Spring 5-2012

A Multidimensional Perspective of Faculty Mentoring and Job Satisfaction during the First Year of Teaching at Lindenwood University

Carla Mueller
Lindenwood University, cmueller@lindenwood.edu

A Multidimensional Perspective of Faculty Mentoring and Job Satisfaction during the First Year of Teaching at Lindenwood University

by

Carla Mueller

A Dissertation submitted to the Education Faculty of Lindenwood University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

Doctor of Education

School of Education

A Multidimensional Perspective of Faculty Mentoring and

Job Satisfaction during the First Year of Teaching

at Lindenwood University

by

Carla Mueller

This dissertation has been approved as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

Doctor of Education

at Lindenwood University by the School of Education

Dr. Donald Heidenreich, Chair	Date
Dr. Sherrie Wisdom, Committee Member	Date
Dr. Cynthia Bice, Committee Member	Date

Declaration of Originality

I do hereby declare and attest to the fact that this is an original study based solely upon my own scholarly work here at Lindenwood University and that I have not submitted it for any other college or university course or degree here or elsewhere.

Full Legal Name: Carla Rose Mueller

Signature: Carla Rose Mueller Date: 4/20/12

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my Lindenwood University colleagues for their support, encouragement, and inspiration. In particular, I would like to express sincere appreciation to President James D. Evans, Ph. D. for his commitment to academic integrity, Dr. Ray Scupin, my mentor in my professional transition to academe, Dr. Richard Boyle, my mentoring program colleague, and my committee members past and present including Dr. Larry Matthews—may he always dance to the music. My gratitude is extended to Dr. Donald Heidenreich and Dr. Sherrie Wisdom for their direction and leadership and to Dr. Cynthia Bice for her time and encouragement. I would like to recognize the faculty new to Lindenwood University for their participation in this research. They have contributed to the refinement and improvement of LU's mentoring program. Special thanks, as always, go to my son, Tim Coady, for his love and patience.

Abstract

Higher education requires exemplary faculty to provide a high quality education to college-level students. When faculty is new to an institution, issues of transition can affect job satisfaction negatively. The literature concludes that job satisfaction can affect retention of quality personnel. As a result, college and university administrators have addressed this concern with the development of mentoring programs for faculty new to their institutions. One of the goals of mentoring programs is based on the assumption that mentoring can affect job satisfaction in a positive way; thus, involvement in such programs will ensure faculty members are more likely to be content in their new employment. This research was designed to explore that assumption.

This study examined the variables of multidimensional perspectives of faculty job satisfaction: teaching, social, employee, and overall job satisfaction. Using a subject pool of 28 faculty new to the university in academic year 2008-09, a survey of faculty job satisfaction was administered at three data points during their first year. These results were analyzed utilizing multiple methods of *z* tests for difference in proportions, ANOVA, and *z* tests for difference in means. To further explore the relationship between faculty mentoring and job satisfaction, individual, paired, and group interviews were conducted with voluntary subjects. These interview subjects included current and past participants and administrative and executive stakeholders in the mentoring program. This mixed methods research design was utilized to address multiple hypotheses and the research question.

Quantitative results of the survey did not support the 80% benchmark of faculty reporting their job satisfaction level as being satisfied or very satisfied. The qualitative results of the survey emphasized the social support received from participating in mentoring. Interviewed research subjects indicated the success of the mentoring program and raised some problematic areas needing correction.

As a result of this research, the university identified needed refinements to the mentoring program. Findings indicated concerns as to role clarification, participation expectations, and topics addressed in across-the-university meetings. Using the results from the participants and administrative and executive stakeholders, changes in training, communication, and faculty-driven programming will be implemented.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Appendices

Chapter One: Introduction

Background of the Problem

The Lindenwood University (LU) School of Education believes that teaching is both an art and a science (LU School of Education, 2011); this could not be a more accurate assessment of the nature of the profession. College and university faculty often come to the profession after many years of gaining an expertise they want to share. These new faculty see their life's work as educating the next generation in their field of study. Those drawn to higher education come to teach, be it English, history, social work, or any college-level curriculum. As experts in their chosen field, these educators want to transmit the knowledge and the practice. College professors express the "joy in teaching your subject" as the highest factor in professional satisfaction (Marston, 2010, p. 439). Very few have taken coursework in how to teach, and most develop a distinctive style of delivery through trial and error, often beginning by modeling personal observations and experiences from admired professors. Higher education faculty in a teaching institution, therefore, develop the art, but often neglect the science of teaching. For faculty new to higher education, mentoring serves a primary function in the enhancement of quality teaching by developing their science of teaching (Von Emmerik, 2008). By providing a formal guide to increase focus on both of these sides of teaching effectiveness, competence can improve, and the faculty member benefits with increased job satisfaction. The institution benefits by higher quality teaching. Mentoring programs designed for faculty new to an institution can serve to address both the art and science of teaching (Shim & Roth, 2008).

In the United States today, the status of being a college professor is ranked among the highest on the social prestige scale (Davis, Smith, & Marsden, 2005). As a result of this social stature, one could reasonably predict college faculty would be very satisfied employees. This relationship between higher education employment and job satisfaction has been verified by TIAA-CREF, a pension company for university faculty, which found, when compared to other workers, full-time faculty members at four-year colleges are reported to be happier with their jobs than are most American workers (Wasley, 2007). Institutions of higher education, however, vary notably in job expectations such as teaching loads, committee work, and research; these variations may affect job satisfaction.

Faculty populations with differing needs possess factors which can substantially influence levels of jobs satisfaction. Job satisfaction may be affected in the common areas of rank, salary, and personal life balance; however, faculty who are parents may require a more flexible schedule; researchers may expect a reduced teaching load. Many factors play into job satisfaction. In a study of higher education faculty and job satisfaction, "The findings imply that faculty were most satisfied with the *content* of their job and least satisfied with the *context* in which their job was performed" (Castillo & Cano, 2004, p. 72). Higher education faculty report overall job satisfaction with teaching their subject area, working with students, and collegial relationships (Marston, 2010). "Burnout was associated with less time spent on teaching, service/administrative tasks, and professional development activities" (Siegall & McDonald, 2004, p. 291).

Many higher educators complain about the environments in which they teach. Concerns may arise from a lack of understanding of the institution as well as having few,

if any, relationships with senior administrators. Faculty members are often frustrated by decisions which are delayed by multiple layers of bureaucratic approvals, the perspective of student as consumer, and the politics of tenure. Concerns as to the relationship with administration, the bureaucratic processes, and most recently, job security can negatively affect their job satisfaction (Siegall & McDonald, 2004). Many in higher education are expected to devote large amounts of time and expertise to administrative tasks such as committee responsibilities, departmental assessment, and meeting accreditation expectations. These are higher education context issues and concerns. These issues can lead to faculty burn-out if not adequately addressed with programs and services designed to support faculty (Bilge, 2006).

Statement of the Problem

Faculty job satisfaction can be affected when an individual moves to a new institution of higher education which may or may not result in a positive organizational fit. It is here where mentoring can have an important impact. According to the Weber State University 2004-05 full-time undergraduate faculty survey, "Self-imposed high expectations, institutional procedures and red tape, and keeping up with information technology were the three most stressful *work-related* factors" (p 1.). When rating "issues you believe to be of 'high' or 'highest' priority at your institution," 43.9% of faculty (40.9% men and 48.8% women) rated "to mentor new faculty" (Webster State University, 2005, p. 5). This finding speaks to the importance of mentoring programs for faculty beginning employment at an institution of higher learning. The Association of American Medical Colleges found "supportive environments can foster faculty satisfaction" (Bunton, 2008, p. 1). A new faculty mentoring program can be instrumental

in creating that supportive environment. A skillful higher educational leader within a responsive institution will ensure the provision of mentoring as an enrichment opportunity.

Lindenwood University (LU), founded in 1827, is located in the St. Louis, Missouri region. As a liberal arts university, LU offers more than 120 undergraduate and graduate degree programs to approximately 17,000 students. The programs offered lead to development of a well-rounded, educated individual. The faculty, staff, and administration seek to enhance the talents, interests, and future of students. Lindenwood is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (LU, 2011).

The mission statement of the university furthers the values and purpose of the institution:

> Lindenwood University offers values-centered programs leading to the development of the whole person–an educated, responsible, citizen of a global community.
>
> Lindenwood is committed to...
>
> • providing an integrative liberal arts curriculum;
>
> • offering professional and pre-professional degree programs;
>
> • focusing on the talents, interests, and future of the student;
>
> • supporting academic freedom and the unrestricted search for truth;
>
> • affording cultural enrichment to the surrounding community;
>
> • promoting ethical lifestyles;

• developing adaptive thinking and problem-solving skills; and

• furthering lifelong learning.

> Lindenwood is an independent, public-serving, liberal arts university that has an historical relationship with the Presbyterian Church and is firmly rooted in Judeo-Christian values. These values include belief in an ordered, purposeful universe, the dignity of work, the worth and integrity of the individual, the obligations and privileges of citizenship, and the primacy of the truth. (LU, 2011, paras. 1-2)

The mission provides a context for faculty, staff, and students to guide their work. Ambrose, Huston, and Norman (2005) discussed how the mission, in addition to structures, student bodies, funding, and resources distinguishes colleges and universities from one another. As a teaching university, many faculty members new to LU struggle with the demands of the teaching load, advising expectations, and service work. "Often 1st year faculty make the mistake of overwhelming themselves, not realizing when to say no" (Bower, 2007, p. 73). Without a formal mentor, these new employees may have to navigate the new experience without guidance, creating unnecessary frustration and dissatisfaction with the complexity of the bureaucracy and informal procedures.

The LU mentors are faculty members who have been approved by the respective academic dean, expected to have a minimum three years of LU teaching experience, and a positive attitude about the LU organizational culture. These mentors are required to meet regularly both formally, in scheduled weekly meetings and informally, in as-needed, drop-in, open door discussions with their mentee to ensure smooth acclimation to their new organizational setting and expectations.

LU values people—students, staff, and faculty. LU has a mentoring program designed to aid in building instructional skills, assist new faculty in making appropriate connections, grow professionally, and get questions answered as quickly as possible. This program is invaluable to LU administrators in expediting the new faculty member's acclimation to the organization. Developing collaborative relationships as part of a supportive university culture is a component of the university's goal of continuous improvement and quality education (see Appendix C).

Purpose of the Study

The Lindenwood University New Faculty Mentoring Program (LUNFMP) began in the Fall Semester of 2006 to replace previous mentoring that had been occurring on an informal basis. LUNFMP has never been formally evaluated as to its objectives and appropriate use of LU resources. This gap in institutional assessment of programs highlighted the need for this study.

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of the LUNFMP as measured across multiple dimensions of faculty job satisfaction. The subjects were faculty new to LU in the academic year 2008-09. Multiple dimensions of job satisfaction were examined: teaching satisfaction, social satisfaction, and employee satisfaction. Mixed methods were used to collect and analyze the data.

Participation in LUNFMP was expected to increase job satisfaction for an overall satisfaction rate of 80%, comparable to what is reported by Cornell University (2006). It is to be noted this is not specifically faculty new to this institution of higher learning, but to all Cornell faculty. Similar reports of LU faculty overall job satisfaction have been compiled. In a Topline Report conducted for the Chronicle of Higher Education Great

Colleges to Work for 2008, surveyed LU faculty rated Job Satisfaction/Support at 69% (Modern Think, 2008). In 2009, the Lindenwood University Faculty Satisfaction Survey reported Job Satisfaction and Support at 80% (Fleishman/Hilliard, 2009). Again, these were surveys of all faculty members who participated, not solely those new to LU.

It is expected that the findings may benefit future new faculty via the improvement of LUNFMP through the feedback received from these research participants. Recommendations for program changes with an action plan for adjustment to LUNFMP have been formally presented to the Vice President of Human Resources. These recommended program modifications are a direct result of information received in this research study.

The objectives of LUNFMP are delineated in the program description. The objectives of LUNFMP are to

- accelerate acclimation,
- retain the performing new faculty,
- improve the quality of education,
- assist with the balance of teaching and service duties,
- and help the new faculty become a member of a professional community in outlook, word, and daily service (see Appendix A).

The mentoring program expectations included individual mentoring and participation in across-the-university monthly meetings to discuss common issues such as dealing with at-risk students, work/personal life balance, and conversing with the president and upper administration. All new faculty members are required to participate; however, not all are willing and/or able to due to other commitments. No incentives or penalties are related to

participation in LUNFMP. To maximize the ability for all faculty members to attend, meetings were offered at two times per meeting month for this large group of faculty new to Lindenwood.

To study mentoring and job satisfaction, several hypotheses were researched:

Hypothesis #1: There will be a difference between the proportion of respondents with overall job satisfaction and the desired benchmark of 80%.

Hypothesis #2: There will be a difference between the proportion of respondents indicating satisfaction with the quality of mentoring and the desired benchmark of 80%.

Hypothesis #3: There will be a difference in proportion of responses of those reporting *satisfied* and *very satisfied* compared to those reporting *dissatisfied* and *very dissatisfied* across the three individual applications of the survey to the entire group of participants on all indicators of job satisfaction.

Hypothesis #4: There will be a difference in proportion of responses of those reporting *satisfied* and *very satisfied* when comparing individual applications of the survey for each of the three categorical sub-groups: teaching satisfaction, social satisfaction, and employee satisfaction.

Hypothesis #5: There will be a difference in average overall response to job satisfaction when comparing responses per application (September 2008, January 2009, and April 2009).

Research question: A research question emerged: Will those directly involved in LUNFMP report the program meets the defined objectives? To evaluate this, it is expected key players invested in the success of new faculty mentors (department chairs, deans, upper administration, mentors, participants from years 2006-07, those faculty who

were informally mentored prior to the inception of LUNFMP) will report the value of the program particularly as it relates to the dimensions of job satisfaction of faculty new to LU.

Definition of Terms

Mentoring. Mentoring is a developmental partnership. Through this relationship, one knowledgeable person shares information, skills, applications and perspectives to foster the personal and professional growth of someone else (Alumni Mentor Program University of Southern California, 2011). Mentoring at LU entails the creation of a formal professional link between newly-appointed faculty members and long-term, respected faculty members, including face-to-face contacts on both a regular and as-needed basis.

Mentor. The faculty member offering the mentoring. The LU mentors are faculty members who have been approved by the respective academic dean, expected to have a minimum three years of LU teaching experience, and a positive attitude about the LU organizational culture. These mentors are expected to meet regularly both formally, in scheduled weekly meetings and informally, in as-needed, drop-in, open door discussions with their mentee to ensure smooth acclimation to their new organizational setting and expectations. Responsibilities of mentors include, but are not limited to, a commitment to mentoring; the ability to provide resources and expertise, guidance, and direction; encouragement of ideas and work of the mentee; ability to challenge the mentee to expand on personal abilities; ability to provide timely, clear, and comprehensive feedback; and ability to share successes and benefits of the mentoring relationship (Berk, Berg, Mortimer, Walton-Moss, & Yeo, 2005).

Mentee or protégé. The recipient of the mentoring; at LU, the faculty person new to teaching full-time at LU.

Induction. The initiation or a formal entry into an organization, position, or office. Includes an orientation to help familiarize new faculty with campus services and resources, assist in completing some documentation required of new faculty, equip new faculty with tips and techniques for a successful first semester, and introduce mentees to some friendly faces (Central Michigan University, 2011).

Acclimation. The process of adjustment to new conditions or learning about the institution of higher education. This is a form of socialization**.** The newcomer gains the values that develop into an identity germane to the institution. This is then translated into acceptable organizational behavior (Paarlberg & Lavinia, 2009).

Effectiveness. The impact or outcome that the program has on achieving stated goals of the intervention (Bloom, Fischer, & Orme, 1999).

Job satisfaction. This term refers to a faculty member's sense of achievement and success including contentment level of an individual employee, a perception of inner fulfillment and pride, and a sense of accomplishment for having done something important and valuable while being suitably rewarded. This includes perceptions of teaching load and scholarship, salary and benefits, academic freedom, academic integrity of the institution, life/work balance, inclusion, and relationship with administration are indicators. Rosser (2005) conceptualized higher education faculty job satisfaction to be related to advising and course load, benefits and security, quality of students, and an overall self-report of job satisfaction.

Limitations

Although all faculty new to LU are required to participate in LUNFMP, this research was limited because not all new faculty actively participate in LUNFMP. Many faculty came with a wealth of experience at other institutions and believed they would not benefit from such a program; many were LU adjuncts who had secured a full-time position and believed they were already familiar with LU; some had other obligations such as teaching during the monthly meetings, but did participate in the one-on-one mentoring. Although not officially endorsed by the LU administration, many of this cohort did not self-identify as new faculty, despite being employed by LU for the first time. As a result, many opted not to participate in the LUNFMP even though involvement was expected by LU administration. Those not participating in the monthly meetings were invited to be interviewed individually. As academic year 2008-09's group of new hires was larger than most years' hiring (28 new faculty), participation was expected to be at least 50% based on previous years' experience. The research findings were limited by this finite group of participants and may not be generalizable in spite of the fact that participants spanned several divisions across LU (see Appendix E, Figure 4). Also, since participation in this research was voluntary, all possible perspectives may not be included. The study was only for the 2008-09 academic year, and the experiences of these new faculty hires may have been different from those in other years. Given these limitations, this research was still expected to yield information as to the effectiveness of LUNFMP both overall and as to particular aspects of the program.

The reliance on self-report and memory may also have been a limitation since many of the subjects were interviewed after the completion of participation in the

LUNFMP. Although interviewees reported clear recollection of the mentoring program, it is possible that time and experience may have tempered the evaluation of the program. As results appear to be consistent, it is not expected that this was a limitation in this research.

This study may have been further limited by the fact this program was facilitated by the primary researcher, who is the Dean of the School of Human Services, and the Vice President of Human Resources/Dean of Faculty, as they have been most influential in getting LUNFMP operational. Bias toward the researcher may have occurred due to perceived power dynamics. The new faculty members were well aware of who facilitates LUNFMP from the first meeting onward. Unfortunately, during the administration of the first survey, the Vice President of Human Resources/Dean of Faculty did not leave the room immediately. This was not the agreed-upon procedure. It is expected that this procedural mistake did not affect participants' responses; however, it cannot be stated with total confidence if it did or did not.

To limit researcher bias, it was determined that the use of a graduate assistant would be helpful to reduce the perception of power dynamics and potential for efforts on the part of participants for pleasing of the researcher. However, the use of a graduate assistant also limits the flexibility in having an open conversational interview allowing for elaboration and exploration of responses. The results may have been less informative by utilization of the graduate student who is less familiar with research interview skills.

Delimitations. This was a limited study as it covered one group of new faculty during their first year at LU. The sample size of 28 also limited the scope of this study.

Information generated from this sample may be used to improve and refine the LUNFMP.

Assumptions. It was important to evaluate all programs at LU. Input from participants and key players in the investment of new faculty was necessary for a thorough evaluation. As resources such as time can be a scarce commodity, it was important to evaluate the usefulness of such a mentoring program. It was assumed new faculty came to LU with a limited knowledge of the university's procedures and organizational culture. As university teaching positions require advanced college degrees (see Appendix E, Figure 3), university faculty have been students, and often faculty, within organizations of higher education. As each college or university has its own culture, an acclimation process needs to occur for faculty to understand the commonalities and the unique approach of the institution despite previous experiences. It was expected the new faculty were honest in their responses as their feedback is critical to the findings. Most of the subjects had been involved in conducting research to attain advanced degrees (see Appendix E, Figure 3), so it was expected that the importance of honest participation was understood. It is reasonable, therefore, to expect involvement in research from this subject pool would be honest, direct, and forthcoming.

Summary

It was important to LU administration to have new faculty who are satisfied with and are acclimated to employment at LU in order to retain the effective higher educators necessary to improve the quality of education. LUNFMP was designed to assist with the process of induction. It was expected to have a positive effect on job satisfaction. Faculty with increased levels of job satisfaction are expected to be more competent,

creative, innovative, loyal and more likely to embrace both the art and science of teaching within an institution of higher education (Pienaar & Bester, 2005).

Responsible and ethical organizations of higher education evaluate major programs. Lindenwood University was committed to the evaluation of LUNFMP as a major program. This study was important as a measure of the significance of new faculty mentoring at LU.

LU was committed to providing resources dedicated to faculty growth and development. The LUNFMP was a faculty program in need of ongoing assessment and evaluation to ensure the resources dedicated to this program continued to enhance the advancement of quality faculty. This study had contributed to the body of research surrounding faculty mentoring and has explored its relationship to faculty job satisfaction.

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 provides the framework for the study. This includes the purpose of this study and how it contributed to the body of literature on mentoring and job satisfaction for those employed in higher education.

The literature review in Chapter 2 explores studies in mentoring new faculty and measures of job satisfaction, thus laying a theoretical, evidence-based foundation for this research study. Chapter 3 discusses the methodology used for the research including a relevant theoretical framework, the instruments used in the study, and the data collection. Chapter 4 presents the data collected during the study, and Chapter 5 addresses conclusions drawn and recommendations made from the collected data.

Chapter Two: Review of Literature

This study explores the level of job satisfaction of faculty new to teaching at LU at three points of the first year of full-time teaching employment. The literature is replete with the positive benefits affiliated with mentoring new faculty, but is bereft of formal program evaluation as it relates to effectiveness (Savage, Karp & Logue, 2004). The significance of evaluating the faculty mentoring program is embodied in the research findings of the benefits of mentoring, both for the mentor and the mentee. These benefits range for the mentor from regeneration and recognition to acclimation and inclusion for the mentee (Bilge, 2006; Bland, Taylor, Shollen, Weber-Main, & Mulcahy, 2009; Wanberg, Kammeyer-Mueller, & Marchese, 2006; Wasserstein, Quistberg, & Shea, 2007). The association with job satisfaction is grounded in the research findings of increased job satisfaction being related to retention of qualified faculty (Glenn, 2007; Norman, Ambrose, & Huston, 2006; Rosser, 2005; Seifert & Umbach, 2008; Terpstra & Honoree, 2004; Blandet al., 2009). Both of these components are desirable for the entrée of faculty new to an institution of higher education. Much of the literature is derived from faculty reports and observations of those who oversee higher education faculty mentoring programs, but is lacking in evidence-based findings from research studies (Allen, Eby, O'Brien, & Lentz, 2008). By combining two factors, this study addresses not only the formal program, but also the components most often identified as indicators of job satisfaction in higher education faculty positions.

"Mentoring has traditionally been defined as a top-down, one-to-one relationship in which an experienced faculty member guides and supports the career development of a new or early-career faculty member" (Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007, p. 58). As with many

colleges and universities, mentoring of new faculty was traditionally offered on an informal basis. LU followed a similar path to the development of a formal mentoring program. Most LU faculty hired prior to the LUNFMP can identify the academic guide who aided in avoiding the pitfalls of the first year. Recognition of these helpful colleagues was non-existent. When LUNFMP was initiated, many faculty commented on how mentoring was already being done. The program developers readily acknowledged this was indeed true, but a formalization of mentoring was beneficial to the university, the newly hired faculty, and the mentors. Consistency of expectations and the assurance all new faculty hires were offered mentoring was at the core of LUNFMP program development.

The Higher Learning Commission (HLC), the accrediting body for LU, cites as a standard of Student Learning and Effective Teaching, in Chapter 3, Criterion 3: "The organization provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its education mission." In Core Component – 3d: "The organization's learning resources support student learning and effective teaching". An example of evidence for this is, "The organization's system and structures enable partnerships and innovations that enhance student learning and strengthen teaching effectiveness" (Higher Learning Commission, 2003). New faculty mentoring is a programmatic resource which yields strengthened teaching effectiveness by providing assistance to promote a smooth induction to LU.

Higher Education Teaching

Higher education faculty often come to teaching to share expertise, but most of those in higher education did not have formal training to teach. Faculty "learn through

doing, experience, previous jobs, or modeling. Their teaching expertise was not recognized as formal knowledge, but rather as a skill or just expertise" (Shim & Roth, 2008, p. 11). Faculty may struggle with the rigors of teaching, particularly when faced with the college-level classroom challenges such as assessment, engagement, involvement, behavior management, and varied abilities, interests, and motivations of students. Having expertise in the given field is the foundation for higher education, but the elements of effective delivery of the knowledge are an essential skill to success in post-secondary teaching.

Motivation to join higher education is characterized by distinctive elements. The intellectual stimulation of one's discipline, the ability to impact one's university, the desire to be part of the academic community, and the recognition and rewards for contributions to the institution create the impetus to pursue a career in higher education (Berberet, 2008). However, the lack of preparation for the demands and minutiae of the rigor of academia are usually not part of this career decision making.

Adams (2002) stated that new faculty is expected to carry demanding workloads of teaching and advising in addition to research and responsibility for some aspects of governance. New faculty often has only a small foundation of experience on which to draw. When expectations of creative approaches to higher education to ensure student success via new pedagogies are increased, even seasoned faculty can find the work load overwhelming. New teaching methodologies such as the use of technology, collaborative learning, and field experiences can be beyond the expertise of the faculty person new to an organization of higher education.

Faculty members new to an organization of higher education face a multitude of challenges in their first year of teaching at a new institution. Despite prior experience in college-level teaching, the uniqueness of each college or university requires learning the organizational structure and procedures, practices in managing the classroom, instructional standards, professional demeanor, political nuances, and the university culture. Higher education often focuses more on recruiting qualified faculty, but often neglects the process of orienting those new employees to the new culture (Lindbeck & Darnell, 2008).

Mullen (2009) stated, "Education as community and culture-based needs rediscovery—the ubiquitous energy of mentoring should be more fully utilized to connect people, reform values, affect decisions and actions, and contribute to the life, world and future of institutions, communities, and societies" (p. 12). With a focus on faculty development and success, mentoring programs can be an integral piece in the future of higher education. As an advocate of mentoring programs, Mullen (2009) values this infusion and commitment as an integral part of the university as community.

Recruitment and Retention

LU is invested in recruiting and retaining high quality educators. Terpstra and Honoree (2009) found universities "that do not emphasize research in any fashion fare the worst in terms of recruitment and retention" (p. 175). This finding is of particular concern to teaching universities such as LU. These researchers reported "voluntary turnover typically involves the best performers because they are more mobile" (Terpstra & Honoree, 2009, p. 175). With the recent downturn of the American economy, teaching universities are interviewing applicants who state a commitment to teaching over

research; however, a concern as to the dedication of teaching as the primary mission is raised in the hiring process. Teaching universities, therefore, must more conscientiously recruit faculty who are invested in the art and science of teaching while still endorsing research and scholarly productivity as a secondary priority to the classroom. Many in academe struggle with this concept, so mentoring assists in the understanding of the duality of these functions. Mamiseishvili and Rosser (2011) reported teaching and service demonstrate faculty members' commitment to students. The researchers suggested higher education institutions would benefit from a rethinking of their reward structures, values systems, and expectations placed on faculty to include these areas.

Mentoring

The use of the word mentor stems from Greek mythology in which Odysseus entrusted the care and education of his child to a friend named Mentor when the father left for the Trojan War (Ragins & Kram, 2007). In higher education, a mentor is a person who helps another become familiarized with "an organization's culture, people, and tasks in order to function effectively, and/or progressively move upward on the ladder of success, as defined by the internal culture" (Mujtaba, 2007, p. 319).

Mentoring is a relationship. Mentorship is a theoretical framework for these relationships in which the mentor, a person with experience and expertise, invests time in those less experienced, the mentee. Through this relationship, it is expected the mentee will grow, be more productive, and achieve expectations or beyond as a result of the mentor's response to the critical needs of the mentee (Johnson, 2007).

LU entrusts the care and education of new faculty hires to selected long-term, respected colleagues to serve as assigned mentors. The benefits of mentoring in higher education can be evaluated from many perspectives.

For the mentee, "speedier adaptation to a new role and/or organization and reduced likelihood of frustration and failure, increased exposure to ideas and connections and friendship" (Penner, 2001, p. 48) enhance the experience. Mentoring aids with issues of transition. The mentee must find the fit within the bigger picture of the university. The mentor/mentee relationship helps with the movement from previous employers to being an employee of LU. The ties to past schools are gradually integrated into the new position. The mentee moves from automatic thinking of, "at _____ University, we did this" to, "at Lindenwood University, we do this." The atmosphere of a university of inclusion is enhanced through the sharing and advising provided by the mentor.

Mentoring is a rewarding experience. For the mentor, mentoring means personal "enrichment through seeing someone else grow and succeed, creativity generated by issues and ideas generated by someone younger and newer, and friendship" (Penner, 2001, p. 47). Mentors often testify helping a new faculty member can inspire their own teaching by having to view the role of faculty member from different perspectives (Zachary, 2000). Since the inception of the LUNFMP, LU mentors frequently report a renewal of a personal and professional commitment to teaching and to the university.

For the university, mentoring means "stronger individuals offering higher quality performance, increased connectivity and caring, and support to formal employee orientation and development programs" (Penner, 2001, p. 48). At LU, the year-long involvement allows for the opportunity for new faculty to be oriented not solely through

an initial week of training, but also via an ongoing individualized mentoring relationship. The university-wide meetings also serve to build the network beyond the professor's department or area of expertise and into a supportive working environment.

Selection of Mentors

Carroll, Fulton, Yoon, and Lee (2005) described the merits and the pitfalls of faculty mentoring. The authors state good mentoring can provide a safety net during the stressful times of the challenging first year; however, the researchers postulate a poorly qualified mentor can be quite harmful when needed assistance is not offered by being unavailable or when a negative direction is presented by being under-informed. These less desirable guides can often reinforce bad practice. The selection of appropriate mentors who can maximize the mentor/mentee relationship is critical to the success of the program.

Research findings of what graduate students look for in their mentors further the characteristics of effective mentorship for higher education faculty. The mentor becomes an agent of encouragement to instill a high level of motivation. Mentoring functions such as psychosocial support and career guidance are a crucial part of the process. Personality characteristics including intelligence, caring, and honesty enhance the relationship (Allen & Eby, 2007; Clark, Harden, & Johnson, 2000 Johnson, 2007).

LU mentors are selected by the academic school dean. Mentors are generally leaders in the department, display an ability to form positive relationships, have the time, interest, and capability to mentor others, are effective communicators, convey empathy and sensitivity to diversity, and understand LU's mission and traditions. Mentoring is voluntary and is recognized in the university's merit pay system.

History of Mentoring

University professors have historically interacted at faculty clubs. These clubs functioned as the place to co-mingle between and among departments, develop university faculty cohesiveness, and improve faculty morale. These common areas for faculty socializing and collegial interchange served as a place to converge for scholarly dialogues and mentoring on college and university campuses. As faculty club membership declined or was eliminated by the university, facilities provided by the university also dispersed. Today, faculty clubs have become *relics* (Savage, Karp & Logue, 2004). These historical meeting places have been replaced by the use of the Internet to exchange collegial knowledge, advice, and support. Unfortunately, this technological replacement is lacking in interpersonal, face-to-face interaction which is known to enhance relationships. Therefore, institutions of higher education have developed more formalized mentoring programs to personalize the transition to the new university setting.

Mentoring programs have historically focused on technical or functionalist mentoring. The mentee is viewed as an apprentice who must master skills and build knowledge acquisition to succeed (Merriam, 1983). The relationship is to be short-term and ends when mastery is sustained. Friere, Fraser, Macedo, McKinnon, and Stokes(1997) puts forth a model of mentees as repositories. Mentors are expected to deposit information and knowledge for the mentee to progress. This philosophy of mentoring establishes a power differential that can inhibit an open and honest dialogue between mentor and mentee.

Functionalist mentoring hierarchically transmits knowledge within organizations and relationship systems (Mullen, 2005). Higher education has traditionally focused on

the transmission of technical efficiency, bureaucratic leadership, and skills-based learning to be the primary objective of mentoring programs (English, 2003). The nature of the mentoring relationship was considered important.

Mullen (2009) described technical mentoring as the "parents of mentoring" (p. 15). This approach perpetuates scientific management approaches to teaching and learning. More contemporary theorists of mentoring view mentoring as a collegial supervision (Johnson, 2007; Darwin, 2000; Allen & Eby, 2007).

Mentoring is often defined with the delineation of roles of supervising, advising, and training. Mullen (2005) found this a minimalist definition. This description of the mentoring role is bereft of the creative solutions developed in the reciprocal and group learning that occurs. Consequently, the traditionally reductionist view of mentoring often yields a lack of administrative support and resources to institutionalize successful faculty mentoring programs (Mullen, 2009). Although higher education administrators view mentoring as an important faculty responsibility, it is rarely acknowledged into the reward structure as is research or teaching (Clark, Harden, & Johnson, 2000).

The historical context of mentoring has changed over the past three centuries. Historic models developed for elementary and secondary education can be adapted for college/university teaching as higher education has undergone a comparable evolution of teaching models. As education changed in goals, philosophy, and the role of the teacher, so did the importance of mentoring.

The 19th Century Factory Model of Education was characterized by a teacher-centered curriculum and classroom where facts were presented in isolation. Lecture was the sole delivery methodology. Students were expected to memorize and then regurgitate

the material. This Industrial Model of Education prepared learners for factory jobs, with emphasis on the *3 R's* (Leland & Kasten, 2002). With a focus on the educational basics—reading, writing, and arithmetic, mentoring of faculty was not valued.

In the 20th century Solo Teaching Model, the teacher acted in isolation in the classroom. Oversight of the curriculum was non-existent. It was assumed a well-educated teacher was doing his/her job. Mentoring was an informal, one-on-one buddy system. Mentors were volunteers with little or no training or incentives (Leland & Kasten, 2002).

In the 21st Century Learning Community Model or Inquiry Model, the curriculum stems from multiple sources. Critical thinking and creativity are rewarded. Technology is an integral part of the classroom setting. The teacher is viewed as a facilitator of learning (Leland & Kasten, 2002). Mentoring is a team-based piece of an induction system. Extensive and continuous training is offered to mentors who have been selected for their skill in content, pedagogy, and ability to coach and work with other teachers (Carroll, Fulton, Yoon, & Lee, 2005). There are clear expectations and accountability for mentors of new teachers.

Mentoring Programs

According to Wasley (2007a), new faculty report being *assaulted by newness*. When one-day orientation sessions are offered rather than an ongoing formal program of mentor/mentee pairing, the new faculty reported barely having time to internalize the basics, much less the nuances of most organizations of higher education. New faculty also reported feeling anxious about voicing difficult experiences or negative impressions without being labeled unprofessional or offensive (Norman et al., 2006). Some senior

faculty members believe formal mentoring is unnecessary as it is seen as a sign of weakness. For most, however, formal mentoring programs make sense as a resource which can play a crucial role in the development of a sense of academic community.

To make acclimation more amenable and to minimize the sense of vulnerability, many universities have developed mentoring programs. Southern Connecticut State University, traditionally a teaching university, provides support in the faculty roles of teaching effectively, implementing creative activities, and developing service to the department, university and profession, and other relevant activities such as research and publication Beatty, Dickerson, & Shyam, 2008). University of Wisconsin at LaCrosse College of Liberal Studies found the outcomes of mentoring new faculty to include "higher rates of retention, more effective teaching and university service, a stronger record of scholarship/creative endeavors, higher rates of achieving tenure and promotion, greater sense of commitment to the university, and better adjustment to the department and to the university" (Johnson, 2007, p. 6). The College of Education at the University of South Florida believed "it takes a village to raise new faculty" (Mullen & Kennedy, 2005, p. 4). Mentoring new faculty is also a global concept. In Japan and China, mentors are viewed with high prestige and honor (Britton & Paine, 2005). Mentoring has been recognized as an important function of a university.

Successful Mentoring Relationships

To succeed, mentors must be carefully selected. One significant quality would be the ability to successfully transfer knowledge of LU to the mentee. Many who would qualify have the years of experience and a strong allegiance to the university, but may be lacking in the ability to transfer their knowledge to their mentees. This is especially a

concern for faculty who may have knowledge of their particular field and academic school, but may be unable to put this information into the broader university context. Other qualities needed for effective mentoring beyond experience include enthusiasm for higher education, an ability to provide direction and support, and availability. "Also important are a good sense of humor, open minded and receptive to other points of view, able to address sensitive issues, able to get along well with different types of people, and high expectations and standards—for themselves as well as others" (Miller, 2006, p. 1).

Mentors need to demonstrate a clear understanding of the mentee's position. As a vulnerable population to be protected from hidden agendas and ulterior motives (Johnson, 2007), mentors must create a safe and open environment "in which each proactively teaches the other" (Galbraith, 2003, p. 17).

Mentees also must possess some characteristics to maximize the mentoring relationship; a mentoring mindset is required. A basic understanding of the faculty position is essential. Effective communication skills are also necessary to not only communicate needs, but also to accept and incorporate feedback. Those mentees who have a predisposition toward learning and self-improvement are most likely to benefit from such a relationship (Searby, 2008).

Smith and Zsohar (2005) described four critical elements of the successful mentoring relationship: (a) mutual trust, (b) respect, (c) professionalism and, (d) an ability to accurately assess the needs of the mentee. Mutual trust is a shared belief each party can depend on the other to achieve a common goal. In mentoring, this level of trust is exemplified in the mentee's believing responsible direction and advice giving will be readily available. Open communication and listening must be the basis for the

relationship. An appropriate level of confidentiality must be maintained so the mentee can trust all discussion and be free from repercussion. Respect is generating a relationship of fairness and equality, including an appreciation of differing values, cultures, and perspectives. Professionalism is the modeling of moral and ethical behaviors. Honesty and integrity are core values. The ability to effectively assess the mentee's needs is an accurate, mutually agreed upon appraisal of the individual faculty member. It is an ongoing evaluation of the mentee's current knowledge, skills, abilities, goals for development and growth, and the methods to succeed.

A coaching approach is also important to anyone serving as a role model, and it is the acceptance of this guidance function that leads to an independently acting faculty person. The goal is for the faculty member to reach full potential. Through support and encouragement, the faculty member new to the institution is eventually weaned off of mentoring and into an autonomous employee. The mentoring relationship changes to one of friendship and ongoing guidance. Recognition that not all competent faculty members have the ability to be high quality mentors is a key to a successful mentor/mentee match (Johnson, 2007).

Effective mentoring is not without its difficulties. When mismatching occurs, a strained relationship develops. Neither the mentor nor the mentee can find an acceptable way to withdraw (Williams-June, 2008). Other potential areas of mismatch are lack of interest, differing scholarly pursuits, and diversity such as gender or race (Mullen & Kennedy, 2005). Physical distance and time can also present a significant barrier to successful mentoring. When mentors are located in close physical proximity to each other, the mentee is more likely to use less structured, drop-in opportunities to facilitate

mentee learning and growth. When the mentor has time to meet regularly, the mentoring relationship is nurtured appropriately. To ensure success, a new faculty mentor program must address all of these concerns when assigning formal mentors.

Phases of the Mentoring Relationship

As the mentoring relationship develops, distinct phases evolve. Kram (1983) described four levels. The initiation phase begins the process where the mentor and mentee define the goals and expectations of the mentoring relationship. The cultivation phase is a level characterized by new levels of career and psychosocial functions. Mutual growth and learning can occur. When the mentee requires autonomy, separation occurs. When successful, the mentee can successfully function independently. When separation is abrupt or unexpected, the mentee may experience job dissatisfaction. The final phase is redefinition where the relationship takes on a more collegial, collaborative style or ends entirely.

Barriers to Mentoring in Higher Education

Searby (2008) described mentoring as lifelong learning. Mentoring fails when goals are not mutually agreed upon, unrealistic assumptions are present, and/or there is an absence of dialogue. Knippelmeyer and Torraco (2007) identified multiple barriers to successful mentoring in higher education. For some mentors, there may be a concern that developing others to their highest potential may result in replacement of the mentor. Others are concerned about the time and energy required to mentor others successfully, on top of an already demanding job. The researchers further described concerns about one voice from an individual mentor, perhaps mistakenly limiting the mentee to only the

mentor's perspective. Due to the power differential, the mentee may not be empowered to raise or express concerns with the mentor.

When mentoring was measured as a variable in career success, Kammeyer-Mueller and Judge (2007) found correlations between attitudinal descriptions of mentoring and attitudinal measures of job satisfaction. These researchers concluded the power of the mentor in the organization may be a factor—a relatively powerless or naïve mentor may be helpful but may not necessarily enhance career success.

Mentoring Program Outcomes

Reports on mentoring programs have generally shown positive responses to the experience (Gibson, 2006; Mullen, 2005, Smith & Zsohar, 2005). Most describe how mentees appreciated the individual support and help, solidified a positive feeling about the college/university, and offered the mentee a safe place to express frustration, doubts, and uncertainties (Blauvelt & Spath, 2008). Positive outcomes of mentoring programs for new faculty include improved job satisfaction in a faculty role, improved teaching quality, and retention in the higher education profession (Smith & Zsohar, 2005).

The Future of Mentoring Programs

Mentoring programs in higher education are changing to keep abreast of changes in teaching in a global, multi-cultural, technological world. Most significant is the movement from technical mentorship to co-mentorship. In this model, the mentor asks the mentee, 'How can we learn from each other?' (Mullen, 2009). The relationship evolves from a hierarchical authority structure to a non-critical reflection and feedback discussion (Hansman, 2002). Relationships will be egalitarian and collaborative.

Mentoring may become accessible from multiple sources and relative to a variety of needs (Mullen, 2009). Learning may include cohort learning, a sharing of experiences and expertise that the mentee brings to the university. Diversity-based mentoring also may be available. Varying cohorts based on family roles, age, race, and/or gender of the mentee may be encouraged. Learning needs such as technology, pedagogy, and research could become a focus of mentoring in differing mentoring groups. Rather than one mentor, the faculty person new to the higher education institution could have access to a network of mentoring resources (Pololi & Knight, 2005).

With the advent of readily accessible technology, mentoring may become distance mentoring. To ensure the faculty person receives the needed expertise that may not be available at the employing college/university, use of electronically based mentoring groups may become part of the network of learning. This alternative model of mentoring is more responsive to the diverse needs for the group to attain creative, productive, and empowered contributions to the university. The future of mentoring may move from the sole sage guide as the mentor to the wisdom, expertise, and experience of many to form a mentoring network for faculty new to the institution.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a concept that has been widely researched. Since the 1950s, job satisfaction has been one of the most studied concepts. An estimated 3,000 articles and dissertations have been published addressing this employee-related variable (Wolford, 2003). The importance of measuring job satisfaction is connected to employment issues. Studies have researched connections between job satisfaction and issues such as improving job performance, surviving downsizing, higher retention, and lower turnover

(Amundson, Borgen, Jordan, & Erlebach, 2004; Johnson & Johnson, 2000; Lopopolo, 2002; Spears & Parker, 2002).

Job satisfaction has been studied with a variety of educational employee populations. Research has included a variety of college/university teachers including 47 nurse educators (Lange et al., 2009), medical school faculty (University of Kansas School of Medicine, 2008), 139 agriculture faculty (Castillo & Cano, 2004), and pharmacy instructors (Fuller, Maniscalco-Feichti, & Droege, 2008). Various settings have also been specified in studies as to faculty job satisfaction. Educational settings such as 74 faculty at a liberal arts college (Marston & Brunetti, 2009) and community colleges (Milosheff, 1990) have been investigated. Other populations researched as to job satisfaction in higher education include 4,231women (Seifert & Umbach, 2008), about 5,000 junior faculty (Ashburn, 2007), 194 university educators in other countries such as Turkey (Bilge, 2006), and varying demographics such as race/ethnicity (Seifert & Umbach, 2008).

According to the National Business Research Institute (2008), job satisfaction is generally an employee's affective or emotional response to their current job conditions. Researchers have examined job satisfaction from the perspective of factors that affect it. These factors can include job performance, retention, and turnover. The relationship between job satisfaction of higher education faculty has been defined in a variety of studies. Houston, Meyer, and Paewai (2006) studied the link between expectations and values. Faculty satisfaction including indicators of job satisfaction, professional growth and development, salary, job security, and collegial relationships was researched by Marston and Brunetti (2009). Norman et al. (2006) defined faculty dissatisfaction that

encompassed issues related to incivility within departments, lack of an intellectual community, and preoccupied or disinterested senior faculty. Rosser (2005) measured satisfaction related to global satisfaction, stress levels, and intent to remain in academe. Seifert and Umbach (2008) added the dimensions of race/ethnicity and gender to evaluate faculty job satisfaction while Terpstra and Honoree (2004) examined geographic differences. While researching faculty stress, burnout, absenteeism, and turnover, Van Houtte (2006) included the role of organization and trust in the assessment of faculty job satisfaction.

For the purpose of this study, job satisfaction referred to the faculty member's sense of achievement and success including how content an individual faculty member is, a perception of inner fulfillment and pride, and a sense of accomplishment for having done something important and valuable while being suitably rewarded. Variables such as perceptions of teaching load and scholarship, salary and benefits, academic freedom, academic integrity of the institution, life/work balance, inclusion and relationship with administration are used to define job satisfaction.

Many theorists have found job satisfaction to be linked to behaviors generally attributed to good employees. Behaviors such as attendance, maintaining quality standards, seeking improved work methods, and cooperating with other employees have been found to be related to job satisfaction. Others have found job satisfaction to be the consequence of such behaviors as these desirable employee behaviors are rewarded by the employing organization (Ajzen, 2011).

Measures of this attitude toward work have found that employees with higher job satisfaction generally believe the organization is supportive and the employer cares about

the quality of work performed. They are more committed as employees of the organization and are more productive employees (Saari & Judge, 2004). As job satisfaction is linked to employee motivation, performance, absenteeism, and turnover, it is clearly an important organization variable (Terpstra & Honoree, 2004).

Job satisfaction—Dimensions in higher education. Traditionally, the role of higher education faculty has been defined by teaching, research, and service with faculty struggling over the balance of research and teaching (Houston et al., 2006). The dual functions of knowledge creation and transmission makes higher education a unique employee experience. Mentoring, therefore, must address this potential conflict which can create job dissatisfaction. Job satisfaction affects teaching, and dissatisfied faculty can become inferior educators. Higher turnover, reduced loyalty to the university, and "an unwillingness to do more than what is required by the job description" (Pienaar & Bester, 2005, p. 377) are negative consequences of lowered morale.

Institutions of higher education, as unique employers, define job satisfaction across a wide spectrum of factors. Kalleberg (1977) described intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of the job. The intrinsic dimension includes if the work is interesting, self-directed, and has direct results. The extrinsic dimension includes financial—salary, benefits and job security, career advancement—rank and tenure for faculty, relationships with co-workers, resources available to do the job well, and convenience factors such as travel, autonomy, and adequate time to complete work. Kalleberg hypothesized that the extent to which these dimensions were met influenced job satisfaction positively. The absence, minimization, or reduction of these factors can cause job dissatisfaction.

In 2005, Cornell University (Cornell University, 2006) measured the job satisfaction of 434 faculty. Satisfaction was measured against four variations: (a) structural position included rank, college, discipline, department and salary; (b) work load considered course load, committee involvement, publications, and grants; (c) life outside the university addressed marital status, presence and ages of children; and (d) general non-university satisfaction. Integration measured collaboration and the social aspects of university life. Cornell's findings included the following: more satisfied faculty earn more money, teach courses close to individual areas of research interest, are married, and are more satisfied with life outside Cornell (marital status, presence and ages of children). Cornell University (2006) also found less satisfied faculty report feeling ignored, are less able to navigate the unwritten rules, are stressed by the organizational politics, and note a lack of collaboration opportunities. These factors are common in integration into an institution of higher education and are issues that can be addressed within an effective mentoring relationship.

Rosser (2005) investigated issues of faculty satisfaction which incorporated the satisfaction level with the quality of students, control over the courses taught, benefits and salary. Administrative and technical support, professional development, and research activities were also studied. When comparing faculty satisfaction between faculty groups surveyed in 1993 and in 1999, self-report of job satisfaction was higher; however, it should be noted that with the advent of external constituencies such as the public and policy makers, the stress of increased accountability would negatively affect the overall satisfaction of higher education faculty. Faculty reported increasing burn-out with

universities adopting a customer service mentality to student-faculty relationships (Williams-June, 2008).

Marston and Brunetti (2009) studied 74 experienced professors at a liberal arts college and delineated primary areas of faculty job satisfaction into factors. Job satisfaction factors included the enjoyment of teaching, interest in teaching in the next five years, choosing the profession again, and overall job satisfaction. Professional satisfaction factors included the value of serving society by teaching, satisfaction in teaching students, being part of a valued profession, joy in teaching expertise, freedom and flexibility in the classroom, and creativity. Practical satisfaction factors included job security, tenure, time off, enjoyment of the institution, and being able to balance the job with the demands of family life. Social satisfaction factors included positive collegial relationships and supportive administrators (Marston & Brunetti, 2009).

The University of Kansas School of Medicine (2008) Faculty Mentoring Program reported specific outcomes of the faculty mentoring program including indicators of job satisfaction. These factors include:

- "develop rapport with other faculty members
- experience increased overall satisfaction with their career and personal life
- experience a healthy balance between their professional and personal life" (p. 11).

Job satisfaction—Public versus private colleges and universities. The organizational dynamics play a role in job satisfaction in higher education. Junior faculty members at public colleges rate the institution as more amenable for personal and professional obligations. Faculty members new to higher education at private colleges

and universities report higher levels of job satisfaction overall than do public ones. Public institutions, however, rate higher in support to balance personal and professional obligations and clarity as to the tenure path (Breslow, 2007). In a non-tenure granting, private liberal arts institution such as LU, the measurement of job satisfaction is far more significant an indicator to consider.

Job satisfaction—Comparison to the American worker. The job satisfaction level of professors is higher than other workers in the United States. When 300 full-time faculty employed for three or more years at a single four-year institution were polled by TIAA-CREF about views on their careers, work-life balance, and retirement expectations; 53% responded very satisfied and 43% responded somewhat satisfied. A Harris Interactive survey of American workers reported 42% were very satisfied and 38% were somewhat satisfied with their jobs (Wasley, 2007b). In further research conducted by TIAA-CREF, 18 interviews found faculty are reluctant to retire as they enjoy their jobs so much, they do not want to leave. Higher education teaching is viewed as a lifestyle, not simply a job to discontinue when traditional retirement age is attained (Foster, Naidtitch, & Politzer, 2011).

Although generally a satisfied group of employees, it is important to acknowledge dimensions of dissatisfaction specific to faculty new to a university to ensure quality teaching and maximize retention. Universities need to note, as employers, limitations in financial resources may exist, but colleges may be able to satisfy some of the other dimensions of faculty job satisfaction. Bensimon, Ward, and Sanders (2000) discussed faculty as the most valuable and expensive asset of colleges and universities. These

authors contend early identification and attention to dissatisfaction and potential disillusionment is crucial as a means to protect this organizational asset.

Job satisfaction—Morale. Morale is the overall level of confidence that a group of employees conveys. This attitude can positively or negatively affect motivation and performance. Low morale is related to lesser quality teaching; faculty morale can be negatively affected by increased class size, budget cuts, and even parking problems. When faculty members believe work goes unrecognized, morale decreases accordingly. Many duties of higher educators are less visible than classroom teaching (Durham, Merritt, & Sorrell, 2007). Additional duties such as committee work, advising, course preparation, scholarship, and research often go unnoticed. Mentoring can assist the new faculty member in the appropriate mechanisms to gain identity and rewards (Stanulis, Burill & Amers, 2007).

The psychosocial function of mentoring emerges from the interpersonal relationship which develops throughout the first year. The support, advice, encouragement, coaching, skill development, guidance, and friendship offered through the mentor/mentee pairing have been known to increase faculty morale among new faculty members. The quality of work life can be enhanced with formal mentoring programs (Baker, 2002).

Job satisfaction—Diversity. Ashburn (2007) reported junior faculty members (those new to teaching) are generally satisfied. Findings from a survey of about 5,000 faculty revealed a variety of sub-groups in the junior faculty members reported differing levels of job satisfaction; women are less satisfied than men, racial minority-group faculty are less satisfied than white counterparts, and research institution faculty are less

satisfied than faculty at liberal arts universities. Across generations, the same level of job satisfaction was reported for senior as was for the youngest faculty members. The younger generation, however, were less satisfied in areas of work/life balance and salary (Foster et al., 2011). Issues of diversity need to be assessed by the effective mentor to ensure acclimation to the institution. Full-time faculty members are more satisfied than part-time faculty (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). Pence (2009) predicted, with the economic condition affecting higher education today, new academes may have to lower their expectations, thus resulting in job dissatisfaction.

Another benefit of mentoring is inclusion with the feeling of a sense of affiliation and an attitude of belongingness. The new attitude becomes, *this is my school, and I belong here* (Glatthorn, Jones, & Bullock, 2006). Mentoring can be particularly helpful for women and faculty from racial minority backgrounds. In a study of 962 full-time faculty, Glenn (2007) concluded that gender is directly related to job satisfaction in higher education. In her qualitative study of nine female faculty, Gibson (2006) concluded, "Women faculty frequently view themselves as 'outsiders', feeling both isolated and constrained by the existing structure of academia or because of outside responsibilities" (p. 63). Wilson (2005) reported that young female professors were less satisfied than young male professors on 19 out of 28 job indicators in her study of about 1,200 tenured-track faculties at 12 institutions. "At every stage of the faculty pipeline, women are leaving at higher rates than men. Study after study has shown that, on average, women faculty at every stage feel less satisfied in their jobs than men" (Clarksberg & Einarson, 2009, p. 1). Female faculty also reported lower levels of satisfaction due to greater responsibilities in advising and other caretaking demands, what

Ropers-Huilman (2000) phrased as *academic mommies*. This traditionally female gender role is significant to successful mentoring. New female faculty members often find establishing appropriate boundaries in relationships with students and colleagues challenging.

When mentors and mentees are matched per special population, feelings of disparity generating from gender, sexual orientation, and/or race may lessen. "Although mentors with different backgrounds can provide significant support, protégés who are in underrepresented groups based on gender and/or race may find it important to have mentors matched on similar characteristics, or targeted mentors" (McCallister, Harold, Ahmedani & Cramer, 2009, p. 90). In this study of 43 lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgendered (LGBT) faculty, it was reported that the experience of "potential struggles including making the decision to come out to coworkers and employers" (McCallister et al., 2009, p. 91) may be more difficult for faculty new to an institution of higher education. Targeted mentoring may assist in a smoother transition to unfamiliar organizations of higher education and aid in increased job satisfaction.

Many factors play into the job satisfaction of higher education faculty including concerns related to diversity. Although all aspects are worth reviewing to fully understand the scope and breadth of faculty job satisfaction, it is beyond the parameters of this research to examine all of these dynamics.

Job satisfaction—Work/life balance. Work-life balance can contribute to job dissatisfaction. Berberet (2008) reported sources of faculty stress. Findings included majorities of men and women believe work takes priority over other activities. The

outcomes from the 450 respondents of the Associated New American Colleges Survey of Early Career Faculty (Jaschik, 2007) included

- 50% report suffering ill health due to work-related stress,
- 91% report that work 'often' takes priority over other activities,
- 77% report coming to work ill,
- 70% say they 'seldom' have time for entertainment,
- 58% say they do not see their children as much as they would like,
- 36% 'get enough' physical exercise,
- 26% report that they 'find time for myself.' (p. 11)

A workplace lacking in family-friendly policies and practices can appear to be less committed to faculty. As a result, faculty can appear to be less committed to the university. Those universities which are willing to afford the most flexibility for work/life balance are more likely to have a competitive edge in attracting and retaining the best talent (Bristol, Abbuhl, Cappola, & Sonnad, 2008).

Job satisfaction—Retention. Although some faculty turnover is healthy and necessary for the organization, it can also be costly and problematic. The expense of the search, the time to interview and hire, and the training resources incurred can slow the productivity of a university. Bensimon, Polkinghorne, Bauman, and Vallejo (2004) acknowledged a university's culture can play a part in a faculty person's decision to seek employment elsewhere. Rosser (2005) studied reasons why faculty members leave a university. Causes included dissatisfaction with advising and course loads, unsatisfactory benefit plans, and the lack of tenure-track positions. Those with high job satisfaction are less likely to move (Bender & Heywood, 2003). Lindenwood University wants to retain

its carefully selected, talented faculty. Retention of talent results in institutional effectiveness and vitality. Mentoring can provide a safe transition to faculty stability via academic success and job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction—Mid-career faculty. Much attention has been given to the issues of new faculty, but the issues of mid-career faculty may have been neglected. "To a large extent, faculty in the middle years are taken for granted and expected to fend for themselves as they carve a path into the uncharted middle years of the academic career" (Baldwin & Chang, 2006, p. 28).

Many in the mid-career phase move into positions of leadership. Administrative roles often take talented faculty from the classroom. Competing demands of time for needed preparation and continued professional development may minimize the effectiveness of the college professor. For those who remain in teaching, an updating of teaching practices and techniques may be necessary. Education changes as student learning styles change. The advent of technology in the classroom, for example, may require the acquisition of new teaching techniques and skills. As an expected developmental life path, many mid-career faculty seek a better balance between their personal and professional lives (Baldwin & Chang, 2006). Faculty mentoring may be an underused resource for this cohort.

Educational leaders in higher education must see mentors as links in the chains of accountability. It is a piece of professional development that can afford the opportunity for every new faculty member to become a great professor. Zachary (2000) described a mentoring culture. Mentoring is aligned within the culture, not as a program add-on.

The infrastructure is supported by the institution of higher learning. "People are encouraged to respect and dedicate time for mentoring" (Zachary, 2000, p. 177).

The Connection—Mentoring for New Faculty and Job Satisfaction

Ambrose, Huston, and Norman (2005) studied 123 faculty to determine levels of satisfaction using qualitative methods. In a key finding, mentoring was cited by faculty as a primary source of satisfaction with the lack of mentoring as a source of dissatisfaction. Three sources of mentoring emerged as important to faculty. Mentoring in intellectual activities was advice on work expectations. Professional/career development mentoring was about how to establish relationships outside of the department and how to balance professional demands. When and how to say no, balancing work/life demands, and how to set reasonable expectations were defined as departmental mentoring. The respondents often remarked that the political mentoring was lacking; the subjects often wished someone had told them *how to play the game*. In an effective mentoring program, this political mentoring would be added as a fourth source.

Marston and Brunetti (2009) classified findings of faculty job satisfaction into satisfaction factors: professional satisfaction factors, practical satisfaction factors, and social satisfaction factors. Also examined were faculty opportunities to engage in scholarship, work with a good administrator, and experience an opportunity to perform service. By evaluating these factors, these researchers discerned the multidimensional perspectives of job satisfaction in higher education. This study examined the employment of 74 experienced professors at a liberal arts college. Utilizing results from two sources: (a) a form of the Experienced Teacher Survey, and (b) 25 extended

interviews with select experienced college professors, these authors concluded the subject faculty were satisfied with their employment. Professional satisfaction factors were seen as particularly strong motivators. The survey questions, "Joy in teaching your subject" and "Satisfaction in seeing your students learn and grow" elicited mean scores of over 3.75 on a 4.0-point scale. "Some professors identified being able to learn and grow themselves as a source of satisfaction: 'I think of teaching as something like gardening . . . because . . . every year you get a new chance.' Practical satisfaction factors included indicators such as job security, holidays and breaks, and salary and benefits with a total mean score of 2.80 on a 4.0-point scale. Interview results on the social satisfaction factors ranged from one female professor's comments, "I really value my friendly relationships with other faculty as being highly important" to one male professor's comment, "Well, some of my colleagues . . . they've given me a little trouble. And of course, they've also been tremendously supportive. So, they're the people that can hurt you the most and they're the people who can help you the most."

The University of Pennsylvania surveyed the School of Medicine faculty in 2003 and concluded "having a mentor, or preferably multiple mentors is strongly related to satisfaction with mentoring and overall job satisfaction" (Wassersteinet al., 2007, p. 210). Those who had two or more mentors were on the tenure track (not on the clinician-educator or researcher track). Faculty with mentors related less expectation of leaving the institution within the next few years. This report of hesitance to remain at the current place of employment can be a measure of job satisfaction.

The Purpose of Mentoring for Faculty New to the University

The purpose of orienting new faculty is not simply to welcome. New faculty mentoring is a vital part of the bi-directional learning which involves the impact of the person on the organization and the impact of the organization on the person. This is imperative for the satisfaction and retention of the new faculty member. Mentoring provides information, advice, and the beginning of "a university-wide environment of open conversation about teaching" (Donahue, 2000, p. 1).

Summary

This literature review defined mentoring. A comparison of models of new faculty mentoring programs was introduced to evaluate the LUNFMP and the beginnings of program refinement. The elements and dynamics of higher education faculty job satisfaction and research studies as to the merits of mentoring have been presented.

Given the wide array of indicators of faculty satisfaction and mentoring approaches, for the purpose of this study, dimensions of faculty job satisfaction in addition to overall job satisfaction were expanded upon to explore the relationship with the offering of the LUNFMP. As a theoretical foundation, this literature review presented multi-dimensional perspectives of job satisfaction using a variety of research methodologies. In Chapter 3, the methodology for this study is presented utilizing these research variables.

Chapter Three: Methodology

Overview

The intent of this study was to examine the effectiveness of the Lindenwood University New Faculty Mentoring Program (LUNFMP) as measured by multiple dimensions of job satisfaction. This study builds upon the foundation of the body of research on faculty mentoring and on job satisfaction of higher education faculty. The findings will be used to evaluate if mentoring is a contributor to job satisfaction, a relationship which had not previously been studied as a factor in retention of faculty at LU. This research adds a theoretical base to LUNFMP. All study procedures were approved by LU's Institutional Review Board (IRB) (Appendix B) prior to the initiation of data collection and completion of the study. Information relative to gender and years of experience was collected on the participating subjects who completed the New Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey (Appendix E, Figures 5 & 6).

Problem Statement

Lindenwood University is invested in maintaining a high quality faculty. In a study of 379 faculty members, Bedeian (2007) found job satisfaction to be among the most frequently cited predictors of both intended and actual turnover of faculty. If faculty members are more satisfied by involvement in supportive networking and informative programming such as LUNFMP, then these faculty members are more likely to remain at the university. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of the LUNFMP as measured across multiple dimensions of faculty job satisfaction. The subjects were faculty new to LU in the academic year 2008-09. Multiple dimensions of

job satisfaction were examined: teaching satisfaction, social satisfaction, and employee satisfaction. Mixed methods were used to collect and analyze the data.

Study Population

The study population was LUNFMP program participants and key stakeholders during the study year of academic year 2008-09. The sample was the 28 faculty members hired to begin full-time teaching at LU for the 2008-09 academic school year. Additional information as to the effectiveness of mentoring was gathered via interviews with key stakeholders including the University Provost, Dean of Faculty, the Deans' Council, faculty mentees, faculty mentors, and faculty who did not have a formal mentoring program available when first hired by LU.

These faculty members were joining an existing group of educators at LU. According to the Lindenwood Ledger: A Fact Book (Office of Institutional Research, 2011), in Fall 2008, Lindenwood University employed 190 full-time faculty, 124 (65%) with terminal degrees. As of June 2010, 221 full-time faculty members were employed: 130 were male (59%) and 91 (41%) were female. Of the 28 faculty new to Lindenwood, 50% were male, 50% were female, 64% had terminal degrees, and 36% had non-terminal degrees.

Phases of First-Year Teaching

A theoretical basis for the study was found in the research conducted by Moir (1990) on the developmental phases of the first year of teaching. Research on teaching in elementary and secondary education has found discernible patterns or phases which are experienced by the first-year teacher (Moir, 1990). Although theorized to aid in the

induction of elementary and secondary education teachers, Moir's phases can be adapted to faculty new to an organization of higher education.

1. The Anticipation Phase is a time of idealism, excitement, and anxiety prior to the beginning of the first class. The role of the university professor is often romanticized in this phase. Despite the level of experience, faculty members are energized by the prospect of influencing young adults to higher levels of critical thinking and ability. These faculty members start with a tremendous commitment to making a difference and a somewhat idealistic view of how to accomplish goals (Moir, 1990).
2. The next phase, the Survival Phase, is during the initial months of active teaching when the faculty member is inundated with a variety of new situations based on the newness to the institution. Everything from developing new curriculum to learning attendance reporting can add stress. Adaptation is required at a rapid pace. New faculty at this phase become very focused and consumed with the day-to-day routine of teaching. There is little time to stop and reflect on their experiences (Moir, 1990).
3. Around November of the first year (the third month of teaching), new faculty members may experience the Disillusionment Phase. The extensive time commitment, the realization that things are probably not going as smoothly as expected, and low morale contribute to this period of disenchantment (Moir, 1990). This is also the time of the first formal evaluation of new faculty as they begin the process of meeting with the dean to review progress to-date and plan for the next academic year. Classroom management may be a source of major

distress. Faculty are evaluating their role in helping struggling students succeed prior to the end of the first term.

4. Once past the Disillusionment Phase, usually about January (around the fifth month of teaching), the Rejuvenation Phase begins. Recuperating during the winter holidays (with non-teaching times during mid-December through the first week in January) and having attained much of the procedural knowledge, new faculty members appear ready to put past problems behind them. A renewed spirit emanates from a better understanding of the system, an acceptance of the realities of teaching, and a sense of accomplishment help to rejuvenate (Moir, 1990). The more confident professor is more able to work on the art of teaching, rather than merely the science. The professor is now able to not just solely present the information, but can now incorporate techniques and challenges that capture critical thinking and take students to deeper levels of learning.
5. The Reflection Phase begins near the end of the first academic year (April to May). Reflecting back over the prior year, faculty reminisce and reflect on events, teaching strategies, lectures, and assignments that were successful and those that were not (Moir, 1990). The new faculty members begin to look forward to their second year of teaching at the institution, and no longer being viewed as the new professor. Given the experience of the first year, the higher educator can begin the second year with a new set of challenges which can replicate this cycle, enhanced by the underpinnings of knowledge of the institution, its practices, and its culture.

Although created for elementary and secondary level education, this developmental approach to the recognition of the phases of the first year of teaching can be readily adapted to higher education settings. For faculty new to LU, the acknowledgement of this process of acclimation can expedite fit with the organization and possibly contribute to job satisfaction.

LUNFMP and the First Year of Teaching at LU

New faculty mentors can assist with the process of acclimation and ease the transition to LU. The mentoring program is designed to help new faculty hires through these phases. The LU mentoring program for new faculty is twofold in its approach to the formal process of transition to LU. In addition to the individualized, one-on-one assigned mentor/mentee relationships, LU has structured meetings in August, September, October, November, January, February, and April. These group mentoring meetings are designed for the mentees from all LU programs to remain in contact and learn about common themes and issues which arise during the first year. The LUNFMP is coordinated by the Dean of the School of Human Services and the Vice President of Human Resources.

Seifert and Umbach (2008) warned of the "nesting" effect where faculty members are nested within disciplines; faculty members within disciplines tend to be similar. Lindenwood University emphasizes a university scope as a piece of its approach to induction with these university-wide meetings. The topics of these group mentoring meetings generally address Moir's (1990) phases of first-year teaching (Appendix C).

After being convened for a welcoming and brief orientation meeting during the Faculty Workshop Week on August 18, 2008 prior to the beginning of the Fall Semester,

the 2008-09 LUNFMP began. Faculty toured the campus and assignment of individual mentors was confirmed.

With the Anticipation Phase came education on the philosophy and history of LU. As an institution of higher learning with a deeply entrenched rich history, LU expects the faculty to have a basic knowledge of its roots since 1827. On September 25 and 29, 2008, the new faculty learned of the university's model and philosophical approach as a teaching university. On October 27 and 30, 2008, the group learned of the history and heritage of LU. Both presentations and discussions were designed to enhance the anticipation of being part of an enduring center of higher education. The purpose was to begin the internalization of a connection to LU.

A session on work-family balance was presented on November 20 and 24, 2008 in anticipation of the Disillusionment Phase. Just prior to the winter holidays and the adjournment of the first semester, new LU faculty often reported feeling overwhelmed, stressed, and ready for some rest. Those faculty members with children at home, in particular, reported a tension between the obligations of work and home life. The purpose of this topic was to help the faculty new to LU achieve balance.

As the Rejuvenation Phase began, mentees met in a celebration reception with the LU President and upper administration on January 21, 2009. The purpose was to answer questions and reinforce the value of the new faculty group. The new faculty members were offered the opportunity to ask questions and hear the vision and direction of the university. The new faculty members were apprised of the role of faculty in Lindenwood's future and as part of the LU community.

The February 23 and 26, 2009 meetings focused on mentoring at-risk students. The meetings with the staff affiliated with the retention programs renew faculty interests in moving our students toward success and eventual graduation. Mentees benefit from learning about the support services available and the faculty role in retaining these students.

On April 27, 2009, with its focus on the Reflection Phase, the LUNFMP looked toward the second year. The new faculty at this point in the first year at LU often reported less reliance on the mentors; they reported they felt able to work more independently and confidently. The members reflected on what had worked, what had not, and pondered ideas for change. The session included a verbal discussion of the mentoring program—its benefits and challenges. The outgoing group was asked for ideas for improvement of LUNFMP for the next academic year's group of faculty new to LU. The purpose was an informal evaluation and an appreciation of personal growth and development. The meeting was designed to prepare the group for an even stronger second year.

At the end of the first academic year at LU, the revival of the Anticipation Phase emerged as the new faculty began to plan for changes to increase success in the second year at LU. In personal discussions with previous faculty participants in the LUNFMP, it was speculated this cycle continues with variation for the length of the teaching career. During a verbal evaluation of the LUNFMP with faculty participants in the second year of the program's delivery, the majority of the participants suggested the newly formed university-wide mentoring group should continue to meet again once the next academic year begins.

Study Design

To study mentoring and job satisfaction, several hypotheses were researched:

Hypothesis #1: There will be a difference between the proportion of respondents with overall job satisfaction and the desired benchmark of 80%.

Hypothesis #2: There will be a difference between the proportion of respondents indicating satisfaction with the quality of mentoring and the desired benchmark of 80%.

Hypothesis #3: There will be a difference in proportion of responses of those reporting *satisfied* and *very satisfied* compared to those reporting *dissatisfied* and *very dissatisfied* across the three individual applications of the survey to the entire group of participants on all indicators of job satisfaction.

Hypothesis #4: There will be a difference in proportion of responses of those reporting *satisfied* and *very satisfied* when comparing individual applications of the survey for each of the three categorical sub-groups: teaching satisfaction, social satisfaction, and employee satisfaction.

Hypothesis #5: There will be a difference in average overall response to job satisfaction when comparing responses per application (September 2008, January 2009, and April 2009).

An additional research question emerged: Will those directly involved in LUNFMP report the program meets the defined objectives? To evaluate this, it is expected that key players invested in the success of new faculty mentors (department chairs, deans, upper administration, mentors, participants from years 2006-07, and those faculty who were informally mentored prior to the inception of LUNFMP) will report the

value of the program particularly as it relates to the dimensions of new faculty job satisfaction.

This is a correlation research method study. Cause and effect cannot be definitively determined, i.e., the LUNFMP does lead to job satisfaction. The presence of other variables, which may lead to job satisfaction may be present; however, a relationship between mentoring and job satisfaction can be reasonably inferred using this methodology. To increase validity, both quantitative, via the use of a survey, and qualitative methods, via interviews with subjects and key university personnel, were used to measure the effectiveness of the LUNFMP as to the four dimensions of job satisfaction.

Although most would surmise job satisfaction is easily measurable, the multi-dimensional aspects for university faculty created a unique perspective for this research. Similar to previous researchers (Kalleberg, 1977; Cornell University, 2006; Rosser, 2005; Marston & Brunetti, 2009; University of Kansas School of Medicine, 2008) faculty job satisfaction was researched utilizing varying dimensions. The four dimensions of job satisfaction measured in this study were teaching satisfaction, social satisfaction, employee satisfaction, and overall job satisfaction. As these dimensions were the most closely linked to the objectives of the LUNFMP, the study focused on concerns and issues faculty new to an organization of higher education may present. Data on such variables may offer LU an indication of areas for improvement in acclimating new faculty to the university's employ.

The quantitative method of survey data and qualitative methods of interviews, both individual and group, were used to evaluate the LU program. These methods are

documented to be measures to evaluate a program's (such as a mentoring program's) efficacy (Bloom et al., 1999).

The New Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey

The Lindenwood University New Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey (Appendix D) was developed with 20 questions about indicators of job satisfaction such as working conditions, teaching load, academic freedom, home/work balance, etc., and a measure of overall job satisfaction. A 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*Very dissatisfied*) to 5 (*Very satisfied*) was utilized. Demographic data of gender (male/female) and years of college-level teaching experience (0-1, 1-3, 3-5, 5-7, 7-10, 10 or more) were also requested (Appendix E). This quantitative method questionnaire was pilot-tested by giving it to 10 current faculty members (two of whom had less than two years teaching at LU) prior to being administered to new faculty. As a result of this testing, minor changes were made to the instrument.

The Lindenwood University New Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey was given out to every participant attending the university-wide meetings on September 25 and 29, 2008, January 21, 2009, and April 27, 2009. Participation was voluntary and anonymous. Subjects were made aware of the nature of the data collection for research purposes (Appendix F). Completion of the survey indicated acknowledgement of informed consent. The meeting facilitators were not to be in the room when the surveys were completed (inadvertently, the Vice President of Human Resources did not leave the room at the first administration of the survey). Of the new faculty, 58.3% completed a survey in their first year of full-time employment at LU.

The timing of the administration of the survey was based on Moir's (1990) research on developmental stages educators experience while beginning their educational career. It has been suspected by this researcher that job satisfaction of faculty new to LU is related to these phases of the academic year.

Analysis of Survey Data

Multiple measures of statistical analysis of this survey data were conducted to address the research hypotheses. Data were triangulated to analyze the research hypotheses. Triangulation is a process used by educational researchers to utilize multiple independent sources of data to establish validity and reliability of findings (Sagor, 2000). Statistical analyses included *z* tests for difference in proportions, ANOVA, and *z* tests for difference in means.

Individual Interviews

A structured interview protocol of questions (Appendix G) to be asked of all subjects was utilized. The questions were open-ended; and, opinion questions were related to the effectiveness of the LUNFMP, its strengths, needed areas of improvement, and its relationship to job satisfaction. This narrative research was designed to help those involved tell of both the benefits and problems of the program in their own words. Narratives helped to explain the complex set of factors which lead to job satisfaction in the first year of employment at LU.

All participants consented in writing and were informed of subjects' rights such as the ability to end the interview whenever requested (Appendix F). Subjects were notified of the purpose and use of the interview information, both for educational research and for evaluation and improvement of LUNFMP.

All of the 28 new faculty members were invited to participate in the interviews via email. Initially, the researcher invited subjects and conducted 12 interviews with 14 subjects (one interview was with a mentor-mentee pair).

The current role of this researcher was Dean of the School of Human Services; a concern as to the influence of perceived power dynamics may have affected the participation rates of subjects. In order to reduce researcher bias and hopefully increase voluntary participation, interviews were conducted by a graduate assistant or another faculty person. The research assistants were instructed in the necessity to remain true to the questions as written, only allowing for elaboration, primarily using a question and answer approach. This was to ensure consistency of responses across subjects. The research assistants were instructed to take thorough notes with pertinent, direct quotes written verbatim. Participant anonymity was ensured by keeping the signed consent forms separate from the interview summaries. The research assistant/faculty volunteer interviewed an additional six faculty members who voluntarily completed the confidential individual interviews.

The interviews took from 20 to 45 minutes each to complete and were usually conducted privately in the subject's office. The interviews were retrospective, being conducted 2–18 months from the subject's involvement in LUNFMP. It should be noted that the LUNFMP previous years' program participants would be relying on the lens of remembrance and sense-making in their responses. A possible advantage with this distance from participation was the ability to view mentoring within the lens of the larger context of the university. Some of the respondents were able to integrate a long-term

identification with LU to evaluate the program's effectiveness on his/her personal relationship with the university.

The interviews were summarized by the interviewer. These non-identifiable summaries were organized by the multi-dimensional perspectives of job satisfaction: teaching satisfaction, social satisfaction, employee satisfaction, and overall job satisfaction (Appendix I).

Group Interview

A group interview of 14 LU administrators who were attending the Deans' Council meeting on May 12, 2009 was facilitated by this researcher. These interviewees included two administrative vice-presidents (Provost and Dean of Faculty), nine academic deans, and three administrative deans. All were interviewed to provide input using the same structured interview schedule (Appendix G). Given not all deans participating in the group interview were academic deans, some were present, but did not participate in the discussion. Most were active in the discussion; many received information about the program and LUNFMP's purpose within LU. As this is a group that meets together regularly to make administrative decisions, it is expected that power differentials did not affect the openness and honesty of responses.

Mentor/Mentee Pair Interview

One pair of mentor/mentee was interviewed simultaneously by this researcher with the same interview schedule (Appendix G). The faculty is within the School of Human Services; this researcher is the dean of this faculty. The pair voluntarily participated in the interview. As findings are similar to those of others interviewed for this study, it is expected that bias did not occur.

Other Interviews—Previous Year Participants, Faculty Prior to LUNFMP

Four additional LU faculty members were interviewed by the researcher including three previous years' mentees and one long-term faculty member who did not have the LUNFMP available at the time of hire. It was expected their responses could lend information as to informal versus formal mentoring.

Analysis of Interview Data

Summaries of the interviews were recorded and secured for confidentiality. The results were reviewed a minimum of five times to identify themes of commonalities. The results were also scrutinized for outlying significant factors. These data were then coded by categorizing responses into the multiple dimensions of faculty job satisfaction: teaching satisfaction, social satisfaction, employee satisfaction, and overall job satisfaction (Appendix I).

Limitations

It was expected that one member from each of the academic schools be part of this research as each school has its own culture; however, due to anonymity promised to interviewees, this could not be ascertained. There was a least one faculty from each of the academic schools in the 28 new faculty member group.

Internal and External Validity

Validity is, "The degree to which correct inferences can be made based on results from an instrument: depends not only on the instrument itself but also on the instrumentation process and the characteristics of the group studied" (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006, p. G-9). Internal validity refers to the extent to which the findings accurately describe reality (Hoepfl, 1997). Threats are those variables that may provide possible

alternative explanations for the outcome of the study (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). External validity is the ability to generalize. The concern becomes the possibility that the findings of this study will be applicable to future populations of faculty new to teaching at LU. Considerations for threats to both internal and external validity are imperative in ethical research design.

Threats to Internal Validity

Research often seeks a causal inference. The researcher seeks to determine if the treatment made a difference, and if so, was there sufficient evidence to support the finding. Therefore, this research study explored if participation in the LUNFMP (the independent variable [IV]) affected job satisfaction (the desired outcome) or could changes in job satisfaction be attributed to other confounding or extraneous variables. In this study, a causal relationship cannot be determined. The purpose of this research was to explore if there is some relationship between participation in LUNFMP and job satisfaction dimensions of teaching satisfaction, social satisfaction, and employee satisfaction.

Internal validity is the extent to which the IV, participation in the LUNFMP, produces the observed effect, job satisfaction. Internal validity can be jeopardized by many factors (Yu & Ohlund, 2010). These variables need to be controlled to increase the internal validity. In this study, the following threats to internal validity were evaluated and controlled as the research design allowed:

- History includes the events that occur between the implementation of the instruments. Events, other than the treatment, can occur during the period

of experimentation. These non-related events can influence the results and thus be a threat to internal validity (Ross & Morrison, 2011).

For example, in this research, the concern became were there significant factors other than participation in the LUNFMP that affected job satisfaction between August, January, and April. Another concern is the possibility that other variables could have affected the new faculty's responses on the job satisfaction survey, either positively or negatively. History was controlled as much as possible as new challenges presented themselves throughout the first academic year, which required ongoing mentoring. However, it is not possible to control all variables, and the findings of this research may have been affected accordingly.

- Maturation or the passage of time may have affected the research results (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). The confidence and learning which occurs over the first year of employment at LU may have affected job satisfaction. To evaluate this potential confounding variable, results between the three dates of survey administration (August, January, April) were compared. Another maturational effect may be the time between the conclusion of participation in LUNFMP and the date the personal interviews were conducted.
- Location can present a validity threat. The particular locations in which data are collected may create alternative explanations for results (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). The location varied as to the place where administration of the survey occurred because the location of the across-the-university

meetings varied. The survey was administered in a similar format in a comfortable setting without identifying information to help control for the variability of the physical setting.

- Procedural bias occurs when the instrument is administered under adverse conditions (University of Illinois-Chicago, 2011). Although designed to be consistent, study protocol was violated at least one time (September) when the Vice President of Human Resources did not initially leave the room when subjects were completing the initial survey. The protocol was strictly maintained in subsequent administration of the job satisfaction survey, and subjects were consistently reminded of the confidentiality of their responses. No administrators were in the room when the subjects completed their surveys.
- Instrumentation may be a threat to internal validity as instruments to measure participants' performance may change over time. Participants may become bored or tired, thus changing performance on the instrument (PsychoMetrics, 2011). Instrumentation threats were controlled by utilization of the same survey instrument, administered by the same researcher, in the same format, and without change. Several months passed between survey administrations to minimize boredom. Interpretation of questions was controlled by pre-administration trials with 10 faculty members who would not be participating in the research. Minor changes were made as a result of feedback obtained.

- Selection of subjects pertains to the possibility that groups in a study may possess different characteristics and that those differences may affect the results (Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 2011). Subject selection was controlled by the use of the LU definition of new faculty being those who are hired to teach full-time during a defined academic year. New faculty is presented to the general public in a brochure identifying who they are, their credentials, and their experience. Despite this delineation, some of the new-to-LU faculty hires chose not to participate due to previous academic experience for which they determined exempted them from the need for and participation in mentoring.
- Mortality or differential attrition is the loss of subjects. This is a problem when subjects drop out of the experiment, fail to participate in some part of the intervention, or fail to complete treatments (McMillan, 2007). Two of the subjects left LU prior to the completion of the first academic year. A few of the new faculty could not attend the monthly meetings due to schedule conflicts. Therefore, despite the 28 subjects that should have been the defined group of subjects, 25 subjects actually participated, even if minimally, in LUNFMP.
- The John Henry effect comes from the legend of a man who outperformed a machine to prove man is better to those who were watching (Chong-ho & Ohlund, 2010). Similarly, this group of subjects may have felt the involvement of the Vice President of Human Resources and the Dean of Human Services may have resulted in a more positive response. To

minimize this effect, all efforts to ensure confidentiality and non-identifiable surveys were utilized.

Threats to External Validity

External validity is the ability to generalize research findings to or across target populations (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). The researcher hopes the outcomes will be generalizable, i.e., the findings can be said to be true of all faculty new to LU. The researcher has to explore alternative plausible explanations that could emerge for these research findings.

External validity in this study would be the ability to generalize the results across all new faculty to LU. The design of this study can only draw conclusions within this subject group, not between other groups of faculty new to LU. A larger subject size, comparisons to groups of other academic years, and the control of the threats to internal validity already described would be necessary to more realistically ensure generalizability. Despite these confounding variables, the results of the research will have served as an evaluation of the program for the group of faculty in this academic year. These results were consistent with the way the research study was designed.

Some of the major threats to internal and external validity were controlled by standardized conditions of survey administration. To minimize research threats, the use of non-identifiable information, coupled with the focus on this group as a cohort rather than as individuals, was part of the research design. The stated importance of the research to study the experience of participation in LUNFMP for evaluation and implementation feedback rather than for any other purpose also served to increase validity.

Use of Qualitative Research Methods

The use of qualitative research methods helped evaluate the link between LUNFMP and job satisfaction. In qualitative research, credibility is less dependent on the sample size. This research method "can yield rich information not obtainable through statistical sampling techniques" (Hoepfl, 1997, p. 9). To enhance the data already collected, the use of qualitative methodologies allowed for elaboration and sharing of personal experiences in LUNFMP from multiple stakeholders.

The interviews were conducted by a combination of the researcher and two research assistants—a graduate assistant and a seven-year veteran LU faculty member. The purpose of the interviews was to further explore a relationship between LUNFMP and job satisfaction. The use of the open-ended questions included the respondent's opinion of that relationship. Because the interviews were voluntary participation, a limitation was the number of subjects willing to be part of the research.

Confidential Treatment of Data

Survey data collected required circling of responses and only the collection of gender and years of teaching experience. The information collected was to be as a group, not as the individual's experience, so the use of coding of individual participant data or other research methodology was not required. Interviews were summarized per question by the researcher or assistant without identifying information included.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of the LUNFMP as measured across the multiple dimensions of job satisfaction: teaching satisfaction, social satisfaction, and employee satisfaction. Chapter 3 details the mixed methodology used

for this study, using both qualitative and quantitative instruments. This chapter began by discussing the study population, introducing Moir's model of the Phases of the First Year of Teaching as a theoretical base for LUNFMP, and presenting survey responses. The results of this study will be offered in Chapter 4 with the analysis of data and statistical treatment of both the quantitative and qualitative results.

Chapter Four: Results

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of the LUNFMP as measured across multiple dimensions of faculty job satisfaction. The subjects were the 28 faculty new to LU in the academic year 2008-09. Multiple dimensions of job satisfaction were examined: teaching satisfaction, social satisfaction, and employee satisfaction. Mixed methods were used to collect and analyze the data.

Participants in the Study

Using the New Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey, this group of 28 full-time faculty members new to teaching full-time at LU was surveyed on multiple dimensions of job satisfaction. This instrument was piloted with 10 faculty members prior to implementation. Revisions were incorporated from the feedback received.

The survey was administered at three points in the faculty group's first year due to the small sample size. Applications of the New Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey (Appendix D) were conducted in September 2008, January 2009, and April 2009. Participation was voluntarily solicited at the monthly across-the-university meetings in those months. The faculty member must have attended to participate in the survey. Attendance at these meetings was expected; however, faculty members were excused for reasons of teaching or other LU duties. Subjects were informed as to the research purposes of the survey. This quantitative data collected were anonymous as the study was designed to focus on aggregate, not individual data. Multiple measures of statistical analysis of this survey data were conducted to address the research hypotheses.

Survey responses were tallied for the months of September 2008, January 2009, and April 2009, as shown in Tables 1, 2, and 3:

Table 1

Lindenwood University New Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey
September 2008

	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied
1. Working conditions	0	3	5	11	3
2. Faculty development	0	1	6	12	2
3. Quality of students	0	2	9	7	4
4. Academic freedom	0	1	1	11	8
5. Teaching load	0	4	8	6	4
6. Salary	0	1	5	11	5
7. Advising expectations	0	2	12	6	2
8. LU's promotion of academic integrity	0	1	4	9	7
9. Quality of mentoring	0	1	2	13	6
10. Communication	0	1	6	9	5
11. Rewards and recognition	0	1	9	8	3
12. Relationship with administration	0	1	3	12	5
13. Professional relationship with other faculty	0	0	3	9	9
14. Job security	1	2	7	7	4
15. Benefits	0	4	3	11	2
16. Home/work balance	0	2	9	7	2
17. Faculty morale	0	2	2	11	6
18. Inclusion	0	1	3	10	7
19. Respect for diverse perspectives	2	1	5	6	6
20. Overall job satisfaction	0	1	2	12	6

Note. 22 respondents

Table 2

Lindenwood University New Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey
January 2009

	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied
1. Working conditions	0	2	1	11	0
2. Faculty development	1	1	6	6	0
3. Quality of students	0	1	5	8	0
4. Academic freedom	0	0	4	7	3
5. Teaching load	0	5	4	4	1
6. Salary	0	0	5	9	0
7. Advising expectations	0	1	7	6	0
8. LU's promotion of academic integrity	0	0	2	10	2
9. Quality of mentoring	0	1	3	6	4
10. Communication	1	0	4	8	1
11. Rewards and recognition	0	0	7	6	1
12. Relationship with administration	0	0	2	11	1
13. Professional relationship with other faculty	0	0	1	5	8
14. Job security	0	3	5	6	0
15. Benefits	0	2	5	7	0
16. Home/work balance	0	3	4	6	1
17. Faculty morale	0	1	3	9	1
18. Inclusion	0	0	4	8	2
19. Respect for diverse perspectives	0	0	2	11	1
20. Overall job satisfaction	0	1	2	9	2

Note. 14 respondents

Table 3

Lindenwood University New Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey
April 2009

	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied
1. Working conditions	0	0	2	10	1
2. Faculty development	0	3	4	6	0
3. Quality of students	0	2	4	7	0
4. Academic freedom	0	0	2	10	1
5. Teaching load	0	5	2	6	0
6. Salary	0	1	3	9	0
7. Advising expectations	0	3	5	5	0
8. LU's promotion of academic integrity	0	1	2	9	1
9. Quality of mentoring	0	1	7	3	2
10. Communication	0	5	1	4	3
11. Rewards and recognition	0	1	5	4	3
12. Relationship with administration	0	0	1	9	3
13. Professional relationship with other faculty	0	0	1	10	2
14. Job security	0	2	3	8	0
15. Benefits	0	2	5	4	2
16. Home/work balance	0	5	3	5	0
17. Faculty morale	0	0	6	5	2
18. Inclusion	0	0	2	9	1
19. Respect for diverse perspectives	0	3	1	9	0
20. Overall job satisfaction	0	0	2	9	2

Note. 13 respondents

Analysis of Data

To address the research hypotheses, multiple analyses of data were conducted. Statistical analyses included *z* tests for difference in proportions, ANOVA, and *z* tests for difference in means.

Null Hypothesis #1*:* There will be no difference between the proportion of respondents with overall job satisfaction and the desired benchmark of 80%.

The indication of satisfaction was determined to be the number of 4's (*Satisfied*)

plus the number of 5's (*Very satisfied*) accumulated from the New Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey (Appendix D) responses on all indicators. A *z* test for difference in proportion (compared to the 80%) was conducted for each application of the survey (August 2008, January 2009, and April 2009). The claim hypothesis (that which is believed by the researcher) was the sample proportion is greater than 80. The tested null hypothesis was that there will be no difference between the proportion of respondents indicating overall job satisfaction and the desired benchmark of 80%. This analysis was a two-tailed test with a 95% confidence level. The *Z* critical values were $\pm$1.96. The test values were compared to the critical value.

For all applications, September 2008, January 2009, and April 2009, the *z*-test value was lower than -1.96. The scores were the following: September 2008, -5.6; January 2009, -4.47; and April 2009, -4.37. In each application, the null hypothesis was rejected. In each application, the proportion of *Satisfied* and *Very satisfied* was significantly lower than 80%. Therefore, Hypothesis #1 was not supported statistically. The faculty employed at LU for the Academic Year 2008-09 who participated in LUNFMP did not report more than 80% overall job satisfaction level at the end of the new faculty's first year of employment.

Overall job satisfaction was checked with Question #20 on the perception survey (Appendix D). *Null Hypothesis #1:* The null hypothesis was, There will be no difference between the proportion of respondents with overall job satisfaction and the desired benchmark of 80%. Question #20, overall job satisfaction, showed an observable level of job satisfaction at 81.7%; however, when a *z* test for difference in proportions was applied in a two-tailed test, the null hypothesis was not rejected and there was no

difference between overall job satisfaction and the desired benchmark of 80%. With a confidence level of 95%, and critical values of +1.96 or -1.96, the test value was equal to .3035. Therefore, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected as 81.7% is not significantly larger than 80%. Hypothesis #1 cannot be supported. The observable results could have been a result of chance and/or additional outside factors.

Null Hypothesis #2*:* There will be no difference between the proportion of respondents indicating satisfaction with the quality of mentoring and the desired benchmark of 80%.

The indication of satisfaction was determined to be the number of 4's (*Satisfied*) plus the number of 5's (*Very satisfied*) accumulated from the New Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey (Appendix D) responses on all indicators. A *z* test for difference in proportion (compared to the 80%) was conducted for each application of the survey (August 2008, January 2009, and April 2009). The claim hypothesis (that which is believed by the researcher) was the sample proportion is greater than 80, that is, the benchmark of 80% will be indicated by subjects. The null hypothesis was, There will be no difference between the proportion of respondents indicating satisfaction with the quality of mentoring and the desired proportion of 80%. This analysis was a two-tailed test with a 95% confidence level. The *z* critical values were $\pm$1.96. The test values were compared to the critical value.

The *z* scores were the following for all applications: September 2008, +1.06; January 2009, -1.14; and April 2009, +5.32.

For September 2008 and January 2009, there was no statistical difference from the 80% benchmark. Hypothesis #2 cannot be supported for these two applications. The

null hypothesis cannot be rejected. There was no difference between the proportion of respondents indicating satisfaction with the quality of mentoring and the desired benchmark of 80%. Faculty employed at LU for the Academic Year 2008-09 who participated in LUNFMP did not report more than 80% satisfaction rate with the quality of mentoring.

The *z* score for April 2009, however, indicated a result that was statistically different. The null hypothesis can be rejected for this application. Faculty employed at LU for the Academic Year 2008-09 who participated in LUNFMP reported a difference from the 80% satisfaction rate with the quality of mentoring.

Observable data shows a decrease in the percentage satisfied, from 86.4% in September 2008 to 38.5% in April 2009. When comparing September 2008 to April 2009, there was no difference in proportion (*z* score of -2.95). The null hypothesis can be rejected. The faculty participants in the mentoring program reported a satisfaction rate different from the desired 80% satisfaction rate. The drop in satisfaction with the quality of mentoring was statistically significant.

Null Hypothesis #3: There will be no difference in proportion of responses of those reporting *Satisfied* and *Very satisfied* compared to those reporting *Dissatisfied* and *Very dissatisfied* across the three individual applications of the survey to the entire group of participants on all indicators of job satisfaction.

The indication of satisfaction was determined to be the number of 4's (*Satisfied*) plus the number of 5's (*Very satisfied*) accumulated from the New Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey (Appendix D) responses on all indicators. The indication of dissatisfaction was the number of 1's (*Very dissatisfied*) plus the number of 2's

(*Dissatisfied*) accumulated from the New Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey (Appendix D) on all indicators. This data was compiled for each application of the survey (August 2008, January 2009, and April 2009). The claim hypothesis was, participants will report a significantly higher level of *Satisfied* and *Very satisfied* than *Very dissatisfied* and *Dissatisfied*. The null hypothesis was: There will be no difference in proportion of responses of those reporting *Satisfied* and *Very satisfied* compared to those reporting *Dissatisfied* and *Very dissatisfied*. This analysis was a two-tailed test with a 95% confidence level. The *z* critical values were +1.96 or -1.96. The test values were compared to the critical value.

For all applications, September 2008, January 2009, and April 2009, the *z*-test value was larger than 1.96. The scores were the following: September 2008, +4.99; January 2009, +3.87, and April 2009, +3.96. Therefore, in each application, the null hypothesis was rejected. In each application, the satisfied categories were significantly larger than the dissatisfied. Hypothesis #3 is supported statistically. The faculty employed at LU for the Academic Year 2008-09 who participated in LUNFMP reported a higher satisfaction level at each application during the new faculty's first year of employment.

Null Hypothesis #4: There will be no difference in proportion of responses of those reporting *Satisfied* and *Very satisfied* when comparing individual applications of the survey for each of the three categorical sub-groups: teaching satisfaction, social satisfaction, and employee satisfaction.

The 20-question Lindenwood University New Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey (Appendix D) was categorized by the researcher into three dimensions of job satisfaction

based on common themes and content. Question #20, Overall job satisfaction, was not included in any of these categories as it is a composite indicator. The remaining questions were categorized as follows (see Table 4).

Table 4

Lindenwood University New Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey
Dimensions of Job Satisfaction

Dimension of Job Satisfaction: Teaching Satisfaction
3. Quality of students
4. Academic freedom
5. Teaching load
7. Advising expectations
8. LU's promotion of academic integrity
Dimension of Job Satisfaction: Social Satisfaction
9. Quality of mentoring
10. Communication
13. Professional relationship with other faculty
17. Faculty morale
18. Inclusion
19. Respect for diverse perspectives
16. Home/work balance
Dimensions of Job Satisfaction: Employee Satisfaction
1. Working conditions
2. Faculty development
6. Salary
11. Rewards and recognition
12. Relationship with administration
14. Job security
15. Benefits
20. Overall job satisfaction

When analyzing the Teaching Satisfaction dimensions, the following results were calculated utilizing a single factor ANOVA (see Table 5).

Table 5

Teaching Satisfaction: ANOVA: Single Factor

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Average*	*Variance*
September 2008	5	298.6	59.72	514.877
January 2009	5	292.8	58.56	417.848
April 2009	5	300	60	395.475

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*Df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	5.8	2	2.91	0.006	0.993	3.885
Within Groups	5312.8	12	442.73			
Total	5318.6	14				

The null hypothesis was, There will be no difference in proportion of responses across applications of those reporting *Satisfied* and *Very satisfied* when comparing responses within the Teaching Satisfaction dimension. As the F score (.006) is lower than the F critical value (3.885), the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. Therefore, there was no significant difference in satisfaction with Teaching Satisfaction from September 2008 to January 2009 to April 2009.

When analyzing the Social Satisfaction dimension, the following results were calculated utilizing a single factor ANOVA (see Table 6).

Table 6

Social Satisfaction: ANOVA: Single Factor

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Average*	*Variance*
September 2008	7	503.8	71.971	262.049
January 2009	7	507.1	72.442	194.582
April 2009	7	429.4	61.342	443.262

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	551.597	2	275.798	0.919	0.416	3.554
Within Groups	5399.369	18	299.964			
Total	5950.966	20				

The null hypothesis was, There will be no difference in proportion of responses across applications of those reporting *Satisfied* and *Very satisfied* when comparing responses within the Social Satisfaction dimension. As the F score (.919) was lower than the F critical value (3.554), the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. Therefore, there was no significant difference in satisfaction with Social Satisfaction from September 2008 to January 2009 to April 2009.

When analyzing the dimension of Employee Satisfaction, the following results are calculated utilizing a single factor ANOVA (see Table 7).

Table 7

Employee Satisfaction: ANOVA: Single Factor

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Average*	*Variance*
September 2008	7	450.3	64.328	112.492
January 2009	7	414.4	59.2	300.88
April 2009	7	453.8	64.828	331.909

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	135.877	2	67.938	0.273	0.763	3.554
Within Groups	4471.689	18	248.427			
Total	4607.566	20				

The null hypothesis was, There will be no difference in proportion of responses across applications of those reporting *Satisfied* and *Very satisfied* when comparing responses within the Employee Satisfaction dimension. As the F score (.273) was lower than the F critical value (3.554), the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. Therefore, there was no significant difference in Employee Satisfaction from September 2008 to January 2009 to April 2009.

Null Hypothesis #5: There will be no difference in average overall response to job satisfaction when comparing responses per application (September 2008, January 2009, and April 2009).

Utilizing a two-tailed z-test comparison for means, with a 95% level of confidence, the following results were computed for comparison of job satisfaction from September 2008 to January 2009 (see Table 8).

Table 8

Job Satisfaction: September 2008 to January 2009
z-Test: Two Sample for Means

	September 2008	*January 2009*
Mean	3.81	3.66
Known Variance	0.076	0.113
Observations	20	20
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
Z	1.543	
P(Z<=z) two-tail	0.122	
z Critical two-tail	1.959	

Although there was an observable drop between the means from 3.81 to 3.66, this lowered mean was not statistically significant. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected as the *z*-test value of 1.543 was lower than the critical value of 1.959 and there was no significant difference when comparing these means. There was no reported difference in job satisfaction from September 2008 to January 2009.

Utilizing a two-tailed z-test comparison for means, with a 95% level of confidence, the following results were computed for comparison of job satisfaction from September 2008 to April 2009 (see Table 9).

Table 9

Job Satisfaction: September 2008 to April 2009
z-Test: Two Sample for Means

	September 2008	*April 2009*
Mean	3.81	3.605
Known Variance	0.076	0.113
Observations	20	20
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
Z	2.108	
P(Z<=z) two-tail	0.034	
z Critical two-tail	1.959	

There was a decrease in the mean scores of all indicators of new faculty job satisfaction. This difference was statistically significant with a *z*-test value of 2.108 compared to the critical value of 1.959, so the null hypothesis could be rejected during this time frame. So, from September 2008 to April 2009, new faculty reported a significant decrease in overall job satisfaction.

Utilizing a two-tailed z-test comparison for means, with a 95% level of confidence, the following results were computed for comparison of job satisfaction from January 2009 to April 2009 (see Table 10).

Table 10

Job Satisfaction: January 2009 to April 2009
z-Test: Two Sample for Means

	January 2009	*April 2009*
Mean	3.66	3.605
Known Variance	0.113	0.113
Observations	20	20
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
Z	0.517	
P(Z<=z) two-tail	0.604	
z Critical two-tail	1.959	

Although there was an observable drop between the means from 3.66 to 3.605, a smaller drop than between September 2008 and April 2009, this lowered mean was not statistically significant. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected when comparing a *z*-test value of .517 to the critical value of 1.959 as there was no significant difference when comparing these means. Therefore, there was no reported difference in job satisfaction from January 2009 to April 2009.

In summary, the statistical analyses from responses to the LU New Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey (Appendix D) yielded the following results:

Hypothesis #1: There will be a difference between the proportion of respondents with overall job satisfaction and the desired benchmark of 80%. Hypothesis #1 was not supported.

Hypothesis #2: There will be a difference between the proportion of respondents indicating satisfaction with the quality of mentoring and the desired benchmark of 80%. Hypothesis #2 was not supported.

Hypothesis #3: There will be a difference in proportion of responses of those reporting *Satisfied* and *Very satisfied* compared to those reporting *Dissatisfied* and *Very dissatisfied* across the three individual applications of the survey to the entire group of participants on all indicators of job satisfaction. Hypothesis #3 was supported.

Hypothesis #4: There will be a difference in proportion of responses of those reporting *Satisfied* and *Very satisfied* when comparing individual applications of the survey for each of the three categorical sub-groups: teaching satisfaction, social satisfaction, and employee satisfaction. Hypothesis #4 was not supported.

Hypothesis #5: There will be a difference in average overall response to job satisfaction when comparing responses per application (September 2008, January 2009, and April 2009). Hypothesis #5 was not supported.

The research question, Will those directly involved in LUNFMP report that the program meets the defined objectives? was addressed in a series of individual and group interviews. Interview data were reviewed within the dimensions of job satisfaction: social satisfaction, employee satisfaction, and teaching satisfaction.

Interviews—Social Satisfaction

In interviews conducted with the mentors and mentees of the LUNFMP, one of the most common threads through all of the feedback regarding social satisfaction was the benefit of a personal approach for learning adaption to a new environment. Mentees appreciated having someone they could ask questions or receive support from, rather than just having to learn it from an impersonal meeting or on their own over time. This demonstrates the mentoring program objective of accelerating the time to acclimate to the university. Just learning the *ins and outs of the university* almost seemed to be secondary

to the importance of having someone to talk to and feeling involved. "It was good to feel like I wasn't by myself," said one mentee. Mentees appreciated the frequent contact and the "checking in." A mentor was, "the person to provide the personal introduction to campus." These statements address the LUNMFP objective of becoming a member of professional management at LU—in outlook, word, and daily service.

The previous year's mentees said mentoring really helped them get acclimated to LU (program objective of timely acclimation). They formed lasting relationships not only with their mentors, but also with other faculty they met through the program (mentoring program objective of becoming a member). Some even continue to use their mentors for advice when they are needed.

Mentors feel LUNFMP is, "a fulfilling experience." They enjoy feeling useful and knowledgeable as much as they enjoy being able to help ease the transition for new faculty. As educators who were once in the same position of those they are now helping, they understand how stressful it can be and what they can do to help. One mentor stated, "[LUNFMP] renewed my enthusiasm for teaching."

Administrators of the university (department chairs and the Dean's Council) were also interviewed on the effectiveness of the LUNFMP. "My experience when I was hired was that I had to seek out a mentor. This is better," said one department chair. A major selling point for the administration was how the program bridged gaps between departments (mentoring program objective of becoming a member). Building this LU community makes the mentee feel more at home at the university much more quickly, improving both job satisfaction and retention. "New faculty are more productive and happier [than before the mentor program]," stated a department chair. The LUNFMP

achieved integration of new faculty with the LU environment and helped to build a support system for employees just starting out at the university (mentoring program objective of becoming a member). Several members of the Deans' Council agreed with one member's comment, "Mentoring is a safe place for new faculty." Other administrators commented on their lack of knowledge about the program, highlighting a need for regular communication about LUNFMP.

In all, the LUNFMP was reported to meet the objective of accelerating acclimation and in helping the new faculty become a member of a professional community. The interviewees consistently confirmed the success and continued need for the program to build social support to faculty new to LU.

Interviews—Employee Satisfaction

Most of the issues that arose from the LUNFMP had to do with the actual execution of the program. Mentees sometimes felt the information being covered was irrelevant or obvious (calling the dean if you are sick, for example), while other, sometimes much more crucial information was not addressed. One recurring issue brought up by both mentors and mentees was the absence of a session covering how to work with student athletes, a situation which can prove difficult for many faculty members starting out at LU. Several members of the administration interviewed about the LUNFMP were concerned the program was voluntary; some suggested it should be mandatory or at least become expected of new faculty.

The single most common complaint was the lack of specificity on the duties of the mentor and the mentee. A simple list of clear, defined expectations and responsibilities would help to alleviate this problem. While the program has some major issues

logistically, the interviewees agreed the program should be continued. The mentees seemed interested in the continuation and longevity of a mentoring program at LU, one saying, “I would be interested in being a mentor.”

Overall, most interviewees believed employee issues are addressed in LUNFMP. A previous year’s mentee stated the “LU does it this way” information (mentoring program objective of acclimation) was clearly and accurately shared. It was generally agreed the formal structure of the program ensured its continuity and ongoing success rather than relying on informal relationships.

Interviews—Teaching Satisfaction

In addition to the benefits the mentees receive from the LUNFMP, the program is also an excellent means of professional development for mentors, requiring those faculty to critically think about what they do and how they do it. “It’s a co-learning experience,” stated one mentor. Most mentees agreed that the representation of cross-disciplines aided in the development of a sense of the LU community, an objective of the LUNFMP (becoming a member). The administration team was pleased with the combined formality of the scheduled meetings and the informality of simply having a cohort the mentee can use as a model. They were also impressed with the benefits of the interdisciplinary nature of the program (mentoring program objective of becoming a member). Not only did this build a community among the new faculty, it also provided a university-wide venue for the sharing of ideas, self-analysis, and the exchange of important information for those involved. The interviewees generally agreed the LUNFMP helped to improve the quality of educators new and old at LU (mentoring program objective of improvement of the quality of education).

Summary

The analysis of quantitative data and review of the qualitative data suggest areas for improvement and refinement of the LUNFMP in addition to acknowledgement of program success. Results were as follows:

Hypothesis #1: There will be a difference between the proportion of respondents with overall job satisfaction and the desired benchmark of 80%. Hypothesis #1 was not supported.

Hypothesis #2: There will be a difference between the proportion of respondents indicating satisfaction with the quality of mentoring and the desired benchmark of 80%. Hypothesis #2 was not supported.

Hypothesis #3: There will be a difference in proportion of responses of those reporting *Satisfied* and *Very satisfied* compared to those reporting *Dissatisfied* and *Very dissatisfied* across the three individual applications of the survey to the entire group of participants on all indicators of job satisfaction. Hypothesis #3 was supported.

Hypothesis #4: There will be a difference in proportion of responses of those reporting *Satisfied* and *Very satisfied* when comparing individual applications of the survey for each of the three categorical sub-groups: teaching satisfaction, social satisfaction, and employee satisfaction. Hypothesis #4 was not supported.

Hypothesis #5: There will be a difference in average overall response to job satisfaction when comparing responses per application (September 2008, January 2009, and April 2009). Hypothesis #5 was not supported.

The research question, Will those directly involved in LUNFMP report that the program meets the defined objectives? was addressed via a series of individual and group

interviews. Interview data were reviewed per the dimensions of job satisfaction: social satisfaction, employee satisfaction, and teaching satisfaction. Interview findings included an indication of success of LUNFMP in addition to areas of concern such as participation expectations, topics presented, and need for role clarification.

Chapter 5 will further examine the results and explore the contributions of this study to higher education research. Implications for future evaluation and program modifications will be presented.

Chapter Five: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of the LUNFMP as measured across the multiple dimensions of faculty job satisfaction: teaching satisfaction, social satisfaction, and employee satisfaction. The encompassing variable of overall job satisfaction was also evaluated. This chapter recaps the research as to mentoring of new faculty and participants' job satisfaction. Discussion and conclusions about the study results are presented. The implications for higher education leadership, suggestions for future research, and recommendations to modify and improve the LUNFMP are also presented in this chapter.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of the LUNFMP as measured across multiple dimensions of faculty job satisfaction. The subjects were faculty new to LU in the academic year 2008-09. Multiple dimensions of job satisfaction were examined: teaching satisfaction, social satisfaction, and employee satisfaction. Mixed methods were used to collect and analyze the data.

The researcher collected data via a survey of job satisfaction indicators which was administered to faculty attending across-the-university meetings of the LUNFMP at three times during the first year of academic appointment at LU—September 2008, January 2009, and April 2009. The instrument, the Lindenwood University New Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey (Appendix D), was a 20-question survey using a Likert scale to measure five indicators of teaching satisfaction, seven indicators of social satisfaction, and seven indicators of employee satisfaction. The last question was an indicator of overall job satisfaction. The survey was submitted anonymously.

Data were triangulated to increase the credibility and validity of the results. The analysis of this data included *z* tests for difference in proportions, ANOVA, and *z* tests for difference in means. Quantitative data were used to examine the research question: Will those directly involved in LUNFMP report the program meets the defined objectives? To support the quantitative measures, qualitative measures of individual, mentor-mentee pair, and group interviews were conducted. A total of 28 subjects were involved in the qualitative findings. Individual interviews were conducted with two current mentors, nine mentees (both current and past), two from a current mentor-mentee pair, and one department chair. For qualitative data from key stakeholders in management and administrative capacities, a 14 member group interview including nine academic deans, three administrative deans, the Dean of Faculty, and the Provost was facilitated. Eight current mentees participated in individual interviews. Two of the individual interviews were conducted by the researcher; however, in the interest of anonymous participation, a graduate assistant and a faculty colleague conducted the six other interviews. These data were then coded by categorizing responses into the multiple dimensions of faculty job satisfaction: teaching satisfaction, social satisfaction, employee satisfaction, and overall job satisfaction (Appendix I). Those interviewed were also asked to generate ideas for LUNFMP improvement.

Relationship of Findings to the Literature

Most of the commonalities with the literature on faculty mentoring and job satisfaction were found in the results of the interviews. Participants noted the social support from mentors. Van Ast (2002) described the primary role of the mentor as

establishing a relationship with the mentee with a foundation in mutual trust, respect, support, and collegiality.

The adaptation of Moir's (1990) developmental approach to the first year of teaching in elementary education is also meaningful in higher education. Utilizing the phases assists mentors and the university in understanding the transition and acclimation that occurs within the first year of employment. Faculty appeared, as perceived by the researcher, to move from the anticipation of the new year, new job, and new opportunities to the survival phase of keeping up with the expectations, norms, and varying tasks assigned to the faculty new to the university. Near the end of the fall semester, faculty appeared to be tired and frequently unsure of their abilities through the disillusionment phase. After a period of recuperation with the winter break, faculty appeared to be rejuvenated and ready to return. As the end of the first year of teaching nears, faculty reflected on what has worked, what has not worked, and places to refine and improve their teaching, research, and service. With the summer break came another time of recuperation, ongoing reflection, and a return to the anticipation phase as the new school years approached.

The value of the mentoring program was delineated from the interviews. Similar to the findings of Bilge (2006), Bland et al. (2009), Wanberg et al. (2006), and Wasserstein et al. (2007), faculty described mentoring as a safe place to fit in with the organization of higher education that was new to them. These findings align with the objective of LUNFMP as to accelerated acclimation to LU.

Utilizing the findings of faculty job satisfaction as researched by Marston and Brunetti (2009) was important to classifying the qualitative findings of this study.

Transforming these researchers' categories of professional satisfaction factors, practical satisfaction factors, and social satisfaction factors to the satisfaction categories of teaching satisfaction, social satisfaction, and employee satisfaction was a useful means for comparison of results between the two studies.

Discussion of Results

It was hypothesized that participating faculty new to LU would self-report an overall job satisfaction average of 80% at the end of their first year of LU employment. This was not supported by the measures of this study. Although the overall job satisfaction data was reported by participants as 81.7%, it was not found to be statistically significant.

It is suspected this may have been a loftier goal than might have been reasonable. The 80% goal was higher or equal to overall job satisfaction of all LU faculty as previously measured. The first year of teaching, as described developmentally by Moir (1990) is characterized by significant professional and personal changes, perhaps making an 80% goal too high a benchmark. The first year of employment at any organization is a learning curve that may negatively affect indicators of job satisfaction.

The hypothesis that subjects would self-report an 80% or higher level of satisfaction with the quality of mentoring was not supported. Of note is the observable drop in satisfaction with the quality of mentoring in the final administration of the survey. Several explanations of this dissatisfaction could include the Disillusionment Phase, "the period of disenchantment" (Moir, 1990). This phase occurs prior to a period of rest, reflection, and rejuvenation, which can occur during the summer break. During that time, the mentee becomes refreshed (as can the mentor).

Dissatisfaction with the quality of mentoring may also be explained by the nature of relationships. As the mentee appears to become self-sufficient toward the end of the first year at LU, the mentor may connect less frequently. The mentee may actually feel more of a bother at this time than at the beginning of the academic year and may ask less from the mentor. Conversely, the mentee may feel the process is more bothersome and may withdraw from active participation in LUNFMP.

An alternative explanation could be that a single mentor and one monthly group meeting of faculty new to LU may be insufficient for comprehensive mentoring. The need may exist for not just one, but for multiple mentors. Additional mentors may be identified for specific, individualized assistance with teaching strategies, information technology, life/work balance, and/or ideas for advancement within the university (Ambrose, Huston, & Norman, 2005).

The subjects did report a higher job satisfaction level at each application (September 2008, January 2009, and April 2009) on all indicators during the 2008-09 academic year; however, when comparing the individual applications of the survey to each of the job satisfaction dimensions (teaching satisfaction, social satisfaction, and employee satisfaction), there was no statistical support for difference. When comparing the indicator of overall job satisfaction, there was no statistical evidence across the three administrations of the survey.

On the other hand, the quantitative methods appeared to support the positive relationship of mentoring to job satisfaction. The responses across all levels of interviewees indicated the role of the mentor in social support. For mentees, it included being able to seek support for all the questions or concerns participants encountered; for

mentors, it involved a recommitment to teaching and to LU; for administrators, LUNFMP aided in accelerating acclimation and inclusion to the professional education community. The interviewees consistently confirmed the success and continued need for the program (especially for social satisfaction). The subjects noted the inter-disciplinary interaction of LUNFMP in a positive light, appreciating the sense of university rather than solely experiencing department or division-driven mentoring.

Concerns about LUNFMP were also raised. Some reported that information presented was irrelevant or obvious while believing much more crucial information should be addressed but was not. Administrators stated participation in the program should be mandatory, rather than expected or optional. Consistent communication about the program to administrators is also necessary. A suggestion to clarify the roles and responsibilities of mentors and mentees was brought forth. These concerns will be addressed in program refinement and program changes.

Quantitative measures were utilized to answer the research question: Will those directly involved in LUNFMP report the program meets the defined objectives (Appendix A). Mentees and mentors consistently reported becoming part of a whole, an acclimation to the university, and the balance required to meet teaching and service duties of faculty. Administrators and deans reported an acceleration of acclimation that is provided via the mentoring program. The objectives of retention and quality of education were not directly addressed in the interviews.

Implications for Higher Education Leadership

Higher education leaders must address the needs of new teaching employees, that is, the faculty new to the institution. To retain quality teaching personnel, the educational

administrator needs to attend to enhancing the dimensions of job satisfaction including social, teaching, and employee satisfaction indicators. Review of the literature verifies mentoring programs have positive outcomes for both the mentor and the mentee (Bilge, 2006; Bland et al., 2009; Wanberg et al., 2006; Wasserstein et al., 2007). Mentors often report a reconnection with teaching and may be recharged by helping others acclimate to the university. Higher education mentoring programs benefit both new and existing faculty.

The LUNFMP is a program targeted for faculty new to LU to accelerate acclimation and membership in this professional community of higher learning. In an effort to ensure the success of this program, this study was conducted to explore the relationship between multiple dimensions of job satisfaction and participation in LUNFMP. Although not supported statistically through all indicators of faculty job satisfaction, qualitative results support these positive outcomes and provide a platform for program refinement to further facilitate program success.

Current Status of the Subjects

Twenty-eight faculty members new to teaching full-time at LU were included in this research subject pool in 2008-09. At the time of this writing over three years later, 75% (21/28 faculty) of the study subjects remain in faculty positions at LU, 7% (2/28) have retired, and 18% (5/28 faculty) have been promoted to division/department chair roles.

Current Status of LU

The LU organization has undergone several paradigm shifts since the inception of this research. At the time of this writing, the university has changed in several ways,

some of which may have affected previous mentoring findings. Changes include a lowered teaching load, course releases for additional universities duties and responsibilities including research, and shared governance.

At the time of this research study, faculty teaching loads were 5-1-5; that is, 5 courses in the fall semester, 1 in January term, and 5 courses in the spring semester. Given the past emphasis on the identity of being a teaching university, this teaching load was viewed as a reasonable expectation. At the time of this writing, changes in teaching load have been instituted. With a new presidency, the executive administration worked with the LU Board of Directors in spring semester 2010 to reduce each semester of teaching by one course, resulting in a 4-1-4 teaching expectation. As lack of time had been a concern expressed by both the mentor and the mentee, it is expected that the reduced teaching load could increase mentoring satisfaction and job satisfaction.

The executive administration also instituted course release for additional duties and responsibilities. Research, program development, and committee leadership are significant roles that can reduce teaching expectations. As many come to academe for ongoing research and scholarship, it is expected that job satisfaction may be enhanced by this academic recognition.

With the change in the presidency, a new era of shared governance with faculty, staff, administration, and executives emerged. Again, the expectation of increased job satisfaction might be expected with this shared leadership and empowerment of faculty in decision-making. As LU continues to evolve in its mission and vision, it will be advantageous to continue to measure the satisfaction of her faculty.

Several themes emerged from the qualitative data analysis. These themes may have significance for the educational leader in acclimating new faculty. The themes are relationships, connection to the LU community, multiple mentors, the benefit of being a mentor, and when mentoring ends.

Emerging Themes: Relationships. Throughout the interviews, the ongoing discussion of social support as a result of collegial relationships was evident. Mentees stated, "It's hard to get to know the new faculty body." As mentoring progressed, mentees reported, "I did not feel on my own"; "I wasn't just floating along"; and "It was a good place to feel like I wasn't in this by myself." Discussion of the benefits of confidential nature of this relationship was presented. A mentee stated, mentoring "is an officially sanctioned place to ask a stupid question." A dean agreed mentoring is "a place for a private conversation without an administrator." Mentees' responses as to the nurturing quality of the mentoring relationships included: my mentor "was always there—like a big brother"; my mentor "took care of me", and "He's there for me."

Many described the mentor/mentee relationship as moving from a professional connection to the development of a friendship. "Relationships are made" reported a mentor. Matching the mentoring pair based not solely on field of teaching, but also on common issues or concerns such as gender, race, sexual orientation and/or age, parenting status, and common interests is a major role of the mentoring program coordinator. A mentee stated, "It helped that our personalities clicked." Administrators will need to be mindful in mentoring assignments to maximize the potential for a positive transition and acclimation to LU.

Emerging theme: Connection to the LU community. The across-the-university meetings to not only familiarize the mentees with the entire university, but also to develop a new network of colleagues needs to be emphasized as a positive by-product of LUNFMP. Mentees described the positive aspects of the mentoring program. A previous year's mentee stated appreciation of "meeting everyone despite departments". One of the mentees responded, "It's nice to brush shoulders with other professors." A dean acknowledged the value of "interconnectedness" of mentoring. Another dean further responded that the benefit of mentoring being "interdepartmental so new faculty can develop as a cohort outside of his/her department." With the ability to work beyond academic silos by reaching out to faculty in different schools and disciplines, faculty new to LU are able to become part of and identify with the university community.

Emerging theme: Multiple mentors. A new direction for mentoring may be to consider that one face-to-face mentor may not suffice for the multiple needs of the faculty new to LU. As one mentor questioned, "Is it OK to seek advice from others?" It is hoped that the birth of mentoring as part of the organizational culture will evolve. Faculty new to LU will be encouraged to meet their acclimation needs by assigned face-to-face mentors, expertise mentors, social support mentors, and electronic mentors for interaction with colleagues from other colleges and universities. The goal would be that mentoring would be institutionalized into the university culture to the extent that formal mentoring programs would no longer be necessary.

Emerging theme: The benefits of being a mentor. "Mentoring is rewarding" stated a second-time mentor. Other mentors reported "It is a fulfilling experience"; "It feels good to be useful"; and "I liked explaining the campus and how it works." A

mentor enjoyed the experience of helping in the acclimation process, “Mentoring helps them become one of us.” A dean described mentoring as “It’s like advising for our new faculty.” One of the mentors expressed appreciation for participating in the program. Mentoring “renewed my enthusiasm for teaching and for LU.”

Mentees expressed an interest in becoming a mentor themselves. A mentee stated, “I would be interested in being a mentor.” It might be in the university’s best interest to nurture this interest and develop a mentor training program. With the goal of LUNFMP becoming a faculty-driven program, a next step might be to develop a shared oversight with the development of new mentoring leaders.

Emerging theme: Concern over when mentoring ends. Some interviewees raised the concern as to keeping the momentum going after the mentoring program. One of the deans asked, “How do we keep the welcoming going after the first year?” A mentee also queried, “How do we keep it going after the first year?” One of the mentees stated, “I would like to attend in the 2nd year.” The interest in an ongoing formal gathering was presented as a possible expansion of the LUNFMP.

The interviews yielded a plethora of information of emerging ideas, thoughts, and directions regarding LUNFMP. Utilizing this data to refine the formal mentoring program is integral to program improvement. Information from all levels of stakeholders involved in LUNFMP from mentees, mentors, department chairs, deans, and executive administration served to enhance the value of the program to LU.

Recommendations for Future Research

To further validate the research findings, this study could be conducted with new groups of LUNFMP participants to be able to compare job satisfaction and ensure that

faculty new to LU in academic year 2008-09 is comparable to that of other new faculty groups. As LU has made recent strides in educational excellence, it is expected that another group new to LU would not experience the same issues, concerns, and problems as previous groups. As LU shifts academic priorities to research and scholarship from a focus on teaching and advising, it would be expected that identified needs of faculty new to LU would also shift.

Future studies would benefit from non-administrative personnel involvement to ensure results are not due to an attempt to please the researchers or administrators. The use of an anonymous technological modality to administer the survey would enhance the anonymity of subjects. Professionally trained and unbiased interviewers may yield more open and honest interview data.

Overall, it is expected that researching the needs and satisfaction of faculty new to LU over a period of several years would yield valuable information about the program. Such ongoing research would be used to make changes that would serve to enhance job satisfaction. Though not part of this study, it would seem that another good outcome, faculty retention, would naturally follow job satisfaction.

Implications for Lindenwood University—LUNFMP Refinement and Modifications

Based on the results of this study, the following refinements are recommended to enhance the success of LUNFMP:

1. Based on the finding that satisfaction with mentoring decreases over the academic year, it is suggested that a meeting with mentor, mentees, and appropriate administrators be convened each January. This meeting would address the needs of the mentee, including consistent connection and checking-in despite the apparent self-

sufficiency of the mentee, a recognition of the work of the mentor, and an option for multiple mentors or a mentoring network based on the individual mentee's needs. The mentoring needs of faculty beginning employment at that time would also be addressed. Multiple mentors might address other mentor and mentee training needs such as use of technology, innovative teaching techniques, and/or assessment methods. Mentors who address special needs or populations such as parents who teach, researchers who want to balance this work with teaching, or issues of culture and diversity may be identified. Mentees may want to develop a supportive, collaborative culture to mentor each other. Mentoring may be more effective if offered as a mentoring network rather than an individual mentor. Movement from the wise sage perspective of mentoring to a more contemporary approach of learning from many, with many, and with each other's support and expertise may be more satisfying to the mentee.

2. To address the responses that the across-the-university meetings may feel more like indoctrination than a faculty-driven program, it is recommended that faculty become involved in the planning of the meetings. To complement the needs of training and orientation and to ensure new faculty concerns are the topics of across-the-university meetings, the last two of the seven academic year meetings will focus on concerns identified by the mentees. Every November, the LUNFMP coordinator would begin to solicit ideas for the February and April meetings. Ideas would be sent to the members for vote, and the most requested would be the topics for these two final sessions.

3. As to the concern over participation in the across-the-university meetings, mentees in this study were encouraged to attend. In prior years, meetings were scheduled in late afternoons, making it impossible for some to attend due to teaching requirements.

To ensure future groups of new faculty are involved in the across-the-university meetings, it is recommended the time of the meetings be changed to 7:00 a.m., when no classes are offered or a time that is agreed on by all participants. Food could be served to participants in an effort to increase attendance and participation.

4. One of the responses in the group interview with the Deans' Council and executive officers was a lack of knowledge and awareness of the program. It was quickly recognized that although the program was instituted, many of the administrative stakeholders were unfamiliar with what actually occurred and how the program can aid in acclimation and inclusion. To increase communication with this group, LUNFMP progress and updates could be presented to the Deans' Council at least twice per semester, every December and April (and as requested). This administrative group could participate in choosing topics for across-the-university meetings to ensure successful acclimation to LU.

5. Many mentors expressed a concern over not knowing the role and responsibilities of the mentor. This may also be a contributing factor to the decrease in satisfaction with the quality of mentoring. To aid in the needed clarification, descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of the mentors and mentees should be written and distributed. This could be introduced at the meeting to welcome mentees with their mentors during mid-August's Faculty Workshop Week. Additionally, a previous mentor-mentee pair would be invited to present their experience in the LUNFMP to the incoming group of participants. Mentors and mentees would be asked to bring forth questions and concerns in ongoing communication with the program coordinator.

6. Mentors could be required to attend an annual training session prior to the

beginning of the academic year. In addition to education and clarification of the mentor/mentee roles and responsibilities, findings from this research would be utilized to emphasize the importance of mentoring to LU's new faculty.

7. Recognition of successful mentors will be recommended in an effort to institutionalize mentoring as an ongoing professional development opportunity for faculty. Recognition of successful mentors will be suggested to be part of the annual faculty awards at the end of every school year in May.

8. To remain current and state-of-the-art in faculty inclusion and acclimation, annual and ongoing evaluation of this program should be conducted. This program evaluation should include feedback from mentees, mentors, and administrative/executive officers. This assessment will provide continual and ongoing information for continued renewal and restructuring of LUNFMP.

With these program revisions, it is expected the success of LUNFMP will continue, and the job satisfaction of faculty new to LU will increase.

Conclusion

The literature and research addressing mentoring emphasizes one salient finding: mentoring matters. This study echoed those findings through quantitative measurements. Mentoring appears to have a relationship with job satisfaction along the multidimensional perspectives of teaching satisfaction, social satisfaction, and employee satisfaction. The mentees interviewed repeatedly acknowledged the social dimension as a primary benefit to participation in LUNFMP.

Post-secondary educators are generally a satisfied group of employees (Jaschik, 2007). The results of this study do not present a strong statistical relationship, but does

present a strong qualitative relationship between mentoring program participation and job satisfaction. The literature and research findings from this study do suggest the need to continue the program with refinement. In the future, it is anticipated that an ongoing evaluation will be institutionalized in this program. Evaluation results will contribute to the continual renewal and assessment of LUNFMP. LU agrees, mentoring matters.

References

Adams, K. (2002). What colleges and universities want in new faculty. *Association of American Colleges and Universities,* 1-14.

Ajzen, I. (2011). Job satisfaction, effort, and performance: A reasoned action perspective. *Contemporary Economics, 5(4),* 32-43. doi: 10.5709/ce.1897-9254.26

Allen, T. D., & Eby, L. T. (Eds.). (2007). *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., O'Brien, K. E., & Lentz, E. (2008). The state of mentoring research: A qualitative review of current research methods and future research implications. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 73, 343-357. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2007.08.004

Alumni Mentor Program University of Southern California. (2011). Mentoring handbook. Retrieved from http://cmcismentorprogram.wordpress.com/mentoring-program manual/definition-of-mentoring/

Ambrose, S., Huston, T., & Norman, M. (2005). A qualitative method for assessing faculty satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 46,* 803-830. doi: 10.1007/s11162-004-6226-6

American Federation of Teachers. (2010). A national survey of part-time/adjunct faculty. *American Academic, 2,* 1-15.

Amundson, N. E., Borgen, W. A., Jordan, S., & Erlebach, A. C. (2004). Survivors of downsizing: Helpful and hindering experiences. *The Career Development Quarterly, 52*(3), 16.

Ashburn, E. (2007). Survey identifies colleges that know how to keep junior faculty members happy. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 53(22),* 6.

Baker, W. (2002). Mentoring- Improving the quality of work life and organisational effectiveness: A case study of a formal mentoring programme implemented in a higher education organisation. *Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia,* 35-43.

Baldwin, R. G., & Chang, D. A. (2006). Reinforcing our strategies to support faculty in the middle years of academic life. *Liberal Education*, 28-35.

Beatty, E.R., Dickerson, M. & Shyam, W. (2008). Four years of learning: the Southern Connecticut State University new faculty mentoring program. Retrieved from http://www.southernct.edu/faculty_development/mentoring/

Bedeian, A. (2007). Even if the tower is "ivory," it isn't "white:" Understanding the consequences of faculty cynicism. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 6(1),* 9-32.

Bender, K. A., & Heywood, J. S. (2003). Job satisfaction of the highly educated: The role of gender, academic tenure, and comparison income. *University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Department of Economics and Graduate Program in Human Resources and Labor Relations,* 1-30.

Bensimon, E.M., Polkinghorne, D.P., Bauman, G.L., & Vallejo, E. (2004). Doing research that makes a difference. *Journal of Higher Education, 75(1),* 104-126.

Bensimon, E. M., Ward, K., & Sanders, K. (2000). Creating mentoring relationships and fostering collegiality. In E. M. Bensimon, K. Ward, K. Sanders (Eds.), *The department chair's role in developing new faculty into teachers and scholars* (pp. 113-137). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Berberet, J. (2008). Perceptions of early career faculty: managing the transition from graduate school to the professional career. *TIAA-CREF Institute Research Dialogue*, 1-22.

Berk, R. A., Berg, J., Mortimer, R., Walton-Moss, B. & Yeo, T. P. (2005). Measuring the effectiveness of faculty mentoring relationships. *Academic Medicine, 80(1),* 66-71.

Bilge, F. (2006). Examining the burnout of academics in relation to job satisfaction and other factors. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 1151-1160.

Bland, C. J., Taylor, A. L., Shollen, S. L., Weber-Main, A. M., & Mulcahy, P. (2009). *Faculty success through mentoring: A guide for mentors, mentees, and leaders.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Blauvelt, M. J., & Spath, M. L. (2008). *Passing the torch: A faculty mentoring program at one school of nursing.* Retrieved from http://nln.allenpress.com/nlnonline/?=get.

Bloom, M., Fischer, J., & Orme, J. G. (1999). *Evaluating practice: Guidelines for the accountable professional*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bower, G. G. (2007). Factors influencing the willingness to mentor 1st-year faculty in physical education departments. *Mentoring & Tutoring, 15(1),* 73-85. doi: 10.1080/13611260601037397

Breslow, J. (2007). Private satisfaction. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 54(5),* 1-8.

Bristol, M. N., Abbuhl, S., Cappola, A. R., & Sonnad, S. S. (2008). Work-life policies for faculty at the top ten medical schools. *Journal of Women's Health, 17*(8), 1311-1320. doi: 10.1089/jwh.2007.0682

Britton, T., & Paine, L. (2005). Applying ideas from other countries. In H. Portner (Ed.), *Teacher mentoring and induction: The state of the art and beyond* (pp. 225-237). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Bunton S. A. (2008). Differences in U.S. medical school faculty job satisfaction by gender. *American Association of Medical Colleges Analysis in Brief, 8(7),* 1-2.

Carroll, T. G., Fulton, K., Yoon, I., & Lee, C. (2005). Induction into learning communities. *National Commission on Teaching and America's Future*, 1-25.

Castillo, J. X. & Cano, J. (2004). Factors explaining job satisfaction among faculty. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 45(3),* 65-74.

Central Michigan University. (2011). Resources for new faculty. Retrieved from http://webs.cmich.edu/newfaculty/schedule.shtml

Chong-ho, Y. & Ohlund, B. (2010). Threats to validity of research design. Retrieved from http://www.creative-wisdom.com/teaching/WBI/threat.shtml

Clark, R. A., Harden, S. A., & Johnson, W. B. (2000). Mentor relationships in clinical psychology doctoral training: Results of a national survey. *Teaching of Psychology, 27(4),* 262-268.

Clarksberg M. & Einarson, M. (2009). Faculty satisfaction: A gendered issue of integration. Retrieved from http://www.wihe.com/printBlog.jsp?id=14166

Cornell University. (2006). Understanding faculty satisfaction. *Institutional Research and Planning*, 1-8.

Cullen, R. & Harris, M. (2008). Supporting new scholars: A learner-centered approach to new faculty orientation. *Florida Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 1-3.

Darwin, A. (2000). Critical reflections on mentoring in work settings. *Adult Education Quarterly, 50*(3), 197-211.

Davis J. A., Smith, T. W., & Marsden, P. V. (2005). *General Social Surveys, 1972-2004: Cumulative Codebook.* Chicago, IL: National Opinon Research Center.

Donahue, T. S. (2000). New faculty become oriented to Vanderbilt. Retrieved from http://www.Vanderbilt.edu/News/register/Sept11_00/story4.html

Dougherty, T. W. & Dreher, G. F. (2007). Mentoring and career outcomes: Conceptual and methodological issues in an emerging literature. In Ragins, B. R. & Kram, K. E. (Eds.), *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research, and practice* (p. 51-93). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Durham, S., Merritt, J., & Sorrell, J. (2007). Implementing a new faculty workload formula. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 28(4),* 184-189.

English, F. W. (2003). Cookie-cutter leaders for cookie-cutter schools: The teleology of standardization and the de-legitimization of the university in educational leadership preparation. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 1-20.

Fetterman, D. M., Fischbacher, E., & Rynearson, K. (1999). Faculty mentoring program evaluation. *Stanford University School of Education,* 1-34.

Fleishman/Hillard. (2009). Lindenwood University faculty satisfaction survey results. St. Louis, MO.

Fogg, P. (2006). An investment in professors that pays off. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 53(11),* 1-4.

Foster, L., Naidtitch, L., & Politzer, L. (2011). Motivating reluctant retirees in higher education: Interviews with college administrators and senior faculty. *TIAA-CREF Institute, 103.* Retrieved from http://www.tiaacref.org/institute/ research/ dialogue/1031.pdf

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Freire, P., Fraser, J. W., Macedo, D., McKinnon, T, & Stokes, W. T. (Eds.). (1997). *Mentoring the mentor: A critical dialogue with Paulo Freire.* New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Fuller, K., Maniscalco-Feichti, M., & Droege, M. (2008). The role of the mentor in retaining junior pharmacy faculty members. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 72(2),* 41-48.

Gibson, S. K. (2006). Mentoring of women faculty: The role of organizational politics and culture. *Innovative Higher Education, 31(1),* 63-79. doi: 10.1007/s10755-006-9007-7

Galbraith, M. W. (2003). The adult education professor as mentor: A means to enhance teaching and learning. *Perspectives: The New York Journal of Adult Learning, 1*(1), 9-20.

Gilbreath, B., Rose, G. L., & Dietrich, K. E. (2008). Assesing mentoring in organizations: An evaluation of commercial mentoring instruments. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnerships in Learning, 16(4),* 379-393. doi: 10.1080/13611260802433767

Glatthorn, A. A., Jones, B. K., & Bullock, A. A. (2006). *Developing highly qualified teachers: A handbook for school leaders.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Glenn, D. (2007). Alienation harms female professors, study finds. *Chronnicle of Higher Education, 53(34),* 45-53.

Hansman, C. A. (Ed.). (2002). *Critical perspectives on mentoring: Trends and issues.* Retrieved from http://www.cere.org/acve/docs/mott/mentroing1.pdf

Haynes, R. K. & Petrosko, J. M. (2009). An investigation of mentoring and socialization among faculty. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnerships in Learning. 17(1),* 41-52. doi: 10.1080/13611260802658520

Higher Learning Commission (2003). The criteria for admission. Retrieved from http://www.ncahigher learning commission.org

Hoepfl, M.C. (1997). Choosing qualitative research: A primer for technology education researchers. *Virginia Tech Digital Library and Archives, 9*(1), 1-11. Retrieved from http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/Jte/V9N1/hoepfl.html.

Houston, D., Meyer, L. H., & Paewai, S. (2006). Academic staff workloads and job satisfaction: Expectations and values in academe. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 28*(1), 17-30.

Indiana University of Pennsylvania. (2011). Threats to internal and external validity. Retrieved from http://www.coe.iup.edu/grbieger/Classes/LTCY698/Module%206/Internal%20and%20External%20Validity.htm

Inzer, L. D. & Crawford, C. B. (2005). A review of formal and informal mentoring: Processes, Problems, and Design. *Journal of Leadership Education, 4*(1), 31-46.

Jaschik, S. (2007). A satisfied full-time faculty. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/print/2007/11/01/faculty?width=775&height=500&if

Jaschik, S. (2008). Confidence gap for new profs. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/07/11/newfac

Johnson, W. B. (2007). *On being a mentor: A guide for higher education faculty*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Johnson, G. & Johnson, W. (2000). Perceived overqualification and dimensions of job satisfaction: A longitudinal analysis. *The Journal of Psychology, 134*(5), 537-555.

Kalleberg, A. L. (1977). Work values and job rewards: A theory of job satisfaction. *American Sociological Review, 42,* 124-143.

Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. & Judge, T. A. (2007). A quantitative review of mentoring research: Test of a model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 72,* 269-283. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2007.09.006

Knippelmeyer, S. A. & Torraco, R. J. (2007). Mentoring as a developmental tool for higher education. Paper presented at the Academy of Human Resource

Development International Research Conference in The Americas, Indianapolis, IN.

Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*(4), 608-625.

Lange, J., Wallace, M., Gerard, S., Lovanio, K., Fausty, N., & Rychiewicz, S. (2009). Effect of an acute care geriatric educational program on fall rates and nurse work satisfaction. *Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing, 40*(8), 371-379.

Leland, C. H., & Kasten, W. C. (2002). Literacy education for the 21st century: It's time to close the factory. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 5-15.

Lindbeck, R. & Darnell, D. F. (2008). An imperative for colleges and universities: Orienting and supporting new faculty members. Retrieved from http://www.academicleadership.org/empirical_research/461_printer.shtml

Lindenwood University. (2011). About Lindenwood. Retrieved from http://www.lindenwood.edu/about/ mission.cfm

Lindenwood University School of Education. (2011). School of Education. Retrieved from http://www. lindenwood.edu/education/index.html

Lopopolo, R. B. (2002). The Relationship of role-related variables to job satisfaction and commitment to the organization in a restructured hospital environment. *Physical Therapy, 82*(10), 948-999.

Lund, J. W. (2007). Successful faculty mentoring relationships at evangelical Christian colleges. *Christian Higher Education, 6*, 371-390. doi: 10.1080/15363750701285875

Mamiseishvili, K. & Rosser, V. J. (2011). Examining the relationship between faculty productivity and job satisfaction. *The Journal of the Professoriate,* 100-132.

Marston, S. H. (2010). Why do they teach? A comparison of elementary, high school, and college teachers. *Education, 131*(2), 437-54.

Marston, S. H. & Brunetti, G. J. (2009). Job satisfaction of experienced professors at a liberal arts college. *Education, 130*(2), 323-347.

McAllister, C.A., Harold, R.D., Ahmedani, B.K., & Cramer, E. P. (2009). Targeted mentoring: Evaluation of a program. *Journal of Social Work Education, 45*(1), 89-104.

McMillan, J. H. (2007). Randomized field trials and internal validity: Not so fast my friend. *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation, 12*(15). Retrieved from http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=12&n=15

Merriam, S. B. (1983). Mentors and protégés: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly, 33,* 161-173.

Miller, R. L. (2006). Mentoring new faculty: Programs & procedures. *NCA Higher Learning Commission Annual Meeting.*

Milosheff, E. (1990). Factors contributing to job satisfaction at the community college. *Community College Review, 18,* 12-22.

Modern Think, LLC. (2008). Lindenwood University Survey Summary. *The Chronicle of Great Colleges to Work For*.

Moir, E. (1990). Phases of first-year teaching. Retrieved from http://www.teachersuppost programs.org/phases_first_year_teaching/

Mujtaba, B. G. (2007). Mentoring diverse professionals. Tamarac, FL: Llumina Press.

Mullen, C. A. (2005). *Mentorship primer.* New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Mullen, C. (2009). Re-imagining the human dimension of mentoring: A framework for research administration and the academy. *The Journal of Research Administration, XL*(1), 10-24.

Mullen, C., & Kennedy, C. (2005). It takes a village to raise new faculty*:* Implementing triangular mentoring relationships. Retrieved from http://cnx.org/content/ m14546/latest/

National Business Research Institute. (2008). *Special Reports: Managing Job Satisfaction*. Retrieved from http://www.nbrii.com/?s=Managing+Job+Satisfaction&btnG=Go

New American College Survey of Early Career Faculty (2007). Research, University of Kentucky. Retrieved from http://www.research.uky.edu/gs/Student Development/Documents/ANACsurvey2007.pd.

Norman, M., Ambrose, S. A., & Huston, T. A. (2006). Assessing and addressing faculty morale: Cultivating consciousness, empathy, and empowerment. *The Review of Higher Education, 29*(3), 347-379.

Office of Institutional Research. (2011). *Lindenwood Ledger: A Fact Book.* Retrieved from http://www.lindenwood.edu/academics/institutionalResearch/docs/ LindenwoodLedger2010/final.pdf

Paarlberg, L.E. & Lavinia, B. (2009). Using research on altruism, prosocial behavior and public service behavior to change how we manage in public organizations. Retrieved from http://www.indiana.edu/~ipsm2009/Paarlberg_ Lavigna.pdf

Pence, G. (2009). How to be happy in academe. Retrieved from http://wf2dnvr8.webfeat.org/prHEM11352/

Penner, R. (2001). Mentoring in higher education. Retrieved from http://www.directionjornal.org/article/?1162

Pienaar, C., & Bester, C. (2005). Addressing career obstacles within a changing higher education work enviornment: Perspectives of academics. *South African Journal of Psychology, 39*(3), 376-385.

Pololi, L. & Knight, S. (2005). Mentoring faculty in academic medicine. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 20*(9), 868-870. doi: 10.1111/j.1525-1497.2005.05007.x

PsychoMetrics (2011). *Threats to internal validity.* Retrieved from http://www.psychmet.com/id12.html

Ragins, B. R., & Kram, K. E. (Eds.). (2007). *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research, and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Reybold, L. E. (2005). Surrendering the dream: Early career conflict and faculty dissatisfaction thresholds. *Journal of Career Development, 32*(2), 107-121.

Ropers-Huilman, B. (2000). Aren't you satisfied yet? Women faculty members' interpretation of their academic work. *New Directions for Insitutional Research, 105,* 21-32.

Ross, S. M. & Morrison, G. R. (2011). *Experimental research methods*. Retrieved from http://aect.org/edtech/ed1/38.pdf

Rosser, V. J. (2005). Measuring the change in faculty perceptions over time: An examination of their worklife and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 46* (1), 81-107. doi: 10.1007/s11162-004-6290-y

Saari, L. M. & Judge, T. A. (2004). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Wiley Periodicals, Inc., 43*(4), 395-407.

Sagor, R. (2000). *Quality school improvement with action research.* Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org

Savage, H. E., Karp, R. S., & Logue, R. (2004). Faculty mentorship at colleges and universities. *College Teaching, 52*(1), 21-24.

Searby, L. (2008). A mentoring mindset: Preparing future principals to be effective protégés. Retrieved from http://cnx.org/content/m16930/latest/

Seifert, T. A., & Umbach, P. D. (2008). The effects of faculty demographic characteristics and disciplinary context on dimensions of job satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 49*(4), 357-381. doi: 10.1007/s11162-007-9084-1

Shim, H. S. & Roth, G. L. (2008). Sharing tacit knowledge among expert teaching professors and mentees: Considerations for career and technical education teacher educators. *Journal of Industrial Teaching and Education, 44*(4), 5-28.

Siegall, M. & McDonald, T. (2004). Person-organization value congruence, burnout and diversion of resources. *Personnel Review, 33*(3), 291-297.

Smerek, R. E. & Peterson, M. (2007). Examining Herberg's theory: Improving job satisfaction among non-academic employees at a university. *Research in Higher Education, 48*(2), 229-250. doi: 10.1007/s11162-006-9042-3

Smith, J. A., & Zsohar, H. (2005). Essentials of neophyte mentorship in relation to the faculty shortage. *Journal of Nursing Education, 46*(4), 184-186.

Sorcinelli, M. D. & Yun, J. (2007). From mentor to mentoring networks: mentoring in the new academy. *Change,* 58-61.

Spears, M. C. & Parker, D. F. (2002). A probit analysis of the impact of training on performance appraisal satisfaction. *American Business Review, 20*(2), 12-16.

Stanulis, R. N., Burill, G. & Amers, K. T. (2007). Fitting in and learning to teach: Tensions in developing a vision for a university-based induction program for beginning teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 34*(3), 135-147.

Terpstra, D. E. & Honoree, A. L. (2004). Job satisfaction and pay satisfaction levels of university faculty by discipline and by geographic region. *Education*, *124*(3), 528-539.

Terpstra, D. E. & Honoree, A. L. (2009). The effects of different teaching, research, and service emphases on individual and organizational outcomes in higher education institutions. *Journal of Education for Business, 84,* 169-176.

University of Illinois-Chicago. (2011). Research bias. Retrieved from http://tigger.uic.edu/~lwbenn/jacswcourses/socw360/week14.htm

University of Kansas School of Medicine. (2008). The faculty mentoring initiative. Retrieved from http://www.kumc.edu/som/facdev/mentoring/kusommentoring booklet.pdf

Van Ast, J. (2002). Community college mentoring program mentor-mentee handbook. Ames, IA: Iowa State University of Science and Technology, College of Education.

Van Houtte, M. (2006). Tracking and teacher satisfaction: Role of study culture and trust. *The Journal of Educational Research, 99*(4), 247-256.

Vick, J. M. (2008). Starting fresh. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 54*(44), 26-27.

Von Emmerik, I. J. H. (2008). It is not only mentoring: The combined influences on individual-level and team-level support on job performance. *Career Development International, 13*(7), 575-593. doi: 10.1108/13620430810911065

Wanberg, C. R., Kammeyer-Mueller, J., & Marchese, M. (2006). Mentor and protege predictors of mentoring in a formal mentoring program. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 410-423.

Wasley, P. (2007a). Orientation for professors. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 54*(5), 28.

Wasley, P. (2007b). Professors' job satisfaction is higher than other workers. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 54*(12), 10.

Wasserstein, A. G., Quistberg, A., & Shea, J. A. (2007). Mentoring at the University of Pennsylvania. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 22*, 210-214. doi: 10.1007/s11606-006-0051-x

Weber State University. (2005). The fall 2004-05 HERI faculty survey: Job satisfaction and sources of stress for faculty and faculty perspectives on campus issues. *UCLA Higher Education Research Institute.*

Williams-June, A. (2008). A helping hand for young faculty members. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 55*(3), 12-14.

Wilson, R. (2005). Giving junior professors a voice. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 52*(5), 24-27.

Wolford, T. D. (2003). *A study of worker demographics and workplace job satisfaction for employees in global engineering and construction organization.* Fort Lauderdale, FL: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University.

Yu, C. & Ohlund, B. (2010). *Threats to validity of research design*. Retrieved from http://www.creative-wisdom.com/teaching/WBI/threat/shtml

Zachary, L. J. (2000). *The mentor's guid*e. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix A
Lindenwood University New Faculty Mentoring Program Description

LINDENWOOD UNIVERSITY
New Faculty Mentoring Program

Purpose: The purpose of the Faculty Mentoring Program is to create a link between newly-appointed faculty and long-term, respected faculty members. It is expected that this program will improve the overall university experience for both mentored faculty members and their senior mentors, through this supportive relationship.

Objectives:

- To accelerate the time required for new faculty to acclimate to the university
- To enhance the likelihood of retaining new faculty
- To improve the quality of education provided to our students
- To facilitate the balance required to adequately meet the teaching and service duties of faculty
- To facilitate the new faculty member's becoming a member of professional management at Lindenwood – in outlook, word, and daily service.

Roles and Responsibilities:

The Division Dean—in consultation with the Provost and President, assigns a mentor to a newly-appointed faculty member as soon as the appointment has been made. It is preferred that the faculty mentor have at least three years of experience teaching at Lindenwood, be available to meet with the mentee at least for one hour for three weeks out of the month and be available for informal consultation as needed by the mentee. Faculty mentoring is required for the first academic year of teaching at Lindenwood. In cases of incompatibility, the Division Dean is to reassign a new mentor to the newly-appointed faculty person.

The Mentor—As soon as possible, the mentor should contact the mentee prior to arrival at Lindenwood, but minimally, within the week of new faculty orientation. At that time, a schedule for the weekly meetings should be negotiated. Meetings are to be an average of one hour each for three of four weeks per month during the first year of the newly appointed faculty member's employment. The mentor is to be as available as possible for consultation between meetings; however, most of the contact time is to be in scheduled meetings.

The mentor is to be a supportive advisor to the mentee. This relationship does not preclude the training and orientation done by the Program Manager or others assigned by the Dean. Sharing of information, principles of "The Lindenwood Way," teaching techniques and tips, strategies for optimizing faculty expectations, appropriate feedback,

and direction to the appropriate individuals is part of the mentoring relationship. The mentor is to be accessible, able to assist the mentee in developing a professional network and be encouraging, not evaluative, in approach. Documentation of meeting times and general topics discussed will be submitted to the Division Dean on a monthly basis. Mentors are expected to derive great satisfaction in assisting in the development of a colleague, and they should list this valuable activity under Contributions to the Division and Contributions to the University Community sections of their IDPs. Division Deans should acknowledge this service in annual reviews of faculty members serving as Faculty Mentors.

The Mentee—is expected to keep the mentor informed of any problems or concerns and bring them to the scheduled meetings. Face-to-face interaction will maximize the mentoring relationship. Mentees are to share, ask advice, reflect on the mentor's recommendations, and report the results of efforts to the mentor.

The Mentoring Program Facilitator—is responsible to ensure that all newly-appointed faculty members are assigned a mentor and will contact the Division Deans to ensure that assignment has occurred. The facilitator will schedule meetings for October, November, January, February, and April in which mentees will meet as a group to discuss issues/concerns in an across-the-University format (not Division specific). The Provost will be invited to these monthly meetings, and other administrative officers will be invited as the agenda warrants. Topics for monthly meetings may include, but not be limited to, time management, roles and responsibilities of faculty members, teaching excellence, service expectations, advising, etc. Documentation of attendance at monthly meetings with general topics/issues discussed will be submitted to the appropriate Division Deans. The Program Facilitator will be required to present the Faculty Mentoring Program to the newly-appointed faculty at the New Faculty Orientation Workshops, present information and progress on the Program at Faculty Meetings, and provide a semi-annual report to the University Provost.

4/06

LINDENWOOD UNIVERSITY
Faculty Mentoring Program
Individual Session Report

Mentee _____ Month of _____ 200___

Date of Meeting	Time— From To	Topics Discussed/Recommendations

_____

Signature of Mentor ***Date***

LINDENWOOD UNIVERSITY
Faculty Mentoring Program
Across-the-University Meetings

Month of _____ 200___

In Attendance:

_____

_____

Guests:

_____

_____

Date of Meeting	**Time— From To**	**Topics Discussed/Recommendations**

Signature of Mentoring Program Facilitator ***Date***

Appendix B
Institutional Review Board (IRB) Application

LINDENWOOD UNIVERSITY

Application for IRB Review of
Research Proposal Involving Human Subjects

1. Title of Project: Project # 09-14

The Effectiveness of the Lindenwood University New Faculty Mentoring Program as Measured by

New Faculty Job Satisfaction

2. Dissertation Chair: Department: Extension: e-mail:

Dr. Tammi Pavelec Chemistry x4454 tpavelec@lindenwood.edu

3. Primary Investigator(s): Department: Local phone: e-mail:

Carla Mueller Human Services x4731 cmueller@lindenwood.edu

4. Anticipated starting date for this project:

September 2008

5. Anticipated ending date for this project:

May 2009

6. State the hypothesis of the proposed research project:

Faculty employed at LU for the Academic Year 2008-09 who participate in the LU New Faculty Mentoring Program will report at least an 80% satisfaction level at the end of the new faculty's first year of employment.

7. State the purpose (objectives) and rationale of the proposed project. Include any questions to be investigated.

Lindenwood University (LU) is a teaching institution that varies considerably in its model of higher education when compared to other colleges and universities. Faculty new to LU anecdotally have experienced a form of culture shock as they

transition from what they have experienced at previous posts to the values/goals/expectations of faculty at LU. The LU New Faculty Mentoring Program was implemented in academic year 2006-07 to facilitate this transition. This research will evaluate the mentoring program's effectiveness as measured by new faculty job satisfaction.

8. Has this research project been reviewed or is it currently being reviewed by an IRB at another institution? If so, please state when, where and disposition (approval/non-approval/pending).

No

9. Participants involved in the study:

a. Indicate how many persons will be recruited as potential participants in this study.

LU participants _____ Undergraduate students

_____ Graduate students

100 Faculty and/or staff **(maximum—28 new faculty; 28 new faculty mentors; 8 Deans; 3 administration (President, Provost, Dean of Faculty); and 30+ voluntary participants of Program Managers and previous mentors/mentees; faculty hired prior to the inception of the program**

Non-LU participants _____ Children

_____ Adolescents

_____ Adults

_____ Seniors

_____ Persons in institutional settings (e.g. nursing homes,

correctional facilities, etc.)

Other (specify):

b. From what source(s) will the potential participants be recruited?

_____ LU undergraduate and/or graduate classes

_____ LU Human Subject Pool (LU HSP)

__**X**__ Other LU sources (specify)

Mentors/mentees; Program Managers, Deans, executive staff for Academic Year 2008-09; Mentors/mentees from Academic Year 2007-08

___ School boards (districts)

_____ Greater St. Charles community

_____ Agencies (please list) _____

_____ Businesses (please list) _____

_____ Health care settings, nursing homes, etc. (please list)

_____

Other (specify):

c. If any persons within the selected group(s) are being excluded, please explain who is being excluded and why. (Note: According to the Office of LU HSP, all students within the LU Human Subject Pool must be allowed to participate, although exclusion of certain subjects may be made when analyzing data.)

None

d. Describe how and by whom the potential participants will be recruited. Provide a copy of any materials to be used for recruitment (e.g. posters, flyers, advertisements, letters, telephone and other verbal scripts).

The faculty/administrators that have direct involvement with first-year faculty will be asked to participate in the evaluation of this program via e-mail and personal invitation.

e. Where will the study take place?

__x__ On campus – Explain: **Classrooms and conference rooms for surveys and focus groups, faculty offices for interviews**

___ Off campus – Explain:

10. Methodology/procedures:

a. Provide a sequential description of the procedures to be used in this study.

Qualitative and quantitative data collection:

New faculty survey of job satisfaction (since the majority of new faculty are on the day, semester schedule, the surveys will be administered per those schedules:

- **Prior to September 20, 2008, new faculty will be surveyed anonymously as to their job satisfaction.**
- **At mid-year in January 2009, new faculty will be anonymously surveyed as to their job satisfaction.**
- **At the end of the first year of faculty employment at LU, by May 30, 2009, new faculty will be anonymously surveyed as to their job satisfaction.**
- **Data will be evaluated to determine the satisfaction percentage on all indicators on the survey including overall job satisfaction.**
- **Comparison of data at the beginning of the academic year to mid-year to year's end will measure influence on job satisfaction.**

Aggregated data from records from mentors as to hours spent in mentoring sessions and attendance records from the across-the university meetings.

- **Data will be collated to assess the level of participation in the New Faculty Mentoring Program by the entire group of new faculty.**

Focus groups and interviews:

- **A focus group with the Deans' Council, Provost and Dean of Faculty and a focus group with Programs Managers of new faculty will be conducted in April 2009 to evaluate the effectiveness of the New Faculty Mentoring Program.**
- **Voluntary interviews with mentor/mentee pairs; new faculty; mentors; and faculty hired prior to the development of the New Faculty Mentoring Program will be conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the New Faculty Mentoring Program. Interviews will be held between September 2008 and March 2009.**
- **Comparison of pre/post program implementation data will be compiled.**
- **All data from face-to-face contacts will be presented in aggregate form. Written permission will be secured for the use of direct quotes or information that may identify the source.**
- **Information obtained will be integrated into the research on the program's effectiveness and into recommendations for improvement.**

Case study

- **With consent from the participant(s), individual case study of a new faculty person describing the process of induction to LU and the effectiveness of the mentoring program on job satisfaction of that individual. Information will be collected via individual interviewing on at least a monthly basis.**
- **All data from face-to-face contacts will be presented in aggregate form. Written permission will be secured for the use of direct quotes or information that may identify the source.**

b. Which of the following procedures will be used? Provide a copy of all materials to be used in this study.

Survey(s) or questionnaire(s) (mail-back)-Are they standardized?

x **Survey(s) or questionnaire(s) (in person)-Are they standardized? No**

Computer-administered task(s) or survey(s)-Are they standardized?

x **Interview(s) (in person)**

Interview(s) (by telephone)

x **Focus group(s)**

Audiotaping

Videotaping

Analysis of secondary data (no involvement with human participants)

Invasive physiological measurement (e.g. venipuncture, catheter insertion, muscle biopsy, collection of other tissues, etc.) Explain:

Other (specify):

11. How will results of this research be made accessible to participants? Explain and attach a copy of any forms that will be used.

The results of this research will be made available via file access to pc common at Lindenwood University.

12. Potential Benefits and Compensation from the Study:

a. Identify and describe anticipated benefits (health, psychological or social benefits) to the participants from their involvement in the project.

It is expected that benefits will include inclusion in improving the mentoring program.

b. Identify and describe any known or anticipated benefits to society from this study.

Possible indirect benefits will be increased self-satisfaction by focusing on helping new faculty become acclimated to Lindenwood.

c. Describe any anticipated compensation (monetary, grades, extra credit, other) to participants.

No compensation will be granted to participants.

13. Potential Risks from the Study:

a. Identify and describe any known or anticipated risks to participants involved in this study. Include physiological, psychological, emotional, social, economic, legal, etc. risks/stressors. A study-specific medical screening form must be included when physiological assessments are used and associated risk(s) to participants are greater than what would be expected in normal daily activities.

As new employment may be stressful, some psychological stress may be experienced by participants.

b. Will deception be used in this study? If so, explain the rationale.

No.

c. Does this project involve information about sensitive behavior, such as sexual behavior, drug/alcohol use, or illegal behavior? If so, explain.

No.

d. Are vulnerable populations (children, institutionalized persons, pregnant women, persons with impaired judgment) used as subjects for this study? If so, explain.

New faculty may be a somewhat vulnerable population and may feel obligated to participate.

Therefore, the voluntary nature of this study will be emphasized in all communications. All surveys will be anonymous and non-identifiable. Voluntary participation in individual interviews or mentor/mentee pairs will be solicited via a general LU email. Informed consent forms will be signed as acknowledgement of understanding prior to participation.

e. Describe the procedures or safeguards in place to protect the physical and psychological health of the participants in light of the risks/stresses identified above. Include procedures in place for handling any adverse events, referral services, etc.

Participants will be consistently informed as to the voluntary basis of participation in this study. Participants are allowed to withdraw at any time.

14. Informed Consent Process:

a. What process will be used to inform the potential participants about the study details and to obtain their consent for participation?

x **Information letter with written consent form for participants or their legally authorized agents; provide a copy. (Attached)**

x **Information letter with written or verbal consent from director of institutions involved; provide a copy. (Attached)**

_____ Information letter with written or verbal consent from teachers in classrooms or daycare; provide a copy.

Other (specify):

x **Information letter with written consent form for use of quotes or identifiable source information; provide a copy. (Attached)**

b. What special provisions have been made for informed consent for non-English speaking persons, mentally disabled or other populations for whom there may be difficulty in providing informed consent?

All participants are expected to be proficient in English; should a translator be required, one will be provided.

15. Anonymity of Participants and Confidentiality of Data:

a. Explain the procedures to be used to ensure anonymity of participants and confidentiality of data both during the research and in the release of the findings.

Surveys will be administered with the researcher out of the room. Answers to surveys are to be circled with no identifiable information. Survey informed consent is implied with completion. Individual or focus group information will be presented in aggregate form unless permission is obtained; summary responses will be published. Informed consent acknowledgement will be made by personal signature prior to interview/focus group participation. Notes will be secured in a locked file cabinet in a locked office or in a password-protected LU computer file.

b. How will confidentiality be explained to participants?

See attached letters explaining informed consent and confidentiality.

c. Indicate the duration and location of secure data storage and the method to be used for final disposition of the data.

Paper Records

_____ Confidential shredding after _____ years.

x Data will be retained indefinitely in a secure location

Locked file cabinet in LU office.

_____ Data will be retained until completion of specific course and then destroyed.

Audio/video Recordings

_____ Erasing of audio/video tapes after _____ years.

_____ Data will be retained indefinitely in a secure location.

_____ Data will be retained until completion of specific course and then destroyed.

Electronic Data

_____ Erasing of electronic data after _____ years.

x Data will be retained indefinitely in a secure location.

Password protected file on LU computer.

_____ Data will be retained until completion of specific course and then destroyed.

Other:

Specify Location:

16. Researchers must ensure that all supporting materials/documentation for their applications are submitted with the signed, hard copies of the IRB Research Proposal Form. Please check below all appendices that are attached as part of your application package. Submission of an incomplete application package will increase the duration of the IRB review process.

Recruitment materials: A copy of any posters, fliers, advertisements, letters, telephone or other verbal scripts used to recruit/gain access to participants (see 9d).

x **Materials: A copy of all surveys, questionnaires, interview questions, interview themes/sample questions for open-ended interviews, focus group questions, or any standardized tests used to collect data (see 10b).**

Feedback letter (see 11).

Medical screening Form: Must be included for all physiological measurements involving greater than minimal risk, and tailored for each study (see 13a).

x **Information letter and consent forms used in studies involving interaction with participants (see 14a).**

x **Information/Cover letters used in studies involving surveys or questionnaires (see 14a).**

_____ Parent information letter and permission form for studies involving minors (see 14a).

_____ Other:

Appendix C

Schedule of LUNFMP Across-the-university Meetings and Attendance

Month	Topic	Number of Faculty in Attendance
August 2008	Orientation	24
September 2008	History of Lindenwood	23
October 2008	The Lindenwood Model	18
November 2008	Home/work Balance	19
January 2009	Reception with the President	16
February 2009	At-risk Students	13
April 2009	The Second Year	14

Figure 1. Schedule of across-the-university meetings and attendance during the 2008-09 academic year. The number of faculty of the 28 faculty members new to Lindenwood who attended the meeting was included.

Appendix D

Lindenwood University New Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey

Lindenwood University New Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey

Directions: Please circle the most appropriate response.

Gender: Male Female

Years of college-level teaching experience:

0-1 1-3 3-5 5-7 7-10 10 or more

1. Working conditions (hours, office space, equipment, classrooms, etc.)

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

2. Faculty development

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

3. Quality of students (engaged in learning, prepared for college-level expectations)

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

4. Academic freedom (the unrestricted ability to teach or communicate ideas/facts)

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

5. Teaching load

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

6. Salary

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

7. Advising expectations

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

8. LU's promotion of academic integrity

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

9. Quality of mentoring

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

10. Communication

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

11. Rewards and recognition

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

12. Relationship with administration

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

13. Professional relationships with other faculty

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

14. Job security

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

15. Benefits

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

16. Home/work balance

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

17. Faculty morale

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

18. Inclusion

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

19. Respect for diverse perspectives

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

20. Overall job satisfaction

1	2	3	4	5
Very dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neutral**	**Satisfied**	**Very satisfied**

Appendix E

Characteristics of Subjects

Gender	14 male	14 female

Figure 2. Gender of the subjects. Of the 28 faculty new to Lindenwood University in academic year 2008-09, 50% were male and 50% were female.

Terminal Degrees	18 terminal degrees	10 non-terminal degrees

Figure 3. Terminal degrees. Of the 28 faculty new to Lindenwood University in academic year 2008-09, 64% had terminal degrees; 36% had non-terminal degrees.

Division	Belleville	Boone Home	Business	Communication	Education	Fine Arts	Human Services	Humanities	Sciences
Number of Faculty	1	1	10	3	6	2	1	2	2

Figure 4. Employed by division. Of the 28 faculty new to Lindenwood University in academic year 2008-09, all divisions had at least one new faculty member. Business and Education, having the largest number of majors, had the greatest number of new faculty.

Gender of survey participants	Number completing survey	Number Male	Number Female	Did Not Indicate
September 2008	22	7	13	2
January 2009	14	5	7	2
April 2009	13	4	7	2

Figure 5. Gender of survey participants.

Survey participants per years of teaching experience	0-1 year	1 to 3 years	3 to 5 years	5 to 7 years	7 to 10 years	10 or more years	Did not indicate
September 2008	4	3	3	3	6	3	0
January 2009	1	2	1	1	2	5	2
April 2009	0	3	1	3	1	3	2

Figure 6. Years of teaching experience of survey participants.

Appendix F

Informed Consent Letter

Dear new LU faculty member,

I am inviting you to participate in a research project towards my dissertation for the Ed. D. at Lindenwood. I am exploring if there is a relationship between the LU New Faculty Mentoring Program and job satisfaction for new faculty at Lindenwood. This is part of the evaluation of the effectiveness of the program. This includes a survey of the 2008-09 new faculty (who agree to participate) at the beginning of the academic year (August 2008), at mid-year (January 2009) and at the end of the school year (May 2009).

If you decide to participate, please complete the enclosed survey. Completion of this survey is implied consent. It should take you no more than twenty minutes to take. This is to be anonymous information. I will leave the room while you are completing the information.

Please return the survey to the envelope and leave the envelope at the front of the room when completed; I will collect the envelopes when one of you tells me that the group is done.

There are no risks to your participation or lack of participation in this research—it is strictly voluntary; there are no penalties if you do not participate. You are free to discontinue participation at any time. Please put no identifying information on your surveys to ensure confidentiality.

When my research is completed, I will post the findings on a file on pccommon at LU. I will notify all new faculty of its availability.

Thank you for your consideration of participation. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at cmueller@lindenwood.edu or at 636-949-4731.

Sincerely,

Carla Mueller

Appendix G

Interview Questions

Questions for Interviews, Academic Year 2008-09

What are the best aspects of the LU New Faculty Mentoring Program?

What are the worst aspects of the LU New Faculty Mentoring Program?

Does the LU New Faculty Mentoring Program meet your needs as a _____ (President, Provost, Dean of Faculty, Dean, Program Manager, Mentor or Mentee)?

Does the LU New Faculty Mentoring Program affect job satisfaction of new faculty at LU? If so, how?

What recommendations would you make to improve the LU New Faculty Mentoring Program?

Appendix H

Consent to Participate

Thank you for your consideration of participation in my research study for my dissertation in the Ed. D. Program at Lindenwood. My research will include interviewing key LU personnel including administrators, faculty, mentors, and mentees. My purpose is to explore if there is a relationship between the LU New Faculty Mentoring Program and job satisfaction of faculty new to teaching at Lindenwood.

As a mentee in the 2008-09 academic year, you are a critical part of the evaluation of this program. To maintain confidentiality, Debra Johnson, will be conducting the interviews and presenting the data to me without identifying information. I recognize that this will be a remembrance of your experience with the program.

Attached are the questions that will be asked if you are willing to be part of this research. Your participation is completely voluntary. You may stop this interview or leave the room at any time. All data from face-to-face contacts will be presented in aggregate form in my dissertation.

Carla Mueller

I understand that participation in this research is completely voluntary, and I agree to participate.

_____ _____

Interviewee Date

_____ _____

Interviewer Date

Appendix I
Summary of Interviews per Dimension

What are the best aspects of the LU New Faculty Mentoring Program?

Social Dimension

Mentees

- Meeting other new faculty
- Unwritten rules of balancing home/work
- Meeting new faculty
- Having an actual person to go to on anything and everything
- Always being available
- Frequent contact
- Person to provide the personal introduction to campus
- I liked that it was available.
- Meeting other new professors
- Information on balancing work and family
- Did not feel on my own
- Having an accessible faculty member
- Mentor checked in on me
- Didn't need to be in my field to be helpful
- Took care of me

Previous years' mentees:

- Meeting everyone despite departments
- Got to know others

Mentor

- "A fulfilling experience"

Mentor/Mentee Pair:

- "an officially sanctioned place to ask a stupid question"
- You know that you have someone you can go to; "He's there for me."
- Helped get me past the nervous/worried phase
- Always there—"like a big brother"
- Feels good to be useful
- Genuinely concerned; would check in; send reminders of deadlines
- It helped that our personalities "clicked".

Department Chair

- Gives the mentee "their person" to ask
- My experience when I was hired was that I had to seek out a mentor. This is better.
- Helps the new person feel part of the LU community much faster

Deans Council

- A safe place for new faculty
- A mentor is a place for private conversation without an administrator
- Interconnectedness
- One-on-one mentor who was focused and accountable

What are the best aspects of the LU New Faculty Mentoring Program?

Employee Dimension

Mentees

- Learning expectations
- Some helpful information (some not)
- Getting to know the difference from being an adjunct
- Good relevant topics
- Learning about the resources

Previous years' mentees

- Could attend one of two meetings
- Concrete information on who to go to
- The "LU does it this way" information

Mentor

- Enjoyed helping in the transition from a non-academic experience to LU
- Like explaining the campus and how it works

Mentor/Mentee Pair

- Liked the formal structure of the program

Department Chair

- Like that it is structured
- Comprehensive—informal, formalized with regular meetings

Deans Council

- Presents the LU model
- Designed with LU faculty and the entire LU academic community
- Consistent and thorough
- Seen as a responsibility of LU and administration
- Presentation of uniform policies and procedures

What are the best aspects of the LU New Faculty Mentoring Program?

Teaching Dimension

Mentees

- Cross disciplines represented

Deans Council

- Inter-departmental so new faculty can develop as a cohort outside of his/her department
- University wide
- A global perspective

Vitae

EDUCATION

Doctorate of Education, Educational Leadership
Lindenwood University 2012

Master of Social Work
University of Illinois—Urbana-Champaign 1979

Bachelor of Science, Social Work and Psychology
Southern Illinois University—Carbondale 1976

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Dean, School of Human Services, Lindenwood University, 2007-Present
Associate Professor of Social Work, Lindenwood University, 1998-Present
EAP Consultant, Personal Assistance Services, 2006-Present
Program Manager, Family Resource Center, 1990-1998
Adjunct Instructor, St. Louis University, 1996-1997
Clinical Assistant Professor, Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville, 1997
Supervisor II, Catholic Services for Children & Youth, 1989-1990
Instructor, Kaskaskia College, 1988-1989
Senior Supervisor, Hudelson Baptist Children's Home, 1988-1989
Program Consultant, United Way of Chicago, 1985-1988
Family Therapist, Professional Counseling Associates, 1984-1985
Executive Director, Benton Community Settlement, 1984-1985
Supervisor, Central Baptist Family Services, 1982-1983
Director of Clinical Services, Hudelson Baptist Children's Home, 1979-1982
Instructor, Rend Lake College, 1979-1980
Coordinator of Adult Services, Jefferson County Comprehensive Services, 1976-1979
Social Worker, United Methodist Children's Home, 1976

COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTIONS

City of St. Charles Disabilities Board, Revision of Accessible Services Guidebook
Francis Howell School Board Task Force on Mandatory Drug Testing
Bridgeway Counseling—Domestic Violence Awareness Project
Willow's Way—Employee Training on Assertiveness Training
Crisis Nursery—Training on Cross-cultural Communication