staff. Utilizing organizational theory as the basis for developing a conceptual framework, working conditions, job duties, and responsibilities will be acknowledged to identify levels of job satisfaction. This chapter describes the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, and significance of the study.
Statement of the Problem

Although access to higher education for students with disabilities has improved over the years, offices that assist students with disabilities have not kept up with the demand for services (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000; West, Kregel, Getzel, Zhu, Ipsen, & Martin, 1993). As more children with disabilities participate in mainstream educational experiences in elementary and secondary schools, one can be sure that these students will want to enroll in postsecondary institutions (Schuh, 2000). Students entering postsecondary institutions today are also likely to expect greater accommodations than did those of a generation ago (Cole & Cain, 1996). Federal statutes such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Individuals with Disabilities Act of 1990, and the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 have invoked and extended rights for students with disabilities. However, postsecondary institutions have no other recourse than to provide reasonable accommodations (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000).

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 describes the antidiscrimination clause such that no otherwise qualified individual with a disability shall “solely by reason of disability be excluded from participating in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance” (29 U.S.C §794). Included in this definition of program is any higher education institution receiving federal student aid, research grants, or other monies.

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 warned that any institution receiving federal funds could lose its funding if they discriminated against persons with disabilities. With the potential of losing significant sums of money, postsecondary institutions have incorporated a disability service unit to address the needs of students with disabilities.
Disability service providers play an integral role for institutions in providing those services.

The American with Disabilities Act of 1990 requires reasonable accommodations to include, but are not to be limited to qualified interpreters or other effective methods of making aurally delivered materials available to individuals with hearing impairments; qualified readers, taped texts, or other effective methods of making usually delivered materials available to individuals with visual impairments; acquisition or modification of equipment or devices; and other similar services and actions (42 U.S.C. §12102). The availability of assistive technology has changed environments so that accessibility for students with disabilities has increased and their academic successes have improved with the use of voice recognition software, wireless technology and other mainstream technology developments (Graham-Smith & Lafayette, 2004).

Disability service offices exist in most community colleges and four-year institutions of higher education. These services are key to help students with disabilities access and persist in higher education (Collins & Mowbray, 2005). Service providers are available at each college and university to plan appropriate support services for qualified postsecondary students with disabilities to which they are entitled in order to meet their individual needs (Graham-Smith & Lafayette, 2004). Disability service units are housed in various offices throughout the campuses including specific academic departments or in the affirmative action office. According to the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS), however for the most part, disabilities services are housed under the student affairs umbrella (2006).
The CAS reports that the earliest disability service providers were re-assigned from student life, counseling, academic advising, or the Dean’s office (2006). The principal mission of disability support services on college and university campuses is to ensure equitable access for students with disabilities to all curricular and co-curricular opportunities offered by the institution (CAS, 2006). El-Khawas (2003) explained that supporting students with disabilities involves more than guaranteeing physical access and safety. Students may need assistance with becoming involved with clubs, organizations, internships, and leadership opportunities that allow them to develop a range of skills and to participate as valued members of the campus community (p. 52).

According to S. Graham-Smith and S. Lafayette (2004), when students with disabilities come to college, the offices of support will become a major source of stability not only by implementing the accommodations procedure for classroom activities, but also by providing advising assistance in the areas of scheduling assistance, disability management, change management, academic probation issues, resource referral, and graduation educational planning. R. A. Stodden, P. W. Dowrick, J. Anderson, K. Heyer, and J. Acosta (2005) indicated that disability support providers frequently give students a valuable human connection to the institutions’ services. In addition, disability service providers assist with career counseling.

Hitchings et al. (1998) conducted a study of career maturity levels of 75 students with and without disabilities from two private liberal arts colleges. They indicated that college students with disabilities have basic career education needs that were not being met. Therefore, with the upsurge in students with disabilities, staff at colleges and
universities should be trained to handle students with disabilities as they enter the offices of disability services for help (p. 29).

The role of disability service providers is complex. B. S. Cole and M. W. Cain (1996) explain that, as experts in the field of disabling conditions, they need to be aware of current medical advances, litigation affecting higher education, and trends in accommodations. Understanding the legal aspects of accommodating students with disabilities often seems intimidating; however, accommodation decisions should be a shared responsibility with the faculty, the student, and even the college or university counsel (Cole & Cain, 1996).

Disability service providers also play an advocacy role for students. Schuh (2000) reported that those with disabilities will expect student affairs officers to serve as their advocates, even though the potential costs associated with the changes they desire may be substantial. West et al. (1993) surveyed 40 college and university students with disabilities to determine their levels of satisfaction with accessibility, special services, and accommodations at their institutions. Students described the lack of understanding and cooperation from class instructors, professors, and other school personnel regarding accommodations and modifications that they, or the coordinator, had requested. They indicated that the office, or coordinator of services for students with disabilities, had made concerted efforts but were ineffective in alleviating their distress, or obtaining needed services and accommodations, due to resistance and discrimination from instructors and other campus personnel.

Students with disabilities come to postsecondary institutions unprepared to approach faculty about their needs for accommodations because their high school
systems are set up to foster parent involvement. Therefore, in order to effectively assist students with disabilities in dealing with the adult parameters of college life, disability support offices need to place a high priority on facilitating self-advocacy skills (Graham-Smith & Lafayette, 2004). S. Paul (2000) also indicates there is a need to educate the faculty as well as improve disabled students’ communication and negotiation skills. In addition, disability service providers are valuable sources of disability knowledge and disseminators of necessary information regarding the availability of disability services (Cole & Cain, 1996). Results of the West et al. (1993) study indicated that many students were unaware of the services to which they were entitled or which were available or indicated that services and accommodations were requested and those received but were too little, too late (p. 461).

Cole and Cain (1996) emphasized the need for faculty development in understanding disabilities-related legislation, court decisions, regulations that define and clarify rights and obligations, and training in the correct use of auxiliary aids, and the multitude of disabling conditions. Graham-Smith and Lafayette (2004) conducted a study of students with disabilities receiving accommodations from the Office of Access and Learning Accommodation at Baylor University. They found that many of the students with disabilities experienced stress that was exacerbated by university staff and faculty lacking the knowledge about and intent to accommodate the special needs of disabled scholars (p. 91). C. P. Smith (2007) conducted a study to explore specific accommodations and programs that institutions of higher education offered to students with Asperger’s Syndrome. Results indicated that faculty education was extremely important in helping the faculty understand how students with Asperger’s Syndrome can
best succeed in the classroom. Smith explained that the purpose of disability service offices is to make accommodations so that the student with disabilities can succeed in the classroom.

In order for a department with this critical mission to function, sufficient funding, accessible resources, and proper staff need to be maintained (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000). M. E. Collins and C. T. Mowbray (2005) conducted a national survey of disability services offices at 275 colleges and universities located in ten states. They suggested the need for structural changes, including more homogeneity in disability resources, a readily identifiable disability office, staff trained in psychiatric disabilities, the development of brochures and materials for these students, and other appropriate services or programs. Collins and Mowbray also proposed that in addition to providing supports for students, colleges and universities need to target efforts to faculty, administrators, and the overall student body regarding the rights, capabilities, and appropriate services for students with psychiatric disabilities (p. 314). In regard to students with disabilities, Paul (2000) explained that these students face both physical and attitudinal barriers within the university environment. West et al. (1993) pointed out that literature tends to describe how postsecondary institutions and students with disabilities have coped with each other, rather than exploring means to improve services and promote success (p. 457). The office of disability services on campus plays an integral role in meeting those obligations; however, the lack of resources makes it difficult to provide adequate services for students who need accommodations. According to CAS (2006), the allocation of financial resources must be adequate to meet the obligations of the institution under relevant national, State, provincial, and local laws.
The weight of responsibility put upon disability service providers can be daunting. The numbers of students with hidden disabilities such as health impairments or learning disabilities have increased. El-Khawas (2003) explained that while not noticeable, these hidden disabilities such as mental health issues and health-related disabilities, including AIDS and chemical sensitivity, still require accommodation or assistance. Cole and Cain (1996) explained, as more students with various visible and invisible disabilities enter higher education, the need increases for faculty development and educational advocacy to address the unique challenges these students present. If disability service providers value their jobs or find their work rewarding, they will experience job satisfaction and remain in their positions. When they become dissatisfied with their jobs and eventually leave positions, it could create a disruption in disability services that institutions are required to provide (Graham-Smith & Lafayette, 2004). Understanding the influence of organizational factors in order to retain these valuable employees who provide and facilitate disability services is significant.

**Purpose of the Study**

The main purpose of this study is to achieve a greater understanding of how organizational factors influence levels of job satisfaction among disability service providers and examine perceived response that both restrict and support their satisfaction levels. This study explores how years of service both in the role of director and total years of service in the disability service field influence the level of job satisfaction. An analysis of the level of job satisfaction in relation to management roles such as managing information, overseeing funds, influencing culture, and building a career is part of the study. In addition, the study includes a summary, discusses current research focusing on
disability services, and examines emerging practices to promote job satisfaction among middle managers at postsecondary institutions.

**Research Questions**

In order to gain a more in-depth understanding into the level of job satisfaction among disability service providers, the following research questions guided this study:

1. What internal and external factors contribute most to overall job satisfaction among disability service providers?
2. What is the impact of the faculty or administrative reporting structure on disability service providers?
   a. How satisfied are disability service providers with support provided by institutional administrators?
   b. How satisfied are disability service providers with support provided by institutional faculty?
3. What is the correlation between years of service as a disability service provider and the level of job satisfaction?
   a. How many years of service do disability service providers remain in their position as director or coordinator?
   b. How many total years of service do disability service providers have in their field of disability services?

**Significance of the Study**

According to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU, 2008), States’ fiscal forecasts are among the top ten policy issues for higher education in 2008. They explain that State revenue growth is slowing and being outpaced
by spending pressures and a period of using surpluses to bolster rainy day funds, boost spending programs, and provide tax cuts as a strategy to patch up budget shortfalls (p. 2). According to J. H. Schuh (2003), States are running short of funds, and the federal government cannot be looked to as a dependable source of revenue. G. E. Kaplan (2006) investigated State fiscal crises and cuts in higher education. She reported that between 2003 and 2004 Colorado imposed the largest two-year cuts in State funding for higher education, reducing expenditures by 22 percent.

According to D. B. Woodard and S. R. Komives (2003), the competition for State and federal dollars has intensified, resulting in a shifting of resources away from higher education. They expect that the current financial stress in higher education will continue to be a reality for the foreseeable future (p. 643). The study by Collins and Mowbray (2005) examined the policy context in which States and educational institutions addressed the needs of individuals with psychiatric disabilities seeking to attend and succeed in postsecondary education. They concluded that inhibiting factors included political and budgetary uncertainty, competing priorities in the mental health system, an emphasis on a medical rather than rehabilitative model, regulations on the vocational rehabilitation system, and lukewarm enthusiasm of the advocacy community (p. 431).

With budgetary constraints affecting the higher education community, the mentality of “do more with less” proliferated. T. Christ and R. Stodden (2005) explained that general fiscal funds cover some of the costs, but rarely, if ever, do the funds match the costs of the services. According to D. B. Woodard (2001), there have been several far-reaching federal mandates over the past 30 years that have had serious budgetary implications; however, the cost of these programs has had the effect of shifting dollars
from one source to another, rather than increasing revenues for institutions. Institutions were instructed to “do more, with less, for more students,” thereby eroding the funding base of higher education (p. 247).

Many States have implemented hiring freezes, so that new positions were not being opened and existing vacated positions were not filled. Schuh (2003) explained that as a result of institutions simply not having a sufficient revenue stream to support all the activities and services they would like to provide, some institutions mandated downsizing, referring to the elimination of positions or, in some cases, entire units. Kaplan (2006) clarified that “most institutions tried their best to avoid layoffs, particularly to faculty, and instead chose to eliminate vacant positions, regardless of whether these were in areas the institution should have been growing” (p. 34). Stodden et al. (2005) pointed out that many students reported that the disability service offices are understaffed and can therefore assist only those students with the most urgent needs.

There is some temporary relief in sight. The State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) could appropriate funds to States that maintain state support for public postsecondary institutions at least at the level of support in fiscal year 2006 (Maloney, 2009). According to K. Maloney (2009), prior to the ARRA States faced budgetary shortfalls that forced cuts to postsecondary education that included eliminating academic programs, closing campuses, and eliminating merit scholarships and financial aid. She indicated that, in order to partly close the budget gap in Arizona, their Governor approved a $141.5 million cut to state universities and the Arizona Board of Regents. She explained that to help alleviate the budgetary shortfall for FY 2009, FY 2010 and/or FY 2011, Arizona will
receive up to $726.3 million specifically allocated towards higher education from the ARRA. In Colorado, prior to the ARRA, a proposal threatened to cut $300 million from higher education, however, Colorado is expected to receive $452 billion from the SFSF for higher education (Maloney, 2009). However, Maloney warned that if States are not prudent about how SFSF money is spent, they will face similar financial issues in two years.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2000), over the past couple of decades both postsecondary education enrollment of students with disabilities and the demands for related services have increased. West et al. (1993) explained that there is widespread concern among students with disabilities that the gains made in recent years could be reversed as colleges and universities faced more and deeper cuts in operating budgets and personnel. From their accounts, a significant number of institutions’ services for students with disabilities were straining under increasing requests for services and declining resources (p. 465).

Postsecondary institutions cannot afford to lose highly trained disability services administrators and the knowledge and experience they possess. According to a study on job satisfaction of social workers by B. B. Butler (1990), income continues to be an issue and low salaries are one of the reasons that agencies are losing some of their most highly trained workers to private practice. Collins and Mowbray (2005) explained that the protection of fundamental rights for students with disabilities to access higher education is a responsibility of the federal government; for some individuals these rights cannot be secured without appropriate support (p. 448). Christ and Stodden (2005) clarified that postsecondary institutions are in the difficult position of serving students with diverse
disabilities by providing a multitude of supports and accommodations despite minimal financial support. Funding for disability service offices, in addition to special initiatives for psychiatrically disabled students, and federal financial aid are needed to assist these students (Collins & Mowbray, 2005).

Many researchers have described the problems and postsecondary service needs for specific disability populations, including students with learning disabilities (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000; Lerner, 2004; Cole & Cain, 1996), mental retardation (Neubert, Moon, Grigal, & Redd, 2001), and psychiatric disabilities (Collins & Mowbray, 2005) from the student’s perspective. However, there is a need to understand and recognize the important role of disability service providers and to identify factors related to the level of job satisfaction in order to maintain leadership at institutions and advance the knowledge and skills of the profession. The underlying principle for this study is to explore the working conditions of disability service providers, such as their roles as middle managers, and duties and responsibilities inherent of their positions.

A web-based survey was developed to identify the level of job satisfaction ratings among disability service providers with regard to managing information, overseeing funds, influencing culture, and building a career. Findings from this study provided an understanding of the working conditions for disability service providers and information from this study can be used to identify priorities for services and advocacy.

**Summary**

This first chapter provided a brief overview of disability service providers and their significance on college and university campuses. Disability service providers assist with academic accommodations, work to improve the institution’s physical access,
advocate for students, and serve as educators and consultants of disability-related issues (Dungy, 2003). Significant public policy related to the increase of students with disabilities was outlined and the importance of disability service providers was examined.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

Introduction

The review of literature includes a summary of the progression of disability services on the college or university campus, the application of organizational development theory, and the role of middle managers. The first section will consider numerous legislative initiatives that have contributed to the increase of disability services. This section will focus on federal laws affecting the role of disability service providers and their responsibility to provide services for students with disabilities. The second section will focus on organizational development theory and will address organizational theory as it relates to higher education. Last, a synopsis on the role of and a conceptual framework for middle managers will be presented.

History of Disability Services on College Campuses

It is clear that students with disabilities have become mainstays on college and university campuses nationwide (Stodden, Whelley, Chang, & Harding, 2001). Paul (2000) explained that higher education in the United States undergoes change in response to modifications in the perceived needs of the society, legislative policies, and social attitudes resulting in a considerable change in the student pool in higher educational institutions, which includes every type of disability. Significant legislation has helped to solidify the rights of people with disabilities and their pursuit of access to education including the 1945 Servicemen’s Readjustment Act, the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the 1973
Rehabilitation Act, the 1990 American with Disabilities Act, the 1990 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and the 1998 Higher Education Amendments. This section will explain each statute and describe their ramifications for disability services at colleges and universities.

1945 Servicemen’s Readjustment Act, G. I. Bill

In the years following World War II, colleges and universities began to experience an expansion that continued for about 25 years (Freeland, 1997). According to R. M. Freeland (1997), two war-related federal programs were important for higher education: during the conflict itself, the organization of scientists to develop military technology; in the later years of the war and the early postwar period, the benefits for veterans in the G.I. Bill included educational entitlements (p. 588). Also known as the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act, the overriding rationale of the G.I. Bill was to help returning veterans assimilate back into civilian life.

The G.I. Bill of Rights, 1994, indicates:

any person who served in the active military or naval service… shall have been discharged or released from active service by reason of an actual service-incurred injury or disability, shall be eligible for and entitled to receive education or training under this part. Such person shall be eligible for and entitled to such course of education or training, full-time or the equivalent thereof in part-time training, as he may elect, and at any approved educational or training institution at which he chooses (Goodchild & Wechsler, 1997, p. 755).

The influx of veterans on college and university campuses was astounding. According to Freeland (1997), for most of 1946, M.I.T. received 4,000 applications per month; between 1945 and 1949 about 2,200,000 former servicemen enrolled in postsecondary education institutions through the G.I. Bill, more than three times the maximum figure projected during the war (p. 590). According to the Department of
Veterans Affairs (VA), by the time the original G.I. Bill ended in July 1956, 7.8 million World War II veterans had participated in an education or training program. The legacy of the original G.I. Bill lives on in the Montgomery G.I. Bill assuring that education programs continue to work for our newest generation of combat veterans (2009). In 2008, the Montgomery G.I. Bill was revised, giving veterans with active duty service on or after September 11, 2001 enhanced educational benefits, covering more educational expenses, providing a living allowance, money for books, and the ability to transfer unused educational benefits to spouses or children (VA, 2009).

The VA also implemented the Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (VR&E) Program to help veterans with service-connected disabilities to prepare for, find, and keep suitable jobs. Under this program, educational and vocational counseling is provided for eligible service members to identify an educational or vocational goal and to select training institutions where this goal may be pursued. Services under this option include on-the-job training (OJT), apprenticeships, postsecondary education such as college, vocational or technical school, internships, job shadowing, work monitoring, work study, and public-private job partnering (VA, 2009). For the fiscal year 2007, the VA estimated approximately 523,000 students received education benefits; 20 percent of them were first-time recipients of VA education benefits (VA, 2008).

**Human and civil rights acts: impact on higher education**

With regard to human and civil rights, Title IC of the 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibited discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin by public elementary and secondary schools and public institutions of higher learning; Title
VI prohibited discrimination by recipients of federal funds (Gehring, 2000). According to the United States Department of Justice (DOJ), recipients of a federally assisted program cannot deny program services, aids, or benefits; provide different services, aid or benefit, or provide them in a manner different than they are provided to others; or segregate or separately treat individuals in any matter related to the receipt of any service, aid, or benefit.

The Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965 provided financial aid in the form of grants, loans, and work study opportunities to qualified students, including individuals with disabilities, to help them pay for their postsecondary educations. In 1998, HEA was amended and two new programs that assisted students with disabilities were created: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEARUP) provided grants to States and to partnerships between postsecondary institutions and high poverty middle schools and junior high schools to prepare students, including those with disabilities, for a college or university education, and the Office of Postsecondary Education Programs (OPE) was created to fund demonstration projects designed to provide faculty and administrators in postsecondary institutions with the skills and support they need to teach students with disabilities (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000).

In an attempt to break down barriers towards people with disabilities, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 prevented any public employer or program from discriminating against an “otherwise qualified handicapped individual,” allowing equal opportunities both in education and in the workforce. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 was modeled after Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act (Gehring, 2000).
Paul (2000) explained that Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended in 1974, was the first significant national legislation affecting students with disabilities in higher educational institutions who strived to secure funds from the federal government. Enforced by the U.S. Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights, Section 504 prohibits discrimination against individuals with disabilities on the basis of their disability by recipients of federal financial assistance, including institutions of elementary and secondary education, higher education, colleges, universities, and postsecondary vocational education and adult education programs (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000).

M. West, J. Kregel, E. E. Getzel, M. Zhu, S. M. Ipsen, and E. D. Martin (1993) detailed the provisions of Subpart E of the rules and regulations which addresses postsecondary educational services and specifically prohibits discrimination in the areas of recruitment and admissions, academic and athletic programs and activities, student examinations and evaluations, housing, financial aid, counseling, and career planning and placement (p. 456). D. D. Gehring (2000) pointed out that the requirement to provide auxiliary aids to disabled students applies whether the student is enrolled in credit or non-credit courses and must be provided unless doing so creates an “undue financial or administrative burden.” In addition, schools at all levels are required to make modifications to academic requirements and other rules that discriminate against students with disabilities, to provide auxiliary aids (such as taped texts and readers) to learners with disabilities, and to ensure that social organizations supported by the school do not discriminate on the basis of disability (West et al., 1993).
According to the United States Department of Justice, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), formally the 1990 Education of the Handicapped Act, required States and local education agencies (LEAs) to provide a free and appropriate public education to children with disabilities. Although IDEA focused primarily on students in primary and secondary education, it affects postsecondary education as well. According to Paul (2000), legislation aimed at eliminating discrimination against individuals with disabilities permitted youths with disabilities who graduated from secondary institutions the opportunity to seek admission to higher educational institutions. In addition, those with severe disabilities and mental retardation were ensured access opportunities on college and university campuses and participation in regular courses (Neubert, Moon, Grigal, & Redd, 2001).

The 1997 IDEA added a new requirement. A statement of transition services had to be included in the Individualized Education Program (IEP) for each student with a disability (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000). The transition plan had to identify needed services for students with disabilities as they transitioned into postsecondary education. According to D. Price-Ellingstad and H. Berry (2000), these changes were intended to help students with disabilities appropriately prepare for and meet the academic requirements of postsecondary education. Collins and Mowbray (2005) reported that the transition plan could include developing postsecondary education and career goals, getting work experience while still in secondary school, and setting up linkages with adult service providers (such as the vocational rehabilitation agency).
Although they are not specific to rights of people with disabilities, other civil rights acts that merit recognition are the Education Amendments of 1972 and the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974. In the passing of the Education Amendments, Title IX prohibited discrimination on the basis of gender by recipients of federal funds which ensured equitable participation opportunities for female students in athletics and, in cases of sexual harassment, by school administrators, teachers, and students. The Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 prohibits specific discriminatory conduct including segregating students on the basis of race, color or national origin, and discrimination against faculty and staff.

**The 1990 American with Disabilities Act**

The 1990 American with Disabilities Act (ADA) is the most comprehensive civil rights act that specifically addresses discrimination against persons with disabilities (Collins & Mowbray, 2005). Hyped as a “second generation civil rights statute,” the ADA considerably expanded the American anti-discrimination law (Lerner, 2004). According to the DOJ, Title II of the ADA most directly applies to educational facilities and guarantees that no individual with a disability shall, by reason of such disability, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, program, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by any such entity. Title III prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in public accommodations, such as schools, operated by private entities.

The ADA broadened the definition of a disabled person to include a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of such
(an) individual; a record of such an impairment; or being regarded as having such an impairment (42 U.S.C §12102). The ADA defines disability as an impairment that substantially limits a major life activity, with reference not to one’s innate abilities, but to the skills of the average American citizen (Lerner, 2004). Although there are many similarities between Section 504 and the ADA, a new emphasis within the ADA marked the inclusion of contagious and non-contagious diseases into the definition of physical and mental disabilities, specifically addressing HIV and AIDS (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000). The Act does not replace the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, but complements and expands its coverage (Cole & Cain, 1996).

Examples of major life activities could include the caring for oneself, performing manual tasks, walking, seeing, hearing, speaking, breathing, learning, and working. A major life activity is “substantially limited” if a person is unable to perform the major life activities that the average person in the general population can perform or significantly restricted - as to condition, manner or duration - in the manner in which the individual can perform a major life activity, relative to the average person in the general population (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000). The ADA Amendments Act of 2008 (ADAAA) took it a step further in defining “disability” and broadens the scope of coverage under both the ADA and Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act (U.S. Department of Labor). The U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) clarified the definition of disability in the ADAAA by modifying key terms such as: expanding the definition of major life activities to be expanded to include major bodily functions; redefining who is regarded as having a disability; modifying the regulatory definition of substantial limits; specifying that
disability includes any impairment that is episodic or in remission; and prohibiting consideration of the ameliorative effects of mitigating measures when assessing whether an impairment substantially limits a person’s major life activities.

A “qualified individual with a disability” means an individual with a disability who, with or without reasonable modifications to rules, policies, or practices, the removal of architectural, communication, or transportation barriers, or the provision of auxiliary aid and series, meets the essential eligibility requirements for the receipt of services or the participation in programs or activities provided by the public entity (42 U.S.C. §12115). The ADA was enacted to assure that individuals with disabilities in the United States are given civil rights protections from discrimination (Cole & Cain, 1996).

The term “reasonable accommodation” may include making existing facilities used by employees readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities and job restructuring, part-time or modified work schedules, reassignment to a vacant position, acquisition or modification of equipment or devices, appropriate adjustment or modification of examination, training materials or policies, the provision of qualified readers or interpreters, and other similar accommodations for individuals with disabilities (42 U.S.C. §12111). M. J. Barr (2003) explained that the ADA not only covers employment issues but also focuses on physical and program accommodations for people with disabilities, including members of the public who may visit the campus and other places of public accommodation. An example of institutional compliance included providing sign language interpreters at all public lectures and programs or providing assistance to visually impaired nonstudents who purchase recreation facility memberships.
When two or more reasonable accommodations are possible, the program may choose the one that is least expensive or easiest to implement; this choice, however, must provide a meaningful opportunity to perform the essential functions and/or requirements of the program (Cole & Cain, 1996).

The ADA recognized that some accommodations that may be requested could pose an undue hardship on the program or facility whereas the term “undue hardship” means an action requiring significant difficulty or expense (42 U.S.C. §12111). If there were an undue hardship placed upon an employer to provide for “reasonable accommodations,” they would be excluded from the mandate of the law (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000).

According to Price-Ellingstad and Berry (2000), in order for a student to receive accommodations, the student must self-disclose their disability and have a documented history of the disability in order for a plan of action for the accommodation to be developed. Once a student is qualified with a disability, the institution must provide reasonable accommodations to access facilities and services. This could include, but is not limited to, qualified interpreters or other effective methods of making aurally delivered materials available to individuals with hearing impairments; qualified readers, taped texts, or other effective methods of making usually delivered materials available to individuals with visual impairments; acquisition or modification of equipment or devices, and other similar services and actions (42 U.S.C. §12102). The college or university is required to provide the accommodation necessary to help the student achieve success in
learning as long as it does not cause undue hardship or unacceptable changes to the program (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000, p. 24).

F. A. Hamrick, N. J. Evans, and J. H. Schuh (2002) explained that the terrain of a campus may be of particular concern to a student who has mobility impairments and faces difficulty walking up and down hilly sidewalks. Although all disabilities are supposed to be addressed on the campuses, students with physical disabilities needing basic architectural access were more likely accommodated by reconstructing doorways, ramps, restrooms, and elevators. Even though this form of accommodation was more costly, it was more easily accomplished since defining it was easier (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000). However, many buildings (and offices, classrooms, or equipment within buildings), especially on older campuses, are not physically accessible and must be brought into compliance within a given time period (Hamrick et al., 2002).

The accessibility of buildings on campus is an issue to which an institution of higher education must pay attention. Schuh (2000) clarified that among the implications of the legislation for student affairs officers include tapping housing reserves for residence hall modifications. G. S. McClellan and M. J. Barr (2000) explained that at a college or university, facilities are more than just buildings; a student union becomes a location for student involvement and participation; a residence hall becomes a place for students to learn about and appreciate differences; and programs, activities, and services within the building and the individuals and groups who use the facility all shape what the building means to a campus community (p. 197).
In Section 504, public colleges and universities were prohibited from discrimination against individuals on the basis of their disabilities because the institutions received federal financial assistance. It was not until the passing of ADA that private colleges and universities were required to follow the same rules. According to the ADA, a public entity means any State or local government; any department, agency, special purpose district, or other instrumentality of a State or States or local government; and, the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (42 U.S.C. §12131). A “private entity” means “any entity other than a public entity” (42 U.S.C. §12181). The ADA affects all companies, businesses, educational facilities, and community activities, whether small or large, private or public, whether or not they received federal funds (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000).

Price-Ellingstad and Berry (2000) indicated that both Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and Title II of the ADA require a postsecondary institution to provide auxiliary aids and services, when appropriate, to guarantee that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated, or otherwise treated differently than other individuals (p. 3). To assist students with these services, collaboration with vocational rehabilitation services was encouraged. In order to promote collaboration, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 was amended in 1998 to include a compromise provision that was contained in Section 101(a)(8)(B) of the Act (p. 7). This provision required each State’s vocational rehabilitation agency and other appropriate agencies to develop an interagency agreement or other mechanism for interagency coordination to ensure the provision of vocational rehabilitation services to eligible individuals with disabilities.
Price-Ellingstad and Berry (2000) explained this new provision was designed to help resolve the disagreements between institutions of higher education and State vocational rehabilitation agencies, on a State-by-State basis, concerning which agency is responsible for financing services for postsecondary students who are also vocational rehabilitation consumers (p. 7).

Another piece of legislation that allowed people with disabilities opportunity for training and employment is the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999. The law gives recipients of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) the right to choose their job training, employment placement and other service providers from a list of providers approved by the Social Security Administration (SSA). According to J. V. Switzer (2003), the difference between this policy and previous policies is the emphasis on choice – allowing individuals to choose what type of training or setting is best suited to their needs. Individuals with disabilities are given a “Ticket” which they can present to an Employment Network provider. The intention of the Ticket Program is to work with businesses, State vocational rehabilitation agencies and other traditional and non-traditional service providers to prepare individuals with disabilities for work and link them with employers who want to hire qualified employees. Switzer (2003) explained that this program also allows individuals to work without losing their Medicare and Medicaid benefits which was a significant deterrent to finding employment.
Summary of disability services on college campuses

The end of the Vietnam War brought about many veterans with war-related injuries to college and university campuses. Although this was not the first time the United States had dealt with disabled soldiers returning home, the number of returning veterans with handicaps was much larger and they were more vocal (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000). When returning from overseas, veterans often have a difficult time readjusting to society in addition to dealing with physical and mental injuries sustained during war (Stringer, 2007). Price-Ellingstad and Berry (2000) explained in the early 1970s Vietnam veterans began returning to American society and started experiencing war-related injury discrimination. Many colleges and universities now offer assistance through veterans programs and/or disability service programs. E. Stringer (2007) highlighted San Diego State University’s Troops for College program which is aimed not only at recruiting veterans but also helping them throughout their college program with support, especially since many of them return with post-traumatic stress disorder and must adjust to college life. Stringer emphasized that colleges and universities can support returning soldiers by offering specialized programming and can assist former military by serving as more than an educational institution through assistance with living out a core value: caring community.

Postsecondary education is vital for better careers and futures among individuals with disabilities. There are many challenges that need to be addressed in order to increase access to and success in colleges and universities (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000). Professional literature suggests that students with disabilities often faced additional
challenges in their educational environments. As the number of students with disabilities seeking to complete their postsecondary educations increases across the country, additional issues present problems to this emerging population (Paul, 2000).

It is important to note that Section 504 requires that programs, not environments, be accessible to students with disabilities and an institution need not create a totally barrier-free environment, so long as the participation of students with disabilities in a program is not hindered when viewed in its entirety (West et al., 1993). Determining whether or not there is a legal duty to accommodate and calibrate the appropriate accommodation to the disability, whether legally mandated or not, are thorny problems that confront educational institutions daily (Lerner, 2004, p. 1093). It is important for colleges and universities to be aware of the laws promoting the rights of students with disabilities and their impact to campus programs and activities. Barr (2003) explained that knowledge of the fundamental legal constraints and newly emerging laws are vital to student affairs administrators since it shapes policies, practices, and decisions.

Both Section 504 and the ADA clearly indicate universities must not discriminate in the admission process including the recruitment, application, testing, interviewing, and decision-making processes (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000). In the 1993 court case Halasz v. University of New England, a learning-disabled individual applied to the university for admission as a transfer student. The university granted admission and provided tutors for his courses. He continued to have difficulty keeping up with the program and, in spite of the extra support from the university, the student felt that it was insufficient. Although the university provided reasonable accommodations, he was not
able to meet the program requirements. The record showed that the university made reasonable accommodations in its admissions process for learning disabled students and the Court found that even after reasonable accommodations were made for the student’s handicaps, he was not otherwise qualified for admission to the university’s baccalaureate program, and the university did not discriminate against him by dismissing him after his first year.

Addressing the needs of physically-disabled individuals often goes beyond architectural access. Some of the “reasonable accommodations” requested by students include modifying testing procedures, instructional delivery systems methods, and specific course activities (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000). Cole and Cain (1996) explained that programs are not required to change their academic requirements if the change would demonstrably require a substantial alteration in an essential element of the curriculum.

The Courts have supported the right of educational institutions and professional programs to set educational policies. In the case of McGregor v. Louisiana State University (1993), a law school student who had suffered spinal and head injuries was admitted but began experiencing academic setbacks despite remedial help and numerous accommodations. After having failed his first-year courses twice, he wanted to continue but was advised to repeat the first year courses for a third time. Due to his physical disabilities, the student requested part-time status and permission to take his exams at home with a proctor. He also requested that the law school offer the exam in an alternate format rather than multiple-choice testing questions. The university claimed that the
format of the exams was essential and to modify the requirement for full-time status or the exam format would alter the program significantly. The student filed a suit claiming discrimination that the university failed to make reasonable accommodations for him. The Court decided for the university, holding that the accommodations the university made were reasonable and that they were not required to lower their standards.

ADA expanded the definition of physical and mental disabilities to include contagious and non-contagious diseases, specifically addressing HIV and AIDS. In the 1995 court case of Doe v. University of Maryland, a neurosurgical resident doctor was stuck with a needle infected with the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) that pierced his skin accidently in the hospital. The doctor subsequently contracted HIV and the hospital suspended him from surgical practice but offered him alternative residency programs in non-surgical fields. After the doctor refused the alternative residencies, the hospital terminated him from its residency program. Both the hospital and university determined that the doctor could potentially risk the health and safety of patients and that reasonable accommodation could not remove the risk. The doctor filed the suit claiming that the hospital had discriminated against him. The Court affirmed that the university had acted properly and that the doctor posed a significant risk to the health and safety of his patients that could not be eliminated by reasonable accommodation. The Court indicated the risk of percutaneous injury could never be eliminated through reasonable accommodation, and therefore, the doctor was not an otherwise qualified individual with a disability.
Gehring (2001) explained that in determining if an individual with a contagious disease is “otherwise qualified,” the Supreme Court has applied a 4-point test, which asks how is the disease transmitted, how long will the carrier be capable of transmitting the disease, what is the potential risk to third parties, and what is the probability that the disease will be transmitted and cause harm?

Most litigation regarding the ADA revolves around programmatic access and the issue of proving if a person was “otherwise qualified” for the job or the position had they not been “disabled” (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000). Although the program cannot ask a student about a disability or past history of a disability during the admission process, applicants may be asked whether they can perform essential functions of the curriculum and program requirements (Cole & Cain, 1996).

In the case of Southeastern v. Davis (1979), a student who had a serious hearing disability sought to be trained as a registered nurse and enrolled at the college. She was not admitted to the program because the college determined that she would not be able to participate safely in the normal training program. In order to communicate, this particular student with severe hearing loss was required to lip read. The hospital and university claimed that the student was unable to fulfill her duties as a nurse because being hearing-impaired and unable to hear what was going on around her could potentially harm patients who depended on her. The Supreme Court held that the college’s policies were legitimate academic policies. The college was not required to lower its standards or limit its freedom to require reasonable physical qualifications for admission to a clinical training program. The Court found that the purpose of the college’s program was to train
people who could serve the nursing profession in all customary ways and that the student could not have participated unless its standards were lowered.

By the 1980s, an increasing number of learning-disabled students was entering higher education. Consequently, disability programs scrambled to identify how to deal with the multitude of issues related to learning-disabled students (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000). Being diagnosed as learning-disabled does not mean that a student is “slow” or unintelligent; the idea is that there is a “substantial discrepancy” between a student’s innate intelligence and his or her academic performance, either generally or in a specific field (Lerner, 2004). Cole and Cain (1996) explained that if students chose not to identify themselves as disabled, they are not entitled to accommodations.

A student with a disability has the responsibility to disclose the disability and request accommodations. In the 1996 case of *Tips v. Texas Tech University*, the student attended the university’s graduate program and had a mathematical disability that was accommodated in a statistics course. The student filed a suit after failing all four parts of her doctoral comprehensive exams claiming that it was due to her inability to conceptually organize material. She did not request an accommodation before she took the exam and the Court concluded that the ADA defined the term “discriminate” to include not making reasonable accommodations to the known limitations of an otherwise qualified individual with a disability. It was the student’s responsibility to inform the university that she needed an accommodation.

According to the United States Department of Education (2003), between 1999 and 2000 nine percent of all undergraduate students in degree-granting institutions
reported having a disability that created difficulties for them as students. Among students
with disabilities, 26 percent reported receiving disability-related services or
accommodations. However, 22 percent of students with disabilities reported not receiving
the services or accommodations they needed. L. Horn and S. Nevill (2006) reported that
11 percent of undergraduates had a disability in 2003-2004, and among students reporting
a disability, 25 percent reported an orthopedic condition, 22 percent reported a mental
illness or depression, and 17 percent reported health impairment. It is evident that there is
an increase in the number of students with disabilities enrolling in colleges and
universities. With the passing of civil rights laws, students with disabilities are
empowered to seek educational training beyond high school. Higher education
institutions must be prepared to assist this divergent population of students and be
equipped to make reasonable accommodations towards their academic success.

Organizational Development Theory

In recognizing the organizational structure of the institution, disability service
providers can better accommodate administrative concerns. Hamrick et al. (2002)
described an institution of higher education as a complex organization that exhibits
characteristics similar to other goal-directed systems and its structure that influences the
behaviors and attitudes of individuals within it (p. 93). This section will focus on
organizational development theory and its impact on the higher education environment.
In addition, a synopsis of the role of the middle managers will be presented and a
conceptual framework for middle managers will be discussed.
Organizational models

Kuh identified four models by which one can examine different institutional organizational systems: Rational Model; Bureaucratic Model; Collegial Model; and, Political Model (Ambler, 2000). The rational model is based on academic values such as rules of logic, order, direction, and predictable behavior. In 1947, Max Weber developed the bureaucratic model which identified most with hierarchical settings where there is a division of labor, specialization areas, technical competence, standard operating procedures, and rules of work. The main component of the collegial model is the focus on valuing participation of all members in the decision-making process. The political model stresses the significance of power, influence, and conflict resolution (Ambler, 2000).

D. A. Ambler (2000) clarified that the rational model of organizational structure is accepted among academe for its rules of logic and order and played upon the notion that there is a universal goal and reception of the institutional mission. I. Chaleff (1998) explained that effective followers assume responsibility for learning the rules of the system in which they operate, which are basically guidelines for using the group’s resources, as methods for orderly decision-making, assurances of fairness, and the clarification and guarantees of expected standards. He concluded that rules are the agreements by which the group maintains its identity, expresses values, and coordinates activities. An effective follower understands the rules and knows how to get things done within a specific framework. While the rational model is prevalent in small, private, or religious colleges, it does not explain the structures found in large, multi-purpose
institutions where many members of the learning community hold diverse and competing agendas (Ambler, 2000).

The bureaucratic model was commonly used among colleges and universities. According to J. C. Dalton (2003), the bureaucratic model emphasized division of labor, specialization of roles, hierarchies of authority, and a complex system of rules and laws that governed relationships and processes. G. D. Kuh (2003) explained that this model appeals to reason and logic with clearly defined roles, functions, responsibilities, scope of authority, and relationships. R. Birnbaum (1989) emphasized that effective and efficient operation of the college depends on compliance with rules and regulations, and conformity is not left to change or to goodwill. Instead, the organization is structured as a hierarchy (p. 112). Yet, critics explained that its inflexibility causes it to be ineffective in establishing a creative environment for academe (Ambler, 2000).

Ambler (2000) explained that the collegial model values participation of all members in the decision-making process. For collegial processes to be effective, people must be open to new ideas (Kuh, 2003). According to Birnbaum (1989), the college is egalitarian and democratic, where administration and faculty are considered equals, and each have the right and opportunity for discussion and influence. He further explained that leadership positions in collegial systems are expected to influence without coercion, to direct without sanctions, and to control without inducing alienation (p. 102). Its central value is the participation of all members of the enterprise in the decision-making process to establish an institutional mission and goals. However, Kuh indicated that this model is
inefficient, insensitive to power differentials, resource availability, and the realities of policy implementation (Ambler, 2000).

The political model stressed the significance of power, influence, and conflict resolution, particularly in calculating resources and influencing policy decisions. Kuh (2003) clarified that although the political view implies faculty and staff will be involved in decision and policy making, this is not necessarily the case. Sometimes a decision is made without the knowledge of those individuals affected by it which could lead to feelings of alienation and problems with implementation (p. 275). Ambler (2000) explained that power is most often derived from the ability to control resources and to influence the development of institutional policy. P. L. Moore (2000) stated that in organizational life the term “politics” may be the most employed and least understood concept among the words we use to describe important aspects of our work.

L. Bolman and T. Deal (1991) looked at organizations from a frames viewpoint. This frame point of view suggests that both leaders and followers with different perspectives will interpret the meaning of leadership differently (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989). Their four frames include Structural Frame; Human Resource Frame; Political Frame; and, Symbolic Frame. The Structural Frame emphasizes formal roles and relationships which is similar to the Bureaucratic Model in that it focuses on hierarchical methods of leadership. The Human Resource Frame focuses on the needs of people, suggesting that organizations should eliminate organizational constraints and allow for employee-centered leadership. The Political Frame considers the conflict over scarce resources and departments represent special interest groups with each vying for resources
and privileges. The Symbolic frame views organizations as cultures with shared values and embraces the process of organizational change (Bensimon et al., 1989).

Bensimon et al. (1989) described a structural frame similar to Kuh’s bureaucratic model which was influenced by Max Weber’s organizational theory. Organizations that employ the structural frame are those with a hierarchical system where divisions of labor are structured and the fundamental nature of the organizations is rationality (Bensimon et al., 1989). Bolman and Deal (1991) suggested that administrators who implement the structural frame control activity by making decisions, resolving conflicts, solving problems, evaluating performances and output, and distributing rewards and penalties. Bensimon et al. (1989) compared the structural frame with University as Bureaucracy, explaining that the essence of bureaucratic leadership is making decisions and designing systems of control and coordination that direct the work of others and verify their compliance with directives. Bureaucratic leaders have been considered heroic due to their positions at the top of a presumably competence-based hierarchy because they have knowledge and power well beyond the range of the average person (Bensimon et al., 1989).

Bensimon et al. (1989) suggested that effective organizations are those that provide opportunities for self-actualization, give attention to removing organizational constraints, and believe that employee-centered leadership will lead to increased morale, which will lead to increased productivity (p. 29). This description supports the position of the human resource frame which focuses on the people in the organization and a democratic system of decision-making.
In 1960, McGregor constructed the Theory X and Theory Y to differentiate the structural from the human resource frame (Bensimon et al., 1989). In his characterizations of Theory X, McGregor explained that workers are lazy, resist change, and must be led by managers, and in Theory Y, workers are inherently motivated and creative, and effective managers are those who structure organizations to use this energy. Rather than emphasizing control and supervision, leaders who adopt the human resource frame give attention to removing organizational constraints on workers and to self-enhancing processes such as increased participation in decision-making and job enlargement (Bensimon et al., 1989).

The University as Collegium is another way Bensimon et al. (1989) described the human resource frame that emphasized equality in a system stressing consensus, shared power and participation in governance, and common commitments and aspirations. They implied that leaders are more servants of the group than masters, who are expected to listen, to persuade, to leave themselves open to influence, and to share the burden of decision-making (p. 55).

Administrators who use a political frame in their structure view the organization as formal and informal groups vying for power to control institutional processes and outcomes as if the organization were fragmented into special interest groups, each pursuing its own objectives (Bensimon et al., 1989). They explained that decisions result from bargaining, influencing, and coalition building, and leaders with a political frame are mediators or negotiators between shifting power blocs. The University as Political System as described by Bensimon et al. (1989) emphasized that leadership in higher
education is viewed through the political frame, where leaders are considered mediators or negotiators between shifting power blocs and as policy makers presiding over a cabinet form of administration (p. 58). Moore (2000) clarified an important caveat: the political approach is not the only useful one in understanding organizations in general and higher education in particular.

The symbolic frame represents organizations that center on culture and symbolism whose leaders are primarily catalysts or facilitators of an on-going process because organizational structures and processes are invented (Bensimon et al., 1989). In describing the symbolic frame, researchers compared it to the University as Organized Anarchy, explaining that leaders channel the institution’s activities in subtle ways, that they negotiate, not command (p. 60). M. Cohen, J. March, and J. Olsen (1972) also described colleges and universities as prototypical “organized anarchies,” a term coined to identify organizations with three characteristics: problematic goals, unclear technology, and fluid participation in decision-making. Kuh (2003) depicted organized anarchy as being compatible with the academe’s vision of autonomy and minimal supervision and acknowledges retrospective understanding rather than prescriptive models.

**Role of middle managers**

In a study of leadership and management effectiveness, Bolman and Deal (1991) suggested that a complex organizational world demands greater cognitive complexity and that effective managers need to understand multiple frames and know how to use them in practice. In their qualitative study, they found that the structural frame appeared in about
60 percent of the cases for college administrators in the United States; political themes appeared in more than 70 percent of the cases. Bensimon et al. (1989) described organizations that incorporate the structural frame as being efficient, providing fairness and equity, and reducing the discretion that superiors might otherwise have in dealing with subordinates. Ambler (2000) explained that within the student affairs organization, the bureaucratic model frequently restricts or conflicts with the ability for staff members to respond to the unique or special needs of students or the unconventional opportunities for student development (p. 123). In describing organizations with leaders who use the political frame, Bensimon et al. (1989) explained that these leaders see organizations as fragmented into special interest groups, each pursuing its own objectives. Ambler (2000), however, explained that although the political model is often the antithesis of the nature of student affairs work, it helps to explain the sometimes limited ability of student affairs organizations to influence academic policy or secure significant institutional resources (p. 124).

In explaining the role of middle managers, D. B. Mills (2000) described their influence in decision-making as being most directly related to their areas of expertise and responsibility. In contrast to lower-level management staff, the middle manager may not be in direct contact with students but may have a primary relationship with staff. J. White, L. Webb, and R. B. Young (1990) suggested that middle managers provide support service and other administrative duties linking vertical and horizontal levels of an organizational hierarchy. A middle manager always provides supervision of programs.
Mills (2000) described the parameters of the middle management role in student affairs and the responsibilities and issues associated with it. In defining middle management in student affairs, he included key components in their roles: managing information, managing funds, influencing culture, and managing a career. He explained that the scope of information in student affairs cannot be under-estimated. As institutions of higher education have grown increasingly complex and the competition for students and resources more intense, gathering and interpreting information has become more important (p. 136). Chaleff (1998) warned that a courageous follower, which in this case could be a middle manager, who is not well-organized, will too often be unprepared, miss deadlines, submit faulty work, or otherwise fail to meet the leader’s expectations. The middle manager can assure the success of programs and services only by receiving data and making decisions based on an appropriate interpretation of that information (Mills, 2000). The use of technology is also an important aspect of managing information. D. G. Creamer, R. B. Winston, and T. K. Miller (2001) explained that the use of technology and information systems enables all student affairs administrators to make data-based decisions. Mills (2000) suggested that not only must the successful middle manager be computer-literate, but should also be knowledgeable about various methods of using technology to provide better information.

Overseeing funds is another key role for middle managers. Schuh (2003) stressed that student affairs managers and leaders have no choice but to develop strong planning and budgeting skills or face dire consequences. Mills (2000) recognized that as funds become scarcer or have more stringent accountability requirements, the middle manager
must not only understand changing conditions but must also develop alternative means of supporting programs. He explained that the budget is the basic document the middle manager uses to implement plans and develop strategies to achieve objectives; priorities, staffing levels, and necessary support must align with the executive-level supervisor and be consistent with institutional priorities and strategic plans (p. 137).

Mills (2000) described the culture of an organization as composed of its mission and value system. The organizational mission keeps its focus on doing the right thing and values define the culture. At the center of the culture of higher education is the academic enterprise, in which the astute middle manager can develop positive and fruitful relationships with the faculty (Mills, 2000). Chaleff (1998) suggested that every group has a distinctive culture: a set of norms for behaving and a way of looking at the world. Successful leaders and followers must learn the norms and respect the power of an existing culture. Mills (2000) found that even though the institutional culture may have an academic core, middle managers in student affairs are in a unique position to understand the culture and impart it to students and other staff (p. 139).

Building and managing a career is an important key component in the roles of middle managers. Mills (2000) stated that not all managers want to be promoted to an executive level. However, whatever their ultimate career decision, movement up the organization or the equally important role of increasing skills and competencies at the current job level, a path and goals must be established. He explained that several issues must be considered when building a career which include individual choice, desires, goals, and lifestyles; institutional promotion practices and criteria; and, economic
conditions such as supply and demand (p. 139). Creamer et al. (2001) explained that one cannot be a student affairs’ professional unless she or he is actively involved in promoting the profession and extending its knowledge base through contributions to the professional literature. Chaleff (1998) reported that assuming responsibility for one’s personal development begins with self-examination since we cannot know in which direction to grow until a starting point is identified. He added that while self-assessment is important, finding out how others see us is equally vital. By eliciting feedback we make sure to hear about perceived flaws and are in a stronger position to consider what to do about them (p. 38).

White et al. (1990) stated that the means of promotion for middle managers in institutions is often ill-defined and recognition that promotions can be achieved both by staying within an organization or by moving to another institution is important in building a career. M. Benke and C. S. Disque (1990) added that the higher education hierarchy is organized as a pyramid with many jobs at the base and fewer positions at the summit. The concept of a career ladder is not well defined since the number of mid-range positions compared to entry-level positions is limited. Chaleff (1998) suggested that it may be desirable to move away from the comfort of a current role to test oneself in a new, unproven role. He reported that in an age when organizations no longer make lifelong commitments to employees, they must allow individuals to chart personal career growth (p. 39).
Conceptual framework

In order to identify the working conditions and duties of disability services providers, there needs to be an understanding of the organizational model in which they reside. The basis of this conceptual framework model is the role of middle managers. Mills (2000) described positions in student affairs that would be classified as middle management, including directors and associate directors of functional departments and programs. For this study, middle managers are directors or coordinators of disability service departments. Mills (2000) stated that middle managers play a vital role in the student affairs function on higher education campuses. They manage staff, budget, information, and their respective programs. In the organizational structure, they implement policy and may on occasion assist with policy development.

Using Mills’ (2000) description of middle managers, a conceptual model was developed in order to better conceptualize the working conditions and duties of disability service providers. With managing data, the success of a program could depend on the accuracy and dissemination of information. In managing funds, a successful middle manager should be able to understand budgets and conditions in which budgets could change. Understanding the culture and values of the institution is just as important as meeting the needs of the students. While building a career in addition to managing their department, middle managers need to be familiar with other functional areas in order to move up the career ladder. Benke and Disque (1990) added that even if lateral moves may be seen as negative, there is evidence that the path to the chief student affairs office is smoothed by obtaining experience beyond a specific functional unit.
Dalton (2003) explained that those who aspire to supervise student affairs staff must be visionary leaders as well as practical managers, model the values they espouse, and be able to inspire their employees to actively participate in all aspects of the student affairs mission. Figure 1 incorporates the role of middle managers and the adaptation of work environments as the overarching function of the disability service provider, which for purposes of this study will be defined as organizational factors. Managing information, overseeing funds, influencing culture, and building a career are the roles that middle managers need to keep in mind. How managers balance their roles will influence the level of job satisfaction. For example, if a manager is dissatisfied with his or her role or performance with overseeing funds, that piece of the block will shorten or break, leaving a strain in the block. The stronger or intact all sides of the block are, the more satisfied and stable middle managers will feel with their job.

White et al. (1990) stated that failure to find a satisfactory answer to the quest for meaning in the relationship between the manager and the institution often causes persons
to seek career opportunities outside student affairs. C. Glisson and M. Durick (1988) identified a number of variables that contribute to either job satisfaction or organizational commitment. The variables that described characteristics of the job tasks performed by workers, the variables that described characteristics of the organizations in which the tasks are performed, and the variables that described characteristics of the workers who performed the tasks. Results of their study indicated that job satisfaction depended largely on the opportunity for the human service worker to use a variety of skills in performing job tasks and on the clarity of the requirements and responsibilities of the job.

White et al. (1990) described extrinsic and intrinsic elements that create the highest levels of satisfaction throughout a career. They stated that extrinsic sources include support from a supervisor, the ability to develop or influence policy, a degree of authority in the position, salary, staff development opportunities, and support from colleagues outside the institution. Intrinsic sources of satisfaction are opportunities to influence students’ development, flexibility and freedom to establish a daily routine, a variety of job responsibilities, freedom to control or change job responsibilities, and respect from superiors and colleagues. They illustrated that an environment that makes possible these elements enhances job satisfaction for the middle manager and minimizes the likelihood of a career midlife crisis. The value disability service providers ascribe to these working conditions and the rewards they achieve from accomplishing duties influences their job satisfaction levels.
Summary of organizational development theory

Understanding organizational structure is important in determining its influences on the behaviors and attitudes of individuals within it (Hamrick et al., 2002). Kuh developed four organizational models which depict traditional structures: Rational Model, Bureaucratic Model, Collegial Model, and Political Model (Ambler, 2000). Bolman and Deal reconfigured these traditional structures and suggested four distinct frames perspective: Structural Frame, Human Resource Frame, Political Frame, and Symbolic Frame (Bensimon et al., 1989). Ambler (2000) contended that while no institution is a pure reflection of any one of these models, elements of each are usually found at every college or university.

Student affairs programs are found in every type of postsecondary institution. Their comprehensive and complete services are accepted as essential to the success of every institution’s educational mission (Ambler, 2000). Dalton (2003) explained that student affairs leaders no longer manage using a single style, rather they borrow from a variety of management and leadership styles suited for their department and institution. An administrative leader might be seen as one who brings about a sense of organizational purpose and orderliness through interpretation, elaboration, and reinforcement of institutional culture (Bensimon et al., 1989). The “many hats” that student affairs officials wear as officers of the institution and as advocates for student concerns are frequently presented as an irreconcilable paradox (Ambler, 2000).

Within student affairs programs, middle managers include directors and associate directors of functional departments and programs (Mills, 2000). Mills (2000) described
key components in the role of middle managers: managing information, overseeing funds, influencing culture, and building a career. He explained that managing information is as integral to the middle manager’s job as supervising and providing programs for students, faculty, and staff. With respect to overseeing funds, Mills highlighted the middle manager’s responsibilities to execute departmental objectives within budgetary constraints. Failure to maintain budget integrity has a significant impact on the entire division of student affairs and the institution. He accentuated that frequent interactions with students places middle managers in a unique position to hear institutional myths and traditions which play a part in defining the institutional culture. Mills (2000) also emphasized the expectation that a middle manager can make deliberate decisions about career aspirations, since executive-level positions will usually be filled from the ranks of the middle managers. Chaleff (1998) concluded that everyone must do a job, not become the job; and to serve well, each person must be passionately committed to a job, but not be consumed by that passion.
Chapter Three: Method of the Research and Design

Introduction

The research used survey methodology to determine factors that influence the level of job satisfaction of disability service providers. This chapter describes the process for selecting institutions and subjects, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis. The selection of institutions and subjects includes an explanation of the identification process, target population, and sample size. The instrumentation section describes the development of the five-part survey developed for this study. Subsequently, the process for data collection is described along with the pilot study. Finally, the data analysis section describes the type of research and statistical procedures used for analysis.

Selection of Institutions and Subjects

A list of postsecondary institutions was obtained from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) (www.nces.ed.gov/IPEDS/). The list consists of institutions categorized as public and private with the level of award being Associate’s, Bachelor’s, and Advanced. Currently, there are four interstate compacts in the United States devoted to improving the quality of higher education in its region. They include the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE) representing 15 Western states, the Midwestern Higher Education Compact (MHEC) representing 12 Midwestern states, the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) representing 16 states in the Southern region, and the New England Board of Higher Education
representing six Eastern states. There are some mid-Atlantic states that are in no compact and others that are in dual compacts. For purposes of this study, the researcher solicited participants from institutions affiliated with the WICHE states because it was an accessible and convenient sample with no states having dual compact membership. The WICHE states included: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

Data from this study were gathered from web-based surveys administered during Fall 2009 to 846 potential disability service providers at postsecondary institutions within the 15-state western region of the United States. Considering that sample size is important in statistical analysis, small samples typically represent low power when testing the hypothesis or premise. According to G. W. Heiman (2002), to maximize external validity the general rule is the more the merrier: the larger a sample, the more of the population that is observed, so it is more likely that the sample will include all relevant types of participants (p. 161).

There was no determinant number that described small or large sample sizes. However, a general consensus would make 60 too small and a sample size of 1,000 to be large (Allison, 1999). The total number of 846 potential postsecondary institutions considered for this study were associated within the WICHE states which represented 101 public advance-institutions, 20 public four-year institutions, 264 public two-year institutions, 244 private advance-institutions, 95 private four-year institutions, and 122 private two-year institutions. Institutions that had multiple or extension sites were
categorized using their main or primary campus, unless campuses had a separate listing in IPEDS. The anticipated recipients of the survey were middle managers, specifically directors or coordinators of the disability service department or the equivalent in title.

Out of the total 846 potential institutions, forty nine percent did not respond to my direct inquiry asking for the contact information of their director of disability services and subsequently were not emailed the survey. A small subset of those who did respond to my direct inquiry explained that either their institution was too small to have a disability service center or not having someone specifically assigned to disability services as their primary role. The remaining 472 postsecondary institutions were emailed the survey and reminders. Thirty percent (n = 140) of those who received an email soliciting their participation responded to the survey. A power analysis was conducted to verify the appropriateness of total sample size for this study. Results of the power analysis suggested a minimal sample size of 74 as appropriate. J. A. Gliner and G. A. Morgan (2000) explained power as the ability to detect a statistically significant difference or the ability to reject a false null hypothesis.

**Instrumentation**

The researcher developed a fixed-response questionnaire. The questions from the Service Provider Job Satisfaction Survey (SPJSS) were derived from review of the literature, public policy issues, and concerns of disability service providers. The Human Subjects Protection Training was completed and specific guidelines followed as required by the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Once IRB approval was obtained, a three-member team of higher education professionals and disability service providers were
reached to assist with the relevance of the initial set of questions so that modifications could be made. The three-member team was chosen based on their knowledge of disability services, personnel related issues, and college student personnel administration. K. R. Bartlett (2005) suggested that the pilot test should be used with a sample as similar as possible to that of the main study. D. A. Dillman, J. D. Smyth, and L. M. Christian (2009) added that the pilot study should be used to assess whether the proposed questionnaire and procedures were adequate for the larger study. The SPJSS was piloted to elicit additional feedback for final revisions of the desired questions.

Once the questions for the survey were determined, it was transferred to a web-based format. M. P. Couper (2008) explained that web surveys are unique and have the following attributes: self-administered, computerized, interactive, distributed, and rich visual graphic and multimedia tools. A web-based survey software program, SurveyMonkey, hosted the survey for data collection. Web-based survey hosts typically offer customers a full range of services, including the ability to create questionnaires, conduct surveys, analyze data, and produce and share reports, all via the company’s website (V. M. Sue & L. A. Ritter, 2007).

D. A. Dillman (2007) and Couper (2008) provided helpful elements for designing web questionnaires ranging from decisions on what information should appear on each screen to which programming tools should be used. A web-based survey specialist provided technical assistance to troubleshoot anticipated problems and assure navigational continuity. Reasonable efforts were made to accommodate people with disabilities so that they could participate and use the web-based survey, however, specific
accommodation needs were provided by the participant’s institution. Once development of the web-based survey was completed, another mini-pilot study using 10 participants was conducted as the final test to solidify procedures. According to Sue and Ritter (2007), one needs to select a small sample of the target population to complete the questionnaire and provide feedback about the questions and about the proper functioning of the technical elements of the survey.

A cross-sectional survey design was used to measure current attitudes among disability service providers with regard to their level of job satisfaction. J. W. Creswell (2002) stated that cross-sectional survey design reports data collected at one point in time which has the advantage of measuring current attitudes or practices. For this study, the dependent variable was the level of job satisfaction and independent variables were managing information, overseeing funds, influencing culture, and building a career. The SPJSS consisted of questions divided into five sections. The demographic characteristics section included questions to assess personal characteristics of the individuals in the sample (Creswell, 2002). The rationale for collecting this data was to discover relationships that might exist among demographic variables and the level of job satisfaction. The next four sections incorporated the role of middle managers as described by Mills (2000) in a conceptual framework to explain how organizational factors influence the level of job satisfaction. For purposes of this study, organizational factors were defined as the role of middle managers and the adaptation of work environments as the overarching function of the disability service provider.
The Organizational Factors sections included managing information, overseeing funds, influencing culture, and building a career. These sections were useful in acquiring insight into detailed aspects leading to the level of job satisfaction with regard to middle managers’ roles and duties. The managing information section focused on data collection and resource availability. The overseeing funds section encompassed budget integrity and strategic planning. The influencing culture section consisted of programmatic priorities, relationship building, and institutional values. The building a career section addressed duties and performance evaluations.

**Research Questions**

The research questions that guided this study are:

1. What internal and external factors contribute most to overall job satisfaction for disability service providers?

2. What is the impact of reporting structure, faculty or administrative, on disability service providers?
   a. How satisfied are disability service providers with support provided by institutional administrators?
   b. How satisfied are disability service providers with support provided by institutional faculty?

3. What is the correlation between years of service as a disability service provider and the level of job satisfaction?
   a. How many years of service do disability service providers remain in their position as director?
b. How many total years of service do disability service providers have in their field of disability services?

**Data Collection**

An emailed cover letter describing the purpose of the study and the procedures to link to the web-based SPJSS was sent to a total of 472 out of a potential of 846 disability service providers at postsecondary institutions affiliated within the WICHE 15-state western region. The researcher emphasized confidentiality procedures and anonymity of responses by the aggregation of data collected. Within two weeks of the initial distribution of the SPJSS, a follow-up email reminder was sent to individuals in order to remind them to complete it swiftly. A second email reminder was sent to encourage response rates.

To improve response rates Creswell (2002) recommended a three-step process: mail out the original survey, follow it two weeks later with a second questionnaire, and after another two weeks, send a postcard reminding them to complete the questionnaire. Dillman (2007) suggests up to four contacts with an additional special contact. He recommends a brief pre-notice letter to give notice that a questionnaire will arrive soon, a questionnaire mailing that includes a detailed cover letter, a thank-you postcard that expresses that if the questionnaire has not been completed that it is hoped it will be returned soon, a replacement questionnaire, and a final contact. A modified version of Creswell’s process was used; web-based surveys rather than mailing surveys.

The SPJSS requested that disability service providers respond to questions presented in the web-based survey. This survey was confidential and the participants
were not identified in any way since the data collected was aggregated, making the data anonymous. The answers required a choice from a list of various options. Bartlett (2005) explained when writing questions with close-ended response options provided, many researchers prefer to use a Likert-type rating scale which could be applied to numerous different response anchors such as disagree to agree, unsatisfied to satisfied, and frequency, among many others.

Using a “Likert scale” reflects the amount or degree of a behavior and produces a more powerful study, noting the subtle differences in the behavior reflected in the data collected (Heiman, 2002). For these items, responses were based on a 6-point weighted and one neutral, non-weighted scale to determine how satisfied they are with regards to their roles and work environment: 1 = very dissatisfied, 2 = dissatisfied, 3 = somewhat dissatisfied, 4 = somewhat satisfied, 5 = satisfied, 6 = very satisfied, and 0 = undeclared. This forced-choice scale was created to force respondents to decide whether they leaned more towards the dissatisfied or satisfied end of the scale for each item. The undeclared option was non-weighted indicating the respondent was neither dissatisfied nor satisfied.

**Data Analysis**

The data were analyzed upon completion by the respondent’s submission using the web-based survey. The data was downloaded from SurveyMonkey into an Excel format, then coded and transferred into the IBM Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS) version 18 software where it was analyzed. There was a deadline for the surveys to be returned. Surveys received after the deadline was not included in the study.
This study was based on a correlation research design in which analysis was determined by the relationships among variables. A correlation design is defined as a statistical test to determine the tendency or pattern for two or more variables or two sets of data to vary consistency (Creswell, 2002; Heiman, 2002). E. F. Holton and M. F. Burnett (2005) explained that a correlation tells us two things: the direction of the association and the strength of the association. Correlation only tells us that a relationship exists, not whether it is a causal relationship (p. 40).

An a-priori power analysis for a multiple linear model regression was conducted. For four predictors the a-priori power analysis indicated to have a statistical significance at .05, a minimum sample size of 74 was necessary. Test for reliability was measured using the Cronbach’s alpha score. Gliner and Morgan (2000) explained, if items on the test have multiple choices, such as a Likert scale, then Cronbach’s alpha is the method of choice to determine inter-item reliability. This survey was deemed reliable based on the Cronbach’s alpha of .94.

An instrument is said to have face validity if the content appears to be appropriate for the purpose of the instrument (Gliner & Morgan, 2000). Face validity was verified during the design of the instrument. Content validity asks if the content that comprises the instrument is representative of the concept that one is attempting to measure (Gliner & Morgan, 2000). Content validity was established with the development of the survey questions gleaned from review of the literature and recommendations from professionals in the field related to disability services and higher education administration. An exploratory factor analysis was also conducted to verify validity. When we try to
determine how someone will do in the future on the basis of a particular instrument, we are usually referring to criterion-related validity, predictive evidence (Gliner & Morgan, 2000). Criterion in this study related to the measure of how satisfied disability service providers would be with their jobs.

Prior to analysis, the data was examined to assess statistical assumptions. The assumption of linearity refers to a straight-line relationship between two variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Since factors were established within the theoretical framework, the scatterplot indicated a linear relationship. Screening continuous variables for normality is an important early step in almost every multivariate analysis, particularly when inference is a goal (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), when a distribution is normal, the values of skewness and kurtosis are zero. The initial check for skewness showed a standard error of .217 and kurtosis as .431. Since these tests were not conclusive more checks were necessary.

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test confirmed that overseeing funds was not significant which meant a non-normal distribution therefore transformation of data was processed. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), eliminating cases with large residual values can produce a better fit for the regression equation and increases the multiple correlations. Outliers may have contributed to the difference of points. An outlier is a case with such an extreme value on one variable or such a strange combination of scores on two or more variables that they distort statistics (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). A new field was created called outliers based on the Cook’s distance test. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), it assesses change in regression coefficients
when a case is deleted; cases with influence scores larger than 1.00 are suspected of being outliers. The formula used for determining outliers was \((n-k-1)/4\). If the resulting score was greater than \((n-k-1)/4\) then that case was determined an outlier. There was a significant difference between the outlier and non-outlier groups which established the need to exclude the outliers in establishing normality. The subsequent Kolmogorov-Smirnov test indicated normality was acceptable.

Multicollinearity and singularity are problems with a correlation matrix that occur when variables are too highly correlated (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). No multicollinearity was present since the condition index did not approach 30 nor were there at least two variance proportions for an independent variable greater than 50 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Tolerances of all the predictors are far in excess of .01 and therefore suggest that multicollinearity is not a problem (Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2006). There were no issues of collinearity since Stevens (2002) recommends variance inflation factor (VIF) to be greater than 10 as indicative of multicollinearity.

Homoscedasticity is related to the assumption of normality because when the assumption of multivariate normality is met, the relationships between variables are homoscedastic (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Homoscedasticity was violated because the relationships between the variables were not evenly spread. The Levene’s test was conducted which established a non-significance and therefore a homogeneous variance. Accordingly, all assumptions for the analyses were met and no data problems were detected.
Data collected was analyzed using multiple regression statistics. A multiple regression is a common associational statistic that is used when the question is whether a combination of several independent variables predicts the dependent variables better than any one predictor alone (Gliner & Morgan, 2000). According to R. A. Bates (2005), multiple regression analysis seeks to find the best combination of multiple independent variables that can predict or explain the variance in a single dependent variable with some degree of accuracy and precision. There are two main reasons to use multiple regression analysis: to either predict or determine an outcome.

Summary

This study focused on identifying factors associated with levels of job satisfaction among disability service providers. A web-based survey was developed and administered to disability service providers at public and private postsecondary institutions regarding managing information, overseeing funds, influencing culture, and building a career. Analysis of the data was conducted to test each of the research questions. Results of the findings are discussed in detail in Chapter IV.
Chapter Four: Results

Introduction

This study attempted to understand how organizational factors influence the level of job satisfaction of disability service providers at postsecondary institutions. The findings reported in this chapter were based on the data analysis of the survey responses and analyzed using correlation and regression. Findings are presented for each of the factors as well as for the demographic section of the survey.

Data Analysis

The Service Provider Job Satisfaction Survey (SPJSS), developed by the researcher, consisted of questions divided into five sections which included a general demographic section and an organizational factors section encompassing managing information, overseeing funds, influencing culture, and building a career.

Survey results: demographic information

The total number of potential postsecondary institutions considered for this study who were associated within the WICHE states represented 101 public advance-institutions, 20 public four-year institutions, 264 public two-year institutions, 244 private advance-institutions, 95 private four-year institutions, and 122 private two-year institutions. Out of the 846 potential postsecondary institutions, the initial distribution of the survey along with the reminders were emailed to a total of 472 institutions, representing 91 public advance-institutions, 15 public four-year institutions, 207 public
two-year institutions, 133 private advance-institutions, 22 private four-year institutions, and 4 private two-year institutions.

The remaining 374 postsecondary institutions were not sent the survey. Almost half (49%) of these were not sent the survey because the contact person for the institution did not respond to my direct inquiry requesting the contact information for the director of disability services. Of those who did respond to my inquiry but were not sent the survey, 70% indicated that their school was too small (less than 1,000 students) to have a disability services director or equivalent in title.

The survey was attempted by 140 directors, managers, or equivalent in title, of disability service centers for a return rate of 30%. The response rate for web-based surveys is approximately 30%, but the studies are limited in number (Sue & Ritter, 2007). Of those 140 surveys that were attempted, 130 were completed.

Of those respondents, 42.3% (n=55) held the title of director (see Table 1). Other titles that were not within the dean, director, or coordinator of disability services category included vice-president, supervisor, manager, assistant, specialist, officer, counselor, advisor, instructor assistant, and department chair.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics: Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Majority (86.9%, n=113) of the positions were full-time (see Table 2). There were
more females (78.5%, n=102) respondents than males.

Table 2

Demographics: Position, Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of the respondents listed White (79.2%, n=103) as their race/ethnicity
(see Table 3) while the next largest representation of race/ethnicity were both Black or
African American and Hispanic or Latino groups at 5.4% (n=7). Other race/ethnicity
categories that were listed which were not part of the designated answers were
Portuguese and Italian.

Table 3

Demographics: Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawai'ian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variable  |  $n$  |  %  
---|---|---
White  | 103  | 79.2  
Hispanic or Latino  | 7  | 5.4  
Decline to Answer  | 2  | 1.5  
Other  | 0  | 0  
Multiple Answers  | 4  | 3.2  

Veterans represented a total of 6.2% ($n=8$) of the respondents and 23.8% ($n=31$) of the respondents identified as having had a documented disability (see Table 4).

Table 4

Demographics: Veteran, Disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability(ies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to Answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest degree earned by the majority of the respondents was a Master’s degree with 66.9% ($n=87$) having earned the degree, followed by 16.9% ($n=22$) having a doctorate (see Table 5). Other highest level of educational attainment categories that were listed which were not part of the designated answers were special certificate and Juris Doctor.
Table 5

Demographics: Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma or Equivalent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The office or position that most respondents worked in prior to disability services was not in higher education (38.5%, n=50). Faculty represented the next highest office or position most respondents worked in prior to disability services with 13.1% (n=17). There was 7.7% (n=10) indicating they worked at two or more offices or positions prior to working in disability services (see Table 6). Other offices or positions that were listed which were not part of the designated answers were rehabilitation counseling, orientation, academic counseling, accreditation, speech therapy, academic support, self-employed, technology support, clinical psychology, special education, sign language interpreting, librarian, secondary school, non-profit, social services, college president, welfare to work, state department of health, security, office administration, professional tutor, and psychiatric nursing.
Table 6

Demographics: Office Prior to Disability Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Prior to Disability Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Counseling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Higher Education</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Answers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents reported to a vice-president of student affairs/support (26.9%, n=35). Reporting to the dean of student affairs/support (22.3%, n=29) was the next highest category (see Table 7). Other positions that were listed which were not part of the designated answers were director of psychological services, provost, president, vice-chancellor, chief administrative officer, vice-president of enrollment, dean of law, human resources for the American with Disabilities Act, director of the wellness center, director of retention, dean of special programs, director of diversity office, and vice-president of multicultural affairs.
Table 7

Demographics: Report To

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report To</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President of Instruction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President of Student Affairs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Instruction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Affairs</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Answers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total years in the field of disability services (see Table 8) varied with the majority having 16 or more years 40.8% (n=53) to the least having 11-15 years 14.6% (n=19).

Table 8

Demographics: Years in Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years in Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority (56.9%, n=74) of the respondents had 0-5 years in their current position, while 8.5% (n=11) had 16 or more years in their current position as director or coordinator of disability services (see Table 9).
Table 9

Demographics: Years in Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years in Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional types varied (see Table 10) from associate’s colleges (42.3%, n=55) to a tribal colleges (.8%, n=1). Another institutional type that was listed which was not part of the designated answers was law school.

Table 10

Demographics: Institutional Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's Colleges</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate-granting Universities</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Focus Institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Colleges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average number of students with disabilities served per academic year is 425.5 (see Table 11).

Table 11

Demographics: Students Served Per Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Students Served</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Served</td>
<td>425.5</td>
<td>625.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents’ institutions full-time enrollment (FTE) varied with the most at 62.3% (n=81) having up to 9,999 FTE and the least 1.5% (n=2) having between 40,000-49,999 FTE (see Table 12). The majority of participants (86.2%, n=112) indicated their disability services office was centralized (one center serving the entire institution) versus 12.3% (n=16) being decentralized (various centers serving the institution).

Table 12

Demographics: Full-Time Enrollment, Disability Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 9,999</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 19,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 - 29,999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 - 39,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 - 49,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Survey results: organizational factors**

The managing information section focused on data collection and resource availability. Responses to the questions within this section resulted in significant correlation to the level of job satisfaction of disability service providers (see Table 13).

Table 13

*Managing Information: Level of Job Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty understanding of the need to provide accommodations for students with disabilities</td>
<td>.384**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The administration’s understanding of the protection for students with disabilities with regards to the American with Disabilities Act</td>
<td>.487**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of disability awareness trainings provided for faculty</td>
<td>.404**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of faculty participation in disability awareness training</td>
<td>.278**</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dissemination of information regarding the location of disability services</td>
<td>.373**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dissemination of information regarding the procedures for requesting disability services</td>
<td>.386**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way your departmental policies/procedures are written</td>
<td>.332**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your department’s use of technology to improve services</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The accessibility of information on your department’s webpage</td>
<td>.295**</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How your program evaluation process is used to improve services</td>
<td>.312**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

The overseeing funds section encompassed budget integrity and strategic planning. Overall, responses to the questions within this section resulted in significant correlation to the level of job satisfaction of disability service providers (see Table 14). The exceptions were that neither the number of grant opportunities available to support
one’s program, nor one’s offices’ relationship with the state vocational rehabilitation program was significantly correlated with the level of job satisfaction.

Table 14

*Overseeing Funds: Level of Job Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution’s financial commitment to disability services</td>
<td>.380**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of influence you have for securing financial resources</td>
<td>.397**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for your programs or activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of funding to accomplish departmental goals</td>
<td>.447**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your budget for reasonable classroom accommodations</td>
<td>.430**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your budget for adequate assistive technology</td>
<td>.293**</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of the cost of technology support for the department</td>
<td>.311**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your level of autonomy in making decisions regarding the department’s</td>
<td>.412**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>financial budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of grant opportunities available to support your program</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your offices’ relationship with the state vocational rehabilitation</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff retention in your department</td>
<td>.384**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

The influencing culture section consisted of programmatic priorities, relationship building, and institutional values. Overall, responses to the questions within this section resulted in significant correlation to the level of job satisfaction of disability service providers (see Table 15). The exceptions were that neither the support one receives from the institution when handling appeals from students who were denied accommodations, nor the accessibility of disability services/accommodations to distance learner students was significantly correlated with the level of job satisfaction.
### Table 15

**Influencing Culture: Level of Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution’s commitment to persons with disabilities</td>
<td>.469**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institutional mission statement reflecting the importance of services to students with disabilities</td>
<td>.446**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The guidance your office provides to the institution to ensure compliance with legal requirements for access</td>
<td>.348**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The accessibility of institution-wide facilities</td>
<td>.479**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The accessibility of institution-wide services</td>
<td>.495**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way your policies/procedures define institutional responsibilities to provide accommodations</td>
<td>.333**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way your policies/procedures define the responsibilities of the student who requests accommodations</td>
<td>.292**</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The support you receive from the institution when handling appeals from students who were denied accommodations</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental processes to handle difficult students</td>
<td>.448**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The accessibility of disability services/accommodations to distance learner students</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

The building a career section addressed duties and performance evaluations. Overall, responses to the questions within this section resulted in significant correlation to the level of job satisfaction of disability service providers (see Table 16). The exception was that the amount of research one participates in that increases one’s knowledge of the profession was not significantly correlated with the level of job satisfaction.

### Table 16

**Building a Career: Level of Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The overall hiring practices of your institution</td>
<td>.442**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall promotional practices of your institution</td>
<td>.292**</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opportunities for advancement at your institution</td>
<td>.304**</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recognition you receive from your immediate supervisor</td>
<td>.602**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The availability of professional development opportunities</td>
<td>.384**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of research you participate in that increases your knowledge of the profession</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your ability to do your job</td>
<td>.438**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your workload</td>
<td>.485**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your pay being comparable to similar positions at comparable institutions</td>
<td>.355**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

**Regression analysis**

Results of the evaluation of assumptions led to transformation of the variables to reduce skewness and the number of outliers, and improve normality and homoscedasticity of residuals. Subsequently, a multiple regression analysis was performed using SPSS software between the level of job satisfaction as the dependent variable and managing information, overseeing funds, influencing culture, and building a career as independent variables. The level of job satisfaction was highly correlated with building a career and years in the field. Negative correlations were achieved between the level of job satisfaction and years in the position. Regression results are summarized in Table 17. Multiple $R$ for regression was statistically significant, $F(4, 130) = 13.042, p < .05, R^2_{adj} = .425$. Two of the seven independent variables (building a career and years in the field) contributed significantly to the level of job satisfaction ($p < .05$). Years in the position, while negatively correlated to the level of job satisfaction, did not make a statistically significant contribution ($p > .05$) to the level of job satisfaction.
Both building a career (.001) and years in the field (.036) were considered to be statistically significant, assuming an alpha level of .05. Years in the position (t = -1.054) had an adverse effect on the level of job satisfaction.

Table 17

*Regression Analysis Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.1486</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Information</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>1.570</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseeing Funds</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing Culture</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building a Career</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>3.297</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report To</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Position</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-1.054</td>
<td>.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Field</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>2.128</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

A test on interaction effect was conducted between the demographics and independent variables. An interaction table was created between the level of job satisfaction versus building a career and years in the field. The level of $R^2$ went down a little (.418) and the Durbin-Watson check was acceptable at 1.948. Unstandardized coefficients suggest for every one point increase in overall score for building a career, the level of job satisfaction will increase by .66, holding for years of service constant and for every one year increase in years in the field, there would be a 1.47 increase in the level of job satisfaction, holding for building a career constant.
Survey results: research question #1

1. What internal and external factors contribute most to overall job satisfaction for disability service providers?

Results of the study indicate that overall respondents (83.8%) were at least somewhat satisfied with their level of job satisfaction (see Table 18).

Internal factors that could have influenced the level of job satisfaction are fulfillment, administrative changes, institutional response, budget, staff reduction, morale, autonomy, and other duties as assigned. There were 11.5% of the respondents who were very dissatisfied to somewhat dissatisfied with their level of job satisfaction. This study suggested the institution’s commitment to persons with disabilities (.469) contributed significantly to the level of job satisfaction ($p < .01$).

Table 18

*Frequencies: Level of Job Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An outcome of the study suggested the institution’s financial commitment to disability services (.380) contributed significantly to the level of job satisfaction ($p < .01$). Results of the study imply staff retention in one’s department (.384) contributed significantly to the level of job satisfaction ($p < .01$). The study suggested the recognition one receives from one’s immediate supervisor (.602) contributed significantly to the level of job satisfaction ($p < .01$). An outcome of the study implied one’s level of autonomy in making decisions regarding the department’s financial budget (.412) contributed significantly to the level of job satisfaction ($p < .01$). Results of the study suggest that one’s workload (.485) contributed significantly to the level of job satisfaction ($p < .01$).

**Survey results: research question #2**

2. What is the impact of reporting structure, faculty or administrative, on disability service providers?

Results of the study suggest to whom one reports to as having no significance to the level of job satisfaction. Majority of the respondents (49.2%) reported to either a vice-president or dean of student affairs/support while only 13.8% reported to either a vice-president or dean of instruction. Other positions that were listed which were not part of the designated answers were director of psychological services, provost, president, vice-chancellor, chief administrative officer, vice-president of enrollment, dean of law, human resources for the American with
a. How satisfied are disability service providers with support provided by institutional administrators?

About 82.3% of the respondents were at least somewhat satisfied with the administration’s understanding of the protection for students with disabilities with regards to the American with Disabilities Act. It also contributed significantly (.487) to the level of job satisfaction \( (p < .01) \). About 71.5% of the respondents were at least somewhat satisfied with the accessibility of institution-wide facilities. There was also significance (.479) to the level of job satisfaction \( (p < .01) \). About 77.7% of the respondents were at least somewhat satisfied with the accessibility of institution-wide services. There was significance to the level of job satisfaction \( .495 (p < .01) \).

b. How satisfied are disability service providers with support provided by institutional faculty?

Majority of the respondents (80.8%) were at least somewhat satisfied with faculty understanding of the need to provide accommodations for students with disabilities. There was a .384 level of significance to the level of job satisfaction \( (p < .01) \). About
62.3% of the respondents were at least somewhat dissatisfied with the level of faculty participation in disability awareness training and there was a .278 level of significance to the level of job satisfaction ($p < .01$).

**Survey results: research question #3**

3. What is the correlation between years of service as a disability service provider and the level of job satisfaction?

Results of the study suggest that total years in the field of disability services (.196) contributed significantly to the level of job satisfaction ($p < .05$). Overall, those who have more years in the field of disability services appear to be satisfied with their level of job satisfaction.

a. How many years of service do disability service providers remain in their position as director?

The majority (56.9%, $n=74$) of the participants had 0-5 years in their current position as director/coordinate of disability services, while 21.5% ($n=28$) had 6-10 years, 13.1% ($n=17$) had 11-15 years, and 8.5% ($n=11$) had 16 or more years in their current position as director/coordinate of disability services.

b. How many total years of service do disability service providers have in their field of disability services?

Total years in the field of disability services varied from 40.8% ($n=53$) having 16 or more years, 25.4% ($n=33$) having 0-5 years,
18.5% (n=24) having 6-10 years, and the least being 14.6% (n=19) having 11-15 years.

Summary

The findings of this study reveal that both building a career and years in the field of disability services contributed significantly to the level of job satisfaction. Total years in the position had an adverse effect on the level of job satisfaction. The limitations of the study and implications for practice will be discussed in the next chapter as well suggestions for future research.
Chapter Five: Discussion

Introduction

This quantitative study investigated organizational factors that influence the level of job satisfaction among disability service providers at postsecondary institutions within the western states. Based on the theoretical framework managing information, overseeing funds, influencing culture, and building a career were the independent variables within organizational factors that were considered. This study fills an important gap in literature whereas other studies focused on satisfaction of students receiving disability services or the provision of services provided by postsecondary institutions. The findings of the study are expected to assist postsecondary institutions in identifying factors that influence the level of job satisfaction so as to maintain valuable staff and sustain quality services. The limitations of the study, implications for practice, and suggestions for future research will be discussed.

Discussion

According to the results of the demographic section, the general profile of overall respondents was white, female, full-time directors of disability service programs who had earned a master’s degree. Most directors did not work in higher education prior to working in disability services at their postsecondary institution. Many reported to a vice-president of student affairs/support. Most directors had 6-10 years of experience in disability services; however, some were only in the position of director 0-5 years. Most of
the directors worked at an institution that granted associate’s degrees with up to 9,999 FTE, of which their disability service centers were centralized. The average number of students served per academic year was 425.5.

The last question in the SPJSS (Question #55) asks whether one is satisfied with their level of job satisfaction (see Appendix B). This question reflects whether one is satisfied with their indicated level of job satisfaction, not necessarily with their job. It was intentionally worded this way to inquire whether one was dissatisfied or satisfied with their decision to be or not be satisfied with their job. In general, respondents indicated an overall level of job satisfaction. A total of 83.8% of the respondents were very satisfied (32.3%), satisfied (33.8%), or somewhat satisfied (17.7%) with their level of job satisfaction. Internal factors that could have influenced the level of job satisfaction are fulfillment, administrative changes, institutional response, budget, staff reduction, morale, autonomy, and other duties as assigned. There were a total of 19 participants who voluntarily made comments. Of those who made comments, five participants reported that they enjoyed what they did and the people with whom they work. They were fulfilled with their ability to help students with disabilities access higher education.

There were 11.5% of the respondents who were very dissatisfied to somewhat dissatisfied with the level of job satisfaction. Of those who made comments, two participants indicated administrative changes, particularly those who have no experience with disability services, as an adverse effect to their level of job satisfaction. However, results of the study suggest that to whom one reports has no significance to the level of job satisfaction. Three participants complained about their institution’s response to
matters regarding physical access and accommodations. According to Stodden et al. (2005), with better coordination, physical barriers caused by construction and repairs could be minimized, and faculty could be prepared for appropriate accommodations to their teaching and other student-related activities.

Budget deficits were a common theme among those who commented. Of the five participants who made comments, one suggested the institution may want to do more but can’t. Three participants indicated that the staff in their departments have diminished and are not being replaced. Price-Ellingstad and Berry (2000) agreed that disability service offices are understaffed to provide the necessary services needed.

According to the results, neither the number of grant opportunities available to support one’s program nor one’s offices’ relationship with the state vocational rehabilitation program was significantly correlated with the level of job satisfaction. This indicates that having a relationship with the state vocational rehabilitation program has no bearing on their level of job satisfaction. Disability service providers assist all students with disabilities regardless of how or who pays for their education. In addition, having grant opportunities did not significantly affect their level of job satisfaction. Since disability service center budgets are supported by their institutions, the availability of grant opportunities had no importance with their level of job satisfaction.

Morale was also an internal factor affecting the level of job satisfaction with one participant indicating their work environment as not being as welcoming as it used to be. Influencing culture was a variable that was found not to be significant. Although one might aspire to influencing their work environment, institutions are already well
established in their traditions and organizational culture. According to Butler (1990), staff gets a lot of support from their co-workers, but this is not a substitute for hearing regularly from management that their work is important and appreciated. According to the results, neither the support one receives from the institution when handling appeals from students who were denied accommodations, nor was the accessibility of disability services/accommodations to distance learner students significantly correlated with the level of job satisfaction. This indicates that when it comes to their level of job satisfaction, disability service providers are indifferent to whether they receive support from the institution when handling appeals. In addition, providing service to all students whether on campus or to distance learners did not significantly affect the level of job satisfaction.

Another internal factor that affected the level of job satisfaction was the lack of autonomy. Of those who made comments, two participants pointed out that they had no control over their program since minor decisions needed to be approved from higher administration. Three participants indicated that overseeing the disability service center were only part of their responsibility, wearing other hats in addition to disability service provider.

External factors that could influence the level of job satisfaction include the current economy, job market, and higher education policy. Based on the theoretical framework, overseeing funds was one of the variables that were found not to be significant. A consideration might stem from the lack of control in budgetary matters and the complacency that one needs to accept the budget doled out from the institution. In
2008, States’ fiscal forecasts were among the top ten policy issues for higher education (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2008). Of those who made comments, some reported that their operating budget had been cut by more than half, which in turn some institutions have sought assistance from non-paid volunteers to continue to provide services. Christ and Stodden (2005) indicated that service providers are now faced with the challenge of meeting the demands of the law despite a shrinking budget. Federal mandates have had serious budgetary implications; however, the costs of these programs have had the effect of shifting dollars from one source to another rather than increasing revenue for institutions (Woodard, 2001).

Managing information was another variable derived from the theoretical framework that was found not to be significant. Overall, respondents were at least somewhat satisfied with how they managed information and may or may not change how they do business. About 82.3% of the respondents were at least somewhat satisfied with the administration’s understanding of the protection for students with disabilities with regard to the American with Disabilities Act. Results of the survey indicated 80.8% of the respondents were at least somewhat satisfied with faculty understanding of the need to provide accommodations for students with disabilities; however, 62.3% of the respondents were at least somewhat dissatisfied with the level of faculty participation in disability awareness training. According to Stodden et al. (2005), postsecondary faculty should become better educated about disability needs and rights of accommodation; in turn, they need effective support to teach in a variety of learning styles and to make other appropriate adjustments.
Limitations of the Study

Limitations of the study included the relatively small number of participating institutions. The research was limited to disability service providers at public and private two-year, four-year, and advanced postsecondary institutions associated with the WICHE. Those postsecondary institutions from the other regions such as those from the Midwest, South, or Eastern states were not represented; therefore, the results of this study should not be generalized to college and universities across the United States which may differ considerably from the Western postsecondary institutions that participated in the study. On the other hand, focusing the study to the western region provided a reasonably comprehensive representation of job satisfaction levels of disability service providers in that region.

It was extremely important to identify the disability services director or equivalent at each postsecondary institution. Efforts were made to obtain the contact information, specifically the appropriate email addresses. The risk of relying on the survey being forwarded to the proper personnel, in some cases, may have contributed in a lower completion rate.

Reliability and validity of the instrument was a limitation to the study. According to Gliner and Morgan (2000), if an outcome measure is not reliable, then we cannot accurately assess the results of the study. Since this instrument was developed by the researcher and was not repeatedly tested for consistency, reliability of the instrument is questionable. Normally, if one uses an instrument already published, then reliability indices should have been established (Gliner & Morgan, 2000). Again, since the
instrument was developed by the researcher, validity was not inherent. Gliner and Morgan (2000) suggested that the evaluation of validity is concerned with establishing evidence for the use of a particular instrument in a particular setting. Further research on the instrument and outcomes need to be conducted to substantiate reliability and validity.

**Implications for Practice**

College student personnel administrators or mid-managers abound on college campuses. Some have flourished in their positions, others are idle, and several have moved on to positions outside of student services. With the budgetary constraints affecting the higher education community, the mentality of “do more with less” proliferates. Christ and Stodden (2005) suggested that institutions must learn to be innovative and economical if they are to continue to provide the level and quality of supports that they currently have on a reduced budget. Postsecondary institutions cannot afford to lose highly trained administrators, their knowledge, nor experience they possess.

In addition, a variety of studies on disability services from the perspective of students (Smith, 2007; Dowrick et al., 2005; Collins & Mowbray, 2005) and faculty (Paul, 2000) has been conducted. However, modest research is out there geared towards disability service providers. There is a need to recognize the important role of disability service providers and identify factors relating to the level of job satisfaction in order to maintain leadership at institutions and to advance the knowledge of the profession. The underlying principle for this study is to explore the working conditions of disability service administrators with regards to their functional areas and the duties inherent in their position.
Findings from this study will support postsecondary institutions in developing programs to assist disability services providers with accommodating students with disabilities. For example, 60% of the respondents indicated they were at least somewhat dissatisfied with the number of disability awareness trainings provided for faculty and 62.3% indicated they were at least somewhat dissatisfied with the level of faculty participation in disability awareness training. Better efforts could be made to offer more disability awareness trainings and increase attendance by faculty. By incorporating the perspectives of disability service providers into program development efforts, postsecondary institutions will be better able to make recommendations for accommodations, meet the policy needs of the institution, and satisfy disability awareness needs on college campuses.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Findings for this study lead to six recommendations for future research. First, since this study was focused specifically on disability service providers, a recommendation for future research could be to expand the participants to incorporate directors from other student affairs/support departments and to generalize the scope for services to students.

Second, the study could be expanded to include college and universities throughout the United States *versus* one region of the country and/or with varying institutional types which could include private and vocational postsecondary institutions.

Third, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the survey instrument based on the theoretical framework of the level of job satisfaction being influenced by
organizational factors such as managing information, overseeing funds, influencing culture, and building a career. According to Stevens (2002), the purpose of exploratory factor analysis is to identify the factor structure or model for a set of variables. Conducting the exploratory factor analysis determined if the survey items interconnected and established essential relationships. Based on the rotational factor analysis, Factor 4 (building a career) was dropped. Justification could suggest that statements originally in Factor 4 could be incorporated into the other factors. There could also be a difference with the correlation of building a career and the level of job satisfaction versus job engagement. One could be satisfied with their job without the prospect of building their career.

A subsequent factor analysis indicated that the 4-factor theoretical model transformed to a 3-factor empirical model. This resulted in 23 items that revealed loadings greater than .50 which were sorted into similar grouping. Managing information and influencing culture combined into Factor 1, overseeing funds remained intact as Factor 2, and building a career became Factor 3. Factor weights in excess of .7 should be used to drive the process of labeling and interpreting each factor. Future research could further investigate the Service Provider Job Satisfaction Survey (SPJSS) using factor analysis to determine which items should be kept or eliminated.

Fourth, based on the exploratory factor analysis, building a career was a significant factor; however, there is a difference with building one’s career and being satisfied versus being engaged and satisfied. One could be satisfied with one’s job by just the mere fact of getting a paycheck while others are not satisfied unless they are engaged
in their work. According to Buckingham and Coffman (1999), organizations should regard the nature of employee engagement and its likelihood to predict an organization’s ability to achieve high results in productivity, profitability, customer service, staff retention, and workplace safety. Future research could look at the difference between the levels of job satisfaction versus engagement.

Fifth, several respondents commented on the lack of financial resources and its repercussions at the institutional and departmental levels. Christ and Stodden (2005) recommend that with financial supports in decline at postsecondary institutions, it is critical to determine factors that contribute to services that are effective, appropriate, and proven to foster success. Future research could replicate the study in five years to gauge the difference of the economy and its implication on higher education.

Sixth, the findings indicated that years in the field contributed significantly to the level of job satisfaction whereas years in the position had an adverse affect. Retention in the field of disability services appear to be high, with the majority of the respondents having 16+ years in the field. However, retention in the position of director or its equivalent was low, with the majority having 0-5 years in the position of director. Future research could explore the range of scope in providing disability services, whether it is specifically within the higher education arena or from other agencies or entities. One could identify the field of the highest degree earned of disability service providers and investigate whether that is significant to being a director at postsecondary institutions. Another issue to explore is factors that influence the length of years a disability service provider remain in their position of director or its equivalent.
Conclusion

With the increase in the number of students with disabilities attending colleges and universities nationwide (U.S. Department of Education, 2003; Horn & Nevill, 2006; Collins & Mowbray, 2005), the role of disability service providers is indispensible. Overall 83.8% of disability service providers at postsecondary institutions in the western states were at least somewhat satisfied with their jobs. However, disability service offices are understaffed to provide the necessary services needed in response to the influx of students with disabilities on college and university campuses (Price-Ellingstad & Berry, 2000).

In hindsight, if the researcher could re-do this study she would have been more specific with questions in the demographic section, particularly with understanding what position or field providers had prior to working in disability services. According to the study, 38.5% of the participants indicated that they did not work in higher education and 14.6% list “other” prior to working in the disability services office. In addition, the researcher would have asked not only what their highest level of education attainment was but in what field the degree was in. Indentifying these demographics would have given insight on the previous experience disability services providers are transferring into their position working at postsecondary institutions and which field of study they were trained in that eventually led them to work in the disability services field. Nevertheless, this study serves as a baseline for discovering organizational factors that influence the level of job satisfaction of disability service providers. Outcomes from this study can be used as a means to identify the importance of various duties and responsibilities of
disability service providers and organizational factors that could contribute to their satisfaction on the job and potentially retention of their position.
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Appendix A

Email Notice to Participate in Survey

Dear Disability Service Provider,

I am writing to request your assistance with an important research study conducted through the University of Denver.

As a rehabilitation counselor and former student services administrator, I have worked with students with disabilities for many years. The purpose of this study is to achieve a greater understanding of organizational factors which influence the level of job satisfaction of disability service providers. You will find instructions for the web-based survey along with the link to begin. The questionnaire should take no more than 15 minutes to complete.

All possible measures to safeguard your confidentiality will be made. The questionnaire does not ask for your name or institution so neither will be identified in the data analysis or findings. The data gathered will be summarized in aggregate form. You may skip any item that may be too sensitive or if the answer is not readily available. The risks to you in completing this survey are not greater than those encountered in everyday life, and there is no penalty of any kind should you elect not to participate. The completion of the web-based survey will be considered your consent of participation.

If you have questions about this research, you may contact me at 720-363-3686 or emwalker@du.edu. You may also contact my dissertation advisor, Sylvia D. Hall-Ellis, at the University of Denver. Thank you in advance for your support.

To begin the survey, please link to the Service Provider Job Satisfaction Survey 2009.
Sincerely,

Emelda “Bing” Walker  
University of Denver  
http://portfolio.du.edu/emwalker  
720-363-3686

Dissertation Advisor  
Sylvia D. Hall-Ellis, PhD  
Associate Professor  
University of Denver, Morgridge College of Education  
303-871-7881  
shellis@du.edu
Follow Up Email 1

Dear Disability Service Provider,

A few weeks ago, you received an email requesting your participation with a research study seeking your perspectives on organizational factors that influence the level of job satisfaction of disability service providers. If you have completed the survey and submitted it, please accept my thanks. If you are not the department manager of disability services, please forward it to the appropriate person.

You certainly are not required to complete the survey but we hope that you will do so because there is a critical need for up-to-date information regarding the level of job satisfaction criteria of disability service providers. The questionnaire should take no more than 15 minutes to complete.

All possible measures to safeguard your confidentiality will be made. The data gathered will be summarized in aggregate form. You may skip any item that may be too sensitive or if the answer is not readily available. The risks to you in completing this survey are not greater than those encountered in everyday life, and there is no penalty of any kind should you elect not to participate. The completion of the web-based survey will be considered your consent of participation.

Please contact me at 720-363-3686 or emwalker@du.edu if you have any questions regarding this study. You may also contact my dissertation advisor, Sylvia D. Hall-Ellis, at the University of Denver.

If you have not completed the survey, there is still time. Please link to the Service Provider Job Satisfaction Survey 2009 and follow the instructions.
Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,
Emelda “Bing” Walker
University of Denver
http://portfolio.du.edu/emwalker

Dissertation Advisor
Sylvia D. Hall-Ellis, PhD
Associate Professor
University of Denver, Morgridge College of Education
303-871-7881
shellis@du.edu
Follow Up Email 2

Dear Disability Service Provider,

A few weeks ago you received a reminder email to complete a Service Provider Job Satisfaction Survey for a research study seeking your perspectives on organizational factors that influence the level of job satisfaction of disability service providers. If you have completed the survey and submitted it, please accept my sincere thanks.

I would like to reiterate that all possible measures to safeguard your confidentiality will be made. The questionnaire does not ask for your name or institution so neither will be identified in the data analysis or findings. In addition, all the data gathered will be summarized in aggregate form. You may skip any item that may be too sensitive or if the answer is not readily available. The risks to you in completing this survey are not greater than those encountered in everyday life, and there is no penalty of any kind should you elect not to participate. The questionnaire should take no more than 15 minutes to complete. The completion of the web-based survey will be considered your consent of participation.

If you have not completed the survey, please link to the Service Provider Job Satisfaction Survey 2009 and follow the instructions.

Please contact me at 720-363-3686 or emwalker@du.edu if you have any questions regarding this study. You may also contact my dissertation advisor, Sylvia D. Hall-Ellis, at the University of Denver.

Thank you for your participation.
Sincerely,

Emelda “Bing” Walker  
http://portfolio.du.edu/emwalker

Dissertation Advisor  
Sylvia D. Hall-Ellis, PhD  
Associate Professor  
University of Denver, Morgridge College of Education  
303-871-7881  
shellis@du.edu
Appendix B

Welcome

Job Satisfaction Survey

Thank you for participating in the Job Satisfaction Survey. The purpose of this study is to achieve a greater understanding of organizational factors which influence job satisfaction of disability service providers. The questionnaire should take no more than 15 minutes to complete.

All possible measures to safeguard your confidentiality will be made. The questionnaire does not ask for your name or institution so neither will be identified in the data analysis or findings. The data gathered will be summarized in aggregate form. You may skip any question that does not apply or if the answer is not readily available. The risks to you in completing this survey are not greater than those encountered in everyday life, and there is no penalty of any kind should you elect not to participate.

If you have questions about this research, you may contact E. Ding Walker at 720-363-3606 or emwalker@du.edu. You may also contact Sylvia D. Hall-Ellis, dissertation advisor, at 303-871-7881 or shellis@du.edu.

If you have any concerns or complaints about how you were treated during the survey, please contact Susan Sadler, Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, at 303-871-3454, or Syik Sotto-Santiago, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at 303-871-4052 or write to either at the University of Denver, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, 2199 S. University Blvd., Denver, CO 80208-4820.

Thank you in advance for your support. The completion of the web-based survey will be considered your consent of participation. To begin the survey, please click the Next button below.

Demographic Information

The following questions are designed to gather demographic information. Please indicate your answer by clicking on the appropriate button.

1. What is your title?
   - [ ] Dean
   - [ ] Director
   - [ ] Coordinator
   - [ ] Other (please specify)

2. Is your position?
   - [ ] Full time
   - [ ] Part-time
3. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female
   - Decline to answer

4. What is your race/ethnicity? Check all that apply.
   - American Indian or Native American
   - Asian
   - Black or African American
   - Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
   - White
   - Hispanic or Latino
   - Decline to answer
   - Other (please specify)

5. Are you a veteran?
   - Yes
   - No

6. Do you have a documented disability(ies)?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Decline to answer

7. Highest level of educational attainment?
   - Less than High School
   - High School diploma or equivalent
   - Associate's degree
   - Bachelor's degree
   - Master's degree
   - Doctorate degree
   - Other (please specify)
8. What office or position did you work at prior to working for the disability services office? Check all that apply.

- ☐ Admission
- ☐ Advising
- ☐ Career Counseling
- ☐ Counseling
- ☐ Faculty
- ☐ Financial Aid
- ☐ Housing
- ☐ Recruitment
- ☐ Student Life
- ☐ Not in higher education
- ☐ Other (please specify)  

9. To whom do you report? Check all that apply.

- ☐ Vice President of Instruction
- ☐ Vice President of Student Affairs
- ☐ Dean of Instruction
- ☐ Dean of Student Affairs
- ☐ Director
- ☐ Other (please specify)  

10. Total years in the field of disability services?

- ☐ 0-5
- ☐ 6-10
- ☐ 11-15
- ☐ 16+

109
11. Number of years in your current position as director/coordinate of disability services?

- 0-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16+

12. What is the institutional category you work in?

- Associate's Colleges
- Baccalaureate Colleges
- Master's Colleges and Universities
- Doctorate-granting Universities
- Special Focus Institutions
- Tribal Colleges
- Other (please specify)

13. On average, how many students with disabilities does your department serve per academic year?

14. What is your institutionalized annual Full-Time Enrollment (FTE)?

- Up to 9,999
- 10,000 - 19,999
- 20,000 - 29,999
- 30,000 - 39,999
- 40,000 - 49,999
- 50,000 or more

15. Is disability services on your campus:

- Centralized (one center serving the entire institution)
- Decentralized (various centers serving the institution)

Managing Information

The following questions are designed to find out how you feel about managing information as it relates to your job. Please indicate the extent to which you are satisfied or not satisfied with each of the following
questions by clicking on the appropriate button. Please choose one answer per question.

**16. Are you satisfied with...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty understanding of the need to provide accommodations for students with disabilities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Managing Information**

Please choose one answer per question.

**17. Are you satisfied with...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The administration’s understanding of the protection for students with disabilities with regards to the American with Disabilities Act (ADA)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Managing Information**

Please choose one answer per question.

**18. Are you satisfied with...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The number of disability awareness trainings provided for faculty?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Managing Information**

Please choose one answer per question.

**19. Are you satisfied with...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The level of faculty participation in disability awareness training?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Managing Information**

Please choose one answer per question.

**20. Are you satisfied with...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The dissemination of information regarding the location of disability services?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please choose one answer per question.

### 21. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The dissemination of information regarding the procedures for requesting disability services?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Managing Information

Please choose one answer per question.

### 22. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The way your departmental policies/procedures are written?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Managing Information

Please choose one answer per question.

### 23. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your department's use of technology to improve services?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Managing Information

Please choose one answer per question.

### 24. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The accessibility of information on your department's webpage?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Managing Information

Please choose one answer per question.

### 25. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How your program evaluation process is used to improve services?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overseeing Funds

The following questions are designed to find out how you feel about overseeing funds as it relates to...
your job. Please indicate the extent to which you are satisfied or not satisfied with each of the following questions by clicking on the appropriate button. Please choose one answer per question.

### 26. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution’s financial commitment to disability services?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overseeing Funds

Please choose one answer per question.

### 27. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The amount of influence you have for securing financial resources for your programs or activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overseeing Funds

Please choose one answer per question.

### 28. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The level of funding to accomplish departmental goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overseeing Funds

Please choose one answer per question.

### 29. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your budget for reasonable classroom accommodations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overseeing Funds

Please choose one answer per question.

### 30. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your budget for adequate assistive technology?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please choose one answer per question.

### 31. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The level of the cost of technology support for the department?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overseeing Funds

Please choose one answer per question.

### 32. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your level of autonomy in making decisions regarding the department’s financial budget?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overseeing Funds

Please choose one answer per question.

### 33. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The number of grant opportunities available to support your program?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overseeing Funds

Please choose one answer per question.

### 34. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your offices’ relationship with the state vocational rehabilitation program?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overseeing Funds

Please choose one answer per question.

### 35. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff retention in your department?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Influencing Culture

The following questions are designed to find out how you feel about influencing culture as it relates to your job. Please indicate the extent to which you are satisfied or not satisfied with each of the following...
questions by clicking on the appropriate button. Please choose one answer per question.

### 36. Are you satisfied with...

The institution’s commitment to persons with disabilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Influencing Culture

Please choose one answer per question.

### 37. Are you satisfied with...

The institutional mission statement reflecting the importance of services to students with disabilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Influencing Culture

Please choose one answer per question.

### 38. Are you satisfied with...

The guidance your office provides to the institution to ensure compliance with legal requirements for access?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Influencing Culture

Please choose one answer per question.

### 39. Are you satisfied with...

The accessibility of institution-wide facilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Influencing Culture

Please choose one answer per question.

### 40. Are you satisfied with...

The accessibility of institution-wide services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Influencing Culture

Please choose one answer per question.
### 41. Are you satisfied with...

The way your policies/procedures define institutional responsibilities to provide accommodations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Influencing Culture

Please choose one answer per question.

### 42. Are you satisfied with...

The way your policies/procedures define the responsibilities of the student who requests accommodations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Influencing Culture

Please choose one answer per question.

### 43. Are you satisfied with...

The support you receive from the institution when handling appeals from students who were denied accommodations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Influencing Culture

Please choose one answer per question.

### 44. Are you satisfied with...

Departmental processes to handle difficult students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Influencing Culture

Please choose one answer per question.

### 45. Are you satisfied with...

The accessibility of disability services/accommodations to distance learner students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Building a Career


The following questions are designed to find out how you feel about building a career as it relates to your job. Please indicate the extent to which you are satisfied or not satisfied with each of the following questions by clicking on the appropriate button. Please choose one answer per question.

### 46. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The overall hiring practices of your institution?</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Building a Career

Please choose one answer per question.

### 47. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The overall promotional practices of your institution?</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Building a Career

Please choose one answer per question.

### 48. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The opportunities for advancement at your institution?</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Building a Career

Please choose one answer per question.

### 49. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The recognition you receive from your immediate supervisor?</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Building a Career

Please choose one answer per question.

### 50. Are you satisfied with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The availability of professional development opportunities?</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Building a Career
Please choose one answer per question.

### 51. Are you satisfied with...

*The amount of research you participate in that increases your knowledge of the profession?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Building a Career

Please choose one answer per question.

### 52. Are you satisfied with...

*Your ability to do your job?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Building a Career

Please choose one answer per question.

### 53. Are you satisfied with...

*Your workload?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Building a Career

Please choose one answer per question.

### 54. Are you satisfied with...

*Your pay being comparable to similar positions at comparable institutions?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Building a Career

Please choose one answer per question.

### 55. Are you satisfied with...

*Your level of job satisfaction?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Undeclared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Comments**


Thank you
Thank you very much for participating in this survey. Please contact E. Bing Walker for any questions or comments at 720-363-3686 or emwalker@du.edu.