

2005

A study of the characteristics, satisfaction, and organizational commitment of faculty members at ten colleges affiliated with the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities

Curtis J. Taylor
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), and the [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Taylor, Curtis J., "A study of the characteristics, satisfaction, and organizational commitment of faculty members at ten colleges affiliated with the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities " (2005). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 1597.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/1597>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

**A study of the characteristics, satisfaction, and organizational commitment
of faculty members at ten colleges affiliated with the Council for
Christian Colleges and Universities**

by

Curtis J. Taylor

A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major: Education (Higher Education)

Program of Study Committee:
Larry H. Ebbers, Major Professor
Virginia Arthur
Sharon Drake
Daniel C. Robinson
Margaret Torrie

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2005

UMI Number: 3184655

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3184655

Copyright 2005 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Graduate College
Iowa State University

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation of

Curtis J. Taylor

has met the dissertation requirements of Iowa State University

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Major Professor

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Program

DEDICATION

To my wife, Sheryl, without whose love, support, encouragement, and occasional gentle prodding, this project would never have been completed. Thank you.

To my children, Ian, Willem, and Mia, who endured long days and nights without my presence while I muddled through the process. Thank you.

To my parents, who provided the seeds for my development through a nurturing Christian home and a selfless devotion to Christian education. Thank you.

To Carl Zylstra and Dordt College, who provided me the resources and time necessary to complete this project. Thank you.

To Larry Ebbers, who never gave up on me, and encouraged me when the road looked too long to travel. Thank you.

And to my God, through Whom all things are possible. Soli Deo Gloria!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	v
PREFACE	viii
ABSTRACT	xiii
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY	34
CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS	43
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	120
APPENDIX A: ADDITIONAL TABLES	149
APPENDIX B: SURVEY INSTRUMENT	284
APPENDIX C: CCCU INSTITUTIONS	299
APPENDIX D: HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL	304
REFERENCES	306
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	317

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Sample distribution by gender	43
Table 2. Sample distribution by age	44
Table 3. Sample distribution by institution	45
Table 4. Sample distribution by church membership requirement	45
Table 5. Sample distribution by type of undergraduate alma mater	46
Table 6. Sample distribution by highest degree earned	47
Table 7. Sample distribution by academic rank	47
Table 8. Sample distribution by years teaching (career)	48
Table 9. Sample distribution by years teaching (institution)	48
Table 10. Sample distribution by expected age of retirement	49
Table 11. Sample distribution by academic field	50
Table 12. Sample distribution by academic divisions	51
Table 13. Reasons for initial affiliation with current institution	53
Table 14. Currently appreciate most about current institution	54
Table 15. Most problematic characteristics of current institution	56
Table 16. OCQ descriptive statistics	58
Table 17. Reliability statistics for the 15 OCQ questions	59
Table 18. Total variance explained for OCQ questions	60
Table 19. ANOVA results of OCQ questions by gender	62
Table 20. ANOVA results of OCQ questions by age	63
Table 21. ANOVA results of OCQ questions by institution	65

Table 22. ANOVA results of OCQ questions by church membership requirement	66
Table 23. ANOVA results of OCQ questions by alma mater	67
Table 24. ANOVA results of OCQ questions by years teaching (career)	68
Table 25. ANOVA results of OCQ questions by years teaching (institution)	69
Table 26. ANOVA results of OCQ questions by expected age of retirement	70
Table 27. ANOVA results of OCQ questions by academic field	70
Table 28. Descriptive statistics for job satisfaction questions	72
Table 29. Descriptive statistics for reasons for leaving current institution	73
Table 30. Descriptive statistics for desired mix of roles in new position	73
Table 31. Descriptive statistics for importance of characteristics in new position	74
Table 32. Descriptive statistics for statements regarding academic issues	75
Table 33. Results of one-sample t-tests of means between study participants and NSOPF participants on job satisfaction questions	77
Table 34. Results of one-sample t-tests of means between study participants and NSOPF participants on reasons for leaving current institution	78
Table 35. Results of one-sample t-tests of means between study participants and NSOPF participants on desired mix of roles in new position	79
Table 36. Results of one-sample t-tests of means between study participants and NSOPF participants on importance of characteristics in new position	80
Table 37. Results of one-sample t-tests of means between study participants and NSOPF participants on statements regarding academic issues	81
Table 38. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by gender	83
Table 39. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by age	88
Table 40. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by institution	93

Table 41. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by church membership requirement	96
Table 42. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by alma mater	99
Table 43. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by highest degree earned	102
Table 44. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by academic rank	105
Table 45. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by years of teaching (career)	108
Table 46. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by years of teaching (institution)	111
Table 47. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by expected age of retirement	115
Table 48. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by academic field	118

PREFACE

The life of a college faculty member can be beset by competing loyalties. Initially, an aspiring academic may have to choose between developing skills that will help him excel as a teacher or a researcher. This choice may need to be made at the time an institution is selected at which he will complete his graduate studies. After graduation, a prospective faculty member must choose an institution at which to work that will reward the particular skills and abilities that he has developed. As his career progresses, he may have to balance his loyalty to an academic specialty with his commitment to a more broadly defined academic major or department. He may also have to divide his time and energy between service to the institution at which he is employed and involvement with a tight-knit community of scholars in his field of expertise. And these choices do not even take into account whether he has additional family considerations that must be factored in to his decision-making.

For a faculty member with strong religious convictions, another choice must be made. He must choose between working at an institution that recognizes, accepts, and encourages his religious convictions, or one that may, at best, tacitly accept his beliefs, but that expressly prohibits the public expression of those beliefs.

The choices for a college or university are no less difficult. When appointing faculty members, academic administrators and boards must consider the needs of the institution, department, and students and balance those needs against the available resources and pool of potential candidates. For Christian colleges that espouse a particular set of philosophical or

theological beliefs, the pool of acceptable candidates can be significantly smaller than that for a public or secular college or university.

Perhaps, at the outset, an example taken from a small, private, church-related college would help to clarify some of the issues that both faculty members and Christian colleges face. The institution was founded approximately half-a-century ago by members of a church denomination that wanted a regional Christian college to train teachers for their local private Christian schools. Until that time, nearly all Christian school teachers were educated at another college affiliated with the denomination, but located over 500 miles away.

For 50 years, the college has maintained a very close relationship with its founding denomination. Although not officially owned by the denomination, the college is recognized and heavily supported by members of the denomination. Over its history, the percentage of students from the denomination has decreased from nearly 100% at its founding to its current level of just over 60%; however, nearly all Board of Trustees members belong to the denomination, and all its faculty members are required to be members of the denomination and assent to their support of the educational mission and philosophy of the college.

Faculty members who are not members of the denomination when they apply for employment are interviewed to ascertain their support of the college policy and their willingness to join the denomination. These faculty members are given up to two years to join the denomination after accepting employment at the college.

For nearly 40 years, during which time the college continued to enroll primarily students from the founding denomination, this policy was well understood, and generally accepted by the Board, constituency, students and faculty. The Board reaffirmed the policy

several times during its first four decades. In recent years, however, the policy has come under greater scrutiny and criticism by faculty, students, and some constituents.

Initially this criticism came from individuals who expressed a desire to be allowed to join similar denominations that were open to more contemporary styles of worship and greater involvement of women in church government and leadership. They articulated that the college's students were becoming increasingly more denominationally diversified, and the faculty and Board should mirror that change. Several times over the years, requests were made to the President for exemptions to the Board church membership policy, but these requests were ordinarily denied (exceptions occasionally being made for members of the clergy in other denominations).

More recently still the requests have begun to change, due to changes in the denomination itself. Since the late 1980s over 10% of the denomination's members have left the denomination to join or form more conservative denominations or churches. These former members of the denomination disagree with the founding denomination's decision to allow women to hold church office and become ministers. Most have joined churches affiliated with denominations that do not allow these ecclesiastical practices.

In the mid-1990s the Board of Trustees approved a change in its bylaws to add six new board members from other denominations that strongly support the college. This change fueled the interest of faculty and some potential faculty members who wished to belong to more conservative denominations. The college administration began to receive requests from faculty and applicants for exemptions to the church membership policy in order to join the denominations that were now represented on the Board of Trustees.

In the early 2000s, the Board convened a sub-committee to study whether to reconsider the policy. After six months of study, during which they received significant comment from faculty on both sides of the issue, the sub-committee reported back to the Board. Their report recommended that although there was significant evidence and opinion that the policy could be reconsidered, the evidence for not changing the policy at that time was more compelling. Central to their evidence was the college's long association with the denomination, the denomination's unwavering support of Christian education, and the Board's determination that the beliefs of the denomination best epitomized the educational philosophy of the college.

The decision was not received well by some faculty who desired a policy change. A number of faculty members again requested an exemption to the policy to join a new church in the community; the Board denied the requests. Several faculty members subsequently left the college to accept positions at other Christian colleges with less-stringent church membership requirements.

This is only one example of the importance of a Christian college recruiting and hiring faculty members who accept and are committed to the mission, philosophy and policies of the institution. It also recognizes the importance of faculty members considering their own personal beliefs and needs before making the choice to accept employment at such an institution. In this example, perhaps the institution was not sufficiently clear about its church membership expectation, or maybe the faculty members who were no longer satisfied with or committed to the institution had not clarified their own personal beliefs or expectations.

This study will address these issues—specifically the choice of a faculty member to seek and hold employment at a committed Christian college or university and the factors related to his satisfaction with that choice and commitment to the chosen institution.

ABSTRACT

This study examined the reasons why faculty members choose to teach at Christian colleges, their commitment to their institution, and their satisfaction with various job-related issues and values. It analyzed comparisons between the characteristics and satisfaction of faculty members at Christian colleges and faculty members in other types of American institutions of higher education.

An on-line survey was administered to all faculty members at 10 diverse institutions affiliated with the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities. Useable responses were received from 238 full-time faculty members. The response rate was approximately 33%.

Survey items were categorized as follows: demographic variables; researcher-designed questions regarding reasons for initial affiliation, current satisfaction, and areas of concern; the 15 items of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ); and 70 items from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF).

Data from the OCQ and the NSOPF questions were analyzed by means of one-way ANOVA to determine mean differences between respondents on 11 independent variables. One-sample t-tests were used to compare the respondents' mean scores on the NSOPF items with mean scores from the national NSOPF surveys.

The primary reasons that faculty members gave for choosing to teach at a Christian college were a desire to work in a Christian environment and the institution's mission. They expressed concern that demands on faculty at their institutions are too heavy and their wages and benefits are insufficient.

Analysis of the OCQ results indicated significant organizational commitment on the part of faculty to their Christian colleges. One-way ANOVA analysis found statistically significant differences on over 30 of the comparisons made with the 11 independent variables ($p < .05$). Results indicated that commitment levels were significantly higher for females, those over age 60, and faculty who were working at their alma mater.

Analysis of the NSOPF results indicated strong satisfaction regarding various work-related variables. Statistically significant differences were found between the mean scores of respondents and the NSOPF studies on 43 of the items, with the faculty in this study demonstrating greater satisfaction on 35 of these items ($p < .05$).

CHAPTER 1.

INTRODUCTION

A 1976 meeting of the Association of American Colleges addressed the contemporary mission of church-related colleges. A summary of this meeting indicated six factors that help church-related institutions achieve their mission. They are: 1) the centrality of the faculty members; 2) strong interaction among faculty and students; 3) personal development of faculty and students; 4) the integration of curriculum and outcomes; 5) a high percentage of students from the sponsoring denomination; and 6) a strong relationship with the sponsoring denomination (*Achieving the Mission*, 1977).

The 1966 Danforth Commission proposed a schema that describes three different archetypes of church-related colleges (Pattillo & Mackenzie, 1966). The three types are: 1) defender of the faith college; 2) non-affirming college; and 3) free Christian college. (A fourth type, the church-related university, is not relevant to this research project).

Defender of the faith colleges are instituted to train leaders for particular denominations. They have a strong clarity of purpose and exert a strong religious influence on students. They are orthodox in their theology, and may be seen as counter-cultural in their curricular and extracurricular activities. Denominational loyalty is important, and financial support by the denomination is usually significant (Pattillo & Mackenzie, 1966).

Non-affirming colleges are church-related, but give little attention to religion. They usually have a historical tie to a particular denomination, but do not maintain the theological tenets of the denomination. In fact, the curriculum has been secularized to such an extent that many students may not even realize that the institution is church-related. Typically, the

denomination maintains a presence on the board of trustees, and may even supply a small portion of the operating budget of the institution, but other connections are minimal (Pattillo & Mackenzie, 1966).

Free Christian colleges are those that place a high emphasis on Christian thought and action, but do not attempt to control their students or faculty. A free Christian college “does not tell its students what they must believe, but it does expect them to grapple with the basic religious and philosophical questions and arrive at a considered position of their own” (Pattillo & Mackenzie, 1966, p. 194). These institutions may or may not have a relationship with a specific denomination, but aside from providing spiritual leadership, the denomination usually does not exert much influence.

A number of 19th and 20th century church-related colleges not only have resisted the secularization described in the Danforth “non-affirming colleges” category, but also have continued staunchly to maintain their religious focus up to the present time. These institutions are most commonly known as “committed Christian colleges” (Burtchaell, 1998, p. 743). Burtchaell defines committed Christian colleges as biblical, conservative, enthusiastic, and informal in ritual, plain in manners, with a tendency toward Wesleyan or Calvinist theology. In Burtchaell’s book, *The Dying of the Light*, he quotes David Reisman as much being much less flattering in his description of these committed Christian colleges as “claustrophobic” (1998, p. 743).

In terms of the Danforth schema, committed Christian colleges--the focus of this study--are best categorized as a combination of defender of the faith colleges and free Christian colleges. Not all of them are linked to specific denominations, but all maintain a close adherence to Christian theology and probably would consider themselves as defenders

of the faith. Some are more willing than others to allow students to wrestle with issues without providing a prescribed religious answer.

Perhaps the best exemplars of these types of committed Christian colleges in the United States today are the 175 member and affiliate-member institutions of the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU). This study will focus on faculty from 10 member institutions of the CCCU. A description of this organization and its member institutions may be found in the review of the literature and a listing of the institutions is included in Appendix C.

Purpose of this Study

This study was designed to examine the reasons why faculty members choose to affiliate with a committed Christian college (specifically, 10 member institutions of the CCCU). It addresses their commitment to their current institution, and their satisfaction with various job-related values and issues. It also makes comparisons between the characteristics and satisfaction of faculty members at committed Christian colleges and faculty members in general in American institutions of higher education. It is hoped that this research will assist academic administrators at these institutions in selecting candidates who possess the characteristics and values that will best fit with the mission and philosophy of their institution.

Research Questions

The primary research questions used to guide this study were:

1. What are the critical factors involved in a faculty member's decision to initially accept a job at a CCCU institution?

2. What are the critical factors involved in a faculty member choosing to remain in a position at a CCCU institution?
3. What are the critical factors that are considered most problematic by faculty members working at a CCCU institution?
4. Are there significant differences in the commitment of faculty to their institution among the faculty at 10 selected CCCU institutions based on the following characteristics: gender, age, current institution, church membership requirement, type of undergraduate alma mater (specifically, whether they are working at the institution at which they completed their undergraduate degree, another CCCU institution, another non-CCCU Christian college, or a public college or university), highest degree earned, academic rank, years of teaching experience (in their career and at their current institution), expected age of retirement, and academic field?
5. Are there significant differences in measures of satisfaction with or opinions about selected job components between faculty members at selected CCCU institutions and faculty members in general at US colleges and universities?
6. Are there significant differences in measures of satisfaction with or opinions about selected job components or values between faculty members at selected CCCU institutions based on the following characteristics: gender, age, current institution, church membership requirement, type of undergraduate alma mater, highest degree earned, academic rank, years of teaching experience (in their career and at their current institution), expected age of retirement, and academic field?

CHAPTER 2.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Four threads of knowledge and research come together as a conceptual framework for this study: 1) the nature and characteristics of committed Christian colleges; 2) the nature and characteristics of college faculty members; 3) satisfaction of faculty members and their commitment to their institution and its mission; and 4) the historical reluctance of an institution to hire its own graduates as faculty members (known as faculty inbreeding).

Christian Colleges

In colonial America, all colleges were innately Christian. The primary mission of each of the earliest institutions of higher education in America was to train Christian clergy and leaders. Brubacher and Rudy (1976) state that the college was a “local encampment of the universal ‘militia’ of Christ” (p. 7) designated to “provide a supply of clergymen ... [and] ensure that the youth were piously educated in good letters and manners” (Rudolph, 1990, p. 7).

At the time of the Revolutionary War, America still had only nine colonial colleges. All but the University of Pennsylvania had been founded by religious organizations. Within 100 years the United States had 250 colleges, but up to 700 others had opened and failed to survive (Rudolph, 1990). Many of the failed colleges had been opened by religious denominations that sought to place their own theological mark on higher education; however, the reason they did not thrive was their sectarian nature (Rudolph, 1990). They failed to recognize that America was a diverse nation that was in transition from a colonial Calvinistic worldview to an expansionist humanistic worldview.

This transition resulted in a conflict between the conservative old-guard at many colonial and early 19th century institutions and the progressive youth and society of the middle 19th century. If a college did not change to recognize the diversity of American values and the moderation of religious thought, as did all of the early colonial colleges, it was not likely to survive. Multiple revivals caused a temporary metamorphosis in individual students, and might even change the nature of an entire institution, but in the end, secularism triumphed over denominationalism (Rudolph, 1990).

The late 19th and early 20th centuries witnessed an ongoing secularization of formerly denominational colleges. Much of this secularization was the result of an evolving understanding of the doctrine of the separation of church and state (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976; Cameron, 1994; Dannelly, 1931) and the rise of the scientific method (Rudolph, 1990). Ringenberg (1984) identified characteristics that marked the secularization of church-related institutions, including the weakening of explicit Christian language in public statements and the lessening of restrictions on the theological beliefs of faculty members.

Clarence M. Dannelly wrote an article in 1931 in the *Journal of Higher Education* that provided five reasons why denominational colleges should not be allowed to disappear entirely from the landscape of American higher education. His reasons were: 1) Christian colleges recognize “the strategic place of the teacher in the educational process and seeks to employ in its faculty only those men and women who are active, aggressive Christians” (p. 186); 2) during the college years, a church college is “the most wholesome place to study” (p. 187); 3) church colleges lead their students to a “definite Christian philosophy of life” (p. 187); 4) the church college provides a “Christian atmosphere” for its students (p. 188); and 5) the church college trains students for “avocational work in the church” (p. 189).

A small number of protestant, evangelical, church-related colleges resisted the secularization that had occurred on many campuses during the early 20th century. As mentioned above, not all of these colleges remain tied to specific church denominations, but they do maintain a close adherence to their founding Christian theology. The member institutions of the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) are examples of these types of institutions.

The CCCU had its genesis in 1971 with the formation of a 10 member Christian College Consortium (Consortium). The Consortium had as its statement of purpose:

to promote the purposes of evangelical Christian higher education in the church and in society through the promotion of cooperation among evangelical colleges, and in that conviction, to encourage and support scholarly research among Christian scholars for the purpose of integrating faith and learning; to initiate programs to improve the quality of instructional programs and encourage innovation in member institutions; to conduct research into the effectiveness of the educational programs of the member colleges, with particular emphasis upon student development; to improve the management efficiency of the member institutions; to expand the human, financial, and material resources available to member institutions; to explore the feasibility of a university system of Christian colleges; and to do and perform all and everything which may be necessary and proper for the conduct of the activities of this organization in furtherance of the purposes heretofore expressed (quoted in Patterson, 2001, p. 32).

The Consortium added four additional institutions during the mid-1970s. By 1975 a growing number of like-minded Christian colleges desired to join with the Consortium in

order to collectively address a number of perceived legal threats, but the presidents of the organizing institutions were not interested in allowing the organization to grow any larger. Instead, they instructed their executive director to draw up plans for a wholly-owned subsidiary organization that could accommodate those institutions that were interested in membership (Patterson, 2001).

The new organization, the Christian College Coalition (Coalition), was launched in 1976 with 38 original institutions, including all 14 of the original Consortium institutions. This institution had as its agenda:

(1) the monitoring of legislation, judicial activity, and public opinion on matters which could affect the freedom of Christian colleges to function educationally and religiously; (2) the development of unified positions on critical issues for presentation to other organizations, governmental bodies, and public policy formers; and (3) the development of an offensive position on potential erosions of religious and educational freedom in the Christian college movement” (quoted in Patterson, 2001, p. 43).

By 1981 the logistics of managing two separate organizations, with two separate boards of directors under one administrator had become very difficult, so the Coalition legally separated from the Consortium. The Consortium continues to this day as an organization of 13 member institutions, all of whom are also members of the CCCU. The Consortium’s primary mission consists of providing:

a unique opportunity for presidents and other college officers to meet together on a regular basis with a relatively small group of peers from similar institutions to discuss the most urgent issues facing the evangelical Christian church, American higher

education in general, and Christian higher education in particular, and then to determine how individually or corporately we focus on these issues (Christian College Consortium, 1997).

During the 1980s the newly-formed CCCU experienced a period of unprecedented growth, doubling in size in its first five years as a separate organization. These years also witnessed the addition of several student programs and faculty development initiatives, the publication of a yearly college guide and a series of textbooks, and a \$2.1 million capital campaign. The 1990s were a time of slower growth in the number of new members, but witnessed, instead, the strengthening of academic programs and national recognition (Patterson, 2001). A name change in 1995 from the Coalition of Christian Colleges to the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities attempted to distance the organization from the conservative *Christian Coalition* and to recognize that the organization exists to serve [hence the use of the word *for* rather than *of*] both Christian *colleges* and *universities* (Patterson, 2001, p. 81).

The CCCU membership currently consists of over 100 protestant, Christian, institutions across the United States and Canada and nearly 70 institutional affiliates in over 20 countries. The mission of the CCCU, as a professional association of academic institutions is “to advance the cause of Christ-centered higher education and help institutions to effectively integrate biblical faith, scholarship and service” (Council for Christian Colleges & Universities, 2000).

The CCCU provides numerous programs and services to its member institutions and affiliates. According to the CCCU website (2000), the most current list of programs and services includes:

- annual conferences for presidents, administrative officers, and professional staff, and executive leadership development institutes for new presidents and chief academic officers,
- national and regional faculty development workshops,
- coordination of sabbatical opportunities among CCCU institutions,
- a congress on multi-cultural issues,
- student study programs in Washington DC, China, England, Costa Rica, Los Angeles, Egypt, and Russia,
- a tuition waiver exchange program between participating CCCU institutions,
- collaborative projects on assessment, retention, and faculty development,
- governmental lobbying,
- collaborative recruitment projects, including the publication of *Peterson's Christian Colleges & Universities*,
- collaborative research projects on administrator/faculty/presidential compensation and enrollment trends, and,
- publication of *Research in Christian Higher Education*, and numerous other publications and resource guides.

All CCCU member institutions must adhere to the following criteria:

- Institutional type and accreditation: Primary orientation as a four-year college or university in North America with curriculum rooted in the arts and sciences. U.S. institutions must have full non-probationary regional accreditation.
- Christ-centered mission: A public mission based upon the centrality of Jesus Christ and evidence of how faith is integrated with the institution's academic and

student life programs.

- **Employment policy:** A current hiring policy which requires of each full-time faculty member and administrator a personal faith in Jesus Christ.
- **Cooperation:** A commitment to advancing the cause of Christian higher education through active participation in the programs of the Council, payment of the annual dues and special assessments, and institutional practices which have been, are now, and will continue to be supportive of other Council members.
- **Financial Integrity:** Institutional fund raising activities which are consistent with the standards of the Evangelical Council for Financial Accountability and demonstration of responsible financial operations (Council for Christian Colleges & Universities, 2000).

In addition to the required criteria, member institutions of the CCCU are similar in many other ways. Literature regarding the CCCU institutions indicates numerous characteristics that most seem to share. These institutions strive to integrate faith and learning (Edwards, 1999; *Peterson's*, 1999; Wolterstorff, 1984), develop in students a Christian world view (Crabtree, 1996; "How my Christian," 1993; Parsons & Fenwick, 1996) offer caring academic communities for students (Cameron, 1994; Tonsor, 1970; "Why attend," 1992), employ scholarly Christian faculty (Carlburg, 1994; *Peterson's*, 1999; Thompson, 1995), are more affordable than people perceive them to be (Carlburg, 1994; Crabtree, 1996; "Why attend," 1992), provide living conditions that espouse Christian values (Carlburg, 1994; Kleiner, 1999), and recently have experienced an enrollment boom (Frame, 1997; Olsen, 1996).

One issue that has been leveled at Christian colleges in the past is that they do not allow faculty members and students to pursue their work in an environment that allows for true academic freedom. Academic Freedom is defined by philosopher Arthur Lovejoy as “the freedom of the teacher or research worker in higher institutions of learning to investigate and discuss the problems of his science and to express his conclusions, whether through publications or in the instruction of students without interference from political or ecclesiastical authority” (1930, p. 84).

In a 1998 article in *Academe*, Jonathan Alger pointed out that the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) “has long been guided by the so-called ‘limitations clause in the AAUP’s 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, which says simply that ‘limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment’” (p. 61). Nevertheless, “some of the most vexing academic freedom issues faced by the Association over the years have arisen at religiously affiliated institutions” (Alger, 1998, p. 61).

In 1997 an AAUP meeting in Chicago pulled together faculty and academic administrators from a variety of religiously affiliated institutions to discuss academic freedom. In an address prepared for that conference, Martin Marty, a religious historian from the University of Chicago, described the academic freedom controversy at Christian colleges as a conflict in approaches to the pursuit of truth. “Academics are supposed to pursue truth through reason. Those in the biblical tradition, Jews and Christians alike, informed by reason, are also responsible to a ‘God of Truth’ or ‘the true God’” (Marty, 1998, p.64). He suggests that conflicts over academic freedom arise when “scholars intend to be responsible

to both approaches to truth” (Marty, 1998, p. 64). Alger, counsel to the AAUP and organizer of the conference, echoed Marty when he said, “In addressing tough issues of academic freedom within the unique circumstances at religiously affiliated institutions, that moral leadership will entail continuous dialogue and interaction as all of the participants struggle with their vision of the search for truth” (Alger, 1998, p. 61).

Marty proposed that church-related institutions can be divided into four different categories, each with varying degrees of conflict with regard to academic freedom: 1) Catholic institutions, 2) mainstream Protestant institutions, 3) African-American Protestant institutions, and 4) Evangelical institutions. At Catholic institutions, Marty suggests that issues of academic freedom relate most directly to the amount of ecclesiastical authority currently being exercised by the Vatican (1998, p. 65). Mainstream Protestant institutions rarely experience questions of academic freedom, due in part to an understanding that “the search for truth can be grounded in religious traditions as well as in post-Enlightenment rationalism” (Marty, 1998, p. 65). Marty states that African-American Protestant institutions report little conflict between classroom truth and ecclesiastical authority.

Evangelical institutions have the highest incidents of clashes with regard to academic freedom. Marty reports that “stories of faculty not getting tenure—or even losing it—at colleges and seminaries in these settings are not uncommon. The pressure on academic freedom at Southern Baptist institutions grew so intense that some schools, including Wake Forest and Baylor Universities, severed ties to their conventions, while still preserving informal ties to the Baptist traditions that so many leaders in those schools cherish. They simply don’t want to fall under arbitrary ecclesiastical authority” (Marty, 1998, p. 65).

Marty believes some of the criticism leveled at religious colleges is unfair. “The religious want to be allowed on the same playing field with secular academics; they are routinely ruled out-of-bounds when they refer to sources of authority other than reason and rationality, while others, who may also curtail academic freedom, are given a free pass” (Marty, 1998, p. 66). He suggests, “Religiously affiliated colleges and universities can serve in a special vocation, one that gets obscured by heresy trials. Their personnel are called on to raise questions about human existence that may often get slighted in the day-to-day workings of secular and tax-based universities. These colleges have as part of their mission to privilege humanistic and theological texts that can point students to profound sets of meanings that often go overlooked in other curricula. Graduate school professors will testify to the quality of well-educated alumni from such undergraduate institutions.”

Anthony Diekema, former president of Calvin College, would agree with Marty. Diekema (2000) argues for a different type of academic freedom at a Christian college; one that is framed by the worldview of the institution. He suggests that the relationship between an institution and its faculty should more resemble a covenant than a contract, and that both parties should have an explicit understanding of the way that truth and meaning are contextualized at the institution.

In a 1999 study published in *Religious Education*, Cooper reports on a related issue. His study examined the attitudes of faculty members in Southern Baptist colleges and universities toward the integration of their Christian faith and their academic disciplines across faculty ranks and demographic factors (p. 382).

All the faculty members in Cooper’s study had positive attitudes toward integration of faith and discipline. There was a difference, however, in where faculty members favored that

integration. While there was no difference between tenured and non-tenured faculty in their support for integration outside of the classroom, tenured faculty were not as positive about integrating faith and discipline in class (Cooper, 1999, p. 389). Interestingly, however, as faculty members aged, their support for in and out-of-class integration increased (Cooper, 1999, p. 390). The study also suggested that tenured faculty members were less supportive of institution-wide integration of faith and discipline than their non-tenured counterparts. Another important factor reported by Cooper is that faculty who graduated from church-related undergraduate institutions were not more likely to support integration; however, Southern Baptist faculty members were more interested in integration issues than those from other denominations, possibly because they have “been conditioned through the Southern Baptist community to hold attitudes which encourage, consciously or unconsciously, the integration of faith and academic discipline” (1999, p. 393). Cooper suggests “this finding underscores the essential need within Southern Baptist higher education for the selection and retention of faculty who are Southern Baptist in their faith” (1999, p. 392).

Examples of incidences where faculty members at Christian colleges are confronted with issues of academic freedom are occasionally reported in the media. In 1997 an associate professor at Old Dominion University, Scott Cairns, had a tenure-track position as a full professor at Seattle Pacific University (a CCCU institution) rescinded after it was learned that he had published his “playfully erotic musings about poetry” in a poem entitled “Interval with Erato” in the Winter 1997 edition of *The Paris Review*. (“Professor loses,” 1997). The chairman of the English department at the time of the offer, subsequently resigned his chairmanship after learning that the offer had been withdrawn.

In 2000 a faculty member at Wheaton College in Illinois was not reappointed because he “failed to develop the necessary basic competence in the integration of Faith and Learning, particularly in the classroom setting” (McMurtrie, 2002, p. A12). The same article described several similar incidents where faculty members were either denied reappointment or subjected to intense scrutiny about their religious beliefs at other Christian colleges affiliated with the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities in Ohio, Washington, Michigan, and Minnesota.

In 2001 two professors were forced to leave the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, Texas for their failure to sign the “Baptist Faith and Message” statement of the Southern Baptist Convention (Jacobson, 2001).

College Faculty

Since colonial times, the primary mission of the college faculty member has been teaching. Today’s threefold model of teaching, research, and service was not the required job description for America’s first faculty members. Rudolph (1990) states that colonial college faculty “believed that in serving the cause of knowledge and truth by promoting liberal education, they were serving the cause of religion” (p. 159), and “only rarely were the professors scholars” (p. 158). It was Thomas Jefferson, in 1824, who hired the first academically trained faculty for his fledgling University of Virginia, five of whom were imported from Europe (Rudolph, 1990).

As colleges changed in the 18th and 19th centuries, so did the requirements for faculty members. Until the latter 19th century faculty followed a clergy model (Braskamp & Ory, 1994); however, the increase in the number of scientific courses and specialization of

programs during the 19th century resulted in the addition of research duties for many faculty members (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976; Rudolph, 1990). By the early 20th century, research became the most important criterion for faculty advancement (Rudolph, 1990).

“From what began as a small group of tutors instructing prospective ministers at Harvard College emerged a profession where instruction was only one facet of the overall role of a faculty member” (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994, p. 11). Today’s faculty members have many job duties. Fairweather (1996) states that faculty members must assume the roles of teacher, adviser, researcher, university citizen, departmental colleague, and consultant. Furthermore, the generic duties of instruction and research are broken down into many subdivisions. Instruction includes formal classroom instruction, independent instruction, advising, counseling, grading, course preparation, and development. Research encompasses preparation, conducting research, preparing and reviewing articles or books, attending professional meetings, and seeking funding (Fairweather, 1996).

Braskamp and Ory (1994) further dissect the teaching, research, professional service, and citizenship classification of faculty work. Teaching is made up of instructing, advising, supervising, guiding, and mentoring students. It also includes developing learning activities and participating in professional development. Research and creative activity consists of conducting research, producing creative works, editing and managing creative works, and participating in funded research and creative projects. Professional service and practice consists of using their skills and knowledge to solve society’s problems by means of conducting applied research and evaluation, disseminating knowledge, developing new practices and procedures, participating in partnerships with other agencies, and performing

clinical service. Finally, citizenship includes contributing to professional associations, to the local campus, and to the larger civic community.

A 1988 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty Report (Russell, Fairweather, Hendrickson, & Zimble, 1991) indicates that full-time faculty at all accredited colleges and universities spend 56% of their time on teaching, 16% on research, 13% on administration, and 16% on other activities. They average 53 hours per week at work if tenured, and 55 hours per week if not tenured. Over the two years preceding the survey, full-time faculty produced an average of 2 articles in refereed journals, 0.6 book chapters and monographs, 0.6 book reviews, 1.5 other reports, and 4.3 professional presentations (Russell, Fairweather, Hendrickson, & Zimble, 1991). Faculty at research institutions spend significantly more time on research (31%), while faculty at liberal arts institutions spend much more time on teaching (68%) (Fairweather, 1996).

A 1994 study conducted by McPherrin examined 148 public and private institutions with student FTE of 3,000 or less. Seventy-five of the 148 were CCCU institutions. McPherrin found that faculty workload at CCCU colleges does not differ significantly from workload at other public and private colleges. However, she did find that the smaller the enrollment of the institution, the larger the workload required of faculty.

Faculty have a significant influence on the success and satisfaction of students. In their book, *Involving Colleges*, Kuh et al. (1991) state that students long for personal relationships with faculty members. Students seek these interactions both in and out of class. Faculty at involving colleges are more likely to be available for students outside of class. They also tend to be satisfied with their work and with their institution.

A 1994 study of one CCCU institution by Lamport supports the research of Kuh et al. Lamport reports that students attribute informal interaction with faculty as positive influence on personal growth, intellectual growth, career goals, educational aspirations, and on the entire college experience. They perceive faculty to be interested in students and in teaching, and they describe faculty to be personable, caring, and encouraging. Students with higher grade point averages are more influenced by faculty interaction and more satisfied with that interaction than are their colleagues with low grade point averages.

Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction

An important factor in determining the success and satisfaction of an employee in his work setting is his commitment to the organization. Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) define organizational commitment as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (p. 27). This commitment is characterized by at least three factors: “(a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization” (p. 27). They suggest that the major influences on organizational commitment can be grouped into three major categories: (a) personal characteristics; (b) job- or role-related characteristics; and (c) work experiences (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982, p. 27).

Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) review research that suggests the components that make up each of these three major categories. The personal characteristics consist of, among other things, age, educational level, gender, race, and tenure level. Job- or role-related characteristics consist of job scope, participation in decision-making, role ambiguity, role

conflict, and task requirements. Finally, work experiences consist of organizational dependability, perceived pay equity and group norms regarding hard work, personal importance to the organization, positive attitudes toward the organization, and social involvement in the organization.

Numerous researchers have conducted studies using the instrument developed by Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974) to measure organizational commitment—the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). In fact, in a comprehensive meta-analysis of organizational commitment, Mathieu and Zajac (1990) reported that the OCQ was used in 103 of the 174 studies that their analysis reviewed. Several studies that investigated the use of the OCQ with college or university faculty will be discussed below, in addition to several studies related to the OCQ's test-retest reliability.

Brookover (2002) assessed organizational commitment levels among faculty members at Clemson University, to determine their attitudinal commitment to the university. One hundred ninety two faculty members completed a survey containing the OCQ. Brookover found a statistically significant positive relationship between attitudinal commitment level and the importance a faculty member feels their work and goals have to organizational goal attainment. Statistically significant difference in the level of attitudinal commitment were found based on degree attainment from Clemson and gender.

Carroll (2002) administered the OCQ to 352 employees at a church-related university. She found that workplace experiences were more predictive of affective commitment than was employee-organizational values congruence. She also found a moderately high level of organizational commitment among the employees.

Harshbarger (1989) used the OCQ to measure faculty commitment at four doctoral-granting universities in the southeastern United States. Surveys were returned by 496 participants. Harshbarger used t-tests to compute correlation coefficients between commitment scores and six independent variables (age, gender, tenure status, terminal degree, years since degree, and years at the university). He found no statistically significant differences. He also used one-way ANOVA to examine possible relationships between commitment scores and academic discipline or faculty rank. He found no statistically significant relationship between academic discipline and the OCQ score. There was a significant difference in the variable of faculty rank; associate professor respondents scored significantly lower on commitment than their colleagues at other ranks.

McCaul and Hinsz (1995) administered the OCQ to 356 employees in two manufacturing companies as part of a battery of five tests. They reported OCQ means that were consistent with those reported by Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979). In addition, they repeated the process six months later and found high test-retest reliability for organizational commitment ($r = .75$). This result was favorably compared to the results reported by Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) of $r = .53$ to $r = .75$. Lam (1998) conducted a similar test-retest study with sales supervisors in Hong Kong. He tested the 104 participants at a 10-week interval and found a test-retest reliability of $r = .59$.

Meehan (2001) used the OCQ to analyze faculty perceptions of their input into decision-making and their level of organizational commitment, and to analyze any differences based upon whether or not the faculty participated in collective bargaining. The sample included 850 full-time faculty members at 10 private colleges and universities in the United States. Meehan found no significant differences in faculty perceptions toward input

into decision-making and level of organizational commitment at unionized and non-unionized institutions, but a moderately high correlation between organizational commitment and input into decision making at both unionized and non-unionized institutions;

Poppens (2001) administered the OCQ to 344 faculty members and administrators at six private institutions of higher education in the Midwest. Poppens was studying the perceived and preferred organizational culture types and the levels of organizational commitment of the participants. Her results indicated that individuals whose perceived organizational culture types were in the same or in agreement with their preferred types had statistically significant higher levels of commitment than those whose perceived and preferred organizational culture types were dissimilar. Similar institutional differences were found. Slight increases in the level of commitment were seen with increased age and years at the institution. Poppens used multiple regression analysis to determine the predictive value of the various variables, and found that agreement or disagreement of individuals culture types were substantially more predictive than the other independent variables tested.

There has been some criticism of the OCQ in its ability to distinguish between the factors associated with organizational commitment and its predictive validity. Benkhoff (1997) leads the way in this criticism. First, she points out that in the Mathieu and Zajac (1990) meta-analysis cited earlier, only 7 of the 48 variables they analyzed appear consistently significant. They are: marital status, ability, salary, skill variety and job scope, task interdependence, leader communication, and participative leadership.

Benkhoff postulates that the reason that organizational commitment has been so difficult to measure by the OCQ is that the instrument does not appear to be as homogenous as Mowday, Porter, and Steers have claimed. She criticizes their use of internal consistency

as a measure of homogeneity (Benkhoff, 1997, p. 115), a low inter-item reliability as extrapolated from the reported Cronbach alpha coefficients (Benkhoff, 1997, p. 116), a lack of benchmarks regarding internal consistency of the instrument (Benkhoff, 1997, pp. 116-117), and the lack of evidence to support a claim for homogeneity of the three-dimensional commitment scales (Benkhoff, 1997, p. 117).

Benkhoff concludes that on the basis of her analysis “one has to reject the hypothesis that the three dimensions of the OCQ represent aspects of the same underlying concept” (Benkhoff, 1997, p. 128). She warns that if managers are using the OCQ, they may not be measuring all of the components that contribute to a comprehensive model of organizational commitment. She acknowledges that the OCQ does adequately measure a sense of belonging and satisfaction, but does not address the concept of motivation and “managers concerned about both turnover and work performance have to be aware of the need to apply a different set of policies in each case” (Benkhoff, 1997, p. 128).

Several additional studies have examined the relationship between faculty members and the Christian colleges at which they work. Niehoff (1995) found that whether the core values of an employee and the institution are complimentary is important. He stated that “an important factor in building shared values is the hiring and retention of persons who are predisposed to become attached to the organization and committed to its values” (Niehoff, 1995, p. 202). He calls this concept *mission value congruence*. In his study of 500 employees at a Jesuit university he observed correlations between job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and mission value congruence.

Niehoff's study found that job satisfaction (whether a person is happy at what they do) was related to the academic degree of the employee, the job classification of the

employee, and years of employment at the university (1995, p. 145). He found that organizational commitment (whether a person identifies with and is involved in their organization) was related to the religious affiliation of the employee (1995, p. 145). Niehoff also found that academic degree, age, gender, job classification and religious affiliation positively are related to mission value congruence (1995, p. 146). Niehoff reported that mission value congruence increased with age, but he found it interesting to note that the correlation was negative with regard to academic degree. The strongest correlation in his study was between mission value congruence and religious affiliation. He summarized his study by stating “it can be presumed that a cohort of satisfied, committed individuals sharing mission values can be an important leaven for mission and service. Clearly these individuals have the potential to influence institutional life significantly” (Niehoff, 1995, p. 13).

Using multiple regression to identify the factors most highly associated with job satisfaction in middle managers who were attendees at the Association of Christians in Student Development (ACSD) national conference, Ellis (2001) found that ideological fit (the degree of congruence between the organization’s ideology and the person’s ideology), relationship with students, autonomy and age all influenced job satisfaction, with ideological fit having the most influence.

In her work on faculty job satisfaction, Hagedorn (2000) proposed a model of job satisfaction based on the concept of triggers and mediators. Triggers are “significant life events that may either be related or unrelated to the job” (p. 6). Mediators are described as a “variable or situation that influences (moderates) the relationships between other variables or situations producing an interaction effect.” (Hagedorn, 2000, p. 6) The model postulates six triggers: 1) change in life stage, 2) change in family-related or personal circumstances, 3)

change in rank or tenure, 4) transfer to new institution, 5) change in perceived justice, and 6) change in mood or emotional state. The model also includes three types of mediators: 1) motivators and hygienes, 2) demographics, and 3) environmental conditions. Finally, the model proposes a metric for determining the extent of job satisfaction: 1) appreciation, 2) acceptance or tolerance, and 3) disengagement.

Validation for Hagedorn's model was accomplished by using data from the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (Kirshstein, Matheson, & Jing, 1997). Mediators for the model included: achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement, salary, gender, ethnicity, institutional type, academic discipline, collegial relationships, student quality or relationships, administration, and institutional climate or culture (Hagedorn, 2000, p. 13). Hagedorn used a multiple regression model to determine the predictive ability of the mediators on a global measure of job satisfaction among college faculty and found that the model was highly significant ($p < .0001$) and explained nearly 50% of the variance of job satisfaction (2000, p.13). The most highly predictive mediators were the work itself, salary, relationships with administration, student quality and relationships, and institutional climate and culture. Hagedorn's analysis of the six triggers indicated that on average, job satisfaction increases with age, is affected by family-related circumstances with married faculty reporting greater satisfaction, is negatively impacted by change in rank or institution, and is positively associated with a perceived high level of justice in the institution (2000, p. 14).

Other researchers have studied the manner in which faculty at Christian colleges respect and promote the mission of the institution at which they work. Ramirez and Brock (1996) addressed the different ways in which faculty members respond to the mission

statement of a CCCU institution as it relates to their teaching of medicine. They found that there were “striking similarities and dissimilarities” (Ramierz & Brock, 1996, p. 16) in the interpretation of the mission of the institution. Browde (1976) states that the faculty at a Christian college must “respect the college’s professed conviction and uphold the right of the same to exist” (p. 7).

Other studies of faculty at both private non-Christian and Christian colleges address faculty involvement, satisfaction, and morale. A 1995 study of CCCU faculty by Sheridan found that the more connected faculty members are to an institution, the more involved they are likely to be in institutional decision making. He also states “there is evidence to suggest that a ‘religion gap’ exists among faculty members that contributes to a lower level of involvement in institutional decision-making among those whose religious identity is at variance with the employing institution” (Sheridan, 1995, p. 4631).

Flowers (1992) states that CCCU faculty have significantly higher levels of satisfaction and morale than do faculty members at other liberal arts colleges. He lists the variables of supportive work environment, trust and respect among colleges, captivation with work, and religious and character role modeling as contributing factors for this higher satisfaction.

A 1987 study by the Council of Independent Colleges reports on high and low morale institutions. The study indicates that there are several factors that contribute to high morale at a private college, including the culture of the workplace, career anchors [“the work-related needs, values and talents that are the primary underlying motivations for one’s career” (Splete, 1987, p. 11)], participation in institutional decision-making, perception of student remedial work and tenure decisions, salary range, and institutional support for faculty vitality

(Splete, 1987). Splete appears to echo Niehoff when he says that “high morale colleges have congruent cultures and a strong sense of identity” (1987, p. 4).

The research cited seems to indicate a positive relationship between faculty members and their CCCU institutions. One negative issue, however, should be mentioned. In her 1997 doctoral dissertation, Garlett reports on some negative career impediments faced by women faculty at CCCU institutions. Cagney (1997), reporting on Garlett’s research, states in *Christianity Today* that “relatively few women faculty at Christian colleges attain the higher ranks of associate or full professor” (p. 72), even though nationally women are making up an increasingly larger percentage of faculty (Magner, 1999). This fact may be attributed to a significantly lower number of women faculty in CCCU schools that hold doctoral degrees than men, however Garlett indicates that female faculty face resistance from students and colleagues that is not related to academic preparation. She states that some male students resent having a woman in authority over them, while colleagues occasionally tell them that they are hurting their families by working. A 1991 study by Johnsrud supports Garlett’s research. Johnsrud states that female academics face discrimination and are promoted less regularly than their male counterparts.

Faculty Inbreeding

The final thread of the conceptual framework for this study deals with the phenomenon of academic or “faculty inbreeding.” Faculty inbreeding is defined as “the practice of selecting former students of an institution as members of its faculty” (Eells & Cleveland, 1935/1999, p. 579). Historically this phenomenon has been considered to be negative because it is perceived to stifle creativity, promote academic stagnation, and result

in faculty who are less productive (Conrad & Wyer, 1982; Dutton, 1980; Eells & Cleveland, 1935/1999; Miller, 1977). President Charles Eliot of Harvard was perhaps most influential in giving faculty inbreeding a bad name when in 1908 he called it, “natural, but not wise” (Conrad & Wyer, 1982, p. 45). This comment is ironic since in 1919, 64% of Harvard’s faculty had obtained degrees from that institution (Conrad & Wyer, 1982).

The literature on faculty inbreeding is somewhat sparse. The primary studies of inbreeding, most of which claimed that inbreeding was largely negative, are over 70 years old. Of primary importance in this era of research were Miller (1918), McNeely (1932), and Eells and Cleveland (1935/1999). Later studies, including McGee (1960), Hargens and Farr (1973), Miller (1977), Dutton (1980), and Conrad and Wyer (1982), were less pessimistic about faculty inbreeding. More recently a number of studies, including Dattilo (1987), Runkel (1987), Moe (1988), Stewart (1992), and Pan (1993) examined the phenomenon in various contexts. A brief summary of several of these studies is provided below.

Eells and Cleveland (1935/1999) was a hallmark study, even though it provided only descriptive statistics about the number of inbred faculty in various types of institutions. The study was interesting and thorough enough, however, to be republished 64 years later in the September/October 1999 issue of *The Journal of Higher Education*. The Eells and Cleveland study considered 16,837 faculty, 34% of whom were graduates of the institutions at which they were working. Eells and Cleveland used as their criterion for being inbred whether faculty members had received any or all of their training in the institution in which they were teaching. Larger institutions were found, on average, to be more inbred than smaller ones; however, greater inbreeding was found in private institutions than ones under public control. Eells and Cleveland also found that inbreeding declines as academic rank increases.

Interestingly, even though they reported only descriptive statistics and conducted no tests of any dependent variables, Eells and Cleveland made several negative statements about faculty inbreeding, and encouraged institutions to give serious thought to discontinuing the practice.

Miller (1977) reported on the status of faculty inbreeding in nursing programs. He also conducted an analysis of education and social work programs to compare the level of inbreeding in those professional preparation programs with that of nursing. Miller found a much higher percentage of inbreeding in nursing programs (48%) than in either social work (39%) or education (31%).

Like Eells and Cleveland, Miller (1977) did not test any dependent variables; however, he did hypothesize about the implications of inbreeding. Miller surmised that inbreeding leads to a lack of creativity and innovation on the part of inbred faculty and a lack of objectivity in the hiring process of new faculty members. As positive implications, however, Miller listed lower costs to recruit faculty, lower salaries for inbred faculty, increased loyalty of inbred faculty, and greater access to information about inbred candidates during the hiring process. He went on to point out that it has always been assumed that inbreeding is negative; however, for a young field like nursing, inbreeding is one means to address a significant faculty shortage.

Dutton (1980) studied the impact of inbreeding and immobility on the professional role and scholarly performance of academic scientists. He found that inbreeding, in and of itself, does not result in significant negative consequences. Inbred faculty are initially just as productive in their teaching, research, and writing as non-inbred faculty. There is a divergence of performance, however, later in their careers. Dutton hypothesized that “immobile faculty, although not initially less productive, tend to fall behind their mobile

colleagues in later years, even after differences in departmental prestige, career age, and academic role are taken into account” (1980, p. 18).

Conrad and Wyer (1982) provide an excellent historical overview of the practice of faculty inbreeding. They thoroughly review the early studies of McNeely (1932) and Eells and Cleveland (1935/1999), as well as the later studies of McGee (1960) and Hargens and Farr (1973). Conrad and Wyer suggest that faculty inbreeding no longer should be viewed with as much negativity as in the past. They state that “prohibitions against inbreeding are based on the fear that institutional vitality will be harmed, that institutional parochialism and reduced productivity will result” (Conrad & Wyer, 1982, p. 46).

Conrad and Wyer (1982) go on to state, however, that the inability to change and accept new ideas is not necessarily linked to the institution at which a faculty member obtained his or her education. Furthermore, in contemporary academe there is much more interaction between faculties at different institutions than at the time of the earlier studies that decried inbreeding. They also hypothesize that the lack of mobility that is observed by Hargens and Farr may be due to sociological shifts that have occurred since the data for that study were collected in 1966. Lack of mobility for inbred faculty may be due to the fact that families are less willing to re-locate than in the past, and an increasing emphasis on the part of institutions to hire women and minorities, thus overlooking their own inbred faculty.

Conrad and Wyer (1982) found that there were important differences between inbred faculty and those that were hired from the outside. Inbred faculty were found to spend less time teaching and preparing for teaching than outsiders. They were also found to spend less time on research and writing, but more time on advising students and administrative tasks. No major differences were found in the production of scholarly work. However, when the

measures of productivity were adjusted for the amount of time devoted to research, inbred faculty were found to be more productive than were outsiders in research and writing.

Several recent doctoral dissertations support the view that inbreeding may not have the negative consequences that were believed earlier to be the case. Dattilo (1987) found no significant differences in scholarly productivity between inbred and non-inbred nursing faculty. Runkel (1987) found a reduction in presidential inbreeding in liberal arts colleges between 1968 and 1983, but stated that inbreeding had a positive impact on the career paths of the presidents that she studied. Moe (1988) found a decrease in faculty inbreeding in chemistry departments at doctoral-granting institutions over the past three decades. Moe's study also supported the work of Dutton (1980), in that mobility, rather than inbreeding, may be a more negative factor. Stewart (1992) reports a reduction in the amount of inbreeding in mathematics departments in American colleges and universities. Finally, Pan (1993) suggests that selective faculty inbreeding be given a rightful place in higher education. He argued that negative perceptions of inbreeding by some department chairs at 11 land grant universities were not supported by the data regarding productivity in research and writing.

Summary

The literature review for this study consisted of four components: 1) the nature and characteristics of committed Christian colleges; 2) the nature and characteristics of college faculty members; 3) the satisfaction of faculty members and their commitment to their institution and its mission; and 4) the historical reluctance of an institution to hire its own graduates (known as faculty inbreeding).

The section on the nature and characteristics described the rise of Christian colleges as part of the fabric of colonial America. It traced their development through the 19th and 20th centuries, demonstrating how many colleges severed their ties with their founding denominations.

In the early 1970s a group of colleges formed a new organization that later became the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities. This organization now consists of over 100 like-minded committed Christian colleges who collaborate on conferences, professional development activities, study-abroad programs, and governmental lobbying efforts. The various characteristics and requirements for institutional membership in the CCCU were defined.

This section also discussed one of the primary criticisms that is often leveled at committed Christian colleges—a perceived lack of academic freedom on the part of faculty members. The review discussed several different perspectives on this issue.

The section on college faculty members described the rise of the role of faculty members in early American colleges. It went on to discuss the current roles and expectations that are placed on contemporary faculty members by both secular and Christian colleges.

The third component of the literature review described research that has been conducted on the nature of employees' commitment to their organizations and their job satisfaction, focusing most heavily on the work of Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982), Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974), and Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979). Examples of other research conducted using the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, including some studies and analyses that were moderately critical of the instrument, were reviewed.

The work of Niehoff (1995) related to mission value congruence of faculty members at a Jesuit university also was discussed.

Particular attention was paid to the work of several researchers who studied satisfaction at member colleges of the CCCU. Haggdorn's study of job satisfaction (2000), Sheridan's study of CCCU faculty morale (1995), and Flower's examination of morale (1992) were considered. Each of these studies indicated a positive relationship between faculty members and their CCCU institutions.

The final thread of the literature review discussed the phenomenon of faculty (or "academic") inbreeding. Faculty inbreeding is the institutional practice of hiring its own graduates as members of its faculty. Traditionally, this practice has been frowned upon, with avoidance of it reaching its zenith in the early 20th century. Recent studies have shown that earlier concerns about lack of scholarly productivity by "inbred" faculty are largely overstated (Conrad & Wyer, 1982; Dattilo, 1987; Dutton, 1980; Miller, 1977; Pan, 1993).

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

Pilot Research

The researcher began the investigation by creating a pilot survey that was sent to the faculty of three small, private Christian colleges, all church-related, and affiliated with the CCCU. The survey was approved by the Iowa State University Human Subjects Review Committee prior to its distribution. The institutions were selected based on the investigator's knowledge of the institutions and their diverse geography and characteristics.

The institutions varied in their selectivity. The *U.S. News & World Report* selectivity ratings—based on admissions acceptance rates for all students and the average high school class standing and SAT/ACT scores of those who enrolled—was used to judge institutional selectivity. One of the institutions was a more selective institution of approximately 2,000 undergraduate students. The second was a less selective institution of approximately 1,000 undergraduate students. The third was a selective institution of approximately 1,500 undergraduate students. The institutions were located in three different regions: one in the Southeast, one in the Midwest, and one in the West.

The chief academic officer (CAO) at each of the institutions was contacted via email and telephone to determine institutional willingness to participate in a faculty survey and possible faculty interviews. Once permission was granted, the CAO provided the email addresses of all of the current full-time faculty members. The survey was emailed to every faculty member on the email lists, following an introductory email message from the CAO to the faculty, requesting that they complete the survey if they were willing.

The survey consisted of 10 open-ended questions. The questions focused on why the individual chose to seek employment at the institution, his or her term of employment and satisfaction with the institution, and his or her reasons for teaching at a Christian college. Approximately 20% of the faculty responded to the email survey. The researcher used the responses to determine which faculty members might be interested in follow-up interviews, and to formulate questions that could be used for those interviews.

The faculty members at each institution who returned the survey were contacted again via email to determine whether they would be willing to participate in a personal interview. Appointments were made via email and follow-up telephone calls. The investigator then traveled to each of the institutions between May and July 2000 and conducted personal interviews with all faculty members who had initially completed a survey and consented to a personal interview.

The researcher conducted approximately 40 interviews on the three campuses. Each interview was approximately 30 minutes in length. The questions that were asked included:

- Why did you choose to work at this institution?
- What characteristics about the institution influenced your decision?
- What personal or professional characteristics or experiences influenced your decision?
- How long have you been teaching at this institution?
- Have you ever considered leaving this institution? If so, why? If not, why not?
- What is the best thing about working at this institution?
- What is most problematic about working at this institution?
- Did you attend this institution or another Christian college as a student?

- Did you have any specific experiences as a student that influenced your decision to return to a Christian college?
- How is your current experience similar to or different from when you were a student at a Christian college?

The interviews were tape recorded, and the researcher took notes during the interview. The tape recordings and notes were subsequently destroyed once the primary research project was begun.

Primary Research

Survey design

The primary research component of this study consisted of a multiple-choice and fill-in-the-blank questionnaire (the instrument can be found in Appendix B). The researcher used the questions and answers given in the pilot interviews to formulate several forced-choice questions and to guide the selection of the other items that were used in the final survey instrument. The entire survey consisted of 118 items.

The items on the questionnaire were divided into four categories: 18 demographic questions, 20 researcher-developed questions, 15 items from the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) by Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979), and 70 questions selected from the *National Study of Postsecondary Faculty* (Russell, Fairweather, Hendrickson, & Zimbler, 1991; Zimbler, 2001) developed by the U.S. Department of Education.

The survey was approved by the Iowa State University Human Subjects Review Committee prior to its distribution.

Selection of institutions

The researcher developed a list of approximately 20 institutions associated with the CCCU, based on their location, their denominational affiliation, their size, and their selectivity. The list then was shared with the researcher's advisor and a panel of experts consisting of three executive officers at the CCCU who have significant knowledge of the institutions.

Several of the institutions were eliminated from the list based on the recommendation of the CCCU officers. Their concerns were based primarily on personal knowledge of the institutions. In one case, a new chief academic officer had recently begun his job; in another case, the institution was experiencing significant financial difficulties. The researcher trusted the judgment of the panel of experts and eliminated those institutions from consideration.

The panel suggested other institutions for consideration that maintained the balance of location, denominational affiliation, size and selectivity that the researcher was seeking to achieve. A final list of 12 institutions was agreed upon by the panel of experts.

The researcher then contacted the Chief Academic Officers of the 12 institutions via email and telephone to inquire as to their willingness to participate in the study. Ten of the CAOs indicated a willingness to participate, while two CAOs indicated that the timing was not appropriate for their participation in the study.

The 10 remaining institutions represented a cross-section of colleges within the CCCU. They were located in 10 different states (1 in the West, 1 in the Southwest, 4 in the Midwest, and 4 in the Southeast). They were split evenly between urban, suburban, and rural campuses. They represented 9 different church denominations. They ranged in size from approximately 950 undergraduates to approximately 2,000 graduates during the 2003-04

academic year (the average number of undergraduates at all 10 institutions was 1,400). The 10 institutions varied in admissions selectivity from less selective to more selective, based on the *U.S. News and World Report* criteria. The percent of applicants who were admitted to the institutions varied from 72% to 100%, with an average admitted percentage of 84%.

Data collection

The researcher electronically administered the survey to the faculty at the 10 selected institutions. The CAOs were asked to send an email message to all full and part-time faculty members of their institution. The message contained an introductory statement by the CAO, indicating an institutional willingness to participate, and urging faculty members to participate in the survey. The message also included the following paragraph from the researcher:

My name is Curtis Taylor, and I serve as Assistant to the President at Dordt College in Sioux Center, Iowa. I am also a Ph.D. candidate in Higher Education at Iowa State University, and it is in the latter capacity that I am asking for your cooperation and assistance in the collection of data for my dissertation research. The topic of my doctoral dissertation, broadly defined, is Christian college faculty. I am interested in exploring the factors (personal and institutional) that impact a faculty member's decision to teach at a Christian college that is a member of the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU). I am also interested in studying the organizational commitment of faculty members to their institution, and their understanding of and satisfaction with various issues at their institution. I have corresponded with the chief academic officer at your institution and have received

permission to contact you and ask you to complete a survey. You can find the survey at http://homepages.dordt.edu/~curtis/faculty_survey.htm. All you have to do is click on this link and follow the directions to complete the survey. Thank you, in advance, for your cooperation and assistance.

The time of administration varied by institution due to the academic calendar at the start of the spring semester. The first CAO to send out the link to the survey did so on January 14, 2004. The final CAO to send out the link to the survey did so on March 1, 2004. On February 10, 2004 the researcher emailed the CAOs of all institutions and asked for the following paragraph to be sent to the same group of faculty:

My name is Curtis Taylor, and I serve as Assistant to the President at Dordt College in Sioux Center, Iowa. A short time ago, your Chief Academic Officer sent you an email message that included a paragraph from me. In that message, I asked for your assistance with my dissertation research. A number of you responded by taking the survey that I have assembled regarding the factors that impact a faculty member's decision to teach at a Christian college. I am hoping that some of you who did not respond at the time may now have the time to do so. You can find the survey at http://homepages.dordt.edu/~curtis/faculty_survey.htm. All you have to do is click on this link and follow the directions to complete the survey. Thank you, in advance, for your cooperation and assistance.

Data collection for the 10 institutions was anticipated to be closed on March 1, 2004; however, since one of the institutions did not distribute the link until that date, the researcher postponed the end of data collection until March 16, 2004, at which time 258 responses had been received.

The researcher had asked the CAOs to distribute the survey to all full- and part-time faculty members at their institutions, if possible. Since they were using email lists to distribute the survey, some of the CAOs were not able to provide an exact number of faculty members from their institution to whom the survey was distributed. The most recent IPEDs data (2003) from all 10 institutions indicated that the institutions had a combined total of 727 full-time faculty members and 598 part-time faculty members.

Data management

The first question on the survey asked participants to provide the last four digits of their Social Security number as a means for the researcher to check for duplicate responses. As surveys were submitted, a time code was applied to each submission. The 258 responses were reviewed in an attempt to determine if any duplicate surveys were submitted inadvertently by participants. In seven cases, the researcher made a determination that responses were duplicated. In each case, 2 adjacent responses were received from respondents who supplied exactly the same four-digit Social Security number. In each case, one of the surveys contained no additional data, while the other survey was completed. The 7 duplicate responses were deleted, leaving 251 valid responses to the survey.

Out of the 251 valid responses to the survey, 238 were from full-time faculty members and 13 were from part-time faculty members. The response rate for the 727 full-time faculty members was 32.7%. The response rate for part-time faculty members was 2.1%. Based on the low number of responses from part-time faculty members, the researcher, in consultation with his major professor, decided to eliminate the part-time faculty member responses from consideration in the remainder of the study.

There were useable responses from all 10 institutions, varying from a low of 9 responses at one institution to a high of 35 from another. Two respondents did not indicate an institutional affiliation.

Data cleaning

Surveys were submitted on-line in a comma-delimited format. The researcher was able to download the data from each survey into SPSS for analysis. Prior to any analysis with SPSS, the data were examined for possible input errors. In the case of several items, the participants did not submit data in the format that had been requested.

In items 15, 17, 18, 20, and 23 participants were asked to indicate the number of years they had been involved in a particular activity. The researcher had expected participants to respond with a discrete number of years (e.g., 3 years or 27 years); however, some participants responded with a number that included a half-year (e.g., 3.5 years or 27.5 years). The responses of those participants who did not respond with a discrete number were rounded up to the nearest discrete number. The researcher made the assumption that, since the survey was administered during the second semester, participants who responded with a half-year likely were reflecting on the fact that the academic year was not yet completed. [The primary reason for choosing this method was that many of the participants who responded with a half year had indicated that they had been involved in the activity for .5 years. The researcher chose to round those responses up to 1 year, and did likewise for other similar responses.]

In item 21 participants were asked to indicate the age at which they expected to retire from college teaching. Again, the researcher had expected participants to respond with a

discrete age, but the survey allowed for a string of data to be entered. Some participants entered a range instead of a discrete age (e.g., between 66 and 70). In these instances, and other similar situations with other variables, the researcher selected the median age of the numbers represented in the string.

In the case of item 114 (*Student Services are taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution*), the electronic survey was coded inadvertently so that all responses were assigned the same value. Item 114 therefore was eliminated from all calculations.

CHAPTER 4.

FINDINGS

General Characteristics of the Sample

Several demographic characteristic variables were included in the survey instrument to assist in the description of the sample and to be used as independent variables in subsequent analysis. The following tables will present frequencies and percentages for gender, age, institution, church membership requirement, type of alma mater, highest degree earned, academic rank, years teaching (career), years teaching (institution), expected age of retirement and academic field.

Gender

Of the 238 respondents, 89 were female (37.7%) and 147 were male (62.3%). Two members of the sample did not indicate their gender.

Table 1. Sample distribution by gender

Gender	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Female	89	37.4	37.7
Male	147	61.8	62.3
Sub-Total	236	99.2	100.0
Missing	2	.8	
Total	238	100.0	

Age

The age of participants was categorized by decades. Eight participants were in their 20s (3.4%), 41 in their 30s (17.3%), 61 in their 40s (25.7%), 87 in their 50s (36.7%), 35 in

their 60s (14.8%), 4 in their 70s (1.7%), and one participant indicated that he was in his 80s (.4%). One person in the sample did not indicate his age.

Table 2. Sample distribution by age

Age	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
20-29	8	3.4	3.4
30-39	41	17.2	17.3
40-49	61	25.6	25.7
50-59	87	36.6	36.7
60-69	35	14.7	14.8
70-70	4	1.7	1.7
Over 80	1	.4	.4
Sub-Total	237	99.6	100.0
Missing	1	.4	
Total	238	100.0	

Institution

Valid surveys were completed by faculty members from all 10 institutions. The number of surveys from each institution varied from a high of 35 at Institution 5 to a low of 9 at Institution 8. Two members of the sample did not indicate the institution at which they worked.

As mentioned above, since the exact number of faculty who received the survey at each institution was unknown, it was difficult to determine the institutional return rates. An estimate of the number of possible faculty participants at each institution was based on IPEDS data from 2003, and the estimated response rate for each institution was calculated from a low of 17.8% at Institution 4 to a high of 59.1% at Institution 10. The estimated overall response rate was 32.5%.

Table 3. Sample distribution by institution

Institution	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Number of Full - Time Faculty (IPEDS 2003)	Estimated Percentage of Full-Time Faculty
Institution 1	29	12.2	12.3	90	32.2
Institution 2	19	8.0	8.1	78	24.4
Institution 3	29	12.2	12.3	76	38.2
Institution 4	19	8.0	8.1	107	17.8
Institution 5	35	14.7	14.8	98	35.7
Institution 6	14	5.9	5.9	66	21.2
Institution 7	24	10.1	10.2	70	34.3
Institution 8	9	3.8	3.8	30	30.0
Institution 9	32	13.4	13.6	68	47.1
Institution 10	26	10.9	11.0	44	59.1
Sub-Total	236	99.2	100.0	727	32.5
Missing	2	.8			
Total	238	100.0			

Church membership requirement

The survey asked participants to indicate whether the institution at which they work has a church membership requirement. Of the 238 respondents, 40 (16.8%) indicated that their institution did have such a requirement, and 198 respondents (83.2%) indicated that their institution did not require membership in a particular denomination.

Table 4. Sample distribution by church membership requirement

Church Required		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Membership Required	40	16.8	16.8
	Membership Not Required	198	83.2	83.2
	Total	238	100.0	100.0

Alma mater

To analyze any faculty inbreeding characteristics, participants were asked to indicate the type of institution they attended as an undergraduate student. Seventy-six (31.9%) indicated that they attended the institution at which they currently work, 59 (24.8%) that they attended another institution that is a member of the CCCU; 26 (10.9%) that they attended another Christian college that is not affiliated with the CCCU, and 77 (32.4%) indicated that they attended a non-Christian college or university.

Table 5. Sample distribution by type of undergraduate alma mater

Type of Undergraduate Alma Mater	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Current Institution	76	31.9	31.9
Another CCCU Institution	59	24.8	24.8
Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	10.9	10.9
Non-Christian Institution	77	32.4	32.4
Total	238	100.0	100.0

Highest degree earned

Participants were asked to indicate the highest degree that they had earned. The doctoral degree was reported as the highest degree by 149 participants (62.6%), the Specialist's or a professional degree by 7 (2.9%), a master's degree by 81 (34.0%), and some graduate work not resulting in a degree by 1 participant (.4%).

Table 6. Sample distribution by highest degree earned

Highest Degree	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Doctoral Degree	149	62.6	62.6
Specialist's or Professional Degree	7	2.9	2.9
Master's Degree	81	34.0	34.0
Graduate Work not resulting in a Degree	1	.4	.4
Total	238	100.0	100.0

Academic rank

When asked to indicate their current academic rank, the rank of professor was the most frequent response with 80 individuals (33.6%); 67 participants (28.2%) said they hold the rank of associate professor; 79 were assistant professors (33.2%); and 12 (5.0%) indicated that they were either Instructor, Technical, or Other.

Table 7. Sample distribution by academic rank

Academic Rank	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Other (Instructor/Technical)	12	5.0	5.0
Assistant Professor	79	33.2	33.2
Associate Professor	67	28.2	28.2
Professor	80	33.6	33.6
Total	238	100.0	100.0

Years teaching

Study respondents were asked to indicate the number of years that they have been teaching at all institutions and the number of years that they have been teaching at their current institution. The responses were given in discrete years, but re-coded into three groups (1-5 years, 6-11 years, and 12 or more years) for analysis.

In the case of teaching at all institutions, 43 (18.2%) indicated they have been teaching for 1-5 years, 55 (23.3 %) for 6-11 years; and 138 (58.5%) for 12 or more years. Two respondents did not indicate how long they have been teaching.

Table 8. Sample distribution by years teaching (career)

Years Teaching (Career)	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
1-5 years	43	18.1	18.2
6-11 years	55	23.1	23.3
12 or more years	138	58.0	58.5
Sub-Total	236	99.2	100.0
Missing	2	.8	
Grand Total	238	100.0	

In the case of the number of years that they have taught at their current institution, 75 (31.5%) indicated that they have been teaching there for 1-5 years, 64 (26.9%) for 6-11 years, and 99 (41.6%) for 12 or more years.

Table 9. Sample distribution by years teaching (institution)

Years Teaching (Current Institution)	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
1-5 years	75	31.5	31.5
6-11 years	64	26.9	26.9
12 or more years	99	41.6	41.6
Total	238	100.0	100.0

Expected age of retirement from teaching

When asked at what age they expect to stop teaching at the college or university level, the largest number of respondents indicated 65 years of age (33.9%). The second highest was 70 (25.1%). The mean age for retirement was 66 years of age (valid $N = 227$) and the

standard deviation was 5.7 years. Eleven participants did not indicate an age at which they expect to stop teaching.

Table 10. Sample distribution by expected age of retirement

Age	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent		
57 or Less	9	3.8	4.0		
58	1	.4	.4		
60	14	5.9	6.2		
62	10	4.2	4.4	Valid N	227
63	2	.8	.9	Missing N	11
64	4	1.7	1.8	Mean	66.27
65	77	32.4	33.9	Median	65.00
66	19	8.0	8.4	Mode	65
67	12	5.0	5.3	Std. Deviation	5.726
68	8	3.4	3.5	Variance	32.783
70	57	23.9	25.1	Skewness	-.038
72	5	2.1	2.2		
75	5	2.1	2.2		
80 or more	4	1.7	1.8		
Sub-Total	227	95.4	100.0		
Missing	11	4.6			
Grand Total	238	100.0			

Academic field

A list of 29 academic fields was provided from which participants could choose their academic field, based on the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) taxonomy of the National Center for Education Statistics. The most frequently cited field was Education with 34 responses (14.3%). Seven of the categories did not have any responses and Interdisciplinary Studies had only one response (.4%). Six individuals did not indicate their field of teaching.

Table 11. Sample distribution by academic field

Field of Teaching	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Business	20	8.4	8.6
Communications	17	7.1	7.3
Computer Science	2	.8	.9
Education	34	14.3	14.7
English and Literature (incl ESL and Linguistics)	13	5.5	5.6
Fine Arts (Art, Music, Drama)	27	11.3	11.6
Foreign Languages	4	1.7	1.7
Health Sciences	7	2.9	3.0
Interdisciplinary Studies	1	.4	.4
Law	3	1.3	1.3
Library Science	8	3.4	3.4
Mathematics and Statistics	6	2.5	2.6
Natural Sciences-Biological Sciences	13	5.5	5.6
Natural Sciences-Physical Sciences	8	3.4	3.4
Other Fields	12	5.0	5.2
Public Affairs (incl Social Work)	2	.8	.9
Philosophy/Religion/Theology	28	11.8	12.1
Psychology	12	5.0	5.2
Recreation/Physical Education	3	1.3	1.3
Social Sciences and History	12	5.0	5.2
Sub-Total	232	97.5	100.0
No Response	6	2.5	
Grand Total	238	100.0	

Since there were not enough respondents in many of the fields to allow for subsequent analysis, the academic fields were grouped into traditional categories or divisions. The CIP codes do not provide for a natural division of courses into liberal arts and sciences, so the courses were divided according to the taxonomy in Table 10. The frequencies for each of the categories are provided below.

Table 12. Sample distribution by academic divisions

Division	Academic Fields	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Humanities		70	30.3	31.0
	English and Literature			
	Fine Arts (Art, Music, Drama)			
	Foreign Languages			
	Philosophy/Religion/Theology			
Physical Sciences		29	12.2	12.5
	Computer Science			
	Math			
	Natural Sciences-Biological Sciences			
	Natural Sciences-Physical Sciences			
Pre-Professional		77	32.4	33.2
	Business			
	Education			
	Health Sciences			
	Law			
	Library Science			
	Public Affairs			
	Recreation/Physical Education			
Social Sciences		41	17.2	17.7
	Communications			
	Psychology			
	Social Sciences (including History)			
Other		13	5.5	5.6
	Interdisciplinary Studies			
	Other Fields			
Missing		6	2.5	
Total		238	100.0	

Questions Developed from Pilot Study

The researcher developed three questions based on the pilot study that was conducted in the summer of 2000. The responses from the initial pilot survey and subsequent personal interviews were converted into three questions that attempted to isolate reasons for initial affiliation with the institution, what faculty members currently appreciate most about the institution, and what they find most problematic about the institution. The results of these questions are presented below.

Reasons for initial affiliation with current institution

Respondents were asked why they initially chose to accept a position with the institution at which they currently work. They were allowed to choose up to three reasons from a list of 18 characteristics that had been formulated during the pilot interview process. In Table 13 the frequencies and percentages for each of the 18 characteristics are listed by first, second and third choice. Totals and cumulative percentages for each reason are also provided. The five most frequently cited reasons for initially choosing to accept a job at the current institution were: 1) Christian Environment/Atmosphere (22.5%), 2) Institutional Mission/Philosophy (15.1%), 3) Location of the Institution (11.7%), 4) Denomination of the Institution (9.8%) and 5) Only Institution that offered me a job (6.2%).

Table 13. Reasons for initial affiliation with current institution

Reason	Initially Accept 1 st		Initially Accept 2 nd		Initially Accept 3 rd		Item Total	Cum. Percent
	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent		
Christian Environment/Atmosphere	80	33.8%	48	21.7%	18	9.3%	147	22.5%
Institutional Mission/Philosophy	38	16.0%	35	15.8%	25	13.0%	98	15.1%
Location of Institution	19	8.0%	31	14.0%	26	13.5%	76	11.7%
Denomination of Institution	22	9.3%	27	12.2%	15	7.8%	64	9.8%
Only Institution that offered me a job	22	9.3%	7	3.2%	11	5.7%	40	6.2%
Other	21	8.9%	3	1.4%	9	4.7%	33	5.1%
Personal Friendship with Colleagues	9	3.8%	10	4.5%	14	7.3%	33	5.1%
Reputation of Institution/Program	8	3.4%	7	3.2%	17	8.8%	32	4.9%
Characteristics/Quality of Students	1	0.4%	14	6.3%	11	5.7%	26	4.0%
Administrative Leadership	1	0.4%	10	4.5%	14	7.3%	25	3.8%
Opportunities for spouse/family	10	4.2%	5	2.3%	8	4.1%	23	3.5%
Academic Quality of Colleagues	1	0.4%	8	3.6%	9	4.7%	18	2.8%
Wages and Benefits	2	0.8%	8	3.6%	6	3.1%	16	2.5%
Academic Freedom	1	0.4%	6	2.7%	6	3.1%	13	2.0%
Quality of Facilities/Resources	1	0.4%	2	0.9%	1	0.5%	4	0.6%
Acceptance of Diversity	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%	2	0.3%
Opportunities to conduct Research	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%	1	0.2%
Professional Development Funds	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%	1	0.2%
Total	237	16.0%	221	100.0%	193	100.0%	652	100.0%
Missing	1		17		45		63	8.8%
Grand Total	238		238		238		714	

Currently appreciate most about current institution

After choosing the top three reasons why they initially affiliated with the institution, respondents were given the opportunity to indicate what they currently appreciate the most about the institution at which they work from the same list of 18 characteristics. In Table 14 the frequencies and percentages for each of the 18 characteristics are listed by first, second

and third choice. Totals and cumulative percentages for each reason are also provided. The five most frequently cited characteristics were: 1) Christian Environment/Atmosphere (23.3%), 2) Institutional Mission/Philosophy (15.9%), 3) Personal Friendship with Colleagues (12.0%), 4) Characteristics/Quality of Students (10.8%) and 5) Location of the Institution (7.0%).

Table 14. Currently appreciate most about current institution

Reason	Currently Appreciate 1 st		Currently Appreciate 2 nd		Currently Appreciate 3 rd		Item Total	Cum. Percent
	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent		
Christian Environment/Atmosphere	86	37.1%	49	21.5%	22	10.3%	158	23.3%
Institutional Mission/Philosophy	46	19.8%	34	14.9%	27	12.7%	107	15.9%
Personal Friendship with Colleagues	26	11.2%	30	13.2%	25	11.7%	81	12.0%
Characteristics/Quality of Students	16	6.9%	28	12.3%	29	13.6%	73	10.8%
Location of Institution	4	1.7%	17	7.5%	26	12.2%	47	7.0%
Administrative Leadership	9	3.9%	13	5.7%	24	11.3%	46	6.8%
Academic Quality of Colleagues	7	3.0%	13	5.7%	15	7.0%	35	5.2%
Reputation of Institution/Program	7	3.0%	7	3.1%	12	5.6%	26	3.9%
Denomination of Institution	5	2.2%	10	4.4%	8	3.8%	23	3.4%
Academic Freedom	11	4.7%	8	3.5%	3	1.4%	22	3.3%
Opportunities for spouse/family	5	2.2%	7	3.1%	7	3.3%	19	2.8%
Wages and Benefits	2	0.9%	3	1.3%	8	3.8%	13	1.9%
Other	5	2.2%	0	0.0%	3	1.4%	8	1.2%
Opportunities to conduct research	1	0.4%	3	1.3%	1	0.5%	5	0.7%
Only Employment Opportunity Available to me	1	0.4%	1	0.4%	2	0.9%	4	0.6%
Quality of facilities or resources	0	0.0%	3	1.3%	1	0.5%	4	0.6%
Acceptance of Diversity	1	0.4%	2	0.9%	0	0.0%	3	0.4%
Professional Development Funds	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	232	100.0%	228	100.0%	213	100.0%	673	100.0%
Missing	6	2.5%	10	4.2%	25	10.5%	41	5.7%
Grand Total	238		238		238		714	

Most problematic characteristics of current institution

In the last of this series of three questions, respondents were asked to indicate what they found most problematic about working at their current institution. Again, this list of 20 characteristics was created from the list of responses the researcher received while conducting the pilot interviews. In Table 15 the frequencies and percentages for each of the 20 characteristics are listed by first, second and third choice. Totals and cumulative percentages for each reason are also provided. The five most frequently cited characteristics that they find most problematic about the institution at which they work are: 1) Demands on faculty are too heavy (19.1%), 2) Wages or benefits are insufficient (15.1%), 3) Ineffective administrative or academic leadership (9.6%), 4) Quality of facilities or resources (8.9%) and 5) Change happens too slowly (8.7%).

Table 15. Most problematic characteristics of current institution

Reason	Most Problematic 1 st		Most Problematic 2 nd		Most Problematic 3 rd		Item Total	Cum. Percent
	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent		
Demands on faculty are too heavy	64	28.4%	22	11.2%	24	15.6%	110	19.1%
Wages or benefits are insufficient	33	14.7%	31	15.8%	23	14.9%	87	15.1%
Ineffective administrative or academic leadership	16	7.1%	24	12.2%	15	9.7%	55	9.6%
Quality of facilities or resources	25	11.1%	17	8.7%	9	5.8%	51	8.9%
Change happens too slowly	27	12.0%	11	5.6%	12	7.8%	50	8.7%
Lack of professional development resources	10	4.4%	24	12.2%	10	6.5%	44	7.7%
Other	8	3.6%	7	3.6%	16	10.4%	31	5.4%
Quality of students	5	2.2%	8	4.1%	11	7.1%	24	4.2%
Institutional values not sufficiently clarified	6	2.7%	11	5.6%	5	3.2%	22	3.8%
Lack of flexibility among colleagues or students	4	1.8%	10	5.1%	5	3.2%	19	3.3%
Too much denominational influence	6	2.7%	3	1.5%	7	4.5%	16	2.8%
Hostile political environment	5	2.2%	8	4.1%	3	1.9%	16	2.8%
Nepotism among faculty or staff	2	0.9%	5	2.6%	3	1.9%	10	1.7%
Location of institution	3	1.3%	3	1.5%	2	1.3%	8	1.4%
Change happens too quickly	2	0.9%	3	1.5%	2	1.3%	7	1.2%
Curriculum is too broad	3	1.3%	3	1.5%	1	0.6%	7	1.2%
Curriculum is too professionalized	3	1.3%	2	1.0%	2	1.3%	7	1.2%
Discrimination against faculty or students	1	0.4%	2	1.0%	2	1.3%	5	0.9%
Too little denominational influence	0	0.0%	1	0.5%	2	1.3%	3	0.5%
Curriculum is too narrow	2	0.9%	1	0.5%	0	0.0%	3	0.5%
Total	225	100.0%	196	100.0%	154	100.0%	577	100.0%
Missing	13	5.5%	42	17.6%	84	35.3%	139	19.4%
Grand Total	238		238		238		716	

Organizational Commitment Questionnaire

The online survey contained the 15 items from the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) by Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979). The OCQ consists of 9

positively worded items and 6 negatively worded items and uses a 7-point Likert-type format. Respondents were asked to choose from the following responses for each item: strongly disagree (value = 1), moderately disagree (value = 2), slightly disagree (value = 3), neither disagree nor agree (value = 4), slightly agree (value = 5), moderately agree (value = 6), or strongly agree (value = 7).

A mean score was calculated for each of the 15 questions and the scores for the negatively worded items were inverted for analysis, so that all scores were evaluated according to the same scale. (Mowday, Steers, and Porter [1979] negatively worded and inverted the scores of these 6 items to reduce response bias). Due to this reason, it should be noted carefully in all further discussion that a higher score for a negatively worded item indicates disagreement with the statement. Question 15 (*Deciding to work for this institution was a definite mistake on my part*) received the highest mean score (6.69), while Question 4 (*I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this institution*) received the lowest mean score (2.94). Results of the OCQ (ranked from highest to lowest scores) can be found in Table 16.

Table 16. OCQ descriptive statistics

Listed below are a series of statements that represent possible feelings that individuals might have about the institution for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the particular institution for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking one of the seven alternatives adjacent to each statement	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Error	Standard Deviation
OCQ 1: I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this institution to be successful.	236	6.37	.058	.892
OCQ 2: I talk up this institution to my friends as a great institution to work for.	236	5.94	.088	1.345
OCQ 3: I feel very little loyalty to this institution. (reversed)	235	5.70	.129	1.972
OCQ 4: I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this institution.	236	2.94	.112	1.722
OCQ 5: I find my values and the institution's values are very similar.	236	6.03	.078	1.197
OCQ 6: I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution.	234	6.19	.079	1.211
OCQ 7: I could just as well be working for a different institution as long as the type of work were similar. (reversed)	234	4.17	.113	1.721
OCQ 8: The institution really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.	235	5.01	.102	1.570
OCQ 9: It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this institution. (reversed)	235	5.56	.101	1.544
OCQ 10: I am extremely glad that I chose this institution to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.	233	5.78	.091	1.396
OCQ 11: There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this institution indefinitely. (reversed)	234	5.40	.109	1.673
OCQ 12: Often I find it difficult to agree with this institution's policies on important matters relating to its employees. (reversed)	234	4.58	.119	1.814
OCQ 13: I really care about the fate of this institution.	236	6.60	.056	.867
OCQ 14: For me this is the best of all possible institutions for which to work.	235	5.25	.110	1.682
OCQ 15: Deciding to work for this institution was a definite mistake on my part. (reversed)	233	6.69	.058	.890
OCQ Mean (from listwise valid <i>N</i>)	223	5.48	.030	1.76

Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) calculated an overall mean for all 15 questions, and used that score as a benchmark score for various groups or individuals. In their study of nine groups of employees in various settings (e.g., hospital, bank business, auto company), they reported mean scores from a low of 4.0 to a high of 6.1, with group standard deviations on the mean from .90 to 1.30. The mean OCQ score for participants in this study was within the range they experienced, at 5.48, with a standard deviation of slightly higher than their study (1.76).

Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) reported three different estimates of internal consistency and reliability (coefficient alpha, item analysis, and factor analysis). Regarding coefficient alpha, they reported a Cronbach's alpha range from .82 to .93 over the nine samples. The Cronbach's alpha for the 15 OCQ questions in this study was .89 (see Table 17 below for reliability statistics), which compares favorably with the results from Mowday, Steers, and Porter. They reported item analysis range of .36 to .72, while the item analysis for the respondents in this study ranged from .34 to .76.

Table 17. Reliability statistics for the 15 OCQ questions

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.885	.899	15

The factor analyses conducted for each of the nine samples by Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) generally resulted in a single-factor solution, which supported their claim of a single underlying construct (p. 232). Where two factors emerged, the resulting eigenvalue for the second factor never exceeded 1.0. An analysis conducted on the respondents in this study resulted in three factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0. The results of this analysis

are displayed in Table 18. The percentage of common variance explained by the first factor was approximately 43%, while factors two and three combined to explain an additional 15% of the variance for a total variance explained by the three factors of 58%. This result was much lower than the 83% to 93% results reported by Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979).

Table 18. Total variance explained for OCQ questions

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	6.499	43.327	43.327	6.499	43.327	43.327
2	1.195	7.967	51.294	1.195	7.967	51.294
3	1.053	7.018	58.312	1.053	7.018	58.312
4	.937	6.250	64.562			
5	.763	5.088	69.650			
6	.678	4.517	74.168			
7	.627	4.181	78.348			
8	.588	3.921	82.270			
9	.535	3.564	85.833			
10	.482	3.215	89.048			
11	.441	2.942	91.990			
12	.406	2.706	94.696			
13	.354	2.358	97.054			
14	.260	1.734	98.788			
15	.182	1.212	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Comparisons of Organizational Commitment between Independent Variables in this Study

The use of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) techniques allows for comparisons between various dependent and independent variables in this study. The researcher conducted multiple one-way ANOVAs using participant responses on the OCQ items as dependent variables and the list of independent variables described as “general characteristics of the sample” earlier in this chapter. In the cases where there were more than two

comparisons within a variable, a Tukey post hoc test was run to determine which mean differences were statistically significant. In all instances in this study where findings are reported as statistically significant, a $p < .05$ level was used to determine significance. The variables considered in this analysis were: gender, age, institution, church membership requirement, type of alma mater, highest degree earned, academic rank, years teaching (career), years teaching (institution), expected age of retirement and academic field. The results as they pertain to each independent variable will be described below.

Gender

A one-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether there were any observed differences between females and males with regard to the questions of the OCQ. Statistically significant differences in means at the .05 level were found on 8 of the 15 questions in the OCQ and in the overall OCQ mean. In each case, the mean scores for the female participants were statistically higher than those of the male participants. Those results are displayed in Table 19. Descriptive statistics for females and males on all 15 questions and the OCQ mean can be found in Appendix A.

Table 19. ANOVA results of OCQ questions by gender

OCQ Question	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
OCQ 2: I talk up this institution to my friends as a great institution to work for.	Between Groups	15.339	1	15.339	8.732	.003
	Within Groups	407.567	232	1.757		
	Total	422.906	233			
OCQ 5: I find my values and the institution's values are very similar.	Between Groups	5.692	1	5.692	4.000	.047
	Within Groups	330.154	232	1.423		
	Total	335.846	233			
OCQ 6: I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution.	Between Groups	15.470	1	15.470	10.951	.001
	Within Groups	324.926	230	1.413		
	Total	340.397	231			
OCQ 7: I could just as well be working for a different institution as long as the type of work were similar. (reversed)	Between Groups	26.055	1	26.055	9.148	.003
	Within Groups	655.045	230	2.848		
	Total	681.099	231			
OCQ 9: It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this institution. (reversed)	Between Groups	15.001	1	15.001	6.410	.012
	Within Groups	540.578	231	2.340		
	Total	555.579	232			
OCQ 11: There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this institution indefinitely. (reversed)	Between Groups	13.941	1	13.941	5.067	.025
	Within Groups	635.518	231	2.751		
	Total	649.459	232			
OCQ 13: I really care about the fate of this institution.	Between Groups	8.098	1	8.098	11.160	.001
	Within Groups	168.334	232	.726		
	Total	176.432	233			
OCQ 14: For me this is the best of all possible institutions for which to work.	Between Groups	28.184	1	28.184	10.379	.001
	Within Groups	627.301	231	2.716		
	Total	655.485	232			
OCQ Mean	Between Groups	9.868	1	9.868	12.348	.001
	Within Groups	185.395	232	.799		
	Total	195.263	233			

Age

To determine whether there were differences between age groups on the OCQ questions, one-way ANOVA tests were performed. Because the category “over 80” had only one respondent, it was collapsed into the “70-79” age group, creating a new range called “70 and above.” It was determined that there were differences in means between groups on two of the 15 questions and the overall OCQ mean. A Tukey post hoc test of pairwise

comparisons was performed to determine which of the means differed from each other. The results indicated that on question 8 (*This institution really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance*) the 70 and above age group scored significantly lower than all 5 other age groups. On question 13 (*I really care about the fate of this institution*) the 20-29 age group scored significantly lower than those respondents in their 30s, 40s, and 50s. Finally, on the overall OCQ mean, the respondents in their 30s scored significantly lower than respondents in their 60s. The ANOVA results for statistically significant comparisons are displayed in Table 20. Descriptive statistics for all participants by age are in Appendix A.

Table 20. ANOVA results of OCQ questions by age

OCQ Question	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
OCQ 8: The institution really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.	Between Groups	50.169	5	10.034	4.419	.001
	Within Groups	517.677	228	2.271		
	Total	567.846	233			
OCQ 13: I really care about the fate of this institution.	Between Groups	12.112	5	2.422	3.423	.005
	Within Groups	162.083	229	.708		
	Total	174.196	234			
OCQ Mean	Between Groups	9.912	5	1.982	2.468	.033
	Within Groups	183.911	229	.803		
	Total	193.824	234			

Institution

The data were analyzed using one-way ANOVA techniques to determine whether there were differences between responses from faculty at the various institutions on the OCQ questions. It was determined that there were differences in means between institutions on 4 of the 15 questions and the overall OCQ mean. A Tukey post hoc test of pairwise comparisons was performed to determine which of the means differed from each other. The results indicated that on questions 2, 6, and 9 (*I talk up this institution to my friends as a*

great institution to work for, I am proud to tell others that I am a part of this institution, and It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this institution) Institution 5 scored significantly higher than Institution 6. On question 12 (*Often I find it difficult to agree with this institution's policies on important matters relating to its employees*) Institution 9 score significantly higher than Institution 7. Finally, on the overall OCQ mean, the ANOVA indicated a significantly significant difference ($F [9, 224] = 2.038$), however the Tukey post hoc test did not indicate which institution(s) varied from the others. An LSD post hoc analysis was conducted to determine which comparisons were significantly different. The LSD uses t-tests to perform all pairwise comparisons between group means, without making an adjustment to the error rate for multiple comparisons. The LSD post hoc analysis indicated that the OCQ mean for Institution 1 was significantly higher than that of Institution 6, that the OCQ mean for Institution 5 was significantly higher than Institutions 3, 4, and 6, and that the mean for Institution 9 was also significantly higher than that of Institutions 3, 4, and 6. The ANOVA results for statistically significant comparisons are displayed in Table 21. Descriptive statistics for all participants by Institution are in Appendix A.

Table 21. ANOVA results of OCQ questions by institution

OCQ Question	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
OCQ 2: I talk up this institution to my friends as a great institution to work for.	Between Groups	38.046	9	4.227	2.477	.010
	Within Groups	382.232	224	1.706		
	Total	420.278	233			
OCQ 6: I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution.	Between Groups	27.745	9	3.083	2.185	.024
	Within Groups	313.285	222	1.411		
	Total	341.030	231			
OCQ 9: It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this institution. (reversed)	Between Groups	49.243	9	5.471	2.402	.013
	Within Groups	507.976	223	2.278		
	Total	557.219	232			
OCQ 12: Often I find it difficult to agree with this institution's policies on important matters relating to its employees. (reversed)	Between Groups	61.640	9	6.849	2.174	.025
	Within Groups	699.257	222	3.150		
	Total	760.897	231			
OCQ Mean	Between Groups	14.974	9	1.664	2.038	.036
	Within Groups	182.843	224	.816		
	Total	197.817	233			

Church membership requirement

A one-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether there were any observed differences between participants at institutions with and without a church membership requirement with regard to the questions of the OCQ. Statistically significant differences in means at the .05 level were found on 4 of the 15 questions in the OCQ. In each case, those faculty members who work at institutions that require their faculty members to belong to a particular church or denomination had statistically significant higher scores than those at institutions that do not require membership in a particular denomination. Those results are displayed in Table 22. Descriptive statistics for all 15 questions and the OCQ mean with regard to this criterion can be found in Appendix A.

Table 22. ANOVA results of OCQ questions by church membership requirement

OCQ Question	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
OCQ 2: I talk up this institution to my friends as a great institution to work for.	Between Groups	15.067	1	15.067	8.597	.004
	Within Groups	410.102	234	1.753		
	Total	425.169	235			
OCQ 6: I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution.	Between Groups	6.321	1	6.321	4.372	.038
	Within Groups	335.405	232	1.446		
	Total	341.726	233			
OCQ 7: I could just as well be working for a different institution as long as the type of work were similar. (reversed)	Between Groups	21.608	1	21.608	7.494	.007
	Within Groups	668.892	232	2.883		
	Total	690.500	233			
OCQ 11: There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this institution indefinitely. (reversed)	Between Groups	14.731	1	14.731	5.363	.021
	Within Groups	637.307	232	2.747		
	Total	652.038	233			

Alma mater

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine whether there were any statistically significant differences between respondents on the questions of the OCQ based upon the type of undergraduate institution that they attended. Statistically significant differences in mean scores were observed on three of the 15 items. A Tukey post hoc analysis indicated that participants who attended another non-CCCU Christian college scored significantly higher than those who attended a CCCU Christian college on question 6 (*I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution*). In question 7 (*I could just as well be working for a different institution as long as the type of work were similar*) those who attended the institution at which they currently work scored significantly higher than those who attended another CCCU institution and those who attended a non-Christian college scored higher than those who attended another CCCU institution. Finally, on question 13 (*I really care about the fate of this institution*), those faculty members who attended the institution at which they

work scored significantly higher than those who attended a non-Christian college. Results for statistically significant means are displayed in Table 23. Descriptive statistics for all 15 questions and the OCQ mean with regard to Alma Mater are in Appendix A.

Table 23. ANOVA results of OCQ questions by alma mater

OCQ Question	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
OCQ 6: I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution.	Between Groups	15.252	3	5.084	3.582	.015
	Within Groups	326.475	230	1.419		
	Total	341.726	233			
OCQ 7: I could just as well be working for a different institution as long as the type of work were similar. (reversed)	Between Groups	34.063	3	11.354	3.978	.009
	Within Groups	656.437	230	2.854		
	Total	690.500	233			
OCQ 13: I really care about the fate of this institution.	Between Groups	5.919	3	1.973	2.679	.048
	Within Groups	170.839	232	.736		
	Total	176.758	235			

Highest degree earned

A one-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether there were any observed differences in OCQ responses between faculty members with differing levels of educational attainment. The analysis indicated no statistically significant differences in responses.

Descriptive statistics for OCQ responses by educational degree can be found in Appendix A.

Academic Rank

Similarly, one-way ANOVA techniques were used to determine whether there were statistically significant differences in OCQ responses between faculty members of different ranks. No such differences in means were found. Mean scores by academic rank can be found in Appendix A.

Years teaching (career)

When one-way ANOVA tests were run on the OCQ questions, using the “years teaching (career)” as the independent variable, two questions produced statistically significant results. On question 9 (It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this institution) those faculty who had taught 12 or more years scored significantly higher than faculty who had been teaching for only 6-11 years. On question 15 (Deciding to work for this institution was a definite mistake on my part) those faculty members who had taught for 1-5 years scored significantly higher than those who had taught for 6-11 years. Results for statistically significant means are displayed in Table 24. Mean scores for all 15 questions and the OCQ mean with regard to years teaching (career) are in Appendix A.

Table 24. ANOVA results of OCQ questions by years teaching (career)

OCQ Question	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
OCQ 9: It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this institution. (reversed)	Between Groups	15.030	2	7.515	3.187	.043
	Within Groups	542.318	230	2.358		
	Total	557.348	232			
OCQ 15: Deciding to work for this institution was a definite mistake on my part. (reversed)	Between Groups	7.597	2	3.798	4.922	.008
	Within Groups	175.962	228	.772		
	Total	183.558	230			

Years teaching (institution)

When the 15 questions of the OCQ were analyzed using one-way ANOVA techniques and years teaching (institution) as the independent variable, only one of the questions showed statistically different means among the three groups. On question 7 (*I*

could just as well be working for a similar institution as long as the type of work were similar) the faculty members who had been at the institution for 12 or more years scored significantly higher than those who had only been at the institution for 1-5 years. Results for statistically significant means are displayed in Table 25. Descriptive statistics for all 15 questions and the OCQ mean with regard to years teaching (institution) are in Appendix A.

Table 25. ANOVA results of OCQ questions by years teaching (institution)

OCQ Questions	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
OCQ 7: I could just as well be working for a different institution as long as the type of work were similar. (reversed)	Between Groups	18.341	2	9.170	3.152	.045
	Within Groups	672.159	231	2.910		
	Total	690.500	233			

Expected age of retirement

A one-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether there were any observed differences between participants' scores on the OCQ items based on their anticipated age of retirement from teaching. Because each of the participants had entered a discreet age for their expected age of retirement, the ages were collapsed into three groups (1= 60 or less, 2 = 61-65, and 3 = 66 and above). Statistically significant differences in means at the .05 level were found on 2 of the 15 questions in the OCQ. In each case, those faculty members who anticipated retiring at age 60 or below had lower scores than those who anticipate retirement at age 66 or above. Those results are displayed in Table 26. Descriptive statistics for all 15 questions and the OCQ mean with regard to this criterion can be found in Appendix A.

Table 26. ANOVA results of OCQ questions by expected age of retirement

OCQ Questions	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
OCQ 9: It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this institution. (reversed)	Between Groups	16.649	2	8.325	3.497	.032
	Within Groups	526.060	221	2.380		
	Total	542.710	223			
OCQ 11: There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this institution indefinitely. (reversed)	Between Groups	21.095	2	10.548	3.904	.022
	Within Groups	597.119	221	2.702		
	Total	618.214	223			

Academic field

The final comparison made regarding the OCQ items related to the academic field of participants. Using one-way ANOVA techniques, it was determined that statistically significant differences were evident on 2 of the 15 questions. In each case, faculty members in pre-professional programs (business, education, health sciences, law, library science, public affairs, and recreation/physical education) scored higher than their counterparts in the social sciences (communications, psychology, social sciences [including history]). Results for the two significantly different means are indicated in Table 27 and descriptive statistics for all 15 questions and the OCQ mean can be found in Appendix A.

Table 27. ANOVA results of OCQ questions by academic field

OCQ Questions	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
OCQ 6: I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution.	Between Groups	20.526	4	5.132	3.815	.005
	Within Groups	299.943	223	1.345		
	Total	320.469	227			
OCQ 10: I am extremely glad that I chose this institution to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.	Between Groups	22.736	4	5.684	3.005	.019
	Within Groups	419.942	222	1.892		
	Total	442.678	226			

Questions from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty

The remaining items in the survey were taken from the *National Study of Postsecondary Faculty* (Russell, Fairweather, Hendrickson, & Zimbler, 1991; Zimbler, 2001). Items were selected from both the instrument used in 1988 and the 1999 edition of the NSOPF, since not all of the pertinent questions had appeared in the most recent (1999) version. The first set of questions from the NSOPF survey focused on the satisfaction of respondents with various characteristics of their job. The items were scored on a four-point range, with 1 = Very Dissatisfied, 2 = Somewhat Dissatisfied, 3 = Somewhat Satisfied, and 4 = Very Satisfied. Means of the various items varied from a high of 3.79 ($N = 235$, $SD = .484$) for *The authority I have to make decisions about content and methods in the courses I teach* to a low of 2.34 ($N = 204$, $SD = .876$) for *Research Assistance that I receive*. Items, in rank-order by means, are listed in Table 28.

Table 28. Descriptive statistics for NSOPF satisfaction questions

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	N	Mean	Standard Error	Standard Deviation
The authority I have to make decisions about the content and methods in the courses I teach	235	3.79	.032	.484
Institutional mission or philosophy	236	3.65	.035	.544
Quality of my colleagues in my department	234	3.50	.044	.676
My overall satisfaction with my job here	236	3.46	.041	.628
The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach	235	3.43	.052	.794
My job security	236	3.40	.052	.806
Quality of leadership in my department	236	3.38	.055	.849
The authority I have to make decisions about other aspects of my job	234	3.36	.044	.668
Reputation of my department	237	3.36	.052	.793
Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area	214	3.29	.053	.780
Freedom to do outside consulting	226	3.27	.048	.727
Overall reputation of the institution	234	3.22	.050	.771
Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution	236	3.12	.060	.924
Quality of faculty leadership at my institution	236	3.12	.052	.806
The opportunity for advancement in rank at my institution	234	3.11	.060	.915
The mix of teaching, research, administration, and service that I am required to do	234	3.09	.052	.791
Spirit of cooperation between faculty at this institution	237	3.08	.050	.763
Quality of students whom I have taught here	237	3.08	.049	.755
My work load	237	2.87	.056	.859
Availability of support services and equipment (clerical support, computers, etc.)	237	2.87	.058	.893
My benefits	236	2.84	.058	.889
Interdepartmental cooperation at this institution	236	2.80	.053	.814
Relationship between administration and faculty at this institution	236	2.79	.060	.917
Teaching assistance that I receive	216	2.69	.060	.886
My salary	237	2.65	.057	.884
Time available for keeping current in my field	235	2.44	.058	.882
Quality of my research facilities and support	226	2.41	.056	.839
Research assistance that I receive	204	2.34	.061	.876

The second set of NSOPF questions dealt with possible reasons why the respondents may leave their current position. Respondents were asked “If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to...” The questions were based on a 3-point Likert-type range, with 1 = Not likely at all, 2 = Somewhat likely, and 3 = Very Likely. They varied from a high of 2.16 ($N = 237$, $SD = .914$) for *Leave to Retire* to 1.19 ($N = 235$, $SD = .473$) for *Leave to Study*. The responses and descriptive statistics are listed in Table 29.

Table 29. Descriptive statistics for reasons for leaving current institution

If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Error	Standard Deviation
Return to school as a student	235	1.19	.031	.473
Accept employment in consulting or other for-profit business or industry or become self-employed	235	1.60	.046	.706
Accept employment at a secular college or university	234	1.64	.043	.662
Accept employment in a non-profit organization	234	1.72	.041	.633
Accept employment at another Christian college or university	235	2.02	.044	.673
Retire	237	2.16	.059	.914

The next set of questions from the NSOPF asked participants “If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same of the following as you currently do?” Again, a 3 point Likert range was used, with 1 = More of this, 2 = Same amount, and 3 = Less of this. Participants in this study were most interested in increasing their level of research (mean = 1.57, $N = 232$, $SD = .640$) and least interested in having more administration (mean = 2.28, $N = 231$, $SD = .680$) at another position. Table 30 shows the descriptive statistics for all questions.

Table 30. Descriptive statistics for desired mix of roles in new position

If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Error	Standard Deviation
Research	232	1.57	.042	.640
Teaching	233	2.14	.038	.581
Service	234	2.15	.037	.560
Advising	232	2.23	.035	.538
Administration	231	2.28	.045	.680

The fourth set of questions on the survey that were drawn from the NSOPF questionnaire asks the participants, “If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?” The questions were rated on the following range: 1 = Not

important, 2 = Somewhat important, and 3 = Very important. The highest-rated item was a *full-time position* (mean = 2.74, $N = 232$, $SD = .585$) and the lowest rated item was a *part-time position* (mean = 1.30, $N = 228$, $SD = .571$). (Since all the faculty respondents who were considered in this study held full-time positions, the highest and lowest rated items in this category are not unexpected.) The second highest rated items (tied) were *Excellent Colleagues* (mean = 2.66, $N = 238$, $SD = .482$) and *Institutional mission or philosophy that is compatible with my own views* (mean = 2.66, $N = 237$, $SD = .517$). The second lowest rated item, at 1.94 ($N = 224$, $SD = .909$), was *Good environment/schools for my children*. The rest of the questions from this section, along with descriptive statistics, are listed in Table 31.

Table 31. Descriptive statistics for importance of characteristics in new position

If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Error	Standard Deviation
A full-time position	232	2.74	.038	.585
Excellent Colleagues	238	2.66	.031	.482
Institutional mission or philosophy that is compatible with my own views	237	2.66	.034	.517
Benefits	238	2.65	.033	.512
Academic Freedom	238	2.58	.036	.551
Good instructional facilities and equipment	237	2.55	.037	.563
Job Security	237	2.54	.040	.621
Affordable Housing	235	2.51	.040	.609
Good geographic location	235	2.44	.041	.627
Salary Level	238	2.44	.036	.561
Excellent Students	238	2.43	.037	.567
Position Level	237	2.35	.040	.609
Opportunities for advancement	238	2.32	.044	.679
New institution is a Christian college	238	2.28	.046	.712
No pressure to publish	238	2.16	.047	.723
Good research facilities and equipment	236	2.13	.043	.666
Good job for my spouse	227	2.10	.056	.848
Good environment/schools for my children	224	1.94	.061	.909
A part-time position	228	1.30	.038	.571

The final set of questions to which participants were asked to respond asked them to “Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.”

The scale for these questions was 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Agree, and 4 = Strongly Agree. The question with the highest mean score was *If I had it to do over again, I would choose an academic career* (mean = 3.78, $N = 238$, $SD = .514$). The lowest scored item in this category was *Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty* (mean = 1.91, $N = 238$, $SD = .693$). The rest of the questions and descriptive statistics can be found in Table 32.

Table 32. Descriptive statistics for statements regarding academic issues

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Error	Standard Deviation
If I had it to do over again, I would choose an academic career	238	3.78	.033	.514
It is important for faculty to participate in governing their institution	237	3.64	.036	.562
Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty	237	3.31	.043	.659
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at my institution	234	3.28	.051	.773
Female faculty members are treated fairly at my institution	236	3.25	.049	.757
My institution effectively meets the educational needs of entering students	235	3.23	.046	.701
Faculty promotions should be based at least in part on formal student evaluations	238	2.95	.050	.769
The tenure system in higher education should be preserved.	237	2.81	.061	.943
The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution	232	2.75	.057	.867
Years of service/advanced degree should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	236	2.48	.050	.769
State or federally mandated assessment requirements have improved the quality of undergraduate education at my institution	229	2.23	.055	.828
Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	238	1.91	.045	.693

Comparison with National NSOPF Means

As mentioned above, the previous five sets of questions were drawn from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (Abraham et al., 2002; Russell, Fairweather, Hendrickson, & Zimbler, 1991). The researcher was able, therefore, to compare the responses of the participants in this study with the responses of a national group of faculty members. In order to make these comparisons, the researcher consulted the Public Use Data Analysis System CD-Rom (Zimbler, 2001) to determine the national means for full-time faculty who were surveyed on the various questions. The researcher then conducted one-sample t-tests to determine whether the means of the sample statistics from this study differed from the means of the national survey data on each of the 65 questions from which data were available from the NSOPF study. Forty-three of the t-tests indicated significant differences in the means at the $p < .05$ level or lower. The results of all of the t-tests that did not indicate any significant differences between the mean scores are in Appendix A.

The first category dealt with faculty members' satisfaction with various aspects of their current job. This category accounted for 30 of the t-tests. Twenty-two of the 30 t-tests indicated that the means of the sample from this study and the NSOPF study were significantly different (all less than $p < .05$ level). In 20 of the 22 tests with significant results, the mean scores of the respondents in this study were higher than the mean scores of the national sample. In the other 2 tests, the mean scores of the national survey participants were higher than the respondents in this study. The results of the 22 significant t-tests in this category are listed in Table 33.

Table 33. Results of one-sample t-tests of means between study participants and NSOPF participants on job satisfaction questions

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Sample Mean	NSOPF Mean	Mean Difference	T-score	Degrees of Freedom	2-tailed significance
Time available for keeping current in my field	2.44	2.68	-0.237	-4.128	234	.000
My work load	2.87	3.06	-0.187	-3.343	236	.001
The authority I have to make decisions about the content and methods in the courses I teach	3.79	3.71	0.081	2.582	234	.010
Quality of students whom I have taught here	3.08	2.95	0.126	2.567	236	.011
Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area	3.29	3.07	0.215	4.033	213	.000
The authority I have to make decisions about other aspects of my job	3.36	3.14	0.219	5.017	233	.000
My overall satisfaction with my job here	3.46	3.21	0.252	6.162	235	.000
Spirit of cooperation between faculty at this institution	3.08	2.82	.260	5.248	236	.000
Relationship between administration and faculty at this institution	2.79	2.50	.288	4.830	235	.000
Interdepartmental cooperation at this institution	2.80	2.51	.291	5.490	235	.000
Availability of support services and equipment (clerical support, computers, etc.)	2.87	2.58	.293	5.058	236	.000
Quality of my colleagues in my department	3.50	3.20	.300	6.788	233	.000
My job security	3.40	3.06	0.338	6.450	235	.000
The opportunity for advancement in rank at my institution	3.11	2.75	0.361	6.037	233	.000
Quality of leadership in my department	3.38	2.92	.457	8.270	235	.000

Table 33. (continued)

Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution	3.12	2.64	.479	7.957	235	.000
Quality of faculty leadership at my institution	3.12	2.54	.579	11.028	235	.000
Quality of my research facilities and support	2.41	1.81	.597	10.693	225	.000
Institutional mission or philosophy	3.65	3.02	.633	17.867	235	.000
The mix of teaching, research, administration, and service that I am required to do	3.09	2.45	.644	12.448	233	.000
Teaching assistance that I receive	2.69	1.62	1.065	17.679	215	.000
Research assistance that I receive	2.34	1.14	1.198	19.544	203	.000

In the second set of questions from the survey in this study, only two questions from the survey could be compared with national NSOPF data. Of those two questions, only one of the one-sample t-tests yielded a significant difference between means. The results of that analysis are in Table 34.

Table 34. Results of one-sample t-tests of means between study participants and NSOPF participants on reasons for leaving current institution

If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	Sample Mean	NSOPF Mean	Mean Difference	T-score	Degrees of Freedom	2-tailed significance
Retire	2.16	1.28	.876	14.754	236	.000

The next set of questions where comparisons between the NSOPF data and the responses from participants in this study were made dealt with the mix of roles that faculty members would desire if they were to leave their current position. The means of five

different questions were compared, and three of the one-sample t-tests produced significant differences in the means. Those three questions are listed in Table 35.

Table 35. Results of one-sample t-tests of means between study participants and NSOPF participants on desired mix of roles in new position

If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?	Sample Mean	NSOPF Mean	Mean Difference	T-score	Degrees of Freedom	2-tailed significance
Administration	2.28	2.18	.097	2.170	230	.031
Teaching	2.14	2.01	.132	3.458	232	.001
Advising	2.23	1.92	.308	8.731	231	.000

Nineteen comparisons between respondents in this study and faculty in the national NSOPF study were made regarding the importance of various elements in a decision to accept another position. Of the 19 one-sample t-tests that were conducted in this category, 9 indicated significant mean differences at the $p < .05$ level or lower. In 4 of the comparisons, the means of the participants from this study were lower than the NSOPF means, and in 5 of the comparisons, the means of respondents in this study were higher. The results of the significant t-tests can be seen in Table 36.

Table 36. Results of one-sample t-tests of means between study participants and NSOPF participants on importance of characteristics in new position

If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?	Sample Mean	NSOPF Mean	Mean Difference	T-score	Degrees of Freedom	2-tailed significance
Good environment/schools for my children	1.94	2.28	-.338	-5.566	223	.000
Good geographic location	2.44	2.55	-.107	-2.627	234	.009
A part-time position	1.30	1.41	-.107	-2.837	227	.005
Salary Level	2.44	2.53	-.089	-2.441	237	.015
Institutional mission or philosophy that is compatible with my own views	2.66	2.58	.082	2.457	236	.015
Affordable Housing	2.51	2.33	.176	4.441	234	.000
A full-time position	2.74	2.56	.177	4.613	231	.000
No pressure to publish	2.16	1.97	.190	4.046	237	.000
Position Level	2.35	2.14	.206	5.204	236	.000

A final set of comparisons between study participants and NSOPF faculty respondents was made regarding questions in which participants were asked to indicate their agreement with several statements. Nine one-sample t-tests were run, and 8 indicated significant differences between the means of the NSOPF study participants and the participants in this study at the $p < .05$ level or less. Four of the comparisons yielded higher NSOPF means and 5 yielded higher means for the respondents in this study.

Table 37. Results of one-sample t-tests of means between study participants and NSOPF participants on statements regarding academic issues

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Sample Mean	NSOPF Mean	Mean Difference	T-score	Degrees of Freedom	2-tailed significance
State or federally mandated assessment requirements have improved the quality of undergraduate education at my institution	2.23	3.05	-.823	-15.046	228	.000
Years of service/advanced degree should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	2.48	3.06	-.581	-11.614	235	.000
Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	1.91	2.12	-.212	-4.726	237	.000
The tenure system in higher education should be preserved.	2.81	3.02	-.206	-3.358	236	.001
Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty	3.31	3.21	.098	2.289	236	.023
Female faculty members are treated fairly at my institution	3.25	3.08	.174	3.535	235	.000
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at my institution	3.28	3.08	.202	3.996	233	.000
If I had it to do over again, I would choose an academic career	3.78	3.31	.472	14.149	237	.000

Comparisons of NSOPF Responses between Independent Variables in this Study

The researcher conducted multiple one-way ANOVAs using participant responses on the 70 NSOPF items as dependent variables and the list of independent variables described as “general characteristics of the sample” earlier in this chapter. In the cases where there were more than two comparisons within a variable, a Tukey post hoc test was run to determine which mean differences were statistically significant. The variables considered in this

analysis were: gender, age, institution, church membership requirement, type of alma mater, highest degree earned, academic rank, years teaching (career), years teaching (institution), expected age of retirement and academic field. The results as they pertain to each independent variable will be described below.

Gender

A one-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether there were any observed differences between females and males with regard to the questions of the NSOPF. Statistically significant differences in means at the .05 level were found on 17 of the 70 NSOPF items. In 14 of the 17 cases, the female respondents had statistically significant higher scores than the male respondents. On three questions the scores of the male respondents were significantly higher than those of the female respondents. Those three questions were: 1) *If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to: Leave for another Christian College?*; 2) *If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position: A full-time position;* and 3) *Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements: Female faculty members are treated fairly at my institution.* The results for all 17 questions are displayed in Table 38. Descriptive statistics for females and males on all 70 questions can be found in Appendix A.

Table 38. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by gender

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Overall reputation of the institution	Between Groups	9.085	1	9.085	16.419	.000
	Within Groups	127.260	230	.553		
	Total	136.345	231			
Reputation of my department	Between Groups	3.966	1	3.966	6.494	.011
	Within Groups	142.289	233	.611		
	Total	146.255	234			
Institutional mission or philosophy	Between Groups	1.407	1	1.407	4.831	.029
	Within Groups	67.555	232	.291		
	Total	68.962	233			
Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution	Between Groups	4.220	1	4.220	5.024	.026
	Within Groups	194.891	232	.840		
	Total	199.111	233			
Quality of faculty leadership at my institution	Between Groups	7.632	1	7.632	12.380	.001
	Within Groups	143.018	232	.616		
	Total	150.650	233			
Quality of students whom I have taught here	Between Groups	4.879	1	4.879	9.065	.003
	Within Groups	125.419	233	.538		
	Total	130.298	234			
My overall satisfaction with my job here	Between Groups	2.519	1	2.519	6.526	.011
	Within Groups	89.554	232	.386		
	Total	92.073	233			
If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Leave for another Christian College	Between Groups	3.041	1	3.041	6.897	.009
	Within Groups	101.852	231	.441		
	Total	104.893	232			
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Salary Level	Between Groups	1.861	1	1.861	6.032	.015
	Within Groups	72.186	234	.308		
	Total	74.047	235			
Opportunities for advancement	Between Groups	1.978	1	1.978	4.347	.038
	Within Groups	106.442	234	.455		
	Total	108.419	235			

Table 38. (continued)

Benefits	Between Groups	1.560	1	1.560	6.061	.015
	Within Groups	60.249	234	.257		
	Total	61.809	235			
Good instructional facilities and equipment	Between Groups	2.927	1	2.927	9.571	.002
	Within Groups	71.260	233	.306		
	Total	74.187	234			
Excellent Students	Between Groups	1.772	1	1.772	5.603	.019
	Within Groups	74.004	234	.316		
	Total	75.775	235			
Good geographic location	Between Groups	1.703	1	1.703	4.478	.035
	Within Groups	87.876	231	.380		
	Total	89.579	232			
A full-time position	Between Groups	1.569	1	1.569	4.631	.032
	Within Groups	77.253	228	.339		
	Total	78.822	229			
A part-time position	Between Groups	5.746	1	5.746	18.987	.000
	Within Groups	67.793	224	.303		
	Total	73.540	225			
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.						
	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Female faculty members are treated fairly at my institution	Between Groups	5.277	1	5.277	9.539	.002
	Within Groups	128.347	232	.553		
	Total	133.624	233			

Age

To determine whether there were differences between age groups on the questions of the NSOPF, one-way ANOVA tests were performed. As mentioned above, because the category “over 80” had only one respondent, it was collapsed into the “70-79” age group, creating a new range called “70 and above.” It was determined that there were differences in means between groups on 22 of the 70 questions of the NSOPF. A Tukey post hoc test of pairwise comparisons was performed to determine which of the means differed from each other.

Many of the significant differences between groups indicated higher mean scores for older faculty. On several questions after the prompt “How satisfied or dissatisfied to you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution” the 60-69 year old age group answered more favorably than those faculty members in the 30-39 year old age range. Those questions were: 1) *Overall reputation of the institution*; 2) *Reputation of my department*; 3) *Institutional mission or philosophy*; 4) *Interdepartmental cooperation at this institution*; and 5) *Spirit of cooperation between faculty at this institution* (60-69 also scored higher than 40-49 on this question). Respondents in the 60-69 year old age range also scored higher than respondents in the 50-59 year old age range on the question *Relationship between administration and faculty at this institution*.

The ANOVA analysis indicated significant mean differences in three questions in this category at the .05 level or below (“How satisfied or dissatisfied to you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution”) however a Tukey post hoc analysis did not indicate the categories that created the significant response. A LSD post hoc analysis was conducted to determine which comparisons were demonstrating significant differences. This analysis indicated that the respondents in their 60s and those who are 70 or older gave stronger responses than those respondents in their 30s and 50s on the questions *Quality of students whom I have taught here* and *My overall satisfaction with my job here*. Respondents in their 60s and those 70 and over also scored significantly higher than those in their 30s, 40s, and 50s on *Teaching assistance that I receive*.

The question “If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to...” produced mixed results. The response *Leave to retire* showed older respondents answering more favorably than younger faculty. Those in their 50s, 60s, and 70s

scored higher than those in their 20s and 30s. Respondents in their 60s also scored significantly higher than respondents in their 40s or 50s.

Two other questions with this prompt, however, received stronger support from younger participants. Respondents in their 20s, 30s, 40s and 50s indicated that they would be more likely to *Accept employment at another Christian college or university* than those in their 60s. Similarly, on the question *Accept employment at a secular college or university* respondents in their 20s, 30s, and 40s responded more favorably than those in their 60s. Respondents in their 20s also scored significantly higher than those in their 40s and 50s on this question.

Older faculty members also showed significantly higher mean scores on the prompt “If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do” than their younger counterparts. Regarding *Service*, faculty members over 70 scored higher than those in the 20-29 year old age range and the 50-59 year old age range. Those participants in their 60s scored higher than those 70 or older regarding their responses to *Administration*.

The final prompt in which there were significantly different responses with regard to age was “If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?” The responses in this category indicated that younger participants had stronger opinions regarding the importance of various factors than older participants. On the response *Job security*, faculty members in their 30s, 40s, and 50s scored higher than those in their 60s. Respondents in the 40-49 year old age range also scored higher than those in their 50s and 60s on the issue of *Opportunities for advancement*. Participants in their 20s, 30s, 40s and

50s all scored significantly higher than those in their 60s with regard to *Good job for my spouse*. The issue of *Good environment/schools for my children* received stronger responses from faculty members in their 30s and 40s than those in the 50-59, 60-69, and 70 or over age ranges.

On this same prompt, those respondents in their 20s, 30s, 40s, and 50s had higher mean scores on the importance of a *Full-time position* than those in their 60s, while the respondents in their 60s responded more favorably to *Part-time position* than those in their 40s or 50s. Finally, as above, the Tukey post hoc analysis was not definitive regarding the prompt *No pressure to publish*, however the LSD post hoc analysis revealed that respondents in the 60-69 and 70 and above age ranges scored significantly higher than those in their 20s, 30s, and 50s.

The ANOVA results for statistically significant comparisons are displayed in Table 39. Descriptive statistics for all participants by age are in Appendix A.

Table 39. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by age

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Overall reputation of the institution	Between Groups	9.934	5	1.987	3.511	.004
	Within Groups	128.461	227	.566		
	Total	138.395	232			
Reputation of my department	Between Groups	8.965	5	1.793	2.964	.013
	Within Groups	139.136	230	.605		
	Total	148.102	235			
Institutional mission or philosophy	Between Groups	3.944	5	.789	2.773	.019
	Within Groups	65.136	229	.284		
	Total	69.081	234			
Relationship between administration and faculty at this institution	Between Groups	10.497	5	2.099	2.617	.025
	Within Groups	183.699	229	.802		
	Total	194.196	234			
Interdepartmental cooperation at this institution	Between Groups	7.388	5	1.478	2.334	.043
	Within Groups	144.995	229	.633		
	Total	152.383	234			
Spirit of cooperation between faculty at this institution	Between Groups	8.963	5	1.793	3.238	.008
	Within Groups	127.342	230	.554		
	Total	136.305	235			
Quality of students whom I have taught here	Between Groups	8.437	5	1.687	3.096	.010
	Within Groups	125.338	230	.545		
	Total	133.775	235			
Teaching assistance that I receive	Between Groups	10.325	5	2.065	2.729	.021
	Within Groups	158.168	209	.757		
	Total	168.493	214			
Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area	Between Groups	6.680	5	1.336	2.259	.050
	Within Groups	122.418	207	.591		
	Total	129.099	212			
My overall satisfaction with my job here	Between Groups	5.102	5	1.020	2.736	.020
	Within Groups	85.409	229	.373		
	Total	90.511	234			
If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Leave to Retire	Between Groups	42.394	5	8.479	12.705	.000
	Within Groups	153.487	230	.667		
	Total	195.881	235			
Accept employment at another Christian college or university	Between Groups	16.186	5	3.237	8.314	.000
	Within Groups	88.776	228	.389		
	Total	104.962	233			

Table 39. (continued)

Accept employment at a secular college or university	Between Groups	12.278	5	2.456	6.214	.000
	Within Groups	89.713	227	.395		
	Total	101.991	232			
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?						
	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Service	Between Groups	4.610	5	.922	3.118	.010
	Within Groups	67.132	227	.296		
	Total	71.742	232			
Administration	Between Groups	7.315	5	1.463	3.315	.007
	Within Groups	98.876	224	.441		
	Total	106.191	229			
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?						
	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Job Security	Between Groups	8.772	5	1.754	4.928	.000
	Within Groups	81.885	230	.356		
	Total	90.657	235			
Opportunities for advancement	Between Groups	8.006	5	1.601	3.666	.003
	Within Groups	100.889	231	.437		
	Total	108.895	236			
No pressure to publish	Between Groups	7.197	5	1.439	2.849	.016
	Within Groups	116.710	231	.505		
	Total	123.907	236			
Good job for my spouse	Between Groups	12.393	5	2.479	3.648	.003
	Within Groups	149.465	220	.679		
	Total	161.858	225			
Good environment/schools for my children	Between Groups	35.492	5	7.098	10.434	.000
	Within Groups	147.629	217	.680		
	Total	183.121	222			
A full-time position	Between Groups	17.719	5	3.544	13.035	.000
	Within Groups	61.173	225	.272		
	Total	78.892	230			
A part-time position	Between Groups	4.930	5	.986	3.154	.009
	Within Groups	69.097	221	.313		
	Total	74.026	226			

Institution

The data were analyzed using one-way ANOVA techniques to determine whether there were differences between responses from faculty at the various institutions on the NSOPF questions. It was determined that there were differences in means between institutions on 21 of the 70 questions. A Tukey post hoc test of pairwise comparisons was performed to determine which of the means differed from each other. On 17 of the 21 comparisons, the Tukey post hoc test indicated the different mean comparisons. On the other 4 comparisons, the LSD post hoc method was used to determine the significant differences.

For the prompt “How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution,” significant differences were found on 13 of the questions. On *My Benefits*, participants from Institution 1 scored significantly lower than those from Institutions 3, 6, and 9 and faculty at Institution 4 also scored significantly lower than those at Institution 9. On *Availability of support services and equipment* respondents from Institutions 4 and 5 scored significantly higher than their counterparts at Institution 8. Regarding *Overall reputation of the institution*, Institution 5’s faculty members scored higher than those from Institutions 3, 4, 6, and 10. On *Quality of leadership in my department*, participants from Institution 5 scored higher than those at Institution 3. Regarding *Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution*, respondents from Institution 9 scored higher than respondents at Institution 7.

The question *Quality of my colleagues in my department* was one in which the LSD post hoc analysis was used to determine that faculty at Institutions 2 and 5 scored significantly higher than those at Institutions 3, 7, and 10, participants from Institutions 6 and

9 scored significantly higher than those at Institution 3, and Institution 9's faculty scored significantly higher than faculty at Institution 10.

Responses from Institution 9 were significantly higher than those from Institution 3 on both *Quality of faculty leadership at my institution* and *Relationship between administration and faculty at this institution*. The faculty from Institution 10 scored significantly lower than those at both Institutions 2 and 9 on *Interdepartmental cooperation at this institution* and lower than those at Institutions 2, 5, and 10 on *Spirit of cooperation between faculty at this institution*. On the question *Quality of students whom I have taught here* participants from Institution 5 scored significantly higher than those from Institutions 2, 3, 6, 9, and 10. Institution 5's faculty also scored higher than those at Institution 2 on *Teaching assistance that I receive*. Finally, on the last question with this prompt, the respondents from Institution 7 scored significantly higher than those of Institution 10 on the question *Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area*.

In the next category, the only significant difference between comparison means was for the question *If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to return to school?* On that question, participants from Institutions 3 and 4 scored higher than those at Institution 5, participants from Institution 4 scored higher than participants at Institution 6, and the respondents from Institution 10 scored significantly higher than those at Institutions 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. This question was another one in which the LSD post hoc analysis was used.

The next category of questions was in response to the prompt "If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?" On the response

Opportunities for advancement, Institution 6's faculty scored significantly lower than those from Institutions 3, 5, and 10 and on the response *Excellent students*, participants from Institution 10 scored lower than those from Institutions 1, 3, and 5. The response *Good job for my spouse* was the third for which the LSD post hoc analysis was used. This analysis indicated that faculty at Institution 2 scored significantly lower than those at Institutions 4, 5, 7, 9, and 10, faculty from Institution 3 scored lower than those working at Institutions 4, 5, and 9, and faculty from Institution 8 scored lower than those employed at Institutions 4, 5, and 9. Finally in this category, on the question *Good geographic location* Institution 7's participants scored significantly lower than those from Institutions 3 and 5.

The final category of questions in this section of comparisons by institution was in response to the prompt "Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements." On the question *The tenure system in higher education should be preserved* respondents from Institution 1 scored significantly higher than those from Institution 7. The question *The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution* required a LSD post hoc analysis to determine that participants from Institutions 1, 4, 6, and 8 scored significantly higher than those from Institutions 5, 9, and 10 and that respondents from Institutions 3 and 7 scored higher than respondents from Institutions 5 and 10. And finally, on the question *My institution effectively meets the educational needs of entering students* respondents from Institution 5 scored higher than those from Institutions 3, 9, and 10. The ANOVA results for statistically significant comparisons are displayed in Table 40. Descriptive statistics for all participants by Institution are in Appendix A.

Table 40. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by institution

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My Benefits	Between Groups	26.074	9	2.897	4.080	.000
	Within Groups	159.075	224	.710		
	Total	185.150	233			
Availability of support services and equipment (clerical support, computers, etc.)	Between Groups	16.730	9	1.859	2.458	.011
	Within Groups	170.181	225	.756		
	Total	186.911	234			
Overall reputation of the institution	Between Groups	18.951	9	2.106	3.915	.000
	Within Groups	119.394	222	.538		
	Total	138.345	231			
Quality of leadership in my department	Between Groups	13.392	9	1.488	2.143	.027
	Within Groups	155.514	224	.694		
	Total	168.906	233			
Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution	Between Groups	15.506	9	1.723	2.093	.031
	Within Groups	184.379	224	.823		
	Total	199.885	233			
Quality of my colleagues in my department	Between Groups	9.455	9	1.051	2.416	.012
	Within Groups	96.540	222	.435		
	Total	105.996	231			
Quality of faculty leadership at my institution	Between Groups	14.208	9	1.579	2.565	.008
	Within Groups	138.456	225	.615		
	Total	152.664	234			
Relationship between administration and faculty at this institution	Between Groups	15.315	9	1.702	2.111	.030
	Within Groups	180.570	224	.806		
	Total	195.885	233			
Interdepartmental cooperation at this institution	Between Groups	14.988	9	1.665	2.665	.006
	Within Groups	140.612	225	.625		
	Total	155.600	234			
Spirit of cooperation between faculty at this institution	Between Groups	15.471	9	1.719	3.171	.001
	Within Groups	121.993	225	.542		
	Total	137.464	234			
Quality of students whom I have taught here	Between Groups	15.767	9	1.752	3.349	.001
	Within Groups	117.697	225	.523		
	Total	133.464	234			
Teaching assistance that I receive	Between Groups	18.398	9	2.044	2.804	.004
	Within Groups	150.195	206	.729		
	Total	168.593	215			
Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area	Between Groups	13.057	9	1.451	2.529	.009
	Within Groups	116.474	203	.574		
	Total	129.531	212			

Table 40. (continued)

If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Return to school as a student	Between Groups	3.837	9	.426	2.102	.030
	Within Groups	45.228	223	.203		
	Total	49.064	232			
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?						
	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Opportunities for advancement	Between Groups	8.225	9	.914	2.061	.034
	Within Groups	100.194	226	.443		
	Total	108.419	235			
Excellent Students	Between Groups	7.256	9	.806	2.665	.006
	Within Groups	68.371	226	.303		
	Total	75.627	235			
Good job for my spouse	Between Groups	14.195	9	1.577	2.295	.018
	Within Groups	148.464	216	.687		
	Total	162.659	225			
Good geographic location	Between Groups	9.365	9	1.041	2.832	.004
	Within Groups	82.297	224	.367		
	Total	91.662	233			
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.						
	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The tenure system in higher education should be preserved.	Between Groups	18.181	9	2.020	2.390	.013
	Within Groups	190.202	225	.845		
	Total	208.383	234			
The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution	Between Groups	19.900	9	2.211	3.193	.001
	Within Groups	153.035	221	.692		
	Total	172.935	230			
My institution effectively meets the educational needs of entering students	Between Groups	10.475	9	1.164	2.494	.010
	Within Groups	104.520	224	.467		
	Total	114.996	233			

Church membership requirement

A one-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether there were any observed differences between participants at institutions with and without a church membership

requirement with regard to the questions of the NSOPF. Statistically significant differences in means at the .05 level were found on 9 of the 70 questions in the NSOPF. In all but one case, those faculty members who work at institutions that require their faculty members to belong to a particular church or denomination had statistically significant higher scores than those at institutions that do not require membership in a particular denomination. On the question *The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution* this trend was reversed, and faculty who work at institutions where membership in a particular denomination is not required had significantly higher scores than those at institutions with a church membership requirement. The results are displayed in Table 41. Descriptive statistics for all 70 questions with regard to this criterion can be found in Appendix A.

Table 41. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by church membership requirement

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Overall reputation of the institution	Between Groups	8.829	1	8.829	15.803	.000
	Within Groups	129.615	232	.559		
	Total	138.444	233			
Reputation of my department	Between Groups	7.370	1	7.370	12.271	.001
	Within Groups	141.145	235	.601		
	Total	148.515	236			
Institutional mission or philosophy	Between Groups	1.878	1	1.878	6.497	.011
	Within Groups	67.631	234	.289		
	Total	69.508	235			
Spirit of cooperation between faculty at this institution	Between Groups	2.326	1	2.326	4.044	.045
	Within Groups	135.151	235	.575		
	Total	137.477	236			
Quality of students whom I have taught here	Between Groups	5.053	1	5.053	9.164	.003
	Within Groups	129.580	235	.551		
	Total	134.633	236			
Teaching assistance that I receive	Between Groups	4.717	1	4.717	6.160	.014
	Within Groups	163.876	214	.766		
	Total	168.593	215			
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Good geographic location	Between Groups	4.557	1	4.557	12.145	.001
	Within Groups	87.418	233	.375		
	Total	91.974	234			
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution	Between Groups	3.655	1	3.655	4.950	.027
	Within Groups	169.845	230	.738		
	Total	173.500	231			
My institution effectively meets the educational needs of entering students	Between Groups	5.075	1	5.075	10.753	.001
	Within Groups	109.972	233	.472		
	Total	115.047	234			

Alma mater

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine whether there were any statistically significant differences between respondents on the questions of the NSOPF based upon the type of undergraduate institution that they attended. Statistically significant differences in mean scores were observed on 9 of the 70 items. A Tukey post hoc analysis was conducted to determine which comparisons accounted for the significant mean differences. This analysis was able to determine the significant comparisons in 6 of the questions. A LSD post hoc analysis was conducted to determine the results in the other 3 questions.

The first category of questions, which were in response to the prompt “How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution,” contained 4 of the significant mean comparisons. With regard to *My job security* and *Availability of support services and equipment*, respondents who are working at their alma mater scored significantly higher than those who did their undergraduate studies at a non-CCCU Christian college and those who attended a secular college or university. For the question *Overall reputation of the institution*, respondents who are working at their alma mater reported greater satisfaction than those who attended another CCCU institution. An LSD post hoc analysis indicated that respondents who are employed at their alma mater scored significantly higher than those who attended a secular college or university with regard to the question *Quality of faculty leadership at my institution*.

The next category of questions that contained significant mean differences between respondent groups was in response to the prompt “If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?” Respondents who are working at their alma mater

scored significantly lower on the question *Academic freedom* than those who attended either a non-CCCU Christian college or a secular institution. Respondents who attended the college at which they are working or another CCCU Christian college had significantly higher responses to the question *New institution is a Christian college* than those who attended a secular college or university. Finally, faculty members who attended a non-CCCU Christian college indicated that *a part-time position* was more important to them than it was to faculty who attended a CCCU college other than the one at which they are currently working or those who attended a secular college or university.

The final category of questions in this particular analysis that displayed significant mean differences was in response to the prompt “Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.” Respondents who are working at their alma mater and those who attended a non-CCCU Christian college both agreed more strongly with the statement *Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty* than those faculty members who attended a secular university. Finally, an LSD post hoc analysis was used on the question *My institution effectively meets the educational needs of entering students* to determine that respondents who are working at their alma mater and those who attended a non-CCCU Christian college had higher means than those who attended another CCCU institution for their undergraduate studies. Results for statistically significant mean differences are displayed in Table 42. Descriptive statistics for all 70 questions with regard to Alma Mater are in Appendix A.

Table 42. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by alma mater

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My job security	Between Groups	10.037	3	3.346	5.446	.001
	Within Groups	142.522	232	.614		
	Total	152.559	235			
Availability of support services and equipment (clerical support, computers, etc.)	Between Groups	6.316	3	2.105	2.697	.047
	Within Groups	181.887	233	.781		
	Total	188.203	236			
Overall reputation of the institution	Between Groups	6.601	3	2.200	3.838	.010
	Within Groups	131.844	230	.573		
	Total	138.444	233			
Quality of faculty leadership at my institution	Between Groups	5.644	3	1.881	2.968	.033
	Within Groups	147.034	232	.634		
	Total	152.678	235			
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Academic Freedom	Between Groups	3.347	3	1.116	3.804	.011
	Within Groups	68.636	234	.293		
	Total	71.983	237			
New institution is a Christian college	Between Groups	7.791	3	2.597	5.409	.001
	Within Groups	112.347	234	.480		
	Total	120.139	237			
A part-time position	Between Groups	4.533	3	1.511	4.864	.003
	Within Groups	69.586	224	.311		
	Total	74.118	227			
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty	Between Groups	4.458	3	1.486	3.531	.016
	Within Groups	98.057	233	.421		
	Total	102.515	236			
My institution effectively meets the educational needs of entering students	Between Groups	3.819	3	1.273	2.644	.050
	Within Groups	111.228	231	.482		
	Total	115.047	234			

Highest degree earned

A one-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether there were any observed differences in NSOPF responses between faculty members with differing levels of educational attainment. The analysis indicated statistically significant mean differences for 12 of the 70 questions at the .05 level or lower. A Tukey post hoc analysis determined the significant comparisons for 11 of the questions and an LSD post hoc analysis was used to determine the significant comparison on the 12th question.

The first category of questions were in response to the prompt “How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution?” For five of the questions: *My workload*, *Time available for keeping current in my field*, *Quality of my research facilities and support*, *Teaching assistance that I receive*, and *Research assistance that I receive*, respondents with a master’s degree were significantly more satisfied than their counterparts with doctoral degrees. On one question, *The opportunity for advancement in rank at my institution*, faculty members with doctoral degrees were more satisfied than those faculty members with only a master’s degree.

The next question in which there were significant differences between mean scores was in response to the question *If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to return to school as a student?* On this question, faculty members with a master’s degree were significantly more likely to leave than those with a doctoral degree.

When asked “If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do” faculty members with a doctoral degree had significantly higher mean scores than those

with a master's degree when it related to *Teaching* and *Service*, but had significantly lower scores than their counterparts with a master's degree when asked about *Research*. The comparison for *Service* was made using the LSD post hoc analysis techniques.

The final category with significant mean differences was "If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?" Faculty members with master's degrees found *Salary level* more important than those faculty members with a specialist or professional degree, and faculty members with a master's degree rated *A part-time position* as more important than those faculty members with doctoral degree. Results for statistically significant mean differences are displayed in Table 43. Descriptive statistics for all 70 questions with regard to highest degree are in Appendix A.

Table 43. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by highest degree earned

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My Work Load	Between Groups	7.463	2	3.732	5.215	.006
	Within Groups	166.723	233	.716		
	Total	174.186	235			
The opportunity for advancement in rank at my institution	Between Groups	6.432	2	3.216	3.921	.021
	Within Groups	188.667	230	.820		
	Total	195.099	232			
Time available for keeping current in my field	Between Groups	6.585	2	3.293	4.344	.014
	Within Groups	175.077	231	.758		
	Total	181.662	233			
Quality of my research facilities and support	Between Groups	6.769	2	3.384	4.956	.008
	Within Groups	151.614	222	.683		
	Total	158.382	224			
Teaching assistance that I receive	Between Groups	10.013	2	5.006	6.697	.002
	Within Groups	158.480	212	.748		
	Total	168.493	214			
Research assistance that I receive	Between Groups	6.877	2	3.438	4.636	.011
	Within Groups	148.345	200	.742		
	Total	155.222	202			
<hr/>						
If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Return to school as a student	Between Groups	4.419	2	2.210	10.650	.000
	Within Groups	47.927	231	.207		
	Total	52.346	233			
<hr/>						
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Research	Between Groups	5.565	2	2.782	7.127	.001
	Within Groups	89.007	228	.390		
	Total	94.571	230			
Teaching	Between Groups	3.606	2	1.803	5.581	.004
	Within Groups	73.980	229	.323		
	Total	77.586	231			
Service	Between Groups	2.078	2	1.039	3.401	.035
	Within Groups	70.249	230	.305		
	Total	72.326	232			

Table 43. (continued)

If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Salary Level	Between Groups	2.425	2	1.213	3.944	.021
	Within Groups	71.938	234	.307		
	Total	74.363	236			
A part-time position	Between Groups	4.226	2	2.113	6.780	.001
	Within Groups	69.801	224	.312		
	Total	74.026	226			

Academic rank

One-way ANOVA techniques were similarly used to determine whether there were statistically significant differences in NSOPF responses between faculty members of different ranks at or below the .05 significance level. The results of the analysis indicated significant mean differences on 11 of the 70 NSOPF items. The Tukey post hoc analysis indicated the comparisons with significant mean differences in 10 of the 11 questions and the LSD post hoc analysis indicated the significant comparison in the 11th question.

The first category of questions, "How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution" produced two questions with significant mean differences. On the question of *My job security*, those faculty members who were full professors scored significantly higher than those who were assistant professors, and on the question of *The opportunity for advancement in rank at my institution*, faculty at the professor level were more satisfied than all three other ranks.

The next category, "If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to" had three questions with significant comparisons. Full professors scored higher on *Leave to retire* than did assistant professors. Respondents at the

instructor/technical level scored higher than those at the associate professor and professor level on the response *Return to school as a student*. Assistant professors scored higher than full professors on that question as well. Finally, participants at the instructor/technical level indicated that it was more likely that they would leave to *Accept employment at a secular college or university* than either associate or full professors.

When asked “If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do” full professors indicated that they would prefer to do more *Advising* than did associate professors.

The category of questions that began with the prompt “If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position” produced the same results for three questions: *Opportunities for advancement*, *Good environment/schools for my children*, and *A part-time position*. In each of these three cases, assistant professors had significantly higher mean scores than full professors.

The final category of questions was in response to the prompt “Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.” To the question, *Years of service/advanced degree should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty*, associate professors responded more favorably than full professors. The LSD post hoc analysis was used to make this determination. On the last question of this category with significant differences on mean scores full professors had a significantly higher mean score than assistant professors on the question *The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution*. Results for statistically

significant mean differences are displayed in Table 44. Descriptive statistics for all 70 questions with regard to academic rank are in Appendix A.

Table 44. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by academic rank

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My job security	Between Groups	7.253	3	2.418	3.860	.010
	Within Groups	145.306	232	.626		
	Total	152.559	235			
The opportunity for advancement in rank at my institution	Between Groups	13.610	3	4.537	5.749	.001
	Within Groups	181.501	230	.789		
	Total	195.111	233			
ANOVA results for: If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?						
Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Leave to Retire	Between Groups	11.101	3	3.700	4.632	.004
	Within Groups	186.122	233	.799		
	Total	197.224	236			
Return to school as a student	Between Groups	3.520	3	1.173	5.547	.001
	Within Groups	48.863	231	.212		
	Total	52.383	234			
Accept employment at a secular college or university	Between Groups	7.588	3	2.529	6.153	.000
	Within Groups	94.536	230	.411		
	Total	102.124	233			
ANOVA results for: If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?						
Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Advising	Between Groups	2.894	3	.965	3.437	.018
	Within Groups	63.998	228	.281		
	Total	66.892	231			
ANOVA results for: If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?						
Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Opportunities for advancement	Between Groups	4.343	3	1.448	3.226	.023
	Within Groups	105.022	234	.449		
	Total	109.366	237			

Table 44. (continued)

Good environment/schools for my children	Between Groups	9.231	3	3.077	3.868	.010
	Within Groups	175.015	220	.796		
	Total	184.246	223			
A part-time position	Between Groups	2.660	3	.887	2.779	.042
	Within Groups	71.459	224	.319		
	Total	74.118	227			
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.						
	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Years of service/advanced degree should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	Between Groups	5.075	3	1.692	2.933	.034
	Within Groups	133.819	232	.577		
	Total	138.894	235			
The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution	Between Groups	10.577	3	3.526	4.934	.002
	Within Groups	162.923	228	.715		
	Total	173.500	231			

Years teaching (career)

When one-way ANOVA tests were run on the NSOPF questions, using the “years teaching (career)” as the independent variable, 12 questions produced statistically significant results. A Tukey post hoc analysis was used to determine the comparisons that produced the significant mean differences.

When asked “How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution,” faculty members who had been teaching for 1-5 years indicated greater satisfaction than those who had been teaching for 12 or more years on *My work load*, *Time available for keeping current in my field*, and *Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution*. Their satisfaction was also greater than those whose teaching career had spanned 6-11 years on *Time available for keeping current in my field* and *My job security*. Faculty members whose teaching careers were 12 years or greater responded more favorably than those who had been teaching 6-11 years on *My job*

security and *The authority I have to make decisions about other aspects of my job* and more favorably than those teaching for 1-5 years on the question *Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area*.

Faculty members who had been teaching for 12 or more years indicated that if they were to leave their current institution, they were more likely to *Leave to retire* than the other two groups. The group of faculty who had been teaching for only 1-5 years indicated that they were more likely to leave to *Accept employment at a secular college or university* than those whose teaching careers spanned 12 or more years.

When asked “If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do,” faculty members with 12 or more years of teaching experience indicated that they would prefer to do more *Administration* than either of the two other groups.

The last question with significant mean differences in this category asked participants “If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?” Participants who had taught for 12 or more years had significantly higher mean scores on *Good instructional facilities* and *Excellent colleagues* than did those who had taught for 1-5 years. Faculty members with 6-11 years of teaching experience also rated *Excellent colleagues* as more important than those with 1-5 years experience. Finally, those faculty members with 6-11 years had higher mean scores than those with 12 or more years of teaching experience on *Good environment/schools for my children*. Results for statistically significant means are displayed in Table 45. Descriptive statistics for all 70 questions with regard to years teaching (career) are in Appendix A.

Table 45. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by years of teaching (career)

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My Work Load	Between Groups	6.179	2	3.090	4.299	.015
	Within Groups	166.732	232	.719		
	Total	172.911	234			
My job security	Between Groups	11.702	2	5.851	9.631	.000
	Within Groups	140.337	231	.608		
	Total	152.038	233			
The authority I have to make decisions about other aspects of my job	Between Groups	2.759	2	1.379	3.142	.045
	Within Groups	100.547	229	.439		
	Total	103.306	231			
Time available for keeping current in my field	Between Groups	9.791	2	4.895	6.554	.002
	Within Groups	171.788	230	.747		
	Total	181.579	232			
Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution	Between Groups	5.905	2	2.953	3.599	.029
	Within Groups	189.501	231	.820		
	Total	195.406	233			
Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area	Between Groups	4.428	2	2.214	3.764	.025
	Within Groups	123.525	210	.588		
	Total	127.953	212			
If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Leave to Retire	Between Groups	11.287	2	5.643	7.120	.001
	Within Groups	183.888	232	.793		
	Total	195.174	234			
Accept employment at a secular college or university	Between Groups	4.127	2	2.063	4.862	.009
	Within Groups	97.179	229	.424		
	Total	101.306	231			
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Administration	Between Groups	5.331	2	2.665	6.004	.003
	Within Groups	100.337	226	.444		
	Total	105.668	228			

Table 45. (continued)

If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Good instructional facilities and equipment	Between Groups	2.537	2	1.269	4.103	.018
	Within Groups	71.743	232	.309		
	Total	74.281	234			
Excellent Colleagues	Between Groups	1.627	2	.813	3.558	.030
	Within Groups	53.255	233	.229		
	Total	54.881	235			
Good environment/schools for my children	Between Groups	6.369	2	3.184	3.964	.020
	Within Groups	176.752	220	.803		
	Total	183.121	222			

Years teaching (institution)

When the 70 questions of the NSOPF were analyzed using one-way ANOVA techniques and years teaching (institution) as the independent variable, 12 of the questions showed statistically different means among the three groups. The Tukey post hoc analysis revealed the significant mean comparisons in this category.

When responding to the question “How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution” faculty members who had been teaching at their current institution for 12 or more years had higher mean scores than those who had only been at the institution for 6-11 years on the issues of *My job security* and *The authority I have to make decisions about other aspects of my job*. Their scores were also higher than those with 1-5 years of teaching service at the institution on *My job security* and *Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area*. Faculty with only 1-5 years of service at the institution had higher mean scores than those with 6-11 years

on *Time available for keeping current in my field* and a higher mean score than those with 12 or more years at the institution on *Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution*.

Regarding their responses to “If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to,” faculty members with 12 or more years of teaching experience at the institution indicated that they were significantly more likely to *Leave to retire* than either of the other two groups. Faculty members with 1-5 years at the institution said had higher mean scores than those who had been at the institution for 12 or more years on *Return to school as a student* and *Accept employment at a secular college or university* and a higher mean score than those with 6-11 years at the institution on the *Accept employment at a secular college or university* as well.

Participants who had taught at their current institution for 12 or more years had a significantly higher mean score than both other groups with regard to *Administration* on the question “If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?” If they were to leave their current institution to accept another position, faculty with 12 or more years of service at that institution indicated that the fact that the *New institution is a Christian college* was significantly more important to them than it was to faculty with only 1-5 years of experience at the institution.

Finally, the analysis indicated that faculty with 12 or more years of teaching experience at their current institution indicated greater agreement with the statements *Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty* and *The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution* than did faculty who had been teaching at the institution for 1-5 years. Results

for statistically significant means are displayed in Table 46. Descriptive statistics for all 70 questions with regard to years teaching (institution) are in Appendix A.

Table 46. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by years of teaching (institution)

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My job security	Between Groups	8.954	2	4.477	7.264	.001
	Within Groups	143.605	233	.616		
	Total	152.559	235			
The authority I have to make decisions about other aspects of my job	Between Groups	3.028	2	1.514	3.468	.033
	Within Groups	100.819	231	.436		
	Total	103.846	233			
Time available for keeping current in my field	Between Groups	5.388	2	2.694	3.539	.031
	Within Groups	176.587	232	.761		
	Total	181.974	234			
Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution	Between Groups	6.392	2	3.196	3.833	.023
	Within Groups	194.286	233	.834		
	Total	200.678	235			
Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area	Between Groups	7.367	2	3.683	6.358	.002
	Within Groups	122.245	211	.579		
	Total	129.612	213			
If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Leave to Retire	Between Groups	18.961	2	9.481	12.445	.000
	Within Groups	178.262	234	.762		
	Total	197.224	236			
Return to school as a student	Between Groups	1.693	2	.847	3.875	.022
	Within Groups	50.690	232	.218		
	Total	52.383	234			
Accept employment at a secular college or university	Between Groups	6.309	2	3.154	7.605	.001
	Within Groups	95.815	231	.415		
	Total	102.124	233			

Table 46. (continued)

If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Administration	Between Groups	8.637	2	4.319	10.085	.000
	Within Groups	97.631	228	.428		
	Total	106.268	230			
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
New institution is a Christian college	Between Groups	4.069	2	2.035	4.120	.017
	Within Groups	116.069	235	.494		
	Total	120.139	237			
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	Between Groups	3.487	2	1.743	3.708	.026
	Within Groups	110.480	235	.470		
	Total	113.966	237			
The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution	Between Groups	5.577	2	2.788	3.803	.024
	Within Groups	167.923	229	.733		
	Total	173.500	231			

Expected age of retirement

A one-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether there were any observed differences between participants' scores on the NSOPF items based on their anticipated age of retirement from teaching. Because each of the participants had entered a discreet age for their expected age of retirement, the ages were collapsed into three groups (1 = 60 or less, 2 = 61-65, and 3 = 66 and above). Statistically significant differences in means at the .05 level were found on 8 of the 70 questions. A Tukey post hoc analysis was conducted to determine the comparisons that yielded the statistically significant comparisons.

The first category of questions with significant differences between mean scores was in response to the prompt, "If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?" On the first question, *Accept employment at another Christian college or university*, those faculty members who expected to retire at age 66 or higher had higher mean scores than those who anticipated retiring at 61-65 years of age. The second question in this category, *Accept employment in consulting or other for-profit business or industry or become self-employed*, produced higher scores for those who are expecting to retire at age 60 or younger than both of the other two groups.

The second category of questions was in response to the prompt, "If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?" In the case of *Research*, those who expected to retire at age 66 or higher scored lower than both other groups, but with regard to *Administration*, the group that anticipated retiring at age 61-65 scored higher than those who planned to retire from teaching at age 60 or younger.

With regard to the prompt, "If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?" those that anticipated retirement at age 66 or higher had higher mean scores than those who expected to retire between age 61 and 65 on the question *New institution is a Christian college*. On the response *A part-time position*, the group that said that they hope to retire at age 60 or younger scored higher than those that expect to retire at age 66 or higher.

The final category of questions was in response to the prompt, "Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements." On the

statement, *The tenure system in higher education should be preserved*, those that said that they expect to retire at age 66 or higher had higher mean scores than those that anticipated retiring at age 60 or lower. And finally, on the statement, *If I had it to do over again, I would choose an academic career*, the group that anticipated retiring from teaching at age 60 or lower scored lower than either of the other two groups. Those results are displayed in Table 47. Descriptive statistics for all 70 questions with regard to this criterion can be found in Appendix A.

Table 47. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by expected age of retirement

If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Accept employment at another Christian college or university	Between Groups	3.752	2	1.876	4.283	.015
	Within Groups	97.243	222	.438		
	Total	100.996	224			
Accept employment in consulting or other for-profit business or industry or become self-employed	Between Groups	7.451	2	3.725	8.021	.000
	Within Groups	103.109	222	.464		
	Total	110.560	224			
ANOVA for the following question:						
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Research	Between Groups	5.096	2	2.548	6.444	.002
	Within Groups	86.602	219	.395		
	Total	91.698	221			
Administration	Between Groups	2.948	2	1.474	3.239	.041
	Within Groups	99.215	218	.455		
	Total	102.163	220			
ANOVA for the following question:						
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
New institution is a Christian college	Between Groups	5.489	2	2.745	5.645	.004
	Within Groups	108.899	224	.486		
	Total	114.388	226			
A part-time position	Between Groups	2.683	2	1.342	4.128	.017
	Within Groups	70.203	216	.325		
	Total	72.886	218			
ANOVA for the following question:						
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The tenure system in higher education should be preserved	Between Groups	5.881	2	2.941	3.399	.035
	Within Groups	192.938	223	.865		
	Total	198.819	225			
If I had it to do over again, I would choose an academic career	Between Groups	2.239	2	1.120	4.353	.014
	Within Groups	57.611	224	.257		
	Total	59.850	226			

Academic field

The final comparison made regarding the NSOPF items related to the academic field of participants. Using one-way ANOVA techniques, it was determined that statistically significant differences in mean scores were evident on 17 of the 70 questions at the .05 significance level or better. The Tukey post hoc analysis indicated the comparisons with significant mean differences in 14 of the 17 questions and the LSD post hoc analysis indicated the significant comparison in the other three questions with significant differences.

The first set of questions in which significant mean differences were found between members of different academic fields was in response to the prompt “How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution?” Regarding *My work load*, *Overall reputation of the institution*, and *Research assistance that I receive*, members of the Pre-Professional fields had significantly higher means than those in the Humanities, Physical Sciences, and Social Sciences. The LSD post hoc analysis technique was used to determine differences on the *Research assistance* question. Faculty in pre-professional programs had higher means than those in the Humanities and Physical Sciences on the questions relating to *Time available for keeping current in my field* and *Quality of students whom I have taught here*. The LSD post hoc techniques were used for each of these questions as well. Regarding *Quality of leadership in my department* and *Teaching assistance that I receive*, faculty members in the Pre-professional programs had higher mean scores than those in the Humanities. Faculty in the “Other” academic field category scored higher than those in the Humanities on the questions *Quality of leadership in my department* and *Reputation of my department*. The final question with significant mean differences in this category was *Quality of my research facilities and*

support, in which faculty in the Pre-Professional fields had higher mean scores than those in the Physical Sciences.

In response to the question “If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do” faculty in Pre-Professional fields and the “Other” category had significantly lower mean scores than those in the Humanities with regard to *Teaching*. With regard to *Administration*, faculty in the Humanities, Physical Sciences, and Social Sciences all had higher mean scores than those in the “Other” category and those in the Physical Sciences also had statistically higher mean scores than faculty in the Pre-Professional fields.

The third set of questions which had significant mean differences with regard to academic field were in response to the prompt, “If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?” Faculty members in the Humanities had higher mean scores than those in the Physical Sciences with regard to *Opportunities for advancement*. Faculty members from both the Physical Sciences and Pre-Professional fields had higher scores than those in the Humanities regarding *No pressure to publish*. Finally, those faculty members in the Social Sciences had higher mean scores than their counterparts in Pre-Professional fields with regard to *Academic Freedom*.

The final category of questions dealt with the extent to which faculty members agree or disagree with various statements. Concerning the statement *The tenure system in higher education should be preserved*, faculty members in the Humanities had significantly higher mean scores than those in Pre-Professional fields. With regard to *The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution*, faculty in the

Physical Sciences had statistically higher mean scores than those in the Pre-Professional fields. And in the last question with significantly different mean scores, *Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at my institution*, those faculty members from the Humanities and the Physical Sciences scored significantly higher than those in the Social Sciences. Results for the significantly different means by academic field are indicated in Table 48 and descriptive statistics for all 70 questions can be found in Appendix A.

Table 48. ANOVA results of NSOPF questions by academic field

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My Work Load	Between Groups	16.956	4	4.239	6.146	.000
	Within Groups	155.884	226	.690		
	Total	172.840	230			
Time available for keeping current in my field	Between Groups	9.123	4	2.281	3.013	.019
	Within Groups	169.549	224	.757		
	Total	178.672	228			
Overall reputation of the institution	Between Groups	8.713	4	2.178	3.949	.004
	Within Groups	123.019	223	.552		
	Total	131.732	227			
Reputation of my department	Between Groups	6.162	4	1.540	2.568	.039
	Within Groups	135.561	226	.600		
	Total	141.723	230			
Quality of leadership in my department	Between Groups	10.545	4	2.636	4.001	.004
	Within Groups	148.238	225	.659		
	Total	158.783	229			
Quality of my research facilities and support	Between Groups	8.463	4	2.116	3.097	.017
	Within Groups	146.896	215	.683		
	Total	155.359	219			
Quality of students whom I have taught here	Between Groups	6.019	4	1.505	2.828	.026
	Within Groups	120.250	226	.532		
	Total	126.268	230			
Teaching assistance that I receive	Between Groups	16.370	4	4.093	5.798	.000
	Within Groups	145.412	206	.706		
	Total	161.782	210			

Table 48. (continued)

Research assistance that I receive	Between Groups	7.518	4	1.879	2.565	.040
	Within Groups	142.151	194	.733		
	Total	149.668	198			
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Between Groups	5.383	4	1.346	4.262	.002
Teaching	Within Groups	70.106	222	.316		
	Total	75.489	226			
	Between Groups	7.945	4	1.986	4.623	.001
Administration	Within Groups	94.517	220	.430		
	Total	102.462	224			
	If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups		4.839	4	1.210	2.714	.031
Opportunities for advancement	Within Groups	101.191	227	.446		
	Total	106.030	231			
	Between Groups	7.078	4	1.769	3.523	.008
No pressure to publish	Within Groups	114.021	227	.502		
	Total	121.099	231			
	Between Groups	3.007	4	.752	2.537	.041
Academic Freedom	Within Groups	97.732	225	.434		
	Total	102.591	229			
	Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups		13.792	4	3.448	4.049	.003
The tenure system in higher education should be preserved	Within Groups	192.442	226	.852		
	Total	206.234	230			
	Between Groups	11.885	4	2.971	4.150	.003
The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution	Within Groups	158.239	221	.716		
	Total	170.124	225			
	Between Groups	8.054	4	2.014	3.831	.005
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at my institution	Within Groups	117.209	223	.526		
	Total	125.263	227			

CHAPTER 5.

CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

This research project was undertaken to examine the reasons why faculty members choose to affiliate with a committed Christian college and to measure their commitment to their current institution and their satisfaction with various job-related values and issues. It also sought to make comparisons between the characteristics and satisfaction of faculty members at committed Christian colleges and faculty members in general in American institutions of higher education.

Four threads of knowledge and research were examined as a conceptual framework for this study: 1) the nature and characteristics of committed Christian colleges; 2) the nature and characteristics of college faculty members; 3) satisfaction of faculty members and their commitment to their institution and its mission; and 4) the historical reluctance of an institution to hire its own graduates as faculty members (known as faculty inbreeding).

A 118-item survey was administered on-line to all faculty members at 10 colleges affiliated with the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU). Useable responses were received from 238 faculty members. The response rate was determined to be approximately 33%.

The survey items were divided into four separate categories: 1) demographic and independent variables, 2) researcher-designed items to examine reasons for initial and current affiliation and critical areas of concern, 3) 15 items from the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) by Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979), and 4) items from the National

Study of Postsecondary Faculty (Russell, Fairweather, Hendrickson, & Zimbler, 1991; Zimbler, 2001).

The primary research questions used to guide this study were:

1. What are the critical factors involved in a faculty member's decision to initially accept a job at a CCCU institution?
2. What are the critical factors involved in a faculty member choosing to remain in a position at a CCCU institution?
3. What are the critical factors that are considered most problematic by faculty members working at a CCCU institution?
4. Are there significant differences in the commitment of faculty to their institution among the faculty at 10 selected CCCU institutions based on the following characteristics: gender, age, current institution, church membership requirement, type of undergraduate alma mater, highest degree earned, academic rank, years of teaching experience (in their career and at their current institution) expected age of retirement, and academic field?
5. Are there significant differences in measures of satisfaction with or opinions about selected job components between faculty members at selected CCCU institutions and faculty members in general at US colleges and universities?
6. Are there significant differences in measures of satisfaction with or opinions about selected job components or values between faculty members at selected CCCU institutions based on the following characteristics: gender, age, current institution, church membership requirement, type of undergraduate alma mater, highest degree earned, academic rank, years of teaching

experience (in their career and at their current institution) expected age of retirement, and academic field?

Discussion of the Results Vis-À-Vis the Research Questions

Question 1: What are the critical factors involved in a faculty member's decision to initially accept a job at a CCCU institution?

The two most frequently stated reasons for initially choosing to accept employment at the institution at which they were the *Christian environment or atmosphere* and the *institutional mission or philosophy*. These choices are logical, since over 67% of the faculty surveyed in this study are graduates of Christian college. In the pilot study conducted by the researcher, these reasons were also most often cited. These responses support Dannelly's contention (1931) that one of the primary foci of Christian colleges is to lead students to a Christian philosophy of life and to provide a Christian atmosphere for academic endeavors.

Closely related to these two responses were those that indicated that the *denomination of the institution* was an important reason for them to choose that particular institution at which to work. The combination of these three responses accounted for over 44% of the total responses to this question and nearly 60% of their first choices. It is apparent to this researcher that these faculty members were eager to accept a job, first and foremost, at a Christian college.

As far as their first choice of reasons, *location* and *lack of any other job offers* were the only other responses that were chosen by more than 5% of respondents; however, *location* was a strong second and third choice for respondents. It appears that once a faculty

member has made a choice to work at a Christian college, location becomes a strong motivator in the choice of that institution.

One other factor worth mentioning was that the reputation of the institution or its programs was not a frequent first or second choice, but it accounted for nearly 9% of respondents third choices.

Question 2: What are the critical factors involved in a faculty member choosing to remain in a position at a CCCU institution?

Similar to their reasons for initially choosing to accept a job at a particular institution, the overall totals indicated that respondents felt that the *Christian environment or atmosphere* and the *institutional mission or philosophy* were the things that they currently appreciated most about their institutions. These two responses accounted for nearly 60% of the first choices for faculty members. Interestingly, the particular *denomination of the institution* did not remain an important characteristic for faculty once they were employed, as only 2% of the respondents indicated that this was the thing that they currently appreciated most about their institution.

Two factors displayed more significant impact on a faculty member's current appreciation, as compared to their initial reason for choosing a position. *Personal friendships with colleagues* was selected 12% of the time in this category, as compared to only 5% in the former question, and *characteristics and quality of students* accounted for 11% of the current responses as compared to only 4% of their initial choice to affiliate. One final note—*location* of the institution fell in its relative standing from 12% of responses in the initial choice to affiliate to 7% with regard to current appreciation.

Question 3: What are the critical factors that are considered most problematic by faculty members working at a CCCU institution?

A wide variety of issues selected cited by faculty as being problematic, but only two responses received a total of more than 10% of the total responses. *Demands on faculty* received over one-quarter of the first choice votes and nearly 20% of all responses, and *insufficient wages or benefits* was cited approximately in approximately 15% of the first choices and total responses. As a second choice *ineffective administrative or academic leadership* and *lack of professional resources* were each mentioned by 12% of the respondents and *slowness of change* was mentioned as a first choice by 12% of the respondents.

Question 4: Are there significant differences in the commitment of faculty to their institution among the faculty at 10 selected CCCU institutions based on the following characteristics: gender, age, current institution, church membership requirement, type of undergraduate alma mater, highest degree earned, academic rank, years of teaching experience (in their career and at their current institution) expected age of retirement, and academic field?

The 15 items of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979) indicated a strong commitment on the part of faculty members to the institution at which they worked. The OCQ utilizes a 7-point Likert-type scale (from strongly disagree to strongly agree) to measure responses. The mean score for all participants on all questions was 5.5, which placed it midway between slightly agree and moderately agree. Every item in the OCQ was rated in the agree range, with the exception of item 4 (*I would accept almost*

any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this institution), which received an average score of 2.94 (slightly disagree). Since all respondents are full-time faculty members at their institutions, it is reasonable to assume that they are not interested in just “any type of job assignment.” If this item is removed in the calculation of the overall mean, the mean score jumps to approximately 5.7.

Of specific interest in this study was whether differences in commitment scores would be observed based on any individual characteristics. Analysis of Variance tests were conducted using 10 different independent variables: gender, age, institution, church membership, type of alma mater, highest degree earned, academic rank, years teaching (career), years teaching (institution), expected age of retirement, and academic field. Harshbarger (1989) reported finding no statistically significant differences based on several similar independent variables; however, ANOVA testing in this study resulted in 31 statistically significant differences in mean scores based on the independent variables tested.

The highest number of mean score differences were found when comparing based on gender. Female faculty members had higher mean scores on 7 of the 15 items, and the overall OCQ mean, indicating greater commitment to their institution than their male counterparts. These findings appear somewhat contrary to Gartlett (1997) who reported that female faculty members face resistance from students and colleagues at their CCCU institutions and to the results of the satisfaction items on the NSOPF surveys (Russell, Fairweather, Hendrickson, & Zimbler, 1991; Zimbler, 2001) in which mean satisfaction scores for women were typically lower than those for men.

The only other categories in which there were significant differences in the Overall OCQ mean score were when age and institution were used as independent variables. In the

case of age, younger faculty members (in their 30s) had significantly lower OCQ scores than their older counterparts (in their 60s), signifying lower institutional commitment. This difference makes sense, since the older faculty members are likely to have been teaching at the institution for a much longer time. When institution was used as an independent variable, two institutions were observed to have significantly higher mean scores than three others, indicating that the faculty at those two institutions demonstrated higher organizational commitment than those at the other three. There was not one single institution that had higher mean scores on any one item than all of the other institutions.

The rest of the significant comparisons were on specific OCQ items, rather than the overall mean score. On four of the questions, faculty members who were required to belong to the denomination which oversees or supports the institution indicated higher mean scores than those who did not have such a requirement. This indicates greater commitment on their part to their institution than those faculty members at institutions without such a requirement. This finding is interesting, especially in light of the example given in the preface to this study. It appears that a church membership requirement is not a detriment to the satisfaction of participants in this study.

With regard to their alma mater, faculty members who attended the institution at which they were working scored significantly higher than those who attended other colleges scored higher on two items. This is particularly interesting to this researcher in light of the studies that eschewed the practice of faculty inbreeding (Conrad & Wyer, 1982; Dutton, 1980; Eells & Cleveland, 1935/1999; Miller, 1977). However, interestingly, faculty members who attended a non-Christian undergraduate institution scored significantly higher

on *I could just as well be working for a different institution as long as the type of work were similar* than their counterparts who had attended another CCCU institution.

The ANOVA results from the independent variables highest degree earned and academic rank showed no significant differences on the OCQ scores. The independent variable, academic field, showed a greater commitment to the organization on two of the questions by faculty members who taught in pre-professional programs than their counterparts in the social sciences.

The last three independent variables (years teaching-career, years teaching-institution, and expected age of retirement) showed several differences in mean scores on individual OCQ items. In each case, those faculty members who had been teaching longer, or who expected to teach to an older age had higher mean scores on the items, perhaps demonstrating a stronger commitment to the institution.

Question 5: Are there significant differences in measures of satisfaction with or opinions about selected job components between faculty members at selected CCCU institutions and faculty members in general at US colleges and universities?

The 70 items from the NSOPF instrument (Russell, Fairweather, Hendrickson, & Zimbler, 1991; Zimbler, 2001) that were used in this study offered an opportunity for comparisons *between* both the participants in the study and faculty members who have participated in the national survey conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics.

The 28 items that addressed faculty members satisfaction with their current position (scored on a 4-point Likert type *scale*) indicated strong levels of satisfaction. On all but three items, the responses fell in the satisfied category, with only *time available for keeping*

current in my field, quality of my research facilities and support, and research assistance that I receive scoring lower than a 2.5 (midpoint between very dissatisfied and very satisfied). In 18 of the questions, respondents scored between somewhat satisfied and very satisfied.

The results of two particular questions mirrored the results of a researcher-designed question that is described above. Respondents indicated strong satisfaction with the *institutional mission or philosophy* and with their *colleagues* at the institution.

The questions that addressed reasons why a faculty member might leave their institution indicated satisfaction as well, with *retirement* being listed as the most likely reason for severing the relationship with their current institution. Only one other reason (*accept employment at another Christian college or university*) fell in the somewhat likely category.

Five questions addressed the type of work in which faculty members would like to be engaged if they were to move to another institution. Scores indicated that faculty members appreciate the current *mix* of activities in which they are currently engaged, since nearly all of the responses fell in the range of “same amount.” The only role that they would appreciate doing more of in a different position is that of *research*.

In the next set of questions, the importance of *colleagues* and the *institutional mission or philosophy* to faculty members at these 10 Christian colleges was again reiterated. In this set of questions respondents were asked what characteristics would be important in another position. These two responses again received the highest degree of importance, along with *benefits, academic freedom, and good instructional facilities and equipment*. Somewhat contrary to other findings in the study, the fact that the *new institution is a Christian college*, while still being “somewhat important” ranked 14th in importance of the 19 questions.

The final set of questions from the NSOPF posed a list of 12 statements to which faculty members were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement. Faculty members indicated agreement with nine of the statements to varying degrees, with highest scores for their *choice of an academic career, the importance of faculty governance, and their support for teaching effectiveness as the primary criterion for faculty promotion*. The three statements with which they expressed disagreement related to *years of teaching as the primary criterion for faculty promotions, the efficacy of assessment at improving undergraduate education at their institution, and the importance of research and publications in faculty promotions*, the final question receiving the lowest score.

The comparisons between respondents in this study and the responses from faculty members who have participated in the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty were very interesting. Using one-sample t-tests to compare the means of the two samples, the researcher found significant mean differences between the two samples on 43 of the 65 questions from the NSOPF.

On the questions that dealt with satisfaction with particular elements of their current positions, the faculty members in this study had greater satisfaction on 20 of the 22 items that demonstrated significantly different mean scores. They are more satisfied with their *co-workers, their academic leaders, their students, their facilities and resources, the mix of teaching/research/administration, and their opportunities for advancement*. They were significantly less satisfied, however, with their *workload and the time that they have to keep current in their field*. This may reflect the observation of McPherran (1994) that while overall faculty workload at CCCU colleges does not differ significantly from the national norms, the smaller the enrollment of the institution, the greater the teaching workload

required by faculty. The greatest differences between the responses of these two groups fell in their satisfaction with *teaching and research assistance*, with participants in this study scoring more than a one point higher than those in the national sample for each of these two categories.

The questions that dealt with the importance of various characteristics in choosing to accept a position at a different institution, respondents in this study were less interested in *personal/family characteristics* than respondents in the national survey; they placed a lower importance on the *environment and schools for their children* and the *geographic location of the new institution*. They also rated *salary* lower than their national counterparts. However, as discussed above, the *mission or philosophy of the new institution* was considered a more important factor, as was a *lack of pressure to publish* in the new position.

The final set of questions from the NSOPF that were posed to participants in this study indicated a lower agreement with the *efficacy of state or federally mandated assessment activities to improve undergraduate education* on the part of respondents than those in the national study. Respondents in this study also had different opinions as to the *tenure and promotion processes* in higher education. They placed a lower value on *research/publications* and *years of service/advanced degree* in the promotion process and a higher value on *teaching effectiveness* as a criterion for promotion, perhaps because of the nature of their institutions as teaching, rather than research-focused institutions. As a group, they also found it less important that the *tenure process in higher education should be continued*.

Faculty members in this study felt more strongly that *both female faculty members and faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly* at their

institution than those respondents in the national study. This is interesting, because as a whole, faculty at colleges affiliated with the CCCU have less gender, ethnic and racial diversity than the faculty sample in the NSOPF.

In summary, as a group, faculty members in this study appear to have an overall higher satisfaction level with the characteristics of their positions and the people with whom they work than those who answered the same questions in the national study.

Question 6: Are there significant differences in measures of satisfaction with or opinions about selected job components or values between faculty members at selected CCCU institutions based on the following characteristics: gender, age, current institution, church membership requirement, type of undergraduate alma mater, highest degree earned, academic rank, years of teaching experience (in their career and at their current institution) expected age of retirement, and academic field?

As with the responses to the OCQ items in the survey, an analysis of variance between mean scores on the NSOPF questions was also conducted based on the same set of independent variables. With regard to gender, the results indicated many statistically significant differences between the responses of males and females. On the whole, females were more satisfied with the characteristics of their current job, including its *overall reputation*, their *departmental reputation*, the *quality of their colleagues*, *leadership*, and *students*, and the *institutional mission or philosophy*. However, when considering what would be important in a new position if they were to leave their current institution, they placed a higher emphasis on *salary*, *benefits*, *facilities*, *excellent students*, and *location* than

their male colleagues. Male faculty members placed a greater importance on the *availability of a full-time job*, if they were to consider a different position.

Above it was mentioned that as a group, the CCCU respondents in this study felt more strongly that *female faculty members are treated fairly* at their institutions. However, the ANOVA results indicated a significant difference between the male and female respondents in this study. Although they still fell within the 'agree' range on this question, females had significantly lower mean scores on this question than males.

When age was used as an independent variable to compare responses between participants on the NSOPF items, more often than not, a bi-modal distribution of scores tended to be observed. Those faculty who were older (60s and 70s) appeared to be more satisfied with their positions than those who were in their middle years (30s, 40s, and 50s), but often faculty members in their 20s also appeared to be more satisfied than those in their middle years. These results seem to mirror those of Hagedorn (2000), since faculty members in their middle years are likely to be experiencing greater changes in family-related circumstances. Older faculty members were more satisfied with the *reputation of their institutions, the cooperation they have with colleagues, the quality of their students* and the *institution's mission or philosophy*.

Not surprisingly, faculty members in their 60s and 70s had higher mean scores relating to their intention to leave in order to *retire* than those who were younger, and those in their middle years indicated a greater willingness to *leave to teach at another Christian college* than those who were nearer to retirement age.

As with the results from the OCQ analysis of variance, the ANOVA results for the NSOPF seemed to indicate that there were differences in satisfaction between faculty at

several of the institutions. A visual analysis of the 21 questions that showed significant mean differences between scores on the NSOPF questions tended to cluster between 5 of the 10 institutions. Two of the institutions tended to have higher mean scores than three of the other institutions.

Similar to the results obtained from the analysis of variance between institutions who require their faculty to belong to a particular denomination and those who do not, the faculty at those institutions with a church membership requirement tended to be more satisfied than those who were not required to belong to a particular denomination. This is possibly the result of a greater overall commitment to the organization, or a stronger sense of mission value congruence as suggested by Niehoff (1995). These faculty members had greater satisfaction with *the reputation of their department and institution, the institutional mission or philosophy* and the *quality of their students*. They also felt more strongly that their *institution meets the educational needs of entering students*. One interesting note, faculty who worked at institutions that require membership in a particular denomination also felt that *the administrative function is taking a greater share of the available resources at their institutions*.

The next independent variable, alma mater, also seemed to indicate that those faculty members who had a stronger connection to their institution were more satisfied with their current position. Faculty members who attended the institution at which they work as an undergraduate student scored more highly than those who attended other types of institutions on several of the questions in the survey. They, and their counterparts who attended another CCCU institution, also were more likely to indicate that if they were to leave their current position, they would be more likely to choose to *work at another Christian college*. Finally,

the faculty members who are working at their alma mater felt less strongly about the *importance of academic freedom* and felt more strongly that *teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion in faculty promotions*.

An interesting observation in this analysis was that attendance at another CCCU Christian college did not necessarily produce greater satisfaction. Attendees of another CCCU institution reported lower satisfaction with the *overall institutional reputation* and their belief that their *current institution meets the educational needs of entering students* than those who are working at their alma mater. This could be due to the fact that faculty members who are working at their alma mater have biased recollections of their undergraduate experience that flavors their current experience.

The level of educational attainment of faculty members did appear to have a modest impact their satisfaction level. Faculty members who have completed the master's degree were more satisfied than those with doctoral degrees with their current positions with regard to *workload, time to keep current, teaching and research assistance and research facilities and support*. However, as expected, those with doctoral degrees were more satisfied with their *opportunities for advancement in rank* at their current institution.

A comparable analysis, using academic rank as an independent variable, produced somewhat different results. There were no significant differences between various academic ranks on many of the satisfaction variables. However, as expected, those faculty members who are full professors were more satisfied with their *job security* and their *opportunity for advancement* than their counterparts whose positions were at a lower academic rank.

Advancement opportunities appear to be on the minds of faculty with lower academic rank. Full professors were more likely to *leave to retire* than assistant professors, and

instructors were more likely to *leave to return to school as a student* and to leave their current job to *accept employment at a secular institution* than full professors and associate professors. This latter category could indicate a lower level of commitment to their institution or, simply, a realization that they may need to seek other employment in order to advance in rank. Faculty members at the assistant professor level were more interested in both *opportunities for advancement* and *good environment and schools for their children* than were full professors. While it is not always the case that faculty members at a lower academic rank are necessarily younger than their counterparts at higher academic ranks, it is a likely assumption that age and family situations are contributing factors to these responses.

The bi-modal results that appeared in the analysis by age and highest degree earned were observed again when the two variables years teaching (career) and years teaching (institution) were analyzed. Although these two variables were analyzed independently, the results for both are very similar. Faculty members who had only been teaching for 1-5 years were more satisfied with several characteristics of their positions (primarily workload-related) than those who had been teaching for a longer period of time. However, faculty who had been teaching for a longer period of time were more satisfied with the opportunities they have to influence their work and institution.

Similar to other individual variables, those faculty who have been teaching for more than 12 years were more likely to *leave to retire* than those with a shorter teaching career, but junior faculty with only 1-5 years of teaching experience were more likely to *leave to teach at a secular institution* than those with more teaching experience. For faculty in the middle category (6-11 years of teaching experience) *good schools*, *opportunities for spouses*, and *excellent colleagues* were more important than those with only 1-5 years of experience.

The last age-related independent variable was slightly different in its orientation. It asked faculty to estimate the age at which they felt that they might retire from teaching. There were three interesting results in this category. One was that faculty who expected to retire at age 60 or younger were more likely to indicate that they would leave their current position *to accept employment in consulting or not-for-profit business* than were faculty who expected to retire at an older age. A second characteristic is that these faculty members were also less likely to respond that *if they had it to do over again, they would choose an academic career*. Finally, if they were to leave their current position they were more interested in *seeking part-time employment* than their colleagues. These three questions seem to indicate a relationship between lack of satisfaction and an earlier expected retirement age—or a desire to seek some other type of employment in addition to their faculty responsibilities.

The final independent variable, academic field, produced 17 significant differences in mean scores on the NSOPF questions. Overall, those faculty in the pre-professional fields were observed to be more satisfied than their counterparts in the other fields on the various work-related characteristics. They had *greater appreciation for their students*, the amount of *assistance* that they receive in their positions, and were also more satisfied with the level of *academic freedom* that they experience.

Summary of the Results

There are many factors that contribute to the decision to choose a particular job, but faculty members at these 10 Christian colleges indicated that their decisions to initially accept employment at these particular institutions was strongly influenced by the mission and

philosophy of the institution, a sense of a strong Christian environment at the institution, and, in some cases, the particular denominational affiliation of the institution.

While the mission and Christian environment of the institution remain strong factors in their decision, the influences of excellent students and strong relationships and collegiality with colleagues are two very significant motivators for the faculty members in this study to remain at their particular institutions. Both of these results support the work of Kuh et al. (1991) and Lamport (1994).

The participants in this study are strongly committed to their institutions, but they still find many things to be problematic or dissatisfying about their current employment. They are frustrated with the heavy demands of their positions and the paucity of key resources, such as a lack of time to keep current in their field, the quality of research facilities and support, and the research assistance that they receive. They are also concerned about the insufficiency of wages or benefits. Some also reported concerns about ineffective administrative or academic leadership.

Results from the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) questions and mean score indicate a strong commitment on the part of these Christian college faculty members to their institutions, supporting the work of Ellis (2001), Niehoff (1995), Sheridan (1995), and Flowers (1992). The mean score of female faculty members on the OCQ items was significantly higher than that their male counterparts, indicating a stronger sense of commitment to their institution. This trend is contrary to some of the other research concerning female faculty members that was reviewed (Gartlett, 1997; Russell, Fairweather, Hendrickson, & Zimbler, 1991; Zimbler, 2001). However, perhaps the impact of the caring academic community that these institutions espouse (Cameron, 1994) and the Christian

values that these institutions attempt to instill (Carlburg, 1994; Kleiner, 1999) is a causal factor that contributes to female faculty members feeling more identification with and commitment to their institution.

The satisfaction of these participants with the characteristics of their work (based on their responses to questions from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty) was strong. Nearly all responses were well in the *satisfied* range of the scale. In general, the respondents in this study had higher mean scores for satisfaction with their jobs than the participants in the national NSOPF studies to which they were compared. The primary exceptions to this were their lower satisfaction regarding their workload and available time, and the lower significance they placed on the importance of academic freedom, the traditional tenure process, and their participation in research and scholarly publications. The perceived lower concern for academic freedom issues support the research of Marty (1998), Diekema (2000), and Cooper (1999).

Several independent variables were observed to impact the satisfaction of faculty members at these institutions. Female respondents were more satisfied with many aspects of their jobs than their male counterparts. Older faculty members and those who had been at the institution for a longer period of time were more satisfied than those who were in the earlier years of their career. Those faculty members who were graduates of the institution at which they currently work were more satisfied than others, as were participants who work at institutions with church membership requirements for faculty members.

Limitations of the Study

As a novice researcher, it is easy to find limitations in one's work. This study was not without errors, omissions and wrong turns. A brief list of limitations follows.

Breadth of the study

This research study was too broadly constructed. The researcher should have limited the number of research questions and more closely focused the topics to be investigated. Individual studies could have been conducted on each of the six research questions posed in this study. The scope of the study did not allow for thorough, in-depth analysis of some of the causal relationships that may be present in the data.

Amount of data

The use of an online instrument allows for immediate, and usually accurate, collection and transmittal of data; however this should not be seen as license to ask more questions than are necessary or appropriate. Several of the questions were superfluous to the study and could have been eliminated (e.g., the number of years in a part-time position, the reasons why a person might leave his or her current institution, and the desired level of various work components in a new position). Several others were poorly constructed and, thus, did not allow for their use in meaningful analysis (e.g., whether a faculty member was in a part-time position by choice and the number of years in a part-time position). A shorter survey may have resulted in a greater response rate.

Clarity of some of the questions

There were several questions in the study that asked participants to determine the “fairness” of treatment on their campus of several sub-groups. Two such questions were: *Female faculty members are treated fairly at my institution* and *Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at my institution*. Even though these questions were taken directly from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, it is possible that the term “fairly” could have been construed differently by faculty who participated in this study. This could have resulted in different types of responses by male and female faculty members or by faculty members who are members of racial or ethnic minority groups and those who are not, thus resulting in apparent contradictions of responses.

Another such issue could pertain to the word “research.” Several questions asked faculty members to address the resources that their institutions provide for research activities and the value of research endeavors in their promotion and tenure process. It was noted several times in the study that teaching is the primary work-activity for faculty members at CCCU institutions and research is a secondary or tertiary activity. For this reason, research could have been construed by some participants in this study as “keeping up with the research in a person’s field of study,” while for others it may have been thought of as “conducting original research for the purpose of ascertaining new insights.” Again, this possible confusion regarding a term in the question could have resulted in some contradictory responses.

Identification and communication with the participants

Since this study was meant to be anonymous, the researcher communicated via email to the participants through the chief academic officer at the various institutions.

Mechanically, this process worked well, but it did not allow for verification of the number of participants in the study, nor did it allow the researcher to manage the timing of the study in an expedient manner. In addition, this process may have caused faculty members who were dissatisfied with their current institution to use caution in their responses, or not respond to the survey at all, out of concern that their chief academic officer may have access to their responses. Direct communication with the participants by the researcher would have improved this study.

Lack of generalization

The faculty members of only 10 institutions within the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities were surveyed. This represents less than 10% of the member institutions in this diverse organization. While a panel of experts was used to select the institutions, and significant attempts were made to diversify the types and locations of the institutions, concern should be taken when generalizing the the results of the study to all of the member institutions.

In addition, the comparisons made with NSOPF survey data should be seen as generalizations. The data from this study was collected from faculty at small, private, Christian colleges, while the NSOPF data were the aggregate of all NSOPF respondents.

Number of responses and return rate

The population of full-time faculty members at the 10 institutions is approximately 725. The number of useable responses from full-time faculty members in this study was 238, resulting in an approximate return rate of 33%, therefore those faculty members who responded to the survey may not have been representative of the entire population. Perhaps they were more likely to respond because they are more satisfied with their position and institution than others who did not respond.

Another delimiting factor was the variance in the number of responses between institutions, from a low of 9 to a high of 35. These numbers make analysis of variation by institutions a difficult task.

Lack of data on part-time faculty members

The extremely low response rate from part-time faculty members (2.1% of the useable responses) did not allow for appropriate statistical analysis, so the responses were omitted. Data from part-time faculty members at CCCU colleges on these topics would be interesting to analyze, but such analysis was not possible in this research study.

Perspective of the researcher

Although every attempt was made by the researcher to maintain his objectivity and professional distance when constructing and conducting this study, it must be noted that the researcher is a product of, and employee at, a committed Christian college (although not one of the institutions surveyed in this study). It is possible that this fact may have contributed to inadvertent biases that may have impacted the study in some way.

Recommendations for Practice

Although this study may not have contributed significantly to a broad understanding of the nature and understanding of faculty members at committed Christian colleges, it does provide some preliminary statistical data to support anecdotal observations regarding the satisfaction of this group. Several practical recommendations for Christian college administrators and boards can be made based on this study.

Institutional mission

All employees, but particularly faculty members, should have an understanding of, appreciation for, and belief in the mission and philosophy of the Christian college for which they work. In every question that related to this topic, the faculty members in this study indicated that the Christian environment and the influence of the institutional mission were fundamental to their satisfaction and continued affiliation with the institution. The findings of the 1977 report from the Association of American Colleges (*Achieving the Mission*) indicated that committed faculty are crucial to the ability of church-related institutions to achieve their missions.

In the faculty hiring process, committed Christian colleges should be open and direct about the nature of their mission and the expectations of faculty members to understand, support, and implement the stated goals of the mission to avoid the “striking ... dissimilarities” of interpretation of college mission reported by Ramirez and Brock (1996, p. 16). They should be forthright about the expectations for membership in a particular denomination, if such a requirement exists. They should explain the nuances of the institutional culture that may be impacted by their values and philosophy. And they should

make efforts to educate and enfold faculty members who may not come from the particular tradition or denomination that founded and maintains the institution particularly if they hope to overcome the “religion gap” described by Sheridan (1995, p. 4631) “between faculty members whose identity is at variance with the employing institution.”

Hiring alumni

Committed Christian college should not be afraid to hire their own graduates. The research regarding the faculty inbreeding shows that the former concerns and aversion to this phenomenon are beginning to lessen. Colleges and universities often rely on their graduates to be strong ambassadors for the institution in their work roles and in their communities. If this is the case, why should they shy away from hiring their graduates to begin this process of inculcation and appreciation for the institution in their students? This study provided some evidence that faculty members who are alumni of the institution have greater satisfaction with their jobs and commitment to their institution than their colleagues from other undergraduate institutions. It is illogical, and not supported by the current research, for institutions to subscribe to an outdated taboo that suggests that faculty inbreeding is inappropriate.

Wage and benefit inequities

Administrators and boards of committed Christian colleges should address perceived wage and benefit inequities on the part of their faculty members. In nearly every category and question, faculty members in this study were more satisfied than their counterparts at other colleges and universities in the United States. However, their responses on questions

related to wages and benefits demonstrated statistically significant lower satisfaction scores than the national average.

While the adage that Christian educators are more willing to make financial sacrifices because of their commitment to the cause of Christian education may be true in part, it does not rectify the perceived, or real, inequity that these faculty members feel regarding their remuneration. Leaders of committed Christian colleges must be in tune to the market forces that impact their faculty members and treat them morally and fairly in their compensation structure.

Opportunities for spouses and families

Closely related to being aware of possible wage and benefit inequities, administrators should do what they can in their institutions and in their communities to promote and encourage good employment opportunities for spouses and the availability of good schools for the children of faculty members. Many faculty members in the study indicated that these two factors were significant to their satisfaction level at their current institution, or would be so if they were to seek employment elsewhere.

College administrators should communicate regularly with school administrators regarding the quality of schools. If the institution has an undergraduate education program, every effort should be made to collaborate on student internships and teacher professional development opportunities.

College administrators should also play an active role in the civic and business communities, in order to promote their institution and develop good will towards its faculty members and their spouses. And, when appropriate, colleges should not be afraid to hire the

spouses of faculty members for jobs within the institution. Of course, the ill effects of nepotism and its potential side-effects must always be weighed, but if best practices in hiring, supervision, and evaluation are followed, these effects can likely be adequately minimized.

Workload of faculty

Administrators at committed Christian colleges should also be aware that their faculty members feel overworked, especially those with higher academic rank and more years of service to the institution. According to Russell, Fairweather, Hendrickson, and Zimbler (1991), faculty members in the United States work between 53 and 55 hours per week. While this study did not ascertain the number of hours that faculty members at the institutions surveyed in this study worked, it is safe to assume that they are close to the national average. The study did indicate, however, that faculty members at these institutions felt overworked, and were frustrated with the amount of time that they have to remain current in their fields. It is possible that this frustration could lead to burnout and lack of effectiveness on the part of faculty members.

Collaboration opportunities

Administrators of committed Christian colleges should promote opportunities for collegiality and collaboration between the faculty members on their campuses. The sense of appreciation and regard that respondents have for their colleagues was a consistent theme in this study. After their appreciation for the institutional mission and Christian environment on their campuses, they rated their relationships with excellent colleagues as the next most important thing that they appreciate about their jobs.

Suggestions for Further Research

As mentioned above, even though this study was quite broad in its scope, there are several areas which provide ample opportunities for further research and reflection. Several of those items are described below.

This study focused only on 10 institutions that are part of the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities. A replication of some of the components of this study, in shorter surveys with greater and broader participation, would allow for a better understanding and greater generalization of the findings herein.

One very interesting adaptation of the study would be to include enough part-time faculty members to be able to determine whether differences exist in their organizational commitment and job satisfaction, particularly since the trend for many institutions, including those in the CCCU, to hire greater number of part-time faculty members is increasing.

Also mentioned above was the lack of this study to examine contributing factors to and causal relationships between several of the factors in this study. It would be important to study the contributing factors to the lower satisfaction of mid-level and mid-aged faculty members, as well as the contributing factors to the higher satisfaction of female faculty members. Using multiple regression analysis techniques, one might also be able to determine the extent to which specific variables in this study are contributing to the satisfaction and organizational commitment of faculty members at these institutions.

Another recommendation for further research would be to identify the characteristics that may contribute to differences between satisfaction and organizational commitment levels that exist between male and female faculty members, and the differences that were apparent

on the various campuses of the CCCU. Due to the breadth of this study and the low response rate from several institutions, such comparisons between institutions were unable to be made.

Further elaboration on the study could also be carried out by surveying administrative staff and other personnel who have significant contact with students on the campuses of the CCCU institutions. If it is true, as suggested in materials from the CCCU (Council for Christian Colleges & Universities, 2000), that member institutions must provide evidence of how faith is integrated with the institution's academic and student life programs, then it follows that other employees in the institution should share in the support of the institution's mission.

APPENDIX A.

ADDITIONAL TABLES

OCQ descriptive statistics by gender

OCQ Questions	Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
OCQ 1: I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this institution to be successful.	Female	89	6.40	.888	.094
	Male	145	6.34	.899	.075
	Total	234	6.36	.894	.058
OCQ 2: I talk up this institution to my friends as a great institution to work for.	Female	89	6.26	1.153	.122
	Male	145	5.73	1.420	.118
	Total	234	5.93	1.347	.088
OCQ 3: I feel very little loyalty to this institution. (reversed)	Female	89	6.00	1.907	.202
	Male	144	5.53	1.968	.164
	Total	233	5.71	1.954	.128
OCQ 4: I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this institution.	Female	89	3.17	1.720	.182
	Male	145	2.79	1.705	.142
	Total	234	2.93	1.717	.112
OCQ 5: I find my values and the institution's values are very similar.	Female	89	6.22	1.085	.115
	Male	145	5.90	1.255	.104
	Total	234	6.03	1.201	.078
OCQ 6: I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution.	Female	88	6.51	1.061	.113
	Male	144	5.98	1.260	.105
	Total	232	6.18	1.214	.080
OCQ 7: I could just as well be working for a different institution as long as the type of work were similar. (reversed)	Female	89	4.58	1.565	.166
	Male	143	3.90	1.759	.147
	Total	232	4.16	1.717	.113
OCQ 8: The institution really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.	Female	89	5.19	1.507	.160
	Male	145	4.90	1.606	.133
	Total	234	5.01	1.572	.103
OCQ 9: It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this institution. (reversed)	Female	89	5.88	1.338	.142
	Male	144	5.35	1.636	.136
	Total	233	5.55	1.547	.101
OCQ 10: I am extremely glad that I chose this institution to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.	Female	89	5.92	1.448	.153
	Male	143	5.69	1.361	.114
	Total	232	5.78	1.396	.092
OCQ 11: There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this institution indefinitely. (reversed)	Female	88	5.70	1.562	.167
	Male	145	5.20	1.714	.142
	Total	233	5.39	1.673	.110
OCQ 12: Often I find it difficult to agree with this institution's policies on important matters relating to its employees. (reversed)	Female	89	4.65	1.816	.192
	Male	143	4.52	1.826	.153
	Total	232	4.57	1.820	.119
OCQ 13: I really care about the fate of this institution.	Female	89	6.83	.406	.043
	Male	145	6.45	1.034	.086
	Total	234	6.59	.870	.057
OCQ 14: For me this is the best of all possible institutions for which to work.	Female	89	5.67	1.321	.140
	Male	144	4.96	1.820	.152
	Total	233	5.23	1.681	.110

OCQ descriptive statistics by gender (continued)

OCQ 15: Deciding to work for this institution was a definite mistake on my part. (reversed)	Female	89	6.83	.727	.077
	Male	142	6.60	.975	.082
	Total	231	6.69	.893	.059
OCQ Mean	Female	89	5.713	.76498	.08109
	Male	145	5.290	.96429	.08008
	Total	234	5.451	.91544	.05984

OCQ descriptive statistics by age

OCQ Questions	Age Range	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
OCQ 1: I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this institution to be successful.	20-29	7	6.00	.577	.218
	30-39	41	6.12	1.077	.168
	40-49	61	6.48	.906	.116
	50-59	86	6.40	.885	.095
	60-69	35	6.46	.701	.118
	70 and above	5	6.60	.548	.245
	Total	235	6.37	.893	.058
OCQ 2: I talk up this institution to my friends as a great institution to work for.	20-29	7	6.00	1.000	.378
	30-39	41	5.85	1.459	.228
	40-49	61	6.13	1.218	.156
	50-59	86	5.77	1.444	.156
	60-69	35	6.17	.985	.166
	70 and above	5	6.60	.548	.245
	Total	235	5.96	1.309	.085
OCQ 3: I feel very little loyalty to this institution (reversed)	20-29	7	5.29	1.799	.680
	30-39	40	5.18	2.229	.352
	40-49	61	5.61	2.052	.263
	50-59	86	5.88	1.869	.202
	60-69	35	6.23	1.629	.275
	70 and above	5	5.20	2.387	1.068
	Total	234	5.71	1.968	.129
OCQ 4: I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this institution.	20-29	7	2.57	1.902	.719
	30-39	41	2.73	1.689	.264
	40-49	61	2.98	1.678	.215
	50-59	86	2.88	1.676	.181
	60-69	35	3.26	1.930	.326
	70 and above	5	3.60	2.074	.927
	Total	235	2.94	1.725	.113

OCQ descriptive statistics by age (continued)

OCQ 5: I find my values and the institution's values are very similar.	20-29	7	5.57	1.397	.528
	30-39	41	5.93	1.212	.189
	40-49	61	6.03	.966	.124
	50-59	86	5.95	1.413	.152
	60-69	35	6.43	.948	.160
	70 and above	5	6.20	.447	.200
	Total	235	6.03	1.198	.078
OCQ 6: I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution.	20-29	7	5.86	1.464	.553
	30-39	40	6.03	1.349	.213
	40-49	61	6.28	1.113	.142
	50-59	85	6.09	1.342	.146
	60-69	35	6.46	.852	.144
	70 and above	5	6.60	.548	.245
	Total	233	6.19	1.214	.080
OCQ 7: I could just as well be working for a different institution as long as the type of work were similar. (reversed)	20-29	7	3.43	1.988	.751
	30-39	41	4.10	1.744	.272
	40-49	61	4.03	1.612	.206
	50-59	84	4.11	1.763	.192
	60-69	35	4.89	1.641	.277
	70 and above	5	3.80	1.643	.735
	Total	233	4.18	1.719	.113
OCQ 8: The institution really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.	20-29	7	4.86	1.345	.508
	30-39	41	4.71	1.569	.245
	40-49	60	5.23	1.358	.175
	50-59	86	5.09	1.606	.173
	60-69	35	5.31	1.430	.242
	70 and above	5	2.20	1.643	.735
	Total	234	5.03	1.561	.102
OCQ 9: It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this institution. (reversed)	20-29	7	5.14	1.676	.634
	30-39	40	5.20	1.572	.249
	40-49	61	5.57	1.565	.200
	50-59	86	5.49	1.614	.174
	60-69	35	6.20	1.132	.191
	70 and above	5	6.20	.837	.374
	Total	234	5.57	1.538	.101
OCQ 10: I am extremely glad that I chose this institution to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.	20-29	7	5.29	.951	.360
	30-39	40	5.40	1.722	.272
	40-49	59	5.85	1.436	.187
	50-59	86	5.79	1.321	.142
	60-69	35	6.23	1.060	.179
	70 and above	5	5.80	1.304	.583
	Total	232	5.79	1.394	.091

OCQ descriptive statistics by age (continued)

OCQ 11: There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this institution indefinitely. (reversed)	20-29	7	5.14	1.676	.634
	30-39	41	4.98	1.782	.278
	40-49	60	5.23	1.750	.226
	50-59	85	5.49	1.616	.175
	60-69	35	6.06	1.327	.224
	70 and above	5	5.60	1.673	.748
	Total	233	5.41	1.661	.109
OCQ 12: Often I find it difficult to agree with this institution's policies on important matters relating to its employees. (reversed)	20-29	7	4.43	1.718	.649
	30-39	40	4.80	1.682	.266
	40-49	60	4.33	1.772	.229
	50-59	86	4.43	1.991	.215
	60-69	35	5.17	1.543	.261
	70 and above	5	4.80	1.789	.800
	Total	233	4.59	1.815	.119
OCQ 13: I really care about the fate of this institution.	20-29	7	5.57	2.070	.782
	30-39	41	6.44	1.074	.168
	40-49	61	6.66	.602	.077
	50-59	86	6.60	.871	.094
	60-69	35	6.91	.284	.048
	70 and above	5	6.60	.548	.245
	Total	235	6.60	.863	.056
OCQ 14: For me this is the best of all possible institutions for which to work.	20-29	7	5.14	1.773	.670
	30-39	41	4.71	2.040	.319
	40-49	60	5.55	1.478	.191
	50-59	86	5.17	1.661	.179
	60-69	35	5.63	1.395	.236
	70 and above	5	5.40	1.817	.812
	Total	234	5.26	1.672	.109
OCQ 15: Deciding to work for this institution was a definite mistake on my part. (reversed)	20-29	7	7.00	.000	.000
	30-39	40	6.40	1.464	.231
	40-49	61	6.70	.760	.097
	50-59	85	6.72	.766	.083
	60-69	34	6.94	.239	.041
	70 and above	5	6.80	.447	.200
	Total	232	6.70	.874	.057
OCQ Mean	20-29	7	5.152	.73203	.27668
	30-39	41	5.184	1.03824	.16215
	40-49	61	5.477	.90618	.11602
	50-59	86	5.438	.92820	.10009
	60-69	35	5.876	.62059	.10490
	70 and above	5	5.467	.70396	.31482
	Total	235	5.461	.91011	.05937

OCQ descriptive statistics by institution

OCQ Questions	Institution	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
OCQ 1: I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this institution to be successful.	Institution 1	29	6.45	.736	.137
	Institution 2	19	6.16	1.259	.289
	Institution 3	29	6.31	.850	.158
	Institution 4	19	5.95	1.079	.247
	Institution 5	35	6.46	.980	.166
	Institution 6	14	6.14	1.292	.345
	Institution 7	24	6.50	.511	.104
	Institution 8	9	6.56	.527	.176
	Institution 9	32	6.38	.871	.154
	Institution 10	24	6.63	.576	.118
	Total	234	6.37	.894	.058
OCQ 2: I talk up this institution to my friends as a great institution to work for.	Institution 1	29	5.97	1.017	.189
	Institution 2	19	5.95	1.508	.346
	Institution 3	29	5.66	1.203	.223
	Institution 4	19	5.37	1.606	.368
	Institution 5	35	6.51	.702	.119
	Institution 6	14	5.14	2.179	.582
	Institution 7	24	5.75	1.751	.357
	Institution 8	9	5.78	1.093	.364
	Institution 9	32	6.44	.759	.134
	Institution 10	24	5.96	1.459	.298
	Total	234	5.94	1.343	.088
OCQ 3: I feel very little loyalty to this institution (reversed)	Institution 1	29	6.21	1.449	.269
	Institution 2	19	6.00	1.732	.397
	Institution 3	29	5.45	1.863	.346
	Institution 4	19	5.63	1.422	.326
	Institution 5	35	5.63	2.276	.385
	Institution 6	14	4.64	2.620	.700
	Institution 7	24	5.83	1.761	.359
	Institution 8	8	6.25	2.121	.750
	Institution 9	32	6.16	1.648	.291
	Institution 10	24	4.92	2.620	.535
	Total	233	5.69	1.978	.130

OCQ descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

OCQ 4: I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this institution.	Institution 1	29	2.76	1.845	.343
	Institution 2	19	2.26	1.558	.357
	Institution 3	29	2.97	1.880	.349
	Institution 4	19	2.32	1.529	.351
	Institution 5	35	3.06	1.731	.293
	Institution 6	14	2.71	1.326	.354
	Institution 7	24	3.42	1.381	.282
	Institution 8	9	2.89	1.900	.633
	Institution 9	32	3.16	1.816	.321
	Institution 10	24	3.46	1.888	.385
	Total	234	2.95	1.725	.113
OCQ 5: I find my values and the institution's values are very similar.	Institution 1	29	6.24	.786	.146
	Institution 2	19	5.84	1.573	.361
	Institution 3	29	6.03	1.117	.208
	Institution 4	19	5.84	1.214	.279
	Institution 5	35	6.17	1.175	.199
	Institution 6	14	5.07	1.900	.508
	Institution 7	24	6.25	1.073	.219
	Institution 8	9	6.44	.527	.176
	Institution 9	32	6.06	1.162	.205
	Institution 10	24	5.96	1.122	.229
	Total	234	6.03	1.201	.078
OCQ 6: I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution.	Institution 1	29	6.24	1.091	.203
	Institution 2	18	6.06	1.697	.400
	Institution 3	28	6.00	1.122	.212
	Institution 4	19	5.79	1.398	.321
	Institution 5	35	6.74	.505	.085
	Institution 6	14	5.36	1.781	.476
	Institution 7	24	6.29	1.160	.237
	Institution 8	9	5.78	.972	.324
	Institution 9	32	6.38	1.070	.189
	Institution 10	24	6.21	1.285	.262
	Total	232	6.19	1.215	.080
OCQ 7: I could just as well be working for a different institution as long as the type of work were similar. (reversed)	Institution 1	28	4.54	1.856	.351
	Institution 2	19	3.63	2.087	.479
	Institution 3	29	4.07	1.831	.340
	Institution 4	19	4.16	1.537	.353
	Institution 5	34	4.74	1.504	.258
	Institution 6	14	3.57	1.828	.488
	Institution 7	24	3.83	1.633	.333
	Institution 8	9	3.67	1.732	.577
	Institution 9	32	4.38	1.737	.307
	Institution 10	24	4.04	1.517	.310
	Total	232	4.16	1.728	.113

OCQ descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

OCQ 8: The institution really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.	Institution 1	29	5.10	1.566	.291
	Institution 2	19	5.16	1.675	.384
	Institution 3	29	4.28	1.579	.293
	Institution 4	19	4.95	1.177	.270
	Institution 5	35	5.40	1.594	.269
	Institution 6	14	4.57	1.828	.488
	Institution 7	24	5.04	1.429	.292
	Institution 8	9	5.11	1.537	.512
	Institution 9	32	5.28	1.486	.263
	Institution 10	23	5.00	1.784	.372
	Total	233	5.01	1.574	.103
OCQ 9: It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this institution. (reversed)	Institution 1	29	5.97	1.149	.213
	Institution 2	19	5.37	1.535	.352
	Institution 3	28	5.04	1.856	.351
	Institution 4	19	5.37	1.342	.308
	Institution 5	35	6.17	1.175	.199
	Institution 6	14	4.50	2.210	.591
	Institution 7	24	5.54	1.444	.295
	Institution 8	9	5.78	1.563	.521
	Institution 9	32	5.91	1.228	.217
	Institution 10	24	5.25	1.847	.377
	Total	233	5.57	1.550	.102
OCQ 10: I am extremely glad that I chose this institution to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.	Institution 1	29	5.86	1.125	.209
	Institution 2	19	5.95	1.649	.378
	Institution 3	28	5.43	1.399	.264
	Institution 4	19	5.21	1.903	.436
	Institution 5	35	6.23	1.308	.221
	Institution 6	14	5.57	1.399	.374
	Institution 7	24	5.92	1.060	.216
	Institution 8	9	6.56	.527	.176
	Institution 9	32	5.63	1.476	.261
	Institution 10	22	5.68	1.393	.297
	Total	231	5.78	1.394	.092
OCQ 11: There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this institution indefinitely. (reversed)	Institution 1	29	5.69	1.514	.281
	Institution 2	19	5.37	1.832	.420
	Institution 3	29	5.00	1.909	.354
	Institution 4	19	5.11	1.761	.404
	Institution 5	35	5.94	1.305	.221
	Institution 6	14	5.21	1.847	.494
	Institution 7	24	4.79	1.744	.356
	Institution 8	9	5.22	1.787	.596
	Institution 9	32	6.03	1.062	.188
	Institution 10	23	4.91	2.021	.421
	Total	233	5.40	1.676	.110

OCQ descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

OCQ 12: Often I find it difficult to agree with this institution's policies on important matters relating to its employees. (reversed)	Institution 1	28	4.86	1.649	.312
	Institution 2	19	4.16	2.218	.509
	Institution 3	29	4.17	1.671	.310
	Institution 4	19	4.79	1.653	.379
	Institution 5	35	4.57	1.883	.318
	Institution 6	14	4.50	2.210	.591
	Institution 7	24	3.50	1.956	.399
	Institution 8	9	5.00	1.225	.408
	Institution 9	32	5.38	1.519	.268
	Institution 10	23	4.74	1.573	.328
	Total	232	4.57	1.815	.119
OCQ 13: I really care about the fate of this institution.	Institution 1	29	6.86	.441	.082
	Institution 2	19	6.26	1.447	.332
	Institution 3	29	6.52	.688	.128
	Institution 4	19	6.47	.513	.118
	Institution 5	35	6.69	1.051	.178
	Institution 6	14	6.50	1.092	.292
	Institution 7	24	6.38	1.135	.232
	Institution 8	9	6.56	.726	.242
	Institution 9	32	6.69	.592	.105
	Institution 10	24	6.75	.676	.138
	Total	234	6.59	.870	.057
OCQ 14: For me this is the best of all possible institutions for which to work.	Institution 1	28	5.75	1.175	.222
	Institution 2	19	4.79	2.016	.463
	Institution 3	29	4.97	1.973	.366
	Institution 4	19	4.84	1.708	.392
	Institution 5	35	5.63	1.516	.256
	Institution 6	14	4.21	2.225	.595
	Institution 7	24	5.42	1.349	.275
	Institution 8	9	5.00	1.414	.471
	Institution 9	32	5.59	1.604	.283
	Institution 10	24	5.25	1.700	.347
	Total	233	5.25	1.687	.111
OCQ 15: Deciding to work for this institution was a definite mistake on my part. (reversed)	Institution 1	29	6.93	.258	.048
	Institution 2	19	6.26	1.593	.365
	Institution 3	29	6.59	1.053	.195
	Institution 4	19	6.26	1.408	.323
	Institution 5	33	6.91	.384	.067
	Institution 6	14	6.64	.842	.225
	Institution 7	24	6.71	.751	.153
	Institution 8	9	6.78	.441	.147
	Institution 9	32	6.84	.574	.101
	Institution 10	23	6.65	.935	.195
	Total	231	6.69	.893	.059

OCQ descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

	Institution 1	29	5.660	.75684	.14054
	Institution 2	19	5.260	1.31954	.30272
	Institution 3	29	5.193	.87837	.16311
	Institution 4	19	5.204	1.02619	.23542
	Institution 5	35	5.754	.59864	.10119
	Institution 6	14	4.957	1.11113	.29696
	Institution 7	24	5.411	.83421	.17028
	Institution 8	9	5.511	.75056	.25019
	Institution 9	32	5.752	.77232	.13653
	Institution 10	24	5.336	1.09676	.22388
OCQ Mean	Total	234	5.453	.92141	.06023

OCQ descriptive statistics by church membership

OCQ Questions	Church Membership	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
OCQ 1: I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this institution to be successful.	Membership Required	40	6.43	1.083	.171
	Membership Not Required	196	6.36	.850	.061
	Total	236	6.37	.892	.058
OCQ 2: I talk up this institution to my friends as a great institution to work for.	Membership Required	40	6.50	.961	.152
	Membership Not Required	196	5.83	1.385	.099
	Total	236	5.94	1.345	.088
OCQ 3: I feel very little loyalty to this institution (reversed)	Membership Required	40	5.50	2.287	.362
	Membership Not Required	195	5.74	1.905	.136
	Total	235	5.70	1.972	.129
OCQ 4: I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this institution.	Membership Required	40	3.13	1.757	.278
	Membership Not Required	196	2.90	1.717	.123
	Total	236	2.94	1.722	.112
OCQ 5: I find my values and the institution's values are very similar.	Membership Required	40	6.13	1.181	.187
	Membership Not Required	196	6.01	1.203	.086
	Total	236	6.03	1.197	.078
OCQ 6: I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution.	Membership Required	40	6.55	.986	.156
	Membership Not Required	194	6.11	1.242	.089
	Total	234	6.19	1.211	.079
OCQ 7: I could just as well be working for a different institution as long as the type of work were similar. (reversed)	Membership Required	39	4.85	1.424	.228
	Membership Not Required	195	4.03	1.747	.125
	Total	234	4.17	1.721	.113
OCQ 8: The institution really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.	Membership Required	40	5.15	1.833	.290
	Membership Not Required	195	4.98	1.514	.108
	Total	235	5.01	1.570	.102
OCQ 9: It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this institution. (reversed)	Membership Required	40	5.90	1.411	.223
	Membership Not Required	195	5.49	1.564	.112
	Total	235	5.56	1.544	.101

OCQ descriptive statistics by church membership (continued)

OCQ 10: I am extremely glad that I chose this institution to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.	Membership Required	39	6.13	1.281	.205
	Membership Not Required	194	5.71	1.410	.101
	Total	233	5.78	1.396	.091
OCQ 11: There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this institution indefinitely. (reversed)	Membership Required	40	5.95	1.239	.196
	Membership Not Required	194	5.28	1.730	.124
	Total	234	5.40	1.673	.109
OCQ 12: Often I find it difficult to agree with this institution's policies on important matters relating to its employees. (reversed)	Membership Required	39	4.59	1.846	.296
	Membership Not Required	195	4.58	1.813	.130
	Total	234	4.58	1.814	.119
OCQ 13: I really care about the fate of this institution.	Membership Required	40	6.78	.423	.067
	Membership Not Required	196	6.56	.929	.066
	Total	236	6.60	.867	.056
OCQ 14: For me this is the best of all possible institutions for which to work.	Membership Required	40	5.68	1.526	.241
	Membership Not Required	195	5.16	1.702	.122
	Total	235	5.25	1.682	.110
OCQ 15: Deciding to work for this institution was a definite mistake on my part. (reversed)	Membership Required	38	6.82	.609	.099
	Membership Not Required	195	6.67	.934	.067
	Total	233	6.69	.890	.058
OCQ Mean	Membership Required	40	5.688	.76197	.12048
	Membership Not Required	196	5.404	.94189	.06728
	Total	236	5.452	.91867	.05980

OCQ descriptive statistics by alma mater

OCQ Questions	Alma Mater	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
OCQ 1: I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this institution to be successful.	Current Institution	76	6.38	.848	.097
	Another CCCU Institution	59	6.37	.869	.113
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	6.42	.703	.138
	Non-Christian Institution	75	6.33	1.018	.118
	Total	236	6.37	.892	.058
OCQ 2: I talk up this institution to my friends as a great institution to work for.	Current Institution	76	6.03	1.306	.150
	Another CCCU Institution	59	5.78	1.378	.179
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	6.27	1.041	.204
	Non-Christian Institution	75	5.87	1.446	.167
	Total	236	5.94	1.345	.088
OCQ 3: I feel very little loyalty to this institution (reversed)	Current Institution	76	5.63	2.045	.235
	Another CCCU Institution	58	5.91	1.657	.218
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	6.23	1.478	.290
	Non-Christian Institution	75	5.41	2.231	.258
	Total	235	5.70	1.972	.129
OCQ 4: I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this institution.	Current Institution	76	3.28	1.852	.212
	Another CCCU Institution	59	2.80	1.584	.206
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.50	1.606	.315
	Non-Christian Institution	75	2.87	1.703	.197
	Total	236	2.94	1.722	.112
OCQ 5: I find my values and the institution's values are very similar.	Current Institution	76	6.07	1.159	.133
	Another CCCU Institution	59	6.02	1.167	.152
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	6.46	.647	.127
	Non-Christian Institution	75	5.85	1.372	.158
	Total	236	6.03	1.197	.078
OCQ 6: I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution.	Current Institution	76	6.26	1.170	.134
	Another CCCU Institution	59	5.92	1.222	.159
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	6.81	.491	.096
	Non-Christian Institution	73	6.11	1.350	.158
	Total	234	6.19	1.211	.079
OCQ 7: I could just as well be working for a different institution as long as the type of work were similar. (reversed)	Current Institution	76	4.47	1.604	.184
	Another CCCU Institution	59	3.53	1.736	.226
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	4.19	1.650	.324
	Non-Christian Institution	73	4.36	1.751	.205
	Total	234	4.17	1.721	.113

OCQ descriptive statistics by alma mater (continued)

OCQ 8: The institution really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.	Current Institution	75	4.95	1.668	.193
	Another CCCU Institution	59	4.98	1.432	.186
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	5.62	1.023	.201
	Non-Christian Institution	75	4.89	1.705	.197
	Total	235	5.01	1.570	.102
OCQ 9: It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this institution. (reversed)	Current Institution	76	5.75	1.471	.169
	Another CCCU Institution	59	5.36	1.423	.185
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	6.00	1.118	.224
	Non-Christian Institution	75	5.39	1.785	.206
	Total	235	5.56	1.544	.101
OCQ 10: I am extremely glad that I chose this institution to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.	Current Institution	75	5.87	1.427	.165
	Another CCCU Institution	58	5.57	1.272	.167
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	6.08	1.197	.235
	Non-Christian Institution	74	5.76	1.515	.176
	Total	233	5.78	1.396	.091
OCQ 11: There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this institution indefinitely. (reversed)	Current Institution	75	5.56	1.687	.195
	Another CCCU Institution	59	5.41	1.510	.197
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	5.85	1.541	.302
	Non-Christian Institution	74	5.07	1.793	.208
	Total	234	5.40	1.673	.109
OCQ 12: Often I find it difficult to agree with this institution's policies on important matters relating to its employees. (reversed)	Current Institution	76	4.61	1.933	.222
	Another CCCU Institution	58	4.60	1.611	.211
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	5.15	1.690	.331
	Non-Christian Institution	74	4.34	1.867	.217
	Total	234	4.58	1.814	.119
OCQ 13: I really care about the fate of this institution.	Current Institution	76	6.79	.471	.054
	Another CCCU Institution	59	6.51	.878	.114
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	6.73	.452	.089
	Non-Christian Institution	75	6.43	1.187	.137
	Total	236	6.60	.867	.056
OCQ 14: For me this is the best of all possible institutions for which to work.	Current Institution	76	5.45	1.747	.200
	Another CCCU Institution	58	5.16	1.508	.198
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	5.65	1.294	.254
	Non-Christian Institution	75	4.97	1.830	.211
	Total	235	5.25	1.682	.110

OCQ descriptive statistics by alma mater (continued)

OCQ 15: Deciding to work for this institution was a definite mistake on my part. (reversed)	Current Institution	76	6.75	.802	.092
	Another CCCU Institution	58	6.62	.895	.118
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	6.96	.200	.040
	Non-Christian Institution	74	6.59	1.084	.126
	Total	233	6.69	.890	.058
OCQ Mean	Current Institution	76	5.575	.91447	.10490
	Another CCCU Institution	59	5.337	.87742	.11423
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	5.762	.59484	.11666
	Non-Christian Institution	75	5.311	1.01481	.11718
	Total	236	5.452	.91867	.05980

OCQ descriptive statistics by highest degree earned

OCQ Questions	Highest Degree	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
OCQ 1: I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this institution to be successful.	Master's Degree	80	6.36	.698	.078
	Specialist's or Professional Degree	7	6.43	.535	.202
	Doctoral Degree	148	6.36	.998	.082
	Total	235	6.37	.893	.058
OCQ 2: I talk up this institution to my friends as a great institution to work for.	Master's Degree	80	6.09	1.285	.144
	Specialist's or Professional Degree	7	6.29	.951	.360
	Doctoral Degree	148	5.84	1.390	.114
	Total	235	5.94	1.346	.088
OCQ 3: I feel very little loyalty to this institution (reversed)	Master's Degree	79	5.51	2.165	.244
	Specialist's or Professional Degree	7	6.00	2.236	.845
	Doctoral Degree	148	5.78	1.858	.153
	Total	234	5.69	1.974	.129
OCQ 4: I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this institution.	Master's Degree	80	3.21	1.666	.186
	Specialist's or Professional Degree	7	3.29	2.215	.837
	Doctoral Degree	148	2.77	1.723	.142
	Total	235	2.94	1.725	.113
OCQ 5: I find my values and the institution's values are very similar.	Master's Degree	80	6.13	1.118	.125
	Specialist's or Professional Degree	7	6.29	.951	.360
	Doctoral Degree	148	5.97	1.253	.103
	Total	235	6.03	1.200	.078
OCQ 6: I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution.	Master's Degree	80	6.35	.982	.110
	Specialist's or Professional Degree	7	6.71	.756	.286
	Doctoral Degree	146	6.07	1.327	.110
	Total	233	6.18	1.212	.079
OCQ 7: I could just as well be working for a different institution as long as the type of work were similar. (reversed)	Master's Degree	80	4.14	1.712	.191
	Specialist's or Professional Degree	7	4.43	1.988	.751
	Doctoral Degree	146	4.17	1.731	.143
	Total	233	4.17	1.725	.113
OCQ 8: The institution really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.	Master's Degree	79	5.08	1.500	.169
	Specialist's or Professional Degree	7	5.43	1.397	.528
	Doctoral Degree	148	4.95	1.622	.133
	Total	234	5.01	1.572	.103
OCQ 9: It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this institution. (reversed)	Master's Degree	79	5.66	1.543	.174
	Specialist's or Professional Degree	7	5.57	1.272	.481
	Doctoral Degree	148	5.51	1.567	.129
	Total	234	5.56	1.547	.101

OCQ descriptive statistics by highest degree earned (continued)

OCQ 10: I am extremely glad that I chose this institution to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.	Master's Degree	79	5.90	1.317	.148
	Specialist's or Professional Degree	7	5.43	1.272	.481
	Doctoral Degree	146	5.75	1.442	.119
	Total	232	5.79	1.394	.091
OCQ 11: There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this institution indefinitely. (reversed)	Master's Degree	79	5.23	1.818	.205
	Specialist's or Professional Degree	7	6.14	1.464	.553
	Doctoral Degree	147	5.46	1.597	.132
	Total	233	5.40	1.674	.110
OCQ 12: Often I find it difficult to agree with this institution's policies on important matters relating to its employees. (reversed)	Master's Degree	80	4.66	1.828	.204
	Specialist's or Professional Degree	7	4.14	2.116	.800
	Doctoral Degree	146	4.56	1.808	.150
	Total	233	4.58	1.818	.119
OCQ 13: I really care about the fate of this institution.	Master's Degree	80	6.61	.834	.093
	Specialist's or Professional Degree	7	7.00	.000	.000
	Doctoral Degree	148	6.57	.905	.074
	Total	235	6.60	.869	.057
OCQ 14: For me this is the best of all possible institutions for which to work.	Master's Degree	80	5.35	1.568	.175
	Specialist's or Professional Degree	7	6.00	1.414	.535
	Doctoral Degree	147	5.14	1.748	.144
	Total	234	5.24	1.681	.110
OCQ 15: Deciding to work for this institution was a definite mistake on my part. (reversed)	Master's Degree	80	6.84	.605	.068
	Specialist's or Professional Degree	7	6.86	.378	.143
	Doctoral Degree	145	6.60	1.023	.085
	Total	232	6.69	.892	.059
OCQ Mean	Master's Degree	80	5.518	.79458	.08884
	Specialist's or Professional Degree	7	5.733	.48534	.18344
	Doctoral Degree	148	5.401	.99535	.08182
	Total	235	5.450	.92035	.06004

OCQ descriptive statistics by academic rank

OCQ Questions	Academic Rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
OCQ 1: I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this institution to be successful.	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	6.17	.835	.241
	Assistant Professor	78	6.38	.810	.092
	Associate Professor	66	6.41	1.007	.124
	Professor	80	6.35	.887	.099
	Total	236	6.37	.892	.058
OCQ 2: I talk up this institution to my friends as a great institution to work for.	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	6.25	.866	.250
	Assistant Professor	78	6.05	1.308	.148
	Associate Professor	66	6.06	1.477	.182
	Professor	80	5.69	1.308	.146
	Total	236	5.94	1.345	.088
OCQ 3: I feel very little loyalty to this institution (reversed)	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	4.92	2.429	.701
	Assistant Professor	77	5.35	2.229	.254
	Associate Professor	66	5.95	1.885	.232
	Professor	80	5.94	1.633	.183
	Total	235	5.70	1.972	.129
OCQ 4: I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this institution.	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	3.17	2.125	.613
	Assistant Professor	78	3.00	1.751	.198
	Associate Professor	66	2.92	1.492	.184
	Professor	80	2.86	1.833	.205
	Total	236	2.94	1.722	.112
OCQ 5: I find my values and the institution's values are very similar.	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	5.92	1.165	.336
	Assistant Professor	78	6.04	1.133	.128
	Associate Professor	66	6.08	1.181	.145
	Professor	80	6.00	1.293	.145
	Total	236	6.03	1.197	.078
OCQ 6: I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution.	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	6.42	.793	.229
	Assistant Professor	76	6.21	1.279	.147
	Associate Professor	66	6.39	1.036	.128
	Professor	80	5.96	1.307	.146
	Total	234	6.19	1.211	.079
OCQ 7: I could just as well be working for a different institution as long as the type of work were similar. (reversed)	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	4.00	1.758	.508
	Assistant Professor	78	4.06	1.746	.198
	Associate Professor	65	4.17	1.626	.202
	Professor	79	4.29	1.791	.202
	Total	234	4.17	1.721	.113
OCQ 8: The institution really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	4.50	1.508	.435
	Assistant Professor	77	5.03	1.597	.182
	Associate Professor	66	5.23	1.465	.180
	Professor	80	4.90	1.635	.183
	Total	235	5.01	1.570	.102

OCQ descriptive statistics by academic rank (continued)

OCQ 9: It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this institution. (reversed)	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	4.92	1.505	.434
	Assistant Professor	77	5.47	1.729	.197
	Associate Professor	66	5.65	1.593	.196
	Professor	80	5.68	1.300	.145
	Total	235	5.56	1.544	.101
OCQ 10: I am extremely glad that I chose this institution to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	5.25	1.288	.372
	Assistant Professor	76	5.64	1.503	.172
	Associate Professor	66	6.02	1.387	.171
	Professor	79	5.80	1.295	.146
	Total	233	5.78	1.396	.091
OCQ 11: There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this institution indefinitely. (reversed)	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	4.83	1.528	.441
	Assistant Professor	77	5.18	1.819	.207
	Associate Professor	66	5.58	1.683	.207
	Professor	79	5.54	1.517	.171
	Total	234	5.40	1.673	.109
OCQ 12: Often I find it difficult to agree with this institution's policies on important matters relating to its employees. (reversed)	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	4.50	1.382	.399
	Assistant Professor	77	4.48	1.825	.208
	Associate Professor	66	4.79	1.902	.234
	Professor	79	4.52	1.804	.203
	Total	234	4.58	1.814	.119
OCQ 13: I really care about the fate of this institution.	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	6.83	.389	.112
	Assistant Professor	78	6.53	1.041	.118
	Associate Professor	66	6.71	.674	.083
	Professor	80	6.54	.871	.097
	Total	236	6.60	.867	.056
OCQ 14: For me this is the best of all possible institutions for which to work.	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	5.33	.888	.256
	Assistant Professor	78	5.26	1.732	.196
	Associate Professor	66	5.45	1.647	.203
	Professor	79	5.05	1.753	.197
	Total	235	5.25	1.682	.110
OCQ 15: Deciding to work for this institution was a definite mistake on my part. (reversed)	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	7.00	.000	.000
	Assistant Professor	77	6.70	.974	.111
	Associate Professor	66	6.70	.859	.106
	Professor	78	6.63	.899	.102
	Total	233	6.69	.890	.058
OCQ Mean	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	5.333	.54458	.15721
	Assistant Professor	78	5.378	.94377	.10686
	Associate Professor	66	5.603 0	.90215	.11105
	Professor	80	5.418	.95058	.10628
	Total	236	5.452	.91867	.05980

OCQ descriptive statistics by years teaching (career)

OCQ Questions	Years Teaching (Career)	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
OCQ 1: I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this institution to be successful.	1-5 years	42	6.43	.770	.119
	6-11 years	55	6.42	.762	.103
	12 or more years	137	6.34	.958	.082
	Total	234	6.38	.881	.058
OCQ 2: I talk up this institution to my friends as a great institution to work for.	1-5 years	42	6.26	.912	.141
	6-11 years	55	5.98	1.569	.212
	12 or more years	137	5.84	1.357	.116
	Total	234	5.95	1.348	.088
OCQ 3: I feel very little loyalty to this institution (reversed)	1-5 years	41	5.22	2.242	.350
	6-11 years	55	5.89	1.802	.243
	12 or more years	137	5.76	1.954	.167
	Total	233	5.70	1.978	.130
OCQ 4: I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this institution.	1-5 years	42	2.79	1.539	.237
	6-11 years	55	2.85	1.704	.230
	12 or more years	137	3.04	1.790	.153
	Total	234	2.95	1.724	.113
OCQ 5: I find my values and the institution's values are very similar.	1-5 years	42	6.05	1.125	.174
	6-11 years	55	5.96	1.232	.166
	12 or more years	137	6.09	1.166	.100
	Total	234	6.05	1.171	.077
OCQ 6: I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution.	1-5 years	41	6.29	1.101	.172
	6-11 years	55	6.20	1.339	.181
	12 or more years	136	6.15	1.204	.103
	Total	232	6.19	1.216	.080
OCQ 7: I could just as well be working for a different institution as long as the type of work were similar. (reversed)	1-5 years	42	3.74	1.547	.239
	6-11 years	54	4.20	1.618	.220
	12 or more years	136	4.28	1.804	.155
	Total	232	4.16	1.723	.113
OCQ 8: The institution really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.	1-5 years	41	5.27	1.379	.215
	6-11 years	55	4.75	1.734	.234
	12 or more years	137	5.04	1.562	.133
	Total	233	5.01	1.577	.103
OCQ 9: It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this institution. (reversed)	1-5 years	41	5.63	1.428	.223
	6-11 years	55	5.11	1.833	.247
	12 or more years	137	5.72	1.433	.122
	Total	233	5.56	1.550	.102
OCQ 10: I am extremely glad that I chose this institution to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.	1-5 years	40	5.85	1.167	.184
	6-11 years	55	5.60	1.822	.246
	12 or more years	136	5.84	1.254	.108
	Total	231	5.78	1.394	.092

OCQ descriptive statistics by years teaching (career) (continued)

OCQ 11: There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this institution indefinitely. (reversed)	1-5 years	41	5.27	1.659	.259
	6-11 years	55	5.24	1.934	.261
	12 or more years	136	5.52	1.563	.134
	Total	232	5.41	1.672	.110
OCQ 12: Often I find it difficult to agree with this institution's policies on important matters relating to its employees. (reversed)	1-5 years	41	4.68	1.709	.267
	6-11 years	55	4.55	1.951	.263
	12 or more years	136	4.58	1.799	.154
	Total	232	4.59	1.814	.119
OCQ 13: I really care about the fate of this institution.	1-5 years	42	6.55	1.041	.161
	6-11 years	55	6.67	.904	.122
	12 or more years	137	6.58	.801	.068
	Total	234	6.60	.870	.057
OCQ 14: For me this is the best of all possible institutions for which to work.	1-5 years	42	5.60	1.380	.213
	6-11 years	55	5.00	1.963	.265
	12 or more years	136	5.23	1.642	.141
	Total	233	5.24	1.685	.110
OCQ 15: Deciding to work for this institution was a definite mistake on my part. (reversed)	1-5 years	41	6.95	.218	.034
	6-11 years	55	6.40	1.342	.181
	12 or more years	135	6.73	.757	.065
	Total	231	6.69	.893	.059
OCQ Mean	1-5 years	42	5.424	.79943	.12336
	6-11 years	55	5.383	1.03361	.13937
	12 or more years	137	5.495	.91315	.07802
	Total	234	5.456	.92146	.06024

OCQ descriptive statistics by years teaching (institution)

OCQ Questions	Years Teaching (Institution)	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
OCQ 1: I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this institution to be successful.	1-5 years	74	6.36	.837	.097
	6-11 years	64	6.23	1.123	.140
	12 or more years	98	6.46	.748	.076
	Total	236	6.37	.892	.058
OCQ 2: I talk up this institution to my friends as a great institution to work for.	1-5 years	74	6.09	1.273	.148
	6-11 years	64	6.05	1.396	.175
	12 or more years	98	5.76	1.355	.137
	Total	236	5.94	1.345	.088
OCQ 3: I feel very little loyalty to this institution (reversed)	1-5 years	73	5.53	2.008	.235
	6-11 years	64	5.83	1.940	.243
	12 or more years	98	5.73	1.977	.200
	Total	235	5.70	1.972	.129
OCQ 4: I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this institution.	1-5 years	74	2.82	1.591	.185
	6-11 years	64	2.97	1.727	.216
	12 or more years	98	3.01	1.825	.184
	Total	236	2.94	1.722	.112
OCQ 5: I find my values and the institution's values are very similar.	1-5 years	74	6.11	1.105	.128
	6-11 years	64	5.80	1.449	.181
	12 or more years	98	6.12	1.067	.108
	Total	236	6.03	1.197	.078
OCQ 6: I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution.	1-5 years	72	6.29	1.144	.135
	6-11 years	64	6.11	1.416	.177
	12 or more years	98	6.16	1.119	.113
	Total	234	6.19	1.211	.079
OCQ 7: I could just as well be working for a different institution as long as the type of work were similar. (reversed)	1-5 years	74	3.76	1.719	.200
	6-11 years	63	4.32	1.721	.217
	12 or more years	97	4.38	1.686	.171
	Total	234	4.17	1.721	.113
OCQ 8: The institution really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.	1-5 years	73	5.10	1.547	.181
	6-11 years	64	4.83	1.667	.208
	12 or more years	98	5.07	1.528	.154
	Total	235	5.01	1.570	.102
OCQ 9: It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this institution. (reversed)	1-5 years	73	5.44	1.641	.192
	6-11 years	64	5.34	1.606	.201
	12 or more years	98	5.80	1.407	.142
	Total	235	5.56	1.544	.101
OCQ 10: I am extremely glad that I chose this institution to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.	1-5 years	72	5.82	1.427	.168
	6-11 years	64	5.58	1.621	.203
	12 or more years	97	5.89	1.198	.122
	Total	233	5.78	1.396	.091

OCQ descriptive statistics by years teaching (institution) (continued)

OCQ 11: There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this institution indefinitely. (reversed)	1-5 years	73	5.32	1.715	.201
	6-11 years	64	5.27	1.793	.224
	12 or more years	97	5.55	1.561	.159
	Total	234	5.40	1.673	.109
OCQ 12: Often I find it difficult to agree with this institution's policies on important matters relating to its employees. (reversed)	1-5 years	73	4.74	1.780	.208
	6-11 years	64	4.67	1.791	.224
	12 or more years	97	4.40	1.858	.189
	Total	234	4.58	1.814	.119
OCQ 13: I really care about the fate of this institution.	1-5 years	74	6.55	.909	.106
	6-11 years	64	6.52	1.008	.126
	12 or more years	98	6.68	.726	.073
	Total	236	6.60	.867	.056
OCQ 14: For me this is the best of all possible institutions for which to work.	1-5 years	74	5.20	1.798	.209
	6-11 years	64	5.17	1.714	.214
	12 or more years	97	5.33	1.579	.160
	Total	235	5.25	1.682	.110
OCQ 15: Deciding to work for this institution was a definite mistake on my part. (reversed)	1-5 years	73	6.75	.894	.105
	6-11 years	64	6.53	1.112	.139
	12 or more years	96	6.75	.696	.071
	Total	233	6.69	.890	.058
OCQ Mean	1-5 years	74	5.408	.93996	.10927
	6-11 years	64	5.409	.97074	.12134
	12 or more years	98	5.513	.87251	.08814
	Total	236	5.452	.91867	.05980

OCQ descriptive statistics by expected retirement age

OCQ Questions	Expected Retirement Age	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
OCQ 1: I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this institution to be successful.	60 or less	24	6.25	1.113	.227
	61-65	93	6.23	.946	.098
	66 or above	108	6.49	.803	.077
	Total	225	6.36	.905	.060
OCQ 2: I talk up this institution to my friends as a great institution to work for.	60 or less	24	5.54	1.719	.351
	61-65	93	5.98	1.268	.132
	66 or above	108	6.02	1.325	.128
	Total	225	5.95	1.350	.090
OCQ 3: I feel very little loyalty to this institution (reversed)	60 or less	24	5.00	2.265	.462
	61-65	93	5.59	2.044	.212
	66 or above	107	5.92	1.838	.178
	Total	224	5.68	1.985	.133
OCQ 4: I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this institution.	60 or less	24	2.83	1.551	.317
	61-65	93	3.01	1.785	.185
	66 or above	108	2.88	1.684	.162
	Total	225	2.93	1.707	.114
OCQ 5: I find my values and the institution's values are very similar.	60 or less	24	6.04	.859	.175
	61-65	93	6.04	1.276	.132
	66 or above	108	6.02	1.184	.114
	Total	225	6.03	1.189	.079
OCQ 6: I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution.	60 or less	23	5.91	1.379	.288
	61-65	93	6.27	1.217	.126
	66 or above	107	6.18	1.212	.117
	Total	223	6.19	1.230	.082
OCQ 7: I could just as well be working for a different institution as long as the type of work were similar. (reversed)	60 or less	24	4.00	1.794	.366
	61-65	93	3.92	1.689	.175
	66 or above	106	4.35	1.762	.171
	Total	223	4.13	1.740	.117
OCQ 8: The institution really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.	60 or less	24	4.71	1.628	.332
	61-65	93	5.09	1.479	.153
	66 or above	107	5.21	1.534	.148
	Total	224	5.10	1.522	.102
OCQ 9: It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this institution. (reversed)	60 or less	24	5.13	1.752	.358
	61-65	93	5.38	1.648	.171
	66 or above	107	5.85	1.393	.135
	Total	224	5.58	1.560	.104
OCQ 10: I am extremely glad that I chose this institution to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.	60 or less	24	5.50	1.383	.282
	61-65	93	5.67	1.477	.153
	66 or above	105	5.96	1.315	.128
	Total	222	5.79	1.397	.094

OCQ descriptive statistics by expected retirement age (continued)

OCQ 11: There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this institution indefinitely. (reversed)	60 or less	24	4.63	1.929	.394
	61-65	93	5.34	1.735	.180
	66 or above	107	5.64	1.487	.144
	Total	224	5.41	1.665	.111
OCQ 12: Often I find it difficult to agree with this institution's policies on important matters relating to its employees. (reversed)	60 or less	24	4.00	1.911	.390
	61-65	92	4.72	1.818	.190
	66 or above	107	4.61	1.768	.171
	Total	223	4.59	1.808	.121
OCQ 13: I really care about the fate of this institution.	60 or less	24	6.54	.509	.104
	61-65	93	6.48	1.069	.111
	66 or above	108	6.67	.761	.073
	Total	225	6.58	.884	.059
OCQ 14: For me this is the best of all possible institutions for which to work.	60 or less	24	4.92	1.840	.376
	61-65	92	5.33	1.658	.173
	66 or above	108	5.30	1.687	.162
	Total	224	5.27	1.689	.113
OCQ 15: Deciding to work for this institution was a definite mistake on my part. (reversed)	60 or less	24	6.63	1.096	.224
	61-65	93	6.65	.963	.100
	66 or above	105	6.75	.769	.075
	Total	222	6.69	.890	.060
OCQ Mean	60 or less	24	5.158	.92935	.18970
	61-65	93	5.439	.98011	.10163
	66 or above	108	5.540	.88587	.08524
	Total	225	5.457	.93331	.06222

OCQ descriptive statistics by academic field

OCQ Questions	Field	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
OCQ 1: I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this institution to be successful.	Humanities	72	6.44	.902	.106
	Physical Sciences	29	6.17	.711	.132
	Pre-Professional	75	6.47	.844	.097
	Social Sciences	41	6.22	1.107	.173
	Other	13	6.31	.855	.237
	Total	230	6.37	.900	.059
OCQ 2: I talk up this institution to my friends as a great institution to work for.	Humanities	72	6.04	1.238	.146
	Physical Sciences	29	5.38	1.568	.291
	Pre-Professional	75	6.16	1.252	.145
	Social Sciences	41	5.88	1.345	.210
	Other	13	6.00	1.683	.467
	Total	230	5.97	1.344	.089
OCQ 3: I feel very little loyalty to this institution (reversed)	Humanities	71	5.66	2.090	.248
	Physical Sciences	29	5.90	1.566	.291
	Pre-Professional	75	5.87	2.009	.232
	Social Sciences	41	5.59	1.897	.296
	Other	13	5.62	1.758	.488
	Total	229	5.74	1.940	.128
OCQ 4: I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this institution.	Humanities	72	2.92	1.782	.210
	Physical Sciences	29	2.28	1.556	.289
	Pre-Professional	75	3.21	1.679	.194
	Social Sciences	41	2.95	1.658	.259
	Other	13	3.31	2.136	.593
	Total	230	2.96	1.732	.114
OCQ 5: I find my values and the institution's values are very similar.	Humanities	72	6.00	1.088	.128
	Physical Sciences	29	6.17	.848	.157
	Pre-Professional	75	6.20	1.263	.146
	Social Sciences	41	5.80	1.327	.207
	Other	13	6.31	.751	.208
	Total	230	6.07	1.154	.076
OCQ 6: I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution.	Humanities	72	6.18	1.179	.139
	Physical Sciences	29	6.00	1.165	.216
	Pre-Professional	73	6.53	1.015	.119
	Social Sciences	41	5.73	1.467	.229
	Other	13	6.62	.506	.140
	Total	228	6.21	1.188	.079
OCQ 7: I could just as well be working for a different institution as long as the type of work were similar. (reversed)	Humanities	71	4.31	1.753	.208
	Physical Sciences	29	4.00	1.890	.351
	Pre-Professional	74	4.38	1.653	.192
	Social Sciences	41	3.93	1.634	.255
	Other	13	4.00	1.871	.519
	Total	228	4.21	1.720	.114

OCQ descriptive statistics by academic field (continued)

OCQ 8: The institution really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.	Humanities	71	5.17	1.512	.179
	Physical Sciences	29	4.72	1.486	.276
	Pre-Professional	75	4.91	1.741	.201
	Social Sciences	41	5.00	1.449	.226
	Other	13	5.38	1.758	.488
	Total	229	5.01	1.587	.105
OCQ 9: It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this institution. (reversed)	Humanities	72	5.72	1.396	.165
	Physical Sciences	29	5.31	1.892	.351
	Pre-Professional	74	5.57	1.562	.182
	Social Sciences	41	5.66	1.237	.193
	Other	13	5.38	1.805	.500
	Total	229	5.59	1.512	.100
OCQ 10: I am extremely glad that I chose this institution to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.	Humanities	71	5.82	1.417	.168
	Physical Sciences	29	5.79	1.264	.235
	Pre-Professional	75	6.13	1.288	.149
	Social Sciences	39	5.36	1.442	.231
	Other	13	5.08	1.656	.459
	Total	227	5.80	1.400	.093
OCQ 11: There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this institution indefinitely. (reversed)	Humanities	71	5.70	1.487	.176
	Physical Sciences	29	4.93	1.791	.333
	Pre-Professional	75	5.37	1.746	.202
	Social Sciences	40	5.63	1.462	.231
	Other	13	4.92	2.019	.560
	Total	228	5.44	1.653	.109
OCQ 12: Often I find it difficult to agree with this institution's policies on important matters relating to its employees. (reversed)	Humanities	72	4.78	1.722	.203
	Physical Sciences	29	4.62	1.935	.359
	Pre-Professional	75	4.68	1.847	.213
	Social Sciences	39	4.38	1.648	.264
	Other	13	4.38	1.981	.549
	Total	228	4.64	1.784	.118
OCQ 13: I really care about the fate of this institution.	Humanities	72	6.64	.893	.105
	Physical Sciences	29	6.52	.634	.118
	Pre-Professional	75	6.71	.835	.096
	Social Sciences	41	6.44	1.074	.168
	Other	13	6.54	.660	.183
	Total	230	6.60	.869	.057
OCQ 14: For me this is the best of all possible institutions for which to work.	Humanities	72	5.22	1.738	.205
	Physical Sciences	29	4.76	1.826	.339
	Pre-Professional	75	5.43	1.578	.182
	Social Sciences	40	5.33	1.859	.294
	Other	13	5.15	1.281	.355
	Total	229	5.24	1.697	.112

OCQ descriptive statistics by academic field (continued)

OCQ 15: Deciding to work for this institution was a definite mistake on my part. (reversed)	Humanities	70	6.63	.920	.110
	Physical Sciences	29	6.72	.960	.178
	Pre-Professional	75	6.80	.658	.076
	Social Sciences	40	6.60	1.150	.182
	Other	13	6.77	.832	.231
	Total	227	6.70	.887	.059
OCQ Mean	Humanities	72	5.512	.91016	.10726
	Physical Sciences	29	5.285	.91407	.16974
	Pre-Professional	75	5.607	.81160	.09371
	Social Sciences	41	5.306	1.06916	.16697
	Other	13	5.451	.91779	.25455
	Total	230	5.474	.91189	.06013

OCQ reliability information

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
OCQ 1	76.03	177.868	.429	.325	.883
OCQ 2	76.43	161.355	.751	.704	.870
OCQ 3	76.67	165.248	.402	.236	.888
OCQ 4	79.41	170.487	.342	.180	.889
OCQ 5	76.35	166.382	.696	.595	.874
OCQ 6	76.19	164.190	.755	.725	.871
OCQ 7	78.20	169.000	.381	.256	.887
OCQ 8	77.37	162.370	.603	.434	.876
OCQ 9	76.82	162.169	.619	.446	.875
OCQ 10	76.60	163.772	.649	.483	.874
OCQ 11	76.96	158.710	.655	.467	.873
OCQ 12	77.84	164.785	.444	.254	.884
OCQ 13	75.78	175.965	.535	.434	.881
OCQ 14	77.11	154.568	.752	.629	.868
OCQ 15	75.70	174.303	.597	.480	.879

NSOPF descriptive statistics by gender

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
My work load	Female	89	2.92	.882	.093
	Male	146	2.86	.847	.070
	Total	235	2.88	.859	.056
My job security	Female	89	3.45	.707	.075
	Male	145	3.37	.866	.072
	Total	234	3.40	.808	.053
My salary	Female	89	2.63	.858	.091
	Male	146	2.65	.907	.075
	Total	235	2.64	.887	.058
My benefits	Female	88	2.90	.803	.086
	Male	146	2.79	.939	.078
	Total	234	2.83	.890	.058
The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach	Female	87	3.39	.826	.089
	Male	146	3.46	.771	.064
	Total	233	3.43	.791	.052
The authority I have to make decisions about the content and methods in the courses I teach	Female	87	3.75	.533	.057
	Male	146	3.83	.445	.037
	Total	233	3.80	.480	.031
The authority I have to make decisions about other aspects of my job	Female	88	3.36	.664	.071
	Male	144	3.37	.666	.056
	Total	232	3.37	.664	.044
The mix of teaching, research, administration, and service that I am required to do	Female	86	3.20	.749	.081
	Male	146	3.04	.813	.067
	Total	232	3.10	.792	.052
The opportunity for advancement in rank at my institution	Female	87	2.97	.946	.101
	Male	145	3.19	.892	.074
	Total	232	3.11	.917	.060
Time available for keeping current in my field	Female	87	2.36	.821	.088
	Male	146	2.51	.912	.075
	Total	233	2.45	.880	.058
Availability of support services and equipment (clerical support, computers, etc.)	Female	89	2.96	.852	.090
	Male	146	2.84	.907	.075
	Total	235	2.89	.887	.058
Freedom to do outside consulting	Female	83	3.20	.712	.078
	Male	141	3.31	.738	.062
	Total	224	3.27	.729	.049
Overall reputation of the institution	Female	88	3.48	.694	.074
	Male	144	3.07	.772	.064
	Total	232	3.22	.768	.050
Reputation of my department	Female	89	3.53	.740	.078
	Male	146	3.26	.806	.067
	Total	235	3.36	.791	.052

NSOPF descriptive statistics by gender (continued)

Institutional mission or philosophy	Female	89	3.75	.459	.049
	Male	145	3.59	.583	.048
	Total	234	3.65	.544	.036
Quality of leadership in my department	Female	89	3.47	.827	.088
	Male	145	3.32	.857	.071
	Total	234	3.38	.847	.055
Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution	Female	88	3.28	.830	.088
	Male	146	3.01	.965	.080
	Total	234	3.11	.924	.060
Quality of my colleagues in my department	Female	89	3.56	.639	.068
	Male	143	3.47	.690	.058
	Total	232	3.50	.671	.044
Quality of faculty leadership at my institution	Female	88	3.35	.743	.079
	Male	146	2.98	.809	.067
	Total	234	3.12	.804	.053
Relationship between administration and faculty at this institution	Female	89	2.91	.821	.087
	Male	145	2.70	.966	.080
	Total	234	2.78	.917	.060
Interdepartmental cooperation at this institution	Female	88	2.82	.810	.086
	Male	146	2.80	.810	.067
	Total	234	2.81	.809	.053
Spirit of cooperation between faculty at this institution	Female	89	3.10	.675	.072
	Male	146	3.08	.797	.066
	Total	235	3.09	.752	.049
Quality of my research facilities and support	Female	86	2.51	.864	.093
	Male	138	2.35	.816	.069
	Total	224	2.41	.837	.056
Quality of students whom I have taught here	Female	89	3.27	.687	.073
	Male	146	2.97	.761	.063
	Total	235	3.09	.746	.049
Teaching assistance that I receive	Female	74	2.84	.922	.107
	Male	140	2.63	.843	.071
	Total	214	2.70	.874	.060
Research assistance that I receive	Female	73	2.45	.883	.103
	Male	129	2.29	.861	.076
	Total	202	2.35	.870	.061
Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area	Female	74	3.23	.900	.105
	Male	139	3.31	.711	.060
	Total	213	3.28	.780	.053
My overall satisfaction with my job here	Female	88	3.59	.539	.057
	Male	146	3.38	.666	.055
	Total	234	3.46	.629	.041

NSOPF descriptive statistics by gender (continued)

If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Leave to Retire	Female	88	2.26	.903	.096
	Male	147	2.08	.918	.076
	Total	235	2.15	.915	.060
Return to school as a student	Female	86	1.27	.541	.058
	Male	147	1.14	.422	.035
	Total	233	1.19	.472	.031
Accept employment at another Christian college or university	Female	86	1.87	.590	.064
	Male	147	2.11	.704	.058
	Total	233	2.02	.672	.044
Accept employment at a secular college or university	Female	85	1.64	.652	.071
	Male	147	1.65	.670	.055
	Total	232	1.64	.662	.043
Accept employment in consulting or other for-profit business or industry or become self-employed	Female	86	1.59	.692	.075
	Male	147	1.61	.717	.059
	Total	233	1.60	.707	.046
Accept employment in a non-profit organization	Female	86	1.67	.583	.063
	Male	146	1.75	.662	.055
	Total	232	1.72	.634	.042
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?	Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Research	Female	84	1.60	.661	.072
	Male	146	1.57	.631	.052
	Total	230	1.58	.641	.042
Teaching	Female	86	2.12	.622	.067
	Male	145	2.16	.549	.046
	Total	231	2.14	.576	.038
Advising	Female	84	2.24	.551	.060
	Male	146	2.23	.535	.044
	Total	230	2.23	.540	.036
Service	Female	86	2.14	.535	.058
	Male	146	2.15	.579	.048
	Total	232	2.15	.562	.037
Administration	Female	84	2.19	.736	.080
	Male	145	2.32	.644	.054
	Total	229	2.28	.681	.045
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?	Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Salary Level	Female	89	2.55	.522	.055
	Male	147	2.37	.574	.047
	Total	236	2.44	.561	.037

NSOPF descriptive statistics by gender (continued)

Position Level	Female	89	2.44	.543	.058
	Male	146	2.28	.641	.053
	Total	235	2.34	.609	.040
Job Security	Female	89	2.62	.574	.061
	Male	146	2.49	.646	.053
	Total	235	2.54	.622	.041
Opportunities for advancement	Female	89	2.43	.562	.060
	Male	147	2.24	.734	.061
	Total	236	2.31	.679	.044
Benefits	Female	89	2.75	.459	.049
	Male	147	2.59	.534	.044
	Total	236	2.65	.513	.033
No pressure to publish	Female	89	2.24	.675	.072
	Male	147	2.10	.747	.062
	Total	236	2.15	.722	.047
Academic Freedom	Female	89	2.56	.563	.060
	Male	147	2.59	.546	.045
	Total	236	2.58	.551	.036
Good research facilities and equipment	Female	87	2.16	.645	.069
	Male	147	2.10	.676	.056
	Total	234	2.12	.664	.043
Good instructional facilities and equipment	Female	88	2.69	.511	.054
	Male	147	2.46	.577	.048
	Total	235	2.55	.563	.037
Excellent Students	Female	89	2.54	.545	.058
	Male	147	2.36	.573	.047
	Total	236	2.43	.568	.037
Excellent Colleagues	Female	89	2.73	.471	.050
	Male	147	2.62	.487	.040
	Total	236	2.66	.483	.031
New institution is a Christian college	Female	89	2.35	.676	.072
	Male	147	2.23	.732	.060
	Total	236	2.28	.712	.046
Institutional mission or philosophy that is compatible with my own view	Female	89	2.65	.524	.056
	Male	146	2.66	.516	.043
	Total	235	2.66	.518	.034
Good job for my spouse	Female	80	2.20	.892	.100
	Male	146	2.05	.820	.068
	Total	226	2.11	.847	.056
Good Geographic Location	Female	86	2.56	.586	.063
	Male	147	2.38	.634	.052
	Total	233	2.45	.621	.041
Affordable Housing	Female	86	2.51	.646	.070
	Male	147	2.51	.578	.048
	Total	233	2.51	.603	.039

NSOPF descriptive statistics by gender (continued)

Good environment/schools for my children	Female	78	1.95	.952	.108
	Male	144	1.95	.888	.074
	Total	222	1.95	.909	.061
A full-time position	Female	86	2.63	.687	.074
	Male	144	2.80	.510	.042
	Total	230	2.73	.587	.039
A part-time position	Female	82	1.51	.689	.076
	Male	144	1.18	.453	.038
	Total	226	1.30	.572	.038
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
It is important for faculty to participate in governing their institution	Female	89	3.71	.482	.051
	Male	146	3.60	.605	.050
	Total	235	3.64	.563	.037
Faculty promotions should be based at least in part on formal student evaluations	Female	89	3.02	.690	.073
	Male	147	2.90	.817	.067
	Total	236	2.94	.773	.050
The tenure system in higher education should be preserved	Female	88	2.67	.880	.094
	Male	147	2.90	.975	.080
	Total	235	2.82	.945	.062
Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty	Female	89	3.29	.678	.072
	Male	146	3.31	.649	.054
	Total	235	3.30	.659	.043
Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	Female	89	1.82	.684	.072
	Male	147	1.96	.701	.058
	Total	236	1.91	.696	.045
Years of service/advanced degree should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	Female	89	2.46	.739	.078
	Male	145	2.49	.792	.066
	Total	234	2.48	.771	.050
The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution	Female	88	2.64	.833	.089
	Male	142	2.82	.886	.074
	Total	230	2.75	.869	.057
State or federally mandated assessment requirements have improved the quality of undergraduate education at my institution	Female	85	2.33	.892	.097
	Male	142	2.17	.790	.066
	Total	227	2.23	.831	.055
Female faculty members are treated fairly at my institution	Female	89	3.06	.803	.085
	Male	145	3.37	.705	.059
	Total	234	3.25	.757	.050
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at my institution	Female	86	3.22	.758	.082
	Male	146	3.31	.784	.065
	Total	232	3.28	.774	.051
My institution effectively meets the educational needs of entering students	Female	87	3.30	.612	.066
	Male	146	3.18	.743	.061
	Total	233	3.23	.698	.046

NSOPF descriptive statistics by gender (continued)

If I had it to do over again, I would choose an academic career	Female	89	3.84	.520	.055
	Male	147	3.75	.508	.042
	Total	236	3.78	.514	.033

NSOPF descriptive statistics by age

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Age	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
My Work Load	20-29	8	3.25	.886	.313
	30-39	40	2.78	.862	.136
	40-49	61	2.82	.827	.106
	50-59	87	2.85	.856	.092
	60-69	35	2.97	.923	.156
	70 and above	5	3.60	.548	.245
	Total	236	2.88	.859	.056
My job security	20-29	8	3.50	.756	.267
	30-39	39	3.31	.832	.133
	40-49	61	3.23	.920	.118
	50-59	87	3.44	.742	.080
	60-69	35	3.71	.519	.088
	70 and above	5	3.60	.894	.400
	Total	235	3.41	.792	.052
My Salary	20-29	8	2.38	.916	.324
	30-39	40	2.68	.917	.145
	40-49	61	2.57	.846	.108
	50-59	87	2.68	.869	.093
	60-69	35	2.74	.886	.150
	70 and above	5	2.80	1.304	.583
	Total	236	2.65	.879	.057
My Benefits	20-29	8	3.13	.641	.227
	30-39	40	2.80	.939	.148
	40-49	60	2.70	.869	.112
	50-59	87	2.87	.873	.094
	60-69	35	3.00	.907	.153
	70 and above	5	3.00	1.000	.447
	Total	235	2.85	.883	.058
The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach	20-29	8	3.50	.756	.267
	30-39	40	3.25	.870	.138
	40-49	61	3.48	.721	.092
	50-59	86	3.40	.830	.090
	60-69	34	3.65	.597	.102
	70 and above	5	3.40	1.342	.600
	Total	234	3.43	.790	.052

NSOPF descriptive statistics by age (continued)

The authority I have to make decisions about the content and methods in the courses I teach	20-29	8	3.88	.354	.125
	30-39	40	3.70	.723	.114
	40-49	61	3.80	.440	.056
	50-59	86	3.79	.437	.047
	60-69	34	3.85	.359	.062
	70 and above	5	4.00	.000	.000
	Total	234	3.79	.482	.032
The authority I have to make decisions about other aspects of my job	20-29	8	3.50	.535	.189
	30-39	40	3.10	.871	.138
	40-49	60	3.38	.640	.083
	50-59	87	3.39	.617	.066
	60-69	33	3.52	.566	.098
	70 and above	5	3.40	.548	.245
	Total	233	3.36	.669	.044
The mix of teaching, research, administration, and service that I am required to do	20-29	8	3.38	.916	.324
	30-39	40	3.03	.800	.127
	40-49	61	2.98	.846	.108
	50-59	86	3.08	.770	.083
	60-69	33	3.30	.684	.119
	70 and above	5	3.60	.548	.245
	Total	233	3.10	.790	.052
The opportunity for advancement in rank at my institution	20-29	8	3.00	1.309	.463
	30-39	40	3.10	.841	.133
	40-49	61	3.05	.884	.113
	50-59	85	3.13	.973	.106
	60-69	34	3.24	.855	.147
	70 and above	5	3.00	1.000	.447
	Total	233	3.11	.917	.060
Time available for keeping current in my field	20-29	8	2.75	1.035	.366
	30-39	40	2.30	.992	.157
	40-49	60	2.28	.976	.126
	50-59	87	2.55	.759	.081
	60-69	34	2.50	.826	.142
	70 and above	5	2.80	.837	.374
	Total	234	2.44	.883	.058

NSOPF descriptive statistics by age (continued)

Availability of support services and equipment (clerical support, computers, etc.)	20-29	8	3.00	.756	.267
	30-39	40	2.75	.954	.151
	40-49	61	2.79	.933	.119
	50-59	87	2.86	.851	.091
	60-69	35	3.14	.879	.149
	70 and above	5	3.20	.837	.374
	Total	236	2.88	.893	.058
Freedom to do outside consulting	20-29	8	3.38	.744	.263
	30-39	37	3.19	.811	.133
	40-49	60	3.37	.610	.079
	50-59	83	3.16	.773	.085
	60-69	32	3.44	.669	.118
	70 and above	5	3.80	.447	.200
	Total	225	3.28	.724	.048
Overall reputation of the institution	20-29	8	3.50	1.069	.378
	30-39	39	2.85	.904	.145
	40-49	61	3.25	.830	.106
	50-59	86	3.22	.621	.067
	60-69	34	3.47	.662	.114
	70 and above	5	3.80	.447	.200
	Total	233	3.22	.772	.051
Reputation of my department	20-29	8	3.38	1.061	.375
	30-39	40	3.00	.847	.134
	40-49	61	3.34	.947	.121
	50-59	87	3.40	.655	.070
	60-69	35	3.57	.608	.103
	70 and above	5	4.00	.000	.000
	Total	236	3.36	.794	.052
Institutional mission or philosophy	20-29	8	3.88	.354	.125
	30-39	40	3.48	.679	.107
	40-49	61	3.67	.507	.065
	50-59	86	3.60	.559	.060
	60-69	35	3.86	.355	.060
	70 and above	5	4.00	.000	.000
	Total	235	3.66	.543	.035
Quality of leadership in my department	20-29	8	3.25	1.035	.366
	30-39	40	3.10	.955	.151
	40-49	61	3.30	.882	.113
	50-59	87	3.43	.816	.087
	60-69	34	3.71	.629	.108
	70 and above	5	3.60	.548	.245
	Total	235	3.37	.850	.055

NSOPF descriptive statistics by age (continued)

Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution	20-29	8	3.63	.518	.183
	30-39	40	3.15	.864	.137
	40-49	61	3.11	.877	.112
	50-59	87	2.95	.987	.106
	60-69	34	3.38	.888	.152
	70 and above	5	3.60	.548	.245
	Total	235	3.13	.916	.060
Quality of my colleagues in my department	20-29	8	3.00	1.069	.378
	30-39	40	3.45	.749	.118
	40-49	60	3.43	.698	.090
	50-59	86	3.52	.608	.066
	60-69	34	3.68	.589	.101
	70 and above	5	3.80	.447	.200
	Total	233	3.50	.677	.044
Quality of faculty leadership at my institution	20-29	8	3.38	.744	.263
	30-39	40	3.00	.816	.129
	40-49	61	2.97	.912	.117
	50-59	86	3.12	.758	.082
	60-69	35	3.46	.657	.111
	70 and above	5	3.20	.837	.374
	Total	235	3.12	.808	.053
Relationship between administration and faculty at this institution	20-29	8	3.25	.707	.250
	30-39	40	2.68	.917	.145
	40-49	61	2.74	.929	.119
	50-59	86	2.66	.902	.097
	60-69	35	3.20	.833	.141
	70 and above	5	3.20	.837	.374
	Total	235	2.80	.911	.059
Interdepartmental cooperation at this institution	20-29	8	2.75	.707	.250
	30-39	40	2.60	.810	.128
	40-49	61	2.70	.919	.118
	50-59	86	2.85	.712	.077
	60-69	35	3.17	.747	.126
	70 and above	5	2.60	.894	.400
	Total	235	2.81	.807	.053
Spirit of cooperation between faculty at this institution	20-29	8	3.00	.756	.267
	30-39	40	2.90	.744	.118
	40-49	61	2.92	.862	.110
	50-59	87	3.13	.696	.075
	60-69	35	3.49	.612	.103
	70 and above	5	3.20	.837	.374
	Total	236	3.08	.762	.050

NSOPF descriptive statistics by age (continued)

Quality of my research facilities and support	20-29	8	2.50	.926	.327
	30-39	39	2.21	.864	.138
	40-49	59	2.34	.863	.112
	50-59	82	2.49	.724	.080
	60-69	33	2.55	.971	.169
	70 and above	4	2.50	1.291	.645
	Total	225	2.41	.841	.056
Quality of students whom I have taught here	20-29	8	3.00	1.069	.378
	30-39	40	2.90	.744	.118
	40-49	61	3.13	.763	.098
	50-59	87	2.95	.714	.077
	60-69	35	3.37	.690	.117
	70 and above	5	3.80	.447	.200
	Total	236	3.07	.754	.049
Teaching assistance that I receive	20-29	7	2.71	1.113	.421
	30-39	37	2.54	.836	.138
	40-49	56	2.50	.831	.111
	50-59	80	2.70	.833	.093
	60-69	31	3.00	1.033	.185
	70 and above	4	3.75	.500	.250
	Total	215	2.68	.887	.061
Research assistance that I receive	20-29	7	2.71	.951	.360
	30-39	37	2.19	.877	.144
	40-49	52	2.15	.849	.118
	50-59	78	2.44	.783	.089
	60-69	26	2.46	1.104	.216
	70 and above	3	3.00	1.000	.577
	Total	203	2.34	.878	.062
Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area	20-29	8	2.63	1.188	.420
	30-39	36	3.11	.785	.131
	40-49	57	3.37	.723	.096
	50-59	81	3.27	.775	.086
	60-69	26	3.50	.707	.139
	70 and above	5	3.60	.548	.245
	Total	213	3.28	.780	.053
My overall satisfaction with my job here	20-29	8	3.50	.535	.189
	30-39	39	3.31	.694	.111
	40-49	61	3.49	.622	.080
	50-59	87	3.39	.617	.066
	60-69	35	3.71	.519	.088
	70 and above	5	4.00	.000	.000
	Total	235	3.47	.622	.041

NSOPF descriptive statistics by age (continued)

If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	Age	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Leave to Retire	20-29	8	1.25	.463	.164
	30-39	41	1.59	.836	.131
	40-49	61	2.03	.912	.117
	50-59	87	2.29	.888	.095
	60-69	35	2.86	.430	.073
	70 and above	4	3.00	.000	.000
	Total	236	2.16	.913	.059
Return to school as a student	20-29	8	1.50	.756	.267
	30-39	41	1.29	.602	.094
	40-49	61	1.11	.370	.047
	50-59	87	1.20	.453	.049
	60-69	34	1.15	.436	.075
	70 and above	3	1.00	.000	.000
	Total	234	1.19	.474	.031
Accept employment at another Christian college or university	20-29	8	2.38	.518	.183
	30-39	41	2.29	.559	.087
	40-49	61	2.10	.597	.076
	50-59	87	2.02	.682	.073
	60-69	34	1.44	.613	.105
	70 and above	3	1.67	.577	.333
	Total	234	2.01	.671	.044
Accept employment at a secular college or university	20-29	8	2.38	.744	.263
	30-39	41	1.88	.714	.112
	40-49	61	1.69	.647	.083
	50-59	86	1.57	.624	.067
	60-69	34	1.26	.448	.077
	70 and above	3	1.33	.577	.333
	Total	233	1.64	.663	.043
Accept employment in consulting or other for-profit business or industry or become self-employed	20-29	8	2.00	.756	.267
	30-39	41	1.51	.597	.093
	40-49	61	1.69	.743	.095
	50-59	87	1.57	.741	.079
	60-69	34	1.47	.662	.114
	70 and above	3	1.67	.577	.333
	Total	234	1.59	.707	.046
Accept employment in a non-profit organization	20-29	8	1.88	.641	.227
	30-39	41	1.59	.591	.092
	40-49	61	1.85	.679	.087
	50-59	86	1.74	.598	.064
	60-69	34	1.59	.657	.113
	70 and above	3	1.33	.577	.333
	Total	233	1.72	.633	.041

NSOPF descriptive statistics by age (continued)

If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?	Age	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
	Research	20-29	8	1.75	.707
30-39		41	1.49	.553	.086
40-49		60	1.57	.745	.096
50-59		86	1.59	.621	.067
60-69		33	1.58	.614	.107
70 and above		3	1.67	.577	.333
Total		231	1.57	.641	.042
Teaching	20-29	8	2.00	.535	.189
	30-39	41	2.20	.679	.106
	40-49	61	2.11	.608	.078
	50-59	85	2.11	.512	.056
	60-69	34	2.26	.567	.097
	70 and above	3	2.33	.577	.333
	Total	232	2.15	.577	.038
Advising	20-29	8	2.13	.641	.227
	30-39	41	2.10	.490	.077
	40-49	61	2.28	.552	.071
	50-59	85	2.22	.543	.059
	60-69	33	2.33	.540	.094
	70 and above	3	2.33	.577	.333
	Total	231	2.23	.539	.035
Service	20-29	8	1.88	.641	.227
	30-39	41	2.12	.510	.080
	40-49	61	2.15	.573	.073
	50-59	86	2.08	.536	.058
	60-69	34	2.35	.544	.093
	70 and above	3	3.00	.000	.000
	Total	233	2.15	.556	.036
Administration	20-29	8	2.00	.535	.189
	30-39	40	2.17	.594	.094
	40-49	60	2.28	.715	.092
	50-59	86	2.26	.723	.078
	60-69	33	2.61	.496	.086
	70 and above	3	1.33	.577	.333
	Total	230	2.28	.681	.045

NSOPF descriptive statistics by age (continued)

If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?	Age	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Salary Level	20-29	8	2.63	.518	.183
	30-39	41	2.51	.506	.079
	40-49	61	2.49	.566	.073
	50-59	87	2.45	.523	.056
	60-69	35	2.20	.677	.114
	70 and above	5	2.60	.548	.245
	Total	237	2.44	.562	.036
Position Level	20-29	8	2.25	.707	.250
	30-39	40	2.33	.526	.083
	40-49	61	2.34	.544	.070
	50-59	87	2.41	.639	.068
	60-69	35	2.20	.719	.122
	70 and above	5	2.60	.548	.245
	Total	236	2.35	.610	.040
Job Security	20-29	8	2.50	.756	.267
	30-39	40	2.68	.526	.083
	40-49	61	2.70	.495	.063
	50-59	87	2.53	.607	.065
	60-69	35	2.11	.758	.128
	70 and above	5	2.60	.548	.245
	Total	236	2.54	.621	.040
Opportunities for advancement	20-29	8	2.63	.518	.183
	30-39	41	2.41	.591	.092
	40-49	61	2.52	.566	.072
	50-59	87	2.20	.713	.076
	60-69	35	2.03	.785	.133
	70 and above	5	2.40	.548	.245
	Total	237	2.31	.679	.044
Benefits	20-29	8	2.63	.744	.263
	30-39	41	2.66	.480	.075
	40-49	61	2.72	.452	.058
	50-59	87	2.68	.494	.053
	60-69	35	2.49	.612	.103
	70 and above	5	2.60	.548	.245
	Total	237	2.65	.511	.033
No pressure to publish	20-29	8	1.88	.835	.295
	30-39	41	2.07	.685	.107
	40-49	61	2.23	.739	.095
	50-59	87	2.03	.723	.077
	60-69	35	2.43	.655	.111
	70 and above	5	2.80	.447	.200
	Total	237	2.16	.725	.047

NSOPF descriptive statistics by age (continued)

Academic Freedom	20-29	8	2.50	.535	.189
	30-39	41	2.44	.634	.099
	40-49	61	2.66	.513	.066
	50-59	87	2.55	.545	.058
	60-69	35	2.66	.539	.091
	70 and above	5	2.80	.447	.200
	Total	237	2.58	.552	.036
Good research facilities and equipment	20-29	8	2.25	.707	.250
	30-39	41	2.34	.575	.090
	40-49	61	2.11	.608	.078
	50-59	87	2.02	.715	.077
	60-69	33	2.15	.667	.116
	70 and above	5	1.80	.837	.374
	Total	235	2.12	.665	.043
Good instructional facilities and equipment	20-29	8	2.50	.535	.189
	30-39	41	2.56	.550	.086
	40-49	61	2.54	.535	.068
	50-59	87	2.54	.606	.065
	60-69	34	2.59	.557	.096
	70 and above	5	2.40	.548	.245
	Total	236	2.55	.563	.037
Excellent Students	20-29	8	2.38	.518	.183
	30-39	41	2.56	.550	.086
	40-49	61	2.38	.522	.067
	50-59	87	2.37	.612	.066
	60-69	35	2.46	.561	.095
	70 and above	5	2.80	.447	.200
	Total	237	2.43	.567	.037
Excellent Colleagues	20-29	8	2.38	.518	.183
	30-39	41	2.80	.401	.063
	40-49	61	2.62	.489	.063
	50-59	87	2.60	.516	.055
	60-69	35	2.77	.426	.072
	70 and above	5	2.80	.447	.200
	Total	237	2.66	.483	.031
New institution is a Christian college	20-29	8	1.88	.835	.295
	30-39	41	2.22	.613	.096
	40-49	61	2.23	.739	.095
	50-59	87	2.32	.739	.079
	60-69	35	2.34	.684	.116
	70 and above	5	2.80	.447	.200
	Total	237	2.28	.712	.046

NSOPF descriptive statistics by age (continued)

Institutional mission or philosophy that is compatible with my own view	20-29	8	2.50	.535	.189
	30-39	41	2.66	.530	.083
	40-49	60	2.63	.551	.071
	50-59	87	2.67	.521	.056
	60-69	35	2.69	.471	.080
	70 and above	5	3.00	.000	.000
	Total	236	2.66	.517	.034
Good job for my spouse	20-29	8	2.50	.756	.267
	30-39	40	2.17	.844	.133
	40-49	57	2.14	.811	.107
	50-59	85	2.21	.818	.089
	60-69	32	1.56	.840	.148
	70 and above	4	1.75	.957	.479
	Total	226	2.10	.848	.056
Good geographic location	20-29	8	2.88	.354	.125
	30-39	41	2.39	.586	.092
	40-49	61	2.54	.594	.076
	50-59	86	2.44	.625	.067
	60-69	34	2.24	.741	.127
	70 and above	4	2.50	.577	.289
	Total	234	2.44	.628	.041
Affordable Housing	20-29	8	2.25	.886	.313
	30-39	41	2.49	.506	.079
	40-49	60	2.55	.622	.080
	50-59	87	2.60	.516	.055
	60-69	34	2.32	.768	.132
	70 and above	4	2.00	.816	.408
	Total	234	2.50	.609	.040
Good environment/schools for my children	20-29	8	2.13	.991	.350
	30-39	40	2.53	.679	.107
	40-49	57	2.23	.887	.117
	50-59	82	1.65	.852	.094
	60-69	32	1.50	.803	.142
	70 and above	4	1.00	.000	.000
	Total	223	1.94	.908	.061
A full-time position	20-29	8	2.75	.463	.164
	30-39	41	2.90	.374	.058
	40-49	60	2.95	.220	.028
	50-59	85	2.76	.527	.057
	60-69	32	2.09	.893	.158
	70 and above	5	2.40	.894	.400
	Total	231	2.74	.586	.039

NSOPF descriptive statistics by age (continued)

	20-29	8	1.38	.518	.183
	30-39	39	1.28	.510	.082
	40-49	59	1.17	.461	.060
	50-59	82	1.27	.522	.058
	60-69	35	1.63	.808	.136
	70 and above	4	1.25	.500	.250
	Total	227	1.30	.572	.038
A part-time position					
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Age	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
It is important for faculty to participate in governing their institution	20-29	8	3.75	.707	.250
	30-39	41	3.59	.547	.085
	40-49	61	3.64	.606	.078
	50-59	86	3.69	.515	.056
	60-69	35	3.60	.604	.102
	70 and above	5	3.40	.548	.245
	Total	236	3.64	.563	.037
Faculty promotions should be based at least in part on formal student evaluations	20-29	8	2.88	.835	.295
	30-39	41	3.05	.805	.126
	40-49	61	3.08	.690	.088
	50-59	87	2.85	.785	.084
	60-69	35	2.83	.747	.126
	70 and above	5	3.00	1.225	.548
	Total	237	2.95	.771	.050
The tenure system in higher education should be preserved.	20-29	8	2.88	.835	.295
	30-39	41	2.85	.937	.146
	40-49	61	2.75	.960	.123
	50-59	87	2.93	.962	.103
	60-69	34	2.56	.927	.159
	70 and above	5	2.80	.837	.374
	Total	236	2.81	.945	.062
Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty	20-29	8	3.25	.707	.250
	30-39	41	3.27	.549	.086
	40-49	61	3.25	.699	.089
	50-59	86	3.36	.649	.070
	60-69	35	3.26	.741	.125
	70 and above	5	3.80	.447	.200
	Total	236	3.31	.659	.043
Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	20-29	8	2.25	.886	.313
	30-39	41	2.05	.590	.092
	40-49	61	1.92	.690	.088
	50-59	87	1.89	.706	.076
	60-69	35	1.71	.710	.120
	70 and above	5	1.60	.548	.245
	Total	237	1.90	.691	.045

NSOPF descriptive statistics by age (continued)

Years of service/advanced degree should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	20-29	8	2.38	1.061	.375
	30-39	41	2.54	.674	.105
	40-49	61	2.62	.820	.105
	50-59	85	2.46	.716	.078
	60-69	35	2.17	.707	.119
	70 and above	5	2.60	1.140	.510
	Total	235	2.47	.764	.050
The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution	20-29	8	2.50	.535	.189
	30-39	39	2.64	.811	.130
	40-49	60	2.75	.836	.108
	50-59	85	2.80	.897	.097
	60-69	34	2.76	.987	.169
	70 and above	5	2.80	.837	.374
	Total	231	2.74	.865	.057
State or federally mandated assessment requirements have improved the quality of undergraduate education at my institution	20-29	7	2.86	.690	.261
	30-39	40	2.33	.797	.126
	40-49	59	2.17	.769	.100
	50-59	85	2.20	.856	.093
	60-69	32	2.22	.906	.160
	70 and above	5	1.80	.837	.374
	Total	228	2.23	.829	.055
Female faculty members are treated fairly at my institution	20-29	8	3.38	.518	.183
	30-39	40	3.25	.742	.117
	40-49	61	3.23	.824	.106
	50-59	87	3.22	.784	.084
	60-69	34	3.32	.638	.109
	70 and above	5	3.80	.447	.200
	Total	235	3.26	.754	.049
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at my institution	20-29	8	3.50	.756	.267
	30-39	38	3.29	.694	.113
	40-49	60	3.18	.873	.113
	50-59	87	3.33	.710	.076
	60-69	35	3.26	.817	.138
	70 and above	5	3.60	.894	.400
	Total	233	3.29	.771	.050
My institution effectively meets the educational needs of entering students	20-29	8	3.50	.756	.267
	30-39	40	3.03	.832	.131
	40-49	61	3.26	.772	.099
	50-59	86	3.21	.635	.068
	60-69	34	3.32	.535	.092
	70 and above	5	3.60	.548	.245
	Total	234	3.23	.703	.046

NSOPF descriptive statistics by age (continued)

If I had it to do over again, I would choose an academic career	20-29	8	3.75	.463	.164
	30-39	41	3.76	.435	.068
	40-49	61	3.77	.589	.075
	50-59	87	3.80	.478	.051
	60-69	35	3.86	.355	.060
	70 and above	5	3.20	1.304	.583
	Total	237	3.78	.515	.033

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Institution	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
My Work Load	Institution 1	29	2.83	.602	.112
	Institution 2	19	2.95	.970	.223
	Institution 3	28	2.93	.858	.162
	Institution 4	19	2.63	.831	.191
	Institution 5	35	2.83	.923	.156
	Institution 6	14	2.50	.760	.203
	Institution 7	24	3.13	.797	.163
	Institution 8	9	2.44	1.130	.377
	Institution 9	32	3.09	.856	.151
	Institution 10	26	2.92	.935	.183
	Total	235	2.88	.861	.056
My job security	Institution 1	29	3.59	.568	.105
	Institution 2	19	3.16	.898	.206
	Institution 3	27	3.37	.884	.170
	Institution 4	19	3.32	.885	.203
	Institution 5	35	3.63	.646	.109
	Institution 6	14	3.21	1.122	.300
	Institution 7	24	3.33	.761	.155
	Institution 8	9	3.22	.667	.222
	Institution 9	32	3.63	.660	.117
	Institution 10	26	3.12	.993	.195
	Total	234	3.40	.808	.053
My Salary	Institution 1	29	2.31	1.004	.186
	Institution 2	19	2.89	.937	.215
	Institution 3	28	2.79	.917	.173
	Institution 4	19	2.84	.688	.158
	Institution 5	35	2.63	.690	.117
	Institution 6	14	2.86	1.099	.294
	Institution 7	24	2.50	1.063	.217
	Institution 8	9	1.89	.601	.200
	Institution 9	32	2.78	.659	.117
	Institution 10	26	2.69	.928	.182
	Total	235	2.65	.886	.058

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

My Benefits	Institution 1	29	2.34	.936	.174
	Institution 2	19	2.84	.688	.158
	Institution 3	28	3.14	.756	.143
	Institution 4	19	2.42	.769	.176
	Institution 5	35	2.91	.781	.132
	Institution 6	14	3.36	.745	.199
	Institution 7	23	2.91	.996	.208
	Institution 8	9	2.33	.866	.289
	Institution 9	32	3.25	.803	.142
	Institution 10	26	2.62	.983	.193
	Total	234	2.84	.891	.058
The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach	Institution 1	29	3.52	.738	.137
	Institution 2	19	3.05	1.079	.247
	Institution 3	28	3.61	.685	.130
	Institution 4	19	3.32	.885	.203
	Institution 5	35	3.49	.702	.119
	Institution 6	14	3.50	.760	.203
	Institution 7	24	3.13	.947	.193
	Institution 8	8	3.75	.463	.164
	Institution 9	31	3.52	.677	.122
	Institution 10	26	3.38	.804	.158
	Total	233	3.42	.795	.052
The authority I have to make decisions about the content and methods in the courses I teach	Institution 1	29	3.76	.577	.107
	Institution 2	19	3.63	.684	.157
	Institution 3	28	3.79	.630	.119
	Institution 4	19	3.68	.478	.110
	Institution 5	35	3.86	.430	.073
	Institution 6	14	3.93	.267	.071
	Institution 7	24	3.71	.464	.095
	Institution 8	8	3.88	.354	.125
	Institution 9	31	3.94	.250	.045
	Institution 10	26	3.73	.452	.089
	Total	233	3.79	.486	.032
The authority I have to make decisions about other aspects of my job	Institution 1	29	3.31	.604	.112
	Institution 2	19	3.16	.958	.220
	Institution 3	28	3.32	.772	.146
	Institution 4	19	3.42	.507	.116
	Institution 5	34	3.41	.609	.104
	Institution 6	14	3.43	.514	.137
	Institution 7	24	3.29	.624	.127
	Institution 8	9	3.44	.527	.176
	Institution 9	31	3.42	.765	.137
	Institution 10	25	3.40	.645	.129
	Total	232	3.36	.669	.044

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

The mix of teaching, research, administration, and service that I am required to do	Institution 1	29	3.24	.830	.154
	Institution 2	19	2.89	.875	.201
	Institution 3	28	3.04	.793	.150
	Institution 4	19	3.00	.667	.153
	Institution 5	35	3.26	.701	.118
	Institution 6	14	2.86	.663	.177
	Institution 7	23	3.13	.694	.145
	Institution 8	9	2.67	1.000	.333
	Institution 9	31	3.19	.910	.163
	Institution 10	26	3.12	.816	.160
	Total	233	3.09	.793	.052
The opportunity for advancement in rank at my institution	Institution 1	29	3.03	1.017	.189
	Institution 2	19	3.11	.809	.186
	Institution 3	27	2.85	1.027	.198
	Institution 4	19	3.11	.809	.186
	Institution 5	35	3.09	.919	.155
	Institution 6	14	2.93	.829	.221
	Institution 7	24	3.21	.932	.190
	Institution 8	9	3.22	.833	.278
	Institution 9	31	3.42	.923	.166
	Institution 10	26	3.12	.909	.178
	Total	233	3.11	.917	.060
Time available for keeping current in my field	Institution 1	29	2.38	1.015	.188
	Institution 2	19	2.32	.946	.217
	Institution 3	28	2.54	.922	.174
	Institution 4	19	2.11	.567	.130
	Institution 5	35	2.54	.780	.132
	Institution 6	14	2.36	.633	.169
	Institution 7	23	2.78	.850	.177
	Institution 8	9	2.00	.707	.236
	Institution 9	31	2.48	.962	.173
	Institution 10	26	2.46	1.029	.202
	Total	233	2.44	.884	.058

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

Availability of support services and equipment (clerical support, computers, etc.)	Institution 1	29	2.66	.936	.174
	Institution 2	19	2.58	.838	.192
	Institution 3	28	2.86	1.113	.210
	Institution 4	19	3.16	.501	.115
	Institution 5	35	3.11	.718	.121
	Institution 6	14	2.50	.941	.251
	Institution 7	24	3.00	.885	.181
	Institution 8	9	2.00	.866	.289
	Institution 9	32	3.00	.803	.142
	Institution 10	26	3.00	.938	.184
	Total	235	2.87	.894	.058
Freedom to do outside consulting	Institution 1	27	3.37	.742	.143
	Institution 2	19	3.11	.875	.201
	Institution 3	27	3.26	.813	.156
	Institution 4	17	3.12	.485	.118
	Institution 5	35	3.46	.505	.085
	Institution 6	13	3.08	.760	.211
	Institution 7	24	3.00	1.022	.209
	Institution 8	7	3.14	.690	.261
	Institution 9	31	3.35	.608	.109
	Institution 10	25	3.48	.653	.131
	Total	225	3.28	.729	.049
Overall reputation of the institution	Institution 1	29	3.34	.614	.114
	Institution 2	19	3.11	.937	.215
	Institution 3	28	2.93	.858	.162
	Institution 4	19	2.84	.765	.175
	Institution 5	35	3.71	.458	.077
	Institution 6	14	2.93	.616	.165
	Institution 7	23	3.43	.590	.123
	Institution 8	9	2.89	.601	.200
	Institution 9	31	3.35	.839	.151
	Institution 10	25	3.04	.889	.178
	Total	232	3.22	.774	.051

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

Reputation of my department	Institution 1	29	3.41	.733	.136
	Institution 2	19	3.32	.946	.217
	Institution 3	28	3.21	.787	.149
	Institution 4	19	3.32	.885	.203
	Institution 5	35	3.77	.598	.101
	Institution 6	14	3.21	.802	.214
	Institution 7	24	3.42	.776	.158
	Institution 8	9	3.33	.866	.289
	Institution 9	32	3.34	.745	.132
	Institution 10	26	3.04	.871	.171
	Total	235	3.36	.796	.052
Institutional mission or philosophy	Institution 1	29	3.72	.455	.084
	Institution 2	19	3.47	.841	.193
	Institution 3	28	3.57	.634	.120
	Institution 4	19	3.68	.582	.134
	Institution 5	35	3.89	.323	.055
	Institution 6	14	3.50	.519	.139
	Institution 7	24	3.54	.588	.120
	Institution 8	9	3.89	.333	.111
	Institution 9	32	3.63	.492	.087
	Institution 10	25	3.60	.500	.100
	Total	234	3.65	.544	.036
Quality of leadership in my department	Institution 1	29	3.34	.974	.181
	Institution 2	19	3.37	.955	.219
	Institution 3	27	2.89	1.013	.195
	Institution 4	19	3.42	.838	.192
	Institution 5	35	3.74	.611	.103
	Institution 6	14	3.14	.949	.254
	Institution 7	24	3.29	.859	.175
	Institution 8	9	3.67	.500	.167
	Institution 9	32	3.50	.622	.110
	Institution 10	26	3.35	.846	.166
	Total	234	3.38	.851	.056
Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution	Institution 1	29	3.31	.891	.165
	Institution 2	19	3.16	.958	.220
	Institution 3	28	2.86	.891	.168
	Institution 4	19	3.00	1.000	.229
	Institution 5	35	3.11	.993	.168
	Institution 6	14	2.86	1.027	.275
	Institution 7	24	2.67	.868	.177
	Institution 8	9	3.00	.866	.289
	Institution 9	31	3.52	.570	.102
	Institution 10	26	3.35	1.018	.200
	Total	234	3.12	.926	.061

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

Quality of my colleagues in my department	Institution 1	28	3.50	.745	.141
	Institution 2	18	3.78	.428	.101
	Institution 3	28	3.21	.686	.130
	Institution 4	19	3.53	.772	.177
	Institution 5	35	3.71	.458	.077
	Institution 6	14	3.71	.611	.163
	Institution 7	23	3.35	.775	.162
	Institution 8	9	3.56	.527	.176
	Institution 9	32	3.63	.660	.117
	Institution 10	26	3.19	.749	.147
	Total	232	3.50	.677	.044
Quality of faculty leadership at my institution	Institution 1	29	3.00	.655	.122
	Institution 2	19	3.16	.834	.191
	Institution 3	28	2.79	.917	.173
	Institution 4	19	2.84	.898	.206
	Institution 5	35	3.37	.843	.143
	Institution 6	14	3.14	.663	.177
	Institution 7	24	3.13	.680	.139
	Institution 8	9	3.22	.833	.278
	Institution 9	32	3.53	.621	.110
	Institution 10	26	2.88	.864	.169
	Total	235	3.12	.808	.053
Relationship between administration and faculty at this institution	Institution 1	29	2.93	.799	.148
	Institution 2	19	2.58	1.071	.246
	Institution 3	28	2.43	.836	.158
	Institution 4	19	2.47	1.124	.258
	Institution 5	35	2.83	.954	.161
	Institution 6	14	2.79	.975	.261
	Institution 7	24	2.58	.830	.169
	Institution 8	9	3.00	.866	.289
	Institution 9	31	3.26	.682	.122
	Institution 10	26	2.85	.925	.181
	Total	234	2.78	.917	.060
Interdepartmental cooperation at this institution	Institution 1	29	2.90	.900	.167
	Institution 2	19	3.11	.459	.105
	Institution 3	28	2.75	.701	.132
	Institution 4	19	2.53	.905	.208
	Institution 5	35	2.94	.873	.147
	Institution 6	14	3.00	.877	.234
	Institution 7	24	2.54	.833	.170
	Institution 8	9	2.89	.782	.261
	Institution 9	32	3.06	.669	.118
	Institution 10	26	2.31	.788	.155
	Total	235	2.80	.815	.053

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

Spirit of cooperation between faculty at this institution	Institution 1	29	2.93	.884	.164
	Institution 2	19	3.42	.607	.139
	Institution 3	28	3.00	.816	.154
	Institution 4	19	3.00	.667	.153
	Institution 5	35	3.40	.736	.124
	Institution 6	14	2.86	.663	.177
	Institution 7	24	2.88	.850	.174
	Institution 8	9	3.33	.707	.236
	Institution 9	32	3.31	.535	.095
	Institution 10	26	2.65	.745	.146
	Total	235	3.08	.766	.050
Quality of my research facilities and support	Institution 1	29	2.45	.985	.183
	Institution 2	18	1.94	.802	.189
	Institution 3	27	2.22	.892	.172
	Institution 4	18	2.44	.784	.185
	Institution 5	32	2.69	.780	.138
	Institution 6	12	2.58	.515	.149
	Institution 7	23	2.43	.728	.152
	Institution 8	8	2.75	.707	.250
	Institution 9	31	2.52	.811	.146
	Institution 10	26	2.19	.895	.176
	Total	224	2.41	.837	.056
Quality of students whom I have taught here	Institution 1	29	3.24	.636	.118
	Institution 2	19	2.84	.688	.158
	Institution 3	28	2.96	.744	.141
	Institution 4	19	3.00	.577	.132
	Institution 5	35	3.57	.502	.085
	Institution 6	14	2.64	.745	.199
	Institution 7	24	3.25	.608	.124
	Institution 8	9	2.89	.782	.261
	Institution 9	32	2.94	.914	.162
	Institution 10	26	2.92	.935	.183
	Total	235	3.08	.755	.049
Teaching assistance that I receive	Institution 1	25	2.52	.770	.154
	Institution 2	19	2.11	.809	.186
	Institution 3	27	2.74	.984	.189
	Institution 4	17	2.41	.870	.211
	Institution 5	34	3.21	.845	.145
	Institution 6	12	2.58	.669	.193
	Institution 7	21	2.81	.814	.178
	Institution 8	7	2.86	.900	.340
	Institution 9	30	2.67	.802	.146
	Institution 10	24	2.63	.970	.198
Total	216	2.69	.886	.060	

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

Research assistance that I receive	Institution 1	23	2.39	.783	.163
	Institution 2	19	1.84	.765	.175
	Institution 3	25	2.28	.980	.196
	Institution 4	16	2.19	.750	.188
	Institution 5	30	2.67	.959	.175
	Institution 6	11	2.55	.688	.207
	Institution 7	19	2.53	.772	.177
	Institution 8	7	2.57	.976	.369
	Institution 9	30	2.27	.907	.166
	Institution 10	24	2.21	.884	.180
	Total	204	2.34	.876	.061
Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area	Institution 1	26	3.04	.720	.141
	Institution 2	16	3.06	.854	.213
	Institution 3	25	3.32	.690	.138
	Institution 4	18	3.22	.647	.152
	Institution 5	34	3.59	.657	.113
	Institution 6	11	3.00	1.000	.302
	Institution 7	22	3.68	.477	.102
	Institution 8	7	3.14	.900	.340
	Institution 9	30	3.40	.675	.123
	Institution 10	24	2.96	1.083	.221
	Total	213	3.29	.782	.054
My overall satisfaction with my job here	Institution 1	29	3.52	.574	.107
	Institution 2	19	3.26	.872	.200
	Institution 3	28	3.43	.573	.108
	Institution 4	19	3.47	.612	.140
	Institution 5	35	3.63	.490	.083
	Institution 6	13	3.15	.899	.249
	Institution 7	24	3.46	.588	.120
	Institution 8	9	3.22	.667	.222
	Institution 9	32	3.63	.492	.087
	Institution 10	26	3.38	.697	.137
	Total	234	3.46	.629	.041

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	Institution	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Leave to Retire	Institution 1	29	2.55	.783	.145
	Institution 2	19	1.84	1.015	.233
	Institution 3	29	2.10	.900	.167
	Institution 4	19	2.16	.958	.220
	Institution 5	35	2.43	.815	.138
	Institution 6	14	2.14	.949	.254
	Institution 7	23	2.13	.920	.192
	Institution 8	9	1.78	.972	.324
	Institution 9	32	2.06	.948	.168
	Institution 10	26	1.96	.916	.180
	Total	235	2.16	.915	.060
Return to school as a student	Institution 1	29	1.10	.310	.058
	Institution 2	19	1.26	.452	.104
	Institution 3	28	1.29	.600	.113
	Institution 4	19	1.32	.671	.154
	Institution 5	35	1.06	.236	.040
	Institution 6	14	1.00	.000	.000
	Institution 7	23	1.13	.344	.072
	Institution 8	9	1.00	.000	.000
	Institution 9	31	1.16	.454	.082
	Institution 10	26	1.42	.643	.126
	Total	233	1.18	.460	.030
Accept employment at another Christian college or university	Institution 1	29	1.90	.618	.115
	Institution 2	19	2.16	.834	.191
	Institution 3	28	1.89	.832	.157
	Institution 4	19	1.84	.602	.138
	Institution 5	35	1.91	.612	.103
	Institution 6	14	2.00	.679	.182
	Institution 7	23	2.22	.518	.108
	Institution 8	9	2.22	.833	.278
	Institution 9	31	2.00	.577	.104
	Institution 10	26	2.19	.694	.136
	Total	233	2.01	.673	.044

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

Accept employment at a secular college or university	Institution 1	29	1.41	.568	.105
	Institution 2	19	1.58	.692	.159
	Institution 3	28	1.64	.826	.156
	Institution 4	19	1.63	.684	.157
	Institution 5	34	1.65	.646	.111
	Institution 6	14	1.50	.519	.139
	Institution 7	23	1.74	.689	.144
	Institution 8	9	1.33	.500	.167
	Institution 9	31	1.68	.653	.117
	Institution 10	26	1.92	.628	.123
	Total	232	1.63	.664	.044
Accept employment in consulting or other for-profit business or industry or become self-employed	Institution 1	29	1.59	.733	.136
	Institution 2	19	1.63	.761	.175
	Institution 3	28	1.75	.799	.151
	Institution 4	19	1.37	.496	.114
	Institution 5	35	1.40	.553	.093
	Institution 6	14	1.50	.650	.174
	Institution 7	23	1.78	.795	.166
	Institution 8	9	2.00	.866	.289
	Institution 9	31	1.58	.672	.121
	Institution 10	26	1.62	.752	.148
	Total	233	1.60	.707	.046
Accept employment in a non-profit organization	Institution 1	29	1.76	.636	.118
	Institution 2	19	1.79	.787	.181
	Institution 3	28	1.57	.690	.130
	Institution 4	19	1.95	.405	.093
	Institution 5	35	1.60	.604	.102
	Institution 6	14	1.64	.745	.199
	Institution 7	23	1.74	.619	.129
	Institution 8	9	1.89	.601	.200
	Institution 9	30	1.60	.498	.091
	Institution 10	26	1.88	.711	.140
	Total	232	1.72	.634	.042

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?	Institution	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Research	Institution 1	29	1.55	.686	.127
	Institution 2	19	1.37	.597	.137
	Institution 3	27	1.74	.712	.137
	Institution 4	19	1.68	.671	.154
	Institution 5	34	1.56	.561	.096
	Institution 6	14	1.64	.633	.169
	Institution 7	24	1.83	.637	.130
	Institution 8	9	1.44	.726	.242
	Institution 9	30	1.53	.629	.115
	Institution 10	25	1.36	.569	.114
	Total	230	1.58	.641	.042
Teaching	Institution 1	29	2.24	.511	.095
	Institution 2	18	2.06	.725	.171
	Institution 3	27	2.15	.662	.127
	Institution 4	19	2.21	.535	.123
	Institution 5	35	2.14	.550	.093
	Institution 6	14	2.21	.426	.114
	Institution 7	24	1.83	.565	.115
	Institution 8	9	2.22	.667	.222
	Institution 9	31	2.13	.499	.090
	Institution 10	25	2.24	.663	.133
	Total	231	2.14	.581	.038
Advising	Institution 1	29	2.31	.471	.087
	Institution 2	19	2.11	.658	.151
	Institution 3	27	2.44	.577	.111
	Institution 4	19	2.26	.562	.129
	Institution 5	35	2.17	.453	.077
	Institution 6	14	2.21	.426	.114
	Institution 7	24	2.00	.590	.120
	Institution 8	7	1.86	.378	.143
	Institution 9	31	2.29	.529	.095
	Institution 10	25	2.28	.542	.108
	Total	230	2.23	.538	.035

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

Service	Institution 1	29	2.28	.591	.110
	Institution 2	19	2.26	.452	.104
	Institution 3	27	2.30	.542	.104
	Institution 4	19	2.11	.567	.130
	Institution 5	35	2.06	.539	.091
	Institution 6	14	2.07	.616	.165
	Institution 7	24	2.08	.654	.133
	Institution 8	9	2.11	.333	.111
	Institution 9	31	2.13	.619	.111
	Institution 10	25	2.04	.539	.108
	Total	232	2.15	.562	.037
Administration	Institution 1	28	2.46	.637	.120
	Institution 2	19	2.21	.787	.181
	Institution 3	27	2.26	.712	.137
	Institution 4	18	2.28	.669	.158
	Institution 5	35	2.29	.622	.105
	Institution 6	14	2.43	.756	.202
	Institution 7	24	2.21	.779	.159
	Institution 8	8	2.63	.744	.263
	Institution 9	31	2.26	.631	.113
	Institution 10	25	2.04	.611	.122
	Total	229	2.28	.682	.045
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?					
	Age	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Salary Level	Institution 1	29	2.21	.559	.104
	Institution 2	19	2.53	.612	.140
	Institution 3	29	2.48	.509	.094
	Institution 4	19	2.26	.562	.129
	Institution 5	35	2.63	.490	.083
	Institution 6	14	2.29	.469	.125
	Institution 7	24	2.50	.511	.104
	Institution 8	9	2.33	.500	.167
	Institution 9	32	2.34	.653	.115
	Institution 10	26	2.62	.571	.112
	Total	236	2.44	.561	.037

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

Position Level	Institution 1	29	2.31	.660	.123
	Institution 2	19	2.42	.692	.159
	Institution 3	29	2.38	.677	.126
	Institution 4	19	2.26	.452	.104
	Institution 5	35	2.43	.608	.103
	Institution 6	14	2.07	.475	.127
	Institution 7	23	2.43	.507	.106
	Institution 8	9	2.22	.441	.147
	Institution 9	32	2.34	.653	.115
	Institution 10	26	2.35	.689	.135
	Total	235	2.34	.610	.040
Job Security	Institution 1	29	2.62	.677	.126
	Institution 2	19	2.47	.772	.177
	Institution 3	29	2.62	.494	.092
	Institution 4	19	2.37	.496	.114
	Institution 5	35	2.60	.604	.102
	Institution 6	14	2.36	.842	.225
	Institution 7	23	2.48	.665	.139
	Institution 8	9	2.56	.527	.176
	Institution 9	32	2.56	.564	.100
	Institution 10	26	2.58	.643	.126
	Total	235	2.54	.621	.041
Opportunities for advancement	Institution 1	29	2.28	.797	.148
	Institution 2	19	2.42	.607	.139
	Institution 3	29	2.48	.634	.118
	Institution 4	19	2.16	.602	.138
	Institution 5	35	2.49	.562	.095
	Institution 6	14	1.71	.914	.244
	Institution 7	24	2.25	.608	.124
	Institution 8	9	2.22	.833	.278
	Institution 9	32	2.25	.622	.110
	Institution 10	26	2.42	.643	.126
	Total	236	2.31	.679	.044
Benefits	Institution 1	29	2.59	.628	.117
	Institution 2	19	2.74	.452	.104
	Institution 3	29	2.72	.455	.084
	Institution 4	19	2.58	.507	.116
	Institution 5	35	2.60	.497	.084
	Institution 6	14	2.57	.514	.137
	Institution 7	24	2.50	.590	.120
	Institution 8	9	2.67	.500	.167
	Institution 9	32	2.69	.535	.095
	Institution 10	26	2.81	.402	.079
	Total	236	2.65	.513	.033

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

No pressure to publish	Institution 1	29	2.07	.753	.140
	Institution 2	19	2.11	.737	.169
	Institution 3	29	2.31	.761	.141
	Institution 4	19	2.05	.848	.195
	Institution 5	35	2.23	.690	.117
	Institution 6	14	2.14	.770	.206
	Institution 7	24	2.13	.680	.139
	Institution 8	9	2.11	.333	.111
	Institution 9	32	2.19	.693	.122
	Institution 10	26	2.12	.816	.160
	Total	236	2.16	.724	.047
Academic Freedom	Institution 1	29	2.69	.541	.101
	Institution 2	19	2.68	.582	.134
	Institution 3	29	2.72	.455	.084
	Institution 4	19	2.21	.631	.145
	Institution 5	35	2.51	.562	.095
	Institution 6	14	2.64	.497	.133
	Institution 7	24	2.46	.658	.134
	Institution 8	9	2.67	.500	.167
	Institution 9	32	2.59	.499	.088
	Institution 10	26	2.58	.504	.099
	Total	236	2.58	.552	.036
Good research facilities and equipment	Institution 1	29	2.38	.677	.126
	Institution 2	19	2.32	.671	.154
	Institution 3	29	2.03	.680	.126
	Institution 4	19	2.05	.524	.120
	Institution 5	34	2.03	.717	.123
	Institution 6	14	2.00	.784	.210
	Institution 7	24	1.83	.637	.130
	Institution 8	9	2.33	.707	.236
	Institution 9	31	2.06	.574	.103
	Institution 10	26	2.27	.604	.118
	Total	234	2.12	.664	.043
Good instructional facilities and equipment	Institution 1	29	2.72	.528	.098
	Institution 2	19	2.47	.612	.140
	Institution 3	29	2.59	.501	.093
	Institution 4	19	2.53	.697	.160
	Institution 5	35	2.57	.502	.085
	Institution 6	14	2.43	.646	.173
	Institution 7	24	2.33	.637	.130
	Institution 8	9	2.78	.441	.147
	Institution 9	31	2.55	.568	.102
	Institution 10	26	2.50	.510	.100
	Total	235	2.54	.563	.037

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

Excellent Students	Institution 1	29	2.62	.494	.092
	Institution 2	19	2.42	.507	.116
	Institution 3	29	2.59	.501	.093
	Institution 4	19	2.37	.684	.157
	Institution 5	35	2.57	.502	.085
	Institution 6	14	2.21	.579	.155
	Institution 7	24	2.38	.647	.132
	Institution 8	9	2.44	.527	.176
	Institution 9	32	2.41	.560	.099
	Institution 10	26	2.04	.528	.103
	Total	236	2.42	.567	.037
Excellent Colleagues	Institution 1	29	2.79	.412	.077
	Institution 2	19	2.63	.496	.114
	Institution 3	29	2.66	.484	.090
	Institution 4	19	2.74	.452	.104
	Institution 5	35	2.63	.490	.083
	Institution 6	14	2.64	.497	.133
	Institution 7	24	2.63	.576	.118
	Institution 8	9	2.78	.441	.147
	Institution 9	32	2.69	.471	.083
	Institution 10	26	2.50	.510	.100
	Total	236	2.66	.483	.031
New institution is a Christian college	Institution 1	29	2.34	.670	.124
	Institution 2	19	2.21	.918	.211
	Institution 3	29	2.28	.702	.130
	Institution 4	19	2.21	.631	.145
	Institution 5	35	2.37	.646	.109
	Institution 6	14	2.29	.726	.194
	Institution 7	24	2.42	.717	.146
	Institution 8	9	2.67	.500	.167
	Institution 9	32	2.19	.821	.145
	Institution 10	26	2.08	.688	.135
	Total	236	2.28	.715	.047
Institutional mission or philosophy that is compatible with my own views	Institution 1	29	2.72	.455	.084
	Institution 2	19	2.58	.692	.159
	Institution 3	29	2.62	.494	.092
	Institution 4	19	2.74	.452	.104
	Institution 5	35	2.77	.426	.072
	Institution 6	14	2.79	.426	.114
	Institution 7	24	2.63	.647	.132
	Institution 8	8	3.00	.000	.000
	Institution 9	32	2.59	.560	.099
	Institution 10	26	2.46	.508	.100
	Total	235	2.66	.517	.034

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

Good job for my spouse	Institution 1	27	1.96	.854	.164
	Institution 2	18	1.61	.850	.200
	Institution 3	29	1.83	.759	.141
	Institution 4	19	2.42	.769	.176
	Institution 5	34	2.32	.843	.145
	Institution 6	14	2.07	.917	.245
	Institution 7	22	2.23	.813	.173
	Institution 8	8	1.63	.518	.183
	Institution 9	31	2.29	.864	.155
	Institution 10	24	2.21	.884	.180
	Total	226	2.10	.850	.057
Good geographic location	Institution 1	29	2.31	.660	.123
	Institution 2	19	2.53	.612	.140
	Institution 3	29	2.59	.501	.093
	Institution 4	19	2.63	.496	.114
	Institution 5	35	2.69	.530	.090
	Institution 6	14	2.14	.663	.177
	Institution 7	23	2.04	.767	.160
	Institution 8	9	2.22	.441	.147
	Institution 9	32	2.47	.621	.110
	Institution 10	25	2.44	.651	.130
	Total	234	2.44	.627	.041
Affordable Housing	Institution 1	29	2.48	.688	.128
	Institution 2	19	2.58	.607	.139
	Institution 3	29	2.45	.632	.117
	Institution 4	19	2.47	.513	.118
	Institution 5	35	2.77	.490	.083
	Institution 6	14	2.36	.633	.169
	Institution 7	23	2.35	.647	.135
	Institution 8	8	2.63	.518	.183
	Institution 9	31	2.48	.570	.102
	Institution 10	26	2.42	.703	.138
	Total	233	2.51	.610	.040
Good environment/schools for my children	Institution 1	27	1.96	.980	.189
	Institution 2	18	1.94	.802	.189
	Institution 3	28	1.96	.962	.182
	Institution 4	18	2.22	.808	.191
	Institution 5	34	2.15	.925	.159
	Institution 6	13	1.46	.877	.243
	Institution 7	22	1.91	.921	.196
	Institution 8	7	2.14	1.069	.404
	Institution 9	31	1.74	.855	.154
	Institution 10	25	1.92	.909	.182
	Total	223	1.95	.909	.061

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

A full-time position	Institution 1	27	2.74	.594	.114	
	Institution 2	19	2.74	.653	.150	
	Institution 3	28	2.71	.600	.113	
	Institution 4	18	2.78	.548	.129	
	Institution 5	35	2.66	.684	.116	
	Institution 6	14	2.57	.852	.228	
	Institution 7	24	2.83	.482	.098	
	Institution 8	8	3.00	.000	.000	
	Institution 9	32	2.81	.397	.070	
	Institution 10	25	2.64	.638	.128	
	Total	230	2.73	.587	.039	
A part-time position	Institution 1	26	1.27	.604	.118	
	Institution 2	19	1.32	.671	.154	
	Institution 3	29	1.24	.511	.095	
	Institution 4	18	1.28	.461	.109	
	Institution 5	35	1.23	.547	.092	
	Institution 6	14	1.21	.426	.114	
	Institution 7	22	1.41	.590	.126	
	Institution 8	8	1.13	.354	.125	
	Institution 9	31	1.35	.661	.119	
	Institution 10	26	1.46	.647	.127	
	Total	228	1.30	.571	.038	
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.		Institution	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
It is important for faculty to participate in governing their institution	Institution 1	28	3.57	.573	.108	
	Institution 2	19	3.79	.419	.096	
	Institution 3	29	3.62	.677	.126	
	Institution 4	19	3.58	.507	.116	
	Institution 5	35	3.71	.519	.088	
	Institution 6	14	3.64	.497	.133	
	Institution 7	24	3.75	.532	.109	
	Institution 8	9	3.44	.527	.176	
	Institution 9	32	3.56	.619	.109	
	Institution 10	26	3.62	.637	.125	
	Total	235	3.64	.563	.037	

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

Faculty promotions should be based at least in part on formal student evaluations	Institution 1	29	3.21	.726	.135
	Institution 2	19	2.68	.820	.188
	Institution 3	29	3.00	.886	.165
	Institution 4	19	3.00	.667	.153
	Institution 5	35	2.94	.765	.129
	Institution 6	14	2.71	.825	.221
	Institution 7	24	3.08	.776	.158
	Institution 8	9	3.11	.601	.200
	Institution 9	32	2.84	.677	.120
	Institution 10	26	2.81	.849	.167
	Total	236	2.94	.773	.050
The tenure system in higher education should be preserved.	Institution 1	29	3.24	.988	.183
	Institution 2	19	3.11	.937	.215
	Institution 3	29	2.97	.944	.175
	Institution 4	19	2.42	.692	.159
	Institution 5	34	2.76	.955	.164
	Institution 6	14	3.07	.829	.221
	Institution 7	24	2.38	.875	.179
	Institution 8	9	3.00	1.000	.333
	Institution 9	32	2.59	.875	.155
	Institution 10	26	2.73	1.002	.197
	Total	235	2.81	.944	.062
Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty	Institution 1	29	3.10	.772	.143
	Institution 2	19	3.47	.697	.160
	Institution 3	28	3.57	.634	.120
	Institution 4	19	3.26	.733	.168
	Institution 5	35	3.26	.701	.118
	Institution 6	14	3.43	.514	.137
	Institution 7	24	3.29	.624	.127
	Institution 8	9	3.22	.441	.147
	Institution 9	32	3.16	.574	.101
	Institution 10	26	3.38	.637	.125
	Total	235	3.31	.660	.043
Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	Institution 1	29	1.79	.675	.125
	Institution 2	19	1.84	.602	.138
	Institution 3	29	2.00	.707	.131
	Institution 4	19	2.05	.621	.143
	Institution 5	35	1.69	.676	.114
	Institution 6	14	2.21	.699	.187
	Institution 7	24	1.67	.565	.115
	Institution 8	9	2.11	.601	.200
	Institution 9	32	1.91	.734	.130
	Institution 10	26	2.12	.816	.160
	Total	236	1.90	.693	.045

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

Years of service/advanced degree should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	Institution 1	28	2.14	.803	.152
	Institution 2	19	2.53	.697	.160
	Institution 3	29	2.38	.903	.168
	Institution 4	18	2.56	.616	.145
	Institution 5	35	2.37	.770	.130
	Institution 6	14	2.57	.756	.202
	Institution 7	24	2.79	.658	.134
	Institution 8	9	2.56	.527	.176
	Institution 9	32	2.47	.718	.127
	Institution 10	26	2.62	.852	.167
	Total	234	2.47	.765	.050
The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution	Institution 1	28	3.00	.903	.171
	Institution 2	18	2.72	.895	.211
	Institution 3	28	2.89	.737	.139
	Institution 4	19	3.16	.765	.175
	Institution 5	35	2.40	.914	.154
	Institution 6	14	3.07	.730	.195
	Institution 7	24	2.92	.881	.180
	Institution 8	9	3.22	.667	.222
	Institution 9	31	2.48	.890	.160
	Institution 10	25	2.36	.700	.140
	Total	231	2.75	.867	.057
State or federally mandated assessment requirements have improved the quality of undergraduate education at my institution	Institution 1	28	2.07	.716	.135
	Institution 2	18	1.89	.832	.196
	Institution 3	27	2.48	.893	.172
	Institution 4	18	2.06	.802	.189
	Institution 5	35	2.49	.887	.150
	Institution 6	14	2.07	.829	.221
	Institution 7	23	2.43	.843	.176
	Institution 8	9	2.44	.882	.294
	Institution 9	30	1.97	.809	.148
	Institution 10	25	2.24	.663	.133
	Total	227	2.22	.830	.055
Female faculty members are treated fairly at my institution	Institution 1	28	2.89	.832	.157
	Institution 2	19	3.26	.806	.185
	Institution 3	28	3.14	.848	.160
	Institution 4	19	3.37	.597	.137
	Institution 5	35	3.49	.781	.132
	Institution 6	14	3.14	.535	.143
	Institution 7	24	3.13	.797	.163
	Institution 8	9	3.33	.866	.289
	Institution 9	32	3.22	.659	.117
	Institution 10	26	3.54	.647	.127
	Total	234	3.25	.759	.050

NSOPF descriptive statistics by institution (continued)

Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at my institution	Institution 1	29	2.97	.823	.153
	Institution 2	19	3.32	.820	.188
	Institution 3	28	3.32	.819	.155
	Institution 4	18	3.06	.725	.171
	Institution 5	35	3.46	.852	.144
	Institution 6	14	3.21	.699	.187
	Institution 7	23	3.30	.703	.147
	Institution 8	9	3.78	.441	.147
	Institution 9	32	3.19	.693	.122
	Institution 10	25	3.48	.714	.143
	Total	232	3.28	.771	.051
My institution effectively meets the educational needs of entering students	Institution 1	29	3.38	.677	.126
	Institution 2	19	3.11	.809	.186
	Institution 3	28	3.07	.766	.145
	Institution 4	19	3.16	.602	.138
	Institution 5	34	3.68	.638	.109
	Institution 6	14	3.00	.555	.148
	Institution 7	24	3.21	.509	.104
	Institution 8	9	3.22	.667	.222
	Institution 9	32	3.09	.641	.113
	Institution 10	26	3.08	.845	.166
	Total	234	3.23	.703	.046
If I had it to do over again, I would choose an academic career	Institution 1	29	3.76	.511	.095
	Institution 2	19	3.95	.229	.053
	Institution 3	29	3.72	.649	.121
	Institution 4	19	3.63	.597	.137
	Institution 5	35	3.91	.284	.048
	Institution 6	14	3.57	.514	.137
	Institution 7	24	3.71	.690	.141
	Institution 8	9	3.56	.527	.176
	Institution 9	32	3.91	.296	.052
	Institution 10	26	3.77	.652	.128
	Total	236	3.78	.516	.034

NSOPF descriptive statistics by church membership

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Church Membership	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
My Work Load	Membership Required	40	2.73	.877	.139
	Membership Not Required	197	2.90	.855	.061
	Total	237	2.87	.859	.056
My job security	Membership Required	40	3.58	.675	.107
	Membership Not Required	196	3.36	.827	.059
	Total	236	3.40	.806	.052
My Salary	Membership Required	40	2.70	.687	.109
	Membership Not Required	197	2.63	.919	.066
	Total	237	2.65	.884	.057
My Benefits	Membership Required	40	2.88	.791	.125
	Membership Not Required	196	2.83	.910	.065
	Total	236	2.84	.889	.058
The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach	Membership Required	40	3.45	.815	.129
	Membership Not Required	195	3.42	.791	.057
	Total	235	3.43	.794	.052
The authority I have to make decisions about the content and methods in the courses I teach	Membership Required	40	3.80	.464	.073
	Membership Not Required	195	3.79	.489	.035
	Total	235	3.79	.484	.032
The authority I have to make decisions about other aspects of my job	Membership Required	39	3.36	.628	.101
	Membership Not Required	195	3.36	.677	.048
	Total	234	3.36	.668	.044
The mix of teaching, research, administration, and service that I am required to do	Membership Required	40	3.10	.810	.128
	Membership Not Required	194	3.09	.790	.057
	Total	234	3.09	.791	.052
The opportunity for advancement in rank at my institution	Membership Required	40	3.03	.920	.145
	Membership Not Required	194	3.13	.916	.066
	Total	234	3.11	.915	.060
Time available for keeping current in my field	Membership Required	40	2.40	.841	.133
	Membership Not Required	195	2.45	.892	.064
	Total	235	2.44	.882	.058

NSOPF descriptive statistics by church membership (continued)

Availability of support services and equipment (clerical support, computers, etc.)	Membership Required	40	3.03	.733	.116
	Membership Not Required	197	2.84	.921	.066
	Total	237	2.87	.893	.058
Freedom to do outside consulting	Membership Required	40	3.33	.656	.104
	Membership Not Required	186	3.26	.743	.054
	Total	226	3.27	.727	.048
Overall reputation of the institution	Membership Required	40	3.65	.580	.092
	Membership Not Required	194	3.13	.777	.056
	Total	234	3.22	.771	.050
Reputation of my department	Membership Required	40	3.75	.588	.093
	Membership Not Required	197	3.28	.807	.057
	Total	237	3.36	.793	.052
Institutional mission or philosophy	Membership Required	40	3.85	.427	.067
	Membership Not Required	196	3.61	.557	.040
	Total	236	3.65	.544	.035
Quality of leadership in my department	Membership Required	40	3.50	.751	.119
	Membership Not Required	196	3.35	.867	.062
	Total	236	3.38	.849	.055
Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution	Membership Required	40	3.18	.903	.143
	Membership Not Required	196	3.11	.930	.066
	Total	236	3.12	.924	.060
Quality of my colleagues in my department	Membership Required	39	3.62	.590	.094
	Membership Not Required	195	3.48	.691	.049
	Total	234	3.50	.676	.044
Quality of faculty leadership at my institution	Membership Required	40	3.30	.823	.130
	Membership Not Required	196	3.08	.800	.057
	Total	236	3.12	.806	.052
Relationship between administration and faculty at this institution	Membership Required	40	2.75	.870	.138
	Membership Not Required	196	2.80	.928	.066
	Total	236	2.79	.917	.060
Interdepartmental cooperation at this institution	Membership Required	40	2.93	.730	.115
	Membership Not Required	196	2.78	.829	.059
	Total	236	2.80	.814	.053

NSOPF descriptive statistics by church membership (continued)

Spirit of cooperation between faculty at this institution	Membership Required	40	3.30	.723	.114
	Membership Not Required	197	3.04	.765	.055
	Total	237	3.08	.763	.050
Quality of my research facilities and support	Membership Required	38	2.55	.860	.140
	Membership Not Required	188	2.38	.834	.061
	Total	226	2.41	.839	.056
Quality of students whom I have taught here	Membership Required	40	3.40	.545	.086
	Membership Not Required	197	3.01	.776	.055
	Total	237	3.08	.755	.049
Teaching assistance that I receive	Membership Required	39	3.00	.946	.151
	Membership Not Required	177	2.62	.859	.065
	Total	216	2.69	.886	.060
Research assistance that I receive	Membership Required	36	2.44	.969	.162
	Membership Not Required	168	2.32	.856	.066
	Total	204	2.34	.876	.061
Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area	Membership Required	39	3.44	.788	.126
	Membership Not Required	175	3.25	.777	.059
	Total	214	3.29	.780	.053
My overall satisfaction with my job here	Membership Required	40	3.60	.496	.078
	Membership Not Required	196	3.43	.649	.046
	Total	236	3.46	.628	.041
If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	Church Membership	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Leave to Retire	Membership Required	40	2.33	.888	.140
	Membership Not Required	197	2.12	.918	.065
	Total	237	2.16	.914	.059
Return to school as a student	Membership Required	39	1.08	.270	.043
	Membership Not Required	196	1.21	.501	.036
	Total	235	1.19	.473	.031
Accept employment at another Christian college or university	Membership Required	39	1.95	.605	.097
	Membership Not Required	196	2.03	.686	.049
	Total	235	2.02	.673	.044
Accept employment at a secular college or university	Membership Required	38	1.68	.662	.107
	Membership Not Required	196	1.63	.663	.047
	Total	234	1.64	.662	.043

NSOPF descriptive statistics by church membership (continued)

Accept employment in consulting or other for-profit business or industry or become self-employed	Membership Required	39	1.44	.552	.088
	Membership Not Required	196	1.63	.730	.052
	Total	235	1.60	.706	.046
Accept employment in a non-profit organization	Membership Required	38	1.63	.541	.088
	Membership Not Required	196	1.73	.649	.046
	Total	234	1.72	.633	.041
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?	Church Membership	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Research	Membership Required	38	1.61	.595	.096
	Membership Not Required	194	1.57	.650	.047
	Total	232	1.57	.640	.042
Teaching	Membership Required	38	2.13	.529	.086
	Membership Not Required	195	2.14	.592	.042
	Total	233	2.14	.581	.038
Advising	Membership Required	39	2.26	.498	.080
	Membership Not Required	193	2.22	.547	.039
	Total	232	2.23	.538	.035
Service	Membership Required	39	2.05	.560	.090
	Membership Not Required	195	2.16	.560	.040
	Total	234	2.15	.560	.037
Administration	Membership Required	39	2.21	.656	.105
	Membership Not Required	192	2.29	.685	.049
	Total	231	2.28	.680	.045
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?	Church Membership	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Salary Level	Membership Required	40	2.58	.501	.079
	Membership Not Required	198	2.41	.570	.041
	Total	238	2.44	.561	.036

NSOPF descriptive statistics by church membership (continued)

Position Level	Membership Required	40	2.42	.549	.087
	Membership Not Required	197	2.33	.621	.044
	Total	237	2.35	.609	.040
Job Security	Membership Required	40	2.60	.591	.093
	Membership Not Required	197	2.53	.627	.045
	Total	237	2.54	.621	.040
Opportunities for advancement	Membership Required	40	2.50	.555	.088
	Membership Not Required	198	2.28	.697	.050
	Total	238	2.32	.679	.044
Benefits	Membership Required	40	2.65	.483	.076
	Membership Not Required	198	2.65	.518	.037
	Total	238	2.65	.512	.033
No pressure to publish	Membership Required	40	2.20	.648	.103
	Membership Not Required	198	2.15	.739	.052
	Total	238	2.16	.723	.047
Academic Freedom	Membership Required	40	2.45	.552	.087
	Membership Not Required	198	2.61	.549	.039
	Total	238	2.58	.551	.036
Good research facilities and equipment	Membership Required	39	2.21	.695	.111
	Membership Not Required	197	2.11	.661	.047
	Total	236	2.13	.666	.043
Good instructional facilities and equipment	Membership Required	40	2.65	.533	.084
	Membership Not Required	197	2.53	.567	.040
	Total	237	2.55	.563	.037
Excellent Students	Membership Required	40	2.55	.552	.087
	Membership Not Required	198	2.40	.569	.040
	Total	238	2.43	.567	.037
Excellent Colleagues	Membership Required	40	2.68	.474	.075
	Membership Not Required	198	2.66	.485	.034
	Total	238	2.66	.482	.031
New institution is a Christian college	Membership Required	40	2.38	.705	.111
	Membership Not Required	198	2.26	.714	.051
	Total	238	2.28	.712	.046

NSOPF descriptive statistics by church membership (continued)

Institutional mission or philosophy that is compatible with my own views	Membership Required	40	2.80	.405	.064
	Membership Not Required	197	2.63	.533	.038
	Total	237	2.66	.517	.034
Good job for my spouse	Membership Required	40	2.30	.883	.140
	Membership Not Required	187	2.06	.837	.061
	Total	227	2.10	.848	.056
Good geographic location	Membership Required	40	2.75	.439	.069
	Membership Not Required	195	2.38	.642	.046
	Total	235	2.44	.627	.041
Affordable Housing	Membership Required	39	2.62	.633	.101
	Membership Not Required	196	2.48	.603	.043
	Total	235	2.51	.609	.040
Good environment/schools for my children	Membership Required	40	2.05	.904	.143
	Membership Not Required	184	1.92	.911	.067
	Total	224	1.94	.909	.061
A full-time position	Membership Required	40	2.78	.577	.091
	Membership Not Required	192	2.73	.587	.042
	Total	232	2.74	.585	.038
A part-time position	Membership Required	40	1.23	.480	.076
	Membership Not Required	188	1.32	.589	.043
	Total	228	1.30	.571	.038
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Church Membership	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
It is important for faculty to participate in governing their institution	Membership Required	40	3.70	.516	.082
	Membership Not Required	197	3.63	.571	.041
	Total	237	3.64	.562	.036
Faculty promotions should be based at least in part on formal student evaluations	Membership Required	40	2.98	.698	.110
	Membership Not Required	198	2.94	.785	.056
	Total	238	2.95	.769	.050
The tenure system in higher education should be preserved	Membership Required	39	2.72	.999	.160
	Membership Not Required	198	2.83	.933	.066
	Total	237	2.81	.943	.061
Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty	Membership Required	40	3.23	.698	.110
	Membership Not Required	197	3.32	.652	.046
	Total	237	3.31	.659	.043

NSOPF descriptive statistics by church membership (continued)

Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	Membership Required	40	1.85	.662	.105
	Membership Not Required	198	1.92	.701	.050
	Total	238	1.91	.693	.045
Years of service/advanced degree should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	Membership Required	40	2.42	.813	.129
	Membership Not Required	196	2.49	.761	.054
	Total	236	2.48	.769	.050
The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution	Membership Required	40	2.48	.877	.139
	Membership Not Required	192	2.81	.856	.062
	Total	232	2.75	.867	.057
State or federally mandated assessment requirements have improved the quality of undergraduate education at my institution	Membership Required	40	2.40	.900	.142
	Membership Not Required	189	2.19	.809	.059
	Total	229	2.23	.828	.055
Female faculty members are treated fairly at my institution	Membership Required	40	3.38	.740	.117
	Membership Not Required	196	3.23	.760	.054
	Total	236	3.25	.757	.049
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at my institution	Membership Required	40	3.38	.774	.122
	Membership Not Required	194	3.26	.774	.056
	Total	234	3.28	.773	.051
My institution effectively meets the educational needs of entering students	Membership Required	40	3.55	.639	.101
	Membership Not Required	195	3.16	.696	.050
	Total	235	3.23	.701	.046
If I had it to do over again, I would choose an academic career	Membership Required	40	3.88	.335	.053
	Membership Not Required	198	3.76	.542	.039
	Total	238	3.78	.514	.033

NSOPF descriptive statistics by alma mater

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Alma Mater	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
My Work Load	Current Institution	76	2.91	.803	.092
	Another CCCU Institution	58	2.97	.878	.115
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.96	.958	.188
	Non-Christian Institution	77	2.74	.865	.099
	Total	237	2.87	.859	.056
My job security	Current Institution	76	3.55	.790	.091
	Another CCCU Institution	58	3.45	.820	.108
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	3.68	.476	.095
	Non-Christian Institution	77	3.12	.827	.094
	Total	236	3.40	.806	.052
My Salary	Current Institution	76	2.66	.888	.102
	Another CCCU Institution	58	2.64	.931	.122
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	3.04	.871	.171
	Non-Christian Institution	77	2.51	.821	.094
	Total	237	2.65	.884	.057
My Benefits	Current Institution	76	2.91	.912	.105
	Another CCCU Institution	57	2.89	.880	.117
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.96	.774	.152
	Non-Christian Institution	77	2.69	.907	.103
	Total	236	2.84	.889	.058
The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach	Current Institution	76	3.49	.739	.085
	Another CCCU Institution	57	3.37	.816	.108
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	3.73	.452	.089
	Non-Christian Institution	76	3.30	.895	.103
	Total	235	3.43	.794	.052
The authority I have to make decisions about the content and methods in the courses I teach	Current Institution	76	3.80	.462	.053
	Another CCCU Institution	57	3.79	.411	.054
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	3.88	.326	.064
	Non-Christian Institution	76	3.75	.592	.068
	Total	235	3.79	.484	.032

NSOPF descriptive statistics by alma mater (continued)

The authority I have to make decisions about other aspects of my job	Current Institution	75	3.32	.701	.081
	Another CCCU Institution	57	3.39	.559	.074
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	3.65	.485	.095
	Non-Christian Institution	76	3.28	.741	.085
	Total	234	3.36	.668	.044
The mix of teaching, research, administration, and service that I am required to do	Current Institution	76	3.09	.751	.086
	Another CCCU Institution	56	3.05	.862	.115
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	3.15	.784	.154
	Non-Christian Institution	76	3.11	.793	.091
	Total	234	3.09	.791	.052
The opportunity for advancement in rank at my institution	Current Institution	76	3.08	.906	.104
	Another CCCU Institution	57	3.23	.846	.112
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	3.16	1.068	.214
	Non-Christian Institution	76	3.04	.930	.107
	Total	234	3.11	.915	.060
Time available for keeping current in my field	Current Institution	76	2.53	.916	.105
	Another CCCU Institution	57	2.39	.861	.114
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.62	.898	.176
	Non-Christian Institution	76	2.34	.857	.098
	Total	235	2.44	.882	.058
Availability of support services and equipment (clerical support, computers, etc.)	Current Institution	76	3.04	.824	.094
	Another CCCU Institution	58	2.83	.939	.123
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	3.08	.744	.146
	Non-Christian Institution	77	2.68	.938	.107
	Total	237	2.87	.893	.058
Freedom to do outside consulting	Current Institution	73	3.29	.754	.088
	Another CCCU Institution	56	3.30	.711	.095
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	3.44	.712	.142
	Non-Christian Institution	72	3.18	.718	.085
	Total	226	3.27	.727	.048
Overall reputation of the institution	Current Institution	75	3.40	.717	.083
	Another CCCU Institution	57	3.02	.790	.105
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	3.44	.712	.142
	Non-Christian Institution	77	3.13	.784	.089
	Total	234	3.22	.771	.050

NSOPF descriptive statistics by alma mater (continued)

Reputation of my department	Current Institution	76	3.47	.774	.089
	Another CCCU Institution	58	3.21	.833	.109
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	3.54	.582	.114
	Non-Christian Institution	77	3.30	.828	.094
	Total	237	3.36	.793	.052
Institutional mission or philosophy	Current Institution	76	3.68	.496	.057
	Another CCCU Institution	58	3.59	.563	.074
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	3.81	.402	.079
	Non-Christian Institution	76	3.62	.610	.070
	Total	236	3.65	.544	.035
Quality of leadership in my department	Current Institution	76	3.34	.841	.097
	Another CCCU Institution	57	3.30	.801	.106
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	3.50	.762	.149
	Non-Christian Institution	77	3.43	.924	.105
	Total	236	3.38	.849	.055
Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution	Current Institution	76	3.18	.890	.102
	Another CCCU Institution	57	2.91	.931	.123
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	3.38	.804	.158
	Non-Christian Institution	77	3.12	.973	.111
	Total	236	3.12	.924	.060
Quality of my colleagues in my department	Current Institution	75	3.61	.634	.073
	Another CCCU Institution	57	3.46	.734	.097
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	3.54	.647	.127
	Non-Christian Institution	76	3.41	.677	.078
	Total	234	3.50	.676	.044
Quality of faculty leadership at my institution	Current Institution	76	3.29	.745	.085
	Another CCCU Institution	58	3.02	.783	.103
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	3.31	.549	.108
	Non-Christian Institution	76	2.96	.916	.105
	Total	236	3.12	.806	.052
Relationship between administration and faculty at this institution	Current Institution	75	2.85	.849	.098
	Another CCCU Institution	58	2.74	.870	.114
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.77	.908	.178
	Non-Christian Institution	77	2.77	1.025	.117
	Total	236	2.79	.917	.060

NSOPF descriptive statistics by alma mater (continued)

Interdepartmental cooperation at this institution	Current Institution	76	2.80	.895	.103
	Another CCCU Institution	58	2.78	.750	.099
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.85	.784	.154
	Non-Christian Institution	76	2.80	.800	.092
	Total	236	2.80	.814	.053
Spirit of cooperation between faculty at this institution	Current Institution	76	3.03	.832	.095
	Another CCCU Institution	58	3.05	.686	.090
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	3.15	.732	.143
	Non-Christian Institution	77	3.13	.767	.087
	Total	237	3.08	.763	.050
Quality of my research facilities and support	Current Institution	73	2.45	.883	.103
	Another CCCU Institution	55	2.40	.807	.109
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	23	2.61	.722	.151
	Non-Christian Institution	75	2.31	.854	.099
	Total	226	2.41	.839	.056
Quality of students whom I have taught here	Current Institution	76	3.20	.766	.088
	Another CCCU Institution	58	3.03	.700	.092
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	3.04	.774	.152
	Non-Christian Institution	77	3.00	.778	.089
	Total	237	3.08	.755	.049
Teaching assistance that I receive	Current Institution	68	2.71	.830	.101
	Another CCCU Institution	53	2.68	.827	.114
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	2.84	.898	.180
	Non-Christian Institution	70	2.61	.982	.117
	Total	216	2.69	.886	.060
Research assistance that I receive	Current Institution	65	2.38	.842	.104
	Another CCCU Institution	51	2.33	.864	.121
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	23	2.48	.790	.165
	Non-Christian Institution	65	2.25	.952	.118
	Total	204	2.34	.876	.061
Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area	Current Institution	72	3.22	.843	.099
	Another CCCU Institution	50	3.38	.667	.094
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	3.24	.831	.166
	Non-Christian Institution	67	3.30	.779	.095
	Total	214	3.29	.780	.053

NSOPF descriptive statistics by alma mater (continued)

My overall satisfaction with my job here	Current Institution	76	3.46	.662	.076
	Another CCCU Institution	58	3.41	.593	.078
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	3.73	.452	.089
	Non-Christian Institution	76	3.41	.657	.075
	Total	236	3.46	.628	.041
If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	Alma Mater	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Leave to Retire	Current Institution	75	2.17	.921	.106
	Another CCCU Institution	59	2.20	.924	.120
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.42	.758	.149
	Non-Christian Institution	77	2.01	.939	.107
	Total	237	2.16	.914	.059
Return to school as a student	Current Institution	74	1.16	.439	.051
	Another CCCU Institution	58	1.21	.487	.064
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	1.23	.514	.101
	Non-Christian Institution	77	1.19	.488	.056
	Total	235	1.19	.473	.031
Accept employment at another Christian college or university	Current Institution	74	1.99	.608	.071
	Another CCCU Institution	58	2.12	.677	.089
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	1.96	.720	.141
	Non-Christian Institution	77	1.99	.716	.082
	Total	235	2.02	.673	.044
Accept employment at a secular college or university	Current Institution	74	1.65	.711	.083
	Another CCCU Institution	58	1.52	.569	.075
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	1.56	.651	.130
	Non-Christian Institution	77	1.74	.677	.077
	Total	234	1.64	.662	.043
Accept employment in consulting or other for-profit business or industry or become self-employed	Current Institution	74	1.65	.711	.083
	Another CCCU Institution	58	1.66	.785	.103
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	1.69	.679	.133
	Non-Christian Institution	77	1.47	.640	.073
	Total	235	1.60	.706	.046
Accept employment in a non-profit organization	Current Institution	73	1.82	.653	.076
	Another CCCU Institution	58	1.81	.606	.080
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	1.65	.629	.123
	Non-Christian Institution	77	1.57	.616	.070
	Total	234	1.72	.633	.041

NSOPF descriptive statistics by alma mater (continued)

If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?	Alma Mater	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
	Research	Current Institution	74	1.61	.699
Another CCCU Institution		58	1.62	.671	.088
Another non-CCCU Christian Institution		25	1.60	.577	.115
Non-Christian Institution		75	1.49	.578	.067
Total		232	1.57	.640	.042
Teaching	Current Institution	75	2.13	.577	.067
	Another CCCU Institution	58	2.07	.588	.077
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	1.96	.539	.108
	Non-Christian Institution	75	2.27	.577	.067
	Total	233	2.14	.581	.038
Advising	Current Institution	75	2.24	.541	.063
	Another CCCU Institution	58	2.26	.515	.068
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	2.24	.597	.119
	Non-Christian Institution	74	2.19	.541	.063
	Total	232	2.23	.538	.035
Service	Current Institution	75	2.09	.574	.066
	Another CCCU Institution	58	2.14	.544	.071
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	2.16	.554	.111
	Non-Christian Institution	76	2.20	.566	.065
	Total	234	2.15	.560	.037
Administration	Current Institution	75	2.28	.689	.080
	Another CCCU Institution	58	2.43	.596	.078
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	2.32	.748	.150
	Non-Christian Institution	73	2.14	.694	.081
	Total	231	2.28	.680	.045

NSOPF descriptive statistics by alma mater (continued)

If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?	Alma Mater	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
	Salary Level	Current Institution	76	2.47	.553
Another CCCU Institution		59	2.37	.522	.068
Another non-CCCU Christian Institution		26	2.31	.549	.108
Non-Christian Institution		77	2.51	.599	.068
Total		238	2.44	.561	.036
Position Level	Current Institution	75	2.32	.573	.066
	Another CCCU Institution	59	2.39	.588	.077
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.15	.613	.120
	Non-Christian Institution	77	2.40	.654	.075
	Total	237	2.35	.609	.040
Job Security	Current Institution	75	2.57	.640	.074
	Another CCCU Institution	59	2.53	.626	.081
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.31	.618	.121
	Non-Christian Institution	77	2.60	.591	.067
	Total	237	2.54	.621	.040
Opportunities for advancement	Current Institution	76	2.24	.671	.077
	Another CCCU Institution	59	2.29	.671	.087
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.27	.667	.131
	Non-Christian Institution	77	2.43	.696	.079
	Total	238	2.32	.679	.044
Benefits	Current Institution	76	2.64	.509	.058
	Another CCCU Institution	59	2.59	.529	.069
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.69	.471	.092
	Non-Christian Institution	77	2.69	.520	.059
	Total	238	2.65	.512	.033
No pressure to publish	Current Institution	76	2.11	.741	.085
	Another CCCU Institution	59	2.19	.656	.085
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.23	.765	.150
	Non-Christian Institution	77	2.17	.750	.086
	Total	238	2.16	.723	.047

NSOPF descriptive statistics by alma mater (continued)

Academic Freedom	Current Institution	76	2.45	.620	.071
	Another CCCU Institution	59	2.53	.537	.070
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.77	.430	.084
	Non-Christian Institution	77	2.69	.494	.056
	Total	238	2.58	.551	.036
Good research facilities and equipment	Current Institution	76	2.03	.632	.072
	Another CCCU Institution	58	2.07	.697	.092
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.23	.587	.115
	Non-Christian Institution	76	2.24	.690	.079
	Total	236	2.13	.666	.043
Good instructional facilities and equipment	Current Institution	76	2.46	.576	.066
	Another CCCU Institution	58	2.57	.565	.074
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.65	.485	.095
	Non-Christian Institution	77	2.58	.570	.065
	Total	237	2.55	.563	.037
Excellent Students	Current Institution	76	2.46	.576	.066
	Another CCCU Institution	59	2.44	.595	.077
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.38	.571	.112
	Non-Christian Institution	77	2.40	.544	.062
	Total	238	2.43	.567	.037
Excellent Colleagues	Current Institution	76	2.72	.479	.055
	Another CCCU Institution	59	2.68	.471	.061
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.54	.508	.100
	Non-Christian Institution	77	2.64	.484	.055
	Total	238	2.66	.482	.031
New institution is a Christian college	Current Institution	76	2.42	.698	.080
	Another CCCU Institution	59	2.46	.625	.081
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.15	.613	.120
	Non-Christian Institution	77	2.05	.759	.087
	Total	238	2.28	.712	.046
Institutional mission or philosophy that is compatible with my own views	Current Institution	76	2.66	.555	.064
	Another CCCU Institution	58	2.79	.409	.054
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.62	.496	.097
	Non-Christian Institution	77	2.58	.547	.062
	Total	237	2.66	.517	.034

NSOPF descriptive statistics by alma mater (continued)

Good job for my spouse	Current Institution	72	2.26	.856	.101
	Another CCCU Institution	56	2.13	.788	.105
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.04	.824	.162
	Non-Christian Institution	73	1.95	.880	.103
	Total	227	2.10	.848	.056
Good geographic location	Current Institution	75	2.39	.695	.080
	Another CCCU Institution	58	2.31	.598	.079
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.50	.510	.100
	Non-Christian Institution	76	2.58	.595	.068
	Total	235	2.44	.627	.041
Affordable Housing	Current Institution	75	2.47	.622	.072
	Another CCCU Institution	59	2.44	.595	.077
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.35	.689	.135
	Non-Christian Institution	75	2.65	.557	.064
	Total	235	2.51	.609	.040
Good environment/schools for my children	Current Institution	72	2.08	.946	.111
	Another CCCU Institution	55	2.09	.867	.117
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	1.72	.843	.169
	Non-Christian Institution	72	1.76	.896	.106
	Total	224	1.94	.909	.061
A full-time position	Current Institution	75	2.76	.566	.065
	Another CCCU Institution	58	2.83	.500	.066
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	2.48	.714	.143
	Non-Christian Institution	74	2.73	.604	.070
	Total	232	2.74	.585	.038
A part-time position	Current Institution	74	1.34	.556	.065
	Another CCCU Institution	56	1.27	.587	.079
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	24	1.67	.761	.155
	Non-Christian Institution	74	1.18	.449	.052
	Total	228	1.30	.571	.038
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Alma Mater	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
It is important for faculty to participate in governing their institution	Current Institution	76	3.67	.500	.057
	Another CCCU Institution	59	3.58	.649	.084
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	3.65	.562	.110
	Non-Christian Institution	76	3.66	.555	.064
	Total	237	3.64	.562	.036

NSOPF descriptive statistics by alma mater (continued)

Faculty promotions should be based at least in part on formal student evaluations	Current Institution	76	3.01	.702	.081
	Another CCCU Institution	59	2.95	.705	.092
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.92	.891	.175
	Non-Christian Institution	77	2.88	.843	.096
	Total	238	2.95	.769	.050
The tenure system in higher education should be preserved.	Current Institution	76	2.63	.950	.109
	Another CCCU Institution	59	2.85	.805	.105
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.77	.951	.187
	Non-Christian Institution	76	2.99	1.013	.116
	Total	237	2.81	.943	.061
Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty	Current Institution	76	3.42	.572	.066
	Another CCCU Institution	59	3.27	.611	.080
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	3.54	.647	.127
	Non-Christian Institution	76	3.14	.743	.085
	Total	237	3.31	.659	.043
Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	Current Institution	76	1.91	.677	.078
	Another CCCU Institution	59	1.97	.742	.097
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	2.00	.632	.124
	Non-Christian Institution	77	1.83	.696	.079
	Total	238	1.91	.693	.045
Years of service/advanced degree should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	Current Institution	76	2.58	.788	.090
	Another CCCU Institution	59	2.44	.749	.098
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	2.56	.712	.142
	Non-Christian Institution	76	2.38	.783	.090
	Total	236	2.48	.769	.050
The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution	Current Institution	76	2.83	.839	.096
	Another CCCU Institution	57	2.88	.803	.106
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	2.80	.957	.191
	Non-Christian Institution	74	2.55	.894	.104
	Total	232	2.75	.867	.057
State or federally mandated assessment requirements have improved the quality of undergraduate education at my institution	Current Institution	75	2.16	.823	.095
	Another CCCU Institution	55	2.38	.782	.105
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	2.32	.748	.150
	Non-Christian Institution	74	2.15	.886	.103
	Total	229	2.23	.828	.055

NSOPF descriptive statistics by alma mater (continued)

Female faculty members are treated fairly at my institution	Current Institution	76	3.29	.708	.081
	Another CCCU Institution	59	3.20	.738	.096
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	3.36	.907	.181
	Non-Christian Institution	76	3.22	.776	.089
	Total	236	3.25	.757	.049
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at my institution	Current Institution	74	3.32	.704	.082
	Another CCCU Institution	59	3.24	.837	.109
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	3.40	.764	.153
	Non-Christian Institution	76	3.24	.798	.092
	Total	234	3.28	.773	.051
My institution effectively meets the educational needs of entering students	Current Institution	76	3.34	.703	.081
	Another CCCU Institution	59	3.08	.651	.085
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	25	3.44	.583	.117
	Non-Christian Institution	75	3.15	.748	.086
	Total	235	3.23	.701	.046
If I had it to do over again, I would choose an academic career	Current Institution	76	3.84	.367	.042
	Another CCCU Institution	59	3.75	.512	.067
	Another non-CCCU Christian Institution	26	3.81	.634	.124
	Non-Christian Institution	77	3.74	.594	.068
	Total	238	3.78	.514	.033

NSOPF descriptive statistics by highest degree earned

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Highest Degree	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
My Work Load	Master's	81	3.11	.775	.086
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.00	.816	.309
	Doctorate	148	2.74	.883	.073
	Total	236	2.87	.861	.056
My job security	Master's	80	3.33	.823	.092
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.57	.535	.202
	Doctorate	148	3.44	.802	.066
	Total	235	3.40	.802	.052
My Salary	Master's	81	2.56	.866	.096
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.86	.690	.261
	Doctorate	148	2.68	.904	.074
	Total	236	2.64	.885	.058
My Benefits	Master's	80	2.89	.795	.089
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.71	.488	.184
	Doctorate	148	2.82	.955	.079
	Total	235	2.84	.891	.058
The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach	Master's	79	3.37	.771	.087
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.86	.378	.143
	Doctorate	148	3.43	.818	.067
	Total	234	3.42	.795	.052
The authority I have to make decisions about the content and methods in the courses I teach	Master's	79	3.76	.486	.055
	Specialist/Professional	7	4.00	.000	.000
	Doctorate	148	3.80	.494	.041
	Total	234	3.79	.485	.032
The authority I have to make decisions about other aspects of my job	Master's	80	3.36	.716	.080
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.57	.535	.202
	Doctorate	146	3.34	.648	.054
	Total	233	3.36	.668	.044
The mix of teaching, research, administration, and service that I am required to do	Master's	79	3.22	.710	.080
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.00	1.000	.378
	Doctorate	147	3.03	.823	.068
	Total	233	3.09	.793	.052
The opportunity for advancement in rank at my institution	Master's	80	2.90	.949	.106
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.86	1.069	.404
	Doctorate	146	3.24	.873	.072
	Total	233	3.11	.917	.060
Time available for keeping current in my field	Master's	79	2.67	.828	.093
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.14	1.069	.404
	Doctorate	148	2.33	.884	.073
	Total	234	2.44	.883	.058

NSOPF descriptive statistics by highest degree earned (continued)

Availability of support services and equipment (clerical support, computers, etc.)	Master's	81	3.04	.798	.089
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.86	.900	.340
	Doctorate	148	2.79	.935	.077
	Total	236	2.88	.893	.058
Freedom to do outside consulting	Master's	78	3.24	.724	.082
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.71	.488	.184
	Doctorate	140	3.26	.736	.062
	Total	225	3.27	.727	.048
Overall reputation of the institution	Master's	79	3.29	.770	.087
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.57	.787	.297
	Doctorate	147	3.16	.768	.063
	Total	233	3.22	.771	.050
Reputation of my department	Master's	81	3.30	.813	.090
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.57	.535	.202
	Doctorate	148	3.39	.796	.065
	Total	236	3.36	.795	.052
Institutional mission or philosophy	Master's	80	3.69	.466	.052
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.71	.488	.184
	Doctorate	148	3.64	.585	.048
	Total	235	3.66	.543	.035
Quality of leadership in my department	Master's	81	3.42	.804	.089
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.57	.787	.297
	Doctorate	147	3.35	.881	.073
	Total	235	3.38	.851	.055
Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution	Master's	80	3.15	.969	.108
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.86	.378	.143
	Doctorate	148	3.06	.905	.074
	Total	235	3.11	.924	.060
Quality of my colleagues in my department	Master's	80	3.51	.675	.075
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.57	.787	.297
	Doctorate	146	3.49	.677	.056
	Total	233	3.50	.677	.044
Quality of faculty leadership at my institution	Master's	81	3.28	.746	.083
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.14	.690	.261
	Doctorate	147	3.03	.835	.069
	Total	235	3.12	.808	.053
Relationship between administration and faculty at this institution	Master's	81	2.81	.976	.108
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.86	.900	.340
	Doctorate	147	2.77	.892	.074
	Total	235	2.79	.918	.060
Interdepartmental cooperation at this institution	Master's	81	2.74	.877	.097
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.00	.816	.309
	Doctorate	147	2.82	.783	.065
	Total	235	2.80	.815	.053

NSOPF descriptive statistics by highest degree earned (continued)

Spirit of cooperation between faculty at this institution	Master's	81	3.07	.803	.089
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.14	.690	.261
	Doctorate	148	3.08	.752	.062
	Total	236	3.08	.765	.050
Quality of my research facilities and support	Master's	77	2.65	.757	.086
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.29	1.113	.421
	Doctorate	141	2.28	.848	.071
	Total	225	2.41	.841	.056
Quality of students whom I have taught here	Master's	81	3.12	.781	.087
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.14	.690	.261
	Doctorate	148	3.05	.745	.061
	Total	236	3.08	.754	.049
Teaching assistance that I receive	Master's	72	2.99	.864	.102
	Specialist/Professional	6	2.67	1.033	.422
	Doctorate	137	2.53	.858	.073
	Total	215	2.68	.887	.061
Research assistance that I receive	Master's	67	2.60	.799	.098
	Specialist/Professional	6	2.17	.983	.401
	Doctorate	130	2.21	.887	.078
	Total	203	2.33	.877	.062
Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area	Master's	68	3.28	.878	.107
	Specialist/Professional	6	2.67	1.211	.494
	Doctorate	139	3.31	.700	.059
	Total	213	3.28	.780	.053
My overall satisfaction with my job here	Master's	81	3.44	.632	.070
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.86	.378	.143
	Doctorate	147	3.45	.632	.052
	Total	235	3.46	.628	.041
If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	Highest Degree	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Leave to Retire	Master's	81	2.16	.901	.100
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.00	1.000	.378
	Doctorate	148	2.17	.921	.076
	Total	236	2.16	.913	.059
Return to school as a student	Master's	79	1.37	.603	.068
	Specialist/Professional	7	1.43	.787	.297
	Doctorate	148	1.09	.328	.027
	Total	234	1.19	.474	.031
Accept employment at another Christian college or university	Master's	79	2.08	.675	.076
	Specialist/Professional	7	1.71	.756	.286
	Doctorate	148	1.99	.665	.055
	Total	234	2.01	.671	.044

NSOPF descriptive statistics by highest degree earned (continued)

Accept employment at a secular college or university	Master's	78	1.72	.662	.075
	Specialist/Professional	7	1.43	.787	.297
	Doctorate	148	1.60	.657	.054
	Total	233	1.64	.663	.043
Accept employment in consulting or other for-profit business or industry or become self-employed	Master's	79	1.67	.746	.084
	Specialist/Professional	7	1.29	.488	.184
	Doctorate	148	1.57	.692	.057
	Total	234	1.59	.707	.046
Accept employment in a non-profit organization	Master's	79	1.72	.619	.070
	Specialist/Professional	7	1.29	.488	.184
	Doctorate	147	1.73	.645	.053
	Total	233	1.72	.634	.042
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?	Highest Degree	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Research	Master's	76	1.75	.614	.070
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.00	1.000	.378
	Doctorate	148	1.46	.610	.050
	Total	231	1.57	.641	.042
Teaching	Master's	78	1.99	.614	.069
	Specialist/Professional	7	1.86	.378	.143
	Doctorate	147	2.23	.550	.045
	Total	232	2.14	.580	.038
Advising	Master's	76	2.12	.541	.062
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.43	.535	.202
	Doctorate	148	2.28	.532	.044
	Total	231	2.23	.539	.035
Service	Master's	78	2.04	.521	.059
	Specialist/Professional	7	1.86	.690	.261
	Doctorate	148	2.21	.562	.046
	Total	233	2.14	.558	.037
Administration	Master's	76	2.20	.633	.073
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.29	.951	.360
	Doctorate	147	2.32	.692	.057
	Total	230	2.28	.681	.045
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?	Highest Degree	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Salary Level	Master's	81	2.54	.501	.056
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.00	.577	.218
	Doctorate	149	2.40	.580	.048
	Total	237	2.44	.561	.036

NSOPF descriptive statistics by highest degree earned (continued)

Position Level	Master's	80	2.31	.628	.070
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.29	.488	.184
	Doctorate	149	2.37	.608	.050
	Total	236	2.35	.610	.040
Job Security	Master's	80	2.56	.633	.071
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.71	.488	.184
	Doctorate	149	2.52	.622	.051
	Total	236	2.54	.621	.040
Opportunities for advancement	Master's	81	2.35	.616	.068
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.43	.787	.297
	Doctorate	149	2.29	.710	.058
	Total	237	2.31	.679	.044
Benefits	Master's	81	2.64	.508	.056
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.71	.488	.184
	Doctorate	149	2.66	.517	.042
	Total	237	2.65	.511	.033
No pressure to publish	Master's	81	2.28	.729	.081
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.43	.787	.297
	Doctorate	149	2.09	.706	.058
	Total	237	2.16	.721	.047
Academic Freedom	Master's	81	2.56	.524	.058
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.57	.535	.202
	Doctorate	149	2.59	.570	.047
	Total	237	2.58	.552	.036
Good research facilities and equipment	Master's	79	2.11	.679	.076
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.00	.577	.218
	Doctorate	149	2.14	.668	.055
	Total	235	2.13	.667	.044
Good instructional facilities and equipment	Master's	80	2.61	.490	.055
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.57	.535	.202
	Doctorate	149	2.52	.600	.049
	Total	236	2.55	.563	.037
Excellent Students	Master's	81	2.44	.548	.061
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.43	.535	.202
	Doctorate	149	2.42	.583	.048
	Total	237	2.43	.568	.037
Excellent Colleagues	Master's	81	2.68	.470	.052
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.29	.488	.184
	Doctorate	149	2.68	.483	.040
	Total	237	2.67	.481	.031
New institution is a Christian college	Master's	81	2.27	.652	.072
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.43	.976	.369
	Doctorate	149	2.28	.736	.060
	Total	237	2.28	.713	.046

NSOPF descriptive statistics by highest degree earned (continued)

Institutional mission or philosophy that is compatible with my own views	Master's	81	2.67	.524	.058
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.57	.535	.202
	Doctorate	148	2.67	.514	.042
	Total	236	2.67	.516	.034
Good job for my spouse	Master's	74	2.19	.886	.103
	Specialist/Professional	7	1.86	.900	.340
	Doctorate	145	2.07	.830	.069
	Total	226	2.10	.850	.057
Good geographic location	Master's	80	2.50	.636	.071
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.43	.787	.297
	Doctorate	147	2.41	.617	.051
	Total	234	2.44	.627	.041
Affordable Housing	Master's	79	2.59	.610	.069
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.29	.756	.286
	Doctorate	148	2.47	.599	.049
	Total	234	2.50	.609	.040
Good environment/schools for my children	Master's	75	2.07	.935	.108
	Specialist/Professional	7	1.86	1.069	.404
	Doctorate	141	1.89	.887	.075
	Master's	223	1.95	.909	.061
A full-time position	Specialist/Professional	78	2.72	.579	.066
	Doctorate	7	2.57	.787	.297
	Total	146	2.75	.582	.048
	Master's	231	2.74	.586	.039
A part-time position	Specialist/Professional	78	1.45	.677	.077
	Doctorate	7	1.71	.951	.360
	Total	142	1.20	.454	.038
	Master's	227	1.30	.572	.038
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Highest Degree	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
It is important for faculty to participate in governing their institution	Specialist/Professional	81	3.64	.532	.059
	Doctorate	7	3.57	.535	.202
	Total	148	3.64	.583	.048
	Master's	236	3.64	.563	.037
Faculty promotions should be based at least in part on formal student evaluations	Specialist/Professional	81	2.89	.725	.081
	Doctorate	7	2.43	.787	.297
	Total	149	3.01	.784	.064
	Master's	237	2.95	.769	.050
The tenure system in higher education should be preserved.	Specialist/Professional	80	2.65	.873	.098
	Doctorate	7	3.29	.488	.184
	Total	149	2.87	.982	.080
	Master's	236	2.81	.942	.061

NSOPF descriptive statistics by highest degree earned (continued)

Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty	Specialist/Professional	80	3.36	.601	.067
	Doctorate	7	3.29	.756	.286
	Total	149	3.28	.689	.056
	Master's	236	3.31	.660	.043
Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	Specialist/Professional	81	1.81	.654	.073
	Doctorate	7	1.86	.690	.261
	Total	149	1.97	.711	.058
	Master's	237	1.91	.692	.045
Years of service/advanced degree should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	Specialist/Professional	81	2.59	.721	.080
	Doctorate	7	2.71	.756	.286
	Total	147	2.41	.784	.065
	Total	235	2.49	.764	.050
The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution	Master's	79	2.59	.760	.085
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.57	.787	.297
	Doctorate	145	2.85	.915	.076
	Total	231	2.75	.867	.057
State or federally mandated assessment requirements have improved the quality of undergraduate education at my institution	Master's	76	2.39	.834	.096
	Specialist/Professional	7	2.14	.900	.340
	Doctorate	145	2.15	.811	.067
	Total	228	2.23	.825	.055
Female faculty members are treated fairly at my institution	Master's	80	3.23	.729	.081
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.29	.756	.286
	Doctorate	148	3.28	.772	.063
	Total	235	3.26	.754	.049
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at my institution	Master's	78	3.24	.793	.090
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.43	.535	.202
	Doctorate	148	3.30	.771	.063
	Total	233	3.29	.771	.050
My institution effectively meets the educational needs of entering students	Master's	79	3.15	.786	.088
	Specialist/Professional	7	3.14	.900	.340
	Doctorate	148	3.28	.637	.052
	Total	234	3.23	.698	.046
If I had it to do over again, I would choose an academic career	Master's	81	3.77	.576	.064
	Specialist/Professional	7	4.00	.000	.000
	Doctorate	149	3.78	.491	.040
	Total	237	3.78	.515	.033

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic rank

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Academic Rank	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
My Work Load	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	3.08	.515	.149
	Assistant Professor	78	3.03	.805	.091
	Associate Professor	67	2.79	1.023	.125
	Professor	80	2.76	.783	.088
	Total	237	2.87	.859	.056
My job security	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	3.25	.866	.250
	Assistant Professor	77	3.23	.857	.098
	Associate Professor	67	3.33	.911	.111
	Professor	80	3.64	.579	.065
	Total	236	3.40	.806	.052
My Salary	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.33	1.155	.333
	Assistant Professor	78	2.63	.854	.097
	Associate Professor	67	2.67	.894	.109
	Professor	80	2.69	.866	.097
	Total	237	2.65	.884	.057
My Benefits	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.75	.754	.218
	Assistant Professor	77	2.90	.852	.097
	Associate Professor	67	2.82	.936	.114
	Professor	80	2.81	.915	.102
	Total	236	2.84	.889	.058
The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach	Other (Inst/Tech)	11	3.36	.809	.244
	Assistant Professor	78	3.37	.775	.088
	Associate Professor	66	3.39	.802	.099
	Professor	80	3.51	.811	.091
	Total	235	3.43	.794	.052
The authority I have to make decisions about the content and methods in the courses I teach	Other (Inst/Tech)	11	3.45	.688	.207
	Assistant Professor	78	3.77	.556	.063
	Associate Professor	66	3.85	.402	.049
	Professor	80	3.81	.424	.047
	Total	235	3.79	.484	.032
The authority I have to make decisions about other aspects of my job	Other (Inst/Tech)	11	3.09	.539	.163
	Assistant Professor	77	3.32	.768	.088
	Associate Professor	66	3.42	.609	.075
	Professor	80	3.38	.624	.070
	Total	234	3.36	.668	.044
The mix of teaching, research, administration, and service that I am required to do	Other (Inst/Tech)	11	2.91	.831	.251
	Assistant Professor	78	3.15	.774	.088
	Associate Professor	66	3.09	.836	.103
	Professor	79	3.06	.774	.087
	Total	234	3.09	.791	.052

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic rank (continued)

The opportunity for advancement in rank at my institution	Other (Inst/Tech)	11	2.55	1.036	.312
	Assistant Professor	78	2.95	.866	.098
	Associate Professor	67	3.03	.953	.116
	Professor	78	3.42	.830	.094
	Total	234	3.11	.915	.060
Time available for keeping current in my field	Other (Inst/Tech)	11	2.36	.809	.244
	Assistant Professor	77	2.55	.897	.102
	Associate Professor	67	2.39	.969	.118
	Professor	80	2.40	.805	.090
	Total	235	2.44	.882	.058
Availability of support services and equipment (clerical support, computers, etc.)	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.75	.866	.250
	Assistant Professor	78	2.90	.906	.103
	Associate Professor	67	2.97	.904	.110
	Professor	80	2.79	.882	.099
	Total	237	2.87	.893	.058
Freedom to do outside consulting	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.92	.900	.260
	Assistant Professor	75	3.36	.650	.075
	Associate Professor	64	3.23	.729	.091
	Professor	75	3.28	.763	.088
	Total	226	3.27	.727	.048
Overall reputation of the institution	Other (Inst/Tech)	11	3.27	.647	.195
	Assistant Professor	77	3.25	.905	.103
	Associate Professor	67	3.31	.633	.077
	Professor	79	3.11	.751	.084
	Total	234	3.22	.771	.050
Reputation of my department	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	3.17	.718	.207
	Assistant Professor	78	3.23	.882	.100
	Associate Professor	67	3.46	.765	.093
	Professor	80	3.43	.725	.081
	Total	237	3.36	.793	.052
Institutional mission or philosophy	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	3.58	.515	.149
	Assistant Professor	77	3.61	.588	.067
	Associate Professor	67	3.78	.420	.051
	Professor	80	3.60	.587	.066
	Total	236	3.65	.544	.035
Quality of leadership in my department	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	3.17	.718	.207
	Assistant Professor	78	3.26	.918	.104
	Associate Professor	67	3.55	.764	.093
	Professor	79	3.38	.852	.096
	Total	236	3.38	.849	.055
Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution	Other (Inst/Tech)	11	3.27	.786	.237
	Assistant Professor	78	3.23	.836	.095
	Associate Professor	67	3.19	.957	.117
	Professor	80	2.93	.978	.109
	Total	236	3.12	.924	.060

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic rank (continued)

Quality of my colleagues in my department	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	3.58	.669	.193
	Assistant Professor	78	3.42	.730	.083
	Associate Professor	66	3.62	.602	.074
	Professor	78	3.46	.678	.077
	Total	234	3.50	.676	.044
Quality of faculty leadership at my institution	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	3.00	.953	.275
	Assistant Professor	78	3.17	.796	.090
	Associate Professor	67	3.18	.851	.104
	Professor	79	3.04	.759	.085
	Total	236	3.12	.806	.052
Relationship between administration and faculty at this institution	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.92	.669	.193
	Assistant Professor	78	2.82	.936	.106
	Associate Professor	67	2.88	1.008	.123
	Professor	79	2.66	.846	.095
	Total	236	2.79	.917	.060
Interdepartmental cooperation at this institution	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.50	.674	.195
	Assistant Professor	78	2.73	.878	.099
	Associate Professor	67	2.78	.850	.104
	Professor	79	2.94	.722	.081
	Total	236	2.80	.814	.053
Spirit of cooperation between faculty at this institution	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.67	.651	.188
	Assistant Professor	78	2.99	.845	.096
	Associate Professor	67	3.19	.657	.080
	Professor	80	3.14	.759	.085
	Total	237	3.08	.763	.050
Quality of my research facilities and support	Other (Inst/Tech)	11	2.55	.820	.247
	Assistant Professor	76	2.45	.823	.094
	Associate Professor	65	2.40	.880	.109
	Professor	74	2.35	.835	.097
	Total	226	2.41	.839	.056
Quality of students whom I have taught here	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	3.00	.853	.246
	Assistant Professor	78	3.00	.837	.095
	Associate Professor	67	3.19	.657	.080
	Professor	80	3.06	.735	.082
	Total	237	3.08	.755	.049
Teaching assistance that I receive	Other (Inst/Tech)	9	2.44	.882	.294
	Assistant Professor	71	2.75	.906	.108
	Associate Professor	61	2.77	.956	.122
	Professor	75	2.59	.807	.093
	Total	216	2.69	.886	.060
Research assistance that I receive	Other (Inst/Tech)	9	2.33	.866	.289
	Assistant Professor	70	2.41	.860	.103
	Associate Professor	57	2.30	.963	.128
	Professor	68	2.29	.830	.101
	Total	204	2.34	.876	.061

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic rank (continued)

Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area	Other (Inst/Tech)	9	2.78	.972	.324
	Assistant Professor	71	3.17	.894	.106
	Associate Professor	60	3.37	.736	.095
	Professor	74	3.39	.637	.074
	Total	214	3.29	.780	.053
My overall satisfaction with my job here	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	3.17	.389	.112
	Assistant Professor	77	3.45	.680	.077
	Associate Professor	67	3.54	.636	.078
	Professor	80	3.45	.593	.066
	Total	236	3.46	.628	.041
If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	Academic Rank	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Leave to Retire	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	1.67	.888	.256
	Assistant Professor	78	1.92	.894	.101
	Associate Professor	67	2.30	.905	.111
	Professor	80	2.34	.885	.099
	Total	237	2.16	.914	.059
Return to school as a student	Other (Inst/Tech)	10	1.60	.699	.221
	Assistant Professor	78	1.29	.561	.064
	Associate Professor	67	1.12	.370	.045
	Professor	80	1.10	.377	.042
	Total	235	1.19	.473	.031
Accept employment at another Christian college or university	Other (Inst/Tech)	10	2.20	.422	.133
	Assistant Professor	78	2.10	.636	.072
	Associate Professor	67	1.99	.707	.086
	Professor	80	1.94	.700	.078
	Total	235	2.02	.673	.044
Accept employment at a secular college or university	Other (Inst/Tech)	10	2.30	.675	.213
	Assistant Professor	77	1.77	.705	.080
	Associate Professor	67	1.54	.611	.075
	Professor	80	1.51	.595	.067
	Total	234	1.64	.662	.043
Accept employment in consulting or other for-profit business or industry or become self-employed	Other (Inst/Tech)	10	1.80	.789	.249
	Assistant Professor	78	1.62	.725	.082
	Associate Professor	67	1.66	.686	.084
	Professor	80	1.50	.694	.078
	Total	235	1.60	.706	.046
Accept employment in a non-profit organization	Other (Inst/Tech)	10	1.80	.789	.249
	Assistant Professor	78	1.65	.621	.070
	Associate Professor	67	1.79	.616	.075
	Professor	79	1.71	.644	.072
	Total	234	1.72	.633	.041

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic rank (continued)

If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?	Academic Rank	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Research	Other (Inst/Tech)	10	1.50	.527	.167
	Assistant Professor	77	1.62	.650	.074
	Associate Professor	65	1.68	.709	.088
	Professor	80	1.45	.571	.064
	Total	232	1.57	.640	.042
Teaching	Other (Inst/Tech)	10	1.70	.483	.153
	Assistant Professor	78	2.14	.618	.070
	Associate Professor	66	2.14	.579	.071
	Professor	79	2.20	.540	.061
	Total	233	2.14	.581	.038
Advising	Other (Inst/Tech)	10	2.10	.738	.233
	Assistant Professor	77	2.12	.537	.061
	Associate Professor	65	2.20	.440	.055
	Professor	80	2.38	.560	.063
	Total	232	2.23	.538	.035
Service	Other (Inst/Tech)	10	1.90	.316	.100
	Assistant Professor	78	2.06	.566	.064
	Associate Professor	66	2.17	.543	.067
	Professor	80	2.24	.579	.065
	Total	234	2.15	.560	.037
Administration	Other (Inst/Tech)	10	2.00	.667	.211
	Assistant Professor	76	2.18	.687	.079
	Associate Professor	65	2.25	.662	.082
	Professor	80	2.42	.671	.075
	Total	231	2.28	.680	.045
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?	Academic Rank	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Salary Level	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.58	.515	.149
	Assistant Professor	79	2.51	.552	.062
	Associate Professor	67	2.43	.557	.068
	Professor	80	2.36	.579	.065
	Total	238	2.44	.561	.036
Position Level	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.42	.515	.149
	Assistant Professor	78	2.31	.610	.069
	Associate Professor	67	2.34	.565	.069
	Professor	80	2.38	.663	.074
	Total	237	2.35	.609	.040

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic rank (continued)

Job Security	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.83	.389	.112
	Assistant Professor	78	2.55	.638	.072
	Associate Professor	67	2.55	.610	.075
	Professor	80	2.48	.636	.071
	Total	237	2.54	.621	.040
Opportunities for advancement	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.58	.515	.149
	Assistant Professor	79	2.42	.612	.069
	Associate Professor	67	2.36	.644	.079
	Professor	80	2.14	.759	.085
	Total	238	2.32	.679	.044
Benefits	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.83	.389	.112
	Assistant Professor	79	2.71	.484	.055
	Associate Professor	67	2.64	.513	.063
	Professor	80	2.58	.546	.061
	Total	238	2.65	.512	.033
No pressure to publish	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.42	.669	.193
	Assistant Professor	79	2.23	.715	.080
	Associate Professor	67	2.16	.751	.092
	Professor	80	2.05	.710	.079
	Total	238	2.16	.723	.047
Academic Freedom	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.25	.622	.179
	Assistant Professor	79	2.59	.494	.056
	Associate Professor	67	2.64	.569	.070
	Professor	80	2.56	.570	.064
	Total	238	2.58	.551	.036
Good research facilities and equipment	Other (Inst/Tech)	11	2.45	.688	.207
	Assistant Professor	79	2.16	.608	.068
	Associate Professor	66	2.05	.666	.082
	Professor	80	2.11	.711	.080
	Total	236	2.13	.666	.043
Good instructional facilities and equipment	Other (Inst/Tech)	11	2.73	.467	.141
	Assistant Professor	79	2.53	.502	.057
	Associate Professor	67	2.58	.581	.071
	Professor	80	2.51	.616	.069
	Total	237	2.55	.563	.037
Excellent Students	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.58	.515	.149
	Assistant Professor	79	2.41	.543	.061
	Associate Professor	67	2.48	.560	.068
	Professor	80	2.39	.606	.068
	Total	238	2.43	.567	.037
Excellent Colleagues	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.75	.452	.131
	Assistant Professor	79	2.65	.481	.054
	Associate Professor	67	2.75	.472	.058
	Professor	80	2.60	.493	.055
	Total	238	2.66	.482	.031

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic rank (continued)

New institution is a Christian college	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.08	.793	.229
	Assistant Professor	79	2.18	.694	.078
	Associate Professor	67	2.43	.657	.080
	Professor	80	2.29	.750	.084
	Total	238	2.28	.712	.046
Institutional mission or philosophy that is compatible with my own views	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.50	.522	.151
	Assistant Professor	79	2.63	.535	.060
	Associate Professor	66	2.73	.513	.063
	Professor	80	2.66	.502	.056
	Total	237	2.66	.517	.034
Good job for my spouse	Other (Inst/Tech)	11	2.27	.905	.273
	Assistant Professor	73	2.21	.833	.097
	Associate Professor	65	2.00	.919	.114
	Professor	78	2.06	.795	.090
	Total	227	2.10	.848	.056
Good geographic location	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.33	.492	.142
	Assistant Professor	78	2.51	.639	.072
	Associate Professor	66	2.53	.613	.075
	Professor	79	2.32	.631	.071
	Total	235	2.44	.627	.041
Affordable Housing	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.25	.754	.218
	Assistant Professor	76	2.55	.620	.071
	Associate Professor	67	2.60	.552	.067
	Professor	80	2.42	.612	.068
	Total	235	2.51	.609	.040
Good environment/schools for my children	Other (Inst/Tech)	11	2.00	.894	.270
	Assistant Professor	73	2.16	.913	.107
	Associate Professor	62	2.00	.941	.119
	Professor	78	1.68	.830	.094
	Total	224	1.94	.909	.061
A full-time position	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.83	.389	.112
	Assistant Professor	77	2.79	.496	.056
	Associate Professor	64	2.64	.721	.090
	Professor	79	2.75	.565	.064
	Total	232	2.74	.585	.038
A part-time position	Other (Inst/Tech)	11	1.27	.467	.141
	Assistant Professor	75	1.41	.660	.076
	Associate Professor	66	1.35	.620	.076
	Professor	76	1.16	.402	.046
	Total	228	1.30	.571	.038

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic rank (continued)

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Academic Rank	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
It is important for faculty to participate in governing their institution	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	3.42	.515	.149
	Assistant Professor	79	3.62	.562	.063
	Associate Professor	66	3.64	.515	.063
	Professor	80	3.70	.604	.068
	Total	237	3.64	.562	.036
Faculty promotions should be based at least in part on formal student evaluations	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.67	.651	.188
	Assistant Professor	79	2.94	.852	.096
	Associate Professor	67	2.91	.733	.090
	Professor	80	3.03	.729	.081
	Total	238	2.95	.769	.050
The tenure system in higher education should be preserved.	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.50	.674	.195
	Assistant Professor	79	2.68	.941	.106
	Associate Professor	66	2.98	.920	.113
	Professor	80	2.85	.982	.110
	Total	237	2.81	.943	.061
Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	3.17	.718	.207
	Assistant Professor	79	3.28	.619	.070
	Associate Professor	66	3.39	.677	.083
	Professor	80	3.29	.679	.076
	Total	237	3.31	.659	.043
Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.00	.739	.213
	Assistant Professor	79	1.87	.648	.073
	Associate Professor	67	1.94	.736	.090
	Professor	80	1.90	.704	.079
	Total	238	1.91	.693	.045
Years of service/advanced degree should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.17	.937	.271
	Assistant Professor	79	2.56	.747	.084
	Associate Professor	67	2.63	.714	.087
	Professor	78	2.32	.781	.088
	Total	236	2.48	.769	.050
The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	2.67	.651	.188
	Assistant Professor	77	2.47	.771	.088
	Associate Professor	65	2.83	.894	.111
	Professor	78	2.97	.897	.102
	Total	232	2.75	.867	.057
State or federally mandated assessment requirements have improved the quality of undergraduate education at my institution	Other (Inst/Tech)	11	2.09	.701	.211
	Assistant Professor	74	2.32	.760	.088
	Associate Professor	67	2.25	.910	.111
	Professor	77	2.13	.833	.095
	Total	229	2.23	.828	.055

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic rank (continued)

Female faculty members are treated fairly at my institution	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	3.17	.577	.167
	Assistant Professor	78	3.18	.818	.093
	Associate Professor	67	3.33	.746	.091
	Professor	79	3.28	.733	.082
	Total	236	3.25	.757	.049
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at my institution	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	3.08	.900	.260
	Assistant Professor	76	3.29	.745	.085
	Associate Professor	66	3.29	.799	.098
	Professor	80	3.30	.770	.086
	Total	234	3.28	.773	.051
My institution effectively meets the educational needs of entering students	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	3.25	.754	.218
	Assistant Professor	78	3.15	.774	.088
	Associate Professor	66	3.29	.674	.083
	Professor	79	3.24	.645	.073
	Total	235	3.23	.701	.046
If I had it to do over again, I would choose an academic career	Other (Inst/Tech)	12	3.67	.492	.142
	Assistant Professor	79	3.80	.490	.055
	Associate Professor	67	3.73	.642	.078
	Professor	80	3.83	.414	.046
	Total	238	3.78	.514	.033

NSOPF descriptive statistics by years teaching (career)

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Years Teaching (Career)	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
My Work Load	1-5 years	42	3.21	.750	.116
	6-11 years	55	2.82	.925	.125
	12 or more years	138	2.78	.844	.072
	Total	235	2.87	.860	.056
My job security	1-5 years	41	3.44	.594	.093
	6-11 years	55	3.00	1.106	.149
	12 or more years	138	3.54	.663	.056
	Total	234	3.40	.808	.053
My Salary	1-5 years	42	2.55	.803	.124
	6-11 years	55	2.64	.969	.131
	12 or more years	138	2.70	.868	.074
	Total	235	2.66	.880	.057
My Benefits	1-5 years	42	2.88	.832	.128
	6-11 years	55	2.75	.985	.133
	12 or more years	137	2.87	.873	.075
	Total	234	2.84	.891	.058
The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach	1-5 years	42	3.43	.630	.097
	6-11 years	55	3.25	.907	.122
	12 or more years	136	3.49	.789	.068
	Total	233	3.42	.796	.052
The authority I have to make decisions about the content and methods in the courses I teach	1-5 years	42	3.81	.397	.061
	6-11 years	55	3.78	.599	.081
	12 or more years	136	3.79	.457	.039
	Total	233	3.79	.483	.032
The authority I have to make decisions about other aspects of my job	1-5 years	42	3.36	.656	.101
	6-11 years	54	3.17	.818	.111
	12 or more years	136	3.43	.593	.051
	Total	232	3.36	.669	.044
The mix of teaching, research, administration, and service that I am required to do	1-5 years	42	3.31	.680	.105
	6-11 years	54	2.98	.879	.120
	12 or more years	136	3.07	.785	.067
	Total	232	3.09	.795	.052
The opportunity for advancement in rank at my institution	1-5 years	42	3.17	.824	.127
	6-11 years	55	3.02	.933	.126
	12 or more years	135	3.14	.940	.081
	Total	232	3.12	.916	.060
Time available for keeping current in my field	1-5 years	41	2.85	.910	.142
	6-11 years	55	2.22	.917	.124
	12 or more years	137	2.42	.828	.071
	Total	233	2.45	.885	.058

NSOPF descriptive statistics by years teaching (career) (continued)

Availability of support services and equipment (clerical support, computers, etc.)	1-5 years	42	3.00	.855	.132
	6-11 years	55	2.75	.886	.120
	12 or more years	138	2.88	.913	.078
	Total	235	2.87	.897	.058
Freedom to do outside consulting	1-5 years	42	3.45	.593	.091
	6-11 years	51	3.18	.767	.107
	12 or more years	131	3.26	.750	.066
	Total	224	3.28	.730	.049
Overall reputation of the institution	1-5 years	42	3.40	.734	.113
	6-11 years	54	3.04	.931	.127
	12 or more years	136	3.24	.704	.060
	Total	232	3.22	.774	.051
Reputation of my department	1-5 years	42	3.21	.842	.130
	6-11 years	55	3.25	.907	.122
	12 or more years	138	3.44	.725	.062
	Total	235	3.36	.795	.052
Institutional mission or philosophy	1-5 years	42	3.62	.492	.076
	6-11 years	54	3.61	.627	.085
	12 or more years	138	3.68	.526	.045
	Total	234	3.65	.544	.036
Quality of leadership in my department	1-5 years	42	3.48	.740	.114
	6-11 years	55	3.20	1.043	.141
	12 or more years	137	3.41	.791	.068
	Total	234	3.37	.851	.056
Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution	1-5 years	42	3.40	.587	.091
	6-11 years	55	3.22	.937	.126
	12 or more years	137	3.00	.970	.083
	Total	234	3.12	.916	.060
Quality of my colleagues in my department	1-5 years	42	3.33	.786	.121
	6-11 years	54	3.54	.665	.090
	12 or more years	136	3.54	.643	.055
	Total	232	3.50	.677	.044
Quality of faculty leadership at my institution	1-5 years	42	3.19	.804	.124
	6-11 years	55	3.02	.892	.120
	12 or more years	137	3.13	.775	.066
	Total	234	3.12	.807	.053
Relationship between administration and faculty at this institution	1-5 years	42	3.02	.680	.105
	6-11 years	55	2.75	1.004	.135
	12 or more years	137	2.74	.926	.079
	Total	234	2.79	.910	.059
Interdepartmental cooperation at this institution	1-5 years	42	2.67	.874	.135
	6-11 years	55	2.71	.916	.124
	12 or more years	137	2.89	.734	.063
	Total	234	2.81	.809	.053

NSOPF descriptive statistics by years teaching (career) (continued)

Spirit of cooperation between faculty at this institution	1-5 years	42	2.95	.825	.127
	6-11 years	55	2.95	.756	.102
	12 or more years	138	3.17	.744	.063
	Total	235	3.08	.766	.050
Quality of my research facilities and support	1-5 years	41	2.51	.746	.116
	6-11 years	53	2.21	.927	.127
	12 or more years	130	2.45	.827	.072
	Total	224	2.40	.841	.056
Quality of students whom I have taught here	1-5 years	42	3.05	.882	.136
	6-11 years	55	2.91	.776	.105
	12 or more years	138	3.14	.700	.060
	Total	235	3.07	.756	.049
Teaching assistance that I receive	1-5 years	39	2.74	.818	.131
	6-11 years	50	2.56	1.013	.143
	12 or more years	125	2.72	.858	.077
	Total	214	2.69	.888	.061
Research assistance that I receive	1-5 years	36	2.39	.728	.121
	6-11 years	49	2.18	.993	.142
	12 or more years	117	2.39	.861	.080
	Total	202	2.34	.874	.061
Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area	1-5 years	39	3.03	.986	.158
	6-11 years	52	3.23	.783	.109
	12 or more years	122	3.40	.676	.061
	Total	213	3.29	.777	.053
My overall satisfaction with my job here	1-5 years	42	3.57	.501	.077
	6-11 years	54	3.35	.731	.099
	12 or more years	138	3.48	.619	.053
	Total	234	3.47	.629	.041
If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	Years Teaching (Career)	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Leave to Retire	1-5 years	42	1.93	.894	.138
	6-11 years	55	1.87	.944	.127
	12 or more years	138	2.34	.867	.074
	Total	235	2.16	.913	.060
Return to school as a student	1-5 years	42	1.26	.544	.084
	6-11 years	55	1.24	.543	.073
	12 or more years	136	1.15	.413	.035
	Total	233	1.19	.472	.031
Accept employment at another Christian college or university	1-5 years	42	2.10	.532	.082
	6-11 years	55	2.16	.660	.089
	12 or more years	136	1.94	.707	.061
	Total	233	2.02	.672	.044

NSOPF descriptive statistics by years teaching (career) (continued)

Accept employment at a secular college or university	1-5 years	42	1.86	.751	.116
	6-11 years	55	1.75	.726	.098
	12 or more years	135	1.53	.583	.050
	Total	232	1.64	.662	.043
Accept employment in consulting or other for-profit business or industry or become self-employed	1-5 years	42	1.71	.708	.109
	6-11 years	55	1.53	.663	.089
	12 or more years	136	1.58	.726	.062
	Total	233	1.59	.708	.046
Accept employment in a non-profit organization	1-5 years	42	1.71	.554	.085
	6-11 years	55	1.73	.679	.092
	12 or more years	135	1.72	.642	.055
	Total	232	1.72	.634	.042
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?	Years Teaching (Career)	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Research	1-5 years	43	1.60	.695	.106
	6-11 years	52	1.42	.605	.084
	12 or more years	135	1.62	.633	.055
	Total	230	1.57	.642	.042
Teaching	1-5 years	43	2.07	.552	.084
	6-11 years	53	2.13	.680	.093
	12 or more years	135	2.16	.549	.047
	Total	231	2.14	.581	.038
Advising	1-5 years	43	2.16	.531	.081
	6-11 years	53	2.15	.533	.073
	12 or more years	134	2.27	.537	.046
	Total	230	2.22	.536	.035
Service	1-5 years	43	2.07	.552	.084
	6-11 years	53	2.09	.597	.082
	12 or more years	136	2.18	.547	.047
	Total	232	2.14	.559	.037
Administration	1-5 years	43	2.07	.704	.107
	6-11 years	52	2.12	.704	.098
	12 or more years	134	2.40	.639	.055
	Total	229	2.28	.681	.045
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?	Years Teaching (Career)	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Salary Level	1-5 years	43	2.51	.592	.090
	6-11 years	55	2.40	.596	.080
	12 or more years	138	2.43	.540	.046
	Total	236	2.44	.562	.037

NSOPF descriptive statistics by years teaching (career) (continued)

Position Level	1-5 years	43	2.37	.655	.100
	6-11 years	54	2.24	.612	.083
	12 or more years	138	2.38	.594	.051
	Total	235	2.34	.610	.040
Job Security	1-5 years	43	2.60	.660	.101
	6-11 years	54	2.52	.606	.083
	12 or more years	138	2.52	.619	.053
	Total	235	2.54	.622	.041
Opportunities for advancement	1-5 years	43	2.47	.631	.096
	6-11 years	55	2.35	.615	.083
	12 or more years	138	2.25	.713	.061
	Total	236	2.31	.679	.044
Benefits	1-5 years	43	2.67	.566	.086
	6-11 years	55	2.69	.466	.063
	12 or more years	138	2.62	.515	.044
	Total	236	2.65	.513	.033
No pressure to publish	1-5 years	43	2.02	.771	.118
	6-11 years	55	2.09	.701	.095
	12 or more years	138	2.22	.712	.061
	Total	236	2.15	.722	.047
Academic Freedom	1-5 years	43	2.47	.550	.084
	6-11 years	55	2.58	.567	.077
	12 or more years	138	2.62	.545	.046
	Total	236	2.58	.551	.036
Good research facilities and equipment	1-5 years	43	2.09	.610	.093
	6-11 years	55	2.20	.558	.075
	12 or more years	136	2.10	.723	.062
	Total	234	2.12	.666	.044
Good instructional facilities and equipment	1-5 years	43	2.33	.566	.086
	6-11 years	55	2.58	.567	.077
	12 or more years	137	2.60	.549	.047
	Total	235	2.54	.563	.037
Excellent Students	1-5 years	43	2.37	.578	.088
	6-11 years	55	2.40	.564	.076
	12 or more years	138	2.45	.568	.048
	Total	236	2.42	.567	.037
Excellent Colleagues	1-5 years	43	2.49	.551	.084
	6-11 years	55	2.73	.449	.061
	12 or more years	138	2.69	.465	.040
	Total	236	2.66	.483	.031
New institution is a Christian college	1-5 years	43	2.21	.742	.113
	6-11 years	55	2.18	.722	.097
	12 or more years	138	2.34	.699	.060
	Total	236	2.28	.713	.046

NSOPF descriptive statistics by years teaching (career) (continued)

Institutional mission or philosophy that is compatible with my own views	1-5 years	43	2.58	.587	.089
	6-11 years	55	2.73	.449	.061
	12 or more years	137	2.66	.518	.044
	Total	235	2.66	.517	.034
Good job for my spouse	1-5 years	39	2.10	.852	.136
	6-11 years	54	2.07	.866	.118
	12 or more years	133	2.11	.846	.073
	Total	226	2.10	.848	.056
Good geographic location	1-5 years	42	2.40	.734	.113
	6-11 years	55	2.51	.573	.077
	12 or more years	136	2.42	.615	.053
	Total	233	2.44	.627	.041
Affordable Housing	1-5 years	42	2.36	.692	.107
	6-11 years	55	2.62	.527	.071
	12 or more years	136	2.50	.609	.052
	Total	233	2.50	.610	.040
Good environment/schools for my children	1-5 years	40	1.95	.904	.143
	6-11 years	53	2.23	.891	.122
	12 or more years	130	1.82	.896	.079
	Total	223	1.94	.908	.061
A full-time position	1-5 years	43	2.74	.539	.082
	6-11 years	54	2.78	.572	.078
	12 or more years	133	2.73	.592	.051
	Total	230	2.74	.576	.038
A part-time position	1-5 years	41	1.41	.631	.099
	6-11 years	54	1.22	.502	.068
	12 or more years	131	1.29	.561	.049
	Total	226	1.30	.562	.037
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Years Teaching (Career)	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
It is important for faculty to participate in governing their institution	1-5 years	43	3.58	.587	.089
	6-11 years	55	3.60	.627	.084
	12 or more years	137	3.68	.528	.045
	Total	235	3.64	.562	.037
Faculty promotions should be based at least in part on formal student evaluations	1-5 years	43	3.07	.737	.112
	6-11 years	55	2.76	.942	.127
	12 or more years	138	2.98	.699	.060
	Total	236	2.94	.773	.050
The tenure system in higher education should be preserved.	1-5 years	43	2.65	.842	.128
	6-11 years	55	2.80	1.007	.136
	12 or more years	137	2.88	.951	.081
	Total	235	2.82	.945	.062

NSOPF descriptive statistics by years teaching (career) (continued)

Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty	1-5 years	43	3.40	.623	.095
	6-11 years	55	3.22	.712	.096
	12 or more years	137	3.31	.650	.056
	Total	235	3.31	.660	.043
Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	1-5 years	43	2.05	.754	.115
	6-11 years	55	1.93	.604	.081
	12 or more years	138	1.86	.707	.060
	Total	236	1.91	.694	.045
Years of service/advanced degree should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	1-5 years	43	2.42	.823	.126
	6-11 years	55	2.56	.688	.093
	12 or more years	136	2.46	.788	.068
	Total	234	2.48	.771	.050
The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution	1-5 years	41	2.51	.779	.122
	6-11 years	53	2.72	.841	.115
	12 or more years	136	2.85	.893	.077
	Total	230	2.76	.868	.057
State or federally mandated assessment requirements have improved the quality of undergraduate education at my institution	1-5 years	41	2.44	.709	.111
	6-11 years	52	2.10	.869	.121
	12 or more years	134	2.21	.841	.073
	Total	227	2.22	.830	.055
Female faculty members are treated fairly at my institution	1-5 years	42	3.29	.673	.104
	6-11 years	55	3.24	.793	.107
	12 or more years	137	3.26	.767	.066
	Total	234	3.26	.754	.049
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at my institution	1-5 years	41	3.37	.623	.097
	6-11 years	53	3.25	.853	.117
	12 or more years	138	3.28	.764	.065
	Total	232	3.29	.761	.050
My institution effectively meets the educational needs of entering students	1-5 years	42	3.31	.749	.116
	6-11 years	55	3.07	.766	.103
	12 or more years	137	3.26	.653	.056
	Total	234	3.22	.701	.046
If I had it to do over again, I would choose an academic career	1-5 years	43	3.74	.581	.089
	6-11 years	55	3.69	.605	.082
	12 or more years	138	3.83	.451	.038
	Total	236	3.78	.516	.034

NSOPF descriptive statistics by years teaching (institution)

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Years Teaching (Career)	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
My Work Load	1-5 years	74	3.00	.936	.109
	6-11 years	64	2.84	.877	.110
	12 or more years	99	2.80	.782	.079
	Total	237	2.87	.859	.056
My job security	1-5 years	73	3.32	.743	.087
	6-11 years	64	3.16	.979	.122
	12 or more years	99	3.62	.666	.067
	Total	236	3.40	.806	.052
My Salary	1-5 years	74	2.59	.792	.092
	6-11 years	64	2.80	.929	.116
	12 or more years	99	2.59	.915	.092
	Total	237	2.65	.884	.057
My Benefits	1-5 years	74	2.88	.843	.098
	6-11 years	63	2.86	.877	.111
	12 or more years	99	2.80	.937	.094
	Total	236	2.84	.889	.058
The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach	1-5 years	74	3.30	.735	.085
	6-11 years	64	3.36	.966	.121
	12 or more years	97	3.57	.691	.070
	Total	235	3.43	.794	.052
The authority I have to make decisions about the content and methods in the courses I teach	1-5 years	74	3.78	.504	.059
	6-11 years	64	3.77	.556	.070
	12 or more years	97	3.81	.417	.042
	Total	235	3.79	.484	.032
The authority I have to make decisions about other aspects of my job	1-5 years	72	3.33	.650	.077
	6-11 years	64	3.20	.780	.098
	12 or more years	98	3.48	.578	.058
	Total	234	3.36	.668	.044
The mix of teaching, research, administration, and service that I am required to do	1-5 years	73	3.22	.786	.092
	6-11 years	64	2.94	.833	.104
	12 or more years	97	3.10	.757	.077
	Total	234	3.09	.791	.052
The opportunity for advancement in rank at my institution	1-5 years	74	3.22	.880	.102
	6-11 years	63	2.95	.869	.110
	12 or more years	97	3.13	.964	.098
	Total	234	3.11	.915	.060
Time available for keeping current in my field	1-5 years	73	2.64	.933	.109
	6-11 years	64	2.25	.891	.111
	12 or more years	98	2.42	.811	.082
	Total	235	2.44	.882	.058

NSOPF descriptive statistics by years teaching (institution) (continued)

Availability of support services and equipment (clerical support, computers, etc.)	1-5 years	74	2.89	.945	.110
	6-11 years	64	2.69	.871	.109
	12 or more years	99	2.98	.857	.086
	Total	237	2.87	.893	.058
Freedom to do outside consulting	1-5 years	71	3.32	.650	.077
	6-11 years	62	3.26	.828	.105
	12 or more years	93	3.25	.717	.074
	Total	226	3.27	.727	.048
Overall reputation of the institution	1-5 years	73	3.22	.854	.100
	6-11 years	64	3.27	.802	.100
	12 or more years	97	3.20	.687	.070
	Total	234	3.22	.771	.050
Reputation of my department	1-5 years	74	3.20	.844	.098
	6-11 years	64	3.44	.852	.107
	12 or more years	99	3.42	.701	.070
	Total	237	3.36	.793	.052
Institutional mission or philosophy	1-5 years	74	3.62	.542	.063
	6-11 years	63	3.60	.636	.080
	12 or more years	99	3.71	.479	.048
	Total	236	3.65	.544	.035
Quality of leadership in my department	1-5 years	74	3.36	.837	.097
	6-11 years	64	3.38	.900	.112
	12 or more years	98	3.39	.833	.084
	Total	236	3.38	.849	.055
Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution	1-5 years	74	3.32	.760	.088
	6-11 years	64	3.16	.946	.118
	12 or more years	98	2.94	.993	.100
	Total	236	3.12	.924	.060
Quality of my colleagues in my department	1-5 years	74	3.38	.771	.090
	6-11 years	63	3.56	.590	.074
	12 or more years	97	3.56	.645	.065
	Total	234	3.50	.676	.044
Quality of faculty leadership at my institution	1-5 years	74	3.15	.855	.099
	6-11 years	64	3.02	.826	.103
	12 or more years	98	3.16	.756	.076
	Total	236	3.12	.806	.052
Relationship between administration and faculty at this institution	1-5 years	74	2.89	.837	.097
	6-11 years	64	2.78	1.015	.127
	12 or more years	98	2.71	.908	.092
	Total	236	2.79	.917	.060
Interdepartmental cooperation at this institution	1-5 years	74	2.76	.873	.101
	6-11 years	64	2.75	.836	.104
	12 or more years	98	2.87	.755	.076
	Total	236	2.80	.814	.053

NSOPF descriptive statistics by years teaching (institution) (continued)

Spirit of cooperation between faculty at this institution	1-5 years	74	3.04	.784	.091
	6-11 years	64	3.08	.697	.087
	12 or more years	99	3.11	.794	.080
	Total	237	3.08	.763	.050
Quality of my research facilities and support	1-5 years	72	2.39	.832	.098
	6-11 years	62	2.42	.915	.116
	12 or more years	92	2.41	.800	.083
	Total	226	2.41	.839	.056
Quality of students whom I have taught here	1-5 years	74	2.96	.851	.099
	6-11 years	64	3.09	.750	.094
	12 or more years	99	3.15	.676	.068
	Total	237	3.08	.755	.049
Teaching assistance that I receive	1-5 years	68	2.63	.879	.107
	6-11 years	59	2.68	.899	.117
	12 or more years	89	2.73	.889	.094
	Total	216	2.69	.886	.060
Research assistance that I receive	1-5 years	65	2.37	.876	.109
	6-11 years	59	2.29	.911	.119
	12 or more years	80	2.35	.858	.096
	Total	204	2.34	.876	.061
Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area	1-5 years	65	3.02	.857	.106
	6-11 years	61	3.33	.811	.104
	12 or more years	88	3.45	.642	.068
	Total	214	3.29	.780	.053
My overall satisfaction with my job here	1-5 years	73	3.51	.580	.068
	6-11 years	64	3.41	.660	.082
	12 or more years	99	3.46	.644	.065
	Total	236	3.46	.628	.041
If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	Years Teaching (Institution)	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Leave to Retire	1-5 years	74	1.82	.881	.102
	6-11 years	64	2.05	.950	.119
	12 or more years	99	2.47	.812	.082
	Total	237	2.16	.914	.059
Return to school as a student	1-5 years	74	1.28	.586	.068
	6-11 years	64	1.23	.496	.062
	12 or more years	97	1.09	.325	.033
	Total	235	1.19	.473	.031
Accept employment at another Christian college or university	1-5 years	74	2.12	.618	.072
	6-11 years	64	2.05	.653	.082
	12 or more years	97	1.92	.717	.073
	Total	235	2.02	.673	.044

NSOPF descriptive statistics by years teaching (institution) (continued)

Accept employment at a secular college or university	1-5 years	74	1.82	.709	.082
	6-11 years	64	1.70	.683	.085
	12 or more years	96	1.45	.560	.057
	Total	234	1.64	.662	.043
Accept employment in consulting or other for-profit business or industry or become self-employed	1-5 years	74	1.58	.702	.082
	6-11 years	64	1.58	.662	.083
	12 or more years	97	1.62	.742	.075
	Total	235	1.60	.706	.046
Accept employment in a non-profit organization	1-5 years	74	1.69	.639	.074
	6-11 years	63	1.68	.643	.081
	12 or more years	97	1.76	.625	.063
	Total	234	1.72	.633	.041
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?	Years Teaching (Institution)	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Research	1-5 years	75	1.57	.661	.076
	6-11 years	61	1.52	.595	.076
	12 or more years	96	1.60	.657	.067
	Total	232	1.57	.640	.042
Teaching	1-5 years	75	2.13	.600	.069
	6-11 years	62	2.10	.646	.082
	12 or more years	96	2.18	.523	.053
	Total	233	2.14	.581	.038
Advising	1-5 years	74	2.19	.515	.060
	6-11 years	62	2.16	.578	.073
	12 or more years	96	2.30	.526	.054
	Total	232	2.23	.538	.035
Service	1-5 years	75	2.11	.559	.065
	6-11 years	62	2.16	.578	.073
	12 or more years	97	2.16	.553	.056
	Total	234	2.15	.560	.037
Administration	1-5 years	74	2.05	.680	.079
	6-11 years	60	2.20	.659	.085
	12 or more years	97	2.49	.631	.064
	Total	231	2.28	.680	.045
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?	Years Teaching (Institution)	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Salary Level	1-5 years	75	2.53	.528	.061
	6-11 years	64	2.34	.597	.075
	12 or more years	99	2.43	.556	.056
	Total	238	2.44	.561	.036

NSOPF descriptive statistics by years teaching (institution) (continued)

Position Level	1-5 years	74	2.41	.618	.072
	6-11 years	64	2.23	.584	.073
	12 or more years	99	2.37	.616	.062
	Total	237	2.35	.609	.040
Job Security	1-5 years	74	2.58	.619	.072
	6-11 years	64	2.50	.617	.077
	12 or more years	99	2.54	.628	.063
	Total	237	2.54	.621	.040
Opportunities for advancement	1-5 years	75	2.44	.598	.069
	6-11 years	64	2.33	.668	.083
	12 or more years	99	2.21	.732	.074
	Total	238	2.32	.679	.044
Benefits	1-5 years	75	2.68	.524	.061
	6-11 years	64	2.67	.506	.063
	12 or more years	99	2.62	.509	.051
	Total	238	2.65	.512	.033
No pressure to publish	1-5 years	75	2.01	.762	.088
	6-11 years	64	2.20	.717	.090
	12 or more years	99	2.24	.686	.069
	Total	238	2.16	.723	.047
Academic Freedom	1-5 years	75	2.51	.578	.067
	6-11 years	64	2.66	.541	.068
	12 or more years	99	2.59	.535	.054
	Total	238	2.58	.551	.036
Good research facilities and equipment	1-5 years	75	2.13	.622	.072
	6-11 years	64	2.14	.614	.077
	12 or more years	97	2.11	.734	.075
	Total	236	2.13	.666	.043
Good instructional facilities and equipment	1-5 years	75	2.47	.553	.064
	6-11 years	64	2.52	.617	.077
	12 or more years	98	2.63	.525	.053
	Total	237	2.55	.563	.037
Excellent Students	1-5 years	75	2.40	.593	.068
	6-11 years	64	2.38	.549	.069
	12 or more years	99	2.48	.560	.056
	Total	238	2.43	.567	.037
Excellent Colleagues	1-5 years	75	2.60	.520	.060
	6-11 years	64	2.67	.473	.059
	12 or more years	99	2.71	.457	.046
	Total	238	2.66	.482	.031
New institution is a Christian college	1-5 years	75	2.15	.748	.086
	6-11 years	64	2.20	.760	.095
	12 or more years	99	2.43	.625	.063
	Total	238	2.28	.712	.046

NSOPF descriptive statistics by years teaching (institution) (continued)

Institutional mission or philosophy that is compatible with my own views	1-5 years	75	2.60	.545	.063
	6-11 years	64	2.66	.570	.071
	12 or more years	98	2.71	.454	.046
	Total	237	2.66	.517	.034
Good job for my spouse	1-5 years	69	1.96	.848	.102
	6-11 years	63	2.17	.853	.107
	12 or more years	95	2.16	.842	.086
	Total	227	2.10	.848	.056
Good geographic location	1-5 years	74	2.38	.676	.079
	6-11 years	64	2.53	.590	.074
	12 or more years	97	2.43	.611	.062
	Total	235	2.44	.627	.041
Affordable Housing	1-5 years	73	2.44	.623	.073
	6-11 years	63	2.52	.644	.081
	12 or more years	99	2.55	.576	.058
	Total	235	2.51	.609	.040
Good environment/schools for my children	1-5 years	69	2.06	.906	.109
	6-11 years	61	1.97	.912	.117
	12 or more years	94	1.84	.908	.094
	Total	224	1.94	.909	.061
A full-time position	1-5 years	73	2.79	.499	.058
	6-11 years	63	2.75	.595	.075
	12 or more years	96	2.69	.638	.065
	Total	232	2.74	.585	.038
A part-time position	1-5 years	72	1.35	.609	.072
	6-11 years	61	1.20	.440	.056
	12 or more years	95	1.34	.612	.063
	Total	228	1.30	.571	.038
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Years Teaching (Institution)	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
It is important for faculty to participate in governing their institution	1-5 years	75	3.63	.564	.065
	6-11 years	64	3.58	.612	.077
	12 or more years	98	3.69	.526	.053
	Total	237	3.64	.562	.036
Faculty promotions should be based at least in part on formal student evaluations	1-5 years	75	2.99	.726	.084
	6-11 years	64	2.89	.819	.102
	12 or more years	99	2.95	.774	.078
	Total	238	2.95	.769	.050
The tenure system in higher education should be preserved	1-5 years	75	2.79	.890	.103
	6-11 years	64	2.72	1.105	.138
	12 or more years	98	2.90	.867	.088
	Total	237	2.81	.943	.061

NSOPF descriptive statistics by years teaching (institution) (continued)

Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty	1-5 years	75	3.36	.584	.067
	6-11 years	64	3.30	.706	.088
	12 or more years	98	3.28	.685	.069
	Total	237	3.31	.659	.043
Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	1-5 years	75	2.08	.731	.084
	6-11 years	64	1.88	.577	.072
	12 or more years	99	1.80	.714	.072
	Total	238	1.91	.693	.045
Years of service/advanced degree should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	1-5 years	75	2.48	.795	.092
	6-11 years	64	2.59	.684	.085
	12 or more years	97	2.40	.799	.081
	Total	236	2.48	.769	.050
The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution	1-5 years	70	2.59	.860	.103
	6-11 years	64	2.66	.895	.112
	12 or more years	98	2.93	.828	.084
	Total	232	2.75	.867	.057
State or federally mandated assessment requirements have improved the quality of undergraduate education at my institution	1-5 years	71	2.38	.834	.099
	6-11 years	62	2.05	.688	.087
	12 or more years	96	2.23	.888	.091
	Total	229	2.23	.828	.055
Female faculty members are treated fairly at my institution	1-5 years	74	3.34	.708	.082
	6-11 years	63	3.19	.820	.103
	12 or more years	99	3.23	.754	.076
	Total	236	3.25	.757	.049
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at my institution	1-5 years	72	3.43	.624	.074
	6-11 years	63	3.24	.837	.105
	12 or more years	99	3.20	.820	.082
	Total	234	3.28	.773	.051
My institution effectively meets the educational needs of entering students	1-5 years	74	3.31	.681	.079
	6-11 years	64	3.09	.791	.099
	12 or more years	97	3.25	.646	.066
	Total	235	3.23	.701	.046
If I had it to do over again, I would choose an academic career	1-5 years	75	3.79	.527	.061
	6-11 years	64	3.78	.519	.065
	12 or more years	99	3.78	.506	.051
	Total	238	3.78	.514	.033

NSOPF descriptive statistics by expected retirement age

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Expected Retirement Age	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
My Work Load	60 or less	24	3.04	.806	.165
	61-65	92	2.86	.872	.091
	66 or above	110	2.85	.869	.083
	Total	226	2.87	.862	.057
My job security	60 or less	24	3.25	.847	.173
	61-65	92	3.45	.803	.084
	66 or above	109	3.42	.773	.074
	Total	225	3.41	.792	.053
My Salary	60 or less	24	2.42	.881	.180
	61-65	92	2.68	.925	.096
	66 or above	110	2.69	.821	.078
	Total	226	2.66	.871	.058
My Benefits	60 or less	24	2.54	1.103	.225
	61-65	91	2.90	.844	.088
	66 or above	110	2.91	.852	.081
	Total	225	2.87	.881	.059
The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach	60 or less	24	3.50	.590	.120
	61-65	92	3.40	.813	.085
	66 or above	108	3.44	.812	.078
	Total	224	3.43	.789	.053
The authority I have to make decisions about the content and methods in the courses I teach	60 or less	24	3.88	.338	.069
	61-65	92	3.67	.576	.060
	66 or above	108	3.85	.428	.041
	Total	224	3.78	.493	.033
The authority I have to make decisions about other aspects of my job	60 or less	24	3.33	.482	.098
	61-65	92	3.37	.722	.075
	66 or above	108	3.39	.624	.060
	Total	224	3.38	.651	.043
The mix of teaching, research, administration, and service that I am required to do	60 or less	24	3.08	.776	.158
	61-65	92	3.12	.754	.079
	66 or above	108	3.08	.810	.078
	Total	224	3.10	.780	.052
The opportunity for advancement in rank at my institution	60 or less	24	2.79	.932	.190
	61-65	92	3.14	.933	.097
	66 or above	108	3.19	.877	.084
	Total	224	3.13	.910	.061
Time available for keeping current in my field	60 or less	23	2.52	.730	.152
	61-65	92	2.41	.904	.094
	66 or above	109	2.46	.918	.088
	Total	224	2.45	.892	.060

NSOPF descriptive statistics by expected retirement age (continued)

Availability of support services and equipment (clerical support, computers, etc.)	60 or less	24	2.96	.908	.185
	61-65	92	2.83	.956	.100
	66 or above	110	2.88	.854	.081
	Total	226	2.87	.899	.060
Freedom to do outside consulting	60 or less	23	3.35	.714	.149
	61-65	89	3.25	.727	.077
	66 or above	106	3.30	.733	.071
	Total	218	3.28	.726	.049
Overall reputation of the institution	60 or less	24	3.21	.884	.180
	61-65	92	3.24	.790	.082
	66 or above	107	3.21	.753	.073
	Total	223	3.22	.779	.052
Reputation of my department	60 or less	24	3.29	.908	.185
	61-65	92	3.37	.822	.086
	66 or above	110	3.36	.763	.073
	Total	226	3.36	.800	.053
Institutional mission or philosophy	60 or less	24	3.67	.482	.098
	61-65	91	3.68	.575	.060
	66 or above	110	3.62	.542	.052
	Total	225	3.65	.548	.037
Quality of leadership in my department	60 or less	24	3.33	.868	.177
	61-65	92	3.39	.851	.089
	66 or above	109	3.39	.828	.079
	Total	225	3.39	.838	.056
Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution	60 or less	24	3.04	.859	.175
	61-65	92	3.20	.867	.090
	66 or above	109	3.07	.979	.094
	Total	225	3.12	.920	.061
Quality of my colleagues in my department	60 or less	23	3.35	.832	.173
	61-65	92	3.58	.615	.064
	66 or above	108	3.46	.703	.068
	Total	223	3.50	.684	.046
Quality of faculty leadership at my institution	60 or less	24	2.92	.929	.190
	61-65	92	3.18	.769	.080
	66 or above	110	3.11	.817	.078
	Total	226	3.12	.810	.054
Relationship between administration and faculty at this institution	60 or less	24	2.71	.806	.165
	61-65	92	2.92	.880	.092
	66 or above	109	2.71	.956	.092
	Total	225	2.80	.913	.061
Interdepartmental cooperation at this institution	60 or less	24	2.50	.659	.135
	61-65	92	2.86	.921	.096
	66 or above	110	2.85	.744	.071
	Total	226	2.81	.817	.054

NSOPF descriptive statistics by expected retirement age (continued)

Spirit of cooperation between faculty at this institution	60 or less	24	2.79	.721	.147
	61-65	92	3.12	.796	.083
	66 or above	110	3.13	.731	.070
	Total	226	3.09	.761	.051
Quality of my research facilities and support	60 or less	23	2.39	.783	.163
	61-65	91	2.44	.897	.094
	66 or above	103	2.41	.785	.077
	Total	217	2.42	.830	.056
Quality of students whom I have taught here	60 or less	24	3.17	.917	.187
	61-65	92	3.07	.753	.079
	66 or above	110	3.07	.726	.069
	Total	226	3.08	.756	.050
Teaching assistance that I receive	60 or less	21	2.86	.727	.159
	61-65	83	2.67	.885	.097
	66 or above	105	2.67	.895	.087
	Total	209	2.69	.874	.060
Research assistance that I receive	60 or less	20	2.55	.759	.170
	61-65	81	2.42	.906	.101
	66 or above	97	2.24	.863	.088
	Total	198	2.34	.874	.062
Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area	60 or less	24	3.33	.637	.130
	61-65	84	3.23	.827	.090
	66 or above	95	3.37	.745	.076
	Total	203	3.31	.768	.054
My overall satisfaction with my job here	60 or less	24	3.21	.779	.159
	61-65	92	3.49	.620	.065
	66 or above	109	3.54	.553	.053
	Total	225	3.48	.613	.041
If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	Expected Retirement Age	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Leave to Retire	60 or less	23	1.83	.887	.185
	61-65	93	2.23	.886	.092
	66 or above	110	2.24	.928	.088
	Total	226	2.19	.911	.061
Return to school as a student	60 or less	23	1.22	.518	.108
	61-65	93	1.27	.554	.057
	66 or above	109	1.14	.396	.038
	Total	225	1.20	.482	.032
Accept employment at another Christian college or university	60 or less	23	1.87	.548	.114
	61-65	93	1.88	.673	.070
	66 or above	109	2.14	.673	.064
	Total	225	2.00	.671	.045

NSOPF descriptive statistics by expected retirement age (continued)

Accept employment at a secular college or university	60 or less	23	1.78	.600	.125
	61-65	93	1.65	.702	.073
	66 or above	108	1.58	.643	.062
	Total	224	1.63	.664	.044
Accept employment in consulting or other for-profit business or industry or become self-employed	60 or less	23	2.04	.638	.133
	61-65	93	1.65	.761	.079
	66 or above	109	1.44	.615	.059
	Total	225	1.59	.703	.047
Accept employment in a non-profit organization	60 or less	23	1.65	.714	.149
	61-65	93	1.77	.694	.072
	66 or above	108	1.68	.577	.056
	Total	224	1.71	.641	.043
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?	Expected Retirement Age	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Research	60 or less	24	1.92	.654	.133
	61-65	90	1.67	.653	.069
	66 or above	108	1.45	.602	.058
	Total	222	1.59	.644	.043
Teaching	60 or less	24	2.21	.509	.104
	61-65	92	2.10	.594	.062
	66 or above	107	2.17	.574	.056
	Total	223	2.14	.575	.039
Advising	60 or less	24	2.29	.550	.112
	61-65	92	2.17	.567	.059
	66 or above	106	2.25	.518	.050
	Total	222	2.23	.541	.036
Service	60 or less	24	2.00	.511	.104
	61-65	92	2.10	.536	.056
	66 or above	108	2.23	.590	.057
	Total	224	2.15	.564	.038
Administration	60 or less	24	1.96	.690	.141
	61-65	91	2.35	.639	.067
	66 or above	106	2.28	.700	.068
	Total	221	2.28	.681	.046
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?	Expected Retirement Age	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Salary Level	60 or less	24	2.54	.509	.104
	61-65	93	2.44	.598	.062
	66 or above	110	2.44	.534	.051
	Total	227	2.45	.557	.037

NSOPF descriptive statistics by expected retirement age (continued)

Position Level	60 or less	24	2.50	.590	.120
	61-65	93	2.26	.641	.066
	66 or above	109	2.39	.593	.057
	Total	226	2.35	.616	.041
Job Security	60 or less	24	2.50	.722	.147
	61-65	93	2.52	.619	.064
	66 or above	109	2.57	.614	.059
	Total	226	2.54	.626	.042
Opportunities for advancement	60 or less	24	2.46	.658	.134
	61-65	93	2.26	.706	.073
	66 or above	110	2.35	.656	.063
	Total	227	2.32	.677	.045
Benefits	60 or less	24	2.63	.647	.132
	61-65	93	2.62	.530	.055
	66 or above	110	2.67	.471	.045
	Total	227	2.65	.514	.034
No pressure to publish	60 or less	24	2.46	.721	.147
	61-65	93	2.17	.746	.077
	66 or above	110	2.07	.700	.067
	Total	227	2.15	.727	.048
Academic Freedom	60 or less	24	2.50	.659	.135
	61-65	93	2.52	.601	.062
	66 or above	110	2.65	.478	.046
	Total	227	2.58	.554	.037
Good research facilities and equipment	60 or less	24	1.96	.690	.141
	61-65	92	2.12	.709	.074
	66 or above	109	2.15	.606	.058
	Total	225	2.12	.658	.044
Good instructional facilities and equipment	60 or less	24	2.46	.588	.120
	61-65	93	2.57	.579	.060
	66 or above	109	2.55	.553	.053
	Total	226	2.55	.566	.038
Excellent Students	60 or less	24	2.33	.637	.130
	61-65	93	2.45	.581	.060
	66 or above	110	2.42	.548	.052
	Total	227	2.42	.570	.038
Excellent Colleagues	60 or less	24	2.63	.576	.118
	61-65	93	2.67	.474	.049
	66 or above	110	2.66	.475	.045
	Total	227	2.66	.484	.032
New institution is a Christian college	60 or less	24	2.08	.654	.133
	61-65	93	2.15	.751	.078
	66 or above	110	2.45	.658	.063
	Total	227	2.29	.711	.047

NSOPF descriptive statistics by expected retirement age (continued)

Institutional mission or philosophy that is compatible with my own views	60 or less	24	2.46	.658	.134
	61-65	92	2.64	.482	.050
	66 or above	110	2.71	.513	.049
	Total	226	2.65	.521	.035
Good job for my spouse	60 or less	23	2.30	.765	.159
	61-65	89	2.15	.833	.088
	66 or above	104	2.02	.870	.085
	Total	216	2.10	.846	.058
Good geographic location	60 or less	23	2.48	.665	.139
	61-65	93	2.48	.653	.068
	66 or above	109	2.42	.598	.057
	Total	225	2.45	.626	.042
Affordable Housing	60 or less	22	2.41	.666	.142
	61-65	93	2.57	.632	.066
	66 or above	109	2.50	.571	.055
	Total	224	2.52	.606	.040
Good environment/schools for my children	60 or less	23	2.35	.832	.173
	61-65	88	1.95	.921	.098
	66 or above	103	1.85	.890	.088
	Total	214	1.95	.905	.062
A full-time position	60 or less	24	2.63	.711	.145
	61-65	92	2.70	.624	.065
	66 or above	106	2.81	.500	.049
	Total	222	2.74	.580	.039
A part-time position	60 or less	23	1.57	.728	.152
	61-65	89	1.36	.626	.066
	66 or above	107	1.21	.476	.046
	Total	219	1.31	.578	.039
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Expected Retirement Age	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
It is important for faculty to participate in governing their institution	60 or less	24	3.50	.659	.135
	61-65	92	3.64	.526	.055
	66 or above	110	3.67	.576	.055
	Total	226	3.64	.566	.038
Faculty promotions should be based at least in part on formal student evaluations	60 or less	24	3.13	.797	.163
	61-65	93	2.92	.726	.075
	66 or above	110	2.95	.771	.073
	Total	227	2.96	.754	.050
The tenure system in higher education should be preserved	60 or less	24	2.46	.932	.190
	61-65	92	2.73	.950	.099
	66 or above	110	2.95	.913	.087
	Total	226	2.81	.940	.063

NSOPF descriptive statistics by expected retirement age (continued)

Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty	60 or less	24	3.25	.608	.124
	61-65	92	3.26	.693	.072
	66 or above	110	3.37	.619	.059
	Total	226	3.31	.649	.043
Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	60 or less	24	1.83	.637	.130
	61-65	93	1.87	.711	.074
	66 or above	110	1.98	.704	.067
	Total	227	1.92	.699	.046
Years of service/advanced degree should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	60 or less	24	2.79	.779	.159
	61-65	92	2.51	.777	.081
	66 or above	109	2.44	.726	.070
	Total	225	2.51	.757	.050
The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution	60 or less	24	2.67	.816	.167
	61-65	92	2.83	.909	.095
	66 or above	107	2.68	.853	.082
	Total	223	2.74	.872	.058
State or federally mandated assessment requirements have improved the quality of undergraduate education at my institution	60 or less	23	2.26	.915	.191
	61-65	90	2.30	.867	.091
	66 or above	106	2.17	.798	.078
	Total	219	2.23	.838	.057
Female faculty members are treated fairly at my institution	60 or less	24	3.13	.947	.193
	61-65	92	3.23	.713	.074
	66 or above	109	3.28	.768	.074
	Total	225	3.24	.765	.051
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at my institution	60 or less	22	3.23	.922	.197
	61-65	93	3.24	.743	.077
	66 or above	108	3.29	.786	.076
	Total	223	3.26	.780	.052
My institution effectively meets the educational needs of entering students	60 or less	24	3.21	.588	.120
	61-65	93	3.24	.728	.076
	66 or above	108	3.22	.715	.069
	Total	225	3.23	.705	.047
If I had it to do over again, I would choose an academic career	60 or less	24	3.50	.722	.147
	61-65	93	3.83	.433	.045
	66 or above	110	3.82	.510	.049
	Total	227	3.79	.515	.034

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic field

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution	Academic Field	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
My Work Load	Humanities	71	2.76	.783	.093
	Physical Sciences	29	2.38	.903	.168
	Pre-Professional	77	3.19	.859	.098
	Social Sciences	41	2.73	.837	.131
	Other	13	3.00	.707	.196
	Total	231	2.87	.867	.057
My job security	Humanities	71	3.30	.868	.103
	Physical Sciences	29	3.48	.738	.137
	Pre-Professional	76	3.43	.736	.084
	Social Sciences	41	3.54	.778	.121
	Other	13	3.31	.855	.237
	Total	230	3.41	.792	.052
My Salary	Humanities	71	2.75	.806	.096
	Physical Sciences	29	2.72	.841	.156
	Pre-Professional	77	2.65	.900	.103
	Social Sciences	41	2.46	.925	.144
	Other	13	2.77	.927	.257
	Total	231	2.66	.869	.057
My Benefits	Humanities	71	2.90	.928	.110
	Physical Sciences	29	2.86	.875	.163
	Pre-Professional	77	2.88	.843	.096
	Social Sciences	41	2.66	.911	.142
	Other	12	2.83	.937	.271
	Total	230	2.84	.887	.059
The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach	Humanities	71	3.39	.819	.097
	Physical Sciences	29	3.59	.568	.105
	Pre-Professional	75	3.37	.785	.091
	Social Sciences	41	3.56	.776	.121
	Other	13	3.62	.768	.213
	Total	229	3.45	.769	.051
The authority I have to make decisions about the content and methods in the courses I teach	Humanities	71	3.77	.566	.067
	Physical Sciences	29	3.86	.351	.065
	Pre-Professional	75	3.76	.489	.056
	Social Sciences	41	3.93	.346	.054
	Other	13	3.62	.506	.140
	Total	229	3.80	.481	.032

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic field (continued)

The authority I have to make decisions about other aspects of my job	Humanities	69	3.36	.707	.085
	Physical Sciences	29	3.45	.632	.117
	Pre-Professional	76	3.36	.626	.072
	Social Sciences	41	3.29	.750	.117
	Other	13	3.46	.519	.144
	Total	228	3.36	.666	.044
The mix of teaching, research, administration, and service that I am required to do	Humanities	70	3.06	.759	.091
	Physical Sciences	29	2.86	.693	.129
	Pre-Professional	76	3.29	.830	.095
	Social Sciences	40	2.95	.815	.129
	Other	13	3.15	.689	.191
	Total	228	3.10	.791	.052
The opportunity for advancement in rank at my institution	Humanities	71	3.20	.904	.107
	Physical Sciences	29	3.10	.939	.174
	Pre-Professional	76	3.04	.930	.107
	Social Sciences	40	3.28	.847	.134
	Other	12	2.92	.996	.288
	Total	228	3.13	.910	.060
Time available for keeping current in my field	Humanities	71	2.31	.855	.101
	Physical Sciences	29	2.17	.805	.149
	Pre-Professional	75	2.69	.900	.104
	Social Sciences	41	2.37	.888	.139
	Other	13	2.69	.855	.237
	Total	229	2.45	.885	.058
Availability of support services and equipment (clerical support, computers, etc.)	Humanities	71	2.77	.944	.112
	Physical Sciences	29	2.69	.891	.165
	Pre-Professional	77	3.06	.864	.098
	Social Sciences	41	2.83	.834	.130
	Other	13	2.92	.954	.265
	Total	231	2.88	.896	.059
Freedom to do outside consulting	Humanities	68	3.37	.644	.078
	Physical Sciences	26	3.08	.845	.166
	Pre-Professional	75	3.37	.673	.078
	Social Sciences	39	3.26	.751	.120
	Other	12	2.92	.996	.288
	Total	220	3.29	.726	.049
Overall reputation of the institution	Humanities	71	3.15	.768	.091
	Physical Sciences	29	3.00	.756	.140
	Pre-Professional	75	3.49	.665	.077
	Social Sciences	40	3.05	.876	.138
	Other	13	3.38	.506	.140
	Total	228	3.24	.762	.050

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic field (continued)

Reputation of my department	Humanities	71	3.18	.833	.099
	Physical Sciences	29	3.31	.712	.132
	Pre-Professional	77	3.45	.770	.088
	Social Sciences	41	3.41	.805	.126
	Other	13	3.85	.376	.104
	Total	231	3.37	.785	.052
Institutional mission or philosophy	Humanities	71	3.62	.544	.065
	Physical Sciences	29	3.76	.435	.081
	Pre-Professional	76	3.68	.496	.057
	Social Sciences	41	3.61	.666	.104
	Other	13	3.77	.439	.122
	Total	230	3.67	.534	.035
Quality of leadership in my department	Humanities	71	3.08	.982	.117
	Physical Sciences	29	3.52	.574	.107
	Pre-Professional	77	3.52	.771	.088
	Social Sciences	40	3.48	.784	.124
	Other	13	3.77	.439	.122
	Total	230	3.39	.833	.055
Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution	Humanities	71	3.03	.925	.110
	Physical Sciences	29	2.86	.990	.184
	Pre-Professional	76	3.30	.880	.101
	Social Sciences	41	3.24	.830	.130
	Other	13	2.92	1.038	.288
	Total	230	3.13	.916	.060
Quality of my colleagues in my department	Humanities	71	3.42	.710	.084
	Physical Sciences	29	3.62	.677	.126
	Pre-Professional	75	3.57	.597	.069
	Social Sciences	40	3.43	.747	.118
	Other	13	3.69	.480	.133
	Total	228	3.51	.667	.044
Quality of faculty leadership at my institution	Humanities	71	3.07	.867	.103
	Physical Sciences	29	2.93	.704	.131
	Pre-Professional	77	3.21	.800	.091
	Social Sciences	40	3.15	.770	.122
	Other	13	3.15	.801	.222
	Total	230	3.12	.803	.053
Relationship between administration and faculty at this institution	Humanities	70	2.76	.842	.101
	Physical Sciences	29	2.55	1.055	.196
	Pre-Professional	77	2.96	.880	.100
	Social Sciences	41	2.80	.872	.136
	Other	13	2.54	1.127	.312
	Total	230	2.80	.909	.060

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic field (continued)

Interdepartmental cooperation at this institution	Humanities	71	2.83	.845	.100
	Physical Sciences	29	2.97	.823	.153
	Pre-Professional	77	2.69	.831	.095
	Social Sciences	40	2.85	.662	.105
	Other	13	2.85	.899	.249
	Total	230	2.80	.810	.053
Spirit of cooperation between faculty at this institution	Humanities	71	3.08	.806	.096
	Physical Sciences	29	3.28	.591	.110
	Pre-Professional	77	3.00	.827	.094
	Social Sciences	41	3.07	.685	.107
	Other	13	3.15	.689	.191
	Total	231	3.08	.762	.050
Quality of my research facilities and support	Humanities	69	2.43	.757	.091
	Physical Sciences	27	2.07	.874	.168
	Pre-Professional	71	2.62	.834	.099
	Social Sciences	41	2.20	.901	.141
	Other	12	2.58	.793	.229
	Total	220	2.41	.842	.057
Quality of students whom I have taught here	Humanities	71	2.97	.696	.083
	Physical Sciences	29	2.86	.743	.138
	Pre-Professional	77	3.26	.696	.079
	Social Sciences	41	3.02	.851	.133
	Other	13	3.38	.650	.180
	Total	231	3.09	.741	.049
Teaching assistance that I receive	Humanities	67	2.37	.850	.104
	Physical Sciences	28	2.86	.756	.143
	Pre-Professional	66	3.00	.911	.112
	Social Sciences	38	2.55	.760	.123
	Other	12	3.08	.793	.229
	Total	211	2.71	.878	.060
Research assistance that I receive	Humanities	66	2.23	.760	.094
	Physical Sciences	24	2.17	.868	.177
	Pre-Professional	62	2.61	1.014	.129
	Social Sciences	35	2.20	.759	.128
	Other	12	2.58	.669	.193
	Total	199	2.36	.869	.062
Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area	Humanities	64	3.25	.816	.102
	Physical Sciences	26	3.35	.689	.135
	Pre-Professional	68	3.34	.803	.097
	Social Sciences	39	3.23	.706	.113
	Other	13	3.31	.947	.263
	Total	210	3.29	.780	.054

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic field (continued)

	Humanities	70	3.46	.582	.070
	Physical Sciences	29	3.45	.632	.117
	Pre-Professional	77	3.48	.620	.071
	Social Sciences	41	3.46	.711	.111
	Other	13	3.54	.660	.183
My overall satisfaction with my job here	Total	230	3.47	.624	.041
If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to?	Academic Field	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Leave to Retire	Humanities	72	2.18	.924	.109
	Physical Sciences	29	2.14	.953	.177
	Pre-Professional	76	2.17	.885	.102
	Social Sciences	41	2.10	.970	.151
	Other	13	2.15	.899	.249
	Total	231	2.16	.915	.060
Return to school as a student	Humanities	71	1.11	.398	.047
	Physical Sciences	29	1.21	.491	.091
	Pre-Professional	75	1.31	.592	.068
	Social Sciences	41	1.12	.331	.052
	Other	13	1.15	.376	.104
	Total	229	1.19	.475	.031
Accept employment at another Christian college or university	Humanities	71	2.18	.661	.078
	Physical Sciences	29	1.93	.799	.148
	Pre-Professional	75	1.92	.632	.073
	Social Sciences	41	2.05	.631	.098
	Other	13	1.92	.641	.178
	Total	229	2.03	.668	.044
Accept employment at a secular college or university	Humanities	70	1.53	.607	.073
	Physical Sciences	29	1.55	.632	.117
	Pre-Professional	75	1.69	.697	.080
	Social Sciences	41	1.73	.672	.105
	Other	13	1.69	.630	.175
	Total	228	1.63	.654	.043
Accept employment in consulting or other for-profit business or industry or become self-employed	Humanities	71	1.42	.669	.079
	Physical Sciences	29	1.59	.628	.117
	Pre-Professional	75	1.64	.782	.090
	Social Sciences	41	1.78	.613	.096
	Other	13	1.62	.650	.180
	Total	229	1.59	.699	.046
Accept employment in a non-profit organization	Humanities	70	1.80	.694	.083
	Physical Sciences	29	1.66	.484	.090
	Pre-Professional	75	1.60	.615	.071
	Social Sciences	41	1.85	.573	.089
	Other	13	1.62	.650	.180
	Total	228	1.71	.624	.041

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic field (continued)

If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do?	Academic Field	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Research	Humanities	70	1.47	.607	.073
	Physical Sciences	29	1.66	.721	.134
	Pre-Professional	74	1.61	.615	.072
	Social Sciences	40	1.55	.677	.107
	Other	13	1.85	.689	.191
	Total	226	1.58	.644	.043
Teaching	Humanities	71	2.30	.571	.068
	Physical Sciences	29	2.14	.516	.096
	Pre-Professional	73	2.00	.553	.065
	Social Sciences	41	2.24	.582	.091
	Other	13	1.77	.599	.166
	Total	227	2.14	.578	.038
Advising	Humanities	71	2.21	.476	.056
	Physical Sciences	29	2.24	.511	.095
	Pre-Professional	72	2.24	.569	.067
	Social Sciences	41	2.27	.549	.086
	Other	13	2.00	.577	.160
	Total	226	2.22	.529	.035
Service	Humanities	71	2.08	.554	.066
	Physical Sciences	29	2.31	.541	.101
	Pre-Professional	74	2.08	.568	.066
	Social Sciences	41	2.27	.501	.078
	Other	13	2.15	.689	.191
	Total	228	2.15	.559	.037
Administration	Humanities	70	2.34	.657	.079
	Physical Sciences	29	2.55	.572	.106
	Pre-Professional	73	2.12	.686	.080
	Social Sciences	40	2.38	.628	.099
	Other	13	1.77	.725	.201
	Total	225	2.27	.676	.045
If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?					
	Academic Field	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
	Humanities	72	2.43	.552	.065
	Physical Sciences	29	2.28	.591	.110
	Pre-Professional	77	2.49	.553	.063
	Social Sciences	41	2.44	.550	.086
	Other	13	2.38	.650	.180
Total	232	2.43	.562	.037	

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic field (continued)

Position Level	Humanities	72	2.40	.548	.065
	Physical Sciences	29	2.17	.658	.122
	Pre-Professional	76	2.39	.655	.075
	Social Sciences	41	2.24	.624	.097
	Other	13	2.38	.506	.140
	Total	231	2.34	.611	.040
Job Security	Humanities	72	2.63	.542	.064
	Physical Sciences	29	2.28	.649	.121
	Pre-Professional	76	2.54	.662	.076
	Social Sciences	41	2.54	.674	.105
	Other	13	2.69	.480	.133
	Total	231	2.54	.623	.041
Opportunities for advancement	Humanities	72	2.44	.625	.074
	Physical Sciences	29	1.97	.566	.105
	Pre-Professional	77	2.32	.733	.084
	Social Sciences	41	2.29	.716	.112
	Other	13	2.38	.506	.140
	Total	232	2.31	.677	.044
Benefits	Humanities	72	2.72	.451	.053
	Physical Sciences	29	2.45	.572	.106
	Pre-Professional	77	2.70	.488	.056
	Social Sciences	41	2.59	.591	.092
	Other	13	2.62	.506	.140
	Total	232	2.65	.513	.034
No pressure to publish	Humanities	72	1.94	.729	.086
	Physical Sciences	29	2.38	.561	.104
	Pre-Professional	77	2.32	.751	.086
	Social Sciences	41	2.10	.700	.109
	Other	13	2.08	.641	.178
	Total	232	2.16	.724	.048
Academic Freedom	Humanities	72	2.61	.519	.061
	Physical Sciences	29	2.52	.634	.118
	Pre-Professional	77	2.49	.576	.066
	Social Sciences	41	2.80	.459	.072
	Other	13	2.46	.519	.144
	Total	232	2.59	.552	.036
Good research facilities and equipment	Humanities	71	2.31	.689	.082
	Physical Sciences	29	2.07	.593	.110
	Pre-Professional	76	1.96	.701	.080
	Social Sciences	41	2.17	.587	.092
	Other	13	2.00	.577	.160
	Total	230	2.12	.669	.044

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic field (continued)

Good instructional facilities and equipment	Humanities	72	2.56	.579	.068
	Physical Sciences	29	2.59	.501	.093
	Pre-Professional	76	2.49	.577	.066
	Social Sciences	41	2.59	.591	.092
	Other	13	2.54	.519	.144
	Total	231	2.54	.565	.037
Excellent Students	Humanities	72	2.47	.530	.062
	Physical Sciences	29	2.34	.670	.124
	Pre-Professional	77	2.40	.591	.067
	Social Sciences	41	2.44	.550	.086
	Other	13	2.38	.506	.140
	Total	232	2.42	.568	.037
Excellent Colleagues	Humanities	72	2.69	.464	.055
	Physical Sciences	29	2.55	.506	.094
	Pre-Professional	77	2.68	.498	.057
	Social Sciences	41	2.66	.480	.075
	Other	13	2.62	.506	.140
	Total	232	2.66	.484	.032
New institution is a Christian college	Humanities	72	2.36	.657	.077
	Physical Sciences	29	2.24	.689	.128
	Pre-Professional	77	2.27	.737	.084
	Social Sciences	41	2.12	.781	.122
	Other	13	2.46	.660	.183
	Total	232	2.28	.711	.047
Institutional mission or philosophy that is compatible with my own views	Humanities	71	2.70	.490	.058
	Physical Sciences	29	2.66	.484	.090
	Pre-Professional	77	2.66	.528	.060
	Social Sciences	41	2.63	.581	.091
	Other	13	2.69	.480	.133
	Total	231	2.67	.515	.034
Good job for my spouse	Humanities	70	2.14	.804	.096
	Physical Sciences	28	1.89	.832	.157
	Pre-Professional	72	2.07	.924	.109
	Social Sciences	39	2.05	.826	.132
	Other	13	2.46	.776	.215
	Total	222	2.09	.851	.057
Good geographic location	Humanities	72	2.31	.597	.070
	Physical Sciences	29	2.34	.670	.124
	Pre-Professional	75	2.56	.620	.072
	Social Sciences	40	2.50	.641	.101
	Other	13	2.46	.660	.183
	Total	229	2.44	.629	.042

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic field (continued)

Affordable Housing	Humanities	72	2.47	.581	.068
	Physical Sciences	29	2.45	.632	.117
	Pre-Professional	75	2.51	.623	.072
	Social Sciences	40	2.55	.677	.107
	Other	13	2.62	.506	.140
	Total	229	2.50	.611	.040
Good environment/schools for my children	Humanities	70	2.00	.933	.111
	Physical Sciences	28	1.89	.916	.173
	Pre-Professional	72	1.85	.914	.108
	Social Sciences	39	1.90	.852	.136
	Other	11	2.55	.820	.247
	Total	220	1.95	.910	.061
A full-time position	Humanities	71	2.80	.496	.059
	Physical Sciences	29	2.62	.728	.135
	Pre-Professional	74	2.65	.671	.078
	Social Sciences	41	2.85	.422	.066
	Other	11	2.82	.405	.122
	Total	226	2.74	.580	.039
A part-time position	Humanities	69	1.28	.539	.065
	Physical Sciences	28	1.29	.535	.101
	Pre-Professional	73	1.42	.665	.078
	Social Sciences	40	1.10	.304	.048
	Other	12	1.42	.669	.193
	Total	222	1.30	.566	.038
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.					
	Academic Field	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
It is important for faculty to participate in governing their institution	Humanities	72	3.69	.521	.061
	Physical Sciences	28	3.54	.744	.141
	Pre-Professional	77	3.57	.548	.062
	Social Sciences	41	3.76	.538	.084
	Other	13	3.69	.480	.133
	Total	231	3.65	.563	.037
Faculty promotions should be based at least in part on formal student evaluations	Humanities	72	2.92	.783	.092
	Physical Sciences	29	3.03	.731	.136
	Pre-Professional	77	2.97	.778	.089
	Social Sciences	41	2.93	.818	.128
	Other	13	3.08	.277	.077
	Total	232	2.96	.758	.050
The tenure system in higher education should be preserved	Humanities	71	3.07	.816	.097
	Physical Sciences	29	2.90	.860	.160
	Pre-Professional	77	2.49	1.034	.118
	Social Sciences	41	2.93	.932	.146
	Other	13	2.62	.870	.241
	Total	231	2.81	.947	.062

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic field (continued)

Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty	Humanities	72	3.26	.671	.079
	Physical Sciences	29	3.34	.670	.124
	Pre-Professional	76	3.46	.642	.074
	Social Sciences	41	3.12	.640	.100
	Other	13	3.15	.555	.154
	Total	231	3.31	.657	.043
Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	Humanities	72	2.00	.671	.079
	Physical Sciences	29	1.86	.743	.138
	Pre-Professional	77	1.84	.689	.079
	Social Sciences	41	1.85	.727	.113
	Other	13	2.08	.641	.178
	Total	232	1.91	.694	.046
Years of service/advanced degree should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	Humanities	71	2.46	.734	.087
	Physical Sciences	29	2.41	.780	.145
	Pre-Professional	76	2.47	.791	.091
	Social Sciences	41	2.39	.802	.125
	Other	13	2.77	.725	.201
	Total	230	2.47	.768	.051
The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution	Humanities	69	2.74	.885	.107
	Physical Sciences	28	3.25	.645	.122
	Pre-Professional	76	2.51	.841	.096
	Social Sciences	40	2.83	.903	.143
	Other	13	2.92	.862	.239
	Total	226	2.75	.870	.058
State or federally mandated assessment requirements have improved the quality of undergraduate education at my institution	Humanities	70	2.37	.783	.094
	Physical Sciences	29	1.97	.865	.161
	Pre-Professional	72	2.13	.804	.095
	Social Sciences	39	2.23	.872	.140
	Other	13	2.54	.776	.215
	Total	223	2.22	.824	.055
Female faculty members are treated fairly at my institution	Humanities	72	3.31	.725	.085
	Physical Sciences	29	3.41	.682	.127
	Pre-Professional	76	3.33	.681	.078
	Social Sciences	40	3.05	.846	.134
	Other	13	3.00	1.080	.300
	Total	230	3.27	.756	.050
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at my institution	Humanities	71	3.41	.667	.079
	Physical Sciences	28	3.57	.573	.108
	Pre-Professional	75	3.35	.688	.079
	Social Sciences	41	2.95	.893	.139
	Other	13	3.23	.927	.257
	Total	228	3.32	.743	.049

NSOPF descriptive statistics by academic field (continued)

My institution effectively meets the educational needs of entering students	Humanities	72	3.31	.705	.083
	Physical Sciences	29	3.17	.658	.122
	Pre-Professional	76	3.18	.647	.074
	Social Sciences	40	3.15	.834	.132
	Other	13	3.54	.519	.144
	Total	230	3.23	.697	.046
If I had it to do over again, I would choose an academic career	Humanities	72	3.81	.432	.051
	Physical Sciences	29	3.83	.384	.071
	Pre-Professional	77	3.70	.670	.076
	Social Sciences	41	3.85	.422	.066
	Other	13	3.92	.277	.077
	Total	232	3.79	.512	.034

APPENDIX B.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Christian College Faculty Survey

You are invited to participate in a dissertation research study to explore the backgrounds, opinions, experiences and perceptions of faculty members at several institutions belonging to the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU). Many of the survey questions in this instrument are taken from the *National Study of Postsecondary Faculty* (NSOPF-93) administered by the U.S. Department of Education and the *Organizational Commitment Questionnaire* (OCQ), as reported by Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979).

The data obtained in this survey will be used by the researcher primarily for a doctoral dissertation, but may also be used to provide aggregate reports to the participating institutions and for future publications. All individual responses will be held in strict confidence. All reporting of data from the survey will be done in the aggregate; no individual survey reports will be released. The questions in the survey are non threatening and should cause no discomfort to the participants. Participation in this study is voluntary and respondents have the opportunity to skip any questions with which they are uncomfortable. Consent will be implied by a participant's submission of the survey.

Directions

Completion of the electronic survey should take less than 15 minutes. When you are finished with all of the questions, click the **<Send Survey>** button at the end of the document. You may also clear the survey by clicking the **<Reset Survey Form>** button at the end of the document. It may be most expedient to **<TAB>** your way through the survey questions. You may submit comments or ask questions of the researcher by clicking on the email link at the end of the survey.

Thank you for your participation.

Please enter the last four digits of your social security number.
(this information is being collected to track whether individuals inadvertently complete the survey more than one time)

Please specify your gender.

Female Male

Please indicate your age by selecting one of the following.

Select one please ▼
Select one please
20-29
30-39
40-49
50-59
60-69
70-79
80+

Please select the name of the institution at which you work.

Select one please	
Select one please	
Institution 1	
Institution 2	
Institution 3	
Institution 4	
Institution 5	[note: the actual names
Institution 6	of the ten institutions have
Institution 7	been removed from this
Institution 8	printed copy of the survey
Institution 9	to protect confidentiality]
Institution 10	

Does your institution require membership in a particular denomination or church?

Yes No

If yes, are you a member of that denomination or church?

Yes No Not applicable


If yes, and if possible, would you choose to be a member of a different denomination or church?

Yes No Not applicable

Please select one of the following:

- I received my baccalaureate degree from the institution at which I currently work.
 - I received my baccalaureate degree from another college that is a member of the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities
(Click [here](#) if you are uncertain if your alma mater is a CCCU institution).
 - I received my baccalaureate degree from a non-CCCU Christian college or university.
 - I received my baccalaureate degree from a non-Christian college or university.
-

Please indicate the highest level of education that you have attained.


Select one please 

Select one please

- No post secondary training
- Associate's degree or equivalent
- Bachelor's degree or equivalent
- Graduate work not resulting in a degree
- Master's degree or equivalent
- Specialist's or Professional degree
- Doctoral degree

In what year did you complete this degree?

Please choose the title that best describes your principal field or discipline of teaching.

Select one please 

Select one please

- Agriculture
- Architecture & Environmental Design
- Business
- Communications
- Computer Science
- Education
- Engineering
- English and Literature (including ESL & Linguistics)
- Fine Arts (including Art Music & Drama)
- Foreign Languages
- Health Sciences
- Home Economics
- Industrial Arts
- Law
- Library & Archival Sciences
- Natural Sciences: Biological Sciences
- Natural Sciences: Physical Sciences
- Mathematics & Statistics
- Military Studies
- Multi/Interdisciplinary Studies
- Parks & Recreation
- Philosophy, Religion & Theology
- Protective Services (including Criminal Justice)
- Psychology
- Public Affairs (including Public Administration & Social Work)
- Science Technologies
- Social Sciences and History
- Vocational Training
- Other Fields

What is the nature of your current appointment?

Full-Time Part-Time

If part-time, is this by choice?

Yes No

If part-time, how many courses did you teach in 2002-2003?

How many years have you been teaching at the college/university level?

Have any of these years been on a part-time basis?

Yes No

If yes, how many years?

How many years have you been teaching at your current institution?

Have any of these years been on a part-time basis?

Yes No

If yes, how many years?

At what age do you think you are most likely to stop teaching at the college or university level?

Which of the following best describes your academic rank?

Select one please	▼
Select one please	
Professor	
Associate Professor	
Assistant Professor	
Instructor	
Lecturer	
Adjunct	
Technical Activities (e.g. programmer, technician, etc.	
Non-Teaching Faculty(e.g. librarian)	
Other	

Including this academic year, how many years have you held this rank?

From the options listed below, please select the three most important reasons why you *initially* chose to accept a position at your current institution.

First choice 

First choice

- Academic freedom
- Academic quality of colleagues
- Acceptance of diversity
- Administrative leadership
- Characteristics or quality of students
- Christian environment/atmosphere
- Denomination of institution
- Institutional mission/philosophy
- Location of institution
- Only institution that offered me a job
- Opportunities to conduct research
- Opportunities for spouse/family
- Personal friendship with colleagues
- Professional development funds
- Quality of facilities or resources
- Reputation of institution or program
- Wages and benefits
- Other

Second choice 

Second choice

- No second choice
- Academic freedom
- Academic quality of colleagues
- Acceptance of diversity
- Administrative leadership
- Characteristics or quality of students
- Christian environment/atmosphere
- Denomination of institution
- Institutional mission/philosophy
- Location of institution
- Only institution that offered me a job
- Opportunities to conduct research
- Opportunities for spouse/family
- Personal friendship with colleagues
- Professional development funds
- Quality of facilities or resources
- Reputation of institution or program
- Wages and benefits
- Other

Third choice	▼
Third choice	
No third choice	
Academic freedom	
Academic quality of colleagues	
Acceptance of diversity	
Administrative leadership	
Characteristics or quality of students	
Christian environment/atmosphere	
Denomination of institution	
Institutional mission/philosophy	
Location of institution	
Only institution that offered me a job	
Opportunities to conduct research	
Opportunities for spouse/family	
Personal friendship with colleagues	
Professional development funds	
Quality of facilities or resources	
Reputation of institution or program	
Wages and benefits	
Other	

From the options listed below, please select the three characteristics that you *currently* appreciate most about your institution.

First choice	▼
First choice	
Academic freedom	
Academic quality of colleagues	
Acceptance of diversity	
Administrative leadership	
Characteristics or quality of students	
Christian environment/atmosphere	
Denomination of institution	
Institutional mission/philosophy	
Location of institution	
Only employment opportunity available to me	
Opportunities to conduct research	
Opportunities for spouse/family	
Personal friendship with colleagues	
Professional development funds	
Quality of facilities or resources	
Reputation of institution or program	
Wages and benefits	
Other	

Second choice	▼
Second choice	
No second choice	
Academic freedom	
Academic quality of colleagues	
Acceptance of diversity	
Administrative leadership	
Characteristics or quality of students	
Christian environment/atmosphere	
Denomination of institution	
Institutional mission/philosophy	
Location of institution	
Only employment opportunity available to me	
Opportunities to conduct research	
Opportunities for spouse/family	
Personal friendship with colleagues	
Professional development funds	
Quality of facilities or resources	
Reputation of institution or program	
Wages and benefits	
Other	
Third choice	▼
Third choice	
No third choice	
Academic freedom	
Academic quality of colleagues	
Acceptance of diversity	
Administrative leadership	
Characteristics or quality of students	
Christian environment/atmosphere	
Denomination of institution	
Institutional mission/philosophy	
Location of institution	
Only employment opportunity available to me	
Opportunities to conduct research	
Opportunities for spouse/family	
Personal friendship with colleagues	
Professional development funds	
Quality of facilities or resources	
Reputation of institution or program	
Wages and benefits	
Other	

From the options listed below, please select the three things that are *most problematic* about working at your current institution.

First choice

First choice

- Change happens too quickly
- Change happens too slowly
- Curriculum is too broad
- Curriculum is too narrow
- Curriculum is too professionalized
- Demands on faculty are too heavy
- Discrimination against faculty or students
- Hostile political environment
- Ineffective administrative or academic leadership
- Institutional values not sufficiently clarified
- Lack of flexibility among colleagues or students
- Lack of professional development resources
- Location of institution
- Nepotism among faculty or staff
- Quality of facilities or resources
- Quality of students
- Too little denominational influence
- Too much denominational influence
- Wages or benefits are insufficient
- Other

Second choice

Second choice

- No second choice
- Change happens too quickly
- Change happens too slowly
- Curriculum is too broad
- Curriculum is too narrow
- Curriculum is too professionalized
- Demands on faculty are too heavy
- Discrimination against faculty or students
- Hostile political environment
- Ineffective administrative or academic leadership
- Institutional values not sufficiently clarified
- Lack of flexibility among colleagues or students
- Lack of professional development resources
- Location of institution
- Nepotism among faculty or staff
- Quality of facilities or resources
- Quality of students
- Too little denominational influence
- Too much denominational influence
- Wages or benefits are insufficient
- Other

very similar.

I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution.

I could just as well be working for a different institution as long as the type of work were similar.

This institution really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.

It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this institution.

I am extremely glad that I chose this institution to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.

There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this institution indefinitely.

Often, I find it difficult to agree with this institution's policies on important matters relating to its employees.

I really care about the fate of this institution.

For me this is the best of all possible institutions for which to work.

Deciding to work for this institution was a definite mistake on my part.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

How satisfied or dissatisfied do you personally feel about each of the following aspects of your job at your current institution?

	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
My work load	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My job security	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My salary	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My benefits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach	○	○	○	○
The authority I have to make decisions about content and methods in the courses I teach	○	○	○	○
The authority I have to make decisions about other aspects of my job	○	○	○	○
The mix of teaching, research, administration, and service that I am required to do	○	○	○	○
The opportunity for advancement in rank at my institution	○	○	○	○
Time available for keeping current in my field	○	○	○	○
Availability of support services and equipment (clerical support, computers, etc.)	○	○	○	○
Freedom to do outside consulting	○	○	○	○
Overall reputation of the institution	○	○	○	○
Reputation of my department	○	○	○	○
Institutional mission or philosophy	○	○	○	○
Quality of leadership in my department	○	○	○	○
Quality of chief administrative officers at my institution	○	○	○	○
Quality of my colleagues in my department	○	○	○	○
Quality of faculty leadership at my institution	○	○	○	○
Relationship between administration and faculty at this institution	○	○	○	○
Interdepartmental cooperation at this institution	○	○	○	○
Spirit of cooperation between faculty at this institution	○	○	○	○
Quality of my research facilities and support	○	○	○	○
Quality of students whom I have taught here	○	○	○	○
Teaching assistance that I receive	○	○	○	○
Research assistance that I receive	○	○	○	○
Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area	○	○	○	○
My overall satisfaction with my job here	○	○	○	○

If you were to leave your current institution, how likely is it that you would do so to:

	Not Likely at All	Somewhat Likely	Very Likely
Retire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Return to school as a student	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Accept employment at another Christian college or university	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Accept employment at a secular college or university	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Accept employment in consulting or other for-profit business or industry or become self-employed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Accept employment in a non-profit organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, would you want to do more, less or about the same amount of the following as you currently do:

	More of this	Same Amount	Less of this
Research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teaching	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Advising Students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Service Activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Administration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you were to leave your current institution to accept another position, how important would each of the following items be in your decision to accept another position?

	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important
Salary Level	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Position Level	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Job Security	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunities for advancement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Benefits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No pressure to publish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Academic Freedom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Good research facilities and equipment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Good instructional facilities and equipment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Excellent Students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Excellent Colleagues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
New institution is a Christian college	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Institutional mission or philosophy that is compatible with my own views	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Good job for my spouse	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Good geographic location	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Affordable housing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Good environment/schools for my children	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A full-time position	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A part-time position	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
It is important for faculty to participate in governing their institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty promotions should be based at least in part on formal student evaluations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The tenure system in higher education should be preserved	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Years of service/advanced degree should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student Services are taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at my institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
State or federally mandated assessment requirements have improved the quality of undergraduate education at my institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Female faculty members are treated fairly at my institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at my institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My institution effectively meets the educational needs of entering students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If I had it to do over again, I would still choose an academic career	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you would like to make additional comments or ask questions of the researcher, please use the email address below.

Thank you for completing this survey!

Send Survey	Reset Survey Form
-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

*Comments or Questions? Contact Curtis Taylor at curtis@dordt.edu
(10/24/2003;11:21)*

APPENDIX C.

CCCU INSTITUTIONS

The following North American colleges and universities are **members** of the CCCU as of April 1, 2005:

A

Abilene Christian University	Abilene, TX	USA
Anderson University	Anderson, IN	USA
Asbury College	Wilmore, KY	USA
Azusa Pacific University	Azusa, CA	USA

B

Belhaven College	Jackson, MS	USA
Bethel College--IN	Mishawaka, IN	USA
Bethel University	Saint Paul, MN	USA
Biola University	La Mirada, CA	USA
Bluffton University	Bluffton, OH	USA
Bryan College	Dayton, TN	USA

C

California Baptist University	Riverside, CA	USA
Calvin College	Grand Rapids, MI	USA
Campbellsville University	Campbellsville, KY	USA
Carson-Newman College	Jefferson City, TN	USA
Cedarville University	Cedarville, OH	USA
College of the Ozarks	Point Lookout, MO	USA
Colorado Christian University	Lakewood, CO	USA
Cornerstone University	Grand Rapids, MI	USA
Covenant College	Lookout Mountain, GA	USA
Crichton College	Memphis, TN	USA
Crown College	St. Bonifacius, MN	USA

D

Dallas Baptist University	Dallas, TX	USA
Dordt College	Sioux Center, IA	USA

E

East Texas Baptist University	Marshall, TX	USA
Eastern Mennonite University	Harrisonburg, VA	USA
Eastern Nazarene College	Quincy, MA	USA
Eastern University	St. Davids, PA	USA
Erskine College	Due West, SC	USA
Evangel University	Springfield, MO	USA

F

Fresno Pacific University	Fresno, CA	USA
---------------------------	------------	-----

G

Geneva College	Beaver Falls, PA	USA
George Fox University	Newberg, OR	USA

Gordon College	Wenham, MA	USA
Goshen College	Goshen, IN	USA
Grace College & Seminary	Winona Lake, IN	USA
Greenville College	Greenville, IL	USA
H		
Hardin-Simmons University	Abilene, TX	USA
Hope International University	Fullerton, CA	USA
Houghton College	Houghton, NY	USA
Houston Baptist University	Houston, TX	USA
Howard Payne University	Brownwood, TX	USA
Huntington College	Huntington, IN	USA
I		
Indiana Wesleyan University	Marion, IN	USA
J		
John Brown University	Siloam Springs, AR	USA
Judson College--AL	Marion, AL	USA
Judson College--IL	Elgin, IL	USA
K		
Kentucky Christian University	Grayson, KY	USA
King College	Bristol, TN	USA
King's University College, The	Edmonton, AB	CANADA
L		
Lee University	Cleveland, TN	USA
LeTourneau University	Longview, TX	USA
Lipscomb University	Nashville, TN	USA
Louisiana College	Pineville, LA	USA
M		
Malone College	Canton, OH	USA
Master's College & Seminary, The	Santa Clarita, CA	USA
Messiah College	Grantham, PA	USA
MidAmerica Nazarene University	Olathe, KS	USA
Milligan College	Milligan College, TN	USA
Mississippi College	Clinton, MS	USA
Missouri Baptist University	Saint Louis, MO	USA
Montreat College	Montreat, NC	USA
Mount Vernon Nazarene University	Mount Vernon, OH	USA
N		
North Greenville College	Tigerville, SC	USA
North Park University	Chicago, IL	USA
Northwest Christian College	Eugene, OR	USA
Northwest Nazarene University	Nampa, ID	USA
Northwest University	Kirkland, WA	USA

Northwestern College--IA	Orange City, IA	USA
Northwestern College--MN	Saint Paul, MN	USA
Nyack College	Nyack, NY	USA
O		
Oklahoma Baptist University	Shawnee, OK	USA
Oklahoma Christian University	Oklahoma City, OK	USA
Oklahoma Wesleyan University	Bartlesville, OK	USA
Olivet Nazarene University	Bourbonnais, IL	USA
Oral Roberts University	Tulsa, OK	USA
P		
Palm Beach Atlantic University	West Palm Beach, FL	USA
Point Loma Nazarene University	San Diego, CA	USA
R		
Redeemer University College	Ancaster, ON	CANADA
Roberts Wesleyan College	Rochester, NY	USA
S		
Seattle Pacific University	Seattle, WA	USA
Simpson University	Redding, CA	USA
Southeastern College	Lakeland, FL	USA
Southern Nazarene University	Bethany, OK	USA
Southern Wesleyan University	Central, SC	USA
Southwest Baptist University	Bolivar, MO	USA
Spring Arbor University	Spring Arbor, MI	USA
Sterling College	Sterling, KS	USA
T		
Tabor College	Hillsboro, KS	USA
Taylor University	Upland, IN	USA
Trevecca Nazarene University	Nashville, TN	USA
Trinity Christian College	Palos Heights, IL	USA
Trinity International University	Deerfield, IL	USA
Trinity Western University	Blaine, WA	USA
U		
Union University	Jackson, TN	USA
University of Sioux Falls	Sioux Falls, SD	USA
V		
Vanguard University of Southern California	Costa Mesa, CA	USA
W		
Warner Pacific College	Portland, OR	USA
Warner Southern College	Lake Wales, FL	USA
Wayland Baptist University	Plainview, TX	USA
Waynesburg College	Waynesburg, PA	USA
Western Baptist College	Salem, OR	USA

Westmont College	Santa Barbara, CA	USA
Wheaton College	Wheaton, IL	USA
Whitworth College	Spokane, WA	USA
Williams Baptist College	Walnut Ridge, AR	USA

APPENDIX D.

HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Institutional Review Board
Office of Research Compliance
Vice Provost for Research and
Advanced Studies
2810 Beardshear Hall
Ames, Iowa 50011-2036
515 294-4566
FAX 515 294-7288

TO: Curtis J. Taylor

FROM: Ginny Austin, IRB Coordinator

RE: IRB ID # 03-872

DATE REVIEWED: December 4, 2003

The project, "Organizational Commitment in Christian College Faculty" regulations as described in 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2).

(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

To be in compliance with ISU's Federal Wide Assurance through the Office of Human Research Protections (OHRP) all projects involving human subjects, must be reviewed by the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Only the IRB may determine if the project must follow the requirements of 45 CFR 46 or is exempt from the requirements specified in this law. Therefore, all human subject projects must be submitted and reviewed by the IRB.

Because this project is exempt it does not require further IRB review and is exempt from the Department of Health and Human Service (DHHS) regulations for the protection of human subjects.

We do, however, urge you to protect the rights of your participants in the same ways that you would if IRB approval were required. This includes providing relevant information about the research to the participants. Although this project is exempt, you must carry out the research as proposed in the IRB application, including obtaining and documenting (signed) informed consent, if applicable to your project.

Any modification of this research should be submitted to the IRB on a Continuation and/or Modification form to determine if the project still meets the Federal criteria for exemption. If it is determined that exemption is no longer warranted, then an IRB proposal will need to be submitted and approved before proceeding with data collection.

cc: ELPS

REFERENCES

- Abraham, S. Y., Steiger, D. M., Montgomery, M., Kuhr, B. D., Tourangeau, R.,
 Montgomery, B., et al. (2002). *1999 National study of postsecondary faculty
 (NSOPF:99) methodology report* (NCES 2002-154). U. S. Department of Education,
 National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing
 Office.
- Achieving the mission of church-related institutions of liberal learning.* (1977). Washington,
 DC: Association of American Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.
 ED136656)
- Adams, K. H. (1995). *Unexpected journeys: The experiences of women in Christian college
 administration* (Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University, 1995). *Dissertation
 Abstracts International*, 56, 3465.
- Alger, J. B. (1998). Academic freedom meets active faith. *Academe*, 84(1), 1.
- Altbach, P. G., & Lewis, L. S. (1995). Professorial attitudes—an international survey.
Change, 27(6), 50-57.
- Benkhoff, B. (1997). Disentangling organizational commitment: The dangers of the OCQ for
 research and policy. *Personnel Review*, 26(1/2), 114-131.
- Boostrom, R. (1994). Learning to pay attention. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies
 in Education*, 7(1), 51-64.
- Braskamp, L. A. & Ory, J. C. (1994). *Assessing faculty work: Enhancing individual and
 institutional performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Brookover, R. S., IV. (2002). An assessment of organizational commitment among faculty at Clemson University (South Carolina). (Doctoral Dissertation, Clemson University, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63, 873.
- Browde, J. A. (1976, November). *The role of the faculty in the church-related college*. Speech presented to the administration and faculty of Meredith College at a retreat, Asheboro, NC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED132945)
- Brubacher, J. S. & Rudy, W. (1976). *Higher education in transition*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Burtchaell, J. T. (1998). *The dying of the light: The disengagement of colleges and universities from their Christian churches*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Cagney, M. (1997, December 8). Do Christian colleges treat their women faculty fairly? *Christianity Today*, 41(14), 72.
- Cameron, N. M. (1994, July 18). Christian colleges' urgent mission. *Christianity Today*, 38(8), 18-19.
- Carlburg, R. J. (1994, November 14). Why Christian colleges make sense for Christians. *Christianity Today*, 38(13), 121-128.
- Carroll, M. G. (2002). Exploring the relationship between organizational commitment and employee eliefs, expectations, and experiences of mission in a values-based organization (Doctoral Dissertation, Gonzaga University, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62, 3847.
- Christian College Consortium. (1997). *Mission statement*. Retrieved April 7, 2000, from http://www.cconsortium.org/mission_statement.asp

- Conrad, C. F. & Wyer, J. C. (1982). Incest in academe: The case for selective inbreeding. *Change*, 14, 45-48.
- Cooper, M. V. (1999). Faculty perspectives on the intergration of faith and academic discipline in Southern Baptist higher education. *Religious Education*, 94(4), 380-395.
- Council for Christian Colleges & Universities. (2000). *Facts about the CCCU*. Retrieved March 23, 2000, from <http://www.cccu.org/about.html>
- Crabtree, D. (1996, March 4). A Christian college education: is it worth the financial investment? *Christianity Today*, 40(3), 36-46.
- Dannelly, C. M. (1931). The denominational college. *Journal of Higher Education*, 2(4), 183-189.
- Dattilo, J. (1987). The scholarly productivity of inbred and noninbred full-time doctorally-prepared nursing faculty in teaching positions in the south. (Doctoral Dissertation, Georgia State University, 1987). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48, 1668.
- Diekema, A. J. (2000). *Academic freedom and Christian scholarship*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Dutton, J. E. (1980, April). *The impact of inbreeding and immobility on the professional role and scholarly performance of academic scientists*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED196714)
- Edwards, M. U., Jr. (1999, April 21). Christian colleges: A dying light or a new refraction? *The Christian Century*, 116(13), 459-463.

- Eells, W. C. & Cleveland, A. C. (1999). Faculty inbreeding. *Journal of Higher Education*, 70(5), 579-588 (Original work published 1935)
- Ellis, B. D. (2001). Searching for the perfect fit: An examination of the job satisfaction of middle management student affairs professionals in Christian institutions of higher education (Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62, 856.
- Faculty attitudes and characteristics: Results of a 1998-99 survey. (1999, September 3). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A20-21.
- Fairweather, J. S. (1996). *Faculty work and public trust: Restoring the value of teaching and public service in American academic life*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Flowers, M. E., Jr. (1992). Christian college distinctives: A study of the institutional satisfaction and morale at Christian College Coalition institutions. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1992). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53, 731.
- Frame, R. (1997, March 3). Boom years for Christian higher education. *Christianity Today*, 41(3), 80-94.
- Garlett, M. W. (1997). Waiting in the wings: Women of God in the evangelical academy (Doctoral Dissertation, The Claremont Graduate University, 1997). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58, 521.
- Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes. In L. S. Hagedorn (Ed.), *What contributes to job satisfaction among faculty and staff* (pp. 5-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Hargens, L. L., & Farr, G. M. (1973). An examination of recent hypotheses about institutional inbreeding. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), 1381-1402.
- Harshbarger, B. (1989). Faculty commitment to the university: Influences and issues. *Review of Higher Education*, 13(1), 29-45.
- How my Christian college surprised me. (1993, March 8). *Christianity Today*, 37(3), 69-76.
- Jacobson, J. (2001, May 7). 2 professors must leave a Baptist seminary for refusing to sign statement of faith. *The Chronicle: Today's News*. Retrieved August 28, 2003, from <http://chronicle.com/daily/2001/05/2001050707n.htm>
- Johnsrud, L. K. (1991). Administrative promotion: The power of gender. *Journal of Higher Education*, 62(2), 119-49.
- Kirshstein, R. J., Matheson, N. & Jing, Z. (1997). *1993 National study of postsecondary faculty (NSOPF-93) instructional faculty and staff in higher education institutions: Fall 1987 and Fall 1992* (NCES 97-447). U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Kleiner, C. (1999, April 26). Nearer to God, one freshman at a time. *U.S. News & World Report*, 126(16), p. 60.
- Kuh, G. D., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J., Andreas, R. E., Lyons, J. W., Strange, C. C., et al. (1991). *Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and development outside the classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lam, S. S. K. (1998). Test-retest reliability of the organizational commitment questionnaire. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 138(6), 787-788. .

- Lamport, M. A. (1994). Student-faculty informal interaction and its relation to college student outcomes in Christian college settings: Research and implications. *Research on Christian Higher Education*, 1(1), 66-78.
- Lovejoy, A. O. (1930). Academic freedom. In R. H. Seligman & A. Johnson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of the social sciences* (p. 84). New York: Macmillan.
- Maehr, M. L. & Braskamp, L. A. (1986). *The motivation factor*. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.
- Magner, D. K. The graying professoriate. (1999, September 3). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A18-19.
- Marty, M. (1998). In the crossfire between academic and religious freedom. *Academe*, 84(1), 63-67.
- Mathieu, J. E. & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 171-194.
- McCaul, H. S. & Hinsz, V. B. (1995). Assessing organizational commitment: An employee's global attitude toward the organization. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 31(1), 80-90. Retrieved May 16, 2001, from EBSCOhost Academic Search Elite database.
- McGee, R. J. (1960). The function of institutional inbreeding. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 65, 483-488.
- McMurtrie, B. (2002, May 24). Do professors lose academic freedom by signing statements of faith? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A12-14.
- McNeely, J. H. (1932). *Faculty inbreeding in land-grant colleges and universities*. Washington, D. C.: Office of Education.

- McPherrren, A. C. (1994). Faculty workload: Hours and activities in Christian College Coalition and small public universities. *Research on Christian Higher Education*, 1(1), 89-105.
- Meehan, M. J. (2001). Decision-making and organizational commitment: A comparison of faculty perceptions at unionized and non-unionized private colleges and universities (Doctoral Dissertation, Seton Hall University, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62, 413.
- Miller, G. A. (1918, January 12). Academic inbreeding. *School and Society*, 7, 53-54.
- Miller, M. H. (1977). Academic inbreeding in nursing. *Nursing Outlook*, 24(3), 172-177.
- Moe, Y. K. (1988). An analysis of faculty inbreeding in chemistry and physics departments at selected doctoral-granting universities. (Doctoral Dissertation, The George Washington University, 1988). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50, 1229.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York: Academic Press.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 224-247.
- Nation: Average pay of full-time faculty members. (1999, August 27). *The Chronicle of Higher Education [Almanac]*, p. 7.
- Nation: Faculty and staff. (1999, August 27). *The Chronicle of Higher Education [Almanac]*, 34-38.

- Niehoff, R. L. (1995). *Job satisfaction, organizational commitment and individual and organizational mission values congruence: Investigating the relationships*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Gonzaga University, Spokane, WA.
- Olsen, T. (1996, February 5). Enrollment booms at Christian colleges. *Christianity Today*, 40(2), 108-109.
- Pan, S. (1993). A study of faculty inbreeding at eleven land-grant universities. (Doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54, 2485.
- Parsons, J. & Fenwick T. J. (1996). *The Christian post-secondary teacher's vocational task*. Edmonton, Alberta: University of Alberta. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED393364)
- Patterson, J.A. (2001). *Shining lights: A history of the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Pattillo, M. M., Jr., & Mackenzie, D. M. (1966). *Church-sponsored higher education in the United States: Report of the Danforth Commission*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Peterson's Christian colleges and universities*. (1999). Princeton, NJ: Peterson's.
- Poppens, B. B. (2001). Perceived and preferred organizational culture types and organizational commitment at Midwestern private, nonprofit colleges (Doctoral Dissertation, University of South Dakota, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61, 3919.

- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 59*, 603-609.
- Professor loses job over erotic poem. (1997, April 4). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A8.
- Ramirez, J. & Brock, B. (1996). The coherent institutional philosophy: Myth or mandate? An ethnography of faculty world views at a Christian university. *Journal of Research on Christian Education, 5*(1), 3-32.
- Ringenberg, W. C. (1984). *The Christian college: A history of Protestant higher education in America*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American college and university: A history*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Runkel, J. E. (1987). Liberal arts college presidents: Credentials, affiliations, socialization and inbreeding. (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1987). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 48*, 2000.
- Russell, S. H., Fairweather, J. S., Hendrickson, R. M., & Zimbler, L. J. (1991). *1988 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-88) Profiles of faculty in higher education institutions, 1988* (NCES 91-389). U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Sheridan, D. A. (1995). The role of faculty members in institutional decision-making in church-related liberal arts colleges. (Doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 56*, 4361.

- Splete, A. (1987). *Community, commitment and congruence: A different kind of excellence*. Washington DC: Council of Independent Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED292370)
- Stellway, R. J. (1984). World-changing Christians: An outcome of Christian higher education. *Faculty Dialogue*, 1, 73-86.
- Stewart, G. B. (1992). Institutional inbreeding among mathematics faculty in American colleges and universities. (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, 1992). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53, 2710.
- Thompson, D. T. (1995). Turning points for successful institutions: A look at 18 private, Christian liberal arts colleges and universities in California. (Doctoral dissertation, Pepperdine University, 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56, 1207.
- Tierney, W. G. & Rhoads, R. A. (1994). *Faculty socialization as cultural process: A mirror of institutional commitment*. Washington, DC: School of Education and Human Development, George Washington University.
- Tonsor, S. J. (1970). The church-related college: Special mission or educational anachronism. *Liberal Education*, 56(3), 403-11.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2003). *Integrated postsecondary education data System (IPEDS) peer analysis system: institutions data report* [Data file]. Available from National Center for Education Statistics Web site, <http://www.nces.ed.gov>
- Why attend a Christian college? (1992, November 9). *Christianity Today*, 36(13), 88-94.
- Wolterstorff, N. (1984). The mission of the Christian college at the end of the 20th century. *Faculty Dialogue*, 1, 39-48.

Zimble, L. J. (2001). National study of postsecondary faculty (NOSPF:99) public access data analysis system [CD-ROM] (NCES 2001-203). U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Curtis J. Taylor was born December 12, 1964 in Grand Rapids, Michigan. He received the Bachelor of Arts in Psychology from Calvin College in 1987 and the Master of Arts in College and University Administration from Michigan State University in 1989. He has served as a Graduate Resident Director at Michigan State University, a Residence Hall Director at the University of Washington, the Director of Residence Life at Dordt College in Sioux Center, Iowa, and the Vice President for Student Services at Dordt College. He is currently serving as the Special Assistant to the President and Director of Institutional Planning at Dordt College.

Curtis married Sheryl Sheeres in 1987 and together they enjoy their three wonderful children – Ian Curtis (10), Willem Levi (6), and Mia Soo-Jee (2).