

A Comparison of Employee-Organizational Linkages of Faculty Members at Public and Private Christian-based Colleges

Kristena P. Gaylor, Assistant Professor of Business Administration, Belhaven College
1500 Peachtree Street, Box 336, Jackson, MS 39202-0336
kgaylor@belhaven.edu 601-968-8769

Abstract

Business schools nationally are experiencing a shortage of faculty. Although compensation is often cited as a factor of turnover, organizational commitment may provide an alternative explanation of the faculty exodus. This study examines organizational commitment with several employee-organizational linkage constructs among business faculty in higher education. Using Meyer and Allen's (1990) Three-Component Model, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, organizational tenure, and job embeddedness, and turnover intention is compared and contrasted among public business school faculty and private business school faculty in the southeastern region of the United States. The author reports the findings and recommends future areas of research. Findings from this study suggest ways to best manage the knowledge workers, such as business faculty at both public and private Christian-based colleges, in the 21st century.

Introduction

Studies suggest that business schools are suffering from a Ph.D. shortage that promises to deteriorate with time (AACSB International, 2003; Bisoux, 2002). Many colleges and universities are losing their intellectual capital as faculty migrate to other institutions and consultancy. Budget problems and higher education funding cuts are consistently cited as the reason for the exodus (Gillette, 2002).

A continuous, paramount, and important concern to organizations in the public and private sectors, particularly colleges and universities, is being able to retain qualified and competent employees by increasing their levels of organizational commitment. If employees are committed, attached, and if they identify with their organization, then they are more likely to remain with the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Cohen, 2003; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Studies have shown that there is a link between organizational commitment and decreased turnover (Angle & Perry, 1981; Mueller & Wallace, 1992). Ameen, Jackson, Pasewark, and Strawser (1995) suggest that "building" commitment of faculty to the university or department may be a useful means of retaining faculty.

Public colleges and universities as well as private Christian-based colleges are confronted with the challenge of retaining faculty. Some comprehensive universities are addressing the issue with their faculty (e.g., Michigan Technological University "Child Care Center at Michigan Tech," 2003; Stanford University "Staff Retention & Recruitment," 2001; Washington State University "Representative Faculty," 2001). For instance, in an effort to retain and recruit

faculty, Washington State University has strategically hired a Vice Provost for Faculty Development (“Representative Faculty,” 2001). Furthermore, several faculty at church-based institutions for higher education (e.g., Abilene Christian University, Concordia College, University of the Incarnate Word, Hope College) have co-authored a book that explains how mentorship programs have been established at their institutions to discuss how effective mentoring can reduce the challenges and turnover of new faculty (Simon, Bloxham, Hailey, Doyle and Light, Hawks, Scibilia and Simmons, 2003). The authors examine the link between mentoring and the Christian mission at religious-tradition colleges.

The Stanford University retention recruitment study findings revealed the cost of turnover at the university was \$68 million annually. The highest separation rates were found within academic areas. Costs associated with conducting entrance and exit interviews, communicating job availability in professional periodicals, and moving/travel expenses are typically incurred by the colleges and universities. In fact, Mercer consultants estimated that turnover for a faculty member can cost up to twice the base salary (“Staff Retention & Recruitment Issues,” 2001). Reducing employee turnover and calculating the costs of employee turnover have been reported by Cascio (1991) and Mobley (1982). Organizations spend large sums of money on selecting and recruiting high performing employees (Cohen, 2003; Glandon & Glandon, 2001).

The job of administrator at Christian-based colleges is doubly challenging because they have the dual purpose challenge of hiring qualified faculty that also have a commitment to teaching from a Christian perspective. So, how do Christian-based colleges retain qualified faculty when often times they are unable to pay competitive salaries and provide the amenities of public and secular private institutions? In this study, several intrinsic motivations are provided to explain the commitment of faculty teaching at private Christian-based colleges versus public colleges/universities.

Employee-Organizational Linkages

This study examined the antecedents and consequences of the multidimensional construct of organizational commitment among business school faculty at public colleges and universities and private Christian-based colleges and universities. Certain antecedents, when present, can represent job motivation and lead to longer organizational tenure, thus enhancing institutional sustainability. While commitment in higher education has been studied; some studies (Chelte & Tausky, 1986; Harshbarger, 1989; Holland, 1992; Koreloff, 1985) evaluate organizational commitment using the unidimensional organizational commitment questionnaire (OCQ) (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). This study examined organizational commitment among business school faculty employing the Three-Component Model (TCM) of commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1984, 1990).

The commitment dimensions have evolved from three general themes: an emotional attachment to an organization, the perceived cost associated with leaving the organization, and an obligation to remain. Meyer and Allen (1984) summarized the themes into the Three-Component Model (TCM) of organization commitment. In sum, employees with a strong affective commitment remain with the organization because they want to; those with strong continuance commitment remain because they need to; and those with strong normative commitment remain because they feel they ought to do so (Meyer & Allen, 1990). Few studies

have applied Meyer and Allen's (1984) TCM of organizational commitment to faculty members in higher education (Brookover, 2002; Flynn, 2000).

Furthermore, while antecedents of commitment are numerous, this study focused on job embeddedness and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is thoroughly grounded in the commitment literature (Reichers, 1985; Curry, Wakefield, Price, & Mueller, 1986; Luthans, Baack & Taylor, 1987; Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Testa, 2001; Cohen, 1995, 2003). Job embeddedness is a new construct that takes into consideration occupational and non-occupational factors that predict intent to leave and voluntary turnover. The study analyzed a consequence of commitment which is turnover (using intent to leave as a proxy). Intent to leave (stay) is a relatively new construct with a significant impact on the level of employee commitment.

The following study hypotheses were formulated and tested using multiple regression analyses:

H₁: Job satisfaction and job embeddedness is inversely related to intentions to leave among business school faculty.

H₂: Affective, continuance, and normative commitment are inversely related to turnover intentions among business school faculty.

Christian Business Faculty

In the literature, there was dearth of studies that examined commitment and employee-organizational linkages among faculty in higher education. Thus, even fewer studies were identified that study business faculty at Christian-tradition colleges. Examining employee-organizational linkage constructs of faculty is an inimitable population to study. This population does not have the traditional employee-organizational relationship in any way. College faculty, i.e. the knowledge worker, is often given the academic freedom to conduct research and create knowledge.

“The mission of a Christian-based college is to prepare students academically and spiritually to serve Christ Jesus in their careers, in human relationship, and in the world of ideas.” (<http://www.belhaven.edu/Belhaven>). Faculty play a key role in effectively meeting the mission of Christian-based colleges. Professors are on the front-line interacting daily with the students, which are the consumers of the service provided. Thus, they must believe in the mission of Christian higher education. These knowledge workers play a vital role in continuing religious tradition in higher education. Faculty members professing at Christian-based colleges are provided the unique opportunity to holistically worship God in their everyday life.

Historically, college faculty members were deeply committed to their colleges. However, that sentiment has changed and it is much less prevalent. Faculty tends to be more committed to their research or academic discipline rather than a particular institution of higher learning (Haynes, 2002). As a result of this migration of faculty from Christian-based colleges, administrators at these colleges must be able to more efficiently manage these knowledge workers otherwise there will be very little meaningful religion identity remaining. Thus, their will be even less impacting lives for Christ and His Kingdom.

Business faculty members have a tremendous opportunity to impact the lives of future business leaders. In light of the many corporate scandals, developing Christian business leaders can potentially have a positive impact in the workplace and society overall. However, the pool of qualified business faculty, with a commitment to integrating the Christian perspective in the classroom, is difficult to find (Dunn, 1990). Many private Christian-tradition colleges are unable to compensate business faculty comparable to what private secular or public colleges are able to pay out. Thus, a challenge for Christian college administrators is how to retain committed and qualified faculty when administration is unable to pay the high salary income.

Institutions' administration should try to strike a balance between faculty and institutional interests in order to retain qualified, productive professors. Thus, it is necessary to study the mechanism of faculty organizational commitment and its antecedents in the literature. The following hypotheses were tested using multivariate analysis of variance:

H₃: Job satisfaction will be different among Christian business faculty and business faculty at public and/or secular schools of business.

H₄: Job embeddedness will be different among Christian business faculty and business faculty at public and/or secular schools of business.

H₅: Organizational commitment will be different among Christian business faculty and business faculty at public and/or secular schools of business.

Research Instruments

The survey instrument (Appendix A) was developed using four well established and reliable scales from the employee-organizational linkage literature stream combined with the responses to several open ended demographic questions. The variables that were studied were: (1) Job satisfaction, (2) Job embeddedness, (3) Affective commitment, (4) Continuance commitment, (5) Normative commitment, and (6) faculty intentions to leave the organization.

The survey instrument contained 90 items. Organizational commitment was measured using Meyer and Allen's (1990) Three-Component Model (TCM). Job satisfaction was measured using Gregson's (1991) scale. Intent to leave (stay) was measured using Bluedorn's (1982) six-question Staying or Leaving Index (SLI). The construct job embeddedness was operationalized using the instrument constructed by Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablinski, and Erez (2001). The organizational tenure question was addressed on the background information form of the administered questionnaire.

Sample

A field, structured, and undisguised questionnaire was used to collect data for this cross-sectional study. The sample target population was comprised of full-time faculty members employed by four-year AACSB-accredited business schools and faculty members employed by CBFA affiliate colleges located in the southeastern region states of the United States. Six

hundred fifty (760) self-reported questionnaires, with self-addressed, return envelopes, were mailed to faculty members that were randomly selected from an original population list. Completed questionnaires were returned by 191 faculty members for a 25.13% response rate. The majority (78%) of the responses were from AACSB colleges and fewer (22%) of the responses were from CBFA affiliate colleges.

Factor Scores

Before testing the study hypotheses, factor analyses were performed on the data to determine the underlying factors, or factor scores, for the questionnaire. Factor scores were generated for each construct of the model (e.g. the Three Component Model – affective, continuance and normative commitment, job satisfaction, job embeddedness and intent to leave). Separate factor structures were generated for each construct in order to define the distinct constructs and to assist the researcher in interpreting the multiple relationships. On each factor analyses run, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure (KMO) of sampling was adequate at greater than or equal to .70 and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was significant at the .05 alpha level. The coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951) for each of the factors is shown to demonstrate the reliability of the scales used in the analysis. All alpha coefficients are greater than 0.70 and, therefore, deemed acceptable (Nunnally, 1978). The factor scores were used in subsequent multivariate analyses.

Analysis and Findings

Organizational commitment was measured using Meyer and Allen's (1990) Three-Component Model (TCM). The mean score value for the affective component of commitment was 4.45; the mean score value for continuance commitment was 3.75; and the mean score value for normative commitment was 3.33. Job satisfaction was measured using the Gregson (1991) 16-item scale. The mean score value among respondents was 5.21, which indicates that on aggregate, faculty members are satisfied with their job.

Job embeddedness, a new construct in the literature, was measured using an instrument constructed by Mitchell et al. (2001). The mean score value for job embeddedness is 5.12, which indicated, on the aggregate, faculty remain with an organization because they may be linked to the community in which they live or believe they fit within the organization. Organizational tenure was addressed on the demographic portion of the questionnaire. Respondents were asked how many years they have been employed with the present college or university.

The mean score value among respondents for organizational tenure was 2.58, which indicates that on the aggregate, faculty members were employed with their current university approximately eleven (11) years. Intent to leave (stay) was measured using Bluedorn's (1982) six-question Staying or Leaving Index (SLI). The mean score value among respondents was 1.39, which indicates that, on aggregate, low turnover intentions exist among the respondents.

Testing of Hypotheses

The survey data was analyzed using SPSS. Multiple regressions were performed to examine the relationship between the independent variables: job satisfaction, job embeddedness

and the three components of organizational commitment and the dependent variable - turnover intentions.

The subcomponents of job satisfaction (satisfaction w/ supervisor, satisfaction w/ pay, satisfaction w/ work, satisfaction w/ promotion opportunities and satisfaction w/ co-workers) and the subcomponents of job embeddedness (link to community, organizational fit, and benefit) formed the linear combination of independent variables in the first regression equation. The model indicates that the linear combination of independent variables was significantly related to turnover intention, $F = 2.631$, $p < .007$. Job embeddedness link to the community provides the most significant contribution to intention to leave ($p < .01$). The standardized coefficient betas for sub component of job satisfaction and job embeddedness are negative, indicating an inverse relationship as hypothesized. Thus, H_1 was supported. The results of the first regression are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Multiple Regression Analysis for Job Satisfaction and Job Embeddedness Variables Predicting Intent to Leave

Variable	Beta	SE	F	R ²
Job embeddedness – link to the community	-.245***	.078	2.631***	.09
Job embeddedness – fit to work	-.157	.096		
Job embeddedness – benefits	.106	.100		
Job satisfaction – Supervisor	-.012	.090		
Job satisfaction – Pay	-.178	.092		
Job satisfaction – Work	.048	.079		
Job satisfaction – promotion opportunity	-.021	.091		
Job satisfaction – co-workers	-.018	.077		

Only Standardized regression coefficients are shown

*** $p < 0.001$

** $p < 0.01$

* $p < 0.05$

In order to test H_2 , which asserts the relationship of the commitment components (affective, continuance, and normative) to the intentions to leave is inversely related, multiple regression was performed. The linear combination of independent variables: affective, continuance and normative commitment was significantly related to turnover intention, $F = 2.142$, $p < .05$. Normative commitment makes the most significant contribution to intention to

leave ($p < .05$). The standardized coefficient betas for normative, affective and continuance commitments are negative, indicating an inverse relationship as hypothesized. However, affective and continuance commitment were not significant predictors of intent to leave. Thus, H_2 was partially supported. The results of the regression are presented in Table 3.

Table 3
Multiple Regression Analysis for Commitment Variables Predicting Intent to Leave

Variable	Beta	SE	F	R ²
Normative Commitment	-.174*	.074	2.142*	.019
Affective commitment	-.066	.074		
Continuance commitment	-.045	.075		

Only Standardized regression coefficients are shown

*** $p < 0.001$

** $p < 0.01$

* $p < 0.05$

The relationship among the dependent variables job satisfaction, job embeddedness and the three components of commitment with the type of college was hypothesized in H_4 , H_5 and H_6 . The hypotheses were examined using a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). MANOVA facilitates the identification of “the optimum structure of each variable set that maximizes the relationship between independent and dependent variable sets” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black, 1998). Group differences were analyzed using Levene’s test for equality of variance. The two groups consist of faculty teaching at Christian-based schools of business and faculty teaching at secular schools of business. The MANOVA was significant, $F(17.563, df = 13, 136, p = .000)$. Since the MANOVA was significant, univariate follow-up tests were used to distinguish which of the independent variables add to the overall group differences.

The univariate follow-up test for type of college was significant. The Levene test for equality was significant for job satisfaction – supervisor ($F = 9.541, p = .002$), job embeddedness – link to community ($F = 3.896, p = .05$), job embeddedness – fit to organization ($F = 7.144, p = .008$), and affective commitment ($F = 19.260, p = .000$). Post hoc tests were not performed for type of college because there are fewer than three groups. In other words, there were significance differences among faculty at Christian colleges and faculty at secular colleges. The difference lies within the constraints of job satisfaction – with supervisor, job embeddedness – link to the community, job embeddedness – fit to organization and affective commitment. An explanation of these findings is addressed in the discussion section.

Descriptive Statistics

Sample respondents ($n = 191$) with respect to gender were (39) 25.3% female and (115) 74.7% male. The gender differences of respondents for this study are aligned with gender

percentages of faculty at AACSB member business schools. The sampling population was also representative with respect to race/ethnicity. For instance, (151) 75.9% of the respondents were Caucasian Americans; similarly, according to the *AACSB International*, 83.1% of business faculty is White (or Caucasian American). Furthermore, (11) 5.5% of the faculty respondents were African American; (13) 6.5% Hispanic Americans, (4) 2.0% Native Americans, (7) 3.5% Asian Americans; while (5) 3.25 were classified as Other.

Respondents' tenure status was: 103 (51.8%) tenured, 59 (29.6%) non-tenured, and 28 (14.1%) non-tenured track respondents. Respondents' academic rank and years with present university/college revealed the majority of the study participants are full professors (n=68), followed by assistant professors (n=56), associate professors (n=48) and instructors (n=19). The majority of respondents at all academic rank levels had been at the universities from 0-4 years (n=63) or 31.7%.

The majority of the respondents (44.8%) from Christian colleges made a salary \$50,000-\$69,999 and the majority of the respondents (34.9%) from public non-Christian colleges made a salary greater than \$90,000. The academy discipline for the majority of the faculty surveyed were in management (46.2%), accounting (17.9%), marketing (12.8%), economics (10.3%), finance (2.6%), operations management (2.6%), information systems (2.6) and 5.1% were classified as other.

Motivations to Work Comparisons

Survey participants were asked to rank the factors that motivate them to continue working at the university where they are currently employed. In order to ensure the participants have a clear understanding of the factors, definitions were provided on the survey instrument. Table 6 and 7 lists the items in rank and in order of importance with 1 = most important and 8 = least important. Faculty employed by Christian-based colleges is provided in Table 6 while the ranking from faculty employed by public or private secular colleges is provided in Table 7.

Table 6
Factors that Motivate Faculty at Christian-based Colleges

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
1	Job satisfaction	1.756	1.113
2	Job embeddedness	3.219	1.864
3	Organizational commitment	3.658	2.174
4	Professional commitment	4.243	2.222
5	Intent to stay	5.146	2.162
6	Salary	5.268	1.936
7	Benefits	5.512	2.05
8	Organizational tenure	5.902	1.80

Table 7
Factors that Motivate Faculty at Public or Private Secular Colleges

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
1	Job satisfaction	2.423	1.79
2	Salary	3.702	1.94
3	Job embeddedness	3.792	2.32
4	Professional commitment	4.48	2.26
5	Benefits	4.900	2.01
6	Organizational commitment	5.176	2.13
7	Organizational tenure	5.423	2.15
8	Intent to stay	5.449	2.27

Job satisfaction is the primary reason why faculty members at both types of colleges choose to stay. Business faculty at public or private secular colleges rank salary as the 2nd most important factor and job embeddedness as the 3rd most important factor. Business faculty at Christian-based colleges list job embeddedness as the 2nd most important factor and organizational commitment as the 3rd most important factor. In the latter group, salary and benefits are of less importance.

The construct of job satisfaction is multidimensional. It includes satisfaction with co-workers, supervisors, pay, work, opportunities for promotion, challenge. The “link to the community” subcomponent of job embeddedness typically provides the strongest explanation for the embeddedness. “Link to the community” includes connections with family, friends and church family that produces the embeddedness.

Discussion

The results from the analyses support H₁ and partially support H₂. In general, satisfied and embedded faculty members are less likely to leave the college. This finding coincides with conventional knowledge. More specifically, the findings suggest that satisfaction with the supervisor leads to reduced turnover and more satisfaction on the job. The new construct job embeddedness plays a significant role in turnover intentions. As expected, faculty linked to the community as a result of family and/or friends in the area and, more relevant to the current population, the church is less likely to leave. Faculty fit to the organization is less likely to leave. Contrasting conventional knowledge, salary is not the primary motivator to work.

Furthermore, affective commitment was found to be a significant predictor of faculty intent to leave. Thus, if faculty members have a sense of affection to the mission of the college then they are less likely to leave the college. They tend to stay with the organization because they “want to” stay.

Moreover, H₃, H₄ and H₅ were partially supported among the sample of the population studied. Faculty at the two types of schools differed based on their level of satisfaction with their supervisor on the job. A difference was detected on the type of job embeddedness; link to the community and fit to the organization provides an explanation for the difference. Faculty at the two types of schools differed on the predominant type of commitment demonstrated. Affective commitment tended to be the most significant difference. As previously stated, affective

commitment is demonstrated by the “want to” stay and attach with the organization. In sum, the findings were partially supported for the relationships between the three component model of organizational commitment and the consequence variable – turnover intentions.

Limitations/Future Research

The research is not void of limitations. There are issues associated with response bias. In survey research, respondents often exhibit an unwillingness to provide information. In this study, respondents chose not to respond to questions related to salary and race/ethnicity, which is consistent with the research conducted on survey response to sensitive questions (Boyd, Westfall & Stasch, 1977). Furthermore, it is not uncommon for respondents to provide the most socially desirable response. Respondents attempt to give answers that they think will please the interviewer or the researcher (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986).

Second, there are issues associated with the statistical techniques used in the study. For instance, multiple regression is the appropriate technique to make predictions and support relationships in a linear problem. However, moderated multiple regression would be a more powerful tool when drawing comparisons between the two groups. Furthermore, few (n = 42) Christian business faculty participated in the current study. Future research should extend the target population of Christian business faculty to the entire country as opposed to a region of the country. Findings will no doubt be fruitful toward bridging gaps and surfacing research voids in the organizational commitment literature addressing the infancy research area of business school faculty in higher education, specifically focusing on business faculty at Christian-based colleges.

The impact of organizational tenure on the relationship between business faculty commitment and performance (teaching, research, service) should also be considered a research priority. Wright and Bonnet’s (2002) study findings revealed that the correlation between commitment and performance was moderately high for new employees and decreasing as tenure is increased. Admittedly, the authors’ findings may very well not be indicative of business faculty attitudes and perceptions in that their study was a meta-analysis from 27 independent studies. However, this is an avenue worthy of exploration to determine length of time on the job and organizational commitment with respect to business faculty in higher education (Gaylor, 2004).

The differential effect (if any) of organizational commitment as opposed to professional commitment should also be addressed in future research efforts focusing on business faculty in higher education. Do business faculty members teach because they are devoted to the profession and/or tenure at the particular college/university? What factors (e.g. salary, benefits, publishing opportunities, service involvement, and peer socialization) impact their professional commitment and/or organizational commitment? Lastly, future research efforts in this field of study will include a religiosity scale in order to better understand the importance of religion among the study participants.

Implications for Higher Education Administration

Despite the aforementioned shortfalls or limitations of this study, there are significant practical and theoretical implications of the study's findings. Business school faculty were chosen as the population to be investigated for both theoretical and practical reasons. Theoretically, studying business school faculty enhances the external validity of the commitment studies on a diverse population. It also examines the explanatory power that organization commitment has on faculty turnover.

Findings from this research study enhance the usefulness of the new construct job embeddedness in the literature. To date, no known study has investigated the influence non-work related factors have on business faculty members' behavior. Job embeddedness and its subcomponents were found to be significant contributors to business faculty organizational commitment and behavior.

As the supply of business faculty declines and institutions continue to experience budget constraints, it is necessary for business school administrators to increase intangibles. According to an annual study conducted by AACSB, intangibles such as faculty job satisfaction with co-workers/supervisors and work (e.g., organizational commitment and job embeddedness) are critical to the survival of quality business education (Doctoral Faculty Commission, 2003). It would be advantageous for organizations to provide amenities, such as competitive compensation packages, housing assistance packages, child care availability, spouse/partner career options, research program support, sabbatical/leave plans, opportunities for advancement and collegial academic environments in order to retain valuable employees and to minimize cost that may be incurred with terminating employees, replacing employees and training new hires.

The findings in the study tend to contradict conventional knowledge about employee compensation. Conventional knowledge would suggest that employee satisfaction in conjunction with their level of compensation is the primary motivation to stay on a job (Gillette, 2002; Kanengiser, 2002). However, this study implies that pay satisfaction is not the most significant determinant of employee affective commitment among business school faculty. Correlations revealed that satisfaction with challenging work, satisfaction with coworkers, satisfaction with promotion opportunities, link to the community and fit to the organization are positive motivations to work and indicators of intentions to stay on the job.

These findings are hinging on the fact that we are not dealing with corporate America employees but rather college professors as a sample. College professors are knowledge workers that must be managed effectively in order to meet their needs in the postmodern Academy. In most instances, college professors genuinely love their profession. The task is for college administrators at Christian-based colleges to effectively manage college professors (i.e. the knowledge worker) in order to meet their needs in the postmodern Academy.

In conclusion, the key to the survival of the Christian higher education system is the ability to retain and maintain Christian faculty. It becomes the charge of administration to identify faculty intrinsic and extrinsic motivations that reduce turnover intentions. It is hoped that

the findings reported from this study assists higher education administration in their understanding of how to best manage Christian faculty.

References

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 63(1):18-38.
- Ameen, E. C., Jackson, C., Pasewark W. R., & Strawser, J. R. (1995). An empirical investigation of the antecedents and consequences of job insecurity on the turnover intentions of academic accountants, *Issues in Accounting Education*, 10(1): 65-79.
- Angle, H., & Perry, J. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 1-14.
- Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) International. (2003) *Results from the 2002-2003 Salary Survey - Doctoral Faculty Demand Survey*. St. Louis, MO: Author.
- Bateman, T.S., & Strasser, S. (1984). A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24(1): 95-112.
- Belhaven College Catalog. (2004). <http://www.belhaven.edu/Belhaven/mission.htm>
- Bisoux, T. (March/April 2002). Is there a Doctorate in the House? *BizEd*, p. 21.
- Bluedorn, A. C. (1982). A unified model of turnover from organizations. *Human Relations*, 35 (2): 135-153.
- Boyd, H. W., Westfall, R. & Stasch, S. F. (1977). *Marketing Research: Text and Cases*. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc. (4th ed.).
- Brookover, R. S. (2002). An assessment of organizational commitment among faculty at Clemson University (Doctoral dissertation, Clemson University, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63/03. (UMI No. 3045198).
- Cascio, W.F. (1991). *Costing human resources: The financial impact of behavior in organizations*. Boston, Massachusetts: PWS-Kent Publishing Company. (3rd ed.).
- Chelte, A. F., & Tausky, C. (1986). A note on organizational commitment: Antecedents and consequences among managers, professional, and blue-collar

- workers. *Work and Occupations*, 13(4): 553-561.
- Child Care Center at Michigan Tech. (n.d.). Retrieved on July 5, 2003, from http://www.mtu.edu/childcare/ccc_why.pdf. Michigan Technological University.
- Cohen, A. (1995). An examination of the relationships between work commitment and nonwork domains. *Human Relations*, 48: 239-263.
- Cohen, A. (2003). *Multiple Commitments in the Workplace: An Integrative Approach*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficients alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16 (3): September: 297-333
- Curry, J.P., Wakefield D.S., Price, J.L., & Mueller, C.W. (1986). On the causal ordering of job satisfaction and organization commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29(4): 847-858.
- Doctoral Faculty Commission. (2003). *Sustaining Scholarship in Business Schools*. Report of the Doctoral Faculty Commission to AACSB International Board of Directors.
- Dunn, Samuel L. (Winter 1990). The Strategic Importance of the Christian College Business Department. *Faculty Dialogue*, 13:105-110.
- Flynn, A. A. (2000). Dimensions of faculty organizational commitment related to turnover, performance, and turnover intention. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61, 07A.
- Gaylor, Kristena P. (2004). "Organizational Commitment in Higher Education: A Multidimensional Perspective." Ph.D. Dissertation, Jackson State University.
- Gillette, B. (2002, October 21-27). State budget problems, higher ed funding cuts spark exodus, *Mississippi Business Journal*, 24(42): 15.
- Glandon, S., & Glandon, T.A. (2001). Faculty turnover and salary compression in business schools: Comparing teaching and research missions, *The Journal of Applied Business Research*, 7(2): 33.
- Gregson, T. (1991). The separate constructs of communication satisfaction and job satisfaction, *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, 41(1): 39-52.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis*. (5th ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Harshbarger, B. (1989). Faculty commitment to the university: Influences and issues. *Review of Higher Education*, 13(1): pp 29-45.
- Haynes, Stephen R. (2002). *Professing in the Postmodern Academy: Faculty and the future of Church-related Colleges*. Baylor University Press.
- Holland, C.B. (1992). The influence and organizational commitment on intention to leave of nurse educators (Doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1992). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53. 09A.
- Hom, P. & Griffeth, R. (1995). *Employee turnover*. Cincinnati: South-Western.
- Kanengiser, A. (2002, September 8). Profs leaving Mississippi in Droves, *The Clarion Ledger*, Section A. p. 1.
- Koroloff, N.M (1985). Factors predicting faculty's organizational commitment and intent to leave the university (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1985). *Dissertation Abstract International*, 46-11.
- Luthans, F., Baack, D., & Taylor L. (1987). Organizational commitment: Analysis of antecedents. *Human Relations*, 40(4): 219-236.
- March, J. & Simon, H. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the "side-bet" theory of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69: 372-378.
- Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization, *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 63(1): p.1-19.
- Mitchell, T. R., Holtom, B. C., Lee, T. W., Sablinski, C. J., & Erez, M. (2001). Why people stay: Using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover, *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(6):1102-1121.
- Mobley, W.H. (1982). *Employee Turnover: Causes, Consequences, and Control*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R.M. (1982). *Employee-organizational linkages*. New York: Academic Press.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14: 224-247.

Mueller, C. W., & Wallace, J. E. (1992). Employee commitment: Resolving some issues, *Work & Occupations*, 19(3): 211-237.

Nunnally, J. C. 1978. *Psychometric theory*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12: 531-544.

Reichers, A.E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment, *Academy of Management Review*, 10(3): 465-476.

Representative Faculty (14 March 2001). Retrieved July 5, 2003, from <http://www.wsu.edu/StrategicPlanning/finalreport3.htm>. Washington State University Strategic Planning Design Team.

Simon, Bloxham, Hailey, Doyle and Light, Hawks, Scibilia and Simmons (2003). *Mentoring For Mission: Nurturing New Faculty at Church-Related Colleges*. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 129 pp.

Staff retention and recruitment issues (25 January 2001). Retrieved June 22, 2003, http://www.stanford.edu/dept/facultysenate/2000_2001/reports/SenD5158_slides Stanford University Human Resource Department.

Testa, M.R., (2001). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and effort in the service environment. *The Journal of Psychology*, 135(2): 226-236.

Wright, T. A., & Bonnett, D. G. (2002). The moderating effects of employee tenure on the relation between organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(6): 1183-1190.

Appendix A

Organizational Commitment in Higher Education Survey Instrument: A Multidimensional Perspective

Confidentiality Statement: Information obtained from this study will be held in the strictest confidence.

Definitions:

<u>Job satisfaction</u> - positive or pleasurable feelings evoked from one’s job experiences.	<u>Organizational commitment</u> -one maintains membership to an organization because of emotional attachment or loyalty and obligation to stay.
<u>Job embeddedness</u> - non-work factors that influence intentions to stay with an organization.	<u>Benefit package</u> - includes retirement plans, insurance benefits, or other perks of one’s job.
<u>Salary</u> - Earnings received for the work one performs over a nine month period.	<u>Intent to stay</u> - the likelihood that an individual will remain with the organization.
<u>Organizational tenure</u> - number of years invested in an organization.	<u>Professional commitment</u> – an individual’s willingness to work hard on behalf of the profession, and a strong desire to remain in a profession

Using the definitions provided above, please rank in order of importance (1-8) the factors that motivate you to continue working at the university where you are presently employed.

____ Job satisfaction ____ Job embeddedness ____ Salary ____ Organizational tenure	____ Organizational commitment ____ Benefit package ____ Intent to Stay ____ Professional commitment
---	---

Part I:

For each item, please check the most correct response reflecting your opinion.

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Weakly Disagree

4 = Neutral

5 = Weakly Agree

6 = Agree

7 = Strongly Agree

NA = Not Applicable or Don't Know

Job Satisfaction (JSS)
(Gregson, 1991)

	Strongly Disagree		Neutral			Strongly Agree		Not Applicable
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
1. My work is satisfying.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
2. My work is challenging.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
3. My work gives me a sense of accomplishment.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
4. I am underpaid.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
5. My pay is bad.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
6. My pay is less than I deserve.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
7. There are good opportunities for advancement at my university.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
8. Opportunities are somewhat limited at my university.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
9. There is a good chance for promotion at my university.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
10. My supervisors are impolite.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
11. My supervisors are quick-tempered.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
12. My supervisors are annoying.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
13. My supervisors are stubborn.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
14. My co-workers are slow.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]

15. My co-workers are stupid.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
16. My co-workers are intelligent	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]

Part II:

For each item, please check the most correct response reflecting your opinion.

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Weakly Disagree

4 = Neutral

5 = Weakly Agree

6 = Agree

7 = Strongly Agree

NA = Not Applicable or Don't Know

TCM of Organizational Commitment

(Meyer & Allen, 1990)

	Strongly Disagree		Neutral			Strongly Agree		Not Applicable
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
17. I would happy to spend the rest of my career with this university.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
18. I enjoy discussing my university with people outside the university.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
19. I really feel as if this university's problems are my own.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
20. I think that I could easily become as attached to another university as I am to this one.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
21. I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my university.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
22. I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this university.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
23. This university has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
24. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my university.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
25. I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
26. It would be hard for me to leave my university right now, even if I wanted to.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
27. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization right now.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
28. It wouldn't be too costly for me to leave this university in the near future.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]

29. Right now, staying with my university is a matter of necessity as much as desire.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
30. I believe that I have too few options to consider leaving this university.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
31. One of the few negative consequences of leaving this university would be the scarcity of available alternatives.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
32. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this university is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice; another university may not match the overall benefits I have here.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
33. I think that people these days move from university to university too often.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
34. I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her university.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
35. Jumping from university to university does not seem at all unethical to me.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
36. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this university is that I believe that loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
37. If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my university.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
38. I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one university.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
39. Things were better in the days when people stayed with one university for most of their careers.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
40. I do not think that wanting to be a “company man” or “company woman” is sensible anymore.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]

Part III:

For each item, please check the most correct response reflecting your opinion.

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Weakly Disagree

4 = Neutral

5 = Weakly Agree

6 = Agree

7 = Strongly Agree

NA = Not Applicable or Don't Know

Intent to Stay
(Bluedorn, 1980)

	Strongly Disagree		Neutral			Strongly Agree		Not Applicable
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
41. Rate your chances of still working for the current organization three months from now.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
42. Rate your chances of still working for the current organization six months from now.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
43. Rate your chances of still working for the current organization twelve months from now.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]

Job Embeddedness
(adapted from Mitchell et al. 2001)

	Strongly Disagree		Neutral			Strongly Agree		Not Applicable
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
44. I love the place where I live.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
45. The weather where I live is suitable for me.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
46. This community is a good match for me.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
47. I think of the community where I live as home.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
48. The area where I live offers the leisure activities that I like.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
49. I like the members of my work group.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
50. My coworkers are similar to me.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
51. My job utilizes my skills and talents well.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
52. I feel like I am a good match for this university.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
53. I fit with the university's culture.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
54. I like the authority and responsibility I have at this university.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
55. Leaving this community would be very hard.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
56. People respect me a lot in my community.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
57. My neighborhood is safe.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
58. I have a lot of freedom on the job to decide how to pursue my goals.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
59. The perks on this job are outstanding.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
60. I feel that people at work respect me a great deal.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]

61. I would sacrifice a lot if I left this job.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
62. My promotional opportunities are excellent here.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
63. I am well compensated for my level of performance.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
64. The benefits are good on this job.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
65. The benefits provided by this organization are excellent.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
66. The retirement benefits here are excellent.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]

**Intent to Leave
(Bluedorn, 1980)**

	Strongly Disagree		Neutral			Strongly Agree		Not Applicable
67. Rate your chance of leaving the organization three months from now.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
68. Rate your chance of leaving the organization six months from now.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]
69. Rate your chance of leaving the organization twelve months from now.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[NA]

Part IV.

Background Information Form (BIF)

A. Research:

How many times in the last 5 years has your research been published or presented in the listed venues?

<input type="checkbox"/> Proceedings <input type="checkbox"/> Refereed journals <input type="checkbox"/> Non-refereed journals <input type="checkbox"/> Book Chapters	<input type="checkbox"/> Grants <input type="checkbox"/> Conference presentations <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ _____
--	---

Have you been honored for excellence in research? Yes No

B. Service:

How many committees do you serve in the following categories?

<input type="checkbox"/> Department <input type="checkbox"/> University	<input type="checkbox"/> Professional organizations <input type="checkbox"/> Community
--	---

Have you been honored for excellence in service? Yes No

C. Gender:

Female Male

D. Race/Ethnicity:

<input type="checkbox"/> Caucasian American <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic (White) <input type="checkbox"/> Asian American	<input type="checkbox"/> African American <input type="checkbox"/> Native American
---	---

E. Family status:

Which best describes your marital status? Single Separated
 Married Divorced
 Widowed

If you are married, does your spouse work outside the home? Yes No

Do you own the home you live in? Yes No

Do you have children? Yes No

Are you the primary or secondary wage earner in your family? Primary Secondary

F. Employment status: Full time Part time

G. Tenure status: Tenured Non tenured, but on tenure track
 Non-tenured, not on tenure track

H. Academic rank: Instructor Associate Professor
 Assistant Professor Professor

I. Years of Employment with the present University: 0-4 years 17-22 years
 5-10 years 23-28 years
 11-16 years 30 and over

How long have you worked in academia? 0-4 years 17-22 years
 5-10 years 23-29 years
 11-16 years 30 and over

J. Salary: < \$50,000 \$80,000-\$89,999
 \$50,000-\$59,999 \$90,000-\$99,999
 \$60,000-\$69,999 > \$100,000
 \$70,000-\$79,999

K. Retirement plan: Do you invest in the university's retirement plan? Yes No
 Other, please specify _____

If yes, how many years do you have invested in the university's retirement plan? < 1 year 11-15 years
 2-5 years 16-20 years
 6-10 years > 21 years

L. The university where you are currently employed. Is it private or public. Private Public

M. Academic discipline: Accounting Management
 Economics Marketing
 Entrepreneurial Studies Statistics/Quantitative Mgt.
 Finance Production/Operations Mgt.
 Information Systems Other, please specify _____

