UNDERSTANDING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORK-LIFE FLEXSTYLE, JOB SATISFACTION, AND TURNOVER INTENTION AMONG NEW PROFESSIONALS IN STUDENT AFFAIRS

By

Paolo Artale

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education – Doctor of Philosophy

2020

ABSTRACT

UNDERSTANDING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORK-LIFE FLEXSTYLE, JOB SATISFACTION, AND TURNOVER INTENTION UPON NEW PROFESSIONALS IN STUDENT AFFAIRS

By

Paolo Artale

Attrition amongst new professionals in student affairs has been cited as high as sixty-percent Holmes, Verrier, & Chisholm 1983; Ward, 1995). High rates of employee turnover are problematic for institutions and result in work inefficiencies, costly rehiring processes, and overburdening current employees with increased load (Kantor, 2016). Studies of attrition within student affairs have found several factors that contribute to these high rates of departure including but not limited to heavy workloads, working long and unusual hours, lack of opportunities for advancement, low levels of pay compared to the private sector, difficulty keeping tasks and emotions that originated at work with those at home (and vice versa), and emotional stress due to being personally invested in the lives of students **(**Evans, 1988; Lorden, 1998; Marshall, Gardner, Hughes, & Lowery, 2016; Ward, 1995).

Within the discussion of meeting combating turnover, the topic of workplace flexibility has emerged. Employees are requiring more latitude to deal with issues such as childcare, elder care, as well as other day-to-day needs. While studies have often referred to policies and formal mechanisms regarding workplace flexibility and the impact it has on retention, there has been a lack of discussion around the role flexstyle plays in employee performance and satisfaction. Flexstyle refers to a way of thinking about the relationships between work and personal life (Kossek & Lautsch, 2008).

The purpose of this study was to understand the potential relationship between work-life

flexstyle amongst new student affairs professionals and the variables of job satisfaction and turnover intention. To examine the relationship between flexstyle, job satisfaction, and turnover intention, an electronic survey utilizing Kossek, Ruderman, Braddy, and Hannum's (2012) work-nonwork boundary management assessment, Judge, Locke, Durham, and Kluger's (1998) shortened version of Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) Job Satisfaction Schedule, and Bothma and Roodt's (2013**)** Turnover Intention Scale – 6 (TIS-6) was administered to those who identified as new professionals to members of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) Knowledge Community for Graduate Students and New Professionals, the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), and the Southern Association of College Student Affairs (SACSA). A total of 287 members provided usable data for use in analysis.

Results from the data that utilized ANCOVA showed that significant differences in means existed for behavior factor groups in relation to both job satisfaction and turnover intention. Results from the data that utilized multiple regression showed that significant positive relationships existed between the flexstyle factors of boundary control and work identity with job satisfaction. In addition, data that utilized multiple regression showed that a significant negative relationship existed between the flexstyle factor of boundary control and turnover intention. Implications for student affairs practitioners and researchers and recommendations for future research are also discussed.

Dedicated to my wife Sherri: Thank you for loving me and my dreams.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My success through this program would not have been possible without the help of many. Acknowledgement must begin with my parents Carmen and Tina who fought for me to be integrated into a school system that said I was “special needs” and needed “different schooling” than other children- whatever the heck that means anyways. Thirty-five years later I am walking away with the highest academic degree an individual can earn from the top program in the world in my field. Thank you.

To my advisor and chair Marilyn Amey for taking me on as an advisee and helping me focus emotion into an actual piece of academic work. Not an easy task. I am extremely grateful for all that you have done for me.

To my committee: Dr. Brenden Cantwell, Dr. Roger Baldwin, and Dr. Angela Hall. Thank you for all you have done not just with the dissertation itself but the openness to help me whenever I needed it over the years.

To my family at Toastmasters International. I walked into the meeting room at noon on a Monday in Erickson Hall so that I could learn about Toastmasters and find a venue to practice motivational speaking. What I ended up finding was a group of people who would be my support system, a sounding board for turning academic thought into plain, coherent language (also not an easy task), dear friends, a second family, and the best darn fans a motivational speaker can have. That family has grown from Erickson Hall to across the globe; especially when I became Michigan’s first (and presently only) Accredited Speaker.

To Susan DeRosa; for helping me feel welcome at MSU and supporting me.

To Ed Tate; who often told me to slow down or I'd burn out and that it was ok to go at a slower place in my speaking to get this PhD done. It's also nice to have a world champion of public speaking be one of your biggest supporters.

To University of Toronto Varsity Blues Football Program (Coaches Howlett and Hadley) for giving a walk on kid who looked different and ran like Mr. Snuffleupagous a chance to fulfill his dream. The resilience and grit I learned as part of the program was what got me through this PhD Journey. I will always bleed Varsity Blue.

To my cousin and best friend Cori; this never seemed crazy to you. The debates and talks we had about organizational culture and work-life balance weren't just fun but helped sharpen my knowledge and helped me figure out what was actually reasonable in a corporate context. Now that I'm done, let's start that podcast.

To the HALE faculty and administration, just like my football career, HALE gave me a chance to "walk on" and make something of myself. I did that. Thanks for the opportunity and support along the way.

To the faculty and administrators in the Human Resources and Labor and Industrial Relations Program; thanks for helping me hone my expertise and welcoming me into your program.

To Dr. Ellen Kossek for the support, endless resources, and honest advice through this time. I have learned so much from your work and insight and was always touched by your generosity to me.

To Dr. Elizabeth Heilman who looked at an autoethnography I wrote for our qualitative methods class and said "This is really good. You should get this published." The paper was on my experience with burnout and lack of work-life balance in student affairs. I didn't have a

dissertation topic in my mind at the time. Well…you can read the rest of the story in the coming pages.

To the department of Student Life and Graduate Career Services for giving me the opportunity to be a graduate assistant but always treating me like a professional colleague.

To Dr. Tammison Smith; for pushing me to be my best and accepting nothing less.

To Dr. Matt Helm; for helping me feel like I belonged du ring that rough first year in the program and for being a great mentor.

To the members of my cohort; me getting to this point in the program probably means most of you lost a $20 bet. Sorry about that.

To those who helped me along the way as I birthed this dissertation: Tonya Jamison, Mary Tate, Nicole Jess, Inese Berzina-Pitcher, Erin Carter, Leanne Perry, and John Lowry.

Finally, to my son Alessio and daughter Sofia. Becoming a father in the middle of a PhD was tough. It changed my trajectory, my progress, and so many other things. It was worth every moment, every delay, every challenge. Remember me when I am old and want a villa in Italy to retire. I love you both.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1: Introduction

It is 6:45p.m and Gary has been searching for jobs on indeed.com for 45 minutes; an occurrence that is becoming increasingly regular. At 6pm, Gary was ready to shut down his computer and head home. He has been on campus since 9 am and was excited at the prospect of working a standard business day. Gary has been working 10-12 hour days steadily over the past few weeks and a few weekends. Although it is the beginning of the year, the pace will not slow down that much for him. A quick review of his outlook calendar reveals an average of three late nights per week he will be on campus to advise Campus Activities Board and oversee their events. Some of this wouldn't be so bad if his supervisor Leslie didn't require him to be in the office no later than 8:30 AM or to attend more evening events just to give student organizations moral support. That's why Gary was thrilled when Leslie allowed him to go home at 6 p.m. on the evening Campus Activities Board was showing a movie. The phone rang as he began to shut down his computer.

"Hey Gary, it's Leslie. I have been rethinking things and I need you to be there for movie night just in case there are issues."

Gary sighs. "Campus Activities Board does these all the time. They are ok on their own and if there are issues, they can contact the student union staff or public safety."

"I feel safer if our people are there. See you at our staff meeting at 8:00 a.m. Enjoy the movie!"

Movie night will get done at 11:30 pm when accounting for clean-up etc. It will be almost midnight by the time Gary would get out of the building plus a 30-minute commute to his apartment. Frustrated, Gary turns his computer back on and thinks about how he does not want to be in this environment much longer. He mutters to himself, "There has to be a better way."

Problem Statement

The student affairs profession has seen an attrition rate for new professionals that has been cited to be between 40% and 60% (Holmes, Verrier, & Chisholm 1983; Ward, 1995). A new student affairs professional is defined as someone who has worked full-time in the profession for five years or less. In general, high rates of employee turnover are problematic for institutions and result in work inefficiencies, costly rehiring processes, and overburdening current employees with increased load (Kantor, 2016). Studies of attrition within student affairs have found several factors that contribute to these high rates of departure. Heavy workloads, working long and unusual hours, lack of opportunities for advancement, low levels of pay compared to the private sector, difficulty keeping tasks and emotions that originated at work with those at home (and vice versa), and emotional stress due to being personally invested in the lives of students have all been shown to have some impact on attrition **(**Evans, 1988; Lorden, 1998; Marshall, Gardner, Hughes, & Lowery, 2016; Ward, 1995). To minimize disruption, colleges and universities have sought ways to support staff and encourage stability within the organization. Researchers have recommended several interventions to reduce turnover rates in the field including investing more in professional development of staff, more targeted recruiting structures, and meeting employees' personal needs (Johnsrud & Rosser, 1999; Lorden, 1998; Tull, 2006). Minimizing the turnover rates of new professionals is important as retention helps build and strengthen a knowledgeable and talented workforce. This can be heightened within the student affairs context given that many professionals find their way into the field and did not enter college with student affairs as a career ambition. As a result, losing new professionals means losing skillsets and institutional knowledge that takes several years to train and thus becomes difficult to replace.

Indeed, meeting employees' personal needs are as important as familial situations have become increasingly complex (Lee, Walker, & Shoup, 2001; Odle-Dousseau, Hammer, Crain, & Bodner, 2016). Within the discussion of meeting employee needs, the topic of workplace flexibility has emerged. Employees are requiring more latitude to deal with issues such as childcare, elder care, as well as other day-to-day needs. Workplace flexibility in the form of being able to control one's schedule in order to meet needs has become an area of focus in research and at institutions. While studies have often referred to policies and formal mechanisms regarding workplace flexibility, there has been a lack of discussion around the role flexstyle plays in employee performance and satisfaction. Flexstyle refers to a way of thinking about the relationships between work and personal life (Kossek & Lautsch, 2008). Within the human resource literature, work-life flexstyles have emerged as a way to bring greater harmony between one's preferred way of working and one's job, creating routines that are "win-win" for employer and employee, increase employee retention, and generally increasing satisfaction in the workplace and are the primary framework of the present study (Kossek & Lautsch, 2008).

Studying retention from a flexstyle perspective is important given the mixture of employee personal needs do not always coincide with traditional office hours and work commitments often bleed past the traditional 9 to 5 structure (Massman, Kibertz, Gregory, McCance, & Biga, 2015). Flexibility then becomes an important tool in retaining employees as it gives them the control to meet both their personal and professional demands, which in turn decreases the desire to find work elsewhere. It should be noted that the traditional 9-to-5 workplace structure was a product of industrialism at a time when rational systems of production were dominant in manufacturing industries, where most households were one income families and where the world was not nearly as integrated as it is today (Grossman, 1978). Integration

refers to blending and blurring of personal/professional domains caused by the increased rise in communications technology such as cell phones, social media, and other wireless devices. Employees and employers now have the ability to communicate with each other at all hours and across different time zones presenting a unique (but not unconquerable challenge). Presently, smart technology and increasing pressures for student affairs divisions to do more with less have further blurred the lines between work and personal life (Golden & Geisler, 2007; Schieman & Young, 2013; Schlacter, McDowall, Cropley, & Inceoglu, 2017).

Workplace flexibility is a need employees of all generations have. If one was to use the broad stroke of generational labels, each generation views work-life balance (and flexibility differently. Generation Xers (born roughly between 1965-1980) value time with family and work-life initiatives but do so from a systemic approach. Generation Xers look for work-life balance from a company and value aspects such as PTO and flexible work policies to enable them to meet both their personal and professional needs (Kohll, 2018). Over the past ten years, generation Xers are also requiring more time to take care ailing family members from the prior baby boomer generation. Baby boomers (born between 1945-1965) are looking to continue working but in part-time and alternative work capacities and Millennials seek flexibility and work-life balance as essential components to their careers (Eisner, 2005). Added to this is the workforce trend that expects the option for more flexible work arrangements and work places that promote better work-life balance (Bennett, Baehr, & Ivanitskaya, 2017; Hershatter & Epstein, 2010). Thus, both boomers and generation Xers have an interest in alternative and flexible work arrangements.

Generations Y (Millennials) and Z have a need not only for work-life balance in the form of flexible policies, but go further in that they seek jobs that align with their values and their

lifestyle preferences. Millennials value a personalized experience, social responsibility, and generally look for companies that promote positive cultures. It should be noted that at present Millennials are the largest generation in the labor force accounting for more than 35% of workers; a number that will continue to grow (Fry, 2018). This shift in attitude becomes important when discussing work-life and work-flexibility issues because organizations who want to retain their top (millennial) talent need to begin to think more creatively about how work is constructed. Both Millennials and Generation Z have work-life philosophies that contrast with the traditional work structure with the former enjoying the mashup of work and life and the latter valuing self-direction and flexibility to accomplish tasks (Pulevska-Ivanovska, Postolov, Janeska-Iliev, & Magdinceva, 2017). As Millennials and Generation Z continue to grow and represent a majority in the workforce the most successful companies will be those who adapt to and adjust to the needs of multiple generations in the workplace (Berkup, 2014; Pulevska-Ivanovska, et al., 2017).

In student affairs this is increasingly important as Millennials and eventually Generation Z graduates will comprise a significant percentage of entry level staff - especially since student affairs gains much of its workforce from recent graduates and has the lowest average starting age of any unit in college administration (Pritchard & McChesney, 2018). Furthermore, personal situations and preferences are diverse, can have an impact on job satisfaction, intent-to-stay, and are impacted by managerial relationships (Rosser & Javinar, 2003; Tull, 2006). The diversity of personal situations and preferences are further complicated in student affairs because of the large variance in student affairs jobs. Examples of jobs within student affairs include but are not limited to fraternity/sorority advisor, student activities coordinator, career counselor, admissions counselor, and orientation coordinator. Each of these positions has a different set of expectations

regarding workload, scheduling, and relationships with students and are further impacted by managerial philosophy. This variation is important in examining flexstyle and satisfaction/turnover intention as certain flexstyle preferences may be a better fit for specific job roles. Theoretically, a new professional who prefers more separation between work and family life may be better suited in academic advising that has more defined working hours versus student activities that requires a greater range of availability during the week.

Finally, linkages between satisfaction and turnover intention have been shown in the literature. Generally, we know that as employees become more dissatisfied, they are more likely to make departure plans (Mobley, 1977; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Literature also shows that employees are more willing to stay if interventions can be made to improve work-life situations and/or address workplace problems (Kossek & Lautsch, 2018; Kossek, 2012; Moen, Kelly, Fan, Lee, Almeida, Kossek, & Buxton, 2016).

The relationship flexstyle has with satisfaction can be used as another method of identifying turnover that would negatively impact the operations of the unit, also known as negative turnover (Kossek, 2012). As stated, the needs of employees can be complex and can compete directly with their duties at work. The less control employees have of their ability to manage and curate both work and personal demands successfully via flexibility, the more likely they are to be dissatisfied. In addition, employees who are able to exercise control and choice of how they integrate (or not integrate) work and life are more likely to stay in their roles as they feel their current work situation meets their needs and enables them to be successful in all areas of life.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to understand the potential relationship between work-life flexstyle amongst new student affairs professionals and the variables of job satisfaction and turnover intention. Given a high five-year turnover rate in the student affairs profession that ranges between 40-60% and the limited literature on the topic of flexstyle in student affairs, a study such as this is useful in helping to gauge a strong connection between new professionals and their overall fit into the student affairs profession (Holmes, Verier, & Chisholm 1983; Ward, 1995). It should be noted that although extrinsic factors have been shown to have an impact on attrition in the profession (i.e., pay and lack of promotion), this study will focus on intrinsic preference as defined through the flexstyle assessment (Evans, 1988; Sagaria & Johnsrud, 1988).

Research Questions

Based on the information presented, the two overarching research questions in this study were:

a) What is the relationship between work-life flexstyle and job satisfaction among new student affairs professionals?
b) What is the relationship between work-life flexstyle and turnover intention among new student affairs professionals?

Background

There is an old cliché that says people do not leave jobs; they leave situations. In other words, an employee is more likely to leave a position when either their environment or their situation infringes on some aspect of their personal domain (i.e., time, values/beliefs, feeling valued, etc.). Within a student affairs context an example of this is represented by the Campus Activities Board Advisor who may love their work but who may experience negative feelings towards their job since it often involves working weekends, staying late to supervise events, and

then having to be on campus at 8am the next morning for meetings. The advisor's feelings and attitudes towards work are more likely to turn negative when the nature of the job bleeds into their personal life or if the position does not lot allow enough flexibility to travel between personal and professional domains. What results is a realization that the advisor's work-life is now encroaching upon their personal life and having negative effects such as thoughts about leaving the job or the profession altogether. Thus, the stage is being set for employee turnover and/or dissatisfaction.

Turnover refers to the number or percentage of workers who leave and are replaced in an organization (Fischer, Schoenfelt, & Shaw, 2006). Staff leave their positions for a variety of reasons ranging from promotion to termination due to poor job performance. Although turnover itself is not inherently negative as open positions can make way for new and talented individuals, high turnover rates should be monitored closely since these rates can be indicative of a negative work culture (Arocas & Camps, 2007; Hester, 2015). High turnover can also reflect undesirable organizational outcomes such as loss of employees (and the organizational knowledge they had accumulated), a disruption in operations, short-term increased workload on other employees, and increased strain on existing employees to socialize/train incoming employees (Hale, Ployhart, & Shepherd, 2016; Hancock, Allen, Bosco, McDaniel, & Pierce, 2013). Within the human resource literature, it is known that losing a staff member and having to fill that vacancy costs anywhere from one-third to over 250% of the employee salary (Fischer, Schoenfelt, & Shaw, 2006; Hester, 2015).

Reducing turnover in an attempt to keep qualified staff is a process companies take seriously. It should be noted that that not all turnover is bad and that some positions are created with the expectation that the employee will leave within two or three years. With this in mind,

however, professions such as student affairs that have high attrition rates should look at initiatives that facilitate transition from one job in the profession to another whenever possible. Work-life balance initiatives are one of the methods used to combat turnover and in recent years have gained attention over more traditional methods such as intentional pre-screening/selection processes, incentive programs, strategic compensation packages, and mentoring programs (Earnest, Allen, & Landis, 2011; McNall, Masuda, & Nicklin, 2009). Work-life initiatives can be defined as tactics that aim to alleviate conflict between work and personal commitments and include initiatives such as reduced work-schedules, compressed or flexible work-schedules, and assistance with childcare, telecommuting, and family leave policies (Cook, 2004). Organizations that invest in work-family policies and practices see lower turnover and burnout rates, and higher job satisfaction rates (Bloom, Kretschmer, & Van Reenen, 2009; Moen, Kelly, & Hill, 2011).

One work-life initiative that can be used as a means to increase employee retention and satisfaction comes through examining work-life flexstyle. Work-life flexstyle refers to the psychological and physical ways in which a person manages the flexibility between their personal and professional lives in order to create a positive balance (Kossek & Lautsch, 2008). In Kossek and Lautsch's (2008) book *CEO of ME* there are three overarching flexstyle types that each contain two subtypes: integrators (those who mesh work and family), separators (those who draws distinct boundaries between work and family), and volleyers (those who both separate and integrate at various points in their life). More information on the flexstyles and their subtypes is given in the theoretical framework section of this chapter.

No single flexstyle is inherently good nor bad; it just is. Conflict occurs however when an individuals' preferred flexstyle does not mesh well with their work environment or when the individual loses control over how to navigate the spaces between personal and professional

commitments and domains. When this occurs, there is a greater chance of job dissatisfaction and turnover occurring in the workplace.

The issue of turnover is all too familiar when referring to student affairs administrators, who are those who work directly with students in non-academic positions in a post-secondary setting (NASPA, 2017; Schuh, Jones, & Harper, 2011). Studies show that the attrition rate for student affairs professionals within the first five years on the job hovers between forty and sixty percent (Evans, 1998; Lorden, 1998; Renn & Hodges, 2007; Tull, 2006). The reasons for attrition/turnover in the student affairs profession have been well documented over the years. Some studies have shown the impact job design has played on departure, and the design of jobs that target new professionals in student affairs may contribute to departure from the profession. By their nature, some jobs require a blending of work and personal life more than others do. For example, those employed in fraternity/sorority life require a more fluid schedule to tend to the needs of the Greek community and to address issues that suddenly occur. This fluidity needed to successfully perform the job would most likely better suit an integrator versus a separator (Kossek & Lautsch, 2008).

In addition to issues of job design, the literature has shown that there are cultural variables that lead to turnover in the profession as well. The culture of student affairs work promotes working long and irregular schedules, being overwhelmed by duties, increased workloads due to working with diminished financial and human resources, as well as a professional culture that discourages employees from utilizing work-life initiatives (Brewer & Clippard, 2002; Tarver, Canada, & Lim, 1999). In turn, the challenges and constraints listed above contribute to lower satisfaction rates and higher turnover intention of student affairs professionals- particularly new professionals.

Furthermore, new professionals are socialized into a professional culture where the needs of the profession/job must often come before personal needs (Davidson, 2009). This is not always immediately evident to the entry level professional given that many student affairs administrators fell into this line of work. Taub and McEwan (2006) note that many professionals enter student affairs work because they enjoyed being student leaders as undergraduates and became aware of student affairs as a profession as they approached graduation. Decisions to enter the profession were also typically made later in a student's academic career and often because an administrator made them aware of student affairs work as a career option. As a result, those new to student affairs work have a passion for their work but enter the field with little or no concept of the work-life culture in the profession. In sum, the combination of the design of entry-level student affairs administration jobs, the culture of student affairs work and little knowledge about what the profession entails for new professionals creates a tension between the employees' personal and professional domains. In fact, the literature suggests that the conflict between personal and professional domains is one of the chief factors in departure and dissatisfaction in the profession (Lagana, 2007; Lorden 1998; Rosser & Javinar, 2003; Volkwein & Zhou, 2003). Although work-life conflict has been identified as a factor in departure in student affairs, no study has examined the role work-life flexstyle (that is to say, how one prefers or wishes their work and life to interact) may have in gauging satisfaction and turnover intention among new student affairs professionals. Examining the impact of flexstyle can help give insight into the intrinsic reasons people leave (or stay) with an organization.

While studies have not looked at work-life flexstyle amongst student affairs administrators, a few have delved into how internal belief systems influences employee satisfaction via locus of control (Tarver, Canada, & Lim, 1999; Tull & Freeman, 2011). Locus

of control refers to the extent to which a person believes they can influence events and comes in two forms: internal and external. Those with internal locus of control believe they can influence events; individuals with external locus of control believe that external events and forces influence them (Rotter as cited in Tarver, Canada, & Lim, 1999). Tarver et al. (1999) studied locus of control amongst 600 student affairs administrators and found that administrators with an internal locus of control reported better job satisfaction rates and were less likely to consider leaving the organization since they believed they could institute change and regulate their work environment. In other words, preference and perceived situational control did have some relationship to satisfaction.

Building upon Tarver et al.'s (1999) study, Tull and Freeman (2011) sought to find a correlation between locus of control and Bolman and Deal's (2003) organizational frameworks by surveying 487 student affairs professionals. According to Bolman and Deal (2003), organizational behavior is best understood via one of four frames: the structural frame (values standardization and systemic principles); the human resource frame (focus on individuals); the political frame (focus on coalitions and gaining influence/power); and the symbolic frame (focus on common symbols and experiences to unite the organization). Tull and Freeman (2011) found that student affairs professionals predominantly identified with the human resources frame and external locus of control. These results imply that although student affairs professionals value relationships and group norms, they often do so at the expense of their own work-life control (Tull & Freeman, 2011). From a work-life perspective, conceding control over factors such as schedules, workload, etc., is linked to lower satisfaction levels and higher likelihood of departure from the job (Lyness, Gornick, Stone, & Grotto, 2012; Tarver et al., 1999**).**

The Tarver et al. (1999) and Tull and Freeman (2011) studies are important in the context of this study as work-life flexstyles are a reflection of internal belief systems and personal preference on how work and life should interact (Kossek & Lautsch, 2008). Some studies examining student affairs administrators have given insight into how control over schedule affects job satisfaction and intent to leave. From an organizational standpoint, employees who reported a strong perception of control over their schedules and work environments reported higher levels of job satisfaction (Lyness et al., 2012).

Theoretical Frameworks

Flexstyle is rooted in boundary theory. Boundary theory examines how people construct and navigate their own personal boundaries and becomes a principal framework in understanding the principle framework of this study: work-life flexstyle.

Boundary Theory

Boundary theory begins with Nippert-Eng's (1996) work that discusses how people either integrate their personalities in all aspects of life or have distinct personalities depending on what they are doing or where they are. Clark (2000) expands on this concept by concluding that people are the authors of their own domains and that the self-determination of boundaries is what leads to increased levels of happiness, control and satisfaction. Clark (2000) also recognizes that although people create their own borders, these borders are impacted and manipulated by several external actors. When the demands from these external actors are not congruent with the individuals then tension occurs. Moreover, the permeability (ability to be physically present in one domain but mentally in another) and flexibility (the pliability of specific roles and domains) of these boundaries are critical in determining if an individual is able to maintain a healthy work-life balance. An example within the student affairs administrative context would be the

Fraternity/Sorority Life coordinator who chooses to separate her life. Although she will occasionally check emails at home, she does not do so while her children are awake. Likewise, she does not give out her personal cell phone number to students and only to select staff for emergency purposes. With that in mind, the late nights on the job and the insistence that she be available at all times for students begins to conflict with the impermeable boundaries she is trying to erect. Thus, when the coordinator is at an event her thoughts are less on what needs to be done and more on how she sees less of her family or begins to question if her presence is even necessary and when she will ever have adequate time to spend with her family.

Work-Life Flexstyle

Flexstyle has been chosen as the theoretical framework for this study as it gives a new and needed insight into the factors of job satisfaction, turnover intention and work-life preference, and provides a fresh perspective on the work-life debate within the profession. Flexstyle looks at one's work-life from a more personal perspective by taking into account personality, job and personal (and/or family) situation. Flexstyle is also a holistic approach that combines several work-life theories into its matrix, most notably spillover theory and boundary control theory (Hannum, Kossek, & Ruderman, 2011). Spillover theory discusses the extent to which personal and professional domains interfere and interact with one another (Hill, Ferris, & Martinson, 2003). Boundary control theory discusses the extent to which people can control (or perceive to control) their work-life boundaries (Clark, 2000). Boundary control and spillover are infused into the three distinct flexstyle categories (and subcategories) of integrators (fusion lovers, reactors), separators (firsters, captives), and volleyers (quality timers, job warriors) (Kossek & Lautsch, 2008). These flexstyle categories deal with how much control one has over their boundaries and the extent to which an individual wants their work and personal lives to

bleed/spillover into each other. For example, individuals who have a higher tendency to have distinct work-life boundary controls such as no emails at home, or no personal calls at work may be classified as separators. Likewise, those who are comfortable with work and life blending and spilling over into each other may more likely be integrators. Volleyers are individuals who prefer to shift their attention to what is most important at the time. In student affairs this can be the Fraternity/Sorority Life Advisor who will concentrate their attention and hours into Greek Week and Recruitment Week activities but will become more available to family during periods when commitments are minimal. In addition, the concepts of boundary control and spillover help determine whether well-being and happiness levels are high or low. For example, an individual who may prefer to have strict boundaries between their different life aspects but has low boundary control via working in a more integrative environment (i.e., a residence hall director) will experience a lower well-being/happiness level on the assessment.

The definition of flexstyle has changed and evolved over the years. Kossek and Lautsch's (2008) work categorized flexstyle into three overarching categories (integrator, volleyer, and separator). In 2011, the work-life inventory (WLI) (Hannum, Braddy, Leslie, Ruderman, & Kossel, 2011)) built upon *CEO of ME* (Kossek and Lautsch, 2008) and looked at flexstyle via three distinct factors (behavior factor, control factor, and identity factor). Each factor had its' own classifications. Based on Hannum et al. (2011), the three factors and their sub-classifications are as follows.

Behavior Factor

Table 1 Description of Behavior Factor Sub-classifications

Cyclers	Cyclers switch between periods of highly integrating family and work and periods of deliberately separating them. This is done based on priorities and circumstances. Such a shift of behavior pattern is done on an established cycle.

Table 1 (cont'd)

Family Firsters	This group allows family to interrupt work but do not allow work to interrupt family.
Integrators	This group blends work and personal tasks consistently.
Separators	Separators keep establish boundaries between work and personal life. Specific blocks of time are committed to both work and family with no interruption of one domain by the other.
Work Firsters	This groups permits work to interrupt family time but do not like family to interrupt work time.

Control Factor

Table 2 Description of Control Factor Sub-classifications

High Control	Individuals with high-level control have the ability and authority to control their time and interruptions between work and family.
Midlevel Control	Individuals with midlevel control have some ability and authority to control their time and interruptions between work and personal life. Individuals with midlevel control may also be in a work situation that allows for adaptation as needed.
Low Control	Individuals with low control have a life that is constructed in such a way that they have fixed boundaries around when, where, and how they work; making it difficult to address family needs in an optimal fashion.

Identity Factor

Table 3 Description of Identity Factor Sub-classifications

Dual Focused	Dual focused individuals identify and invest equally in their work and family. Days are constructed to give energy equally to both domains.
Family Focused	Family focused individuals identify with and channel most of their energy into their family roles. Lives are structured to best meet familial needs and commitments.
Other Focused	Individuals who are other focused invest time and energy into identities that are not work and family related. Examples include athletics, volunteering, performing arts, motivational speaking etc. As a result, other focused individuals try to funnel as much time as possible into these other endeavors.
Work Focused	Work focused individuals identify with and channel most of their energy into their career. Lives are structured to best meet professional needs and commitments.

Methods

This study attempted to answer the research questions: 1) what is the relationship between flexstyle and job satisfaction among new student affairs professionals, and 2) what is the relationship between flexstyle and turnover intention among new student affairs professionals by conducting a quantitative analysis. Quantitative analysis was the best choice for answering the research questions because I sought to gain a general understanding of new professionals in student affairs. Moreover, quantitative analysis has the ability for me understand correlation (and possible causation) between two variables. Participants for the study were drawn from the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) Knowledge Community for Graduate Students and New Professionals, and the Southern Association of College Student Affairs (SACSA), which were all organizations that serve the student affairs profession as a whole.

Given that one single instrument does not exist to answer all these research questions, four separate (and validated) assessments were utilized and will be described in more detail in Chapter 3. To determine flexstyle, Kossek, Ruderman, Braddy, and Hannum's (2012) work-nonwork boundary management assessment was used and the flexstyles were sorted using the three overarching factors that made up Kossek et al.'s (2011) Work-Life Indicator. The assessment was a seventeen-item, five-subscale survey. Kossek et al.'s (2012) work validated the qualitative description of flexstyle initially create in *CEO of ME* (Kossek & Lautsch, 2008*)* and further refined the initial Work-Life Indicator Assessment (Hannum, Braddy, Leslie, Ruderman, & Kossek, 2011). Job satisfaction was measured with a shortened version of Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) job satisfaction scale as was conducted by Judge, Locke, Durham, and Kluger's (1998). The Job Satisfaction Schedule was a five-item survey that measured the

satisfaction level of a respondent. Turnover intention was measured using Bothma and Roodt's (2013**)** Turnover Intention Scale – 6 (TIS-6). The TIS-6 is a six-item scale that measures how likely one is to stay in their current role. In order to control for personality, a 10-item version of the Positive Affect Negative Affect Scale was used (Mackinnon, Jorm, Christensen, Korten, Jacom, & Rodgers, 1999)**.** The PANAS measures the extent to which a respondent has a positive or negative approach to life and for the purposes of this study, how that influences participant responses. These four assessments were analyzed utilizing a correlational approach that would involve regression analysis. Regression was used to understand the nature of the relationship between two or more variables and would be appropriate given that both research questions are seeking to answer.

Chapter Summary

An initial assessment of the landscape in higher education has shown that departure from student affairs professions amongst new professionals is problematic given their high turnover rate. Although some reasons for involuntary turnover have been cited such as burnout and lack of advancement, no studies have looked at the issue from the perspective of flexstyle. Examining flexstyle not only offers a fresh perspective on the experience and satisfaction of new professionals but also can help to better understand if emerging trends in generational workforce are also reflected in the student affairs arena. In the next chapter I will outline the literature related to student affairs administration, new professionals, and flexstyle to deepen understanding on this topic.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

The two research questions of this study were:

1) What is the relationship between flexstyle and job satisfaction among new student affairs professionals?
2) What is the relationship between flexstyle and turnover intention among new student affairs professionals?

Understanding flexstyle is important because creating and maintaining a sense of boundary is an integral part of employee satisfaction (Vanderkam, 2015). A sense of control over one's schedule and arrangements (regardless of style) has also been shown to increase an employee's resolve to persist through challenges at work (Cheng, Mauno, & Lee, 2013). Given the high turnover rate of new professionals including those in student affairs, it is important to know if specific flexstyles interact with the variables of job satisfaction and turnover intention. Studying this may allow better insight as to the role internal preference plays in a professional's decision to stay in the field.

Given that this is an exploratory study and there is little literature on flexstyle in student affairs, the following hypotheses have been made as it regards the variables of behavior factor, control factor, and identity factor and their potential relationship with job satisfaction and turnover intention.

Hypotheses Related to Job Satisfaction

Hypothesis 1a: There will be no mean difference for flexstyle (behavior factor) groups.

Hypothesis 1b: There will be no mean difference for boundary control factor groups.

Hypothesis 1c: There will be no mean difference for work-life identity factor.

Hypotheses Related to Turnover Intention

Hypothesis 2a: There will be no mean difference for flexstyle (behavior factor) groups.

Hypothesis 2b: There will be no mean difference for boundary control factor groups.

Hypothesis 2c: There will be no mean difference for work-life identity factor.

This chapter begins by exploring both boundary creation and flexstyle both as a construct and its relevance to new professionals in student affairs. Next, the chapter defines and discusses the constructs of job satisfaction and turnover intention both broadly and within the student affairs literature.

It should be noted that although lack of previous research has made it difficult to create hypotheses based on overall flexstyle groups, more predictive hypotheses were made using the subscales of the work-nonwork boundary management profiles (Kossek et al., 2012). The subscales were work interrupting nonwork, nonwork interrupting work, boundary control, family identity and work identity. The remaining hypotheses will be revealed throughout this chapter.

Theoretical Basis

The introductory chapter defined and highlighted boundary theory and the three overarching flexstyles (integrator, separator, and volleyer). This section discusses some of the theoretical bases incorporated into that model as well as how boundary theory has been assessed in the human resource literature. Flexstyle has been chosen as a framework because of its ability to characterize boundary preferences and how they can impact a person's satisfaction in life. Previous literature in student affairs has not directly discussed flexstyle (or preferences) and the role it may play in retaining employees. It is important to look at flexstyle because boundaries establish the rules by which we want to engage in our work. When the time demands of the work environment is incongruent with employee boundary preferences then chances of increases

the chances of job dissatisfaction and intent-to-leave increase (Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2006; Kreiner, Hollensbe, & Sheep, 2009).

Boundaries

A review of flexstyle must first begin with a theoretical foundation of boundary creation, management, and transition. Boundaries are best defined as the parameters placed around life roles as well as how people order and maintain environments (Nippert-Eng, 1996). Three key pieces are revealed in the literature as the foundation of boundary management theory: Neppert-Eng's (1996) work on boundary roles, Clark's (2000) work on work/family border theory, and Ashforth, Kreiner, and Fugate's (2000) work on boundary transitions. A brief description of each work follows.

Patricia Nippert-Eng's (1996) work dealt largely with the basic concept of boundaries and work. Nippert-Eng's (1996) continuum clearly defines the differences between those who have a highly integrative and those who have a highly segmented approach to boundary creation. Thus, in a highly integrated continuum, the concept of "home" and "work" do not have distinct differences; they are the same. This not only influences *where* work and family roles may occur, but also one's mental disposition towards them. Highly integrative individuals do not switch roles and they act similarly with all people (Nippert-Eng, 1996). Conversely, those who rate as highly segmented on the continuum have clearly defined boundaries and expectations for their various roles.

One's boundary preferences are created and reinforced largely through artifacts and ritual. A calendar, for example, represents order and precision amongst those who are highly segmented, whereas integrators may have several calendars, post-it notes or receive other cues (looking at a clock, music etc.) to assist them in transitioning into another activity or role

(Nippert-Eng, 1996). Such differences drastically alter how integrators (those who prefer to blend work and life) and segmentors (those who like to have separate and clean boundaries between work and life) view time, space, and commitment. Therefore, what an integrator may do out of sheer will, a segmentor will do out of obligation. What an integrator may perceive as "the way it is" may present a threat to the borders that a segmentor has clearly defined (Nippert-Eng, 1996).

Building on Nippert-Eng's (1996) work, Clark (2000) introduces the idea of people being the authors and creators of the boundaries between their work and family life. Although people shape borders between worlds, they are also influenced and shaped by their various roles, which presents an interesting paradox. Work/family border theory attempts to explain the complex interaction between border-crossers and their work and family lives as well as predicts when conflict will occur, and gives a framework for attaining balance (Clark, 2000).

Clark (2000) discusses the importance of border strength in determining one's ability to cope with work/family boundaries. Although many would interpret having weak borders (characterized as being permeable and having high flexibility) as a positive asset in today's changing world, in reality workers were found to demonstrate great frustrations with these arrangements as expectations and duties become murkier on both ends of the work-family spectrum. Clark (2000) also introduces the concept of border keepers and their influence in border creation. A border keeper can be a supervisor, spouse, or other figure of importance in a person's life. These keepers have their own definition of what constitutes work and family, which in turn can directly conflict with an employee's ability to create and maintain appropriate work-family boundaries. Thus, border-keepers (particularly supervisors) need to be aware of the extreme power and influence they have over employee wellness and balance. The study also

concludes that although companies have made strides in creating flexible work arrangements and more work-family friendly policies, they have generally failed to create a culture that supports these arrangements (Clark, 2000).

Ashforth et al. (2000) discuss the importance in understanding how people transition from one role to another. They discuss the concept of role segmentation (the level to which work, family, and other roles are separated in a person's life) and its interplay with the permeability of one's own boundaries. The greater the extent to which an individual segments his/her life, the more time they will need to transition from one role to the next (Ashforth et al., 2000). Higher segmentation and higher impermeability also mean that consistent shifts in patterns or attempts that blur the line between domains will have negative effects on employees. Likewise, employees who integrate their lives must work to define and maintain their boundaries to the extent that work, family, and other roles do not become interchangeable. Ashforth et al. (2000) discourage a "one size fits all" supervisor approach to work-boundary management given how unique and diverse employees' lives are. More importantly, respecting employee boundary preferences and allowing a reasonable amount of autonomy in determining the level of integration-segmentation in their lives led to increased organizational commitment (Ashforth et al., 2000). Ashforth et al.'s (2000) work on segmentation should be of note to student affairs managers who may be unaware of employees' boundary preferences and may inadvertently construct work and expectations in a manner that is not congruent with those preferences. For example, adding meetings and extra assignments that alter a student affairs professional's work schedule often may prove to be stressful for employees with high boundary segmentation.

Flexstyle

While boundaries and boundary management focus on how we create and navigate our boundaries, flexstyle deals with the psychological and physical ways we manage relationships between our job and personal lives (Kossek & Lautsch, 2008). Flexstyle moves away from the binary that work and life need to come into a tight balance and focuses more on finding a personal fit between the person and the environment they are in (Kossek & Lautsch, 2008). Although a more thorough description of flexstyle was given in chapter 1, an explanation of the importance of flexstyle in today's work environment warrants some attention.

First, flexstyle emphasizes putting control of work-life issues back into the hands of the individual. This is significant given how important perceived control is in bringing about job satisfaction and dealing with workplace adversity (Tarver et al., 1999). Second, today's marketplace features a much wider array of job types that could better suit the flexstyle preferences of the administrator. Third, acceptance of alternative work arrangements is becoming more commonplace in today's society (Kossek & Lautsch, 2012). By understanding flexstyle and the level to which an individual may want to segment (or unsegment) their personal and work life, one is better able to decrease the amount of role conflict in their lives (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Kossek & Lautsch, 2008).

An example of this would be Rothbard, Phillips, and Dumas' (2005) research that examined the relationship between the desire for segmentation/integration and employees' access to policies that would be congruent with their preferences. Surveying 460 employees, the study found that individuals were more committed to and satisfied with their company when policies allowed for greater segmentation. For example, a separator would be far more content when the

company did not offer on-site childcare as it would increase the likelihood of spillover between the professional and personal domains (Rothbard et al., 2005).

Another area related to flexstyle discusses the interaction between flexstyle and technology. Fleck, Cox, and Robison (2015) conducted a study with 287 employees using a questionnaire to ask about their use of technology at home and work. Fleck et al. (2015) found that almost 75% of participants used between 2-4 technological devices in their daily lives. The results also showed that using separate devices for work and home was something that workers did *but* the extent to which they separated their devices was closely related to their flexstyle (Fleck et al., 2015). Thus, those who were separators were just as likely to use as many devices as integrators with the difference being that the separator had devices specifically for their work or family domain. Although the current study will not discuss the role of technology, Fleck et al.'s (2015) research demonstrates that flexstyle affects how people interact with their professional environment.

The importance of flexstyle as an intervention strategy to improve employee engagement and satisfaction has shown some positive results. Kossek (2016) lists flexstyle education within an organizational context as the first key strategy in bringing about positive organizational culture. Kossek (2016) calls for flexstyle assessments to be given and discussed in workshops at all levels in order to bring about a deeper understanding of employee needs and preferences. The sessions also serve as opportunities to set goals and interventions for the workplace. This was tested by creating family supportive supervisor behavior training at 12 grocery stores in Michigan. Six stores received training in family supportive behaviors including understanding flexstyle while six stores did not receive the training. Job satisfaction and other items were surveyed at the stores at both the time of training and several months after the training. The

results found that employees showed increased job satisfaction and wellbeing after training versus employees at stores where managers did not receive the training (Kossek, 2016). The results of the study indicate that not only is knowing flexstyle important on an individual level, but that managerial understanding of flexstyle and personal needs has a positive impact on job satisfaction (Kossek, 2016).

The results mentioned above are consistent with Kossek, Ruderman, Braddy, and Hannum's (2012) survey of managers that found that a person-centered approach to managing boundary profiles (aka flexstyle) was needed when addressing employees' needs in part because of how different flexstyle (and the clusters within those flexstyles such as work firster) deal with role conflict and work-to-family and family-to-work interruptions (Kossek et al., 2012). Work-to-family interruptions are characterized by job duties encroaching on a person's family time. Examples may include taking a business call on the weekend, answering emails on vacation, etc. Conversely, family-to-work interruptions are typified by family matters overlapping with the business days. Examples include arranging emergency childcare or conversing with a child's teacher from work. The report also held that greater perceptions of control over boundaries and flexstyle were negatively correlated with turnover intention and psychological distress (Kossek et al., 2012).

This section has highlighted both the reasoning for using flexstyle in this study and some of the theoretical literature related to flexstyle itself. Flexstyle was chosen as the framework for this study because it helps us understand the conditions that help people navigate their personal and professional lives. Flexstyle helps us to account for how different dynamics can interplay with one's flexstyle preference such as managerial style or the role of technology. It is through

this understanding of flexstyle that we are better able to create interventions that improve working conditions for professionals in all fields, including student affairs administrators.

The Relevance of Flexstyle for New Professionals in Student Affairs

Flexstyle is likely to have relevance for new professionals in student affairs. One of the more common challenges for new professionals deals with jobs that are not completely defined and often cause conflict between employees' personal and professional domains. This conflict has been shown to have lower job satisfaction rates and in some cases has been cited as a chief factor in leaving the profession (Marshall, Gardner, Hughes, & Lowery, 2016). Given that managers often act as the gatekeepers of employee schedules in student affairs an examination of flexstyle may also be useful in determining if at least some conflict and dissatisfaction is a result of not meeting the needs of those with a particular flexstyle.

Issues of satisfaction and work-life flexibility can be found in the student affairs literature to some extent by looking at literature that discuss stress and burnout. An underlying observation is that student affairs work itself is extremely stressful and puts a great deal of strain on the shoulders of administrators in relation to time and expectations (Birk, Dye, & Hughey, 2016; Volkwein & Zhou, 2003). The recommendations on how to handle the stress of student affairs focuses on an individualistic approach as handling stress and navigating the work-life landscape varies from person to person (Kerka as cited in Guthrie, Woods, Gusker, & Gregory, 2005). It is within this individualistic approach to dealing with stress that understanding flexstyle and its relationship with satisfaction and turnover intention is important.

To date I have found no studies directly examining flexstyle and student affairs administration. Studying flexstyle would be useful to student affairs administration for several reasons. The flexstyle assessment may reveal if professionals with specific flexstyle types are

more satisfied with student affairs work in general. The assessment may also potentially reveal if there is a relationship between flexstyle and different areas of student affairs work (fraternity/sorority life, advising, etc.). For example, integrators may show to be more satisfied in campus activities work that may allow for more flexible work options given the consistent irregular hours associated with that position. Conversely, separators may be more satisfied with positions in career services or advising that have a more consistent schedule, thus allowing for a much easier separation between an individual's personal and professional worlds.

Job Satisfaction in Student Affairs

Job satisfaction is defined as the level of contentment a person has with her/his job and involves employees weighing their values and expectations against the organizational climate within which they operate (Alam & Shahi, 2015). An individual's level of job satisfaction determines the extent to which they look to stay or leave an organization. Generally speaking, the more satisfied one is in their job, the more likely they are to stay at that company/institution (Johnsrud, Heck, & Rosser, 2000; Rosser, 2004). Several variables impact job satisfaction across professionals such as compensation, job security, recognition, mobility, working conditions, and relationships within the organization (Alam & Shahi, 2015; Rosser & Jaivnar, 2003; Ward, 1995). Research has been unable to find a single factor that decisively impacts job satisfaction. For example, it is sometimes believed that in student affairs low pay is the cause of poor job satisfaction and turnover intention (Evans, 1988; Lorden, 1998; Marshall et al., 2016; Rosser & Javinar, 2003). Pay, however, both within higher education and in other professional sectors has not definitively impacted satisfaction one way or another. Even if pay were a determining factor, it is difficult to attribute level of pay to the job satisfaction of an employee (Smith & Shields, 2012). Likewise, role stress has been shown to lead to burnout and decreased

satisfaction (Bender, 1980; Tull, 2006). Role stress can be defined as the stress experienced by an individual because of their job and the expectations placed upon them. Within student affairs, this can occur via heavy workloads, lack of staffing, and the emotional and physical fatigue that comes with the expectation to mentor and advise students and student groups.

Bender (1980) surveyed 145 student affairs professionals and found that overall, those in the profession were generally satisfied with their jobs, posting a satisfaction rate of 66%. Despite such high levels of satisfaction, her results also showed that over 41% of professionals between the ages of 23-36 did not see themselves continuing with student affairs work (Bender, 1980). Anderson's (1998) research compliments Bender's (1980) work by examining job satisfaction amongst senior student affairs officers (SSAOs) finding that older, married professionals were more satisfied with their work. The Anderson study (1998) noted, however, that positive job satisfaction rates were largely due to the senior professionals being established in the profession and being able to navigate better navigate. SSAOs higher satisfaction rates were due to learning to navigate and set their own boundaries and communicate them with supervisors as they climbed the ranks.

Thus, younger professionals face more professional turbulence in the field as they have greater difficulty understanding boundaries, setting boundaries, and building positive relationships with supervisors and as a result question whether a long-term career is a good fit. Student affairs work has been cited as unfulfilling and an emotional burden that interferes with new professional's work-life balance (Silver & Jakeman, 2014). Studies of those who left the student affairs profession noted a more positive work-life situation largely due to non-student affairs jobs having schedules that are more regular and offering more control to the employee (Marshall et al., 2016).

Given how important control of boundaries is in impacting satisfaction rates, the following hypotheses can be made:

Hypothesis 1d: There will be a positive relationship between nonwork interrupting work behaviors and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1e: There will be a negative relationship between work interrupting nonwork and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1f: There will be a positive relationship between boundary control and job satisfaction.

An important factor in examining satisfaction amongst new professionals in student affairs is the mid-level manager. Since mid-level managers act as a buffer between senior administration and new professionals, they often find themselves in the unique position of having to interpret and implement policy, mirror acceptable behaviors, and are often the gatekeepers to alternative work arrangements, accommodating flexstyle, and other work-life accommodations (Tull, 2006). This gatekeeper role, then, becomes important in relation to new professionals as the expectations around employee work-life have a direct impact on the new professional.

Volkwein and Zhou (2003) conducted a robust and in-depth analysis of job satisfaction amongst student affairs professionals. Their study looked for correlations between institution type and various factors that could affect job satisfaction, and sought to explain how state, institutional, and personal characteristics impacted administrative work climates and job satisfaction. The study examined satisfaction by classifying campus administration into five categories: academic affairs, human resources, institutional research, business, and student services. Volkwein and Zhou (2003) found that institution type did not influence job satisfaction but they did find significant relationships between organizational climate, personal variables and satisfaction. The results showed that student service professionals scored significantly low on extrinsic satisfaction (factors such as pay, security, and working conditions) and low on intrinsic

satisfaction (factors such as recognition and autonomy). Furthermore, the results indicated that there was a considerable amount of family-to-work conflict amongst all types of administrators as age and familial situations were shown to have significant correlations with job satisfaction (Volkwein & Zhou, 2003). Finally, the study concluded that personal problems and employee perception of control in the work environment had significant ties to job satisfaction. The authors also found that the workplace culture and teamwork had positive impacts on job satisfaction and called for a deeper understanding of job satisfaction for university administrators.

Surveying 2000 mid-level administrators (which included student affairs administrators) Rosser (2004) examined how personal demographics and work-life issues affected the relationship between morale, job satisfaction and intent to leave. The results revealed that work-life issues were directly correlated to an employee's intent to leave. The study listed a number of variables in its definition of "work-life" issues including career support, discrimination, external review, intra-departmental relations, etc. Factors that affected satisfaction were career support, advancement, feedback/intervention, and development. The study revealed that job satisfaction had a significant relationship with morale, but morale had no relationship to job satisfaction (Rosser, 2004). What can be taken from this last point is that satisfaction with work spills over into one's personal domain but that happiness in one's own personal domain does not necessarily spillover into job satisfaction. Furthermore, there can be a difference between how a person feels about the organization they work for and the current role they have.

Workplace relationships have been shown to positively impact job satisfaction in student affairs. Rosser (2004) noted that mid-level manager relationships with faculty and other stakeholders external to their department increased satisfaction levels. Likewise, Loyd's (2005) work found a positive connection between satisfaction and teamwork amongst student affairs

professionals. Hirschy, Wilson, Liddell, Boyle, and Pasquesi (2014) examined several variables that contributed to professional identity formation among new professions and among the factors listed that were statistically significant in their model were relationships with peers, mentors, and professional associations. In general, the student affairs literature has shown that satisfaction has a link to relationships and interactions between members of the organization. Interactions with the organization and professional relationships typically begin with the period in which employees learn the essential tools, skills, and relationships needed to be successful in their role known as the onboarding process. Without proper socialization and onboarding into the organization, new professionals experience greater frustration, dissatisfaction, and ultimately will look to leave the organization (Exum, 1998). It is during the onboarding process that mentors (both supervisors and nonsupervisors) play a role in employee retention and increased satisfaction (Coleman & Johnson, 1993; Pittman & Foubert, 2016). Gaining assistance and advice from a knowledgeable professional helps create positive collegial relationships that in turn increase job satisfaction (Barr, 1993).

Davidson's (2009) dissertation examined job satisfaction amongst entry-level and mid-career student affairs professionals. Surveying 766 professionals, the results indicated that mid-level administrators were far more satisfied than entry-level professionals were. There were also considerable satisfaction differences between new professionals and experienced professionals with new professionals scoring much lower regarding job satisfaction (Davidson, 2009). Thus, while the study did not parcel out new professionals (those who have been working 1-5 years) it was clear that employees serving in job functions traditionally left to new professionals were dissatisfied with their work. Davidson (2009) did find that opportunities for promotion/growth and relationships at work were predictors of satisfaction.

Recent research indicates that new professionals are more dissatisfied with their work and are more likely to exit the profession than their more established counterparts (Mullen, Malone, Denney, & Santa Dietz, 2018). New professionals are more likely to experience job dissatisfaction as navigating the work environment proves challenging (Renn & Jessup-Anger, 2008; Renn & Hodges, 2007). Postsecondary institutions can be highly complex and politicized organizations that can make navigating the landscape difficult and frustrating. In addition, many of the jobs new professionals are hired into come with ambiguous duties (Renn & Hodges, 2007). For example, advising a student organization may involve attending general meetings and key events but may also require attendance at all functions and consistent contact outside of traditional office hours. In addition, new professionals who do not receive adequate training and mentoring have been shown to be less satisfied in their roles. A study of 435 new professionals in student affairs that focused on synergistic supervision (which is defined as a focus on a holistic approach to management which discusses performance, career goals and needs) showed a strong positive relationship between perceived synergistic supervision and job satisfaction amongst new student affairs professionals (Tull, 2006). Tull (2006) also found strong negative correlations between low perceptions of synergistic supervision and turnover intention. In other words, the better supported and understood a new professional felt, the more satisfied they were and the less likely they were to leave the profession. Bartham and Winston Jr. (2006) reinforce this last point as their qualitative study found new professionals were satisfied and better transitioned into their roles when supervisors were able to identify and address their needs.

In summation, relationships are significant indicators of job satisfaction amongst student affairs professionals. The nature of student affairs work often makes juggling family and work difficult. Thus, I posit:

Hypothesis 1g: There will be a negative relationship between family identity and job satisfaction.

Conversely, student affairs professionals often have strong identities and ties to their work. Their love of their work leads to the final hypotheses related to job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1h: There will be a positive relationship between work identity and job satisfaction.

Turnover Intention

Turnover intention is best defined as the measurement of whether employees at a company desire to leave (or not leave) and refers to the final cognitive decision-making process that leads to turnover (Ovalle, 1984). The decision-making process relating to turnover intention deals with employees' thoughts on quitting a job, searching for a job, and intention to leave a job (Kim, Tam, Kim, & Rhee, 2017). Several variables can be identified as factors that affect turnover such as managerial support, supervisor, reward/compensation, fairness in the workplace, fair grievance procedures, perceived employee control, and shifts/schedules (Kumar & Govindarajo, 2014). Findings suggest that an employee with a high turnover intention is the forerunner to leaving the organization and in the case of student affairs work, often the profession altogether (Markowitz, 2012). Not all turnover intention is negative. Intent-to-stay refers to the likelihood an employee will stay in their current position. It can be argued that both intent-to-leave and intent-to-stay have a somewhat symbiotic relationship since factors that impact intent-to-leave can also influence intent-to-stay when they are inverted (Cho, Johanson, & Guchait, 2009). For example, the variable of perceived organizational support (defined as support from managers and policies that help employees) was shown to be positively related to intent-to-stay and had a negative effect on intent-to-leave (Cho et al., 2009).

Understanding turnover intention is important because linkages have been shown to exist between intended turnover and actual turnover (Kim et al., 2017; Lambert, Hogan, & Barton, 2001). Kim et al. (2017) examined turnover intention through the lens of three variables:

organizational justice (perception of fair treatment from an organization), supervisory justice (perception of fairness from a supervisor), and authoritarian control culture (a top down decision-making culture that has little regard for employee input). Their survey of 300 employees found that turnover intention was most impacted by factors at the organization level. The organization-employee relationship was critical in relation to turnover intention (negative relationship correlated to higher turnover intention rates).

The organization-employee relationship was also examined by Jensen, Patel, and Messersmith (2013) who looked at the impact of high-performance work systems (HPWS) on turnover intentions. HPWS is a specific and targeted blending of theory-into-practice that aims to improve organizational effectiveness (Jensen et al., 2013). Although HPWS aim to give organizations a competitive edge, they can also potentially create heavy workloads and strain on employees. Jensen et al. (2013) found that when employees had lower levels of job control (the ability to control their job functions and how/when they were performed) their turnover intentions increased. In other words, if an employee's work-style and level of control over it is not aligned with organizational culture and expectations, increased turnover intention occurs.

Turnover Intention in Student Affairs

Much of the literature in student affairs frames turnover intention in terms of intent-to-stay/intent-to-leave. One study that examines turnover intention more directly is Mullen, Malone, Denney and Santa Dietz's (2018) study of the relationship between job stress, job satisfaction, burnout, and turnover intention among student affairs professionals. Surveying 789 student affairs professionals, Mullen et al. (2018) found that higher levels of job stress and burnout were correlated with higher levels of job dissatisfaction and turnover intention. The study also noted that although student affairs professionals generally reported higher rates of job

satisfaction, overall, younger professionals' scores were lower than the population and thus they were more likely to consider exiting the profession (Mullen et al., 2018).

In an examination of departure for new professionals in student affairs, Frank (2013) interviewed 24 former student affairs professionals who earned a master's degree in student affairs or a related profession between 2004 and 2010 and left the field between 2009 and 2011. Findings revealed that professionals left the field for both individual and institutional reasons. Among the individual reasons for attrition, Frank (2013) found that a connection to the institution and the work being performed was important and led to departure if those needs for connection were unmet. Frank (2013) also noticed that juggling work-life balance was difficult for new professionals. The setting and enforcing of boundaries were found to be difficult and affected a professional's decision to stay within student affairs (Frank, 2013). Likewise, participants stated that although the nature of student affairs work involved long and irregular hours, they felt that there was a lack of flexibility in setting a work schedule that would better suit their personal needs (Frank, 2013). For these reasons, I hypothesize:

Hypothesis 2d: There will be a negative relationship between work interrupting nonwork and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 2e: There will be a positive relationship between nonwork interrupting work behaviors and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 2f: There will be a negative relationship between boundary control and turnover intention.

Renn and Hodges' (2007) qualitative study of new professionals found that fit with the job was a chief factor in aiding satisfaction and ensuring a positive transition from graduate work to full-time work. Hirschy, Wilson, Liddell, Boyle, and Pasquesi (2015) found that congruence between personal values and the values of the institution/profession were significant factors in the identity development of new student affairs professionals. This last point is important

because professional culture influences whether an employee feels that their values (which includes how they visualize the relationship between work and personal life) fit with the profession. If there is incongruence between personal and professional values, then exiting the profession is more likely. Given the stated importance of values (personal and professional) and the stated conflict student affairs work and family life can have on departure it was hypothesized:

Hypothesis 2g: There will be a negative relationship between family identity and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 2h: There will be a p relationship between work identity and turnover intention.

Chapter Summary

This chapter began with a discussion of boundary theory and its relationship with flexstyle. Relating to how people construct boundaries it was established that individuals have a certain preference as to how much they want to integrate or separate their work and personal domains. Clark (2000) introduced the concept of people being the authors of their own boundaries as well as the concept of border keepers (those who can potentially influence an individual's work/life boundaries). Kossek and Lautsch (2008) built upon these theories by creating flexstyle categories and subcategories that take into account both a person's integrative preference and the impact outside forces (i.e., border keepers) have on their contentment. Job dissatisfaction amongst new professionals was linked to both irregular schedules and ambiguous job definitions and expectations from the organization. Flexstyle was chosen as the theoretical framework for this study as it allows the ability to study issues related to job satisfaction and turnover intention from a new perspective that may potentially allow for a deeper understanding of why new professionals leave student affairs work. Imbedded in this work is also the concept of personal values and needs and their intersection with job expectations.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the current study was to determine if any relationship exists between flexstyle and the variables of job satisfaction and turnover intention among new student affairs professionals and aimed to discover if understanding an individual's flexstyle will shed new light into the student affairs departure puzzle. A better understanding of how flexstyle interplays with the nature of student affairs work will be useful in helping administrators better understand and prevent negative staff turnover.

Research Questions

Since the current study seeks to explore the relationship between flexstyle and job satisfaction and turnover intention, the two central research questions were:

1) What is the relationship between flexstyle and job satisfaction among new student affairs professionals?
2) What is the relationship between flexstyle and turnover intention among new student affairs professionals?

Research Design

The current study was conducted using quantitative methods via an online survey. Quantitative methods are the best choice as the questions seek to find overall trends when examining the relationship between variables (Field, 2013). Understanding the relationships between flexstyle, job satisfaction, and turnover intention with a focus on if there is a prevalent trend among the variables is at the core of the research questions above. The dissertation began used a correlational research design. Correlational research design is used to discover if a relationship exists between two variables and if so, what type of relationship exists between them

(Wheelan, 2013). After responses were collected and analyzed and in reevaluating the instrumentation, it was decided to use analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) in addition to correlational research design in order to understand the research question more holistically. ANCOVA would help to discover if significant differences existed between different group types within flexstyle.

The dependent variables for this study were job satisfaction and turnover intention; the independent variables was flexstyle. A separate assessment was used to measure each of the dependent and independent variables. As a result, the instrumentation for the current study combined four assessments to answer the research questions. The assessments utilized were: the work-nonwork boundary management profiles (Kossek, Ruderman, Hannum, & Braddy, 2012), Judge, Locke, Durham, and Kluger's (1998) shortened version of Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) Job Satisfaction Schedule. the Turnover Intention Scale (TIS-6) (Bothma & Roodt, 2013), and a 10-item version of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) (Mackinnon, Jorm, Christensen, Korten, Jacom, & Rodgers, 1999). Detailed descriptions of each of these instruments is discussed in the instrumentation section of this chapter.

Instrumentation

The instrument in the current study had five distinct sections in addition to the consent form. After filling out a consent form, participants were next taken to sections where they completed several assessments. Those who met the initial criteria next took the following assessments in this order: the work nonwork boundary management profiles, the job satisfaction schedule, the TIS-6, and the 10-item version of the PANAS. Upon completing the assessments, participants input their demographic data (gender, age, race, etc.). The order in which the assessments were organized was chosen based on the order of the research questions.

Participants were not given their flexstyle score or the score to any other assessment in the study so that assessment results would not influence future answers.

Please note the validity and reliability of each survey used in the current study was previously tested using the Cronbach's alpha. Reliability is best defined as the extent to which a scale measures what it should (Field, 2013). The Cronbach's alpha is an estimate of reliability of a survey and is an indicator of consistency (Field, 2013). It is used to see if multiple question Likert scale assessments are reliable (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003). This is a logical test to use to rate the individual assessments since they are also all Likert-Scale measures. Cronbach alpha scores range from .00 (no consistency in measurement) to 1.0 (perfect consistency in measurement). As a general rule, alpha scores below .50 are deemed unacceptable, and scores above .7 are deemed strong indicators of reliability (Field, 2013).

Work-Nonwork Boundary Management Profiles

Work-life flexstyles were originally conceptualized in Kossek and Lautsch's (2008) book *CEO of Me.* The instrument that was used to determine flexstyle was later expanded and led to the creation of the Work-Life Indicator (WLI) (Hannum et al., 2011). Initially the WLI was a 23-item survey that measured sorted took scores from five subscales to determine an individual's preferences into one of three areas: behaviors, boundary control factor and identity. In 2012, Kossek et al. took the WLI assessment validated it into the work-nonwork boundary management profiles: 17-item, five subscale survey with Likert responses ranging from 1 (Strongly Agree) to 5 (Strongly Disagree). The work-nonwork boundary management profiles validate the initial questions that were present in Kossek and Lautsch's (2008) flexstyle self-assessment and alters them to give better clarity. For example, the original question "except in an emergency, I generally try to take care of personal or family needs at work only when I'm on

break or during my lunch hour" was simplified to "I take care of personal or family needs during work" (Kossek et al., 2012). The assessment asks participants to answer all questions and adds up their raw score in five distinct categories. Those categories are: work-interrupting nonwork, nonwork interrupting work, boundary control, family focus, and work focus ad in brief are thusly defined. *Work interrupting non-work behaviors* relates to behaviors that allow work responsibilities and duties to interrupt one's personal life. Conversely, *non-work interrupting work* relates to behaviors that allow family and other non-work commitments to interrupt work duties. *Boundary refers to* how one manages the boundaries and borders between the work and professional domain. *Family focused* and *work focused* identity refers the extent to which an individual identifies with and invests in the work or family respectively (Kossek et al., 2012). Permission to use the work-life-indicator (WLI) and work-nonwork boundary management profiles was given by Dr. Ellen Kossek (Appendix A).

Kossek and Lautsch's (2008) flexstyle assessment (also referred to as boundary management profiles) built on previous literature relating to boundary control theory (Ashforth et al., 2000; Nippert-Eng, 1996). The assessment categorizes responses into one of three boundary management styles: separators, integrators, and volleyers (Kossek & Lautsch, 2008). Flexstyle was initially covered in Kossek, Lautsch, and Eaton (2006). 245 professionals at two Fortune 500 firms with telework policies were surveyed. Kossek et al.'s (2006) work examined the impact of perceived job control integration strategies and the impact they had on work-family conflict. These strategies were pulled from Kossek, Noe, and DeMar's (1999) construct of boundary management strategy. Likert-scale questions ranging from 1 to 5 were used to gauge if strategies favored high separation (1) or integration (5) (Kossek et al., 1999). Relationships between boundary management and job control were examined in Kossek et al. (2006) and found

that higher integrative strategies were related to increased work-family conflict. Moreover, Kossek et al.'s (2006) model of integration began to talk about how psychological variables affected job control and family conflict. Boundaries, then, are not exclusively set by the employer but are also a product of individual value, belief, and how those values and beliefs integrate with the environment (Kossek et al., 2006).

As discussed, Kossek and Lautsch's (2008) study classifies individuals into three distinct overarching clusters: integrators, separators, and volleyers. Although the work on flexstyle did infer that distinct flex preferences exist, and that they could be linked to outcomes, the measure itself was never validated or linked to quantitative measures. In 2011, Hannum et al. took the flexstyle construct and create the WLI which broke flexibility into three principle factors: behavior factor, boundary factor, and identity factor. Seeking further validation, Kossek, Ruderman, Braddy, and Hannum (2012) further validated these measures via the work nonwork boundary management profiles. The profiles validated the distinction between separative and integrative behavior. In addition, Kossek et al.'s (2012) work took Kossek and Lautsch's (2008) flexstyle assessment modifying the questions to add clarity, and further divided the questions into the categories of work interrupting nonwork behaviors and nonwork interrupting work behaviors (which gave greater clarity and validity to the separator/integrator classifications).

Cronbach alpha scores of work interrupting nonwork behaviors were .84 and .83 in their respective samples, while Cronbach alpha scores for work interrupting non-work behaviors were .79 and .74 in their respective samples. Alphas for boundary control were .88 in both samples. Finally, Cronbach alpha scores for work identity were .76 ad .75 and family identity were .85 and .77 in both their respective samples (Kossek et al., 2011). The alpha scores indicate that the

questions are not only consistent but that more definitive distinctions between separative and integrative flexstyles can now be ascertained.

In this study, the alphas for work-interrupting nonwork, nonwork interrupting work, boundary control, family identity and work identity were .87, .66, .83, .82, and .63. In the case of nonwork-interrupting work, a reliability without items analysis was conducted on SPSS and 1 item was removed to create a slightly more reliable alpha of .67. Although two of the subscales were below the .7 threshold, they were still utilized in the final analysis. The guidelines regarding alpha scores have some level of subjectivity. As Kline (1999) points out that although alphas above .8 for intelligence tests and .7 for ability tests are acceptable, surveys that examine psychological/emotional ideas can dip below .7 and still be reliable due the diversity of the constructs being measured. In the case of the nonwork interrupting work subscale, the .67 alpha score is not far below the recommended .7 threshold. In the case of the lower work identity alpha of .62, it should be noted that two-question subscales can lend themselves to lower alpha score (Fields, 2013).

A note on the use of the Work Nonwork Boundary Management Profiles and Work-Life Indicator Interpretation and use in this study

Prior to beginning this study, it was conceptualized to look at flexstyle as a continuum between those being more integrative vs those being more separative based on Kossek and Lautch's (2008) work. Seeking to use a more validated measure in this research and in consultation with Dr. Ellen Kossek, the work nonwork boundary management profiles (Kossek et al., 2011) and the WLI (Hannum et al., 2011) were presented as validated alternatives. Initially, the intent was to use and/or combine the *work interrupting nonwork* and *nonwork interrupting work* subscales of work nonwork boundary management profiles to better

understand the integrator/separator dynamic. In further consultation with Dr. Kossek, it was decided that approach would be too blunt and that using the work nonwork boundary management profiles in their entirety was a more appropriate methodological choice.

Kossek et al.'s (2012) work-nonwork boundary profiles interpret the scores from the instrument's five subscales and place them into one of six flexstyle categories which is achieved by conducting a K-Means cluster analysis with a Euclidian distance (Kossek et al., 2012). In the case of this study, it was observed that responses did not fit into these six flexstyles in a way that coincided with Kossek et al.'s (2012) typography. As a result, I decided to interpret the five subscales using Hannum et al.'s (2011) work-life indicator as a guide which took scores from the five subscales and broke them into three overall categories: behavior factor (comprised of the work-interrupting nonwork and nonwork interrupting work subscales); boundary control factor; (calculated using the boundary control subscale); and identity factor (calculated using the work focus and family focus subscales).

The use of the three work-life dimensions also changed the nature of analyses as now ANCOVAS were used to understand the research questions. This marks a departure from the original analytical plan that initially involved a purely correlational design. This study was rooted in understanding correlation and as such it was determined to utilize multiple regression with each of the five subscales individually as well in order to get a deeper perspective on this research topic.

Out of 287 usable surveys, the results revealed that two work-life behaviors [integrators (n=135) and family firsters (n=102)] comprised 82% of the sample population. This statistic not only explains why responses did not fall cleanly into Kossek et al.'s 2012 model but may also

give insight into shifts in generational work-style preferences. This insight is discussed later in the implications section of this chapter.

Job Satisfaction Schedule

Job Satisfaction was measured using a shortened version of Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) job satisfaction scale. The original scale consisted of nineteen Likert scale questions (Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree) that looked at assessing overall job satisfaction and reported a coefficient alpha of 0.87. In their (1998) study that focused on core self-evaluation, Judge et al. (1998) took five items from Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) job satisfaction index and administered it to their sample population. The five items were "I feel well satisfied with my present job," "Most days I am enthusiastic about my work," "Each day of work seems like it will never end" (reverse scored), "I find real enjoyment in my work," and "I consider my job rather unpleasant" (reversed scored) (Judge et al., 1998). The Job Satisfaction Schedule is available for public use for educational purposes.

To test validity and reliability, Judge et al. (1998) administered the shortened measure to 222 university employees and yielded a Cronbach alpha of .88. The Cronbach alpha for the Judge et al.'s (1998) measure in this study was .88.

The Turnover Intention Scale 6 (TIS-6) Assessment

The second research question asks if there is a relationship between flexstyle and turnover intention. The TIS was a 15 item Likert scale developed to measure the likelihood that an employee would leave their job (Bothma & Roodt, 2013). The TIS was developed in response to a lack of multi-item scales addressing intent to leave within human resources research and a prevalence to use single item measures to determine turnover intentions (Roodt, 2004). Single item scales make it difficult to determine if a survey is measuring what it claims

and thus have a low construct validity (Field, 2013). Roodt's (2004) original scale was unpublished but a shortened version of the instrument (TIS-6) was created and validated in 2013 (Bothma & Roodt, 2013). Much like its 15-item counterpart, this 6-item survey utilizes a 5-point Likert scale (1= never, 5 = always) and measures the likelihood that an individual is willing to stay at an organization. Scores ranging between 1-2 indicate a likelihood that someone is willing to stay in their position, a mean score between 2-3 indicates uncertainty about staying in a job, and a mean score between 3-5 indicates the likelihood that an individual will leave the company if given the opportunity (Bothma & Roodt, 2013). As a result, the lower one's score on the assessment, the more likely they are to stay at an organization (Bothma & Roodt, 2013). The TIS-6 was used with the permission of Dr. Gerhard Roodt (Appendix B). The TIS-6 has been chosen as an instrument for the current study for two reasons. First, the TIS-6 can determine the likelihood someone is going to stay in an organization, and this allows the researcher to answer secondary question B (is there a relationship between flexstyle and turnover intention). Second, the TIS-6 has proven reliability and validity.

The TIS-6 scale was initially used and validated in a study of 2429 employees that examined multiple organizational principles such as managerial relationships and values congruence. Bothma and Roodt (2013) tested the TIS-6 for reliability and validity. The TIS-6 had a Cronbach alpha score a 0.80. These findings confirm the reliability of the TIS-6 especially as measured against Nunnally and Bernstein's (1994) work that states an alpha of .70 is the threshold for reliability. The initial Cronbach alpha for the TIS-6 in this study was .41; well below the acceptable standard. A reliability analysis without items was conducted in SPSS and 2 questions were dropped from the instrument for analysis. The modified four-item version of the TIS-6 yielded an alpha of .79.

Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS)

Initially created in 1988, the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) was a self-reported questionnaire comprised of two 10-item scales that would measure positive and negative affective. Respondents were asked to rate how much they had felt a specific emotion (some examples include "alert," "inspired," "enthusiastic," and "scared") over the past week on a 5 point Likert scale that ranged from "very slightly or not at all" (1) to "extremely" (5). Affect describes the extent to which an individual experiences positive or negative emotions and how that influences their relationships with their surroundings (Watson & Clark, 1988). The PANAS was appropriate to use in this study as a control variable in order to determine if how respondents overall affect had any impact on their satisfaction or turnover intention scores. Judge, Erez, and Thoresen (2000) discuss that negative affect (NA) has a significant impact on measuring stress related variables (such as turnover intention and satisfaction) and can bias the way survey items are answered. In order to determine whether NA impacts stress related constructs it is important to also control for positive bias (positive affect) as well (Judge et al., 2000). In short, controlling for both positive and negative affect as appropriate for this study as it helped to mitigate potential biases and helped control for the individual personality of participants (Judge et al., 2000). In order to decrease overall response time and increase completion rates, a shortened 10-item version of the PANAS by Mackinnon et al. (1999) was employed.

MacKinnon et al.'s (1999) short-form version of the PANAS yielded Cronbach alpha for the Positive Affect Schedule of 0.78 and 0.87 for the Negative Affect Schedule. The alpha for Mackinnon et al.'s (1999) shortened measure in this study were .82 for positive affect and .81 for negative affect.

Sample Selection

The population for the current study was full-time administrators in student affairs who were new professionals. New professionals are defined as those with five years or less of full-time experience in student affairs work (Cilente et al., 2006; Coleman & Johnson, 1990; Renn & Hodges, 2007). Student affairs has a wide variety of units within its realm. Love (2003, paragraph 7) states that units typically associated with student affairs include (but are not limited to):

> Residence life, commuter services, graduate student services, admissions, new student orientation, financial aid, counseling centers, advising centers, leadership development, Greek affairs, student activities, student unions, leadership development, community service, service learning, career planning and placement, discipline and judicial affairs, alumni relations and development, services for students with disabilities, developmental learning services, and advocacy and support programs (e.g., for students of color, lesbian, bisexual, gay, and transgender students, veterans, women, international students, adults).

The current study employed purposeful sampling. Purposeful sampling is defined as a non-probability sampling technique where the participants studied are based on the judgment of the researcher (Creswell, 2009). Purposeful sampling focuses on particular characteristics of a population that are of interest. In this case, the characteristics of interest related to student affairs professionals employed for less than five years in the field. The decision to use five years of full-time professional experience was chosen as that mark has been used to define new professionals and is referred to as the cut-off point for this population (Cilente et al., 2006; Coleman & Johnson, 1990; Renn & Hodges, 2007).

Three associations were chosen to help distribute the survey instrument. The Association of College Personnel Administrators (ACPA) was chosen to select a sample because it is one of the largest and broadest associations for student affairs professionals. ACPA has a membership of 6,500 (ACPA, 2019). ACPA's membership also provides a rich diversity in respects to job

types and functional areas. This diversity in job types and areas made ACPA a strong choice given that the current study sought to find relationships among all new professionals and the membership work in these areas (as opposed to new professionals in a specific field such as Fraternity/Sorority Life). Likewise, the National Association of Student Affairs Professionals (NASPA) is also one of the largest professional associations in student affairs. Although distribution to all new professionals in NASPA was not possible, NASPA's subcommittee (known as a knowledge community) for New Professionals and Graduate Students did distribute the survey on my behalf. Finally, the Southern Association for College Student Affairs (SACSA) also sent out the survey to all members who identified as new professionals. All three associations have members who represent a broad cross section of student affairs work and were thus strong choices for survey distribution.

The survey was sent out to a total of 1,623 members of ACPA who identified as new professionals, 1,500 members of the NASPA New Professionals and Graduate Student Knowledge Community listserv, and 96 members who identified as new professionals from SACSA. A cover letter was included with the email and ACPA sent the link to their members twice on my behalf. The appropriate sample size for the current study was obtained by determining the needed sample size. The needed sample size is found by setting the confidence level to 95% and margin of error to 5% in order to meet the assumptions of normality. Confidence level refers to the assurance that the test will continually fall within the same parameters. Margin of error (confidence interval) simply refers to amount of error or inaccuracy the study will allow. These levels were set as they are standard levels used in educational research (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003). With these parameters in place, a target sample size

of 260 was needed to have the ability to conduct parametric tests when total number of surveys sent equals 800.

Basic distribution statistics for this study were as follows: 3,191 surveys were sent to association membership in ACPA, NASPA, and SACSA combined. 358 surveys were collected (11.2% response rate). Seventy-one surveys were eliminated from the pool for the following reasons: incomplete assessments (53 respondents), more than five years of full time professional experience (18 respondents), Thus, a total of 287 surveys were deemed acceptable for analysis for this study.

Data Collection

Data were collected using the cloud-based program Qualtrics, which is licensed to Michigan State University students. Each of the assessments was coded (and reverse coded when appropriate) and made ready for distribution via the online program Qualtrics. Participants received a link to the surveys that captured both demographic data and assessment scores. Survey data were downloaded from Qualtrics and uploaded into SPSS where raw data was cleaned then tabulated to get descriptive measures as well as tabulating scores for each of the four separate assessments. The demographic variables were gender, age, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, marital status, number of children (if applicable), education level, if graduate degrees were attained in student affairs or related programs, ability status, type of disability (if applicable), and type of student affairs unit worked in (i.e., Fraternity/Sorority Life, Campus Activities etc.), number of years conducting full- time work in student affairs, and number of full-time positions held in student affairs. Although the research questions are broad in scope, these demographic variables were important to the study as literature has revealed that these variables may impact the data as they relate to the research questions. Given that employees

have different identities based on gender, race, age etc., it may prove useful to capture demographic data to ascertain if there are any unique patterns amongst these groups. Understanding student affairs units was important to the current study since the varied nature of administrative work in the profession may have impacted satisfaction levels amongst employees. Moreover, this variance needed to be examined to determine whether the results were representative of the overall population or if subsets of student affairs work varied greatly from the overall population.

In regards to protecting privacy, participant privacy was protected in several ways. First, participant names were not collected in the survey. Second, specific survey data were not shared with participant supervisors or institutions. Furthermore, data were collected and stored via password-protected software and downloaded to the researcher's computer. Survey response were tabulated and coded as they were received. The computer itself was password protected and the data were placed in a password-protected folder. Participants received a $5 Amazon gift card for completion of the survey. Emails were collected using the cloud-based software Survey Monkey. A link to the Survey Monkey form presented itself at the end of the survey. Since the link was provided on a platform outside of Qualtrics, participant anonymity was protected.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed and interpreted using SPSS. SPSS was used to provide descriptive analyses for demographic variables (i.e., race, gender identity, age) as well as to conduct regression analyses. In order to discover relationship between flexstyle and job satisfaction and flexstyle and turnover intentions, analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to understand relationships between the continuous dependent variables of job satisfaction and turnover intention and the independent variables of work-life behaviors, boundary control factor,

and identity factor. Multiple regression was used to understand each of the work-nonwork boundary management profiles subscales (work interrupting nonwork, nonwork interrupting work, boundary control, work identity, family identity) relationship with the variables of job satisfaction and turnover intention.

It also was determined that there would be value in testing each of the work-nonwork boundary management profiles subscales individually to discover if more nuanced and subtle relationships could be found. As has been discussed in the previous chapter, several hypotheses were formed that would help answer the two overarching research questions. Those hypotheses are:

Hypotheses Related to Job Satisfaction

Hypothesis 1a: There will be no mean difference for behavior factor groups.

Hypothesis 1b: There will be no mean difference for boundary control factor groups.

Hypothesis 1c: There will be no mean difference for identity factor groups.

Hypothesis 1d: There will be a positive relationship between nonwork interrupting work behaviors and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1e: There will be a negative relationship between work interrupting nonwork and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1f: There will be a positive relationship between boundary control and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1g: There will be a negative relationship between family identity and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1h: There will be a positive relationship between work identity and job satisfaction.

Hypotheses Related to Turnover Intention

Hypothesis 2a: There will be no mean difference for behavior factor groups.

Hypothesis 2b: There will be no mean difference for boundary control factor groups.

Hypothesis 2c: There will be no mean difference for identity factor groups.

Hypothesis 2d: There will be a negative relationship between work interrupting nonwork and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 2e: There will be a positive relationship between nonwork interrupting work behaviors and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 2f: There will be a negative relationship between boundary control and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 2g: There will be a negative relationship between family identity and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 2h: There will be a p relationship between work identity and turnover intention.

With categories created, I decided to understand group means via ANCOVA which would help determine if there was a difference among the different behavior (flexstyle), boundary control, and identity groups.

The second dimension to understanding the research questions employed a correlational design that examined the relationship between each of the Kossek et al.'s (2012) five subscales and the variables of job satisfaction and turnover intention. Multiple regression was used to estimate if there was a predictive relationship between work-life flexstyle and job satisfaction, and intent-to-stay when controlling for multiple variables (Field, 2013). The variables that were controlled for were age, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, units in student affairs, number of full-time jobs in student affairs over career, marital status, number of years in full-time work in student affairs, if the respondents had children, educational attainment, positive affect and negative affect.

Risks and Limitations

There were few potential risks for participating in this study. First, an online survey did not pose any physical harm to the participant. Questions about job satisfaction and turnover intention could have potentially posed a minimal emotional risk to participants as it may trigger

negative or sensitive memories. With that in mind, the risk was minimized as questions did not ask for specific experiences or recollections.

Given that the respondents' identities were not known to the researcher there is no conflict of interest. Likewise, the researcher did not financially gain from this study. It should be noted that the researcher does present and conduct workshops on work-life issues for several national associations at national conferences, webinars, and in his practice as a professional speaker, which may have some impact on participants taking the survey. It is still unlikely that the researcher had a known relationship to any of the participants, and anonymity of the surveys should have protected against this.

The limitations to the current study were as follows. First, the current study was broad in its outreach and may not have reached a proportionate number of student affairs professionals. In other words, there may have been overrepresentation in one field (for example campus activities) from others areas of student affairs work (e.g., fraternity/sorority life). The current study conducted its outreach using listservs of major professional associations in student affairs. Although this was a logical choice given that ACPA, NASPA, and SACSA represent the student affairs profession as a whole and that the listservs gave easy access to the target populations, the samples may not have been representative of all student affairs practitioners given that: a) each institution funds professional development differently which leads some professionals to not join an association; b) some new professionals may opt to join a more specialized professional association (i.e., the National Association of Colleges and Employers for those in Career Services), and c) some professionals may not be a part of any association.

Another limitation of the study is the time of year the survey was distributed. The survey was distributed in July, a time of year that is often fairly calm in the student affairs

administration. This may have skewed the data. Another limitation of the study is that participants were not asked what type of institution they worked at. Thus, understanding the sample responses from an institutional type perspective was not conducted in this study.

Chapter Summary

This chapter outlined the methodological choices made associated with the study, the validity and reliability of the instruments used, the challenges and alterations to the research design that were made base in order to best answer the research questions, and new hypotheses that were created in order to best answer the two principal research questions. The next chapter will outline the findings of the researcher and which hypotheses were supported.

Chapter 4: Results

This chapter shares the findings of the study including participant demographics, answers to hypothesis and rationale for analytical courses of action when appropriate. The research questions for this study were:

1) What is the relationship between flexstyle and job satisfaction among new student affairs professionals?
2) What is the relationship between flexstyle and turnover intention among new student affairs professionals?

Given that it was not possible to determine a six-cluster solution as laid out in Kossek et al. (2012), it was decided to answer the research questions using both ANCOVA and regression. ANCOVA would determine if there were significant differences between the categories of behavior, boundary control, and identity with job satisfaction and turnover intention. In addition, I felt it was important to see if a relationship existed between job satisfaction and turnover intention with each of the five subscales separately to see if there were any nuances and other findings that could be found in the sample. As a result, the following hypotheses were created:

Hypotheses Related to Job Satisfaction

Hypothesis 1a: There will be no mean difference for behavior factor groups.

Hypothesis 1b: There will be no mean difference for boundary control factor groups.

Hypothesis 1c: There will be no mean difference for identity factor groups.

Hypothesis 1d: There will be a positive relationship between nonwork interrupting work behaviors and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1e: There will be a negative relationship between work interrupting nonwork and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1f: There will be a positive relationship between boundary control and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1g: There will be a negative relationship between family identity and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1h: There will be a positive relationship between work identity and job satisfaction.

Hypotheses Related to Turnover Intention

Hypothesis 2a: There will be no mean difference for behavior facto) groups.

Hypothesis 2b: There will be no mean difference for boundary control factor groups.

Hypothesis 2c: There will be no mean difference for identity factor groups.

Hypothesis 2d: There will be a negative relationship between work interrupting nonwork and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 2e: There will be a positive relationship between nonwork interrupting work behaviors and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 2f: There will be a negative relationship between boundary control and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 2g: There will be a negative relationship between family identity and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 2h: There will be a positive relationship between work identity and turnover intention.

Demographics of Survey Participants

Thirteen demographic questions were asked of participants. All questions gave respondents the option to not answer or not to disclose their information. The breakdowns for the variables of gender, race/Ethnicity, marital status, and child status are listed below. The demographic output of other variables can be found in Appendix C.

Table 4 Gender of all Participants

	Frequency	**Percent**
Male	75	26.1
Female	200	69.7
Transgender	2	7
Non-Binary	6	2.1
Other	3	1
Prefer not to Disclose	1	0.3
Total	**287**	**100**

Female participants were the largest gender group in this study comprising almost seventy percent of the population. Men were the second largest group in the study at twenty-sex percent. In general, the participants in this survey conformed with gender binary norms. This is consistent with the national trend that reports seventy-one percent of student affairs positions are held by women (Pritchard & McChesney, 2018).

Age

The median age for participants was 27.7 years of age. The significance in this median age is that the median age for the group that validated the Kossek et al.'s (2012) work nonwork boundary management profiles was 44.4. This marks a significant demographic shift from the group for which the chief instrument in this study was created.

Table 5 Race and Ethnicity of all Participants

	Frequency	**Percent**
White/Caucasian	172	59.9
Black/African American	38	13.2
Hispanic (regardless of race)	22	7.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	22	7.7
Native American/1st Nations	3	1.0
Mixed Race	13	4.5
Latinx	2	.7
Caribbean	1	.3
Middle Eastern	1	.3
Other	11	3.8
Prefer not to Disclose	2	.7
Total	**287**	**100**

Table 6 Marital Status of all Participants

	Frequency	**Percent**
Single	194	67.6
Married	54	18.9
Domestic Partnership	26	12.5
Divorced	2	.7
Prefer not to Disclose	1	.3
Total	**277**	**100**

Table 7 Child Status of all Participants

	Frequency	**Percent**
Yes	17	6.4
No	269	93.7
Prefer not to Disclose	1	.3
Total	**287**	**100**

Comparing marital status to the population Kossek et al. (2012) used when creating the work-nonwork boundary management profiles reveals a stark contract to this population. 31.4% of the participants of this study were married or partnered compared to 85.1% of Kossek et al. (2012). The reason for this is quite simple given that new professionals are typically (albeit not exclusively) in early stages of their careers and trend younger as a result. On a much more macro level, the predominant group participating in this study were single with no children. This demographic finding had implications for the how flexstyle grouping came about in this study. This phenomenon is discussed later in the chapter.

Demographic Breakdown

Hannum et al.'s (2011) work-life indicator is broken down into three distinct profiles: behavior factor, boundary control factor, and identity factor. Demographic breakdown for each of the three factors was as follows:

Table 8 Participant Population Based on Behavior Factor

	Frequency	**Percent**
Cyclers	45	15.6
Family Firster	102	35.5
Integrators	135	47
Separators	4	1.4
Work Firster	1	.3
Total	**287**	**100**

Table 9 Participant Population Based on Boundary Control Factor

	Frequency	Percent
High Control	151	52.6
Midlevel Control	21	7.3
Low Control	115	40.1

Table 9 (cont'd)

Total	**287**	**100**

Table 10 Participant Population Based on Identity Factor

	Frequency	**Percent**
Dual Focus	84	29.3
Family Focus	7	2.4
Other Focus	4	1.4
Work Focus	192	66.9
Total	**287**	**100**

In brief, tables 8, 9, and 10 reveal a few interesting trends in terms of preferences of the participants. In relation to behavior factor the population in this study was largely family firsters and integrators. Family firsters allow family to interrupt work but not the inverse. Hard boundaries are created to ensure that family time remains uninterrupted. Integrators allow work and life to blend into each other (Hannum et al., 2011). The dominance of these two behavior factors indicates that allowing outside forces such as family and personal commitments to interrupt and shift work patterns is common but work interrupting personal and family commitments does not necessarily hold true. Table 9 examined boundary control factor (the extent to which an individual can control how they construct work and life) and reveals that new professionals in this study either had very high or very low boundary control; there was very little middle ground. Finally, the identity factor demographics indicate that the new professionals in this study have a very strong work identity.

Demographics Based on Behavior Factor

In addition, demographic information for each of the three dimensions of the work-life indicator (behavior factor, boundary control factor, and identity factor) were tabulated. The first group examined were work-life behaviors (flexstyle). Work-life behaviors are broken down into five distinct subgroups: cyclers, family firsters, integrators, separators, and work firsters. Below

is the output for the variables of gender, race/ethnicity, marital status, and child status. Outputs for additional variables can be found in Appendix C.

Table 11 Participant Population Based on Behavior Factor and Gender

		Frequency	**Percent**
Cyclers	Male	9	20.0
	Female	33	73.3
	Non-Binary	3	6.7
	Total	**45**	**100.0**
Family Firster	Male	29	28.4
	Female	69	67.6
	Non-Binary	3	2.9
	Prefer not to Disclose	1	1.0
	Total	**102**	**100.0**
Integrators	Male	35	25.9
	Female	95	70.4
	Transgender	2	1.5
	Other	3	2.2
	Total	**135**	**100.0**
Separators	Male	1	25.0
	Female	3	75.0
	Total	**4**	**100.0**
Work Firster	Male	1	100.0

Table 12 Participant Population Based on Behavior Factor and Race and Ethnicity

		Frequency	**Percent**
Cyclers	White/Caucasian	24	53.3
	Black/African American	3	6.7
	Asian/Pacific Islander	3	6.7
	Hispanic (regardless of race)	7	15.6
	Native American/First Nations	3	6.7
	Mixed Race	5	11.1
	Total	**45**	**100.0**
Family Firster	White/Caucasian	57	55.9
	Black/African American	16	15.7
	Asian/Pacific Islander	8	7.8
	Hispanic (regardless of race)	9	8.8

Table 12 (cont'd)

	Mixed Race	4	3.9
	Other	7	6.9
	Prefer not to Disclose	1	1.0
	Total	**102**	**100.0**
Integrators	White/Caucasian	89	65.9
	Black/African American	19	14.1
	Asian/Pacific Islander	11	8.1
	Hispanic (regardless of race)	4	3.0
	Mixed Race	11	8.0
	Prefer not to Disclose	1	.7
	Total	**135**	**100.0**
Separators	White/Caucasian	2	50.0
	Hispanic (regardless of race)	1	25.0
	Mixed Race	1	25.0
	Total	**4**	**100.0**
Work Firster	Hispanic (regardless of race)	1	100.0

Table 13 Participant Population Based on Behavior Factor and Marital Status

		Frequency	**Percent**
Cyclers	Single	33	73.3
	Married	4	8.9
	Domestic Partnership	5	11.1
	Divorced	2	4.4
	Prefer not to Disclose	1	2.2
	Total	**45**	**100.0**
Family Firster	Single	63	61.8
	Married	27	26.5
	Domestic Partnership	12	11.8
	Total	**102**	**100.0**
Integrators	Single	95	70.4
	Married	22	16.3
	Domestic Partnership	18	13.3
	Total	**135**	**100.0**
Separators	Single	2	50.0
	Married	1	25.0
	Domestic Partnership	1	25.0
	Total	**4**	**100.0**

Table 13 (cont'd)

Work Firster	Single	1	100.0

Table 14 Participant Population Based on Behavior Factor and Child Status

		Frequency	**Percent**
Cyclers	Yes	2	4.4
	No	43	95.6
	Total	**45**	**100.0**
Family Firster	Yes	6	5.9
	No	95	93.1
	Prefer not to Disclose	1	1.0
	Total	**102**	**100.0**
Integrators	Yes	9	6.7
	No	126	93.3
	Total	**135**	**100.0**
Separators	No	4	100.0
Work Firster	No	1	100.0

These demographics indicate that those who are married/partnered are more likely to be integrators or family firsters. These demographics show a trend away from highly separative tendencies; including participants who are married or partnered.

Demographics based on Boundary Control Factor

Boundary Control factor is broken down into three sub-categories: low, medium, and high. Below is the output for the variables of gender, race/ethnicity, marital status, and child status. Outputs for additional variables can be found in Appendix C.

Table 15 Participant Population Based on Boundary Control Factor and Gender

		Frequency	**Percent**
Low	Male	27	23.5
	Female	82	71.3
	Transgender	1	.9
	Non-Binary	3	2.6
	Other	2	1.7
	Total	**115**	**100.0**

Table 15 (cont'd)

Medium	Male	4	19.0
	Female	17	81.0
	Total	**21**	**100.0**
High	Male	44	29.1
	Female	101	66.9
	Transgender	1	.7
	Non-Binary	3	2.0
	Other	1	.7
	Prefer not to Disclose	1	.7
	Total	**151**	**100.0**

Table 16 Participant Population Based on Boundary Control Factor and Race and Ethnicity

		Frequency	**Percent**
Low	White/Caucasian	80	69.6
	Black/African American	10	8.7
	Asian/Pacific Islander	7	6.1
	Hispanic (regardless of race)	8	7.0
	Mixed Race	8	7.0
	Other	1	.9
	Prefer not to Disclose	1	.9
	Total	**115**	**100.0**
Medium	White/Caucasian	10	47.6
	Black/African American	3	14.3
	Asian/Pacific Islander	3	14.3
	Hispanic (regardless of race)	2	9.5
	Native American/First Nations	1	4.8
	Mixed Race	2	9.6
	Total	**21**	**100.0**
High	White/Caucasian	82	54.3
	Black/African American	25	16.6
	Asian/Pacific Islander	12	7.9
	Hispanic (regardless of race)	12	7.9
	Native American/First Nations	2	1.3
	Mixed Race	16	10.6
	Other	1	.7
	Prefer not to Disclose	1	.7
	Total	151	100.0

Table 17 Participant Population Based on Boundary Control Factor and Marital Status

		Frequency	Percent
Low	Single	77	67.0
	Married	23	20.0
	Domestic Partnership	13	11.3
	Divorced	2	1.7
	Total	**115**	**100.0**
Medium	Single	14	66.7
	Married	4	19.0
	Domestic Partnership	3	14.3
	Total	**21**	**100.0**
High	Single	103	68.2
	Married	27	17.9
	Domestic Partnership	20	13.2
	Prefer not to Disclose	1	.7
	Total	**151**	**100.0**

Table 18 Participant Population Based on Boundary Control Factor and Child Status

		Frequency	Percent
Low	Yes	8	7.0
	No	106	92.2
	Prefer not to Disclose	1	.9
	Total	**115**	**100.0**
Medium	No	21	100.0
High	Yes	9	6.0
	No	142	94.0
	Total	**151**	**100.0**

Demographics Based on Identity Factor

The third element of the work-life indicator is work identity factor that has four subgroups: dual focus, family focus, other focus, work focus. A demographic breakdown of this for the variables of gender, race/ethnicity, marital status, and child status are below. For the output of additional demographic variables, please see Appendix C.

Table 19 Participant Population Based on Identity Factor and Gender

		Frequency	Percent
Dual Focus	Male	20	23.8
	Female	61	72.6
	Non-Binary	3	3.6
	Total	**84**	**100.0**
Family Focus	Female	7	100.0
Other Focus	Male	2	50.0
	Female	1	25.0
	Non-Binary	1	25.0
	Total	**4**	**100.0**
Work Focus	Male	53	27.6
	Female	131	68.2
	Transgender	2	1.0
	Non-Binary	5	2.6
	Prefer not to Disclose	1	.5
	Total	**192**	**100.0**

Table 20 Participant Population Based on Identity Factor and Race and Ethnicity

		Frequency	Percent
Dual Focus	White/Caucasian	50	59.5
	Black/African American	15	17.9
	Asian/Pacific Islander	2	2.4
	Hispanic (regardless of race)	7	8.3
	Native American/First Nations	2	2.4
	Multiple	8	9.6
	Prefer not to Disclose	1	1.2
	Total	**84**	**100.0**
Family Focus	White/Caucasian	3	42.9
	Black/African American	1	14.3
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	14.3
	Hispanic (regardless of race)	2	28.6
	Total	**7**	**100.0**
Other Focus	White/Caucasian	2	50.0
	Black/African American	1	25.0
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	25.0
	Total	**4**	**100.0**

Table 20 (cont'd)

Work Focus	White/Caucasian	117	60.9
	Black/African American	21	10.9
	Asian/Pacific Islander	18	9.4
	Hispanic (regardless of race)	13	6.8
	Native American/First Nations	1	.5
	Mixed Race	21	10.9
	Prefer not to Disclose	1	.5
	Total	**192**	**100.0**

Table 21 Participant Population Based on Identity Factor and Marital Status

		Frequency	**Percent**
Dual Focus	Single	52	61.9
	Married	18	21.4
	Domestic Partnership	13	15.5
	Divorced	1	1.2
	Total	**84**	**100.0**
Family Focus	Single	5	71.4
	Married	1	14.3
	Divorced	1	14.3
	Total	7	100.0
Other Focus	Single	2	50.0
	Married	2	50.0
	Total	**4**	**100.0**
Work Focus	Single	135	70.3
	Married	33	17.2
	Domestic Partnership	23	12.0
	Prefer not to Disclose	1	.5
	Total	**192**	**100.0**

Table 22 Participant Population Based on Identity Factor and Child Status

		Frequency	**Percent**
Dual Focus	Yes	12	14.3
	No	71	84.5
	Prefer not to Disclose	1	1.2
	Total	**84**	**100.0**
Family Focus	**No**	**7**	**100.0**

Table 22 (cont'd)

Other Focus	**No**	**4**	**100.0**
Work Focus	Yes	5	2.6
	No	187	97.4
	Total	**192**	**100.0**

Results for Research Question #1

The primary research question asked if there was a relationship between flexstyle and job satisfaction among new professionals in student affairs. The results to the hypothesis related to this question is as follows:

Hypothesis 1a. There will be no significant mean difference between job satisfaction and behavior factor groups

The means for job satisfaction scores amongst all participants was 3.81 on a scale of five. The job satisfaction schedule (Judge et al., 1998) consisted of five Likert scale questions ranging from (1) to (5). The higher ones score was on the scale, the more satisfied they were. Satisfaction scores below 2.5 indicate a stronger trend towards job dissatisfaction. Therefore, an overall mean of 3.8 indicates a fairly strong level of job satisfaction amongst all participants. The job satisfaction means of the five flexstyles were as follows:

Table 23 Job Satisfaction Means Based on Behavior Factor

	Frequency	**Mean**
Cycler	45	3.79
Family Firster	102	3.98
Integrator	135	3.68
Separator	4	4.3
Work Firster	1	2.6

Family firster had the highest job satisfaction rate out of the behavior factor sub-classification groups. It can be inferred from this result that placing some priority on family/personal matters has a positive impact on job satisfaction. Family firster individuals put a high priority on the family. In addition, the behavior factor sub-classification group with the

second highest job satisfaction mean (Cyclers) prioritize what times of year require attention for personal matters and Integrators scores were lower, indicating that the blending of work and life may have some negative impact on job satisfaction when compared to other the other behavior control sub-classifications. Separator and work firster groups were too small to make proper inference.

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to compare the effect between behavior factor on job satisfaction in new professionals in student affairs with the following variables being controlled for: age, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, units in student affairs, number of full time jobs in student affairs over career, marital status, number of years in full time work in student affairs, if the respondents had children, educational attainment, positive affect and negative affect. A Levene's test and normality check were conducted and the assumptions were met. In order to run post-hoc tests, the work firster group was eliminated from the analysis as it only had one participant. Results indicated no significant main effect for work-life behavior, $F(3,219) = 1.00$, $p > .05$ (.394) $\eta 2 = 0.014$. Although no significant relationship was found between flexstyle and job satisfaction the following effects had significant impact on variation within the model: number of fulltime jobs in student affairs $F(3,219) = p < .05.036 =$. $\eta 2 = .038$, positive affect $F(1,219) = 82.379$ $p < .01$ (.000) $\eta 2 = 0.273$, negative affect $F(1,219) = 9.942$ $p < .01$ (.001) $\eta 2 = 0.043$, and years of full-time work in student affairs $F(1,219) = 5.049$, $p < .05$ (.026), $\eta 2 = 0.023$ all had significant variation on the model. The hypothesis was supported.

Hypothesis 1b. There will be no significant mean difference between job satisfaction and boundary control factor groups

The means for job satisfaction scores amongst all participants was 3.81 on a scale of five with higher scores indicating job satisfaction. Broken down individually the means of the three boundary control groups were as follows:

Table 24 Job Satisfaction Means Based on Boundary Control Factor

	Frequency	**Mean**
Low	115	3.61
Medium	21	4.55
High	151	4.00

Examining job satisfaction rates based on boundary control factor indicates some interesting results. Those with medium control had the highest mean of 4.55 indicating very strong job satisfaction while those with high control also have a high satisfaction rates. It may be possible that those with medium boundary control have found an equilibrium between what aspects of life they wish to control and which ones they are ok not having a direct say in matters. What this chart also reveals that one some level, as control levels increase there is a possibility that satisfaction increases as well. This phenomenon is tested in hypothesis 1f.

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to compare the effect between boundary control factor on job satisfaction in new professionals in student affairs with the following variables being controlled for: age, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, units in student affairs, number of full time jobs in student affairs over career, marital status, number of years in full time work in student affairs, if the respondents had children, educational attainment, positive affect and negative affect. The Levene's test and normality checks were conducted and the assumptions were met. Results indicated a significant relationship between job satisfaction and boundary control factor, $F(2,221) = 3.628$, $p = < .05$ (.027) $\eta 2 = 0.032$. In addition, the following variables had significant impact on variation within the model: positive affect $F(1,221) = 81.494$ $p < .01$ (.000) $\eta 2 = 0.269$, and negative affect $F(1,221) = 6.153$ $p < .05$ (.014)

$\eta 2 = 0.027$. Post hoc tests showed there was a significant difference between medium and high boundary control ($p = .019$). The null hypothesis of there not being a significant relationship between boundary control factor and job satisfaction was not supported.

Hypothesis 1c: There will be no significant mean difference between job satisfaction and work-life identity factor groups

The means for turnover intention scores amongst all participants was 3.81 on a scale of five, with five indicating strong job satisfaction. Thus, the higher an individual scores on the job satisfaction scale the more satisfied they are with their current job. Broken down individually the means of the four work-life identity groups were as follows:

Table 25 Job Satisfaction Means Based on Identity Factor

	Frequency	**Mean**
Dual Focus	84	3.87
Family Focus	7	3.31
Other Focus	4	3.25
Work Focus	192	3.81

The job satisfaction means based on identity factor yielded some interesting results. Dual focus had the highest satisfaction rate at 3.87. When broken down by identity factor, satisfaction tends to favor those whose identity has a strong work identity. It should be noted that identity factor assesses the extent to which an individual's identity is attached to work or personal life while behavior factor examines the extent to which individuals allow work and personal commitments to interrupt (or not interrupt) each other.

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to compare the effect between work-life identity on job satisfaction for new professionals in student affairs with the following variables being controlled for: age, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, units in student affairs, number of full-time jobs in student affairs over career, marital status, number of years in full time work in student affairs, if the respondents had children, educational attainment,

positive affect and negative affect. The Levene's test and normality checks were conducted and the assumptions were met. Results indicated a significant main effect for work-life identity, $F(3,220) = 2.919$, $p < .01$ (0.035) $\eta 2 = 0.038$. In addition positive affect $F(1,220) = 89.231$, $p < .01$ (.000) $\eta 2 = .289$, negative affect $F(1,220) = 8.609$, $p < .01$ (.004) $\eta 2 = 0.038$, number of full time jobs in student affairs, $F(3,220) = 3.430$ .018, $p < .05$ (.018) $\eta 2 = .045$, and years of full-time work in student affairs $F(1,220) = 5.765$ $p < .05$ (.017), $\eta 2 = .026$ all had significant variation on the model. The hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 1d. There will be a positive relationship between nonwork interrupting work behaviors and job satisfaction

As previously mentioned, the flexstyle score was ascertained by comparing the means of two subscales (work interrupting nonwork behaviors and nonwork interrupting work behaviors). I thought it was beneficial to see if there was a significant relationship between these subscales individually and job satisfaction. To do so a multiple regression was carried out to investigate whether nonwork interrupting work behaviors could impact job satisfaction when controlling for the following variables: age, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, units in student affairs, number of full time jobs in student affairs over career, marital status, number of years in full-time work in student affairs, if the respondents had children, educational attainment, positive affect and negative affect. In the first step, the control variables were entered into the model with the independent variable entered during the second step.

The results of the regression indicated that the model explained 41.8% of the variance and that the model itself was a significant predictor of job satisfaction $F(13,268) = 13.911$, $p < .001$ (000). Although nonwork interrupting work did not have a significant contribution to the model ($B = -.053$, $p = .413$) when controlling for demographic variables and both positive and negative affect, a small negative correlation did exist. Positive affect ($B = .563$, $p = .000$),

negative affect (B = -.203, p = .000), and years of full-time professional student affairs work (B = -.081, p= .047) all had significant contributions to the model. The results of the model demonstrate that a positive relationship between non-work interrupting work does not exist. The hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 1e. There will be a negative relationship between work interrupting nonwork and job satisfaction

The results of the regression indicated that the model explained 40.8% of the variance and that the model itself was a significant predictor of job satisfaction F(13,268) = 13.911, p < .001 (000). Although work interrupting nonwork did not have a significant contribution to the model (B = -.062, p = .097) when controlling for demographic variables and both positive and negative affect, a small negative correlation did exist. Positive affect (B = .561, p = .000) and negative affect (B = -.188, p = .000), all had significant contributions to the model. The results of the model demonstrate that a statistically significant negative relationship between work interrupting nonwork and job satisfaction did not exist. The hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 1f: There will be a positive relationship between boundary control and job satisfaction

The results of the regression indicated that the model explained 41.9% of the variance and that the model itself was a significant predictor of job satisfaction F(13,268) = 13.911, p <. 001 (000). Boundary control factor was found to have a statistically significant contribution to the model (B = .137, p = .001) when controlling for demographic variables and both positive and negative affect. Positive affect (B = .551, p = .000) and negative affect (B = -.169, p = .001) both had significant contributions to the model. The results of the model demonstrate that a statistically significant positive relationship between boundary control and job satisfaction does exist and the hypothesis was supported.

Hypothesis 1g. There will be a negative relationship between family identity and job satisfaction

The results of the regression indicated that the model explained 40.4% of the variance and that the model itself was a significant predictor of job satisfaction F(13,268) = 13.965, p <. 001 (000). The family identity subscale was found to not have a statistically significant contribution to the model (B = .071, p = .075) when controlling for demographic variables and both positive and negative affect. Positive affect (B = .551, p. = .000) and negative affect (B= -.196, p = .000), and years of full-time professional experience in student affairs (B = -.081, p = .046) all had significant contributions to the model. The results of the model demonstrate that there was no statistically significant negative relationship between family identity and job satisfaction. As such, the hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 1h. There will be a positive relationship between work identity and job satisfaction

The results of the regression indicated that the model explained 40.5% of the variance and that the model itself was a significant predictor of job satisfaction F(13,268) = 14.177, p < .001 (000). The work identity subscale was found to have a statistically significant positive contribution to the model (B = .138, p = .028) when controlling for demographic variables and both positive and negative affect. Positive affect (B = .528, p. = .000), negative affect (B= -.210, p = .000), and years of full-time professional experience in student affairs (B= -.086, p = .033) all had significant contributions to the model. The results of the model demonstrate that there was statistically significant positive relationship between work identity and job satisfaction. As such, the hypothesis was supported.

Results for Research Question #2

The second research question asked if there was a relationship between flexstyle and turnover intention. The results to the hypothesis related to this question is as follows:

Hypothesis 2a. There will be no significant mean difference between turnover intention and behavior factor groups

The means for turnover intention scores amongst all five flexstyles was 2.42. Bothma and Roodt's (2013) Turnover Intention Scale–6 (TIS-6) consisted of four Likert-scale questions ranging from 1 (unlikely to turnover) to 5 (likely to turnover). The higher one's score the more likely they would be to turnover. Broken down individually the means of the five flexstyles were as follows:

Table 26 Turnover Intention Means Based on Behavior Factor

	Frequency	**Mean**
Cycler	45	2.36
Family Firster	102	2.21
Integrator	135	2.60
Separator	4	2.15
Work Firster	1	2.5
Overall	**287**	**2.42**

The TIS-6 scale (Bothma & Roodt, 2013) is a five-point scale with scores indicating a higher likelihood of turnover intention as scores get larger. The overall mean of 2.42 for all groups reveals that new professionals in student affairs are neither highly likely to turnover in their current positions nor are they highly likely to stay. Given that the sample was overall satisfied and relatively young, the scores not indicating strong or weak turnover intention may be reflective of new professionals looking for opportunities to find a position that advances their career. In regards to behavior factor, *Separators* were the most likely to stay in their jobs although low numbers in this group make it difficult to make accurate observations regarding turnover intention and the separator sub-classification. *Integrators* are the most likely to leave their positions but this number itself if just north of the 2.5 midpoint on the 5.0 TIS-6 scale. The 2.6 mean indicates that integrators were neither highly likely nor highly unlikely to leave their positions at the time the assessment was taken.

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to compare the effect between behavior factor and job satisfaction for new professionals in student affairs with the following variables being controlled for: age, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, units in student affairs, number of full-time jobs in student affairs over career, marital status, number of years in full-time work in student affairs, if the respondents had children, educational attainment, positive affect and negative affect. Results indicated that there was no significant main effect for the variable of behavior factor $F(3,219) = .908$, $p > .05$ (0.438) $\eta 2 = 0.012$. In addition positive affect $F(1,219) = 43.930$, $p < .01$ (.000) $\eta 2 = .167$, negative affect $F(1,219) = 26.653$, $p < .01$ (.000) $\eta 2 = 0.108$, years of full-time work in student affairs $F(1,219) = 10.031$ $p < .01$ (.002), $\eta 2 = .044$, and age $F(1,219) = 4.107$, $p < .05$ (.044), $\eta 2 = .018$ all had significant variation on the model. The results of this test demonstrate that there is no significant relationship between flexstyle and turnover intention and the hypothesis was supported.

Hypothesis 2b: There will be no significant mean difference between turnover intention and boundary control factor groups

The means for turnover intention scores amongst all participants was 2.42. Broken down individually the means of the three boundary control groups were as follows:

Table 27 Turnover Intention Means Based on Boundary Control Factor

	Frequency	**Mean**
Low	115	2.63
Medium	21	2.61
High	151	2.23
Overall	**287**	**2.42**

The overall mean of 2.42 for all groups reveals that new professionals in student affairs are neither highly likely to turnover in their current positions but they are also not highly likely to stay. In regards to boundary control factor, those with high boundary control were less likely to turnover than those with low and medium boundary control. This indicates that the more

boundary control an individual has the less likely they are to turnover and leave their jobs in an organization.

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to compare the effect between control factor on turnover intention on new professionals in student affairs with the following variables being controlled for: age, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, units in student affairs, number of full-time jobs in student affairs over career, marital status, number of years in full-time work in student affairs, if the respondents had children, educational attainment, positive affect and negative affect. The Levene's test and normality checks were conducted and the assumptions were met. Results indicated no significant main effect for boundary control factor, $F(2,221) = .905$, $p > .05$ (0.406) $\eta 2 = 0.008$. Although there was no significant interaction between boundary control factor and turnover intention, the following variables had significant impact on variation within the model: positive affect $F(1,221) = 41.461$, $p < .01$ (.000) $\eta 2 = 0.158$, negative affect $F(1,221) = 19.222$ $p < .01$ (.000) $\eta 2 = 0.080$, years of full-time work in student affairs $F(1,221) = 63.956$, $p < .05$ (0.011), $\eta 2 = 0.029$, and if participants had children $F(1,221) = 2.865$, $p < .05$ (.018), $\eta 2 = .036$. Thus, there was no significant relationship between boundary control factor and turnover intention. The hypothesis was supported.

Hypothesis 2c: There will be no significant mean difference between turnover intention and identity factor groups

The means for turnover intention scores amongst all participants was 2.42. Broken down individually the means of the four work-life identity groups were as follows:

Table 28 Turnover Intention Means Based on Identity Factor

	Frequency	**Mean**
Dual Focus	84	2.37
Family Focus	7	2.85
Other Focus	4	3
Work Focus	192	2.41
Overall	**287**	**2.42**

Given that the higher the score (closer to 5), the higher the intention to turnover, the mean scores when broken down by identity group also show that individuals whose primary focus *is not* work (specifically family focus and other focus) are more likely to leave their positions than those where work is a primary or equal focus to their outside commitments. The participants who were dual focused (had an equal emphasis on work and personal commitments) were the least likely to turnover out of the four identity factor groups.

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to compare the effect between identity factor on turnover intention for new professionals in student affairs with the following variables being controlled for: age, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, units in student affairs, number of full-time jobs in student affairs over career, marital status, number of years in full-time work in student affairs, if the respondents had children, educational attainment, positive affect and negative affect. The Levene's test and normality checks were conducted and the assumptions were met. Results indicated a significant main effect for work-life identity, $F(3,220) = 3.187$, $p < .05$ (0.25) $\eta 2 = 0.042$. In addition positive affect $F(1,220) = 43.232$, $p < .01$ (.000) $\eta 2 = .164$, negative affect $F(1,220) = 23.317$, $p < .01$ (.000) $\eta 2 = 0.096$, whether participants had children $F(2,220) = 5.659$, $p < .01$ (.004), $\eta 2 = 0.049$, years of full-time work in student affairs $F(1,220) = 9.549$, $p < .01$ (.002), $\eta 2 = .042$, and age $F(1,220) = 5.020$, $p < .05$ (.026), $\eta 2 = .022$ all had significant variation on the model. Given that there was a significant difference in means the null hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 2d. There will be a negative relationship between work interrupting nonwork and turnover intention

To test the relationship between work-interrupting nonwork subscale and turnover intention, a multiple regression was carried out to investigate whether nonwork interrupting work behaviors could impact job satisfaction when controlling for the following variables: age,

gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, units in student affairs, number of full-time jobs in student affairs over career, marital status, number of years in full time work in student affairs, if the respondents had children, educational attainment, positive affect and negative affect. In the first step, the control variables were entered with the independent variable entered during the second step.

The results of the regression indicated that the model explained 34.9% of the variance and that the model itself was a significant predictor of job satisfaction $F(13,268) = 11.033$, $p < .001$ (000). Although work interrupting nonwork did not have a significant contribution to the model ($B = -.192$, $p = .266$) when controlling for demographic variables and both positive and negative affect, a small positive correlation did exist. Positive affect ($B = -1.812$, $p = .000$), negative affect ($B = -1.258$, $p = .000$), years of full-time professional student affairs work ($B = .555$, $p = .003$), and if respondents had children ($B = -1.812$, $p = .041$) all had significant contributions to the model. The results of the model demonstrate that a negative relationship between work interrupting nonwork does not exist. The hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 2e: There will be a positive relationship between nonwork interrupting work behaviors and turnover intention

To test the relationship between nonwork-interrupting work subscale and turnover intention, a multiple regression was carried out to investigate whether nonwork interrupting work behaviors could impact job satisfaction when controlling for the following variables: age, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, units in student affairs, number of full-time jobs in student affairs over career, marital status, number of years in full-time work in student affairs, if the respondents had children, educational attainment, positive affect and negative affect. In the first step, the control variables were entered with the independent variable entered during the second step.

The results of the regression indicated that the model explained 34.7% of the variance and that the model itself was a significant predictor of job satisfaction $F(13,268) = 10.934$, $p < .001$ (000). Nonwork interrupting work did not have a significant contribution to the model ($B = .189$, $p = .526$) when controlling for demographic variables and both positive and negative affect, a small positive correlation did exist. Positive affect ($B = -1.815$, $p = .000$), negative affect ($B = -1.304$, $p = .000$), years of full-time professional student affairs work ($B = .567$, $p = .003$), and if respondents had children ($B = -1.822$, $p = .042$) all had significant contributions to the model. The results of the model demonstrate that a positive relationship between nonwork interrupting work does not exist and the hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 2f. There will be a negative relationship between boundary control and turnover intention

A multiple regression was carried out to investigate whether boundary control had a relationship with turnover intention when controlling for the following variables: age, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, units in student affairs, number of full-time jobs in student affairs over career, marital status, number of years in full-time work in student affairs, if the respondents had children, educational attainment, positive affect and negative affect. In the first step, the control variables were entered with the independent variable entered during the second step.

The results of the regression indicated that the model explained 35.8% of the variance and that the model itself was a significant predictor of job satisfaction $F(13,268) = 11.514$, $p < .001$(000). Boundary control was found to have a significant contribution to the model ($B = -.456$ $p = .022$) when controlling for demographic variables and both positive and negative affect. The nature of the relationship was negative. Positive affect ($B = -1.775$, p. = .000), negative affect ($B = 1.193$, $p = .000$), years of full-time professional student affairs work ($B = .555$, $p =$

.003), and if respondents had children (B = -1.841, p = .036) all had significant contributions to the model. The results of the model demonstrate that a negative relationship between boundary control and turnover intention exists at a statistically significant level and as such the hypothesis was supported.

Hypothesis 2g: There will be a negative relationship between family identity and turnover intention

A multiple regression was carried out to investigate whether family identity had a relationship with turnover intention when controlling for the following variables: age, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, units in student affairs, number of full-time jobs in student affairs over career, marital status, number of years in full-time work in student affairs, if the respondents had children, educational attainment, positive affect and negative affect. In the first step the control variables were entered with the independent variable entered during the second step.

The results of the regression indicated that the model explained 34.8% of the variance and that the model itself was a significant predictor of job satisfaction $F(13,268) = 11.020$, $p < .001$ (000). Family identity was found to have no significant contribution to the model (B = -.196 p = .289) when controlling for demographic variables and both positive and negative affect. The nature of the relationship was negative. Positive affect (B = -1.781, p. = .000), negative affect (B = 1.283, p = .000), years of full-time professional student affairs work (B = .568, p= .003), and if respondents had children (B = -2.036, p = .023) all had significant contributions to the model. The results of the model demonstrate that a negative relationship between family identity and turnover intention did not exist at a statistically significant level. The hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 2h: There will be a positive relationship between work identity and turnover intention

A multiple regression was carried out to investigate whether work identity had a relationship with turnover intention when controlling for the following variables: age, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, units in student affairs, number of full-time jobs in student affairs over career, marital status, number of years in full-time work in student affairs, if the respondents had children, educational attainment, positive affect and negative affect. In the first step the control variables were entered with the independent variable entered during the second step.

The results of the regression indicated that the model explained 35.2% of the variance and that the model itself was a significant predictor of job satisfaction $F(13,268) = 11.197$, $p < .001$ (000). Work identity was found to have no significant contribution to the model (B = -.470. p = .105) when controlling for demographic variables and both positive and negative affect. Positive affect (B =.-1.698, p. = .000), negative affect (B = 1.329, p = .000), years of full-time professional student affairs work (B = .585, p= .002), and if respondents had children (B = -1.968, p = .026) all had significant contributions to the instrument. The results demonstrate that a positive relationship between work identity and turnover intention did not exist at a statistically significant level. The hypothesis, therefore, was not supported.

Chapter Summary

This chapter analyzed the results of the two-pronged research approach that gave deeper Understanding into the discovering whether significant relationships existed between flexstyle and job satisfaction and turnover intention. A summary of the hypotheses can be seen in the chart on the following page:

Table 29 Index of Hypotheses and Results Related to Job Satisfaction

Hypothesis	**Result**
Hypothesis 1a. There will be no significant mean difference for behavior factor groups.	Hypothesis supported.
Hypothesis 1b. There will be no significant mean difference for boundary control factor groups.	Hypothesis not supported.
Hypothesis 1c. There will be no significant mean difference for identity factor groups.	Hypothesis not supported.
Hypothesis 1d. There will be a positive relationship between nonwork interrupting work behaviors and job satisfaction.	Hypothesis supported.
Hypothesis 1e. There will be a negative relationship between work interrupting nonwork and job satisfaction.	Hypothesis supported.
Hypothesis 1f. There will be a positive relationship between boundary control and job satisfaction.	Hypothesis supported.
Hypothesis 1g. There will be a negative relationship between family identity and job satisfaction.	Hypothesis not supported.
Hypothesis 1h. There will be a positive relationship between work identity and job satisfaction.	Hypothesis supported.

Table 30 Index of Hypotheses and Results Related to Turnover Intention

Hypothesis	**Result**
Hypothesis 2a. There will be no significant mean difference for behavior factor groups.	Hypothesis supported.
Hypothesis 2b. There will be no significant mean difference for boundary control factor groups.	Hypothesis supported.
Hypothesis 2c. There will be no significant mean difference for identity factor.	Hypothesis not supported.
Hypothesis 2d. There will be a negative relationship between work interrupting nonwork and turnover intention.	Hypothesis not supported.
Hypothesis 2e. There will be a positive relationship between nonwork interrupting work behaviors and turnover intention.	Hypothesis not supported.
Hypothesis 2f. There will be a negative relationship between boundary control and turnover intention.	Hypothesis supported.
Hypothesis 2g. There will be a negative relationship between family identity and turnover intention.	Hypothesis not supported.

Table 30 (cont'd)

Hypothesis 2h. There will be a positive relationship between work identity and turnover intention.	Hypothesis not supported.

In the next chapter, I will discuss the practical and research implications of these results.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

In this chapter I review the initial premise behind the study, challenges in the study, and the overall research questions. This chapter next will provide a brief summary of my findings, their interpretations; identify implications for research, theory, and practice. This chapter ends with recommendations for future research.

Overview of the Study

This study was conducted to help better understand the issue of attrition amongst new professionals in student affairs; a profession that has an attrition rate between 40 and 60% (Bender, 1980; Lorden, 1998; Tull, 2006). The literature review demonstrated several determinants that contributed to the departure puzzle such as pay, irregular hours, workload, and lack of advancement (Evans, 1988; Lorden, 1998; Marshall et al., 2016; Mullen et al., 2018). Despite this large body of work, no studies had looked to see if flexibility preference (aka flexstyles) had any impact on attrition of new professionals in student affairs. As such, Kossek et al.'s (2012) work-nonwork boundary management profile instrument was chosen as a means for understanding flexibility preferences. It should be noted that Kossek's work-nonwork boundary management profile instrument evolved from two instruments: the Work-Life Indicator (Hannum et al., 2011) and Kossek and Lautsch's (2008) flexstyles assessment that was found in the book *CEO of ME*. The result was a 17-item Likert scale instrument comprised of five subscales and six flexstyles as a result.

The purpose of this study was to understand if a potential relationship existed amongst new student affairs professionals and the variables of job satisfaction and turnover intention. Based on the information presented previously, the two overarching research questions in this study were:

1) What is the relationship between work-life flexstyle and job satisfaction amongst new student affairs professionals?
2) What is the relationship between work-life flexstyle and turnover intention amongst new student affairs professionals?

Discussion of the Findings

The following section discusses the overall findings of the study. In addition, the section also discusses any statistically significant results from this study, giving insight as to how the findings fit in the literature as well as practical implications for practice.

Work-Life Flexstyle and Job Satisfaction

This study found that no significant relationship existed between flexstyle and job satisfaction. The average job satisfaction mean of all groups was fairly high with a mean of 3.81 (on 5.0 scale)**.** Overall, new professionals are satisfied in their jobs. Although no significance was found, the large skewness of work-life flexstyles signals a potential shift that may reflect the generational shifts present in new professionals, namely Millennials and Generation Z. This is indicative of current generational and broad-based workforce trends that reveal that employees prefer to mix work and nonwork commitments in ways that allow them to find fulfillment and success in both arenas (Berkup, 2014; Pulevska-Ivanovska, Postolov, Janeska-Iliev, & Magdinceva, 2017). This is reflected in two out of the three dominant flexstyles that emerged in this study: integrators and cyclers. What is of interest is the second largest group in the study (family firster) allows nonwork to interrupt family but not the reverse. This group demonstrated the highest mean on the boundary control factor scale (3.98) as well as had the largest grouping of high-boundary controlling individuals (73 out of 102). Moreover, perhaps what is most significant is which groups *are not* represented well in the overall study sample: work-firsters

and separators. The overarching narrative of Millennials and Generation Z in the workplace states that personal commitments, experiences, and the ability to navigate a life that allows personal needs to be met is important (Pulevska-Ivanovska, et al., 2017). Thus, the flexstyle that put work above personal commitments (work-firster) was not represented. Likewise, the separator flexstyle was not well represented which may reflect the millennial preference to blend domains.

This study also found that boundary control factor had a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction. Those with high boundary control tendencies reported a statistically significant higher mean (4.00) than those with medium (3.55) and low (3.61) boundary control factors. These results indicate that employees who have the ability to set their own boundaries are more satisfied than those who may not feel that they have control between their domains. Two factors of importance should be noted about this observation: first, employees skilled at setting boundaries should be sought after if a more positive work climate is desired. Although boundary setting alone does not create a positive work climate, clearer expectations and agreements definitely contribute to an ideal work culture. This is in line with research that posits employees who can be open and honest about their needs and have those needs met perform better than those who cannot (Mas-Machuca, Berbegal-Mirabent, & Alegre, 2016; Tull, 2006). Second, managers should be aware that employees with high boundary control factors are more likely to articulate their needs and managers should therefore be prepared to articulate job requirements, job expectations, flexible work options, expectations related to flexible work options.

A statistically significant relationship existed between job satisfaction and work identity factor. The means for work identity factor groups were dual focus, family focus, other focus, and

work focus were 3.87, 3.31, 3.25 and 3.81, respectively. Family focus and other focused individuals did have lower satisfaction levels than their Work Focus and Dual Focused colleagues. At the individual subscale level, there was no significant difference between job satisfaction and family identity but there was a significant positive relationship between work identity and job satisfaction. This indicates that new professionals invest a large part of themselves into their work and that the work itself is a positive force in their work-life. This is reflective of literature in the field that often speaks to the initial passion new professionals have for student affairs work as the work itself touches a part of their personal identity (race, gender, ability, etc.) or valuable experience as an undergraduate (athletics, fraternity/sorority life, or admissions, etc.) (Hunter, 1992; Taub & McEwen, 2006).

A distinction in terminology should be noted at this point. The overall flexstyle of family firster may be somewhat confusing when contrasted to the work first subscale identity – both of which had large group participation. On the surface it may seem as if these two styles and dimensions cannot coexist so dominantly within a single sample. It should be noted that the family firster flexstyle deals with an individual's ability to allow personal matters to interrupt work. This does not mean that work is not important to family firster; it simply helps us understand the parameters individuals create that allow them to be successful in both their personal and professional domain. The identity of work firster discusses the amount of energy and identity individuals put into their work. This is not necessarily at odds with a family firster interruption behavior type; rather it is a nuanced subset that seems to be more dominant in this sample. To give a hypothetical example, a professional with both of these identities may commit much of their time to their professional lives yet allow family to call them when needed. Because so much time is invested in professional endeavors, the student affairs administrator

may naturally put up stricter boundaries around work interrupting family time since family time may be rarer and thus more heavily protected.

Work-Life Flexstyle and Turnover Intention

This study also examined the relationship between work-life flexstyle and turnover intention. In relation to flexstyle, no statistically significant relationship was found both in terms of overall flexstyles and by analyzing the individual subscales of work interrupting nonwork and nonwork interrupting work, respectively. Indeed, the mean for the sample was 2.42 indicating a trend neither towards nor away from turnover intention. Likewise, identity factor and its respective subscales did not have a statistically significant relationship with turnover intention. The examination of boundary control found when divided into groups (low, medium, high) there was no significant variance or relationship with turnover intention. When boundary control was measured as a single continuous scale, a small but statistically significant negative relationship existed. The ability to control and set boundaries does have *some* impact on whether individuals look to stay at a company *even* if they are satisfied. A lack of boundary control has the potential to contribute to the turnover intention.

The ability for someone to control his or her work-life environment seems to be the clearest and most significant finding in this study especially when coupled with job satisfaction's positive relationship to boundary control. Categorically the lack of a statistically significant mean difference among groups (yet a significant relationship through multiple regression) can be best explained in that the means from all three groups were similar and relatively low for this dimension. The regression then verified the nature of this relationship between these two variables.

As individual subscales, no relationships were found between turnover intention and family identity and work identity. Significant mean differences were found in respect to work-life identity types. One explanation for this outcome is that the individual subscales of family identity and work identity may have been too general and blunt a measure for this study and that work and family identity are interrelated. Participants who were dual focused and work focused had lower turnover intention than those who were other or family focused. Of all the four identity groups those who were dual focused recorded the lowest likelihood of turnover intention (mean of 2.37). This would make sense theoretically as those who are able to strike an equal balance between both realms would (and did) have higher levels of job satisfaction (Dual focused had a mean satisfaction of 3.87 - the highest in this study). There was no significant mean difference between dual focused and work focused identity types. The satisfaction and lower turnover rates in this group can be attributed in part to student affairs professionals loving their work and having a connection to it and as a result, an early career work-focused individual would not necessarily think to exit their job or the field.

The Role of Positive and Negative Affect

The control variables of positive affect (PA) and negative affect (NA) had statistically significant impact on the findings in this study. In general, new student affairs administrators had fairly strong positive affect scores (mean of 3.35) and low negative affect scores **(**mean of 2.05). PA and NA interacted with job satisfaction; as one would logically predict, those with higher PA scores had higher satisfaction and lower turnover intention ratings. Conversely, those with higher NA scores saw decreases in job satisfaction and increases in turnover intention. The significance of this signals that new professionals generally have a positive outlook in life and in initial stages of employment (which is as much as we can forecast in this study). This can be

seen as a benefit because positive outlook can carry professionals through some of the uncertainty and rigors of student affairs work. This study reveals that how an individual views their environment has a meaningful impact on how they interpret and respond to the situation, both good and bad.

The Role of Having Children in this Study

Another factor that had an impact on the findings regardless of outcome was whether participants had children or not. Participants with children reported lower levels of job satisfaction and higher levels of turnover intention. In the case of turnover intention, there was statistically significant difference between those who had children and those who did not and the statistic was significant at the .05 level reporting a *p* value of .019. Thus, attention should be paid to child status and that although satisfied, employees with children are more likely to look at leaving their positions, particularly if work environments do not allow for flexibility and integration. 53% of participants with children identified with the integrator personality style and 70% of participants with children identified as having a dual focus in terms of work-life identity. These reinforces the idea that both groups value their personal time and work time equally, which is contrary to some notions that an individual with child(ren) may be more family-focused in their work-life preferences.

The Role of Number of Years in the Profession in This Study

The final variable that had consistent impact on the findings was the number of years of full-time work in the student affairs profession. With this data set, there was no significant mean difference for both job satisfaction and turnover intention. A small drop in satisfaction levels and increase in turnover intention does occur for those in their third year of professional work, but this was not proven to be statistically significant. What should be noted is that years in the

field does play a factor in the professional experiences of new professionals and that time progression can be an indicator of departure from a job. A true trend could not be ascertained from this sample as those with four or more years of work experience in student affairs only amounted to three cases and thus lacked statistical power. A breakdown of levels by year of work for both dependent variables also indicated that job dissatisfaction and turnover intention were at their highest during the first year in the profession. This is consistent with previous research that discusses the importance in helping new professionals acclimate to the work as poor transition and support mechanisms may lead to early departure from the profession (Buchanan & Shupp, 2015; Lombardi & Mather, 2016; Renn & Hodges; 2007; Renn & Jessup-Anger, 2008).

Recommendations for Future Research

This study sought to determine if there were any relationships between flexstyle, job satisfaction and turnover intention. Although there were few statistically significant findings, there is still much to be examined in the realm of flexstyle and workplace flexibility. What follows are my recommendations for future research.

On a pragmatic level, this study revealed that researchers need to be mindful of age and possible generational effect when conducting research that involves personality typography given the rapid changing characteristics present in generations due to technological changes that impact how work and life interact. Previous studies that utilized the Work-Life Indicator reported an average age of 44.58 and 75% of the population was married (75%) or living as married (10%) (Kossek et al., 2011). This is in contrast with this study's sample that reported an average age of 27, with 18% reported being married and 12% reporting living as married (classified as domestic partnership in this study). Future research should continue to follow

student affairs professionals throughout their career to reassess if flexstyle changes with age, years of experience, and marital status. Likewise, continued investigation into flexstyle should be continued with new professionals to determine if the trends in this study were unique to the sample or more generalizable and can signal future shifts in generational conceptualizations of work and life.

With respect to timing of this survey, the majority of participants took this survey in July of 2019- a month in which many units are experiencing lower levels of workload. Although the instrument was released in July for practical reasons, researchers studying student affairs should be aware of how particular times of year may impact results. It was not clear whether the July timeframe influenced satisfaction and turnover intention levels. Furthermore, it can only be theorized as to whether a survey release in September-October when work is much busier would have significantly changed the results of the study. Thus, the time of year surveys are conducted should be considered at the very least given how cyclical student affairs work often is. Future research could investigate job satisfaction and turnover intention based on time of year to see if different levels of workloads and commitments has a significant effect. Future research should investigate the relationship between flexstyle, job satisfaction, and turnover intention based on time of year in the student affairs calendar to see how different flexstyles respond to varying levels of workload intensity.

Future research should be conducted using Kossek et al.'s (2012) model on mid-level and senior level administrators as well as a sample of student affairs administrators across all points in their career. Doing so would allow for deeper understanding in two areas: generational trends and impact over career span. Given that there were not enough members of the separator and work-firster groups, a larger sample across career levels and ages will help illuminate if the

findings in this study were specific to this sample or were reflective of the millennial generation in the workplace. Doing so could allow for a more definitive answer as to whether flexstyle has a relationship with job satisfaction and turnover intention with new professionals. Finally, further research in this realm would also allow us to better understand to what extent flexstyle tendencies change as careers progress and those changes have any impact on job satisfaction and turnover intention.

The significant impact of having (or not having) children spurs the following recommendations. Future research may want to examine not only the impact of being a parent but also if other major life commitments (elder care, pets, or serious hobbies) have a statistically significant impact on job satisfaction and turnover intention. Since employees with children were a relatively small group, further research could also focus on if employees with children are more likely to have dominant flexstyles. Research could also further explore the dynamic between employees with children and those without and the impact that may have on inter-office culture and team building. Qualitative study could also be conducted to better understand how employees with children navigate their flexstyle and what their challenges, successes, and experiences are. Understanding how parents navigate their flexstyle is important as it would give a voice to the challenges and lived experiences of student affairs professionals, perhaps even dispelling or confirming stereotypes of in which areas of student affairs professionals with children prefer to work. Although quantitative data helps to understand trends and relationships, a qualitative study would deepen our understanding of this experience on a more personal level and would produce recommendations supervisors could tailor to their staff. Although this study asked participants if they had children as a demographic control variable since parenting definitely creates a unique set of personal circumstances for employees with children (Fochtman,

2010; Waltrip, 2012), future research may also wish to examine or include questions about elder care and other personal commitments such as pets, serious hobbies such as competitive marathon running, and side businesses. The number of employees who have to take care of a parent or other aged family member continues to rise and research conducted in this realm to better understand what king of implications elder care may have for turnover intention, job satisfaction, and flexstyle is warranted (Cheng, Jepsen, & Wang, 2018; Zacher & Shulz, 2015.)

An additional area for further research would be to understand the impact an increase in pay may have on turnover intention. One of the questions in this study asked if participants would leave their current job for a similar job at another institution for the same pay. The goal of the question was to determine if there was an environmental/organizational cultural push towards departure. It may be of benefit if questions examined whether an increase in pay or position would have an impact on turnover intention. According to a recent study by the Society for Human Resource Managers (SHRM) (2018) quite often individuals will not leave a job for a lateral move with comparable pay if the nature of the work is essentially identical. An employee is more likely to stay and wait for a job with better pay or one that offers an opportunity for career advancement via promotion, increased exposure or both (SHRM, 2018).

Continued research in the area of positive and negative affect would also be of value due to how significant these two variables were both to the instrument and to the sample population. Given the emphasis on employee mental health in today's workplace (LaMontagne, Martin, Page, Reavley, Nobley, Milner, Keegel, & Smith, 2014; World Health Organization, 2019), seeking to better understand how affect may impact mental health, resilience, and workplace innovation may be of interest to student affairs researchers. Burnout is still a challenge in student affairs and understanding how positive/negative affect may or may not associate with

that could provide useful insights and interventions for employees experiencing psychological distress (Buchanan, 2012; Mullen et al., 2018). This is especially of interest given that 17 out of 33 participants who disclosed having a disability listed "psychological" as their disability type. This study was a snapshot of a segment of the student affairs profession and more research into positive and negative affect could assist in professionals maintaining positive mental health and increased resilience over the duration of their careers.

Further research should also be conducted on the impact of individuals who prefer to integrate work and life. Not only was this the most dominant group in the study numerically, but integration itself has been the cause for much debate in the workplace. More integrative approaches to work and life are increasing since digital technology is continually blurring boundary lines for employees and as this study showed, employees value their life outside of work (Alton, 2018; Kossek, 2016; Williams, Berdahl, & Vandello, 2016). Although there will always be those who separate, cycle, or prioritize their work-life, the establishment of smart technology has changed the nature of work, boundaries, privacy, and employee engagement. In many respects, the rise of integrators coincides with the rise in smartphones, the internet, and the global world market. More research should explore this phenomenon both on how integrative employees operate in the current work environment as well as how managers are adjusting to a more integrative workforce.

A formal study of schedule control and job control, and their relationship on or with flexstyles as well as job satisfaction and turnover intention should also be considered for future research. Schedule control is the extent to which an individual believes they control (or do not control) their work schedule. Job control is the extent to which one believes they can (or cannot) control the way their job is structured. This study provided early glimpses into this

factor by examining boundary control as a measure (Fisher, Schoenfeld, & Shaw, 2013). The use of a more targeted and specific schedule and job control measures would provide deeper insight into this phenomenon and help to define to what elements of student affairs work and job structures may be of concern.

It is recommended that further research be conducted that compares satisfaction and turnover related to manager and employee flexstyles. This study focused on the student affairs professional and did not include what type of supervisory duties they had nor did it take into account managerial relationships. Given that managerial relationships have been shown to have a significant impact on job satisfaction and turnover intention in past studies (Kossek & Thompson, 2016; Tarver, Canada, & Lim, 1999; Tull 2006), an examination of the employee-supervisor dynamic using flexstyles as a frame of reference would provide an alternative method of understanding interpersonal relationships in the workplace.

Implications for Practice

There are some practical implications for student affairs practitioners that can be ascertained from this study. First, managers should consider incorporating training for new professionals that is focused on communicating and setting boundaries. As has been established, the impact of boundary control on job satisfaction was one of the most statistically significant findings in this research. For employees with low boundary control, training may assist with their ability to navigate between work and nonwork spaces in a manner that allows them to be successful in both arenas. Training on setting boundaries would also help set a cultural standard within student affairs units that having boundaries is not only permissible but also encouraged.

To further expand upon boundary training, managers should also consider receiving training themselves not only because it could be of personal benefit, but also because it will help

encourage dialogue between managers and employees about what boundary preferences are, what is acceptable within the scope of the job, and in general what are the personal and professional needs and challenges of all parties involved. It has been shown that engaged, synergistic supervision that involves open dialogue and playing to employee strengths has had positive results on job satisfaction and employee engagement with new professionals in student affairs (Tull, 2006**)** and as such, these interactions based around boundaries and needs may help spur synergistic interactions.

Another recommendation would be for managers and institutions to look towards more results oriented work environments (ROWE). ROWEs stress the importance of meeting objectives and expectations by clearly defining them, giving employees the necessary training to be successful, and then empowering them to get the work done in whatever manner is deemed best by the employee. ROWE gives employees the flexibility and freedom to succeed while also holding them completely accountable for the deliverable results (Ressler & Thompson, 2008, 2013). This approach is appropriate option given the importance of boundary control factor with this sample. It would allow employees with high boundary control to flourish while allowing those with low boundary control the ability to improve their work-life interactions with minimal interference from institutional policies.

Given the impact positive and negative affect had on the instrument student affairs units may want to examine and bolster mental health and wellness programs and initiatives. Mental health is garnering more attention in human resource practices (and rightfully so!). Practitioners should pay careful attention to mental health issues and should include mental health awareness into their onboarding and staff trainings. Consistent promotion of resources and benefits (such as free counseling sessions in employee assistance programs) should also be incorporated into

the student affairs workplace culture. In short, just as much effort should be placed into promoting positive mental health amongst student affairs professionals as is put into promoting positive mental health among students.

Generational understanding and dynamics is another theme that emerged from this study. Understanding generational dynamics are an important workplace culture and retention tool given that professional careers are lasting longer which is leading to more generations being present in the workplace at once. Within the context of this study managers and institutions should continue to learn about generational preferences, so that they can continue to create work environments that are commensurate with the work and boundary preferences of current employees. If the results of this study are any indication, this will be increasingly important as work preferences of emerging generations may continue to be more integrative in nature. Recommendations to assist with this include continued professional development workshops in the area of managing employees who have integrative flexstyles as well as a review of all positions to see if they can be adapted for more integrative work preferences.

Finally, administrators should pay careful attention to the fact that in this study new professionals have a very high work focus identity. This study found satisfaction levels to be higher among new professionals and turnover intention levels to be moderate at best, and also found work focus a dominant feature of the sample. Managers should continue to provide resources and trainings on maintaining work-life balance. As years progress, high work focus identities could be more prone to burnout and departure from the field. Teaching work-life balance from a holistic point of view would benefit student affairs professionals as they continue to define what work-life means for them. Managers should also examine the behaviors they demonstrate themselves and the cultural norms that are rewarded to ensure that work-life

initiatives are accepted and encouraged on their respective campuses. Research has shown that how new professionals are socialized into the field impacts how they conduct work and what is deemed to be professionally acceptable work behavior (Tull, Hirt, & Saunders, 2009). Socialization into the profession that includes work-life balance as an element of successful practice will help combat the high turnover in the field. For professionals with high work focus identities this is of importance when life events (birth of children, medical events, loss of loved one, etc.) occur and a high work focus may make it difficult for them to step away from professional duties. A summary of take-way recommendations can be seen in Table 31.

Table 31 Index of Recommendations Based on Findings

Category	**Recommendation**
Training and Development	• Incorporate training on boundary setting for new professionals • Foster environments and culture that support open communication about boundaries and work-life needs • Continuous training on generational dynamics in workplace • Adopt work-life practices that support flexibility, personal needs, and organizational goals.
Organizational Operations	• Adopt Results Oriented Work Environments (ROWE) principles as much as possible • Managers should be open to considering alternative ways of achieving work objectives in order to lesson conflict between personal and professional domains
Mental Health	• Continually promote mental health resources and programs available to staff • Evaluation of organizational culture and impact it has on employee mental health (via social norms)
Recruitment and Onboarding of Staff	• Current positions should be examined to see how the best (mis)align with integrative, separative, or volleying behaviors.

Table 31 (cont'd)

Recruitment and Onboarding of Staff	• Current positions should be examined to see how the best (mis)align with integrative, separative, or volleying behaviors. • Managers and organizations should be upfront about the type of hours and schedules jobs carry to ensure a better fit between candidates and positions.

Conclusion

This study wanted to understand if there was any relationship between flexstyle and job satisfaction and turnover intention among new student affairs professionals. What was discovered went well beyond understanding these simple relationships. What can be most inferred from this study is that the nature of how work is seen and performed amongst new professionals has the potential to redefine the intersections between work identity, family identity, and boundary control. This is seen primarily through the significant impact boundary control had on both job satisfaction and turnover intention. The more boundary control someone had the better satisfied they were and less likely to leave their jobs. This sample, and perhaps the generation(s) it represents in the workforce wants a say in how work and life interacts. The company, or in this case, the educational institution needs to pay attention to this because this study also showed that although new professionals value their endeavors outside of work, that they also had a strong work identity. Departure from the field is not because professionals do not like the work or because they value other aspects of life more. The results indicate the contrary. The findings in this study point to that departure becomes more likely when work and life cannot interact in a manner that the new professionals deem to be optimal for their lifestyle. Student affairs administrators enter the profession in large part because they love the work they do and have a sincere desire to improve the postsecondary experience for students. As a result, they

throw much of themselves into their work. That being said, they also value the time outside of work, holding it sacred, and work should not interrupt this outside work time unless absolutely necessary.

Digital technology continues to blur the lines and boundaries between the various domains in our lives. As Generation Z enters the workforce, we must be mindful that this trend will likely continue. Student affairs work is often more art than science. There are many variables as to what makes employee X successful in a student affairs job. These variables go well beyond time spent in an office or attending the umpteenth function for the sake of visibility and support (whatever that means) and hinge on factors relating to work-life balance such as job flexibility, schedule control, and open communication about realistic job and time demands (Anderson, Guide-DeBrito, & Morrell, 2000; Marshall, Gardner, Hughes, & Lowery, 2016) . This sample's tendency to have more integrative flexstyle, the highly significant tendency towards high boundary control, and a high work focus means higher education managers and chief student affairs officers need to ask one central question of their employees when deciding *how* he work gets done. That question is: what is the deliverable? In other words, *what actually needs to be produced* within a certain time? Providing an answer to this question and being able to define the overall objective of the work will give new professionals a clear expectation of what needs to be done while also giving them the ability to mold their nonwork needs around their work (and vice versa). Doing so requires a level of freedom to trust on the part of senior student affairs officers. Trusting that the work gets done in a manner that may not be familiar to a seniors student affairs officer (SSAO) will be uncomfortable and strange at first , but doing so will not only begin to align with emerging workplace trends; it will help ensure that new professionals who are currently satisfied in their jobs stay satisfied. Staying satisfied means

a higher likelihood of staying in the profession. Staying in the profession means a deeper and more experienced pool of talent that will become managers themselves and eventually senior student affairs officers who will be more likely to embrace the integrative nature of work-life.

This study was inspired in its infancy by the simple statistic that new professionals have a five-year turnover rate that ranged between 40% and 60% (Holmes, Verrier, & Chisholm, 1983; Ward, 1995). My desire to find another way to look at the turnover puzzle via flexstyle was rooted in not only reducing turnover cost and keeping talent in the profession for the sake of keeping talent in the profession. It was rooted in the idea that keeping talent in the profession better serves the students in our institutions AND allows for a rewarding profession for administrators that allows them to meet all of their life needs. This study has provided a glimpse that supporting integration may very well be a significant method of achieving this idea.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Permission to use Work-Life Indicator and Work-Nonwork Boundary Management Profiles

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Kossek, Ellen E** <ekossek@purdue.edu>
Date: Thu, Apr 11, 2019, 3:55 PM
Subject: RE: Permission to use WLI in dissertation instrument
To: Paul Artale <paulartale@gmail.com>

Hi Paul,

Yes I think you wrote to me and I said yes. Just be sure to put this cite in

Kossek, E., Ruderman, M., Braddy, P., Hannum, K. 2012. Work-nonwork boundary management profiles: A person-centered approach, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Selected as Monograph (longer featured article), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.04.003; 81: 112–128.

From: Paul Artale <paulartale@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 11, 2019 3:31 PM
To: Ellen Ernst Kossek <kossek@msu.edu>
Subject: Permission to use WLI in dissertation instrument

Hello Dr. Kossek,

I am putting together my appendices (which include permissions) and realized that I may not have asked to use the WLI as in my dissertation instrument.

Please let me know if I can.

I hope all is well

-Paul

APPENDIX B

Permission to use the TIS-6

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Roodt, Gerhard** <groodt@uj.ac.za>
Date: Mon, Jan 16, 2017 at 12:12 AM
Subject: RE: Use of the TIS-6 in my study.
To: Paul Artale <artale@msu.edu>

Dear Paul

You are welcome to use the TIS!

For this purpose please find attached the longer 15-item version of the scale. The six items used for the TIS-6 are high-lighted. You may use any one of these two versions.

Please note that some item numbers are followed by an 'R'. These items' scores should be reflected or reverse scored. The total score can be calculated by merely adding the individual item scores. I would strongly recommend that you also conduct a CFA on the item scores to determine which item scores should be reflected.

The only conditions for using the TIS is that you acknowledge authorship (Roodt, 2004) by conventional academic referencing. The TIS may not be used for commercial purposes.

I wish you the very best with your research project!

Best regards

Gert

Prof Gert Roodt
Vice Dean: Research
Faculty of Management

APPENDIX C

Additional Demographic Outputs

Table 32 Sexual Orientation of all Participants

	Frequency	**Percent**
Asexual	2	.7
Bisexual	16	5.6
Gay	29	10.1
Straight/Heterosexual	177	61.7
Lesbian	6	2.1
Queer	21	7.3
Questioning/Unsure	5	2.1
Identity not listed	5	1.7
Multiple boxes checked	8	2
Prefer not to Disclose	9	3.1
Total	**287**	**100**

Table 33 Disability Status of all Participants

	Frequency	**Percent**
Yes	33	11.5
No	245	85.4
Prefer not to Disclose	9	3.1
Total	**287**	**100**

Table 34 Disability Type of all Participants

	Frequency	**Percent**
Physical	6	18
Intellectual/Learning	3	9
Psychological	14	42
Visual Impairment	2	6
Hearing Impairment	2	6
Neurological	1	3
Checked more than 1 box (multiple)	4	12
Prefer not to Disclose	1	3
Did not reply	1	3
Total	**34**	**100**

Table 35 Degree Attainment of all Participants

	Frequency	**Percent**
High School/GED	1	.3
Bachelors	48	16.7
Masters	224	78

Table 35 (cont'd)

PhD	8	2.8
Other	6	2.1
Total	**287**	**100**

Table 36 Graduate Degrees in Student Affairs of all Participants

	Frequency	**Percent**
Masters	191	82.3
PhD	1	.4
No degree in student affairs, higher education, or related field	39	16.8
Other	1	.4
Total	**232**	**100**

Table 37 Units Within Student Affairs of all Participants

	Frequency	**Percent**
Student Advising and Success	40	13.9
Affinity and Identity Services	27	9.4
Career Services	17	5.9
Conduct/Judicial Affairs	7	2.4
Residence Life	63	22
Student Activities	31	10.8
Residence Life (blended with another functional area)	13	4.5
Blended positions (with no residence life duties)	40	13.9
Other	49	17.1
Total	**287**	**100**

Table 38 Participant Population Based on Behavior Factor and Sexual Orientation

		Frequency	**Percent**
Cyclers	Bisexual	3	6.7
	Gay/Lesbian	3	6.6
	Straight/Heterosexual	31	68.9
	Non-Binary	4	8.8
	Questioning/Unsure	1	2.2
	Identity not listed	2	4.4
	Prefer not to Disclose	1	2.2
	Total	**45**	**100.0**
Family Firster	Bisexual	7	6.9
	Gay	11	10.8

Table 38 (cont'd)

Family Firster	Straight/Heterosexual	59	57.8
	Non-Binary	8	7.8
	Queer	8	7.8
	Questioning/Unsure	4	3.9
	Identity not listed	1	1.0
	Prefer not to Disclose	4	3.9
	Total	**102**	**100.0**
Integrators	Asexual	2	1.5
	Bisexual	6	4.4
	Gay	15	11.1
	Straight/Heterosexual	85	63.0
	Lesbian	5	3.7
	Non-Binary	6	4.4
	Queer	11	8.1
	Questioning/Unsure	1	.7
	Identity not listed	2	1.5
	Prefer not to Disclose	2	1.5
	Total	**135**	**100.0**
Separators	Straight/Heterosexual	2	50.0
	Prefer not to Disclose	2	50.0
	Total	**4**	**100.0**
Work Firster	Gay	1	100.0

Table 39 Participant Population Based on Behavior Factor and Disability Status

		Frequency	**Percent**
Cyclers	Yes	3	6.7
	No	39	86.7
	Prefer not to Disclose	3	6.7
	Total	**45**	**100.0**
Family Firster	Yes	10	9.8
	No	90	88.2
	Prefer not to Disclose	2	2.0
	Total	**102**	**100.0**
Integrators	Yes	19	14.1
	No	112	83.0
	Prefer not to Disclose	4	3.0

Table 39 (cont'd)

Integrators	**Total**	**135**	**100.0**
Separators	Yes	1	25.0
	No	3	75.0
	Total	**4**	**100.0**
Work Firster	No	1	100.00
	Total	**1**	**100.00**

Table 40 Participant Population Based on Behavior Factor and Units in Student Affairs

		Frequency	**Percent**
Cyclers	Student Advising and Success	4	8.9
	Affinity and Identity	3	6.7
	Career Services	5	11.1
	Conduct/Judicial Affairs	1	2.2
	Residence Life	11	24.4
	Student Activities	4	8.9
	Other	7	15.6
	Multiple Positions (Res Life Duties)	2	4.4
	Multiple Positions (No Res Life Duties)	8	17.8
	Total	**45**	**100.0**
Family Firster	Student Advising and Success	16	15.7
	Affinity and Identity	14	13.7
	Career Services	4	3.9
	Conduct/Judicial Affairs	4	3.9
	Residence Life	19	18.6
	Student Activities	15	14.7
	Other	14	13.7
	Multiple Positions (Res Life Duties)	4	3.9
	Multiple Positions (No Res Life Duties)	12	11.8
	Total	**102**	**100.0**
Integrators	Student Advising and Success	18	13.3
	Affinity and Identity	10	7.4
	Career Services	7	5.2
	Conduct/Judicial Affairs	2	1.5
	Residence Life	33	24.4

Table 40 (cont'd)

	Student Activities	12	8.9
	Other	27	20.0
	Multiple Positions (Res Life Duties)	6	4.4
	Multiple Positions (No Res Life Duties)	20	14.8
	Total	**135**	**100.0**
Separators	Student Advising and Success	2	50.0
	Career Services	1	25.0
	Other	1	25.0
	Total	**4**	**100.0**
Work Firster	Residence Life Blended	1	100.0

Table 41 Participant Population Based on Behavior Factor and Number of Jobs Held in Student Affairs

	# of Jobs	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Cyclers	1	25	55.6
	2	17	37.8
	3	3	6.7
	Total	**45**	**100.0**
Family Firster	1	60	58.8
	2	35	34.3
	3	6	5.9
	4	1	1.0
	Total	**102**	**100.0**
Integrators	1	80	59.3
	2	36	26.7
	3	17	12.6
	4	2	1.5
	Total	**135**	**100.0**
Separators	1	4	100.0
Work Firster	1	1	100.0

Table 42 Participant Population Based on Boundary Control Factor and Sexual Orientation

		Frequency	**Percent**
Low	Asexual	1	.9

Table 42 (cont'd)

Low	Bisexual	8	7.0
	Gay	18	15.2
	Straight/Heterosexual	67	58.3
	Lesbian	6	3.5
	Non-Binary	6	5.3
	Queer	8	7.0
	Questioning/Unsure	3	2.6
	Identity not listed	2	1.7
	Prefer not to Disclose	2	1.7
	Total	**115**	**100.0**
Medium	Bisexual	1	4.8
	Gay	2	9.5
	Straight/Heterosexual	17	81.0
	Queer	1	4.8
	Total	**21**	**100.0**
High	Asexual	1	.7
	Bisexual	7	4.6
	Gay	13	8.6
	Straight/Heterosexual	93	61.6
	Lesbian	2	1.3
	Non-Binary	10	6.8
	Queer	12	7.9
	Questioning/Unsure	3	2.0
	Identity not listed	3	2.0
	Prefer not to Disclose	7	4.6
	Total	**151**	**100.0**

Table 43 Participant Population Based on Boundary Control Factor and Disability Status

		Frequency	**Percent**
Low	Yes	17	14.8
	No	96	83.5
	Prefer not to Disclose	2	1.7
	Total	**115**	**100.0**
Medium	No	20	95.2
	Prefer not to Disclose	1	4.8
	Total	**21**	**100.0**

Table 43 (cont'd)

High	Yes	16	10.6
	No	129	85.4
	Prefer not to Disclose	6	4.0
	Total	**151**	**100.0**

Table 44 Participant Population Based on Boundary Control Factor and Units in Student Affairs

		Frequency	**Percent**
Low	Student Advising and Success	11	9.6
	Affinity and Identity	9	7.8
	Career Services	5	4.3
	Conduct/Judicial Affairs	2	1.7
	Residence Life	31	27.0
	Student Activities	11	9.6
	Other	21	18.3
	Multiple Positions (Res Life Duties)	4	3.5
	Multiple Positions (No Res Life Duties)	21	18.3
	Total	**115**	**100.0**
Medium	Student Advising and Success	3	14.3
	Affinity and Identity	2	9.5
	Career Services	2	9.5
	Residence Life	4	19.0
	Student Activities	2	9.5
	Other	4	19.0
	Multiple Positions (No Res Life Duties)	4	19.0
	Total	**21**	**100.0**
High	Student Advising and Success	26	17.2
	Affinity and Identity	16	10.6
	Career Services	10	6.6
	Conduct/Judicial Affairs	5	3.3
	Residence Life	28	18.5
	Student Activities	18	11.9
	Other	24	15.9
	Multiple Positions (Res Life Duties)	9	6.0
	Multiple Positions (No Res Life Duties)	15	9.9
	Total	**151**	**100.0**

Table 45 Participant Population Based on Boundary Control Factor and Number of Jobs Held in Student Affairs

	# of Jobs	Frequency	Percent
Low	1	68	59.1
	2	37	32.2
	3	10	8.7
	Total	**115**	**100.0**
Medium	1	12	57.1
	2	6	28.6
	3	2	9.5
	4	1	4.8
	Total	**21**	**100.0**
High	1	90	59.6
	2	45	29.8
	3	14	9.3
	4	2	1.3
	Total	**151**	**100.0**

Table 46 Participant Population Based on Identity Factor and Sexual Orientation

		Frequency	Percent
Dual Focus	Bisexual	3	3.6
	Gay	3	3.6
	Straight/Heterosexual	62	73.8
	Lesbian	1	1.2
	Non-Binary	1	4.8
	Queer	6	7.1
	Questioning/Unsure	1	1.2
	Identity not listed	2	2.4
	Prefer not to Disclose	2	2.4
	Total	**84**	**100.0**
Family Focus	Straight/Heterosexual	7	100.0
Other Focus	Bisexual	1	25.0
	Straight/Heterosexual	1	25.0
	Questioning/Unsure	1	25.0
	Non-Binary	1	25.0

Table 46 (cont'd)

Other Focus	**Total**	**4**	**100.0**
Work Focus	Asexual	2	1.0
	Bisexual	12	6.3
	Gay	26	13.5
	Straight/Heterosexual	107	55.7
	Lesbian	5	2.6
	Non-Binary	11	5.6
	Queer	15	7.8
	Questioning/Unsure	4	2.1
	Identity not listed	3	1.6
	Prefer not to Disclose	7	3.6
	Total	**192**	**100.0**

Table 47 Participant Population Based on Identity Factor and Disability Status

		Frequency	Percent
Dual Focus	Yes	8	9.5
	No	72	85.7
	Prefer not to Disclose	4	4.8
	Total	**84**	**100.0**
Family Focus	No	7	100.0
Other Focus	Yes	1	25.0
	No	3	75.0
	Total	**4**	**100.0**
Work Focus	Yes	24	12.5
	No	163	84.9
	Prefer not to Disclose	5	2.6
	Total	**192**	**100.0**

Table 48 Participant Population Based on Identity Factor and Units in Student Affairs

		Frequency	**Percent**
Dual Focus	Student Advising and Success	13	15.5
	Affinity and Identity	9	10.7
	Career Services	5	6.0
	Conduct/Judicial Affairs	1	1.2
	Residence Life	16	19.0
	Student Activities	9	10.7
	Other	15	17.9

Table 48 (cont'd)

	Multiple Positions (Res Life Duties)	4	4.8
	Multiple Positions (No Res Life Duties)	12	14.3
	Total	**84**	**100.0**
Family Focus	Career Services	1	14.3
	Residence Life	2	28.6
	Student Activities	2	28.6
	Other	2	28.6
	Total	**7**	**100.0**
Other Focus	Affinity and Identity	2	50.0
	Conduct/Judicial Affairs	1	25.0
	Multiple Positions (No Res Life Duties)	1	25.0
	Total	**4**	**100.0**
Work Focus	Student Advising and Success	27	14.1
	Affinity and Identity	16	8.3
	Career Services	11	5.7
	Conduct/Judicial Affairs	5	2.6
	Residence Life	45	23.4
	Student Activities	20	10.4
	Other	32	16.7
	Multiple Positions (Res Life Duties)	9	4.7
	Multiple Positions (No Res Life Duties)	27	14.1
	Total	**192**	**100.0**

Table 49 Participant Population Based on Identity Factor and Number of Jobs Held in Student Affairs

		Frequency	**Percent**
Dual Focus	1	55	65.5
	2	21	25.0
	3	8	9.5

Table 49 (cont'd)

Dual Focus	**Total**	**84**	**100.0**
Family Focus	1	4	57.1
	2	3	42.9
	Total	**7**	**100.0**
Other Focus	1	3	75.0
	2	1	25.0
	Total	**4**	**100.0**
Work Focus	1	108	56.3
	2	63	32.8
	3	18	9.4
	4	3	1.6
	Total	**192**	**100.0**

APPENDIX D

Survey Instrument

(Qualtrics Estimated Completion Time – 11 Minutes)

CONSENT

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM FOR STUDY

Study title: What is the impact of flexstyle on job satisfaction and intent to stay amongst new professionals in student affairs

Researcher: Paul Artale, doctoral candidate in Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education (HALE)

Department and Institution: Educational Administration, Michigan State University

Purpose of Study: You are asked to participate in a study that seeks to see if there is a relationship between flexstyle and the factors of job satisfaction and turnover intention for new professionals in student affairs. We are defining the term "new professional" as someone who has worked in the profession full time for less than five years This study is interested in seeing if what role flexstyle (if any) has in employee satisfaction and loyalty to the organization and how that may potentially aid in retaining new professionals in student affairs.

You will be asked to complete a survey with Likert-style questions that will help ascertain your overall flexibility preference, your overall job satisfaction, and your turnover intention. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. You will be also be asked to answer some basic demographic questions. Your survey responses and scores will be used for further statistical analysis by the researcher only. Please note you must be at least 18 years old to participate.

Please note that no identifiable information (name, email, address, institution etc.) will be asked of you in this study. Your answers are completely anonymous.

Your Rights to Participate, Say No, or Withdraw

Participation in this research project is completely voluntary. You have the right to say no. You may change your mind at any time and withdraw. You may choose not to answer specific questions or to stop participating at any time without penalty.

Costs and Compensation for Being in this Study

There is no compensation or costs associated with this participation in this study.

Confidentiality and Privacy: The data for this project are being collected by survey using a software called Qualtrics. The Qualtrics software disassociates identifiable student information from survey responses so that the researchers will not be able to link your survey data to you. Survey responses from all participants will be pooled and reported collectively to further aid in maintaining confidentiality.

Voluntary Participation: Your participation is voluntary. Refusal to participate or withdrawal of your consent or discontinued participation in the study will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits.

Request for Additional Information: If you have any questions about this study, please contact Paul Artale, doctoral candidate, at (913) 749-2489 or artalepa@msu.edu. Mailing address is 3150 Pine Run Drive, Swartz Creek, MI 48473.

If you have concerns regarding your rights as a study participant or are dissatisfied at any time with any aspect of this study, you may contact – anonymously, if you wish, Dr. Marilyn Amey, 418 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University (517) 432-1056 or via email amey@msu.edu . Clicking the "I Agree" button and beginning the survey, indicates your voluntary agreement to participate in this study.

- I agree to participate in this study (1)
- I do not agree to participate in this study (2)

SECTION 1

Read each statement. Select the number indicating how much you agree or disagree with the statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Somewhat disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Somewhat agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
I take care of personal or family needs during work. (1)	1	2	3	4	5
I respond to personal communications (e.g., emails, texts, and phone calls) during work. (2)	1	2	3	4	5
I do not think about my family, friends, or personal interests while working so I can focus. (3)	1	2	3	4	5
When I work from home, I handle personal or family responsibilities during work. (4)	1	2	3	4	5

Section 1 (cont'd)

I monitor personal-related communications (e.g., emails, texts, and phone calls) when I am working. (5)	1	2	3	4	5
I regularly bring work home. (6)	1	2	3	4	5
I respond to work-related communications (e.g., emails, texts, and phone calls) during my personal time away from work. (7)	1	2	3	4	5
I work during my vacations. (8)	1	2	3	4	5
I allow work to interrupt me when I spend time with my family or friends. (9)	1	2	3	4	5
I usually bring work materials with me when I attend personal or family activities. (10)	1	2	3	4	5
I control whether I am able to keep my work and personal life separate. (11)	1	2	3	4	5
I control whether I have clear boundaries between my work and personal life (12)	1	2	3	4	5
I control whether I combine my work and personal life activities throughout the day. (13)	1	2	3	4	5
People see me as highly focused on my work. (14)	1	2	3	4	5
I invest a large part of myself in my work. (15)	1	2	3	4	5
People see me as highly focused on my family. (16)	1	2	3	4	5
I invest a large part of myself in my family life. (17)	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION 2:

Please select your level of agreement with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Disagree or Agree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

Section 2 (cont'd)

I feel fairly satisfied with my present job	1	2	3	4	5
Most days I am enthusiastic about my work	1	2	3	4	5
Each day at work seems like it will never end	1	2	3	4	5
I find real enjoyment in my work	1	2	3	4	5
I consider my job to be rather pleasant	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION 3

Please read each question and indicate your response using the scale provided for each question:

During the past 9 months…

	Never (1)	Sometimes (2)	About half the time (3)	Most of the time (4)	Always (5)
How often have you considered leaving your job? (1)	1	2	3	4	5
How often are you frustrated when not given the opportunity at work to achieve your personal work-related goals? (2)	1	2	3	4	5
How often do you dream about getting another job that will better suit your personal needs? (3)	1	2	3	4	5
How often do you look forward to another day at work? (4)	1	2	3	4	5

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements:

	To no extent (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	To a very large extent (5)
To what extent is your current job satisfying your personal needs? (5)	1	2	3	4	5

	Highly Unlikely (1)	Click to write Scale point 2 (2)	Neither Likely or Unlikely (3)	Click to write Scale point 4 (4)	Highly Likely (5)
How likely are you to accept another job at the same compensation level should it be offered to you? (6)	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION 4

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you resonate with the items generally in your life. Use the following scale to record your answers

1 - Very Slightly or not at all 2- A little 3 - Moderately 4 - Quite a bit 5 - Extremely

_____ Alert	_____ Afraid
_____ Excited	_____ Upset
_____ Inspired	_____ Nervous
_____ Enthusiastic	_____ Scared
_____ Determined	_____ Distressed

SECTION 5: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Q1 With which gender do you identify?

- Male (1)
- Female (2)
- Transgender (3)
- Non-binary (4)
- Other (please specify) (5)
- Prefer not to disclose (6)

Q2: Please enter your age _____

Q3 With which race and ethnicities do you identify with?

- White/Caucasian (1)
- African-American (2)
- Asian/Pacific Islander (3)
- Latino/Latina/Latinx
- Native American/First Nations (4)
- Middle Eastern (5)
- Multiple/mixed race (6)
- Other race (please specify) (7)

- Prefer not to disclose (8)

Q4 What is your sexual Orientation (choose all that apply):

- asexual (1)
- bisexual (2)
- gay (3)
- straight (heterosexual) (4)
- lesbian (5)
- Pansexual (6)
- queer (7)
- questioning or unsure (8)
- same-gender loving (9)
- an identity not listed: _____ (10)
- Prefer not to disclose (11)

Q5 What is your marital status?

- Single (1)
- Married (2)
- In a domestic partnership (3)
- Divorced (4)
- Widowed (5)
- Prefer not to disclose (6)

Q6 Do you have children?
IF YES → 6.1 How many? _____

Q7 Do you have a disability?
Yes
No
Prefer not to answer

IF YES -→ 7.1
Please indicate the nature of your disability/disabilities (check all that apply)
[ ] Physical Disability
[ ] Intellectual or Learning Disability
[ ] Psychiatric Disability
[ ] Visual Impairment
[ ] Hearing Impairment
[ ] Neurological Disability

Q8 What is the highest degree you have attained?

- Associates Degree (1)
- Bachelor's Degree (2)
- Master's Degree (3)
- PhD (4)
- Other Professional Degree (5)

→ IF YES 8.1.

Which of your graduate degrees were in student affairs, higher education administration, or another similar field? [check all that apply]

- Masters (1)
- PhD (2)

Q9 What units within student affairs do you work?

- Career Services (1)
- Fraternity and Sorority Life (2)
- Student Activities (3)
- Student Organizations (4)
- Advising (5)
- Academic Success (6)
- Conduct/Judicial Affairs (7)
- LGBTQ Center (8)
- Residence Life (9)
- Multicultural affairs (10)
- Disability Services (11)
- Student Veteran Resource Center (12)
- Orientation (13)
- Athletics (14)
- Student Success (15)
- Other (please specify) (16)

Q10 How long have you been working full time in student affairs?

- 0-1 years (1)
- 1-2 years (2)
- 2-3 years (3)
- 3-4 years (4)
- 4-5 years (5)
- 5+ years (6)

Q11 To date, how many full-time positions have you had in student affairs?

- 1 position (1)
- 2 positions (2)
- 3 positions (3)
- 4 positions (4)
- 5 positions (5)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American College Personnel Association, (2019) *Who we are* retrieved from: http://www.myacpa.org/who-we-are, April 1, 2019

Alam, S. M. T. (2015). Factors affecting job satisfaction, motivation and turnover rate of medical promotion officer (MPO) in pharmaceutical industry: a study based in Khulna city. *Asian Business Review, 1*(2), 126-131.

Allen, T. D., & Eby, L. T. (2016). *The Oxford handbook of work and family*: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, J. E. (1998). *A comparison of female and male senior student affairs officers' job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and inter-role conflict.* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Northern Colorado)

Anderson, J. E., Guido-DiBrito, F., & Morrell, J. S. (2000). Factors That Influence Satisfaction for Student Affairs Administrators. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 27*(1), 99-110.

Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management review, 25*(3), 472-491.

Barham, J. D., & Winston Jr, R. B. (2006). Supervision of New Professionals in Student Affairs: Assessing and Addressing Needs. *College Student Affairs Journal, 26*(1), 64-89.

Barr, M. J. (1993). *The Handbook of Student Affairs Administration. The Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Bender, B. E. (1980). Job satisfaction in student affairs. *NASPA journal, 18*(2), 2-9.

Bennett, M. M., Baehr, T. A., & Ivanitskaya, L. V. (2017). Work-family conflict: Differences across generations and life cycles. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*(4), 314-322.

Berkup, S. B. (2014). Working with generations X and Y in generation Z period: Management of different generations in business life. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 5*(19), 218.

Bloom, N., Kretschmer, T., & Van Reenen, J. (2009). Determinants and Consequences of Family-Friendly Workplace Practices: An International Study. *Strategic Management Journal*.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing Organizations (ed*.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bothma, C. F., & Roodt, G. (2013). The validation of the turnover intention scale. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 11*(1), 1-12.

Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of applied psychology, 35*(5), 307.

Brewer, E. W., & Clippard, L. F. (2002). Burnout and job satisfaction among student support services personnel. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 13*(2), 169-186.

Buchanan, J. (2012). *Factors that influence attrition of new professionals in student affairs*: Widener University.

Buchanan, J., & Shupp, M. (2015). Factors that influence the attrition of entry-level student affairs professionals. *Journal of Student Affairs, 25*, 107.

Burke, M. G., Dye, L., & Hughey, A. W. (2016). Teaching mindfulness for the self-care and well-being of student affairs professionals. *College Student Affairs Journal, 34*(3), 93-107.

Cheng, T., Mauno, S., & Lee, C. (2014). Do job control, support, and optimism help job insecure employees? A three-wave study of buffering effects on job satisfaction, vigor and work-family enrichment. *Social Indicators Research, 118*(3), 1269-1291.

Cheng, Z., Jepsen, D. M., & Wang, B. Z. (2018). A dynamic analysis of informal elder caregiving and employee wellbeing. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1-14.

Cho, S., Johanson, M. M., & Guchait, P. (2009). Employees' intent to leave: A comparison of determinants of intent to leave versus intent to stay. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 28*(3), 374-381.

Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human relations, 53*(6), 747-770.

Coleman, D. D. (1990). *The New Professional: A Resource Guide for New Student Affairs Professionals and Their Supervisors. Monograph Series Volume 10*: ERIC.

Daly, C. J., & Dee, J. R. (2006). Greener pastures: Faculty turnover intent in urban public universities. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(5), 776-803.

Davidson, D. L. (2009). *National Job Satisfaction of Entry-and Mid-level Student Affairs Professionals.* (Doctoral Dissertation, Bowling Green State University).

Earnest, D. R., Allen, D. G., & Landis, R. S. (2011). Mechanisms linking realistic job previews with turnover: A meta-analytic path analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(4), 865-897.

Eisner, S. P. (2005). Managing generation Y. *SAM Advanced Management Journal, 70*(4), 4.

Evans, N. J. (1988). Attrition of Student Affairs Professionals: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of College Student Development, 29*(1), 19-24.

Exum, M. (1998). An examination of the relationship between organizational socialization and the organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and role orientation of new student affairs professionals. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio University*.

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Fleck, R., Cox, A. L., & Robison, R. A. (2015). *Balancing boundaries: Using multiple devices to manage work-life balance.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems.

Fochtman, M. M. (2010). *Mid-career women student affairs administrators with young children: Negotiating life, like clockwork.* (Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University)

Frank, T. E. (2013). *Why do they leave? Departure from the student affairs profession.* (Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic University*).*

Golden, A. G., & Geisler, C. (2007). Work–life boundary management and the personal digital assistant. *Human Relations, 60*(3), 519-551.

Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of management review, 10*(1), 76-88.

Gregory, D. M., Way, C. Y., LeFort, S., Barrett, B. J., & Parfrey, P. S. (2007). Predictors of registered nurses' organizational commitment and intent to stay. *Health Care Management Review, 32*(2), 119-127.

Guthrie, V. L., Woods, E., Cusker, C., & Gregory, M. (2005). A Portrait of Balance: Personal and Professional Balance among Student Affairs Educators. *College Student Affairs Journal, 24*(2), 110-127.

Hale Jr, D., Ployhart, R. E., & Shepherd, W. (2016). A two-phase longitudinal model of a turnover event: Disruption, recovery rates, and moderators of collective performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 59*(3), 906-929.

Hancock, J. I., Allen, D. G., Bosco, F. A., McDaniel, K. R., & Pierce, C. A. (2013). Meta-analytic review of employee turnover as a predictor of firm performance. *Journal of Management, 39*(3), 573-603.

Hannum, K. M., Braddy, P. W., Leslie, J. B., Ruderman, M. N., & Kossek, E. E. (2011). *WorkLife Indicator: Increasing Your Effectiveness On and Off the Job Technical Manual.* Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Hershatter, A., & Epstein, M. (2010). Millennials and the world of work: An organization and management perspective. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 25*(2), 211-223.

Hill, E. J., Ferris, M., & Märtinson, V. (2003). Does it matter where you work? A comparison of how three work venues (traditional office, virtual office, and home office) influence aspects of work and personal/family life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63*(2), 220-241.

Hinkle, D.E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S.G. (2003). *Applied Statistics for the behavioral sciences, Belmont*, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning

.

Hirschy, A. S., Wilson, M. E., Liddell, D. L., Boyle, K. M., & Pasquesi, K. (2015a). Socialization to student affairs: Early career experiences associated with professional identity development. *Journal of College Student Development, 56*(8), 777-793.

Holmes, D., Verrier, D., & Chisholm, P. (1983). Persistence in student affairs work attitudes and job shifts among master's program graduates. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 24*, 439-443.

Hunter, D. E. (1992). How student affairs professionals choose their careers. *NASPA journal, 29*(3), 181-188.

Jensen, J. M., Patel, P. C., & Messersmith, J. G. (2013). High-performance work systems and job control: Consequences for anxiety, role overload, and turnover intentions. *Journal of Management, 39*(6), 1699-1724.

Johnsrud, L., & Rosser, V. (1999). Predicting and reducing mid-level administrative staff turnover. *CUPA Journal, 49*(1), 2.

Johnsrud, L. K., Heck, R. H., & Rosser, V. J. (2000). Morale matters: Midlevel administrators and their intent to leave. *The Journal of Higher Education, 71*(1), 34-59.

Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (1999). College and university midlevel administrators: Explaining and improving their morale. *The review of higher education, 22*(2), 121-141.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of applied psychology, 83*(1), 17.

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., & Thoresen, C. J. (2000). Why negative affectivity (and self-deception) should be included in job stress research: Bathing the baby with the bath water. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*(1), 101-111.

Kantor, J., & Crosser, A. (2016). High turnover costs way more than you think. *The Huffington Post*.

Kim, S., Tam, L., Kim, J.-N., & Rhee, Y. (2017). Determinants of employee turnover intention: Understanding the roles of organizational justice, supervisory justice, authoritarian organizational culture and organization-employee relationship quality. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 22*(3), 308-328.

Kossek, E., Ruderman, M., Braddy, P., & Hannum, K. (2011). *Development and validation of work-nonwork boundary management profiles.* Paper presented at the National Academy of Management meetings, San Antonio, TX.

Kossek, E. E. (2016). Implementing organizational work–life interventions: toward a triple bottom line. *Community, Work & Family, 19*(2), 242-256.

Kossek, E. E., & Lautsch, B. A. (2008). *CEO of me: Creating a life that works in the flexible job age*: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Kossek, E. E., & Lautsch, B. A. (2012). Work–family boundary management styles in organizations: A cross-level model. *Organizational Psychology Review, 2*(2), 152-171.

Kossek, E. E., & Lautsch, B. A. (2018). Work–life flexibility for whom? Occupational status and work–life inequality in upper, middle, and lower level jobs. *Academy of Management Annals, 12*(1), 5-36.

Kossek, E. E., Lautsch, B. A., & Eaton, S. C. (2006). Telecommuting, control, and boundary management: Correlates of policy use and practice, job control, and work–family effectiveness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*(2), 347-367.

Kossek, E. E., Ruderman, M. N., Braddy, P. W., & Hannum, K. M. (2012). Work–nonwork boundary management profiles: A person-centered approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 81*(1), 112-128.

Kreiner, G. E., Hollensbe, E. C., & Sheep, M. L. (2009). Balancing borders and bridges: Negotiating the work-home interface via boundary work tactics. *Academy of management journal, 52*(4), 704-730.

Kumar, D., & Govindarajo, N. S. (2014). Instrument development "intention to stay instrument" (ISI). *Asian Social Science, 10*(12), 149-169.

Lagana, B. T. (2007). Preliminary investigation of the relationships between involvement in student affairs professional development and margin in life. *NASPA Journal, 44*(2), 327-340.

Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Barton, S. M. (2001). The impact of job satisfaction on turnover intent: a test of a structural measurement model using a national sample of workers. *The Social Science Journal, 38*(2), 233-250.

LaMontagne, A. D., Martin, A., Page, K. M., Reavley, N. J., Noblet, A. J., Milner, A. J., . . . Smith, P. M. (2014). Workplace mental health: developing an integrated intervention approach. *BMC psychiatry, 14*(1), 131.

Lee, J. A., Walker, M., & Shoup, R. (2001). Balancing elder care responsibilities and work: The impact on emotional health. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 16*(2), 277-289.

Lombardi, K. M., & Mather, P. C. (2016). Understanding anticipatory socialization for new student affairs professionals. *College Student Affairs Journal, 34*(1), 85-97.

Lorden, L. P. (1998). Attrition in the student affairs profession. *NASPA journal, 35*(3), 207-216.

Love, P. (2003). Considering a career in student affairs. *Retrieved on June 3rd, 2019* https://www.myacpa.org/considering-career-student-affairs

Luna-Arocas, R., & Camps, J. (2007). A model of high performance work practices and turnover intentions. *Personnel Review, 37*(1), 26-46.

Lyness, K. S., Gornick, J. C., Stone, P., & Grotto, A. R. (2012). It's all about control: Worker control over schedule and hours in cross-national context. *American Sociological Review, 77*(6), 1023-1049.

Mackinnon, A., Jorm, A. F., Christensen, H., Korten, A. E., Jacomb, P. A., & Rodgers, B. (1999). A short form of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule: Evaluation of factorial validity and invariance across demographic variables in a community sample. *Personality and Individual differences, 27*(3), 405-416.

Markowitz, G. A. (2012). *Faculty intent to stay and the perceived relationship with supervisor at a career-focused university.* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Miami)

Marshall, S. M., Gardner, M. M., Hughes, C., & Lowery, U. (2016). Attrition from student affairs: Perspectives from those who exited the profession. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 53*(2), 146-159.

McNall, L. A., Masuda, A. D., & Nicklin, J. M. (2009). Flexible work arrangements, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions: The mediating role of work-to-family enrichment. *The Journal of psychology, 144*(1), 61-81.

McNall, L. A., Nicklin, J. M., & Masuda, A. D. (2010). A meta-analytic review of the consequences associated with work–family enrichment. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 25*(3), 381-396.

Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of applied psychology, 62*(2), 237.

Moen, P., Kelly, E. L., Fan, W., Lee, S.-R., Almeida, D., Kossek, E. E., & Buxton, O. M. (2016). Does a flexibility/support organizational initiative improve high-tech employees' well-being? Evidence from the work, family, and health network. *American Sociological Review, 81*(1), 134-164.

Moen, P., Kelly, E. L., & Hill, R. (2011). Does enhancing work-time control and flexibility reduce turnover? A naturally occurring experiment. *Social problems, 58*(1), 69-98.

Mullen, P. R., Malone, A., Denney, A., & Santa Dietz, S. (2018). Job stress, burnout, job satisfaction, and turnover intention among student affairs professionals. *College Student Affairs Journal, 36*(1), 94-108.

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (2019). *NASPA Membership FAQ* Retrieved from: https://www.naspa.org/about/membership/faq April 1, 2019.

Nippert-Eng, C. (1996, September). Calendars and keys: The classification of "home" and "work". In *Sociological Forum* (Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 563-582). Kluwer Academic Publishers-Plenum Publishers.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Psychological theory. *New York, NY: McGraw-Hill*, 131-147.

Perrigino, M. B., Dunford, B. B., & Wilson, K. S. (2018). Work–Family Backlash: The "Dark Side" of Work–Life Balance (WLB) Policies. *Academy of Management Annals, 12*(2), 600-630.

Pittman, E. C., & Foubert, J. D. (2016). Predictors of professional identity development for student affairs professionals. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 53*(1), 13-25.

Pritchard, A., & McChesney, J. (2018). Focus on Student Affairs, 2018: Understanding Key Challenges Using CUPA-HR Data. *College and University Professional Association for Human Resources*.

Pulevska-Ivanovska, L., Postolov, K., Janeska-Iliev, A., & Magdinceva Sopova, M. (2017). Establishing balance between professional and private life of generation Z. *Research in Physical Education, Sport and Health, 6*(1), 3-10.

Raina, R., & Roebuck, D. B. (2016). Exploring cultural influence on managerial communication in relationship to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and the employees' propensity to leave in the insurance sector of India. *International Journal of Business Communication, 53*(1), 97-130.

Renn, K. A., & Hodges, J. (2007). The first year on the job: Experiences of new professionals in student affairs. *NASPA journal, 44*(2), 367-391.

Renn, K. A., & Jessup-Anger, E. R. (2008). Preparing new professionals: Lessons for graduate preparation programs from the national study of new professionals in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*(4), 319-335.

Ressler, C., & Thompson, J. (2008). *Why work sucks and how to fix it: No schedules, no meetings, no joke--The simple change that can make your job terrific*: Penguin.

Rosser, V. J. (2000). Midlevel Administrators: What We Know. *New Directions for Higher Education, 111*, 5-13.

Rosser, V. J. (2004). A national study on midlevel leaders in higher education: The unsung professionals in the academy. *Higher Education, 48*(3), 317-337.

Rosser, V. J., & Javinar, J. M. (2003). Midlevel student affairs leaders' intentions to leave: Examining the quality of their professional and institutional work life. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*(6), 813-830.

Rosser, V. J., & Tabata, L. N. (2010). An examination of faculty work: Conceptual and theoretical frameworks in the literature *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 449-475): Springer.

Rothbard, N. P., Phillips, K. W., & Dumas, T. L. (2005). Managing multiple roles: Work-family policies and individuals' desires for segmentation. *Organization Science, 16*(3), 243-258.

Sagaria, M. A. D., & Johnsrud, L. K. (1988). Mobility within the Student Affairs Profession: Career Advancement through Position Change. *Journal of College Student Development, 29*(1), 30-40.

Schieman, S., & Young, M. C. (2013). Are communications about work outside regular working hours associated with work-to-family conflict, psychological distress and sleep problems? *Work & Stress, 27*(3), 244-261.

Schlachter, S., McDowall, A., Cropley, M., & Inceoglu, I. (2018). Voluntary Work-related Technology Use during Non-work Time: A Narrative Synthesis of Empirical Research and Research Agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 20*(4), 825-846.

Services, N. O. f. H. (2019). What is Human Service? Retrieved April 4, 2019

Silver, B. R., & Jakeman, R. C. (2014). Understanding intent to leave the field: A study of student affairs master's students' career plans. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 51*(2), 170-182.

Smith, D. B., & Shields, J. (2012). Factors related to social service workers' job satisfaction: Revisiting Herzberg's motivation to work. *Administration in Social Work 37*(2), 189-198.

Steel, R. P., & Ovalle, N. K. (1984). A review and meta-analysis of research on the relationship between behavioral intentions and employee turnover. *Journal of applied psychology, 69*(4), 673.

Tarver, D. Canada, R., & Lim, M.(1999). The relationship between job satisfaction and locus of control among college student affairs administrators and academic administrators. *NASPA Journal, 36*(2), 96-105.

Taub, D. J., & McEwen, M. K. (2006). Decision to enter the profession of student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(2), 206-216.

Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel psychology, 46*(2), 259-293.

Thompson, J., & Ressler, C. (2013). *Why Managing Sucks and How to Fix It: A Results-Only Guide to Taking Control of Work, Not People*: John Wiley & Sons.

Tull, A. (2006). Synergistic supervision, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(4), 465-480.

Tull, A., & Freeman, J. P. (2011). Reframing student affairs leadership: An analysis of organizational frames of reference and locus of control. *Research in the Schools, 18*(1), 33.

Tull, A., Hirt, J. B., & Saunders, S. A. (2009). *Becoming socialized in student affairs administration: A guide for new professionals and their supervisors*: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Vanderkam, L. (2015, March 6). Work-life balance is dead; here's why that may be a good thing. Retrieved from: https://fortune.com/author/laura-vanderkam/page/4/

Volkwein, J. F., & Zhou, Y. (2003). Testing a model of administrative job satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 44*(2), 149-171.

Waltrip, L. H. (2012). *Voices from the field: Stories of women who chose to leave their careers as student affairs professionals*: University of Florida.

Ward, L. (1995). Role stress and propensity to leave among new student affairs professionals. *NASPA Journal, 33*(1), 35-44.

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: the PANAS scales. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 54*(6), 1063.

Williams, J. C., Berdahl, J. L., & Vandello, J. A. (2016). Beyond work-life "integration". *Annual review of psychology, 67*, 515-539.

Zacher, H., & Schulz, H. (2015). Employees' eldercare demands, strain, and perceived support. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 30*(2), 183-198.