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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine what factors influenced the intention of nurse educators to leave their current teaching positions at the university level in Louisiana. A simple random sample of 125 nurse educators employed full time in baccalaureate degree nursing programs were the study subjects. Respondents were 115 (92%) of the nurse educators.

A four part instrument was used for data collection and analysis: Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job In General (JIG), Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), Intention to Leave (ITL), and demographic information. Intention to Leave was a researcher developed instrument to measure intention to leave. The demographic information identified nurse educators' individual and work-related characteristics.

Factors which were found to be related to intention to leave included satisfaction with Job in General, present job, opportunities for promotion, pay, and supervision. Demographic factors which were found to be related to opportunities for promotion: years experience as a nurse, years in teacher retirement system, years as a nurse educator at their current university, status in retirement systems, tenure, and years experience as a nurse. All of these relationships were negative. The calculated
coefficient between intention to leave and organizational commitment was $r = -.23$ ($p = .01$).

Using multiple regression, a model was found explaining a significant portion of the variance (35%) in Intention to Leave of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education. The eleven variables which entered the model included present job, pay, opportunities for promotion, number of years employed full-time in their current university, attempted scholarship, significant dependent others, successful scholarship, employment status, total years experience as a nurse educator, years in other retirement systems, and years in Teacher Retirement Systems.

Nurse educators in Louisiana had a low level of job satisfaction for the component of pay and were satisfied with the other four components. Nurse educators with higher satisfaction with present job and opportunities for promotion tended to have lower intention to leave.

It is recommended that a follow-up study be done to determine if actual turnover of nurse educators is related to intention to leave.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Seventh Report to the President and Congress on the Status of Health Personnel in the United States (U. S. Department of Health and Human Services [USDHHS], 1990) contained some alarming news. The report documented that the nation is in the midst of a nursing shortage. This shortage is nationwide; however, it is more severe in some geographic areas than others.

Louisiana had the fewest registered nurses (RNs) per capita (442 RNs per 100,000 population) in 1988, and projections were that the number of RNs per 100,000 population will drop to 357 by December 31, 2000 (USDHHS, 1990). In addition, the projected increase in the number of persons with human immunodeficiency virus, the number of the immigrant population, the number of senior citizens, and the infant mortality rate guaranteed a continually increasing need for nurses (USDHHS, 1990).

One way to address the problem was to explore issues in nursing education. Issues that have been addressed included retention of students (Holland & Burnett, 1992), decreasing enrollment in programs in some areas of the country (Rosenfeld, 1988), and the backlog of qualified
students waiting to gain admissions to programs in Louisiana (Louisiana State Board of Nursing, 1991).

Leaders in higher education, however, added another issue that may influence the nursing shortage. Mooney (1989) stated that some institutions were stockpiling qualified faculty because a faculty shortage was expected in the 1990s. The Pew Health Professions Commission (1991) reported the aging of this cohort [faculty] will result in "massive retirement in the late 1990s and early 2000s resulting in severe faculty shortage" (p. 80). Some issues identified as contributing to the decreasing number of faculty were money, "weaker applicants", competition with private industry, fewer minorities in graduate schools who could help to meet the affirmative action guidelines, inadequate quality of life issues (a positive environment outside the institution to meet family and social needs), "older" faculty keeping the quota of advanced positions, the number of United States citizens receiving doctoral degrees, the increased length of time candidates for the PhD are taking to complete the degree, "stealing of faculty," the image that undergraduates have regarding faculty salaries and faculty expectations (research and publishing) in perspective with already existing faculty expenditures in education and many
faculty members reaching retirement age (Mooney, 1989; Pew Health Professions Commission, 1991).

Trow (1988) reported that general enrollment in higher education was increasing. Already there were more minorities, women, part-time students, and older students returning to college. The number of high school graduates was projected to be approximately 2.3 million per year from 1990 to 1994, then increase to approximately 2.6 million in 1999. One would expect enrollment in nursing to increase because of the traditional role of women and the availability of employment in nursing. However, declining numbers of faculty may interfere with increasing enrollments in programs.

Smart (1990) found that faculty shortage was not a problem, today, but with the expected increasing student enrollment and the expected increasing retirement of faculty in colleges and universities, it may become a problem. Cotton and Tuttle (1986) found turnover rates were higher for women than men in the general population. This factor may have a connection to the predominantly female group of nursing faculty changing employment.

Criteria for promotion and tenure is an issue facing all faculty today. Blackburn and Havinghurst (1979) found that those faculty members who were valued and engaged in scholarly activities were more likely to remain at their
institutions. The Pew Health Professions Commissions reported that "tension arises from the academic system that rewards faculty research and publications with tenure and promotion . . . " (1991, p. 84).

Since 1961, there has been an increase of doctoral programs to prepare nurse educators to do research (Flynn & Heffron, 1988). Farren (1991) stated that 30% of the doctorate prepared nurse educators that she surveyed had done no post-doctoral research. To be a productive researcher required release time, clerical, financial, and people support, including a mentor (Farren, 1991). The requirements for promotional opportunities and salary increases of higher education may create tension in nurse educators.

Cotton and Tuttle (1986), after conducting a meta-analysis of research on turnover, stated that research needed to be conducted to determine if variables were causally linked to turnover and how these links were moderated by other variables. They also suggested that research was needed by specific industries to see how factors affect turnover. Variables that were identified as needing to be studied were employee populations, professionalism, job characteristics, and organizational structure and size.
The Louisiana State Board of Nursing ([LSBN], 1991) called for joint efforts of state government, nursing organizations, schools of nursing, and employers of nurses to make efforts toward increasing the number of qualified nursing graduates and nursing faculty.

Enrollment in colleges is increasing, society's need for health care is increasing, and a predicted faculty shortage is approaching. Therefore, the researcher chose to examine the variables related to the intention of nurse educators in Louisiana to leave their current teaching position.

Statement of the Problem

The need for this research was founded on the national shortage of nurses and the predicted national shortage of nurse educators in higher education (Mooney, 1989; Pew Health Professions Commission, 1991; USDHHS, 1990). The Louisiana State Board of Nursing (1991) and the Seventh Report to the President and the Congress on the Status of Health Personnel in the United States (USDHHS, 1990) stated these shortages already exist in Louisiana. The focus of this research was on the nurse educators in the baccalaureate degree nursing education programs of Louisiana. Specifically, this study examined the probable future shortage of nurse educators by determining the intention to leave of current nurse
educators. The rationale for studying this problem was the potential impact on society's health care needs for the future.

The purpose of this study was to determine what factors influenced the intention of nurse educators to leave their current teaching positions at the university level in Louisiana. In addition, this study described nurse educators in Louisiana on selected personal and professional demographic characteristics.

Objectives

In order to accomplish the purpose of the study, the objectives which were formulated to guide the researcher were to:

1. Describe nurse educators in Louisiana higher education on selected personal and professional characteristics. The characteristics included the following: age, gender, ethnic origin, marital status, kinship responsibility (number of dependent children and number of other significant individuals depending on faculty), educational level, certification status, health status, alternative employment options, years experience as a nurse, years experience as a nurse educator, years of experience as a nurse educator at their current university, academic rank, tenure status, employment status, amount of time for association with co-workers, membership in professional
organizations, scholarly productivity (articles and grants), moonlighting status, amount of moonlighting, status in retirement systems, number of years in retirement systems (Teacher Retirement System, Social Security System, and other retirement systems, and salary (teaching & total).

2. Describe nurse educators in Louisiana higher education on the following psychological measures: job satisfaction as measured by the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job in General (JIG), organizational commitment as measured by the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), and intention to leave as measured by a researcher designed instrument (ITL).

3. Determine if a relationship existed between job satisfaction (measured by the JDI) and intention to leave (measured by ITL) of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education.

4. Determine if a relationship existed between the components of job satisfaction (satisfaction with salary, co-workers, supervision, present job, and promotional opportunities), as measured by the scales of JDI and JIG, and intention to leave of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education.

5. Determine if a relationship existed between job satisfaction (as measured by the JDI and JIG) of nurse
educators in Louisiana higher education and selected demographic characteristics.

6. Determine if a relationship existed between organizational commitment (as measured by the OCQ) and intention to leave (as measured by ITL) of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education.

7. Determine if a relationship existed between organizational commitment (as measured by the OCQ) of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education and selected demographic characteristics.

8. Determine if a model existed which explains a significant portion of the variance in intention to leave of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education from the following measures: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, age, gender, ethnic origin, marital status, kinship responsibility (number of dependent children and number of other significant individuals depending on faculty), educational level, certification status, years experience as a nurse, years experience as a nurse educator, years of experience as a nurse educator at their current university, academic rank, tenure status, employment status, amount of time for association with co-workers, membership in professional organizations, scholarly productivity (articles and grants), moonlighting status and amount of moonlighting, status in other
Significance of the Study

Because of the existing shortage of nurse educators in Louisiana, information regarding the intention of the presently employed nurse educators could more accurately predict the future status of the supply of nurse educators. If accurately predicted, actions could be taken to reduce the problem. Accurate predictions could prevent a crisis situation from occurring.

A few studies have attempted to predict intention to leave for faculty in higher education. No studies were found predicting intention to leave for nurse educators; although, many studies examined turnover among nurses. Price and Mueller (1981, 1986) developed a model predicting turnover for registered nurses. Therefore, this study adds to the body of knowledge about turnover for nurse educators in baccalaureate education. Several authors (Bowles, 1983; Brown, 1986; Koroloff, 1985; Price & Mueller, 1981; Smart, 1990; Tanaomi, 1990; Torbert, 1987; Zey-Ferrell, 1982) recommended that further research be conducted on turnover, including intention to leave. Since the specific population of this study was nurse educators, a shortage of these people would influence the
general faculty shortage and directly impact the future nursing shortage.

"Overall research in employee turnover has been especially prolific, yet there were no firm conclusions as to the turnover process" (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986, p. 66). In addition, definite conclusions had not been reached regarding the influence of satisfaction and organizational commitment on intention to leave. Specific variables needing investigation were the job characteristics, specific populations, and behavioral intentions. This study sought to add to the knowledge base regarding job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention to leave.

**Operational Definitions**

For the purposes of this study, the following terms were operationally defined:

**Amount of time for association with co-workers** was the amount of time that faculty are able to be see each other during the work week.

**Certification status** referred to certification by a professional nursing organization.

**Intention to leave** (intention to turnover) was defined as "an individual's perception of the likelihood of discontinuing membership in an organization" (Price & Mueller, 1986, p. 17). Intention to leave is the last

Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job in General (JIG) are copyrighted job satisfaction instruments available from Bowling Green State University. The JDI components measure discriminately different aspects of the job (present job, pay, opportunities for promotion, co-workers, and supervision). JIG measures overall job satisfaction (Balzer, Smith, Kravitz, Lovell, Paul, Reilly, & Reilly, 1990).

Kinship responsibility was the number of dependent children (financially) and the number of significant others in the community the subjects feel responsible for checking on weekly.

Moonlighting referred to working extra for other institutions for money.

Nurse educator had a Masters in Nursing and is employed full-time to instruct clinical practice, classroom instruction, or do administrative type duties within the school of nursing.

Organizational Commitment Questionnaire is a nine item positively written instrument developed to measure an individuals commitment to the institution (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979).

Scholarly productivity referred to submitting manuscripts and grants and having articles accepted and grants awarded.


University was a four year baccalaureate degree granting institution, either private or public, located in
Louisiana. Each university nursing program is approved by the Louisiana State Board of Nursing.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter was to provide information that served as the foundation of the study. The chapter is organized into the following sections: definition of intention to leave, impact and consequences of intention to leave, an analysis of intention to leave questionnaires, projections for the future, general factors influencing intention to leave, variables of importance, and theoretical models of intention to leave. Definition and findings in general and in higher education are discussed in depth for major variables that have been found to influence intention to leave. These variables are job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and personal characteristics.

Definitions of Intention to Leave

"It is very difficult to use efficiently a literature that is not highly codified. . . . The immense literature about organizational turnover is disorderly and dispersed and therefore is especially in need of codification" (Price, 1977, p. 3).

When describing the turnover process, various terms such as retention, turnover, voluntary turnover, involuntary turnover, employee turnover, intention to turnover, intention to leave, intention to stay, and
intention to remain have been used by researchers. Turnover was described as a process having two sides (aspects). The sides could be (separated into) simply stated (identified) as staying and leaving. Leaving also could be broken into parts including voluntary and involuntary. In addition, the withdrawal process had typically involved a range of ideas from thinking about leaving to actually leaving. Since different aspects of the process have been studied, a variety of definitions have been formulated. Because of the lack of codification, definitions from the literature were explored to understand the terminology better.

Bluedorn (1982) divided turnover data into stayers and leavers. Many researchers believe both sides of turnover need to be researched; therefore, the definitions of stayers was addressed first. Several studies (Bowles, 1983; Flowers & Hughes, 1973) have addressed employees remaining at their present position. Bowles defined intent to remain as "the indication by an employee that he/she intends to remain employed in his/her college or university position" (p. 8). Flowers and Hughes studied turnover, but concentrated on retention. Retention could be explained by "inertia . . . a body will remain as it is until acted on by force." (p. 50). Price and Mueller...
(1981), in their development of a causal model of turnover, found that an intervening variable, intent to stay, had a negative influence on turnover. Price and Mueller's definition of intent to stay was "the estimated likelihood of continued membership in an organization" (1981, p. 546).

Turnover was divided into voluntary and involuntary termination (Abelson, 1987; Bluedorn, 1976, 1982; Caplow & McGee, 1958; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979; Price, 1977). Price defined involuntary turnover as terminations that were not initiated by the individual and were related to incidents of dismissals, retirement, layoffs, or deaths. According to the US Bureau of Labor Statistics voluntary turnover was defined as the "individual movement across the membership boundary of a social system which is initiated by the individual" (cited in Price, 1977, p. 9). Caplow and McGee (1958) defined voluntary terminations as those that occur "(1) because of discontent and discord within the department, (2) upon the reception of an unbeatable offer, (3) through a "drifting away" process, and (4) for nonacademic, personal reasons" (p. 52). Bluedorn's (1976) definition of voluntary turnover was the degree of an individual's movement across the membership boundary of an organization. Mobley et al. (1979) in their comprehensive review of literature
cited Marsh and Mannari's definition of voluntary turnover as including pregnancy. An opposing definition was cited by Bluedorn who considered pregnancy involuntary; therefore, pregnant persons were not included. Abelson (1987) used additional terms, avoidable and unavoidable turnover to differentiate between voluntary turnover and involuntary turnover.

Several studies (Bluedorn, 1976, 1982; Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Mobley, 1977; Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978; Morita, Lee, & Mowday, 1989; Muchinsky & Morrow, 1980; Price, 1977, Price & Mueller, 1881, 1986) have used the term turnover. Muchinsky and Morrow (1980) stated that turnover "refers to an individual's voluntary termination of employment from an organization" (p. 267). On a broader scale, Price, a sociologist, stated "turnover is the degree of individual movement across the membership boundary of a social system" (p. 4). In addition, Price pointed out that turnover had mostly been studied as related to the process of an individual leaving or withdrawing from an organization or social system. Thus, he did not limit the term to withdrawal from work but from any organization. Price included absenteeism and accidents as part of withdrawal from work.
Cotton and Tuttle (1986) used the term employee turnover in their meta-analysis of 120 studies. However, they presented no definition.

Mobley (Mobley, 1977; Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978; Youngblood, Mobley, & Meglino, 1983) used the term employee withdrawal process, employee turnover, turnover, and turnover process interchangeably. Morita et al. (1989) in studying turnover, introduced the statistical method of survival analysis. The use of the survival analysis technique allowed the researchers to study turnover as a process whose intensity (rate) was allowed to vary over time rather than remain fixed.

In studying the withdrawal process, several authors (Bluedorn, 1982; Brown, 1986; Doran, Stone, Brief, & George, 1991; Bowles, 1983; Mobley, 1977; Mobley et al., 1979; Price, 1977; Price & Mueller, 1981, 1986; Smart, 1990) have given definitions of intention to quit, intention to turnover, or intention to leave. Mobley (1977) found that intention to quit was the only variable that exhibited a significant relationship with turnover. Behavioral intention to leave (Bluedorn, 1982; Mobley et al., 1979) was considered an immediate precursor to turnover. "Intent to leave refers to the individual's interest in seeking employment elsewhere as exemplified through active behaviors--applying for jobs, having
references forwarded, informing department heads of search procedures, going through interviews, and turning down job offers or accepting a job offer" (Brown, 1986, p. 36). Smart (1990) defines intention to leave as "a single item reflecting the intention of faculty to accept a job in either a college or university or a nonacademic setting." (p. 412). Doran et al. (1991) used intentions to leave to describe the "intent-to quit—job satisfaction relationship" (p. 41).

Two similar terms, turnover intention and withdrawal cognitions are referenced in the literature. "A general limitation of the Spencer, Steers, and Mowday (1983) study was that turnover intention rather than actual turnover behavior was examined" (cited in Mowday, Koberg, & McArthur, 1984, p. 81). "Withdrawal cognitions" used by Mobley et al. (1978) in the withdrawal decision process included thinking of quitting, intention to search, probability of finding an acceptable job with another employer, and intention to leave. This process could be used to identify a variety of possible precursors of employee turnover (Mobley et al., 1978).

For the purposes of this research, the primary dependent variable, intention to leave, was defined using Price and Mueller's (1986) definition of intention to turnover. This definition was "an individual's perception
of the likelihood of discontinuing membership in an organization" (Price & Mueller, 1986, p. 17). Although one group of researchers (Mowday et al., 1984) disagreed with this approach and advocated the study of actual turnover, there are numerous studies (Bluedorn, 1982; Brown, 1986; Doran et al., 1991; Bowles, 1983; Mobley, 1977; Mobley et al., 1979; Mueller, 1986; Price & Mueller, 1981, 1986; Smart, 1990) that supported intention to leave as a predictor of turnover.

**Impact and Consequences of Intention to Leave**

Several authors (Dalton & Tudor, 1982; Lowery & Jacobsen, 1984; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Muchinsky & Morrow, 1980; Price, 1977; Wolf, 1981) have discussed the impact of intention to leave. Muchinsky and Morrow (1980) divided the processual model of voluntary employee turnover into determinants and consequences. The three determinants were individual factors, work-related factors, and economic opportunity. The four consequences were individual consequences, organizational consequences-social, organizational consequences-economic, and societal consequences. Each of these consequences are examined in the following sections.

**Individual**

According to Muchinsky and Morrow (1980), little was known about the consequences of turnover on the
individual. The consequences may relate to the reason for turnover. For instance, planned retirement may be a positive reason for turnover. However, studies cited by Muchinsky and Morrow (1980) indicated that there have been persons who retired that became depressed, had declining interpersonal relationships, and even committed suicide. Cherry's study (cited in Muchinsky & Morrow, 1980) found that those persons who frequently change jobs have higher levels of unemployment, delinquency, psychiatric illness, and family problems. Bray et al. and Mattilla (cited by Muchinsky & Morrow, 1980) found leavers did not tend to increase their salaries by leaving. Nevertheless, turnover did not appear to improve or detract from the probability of career success.

Doran et al. (1991) found that the economic meaning of work in people's lives conditions how they will respond to their jobs. For instance, Carsten and Spector (1987) conducted a meta-analysis of the literature to determine if a relationship existed between satisfaction and turnover that was moderated by the economic conditions of the time. This study served to validate results found by Muchinsky and Morrow (1980) who stated that during times of economic depression, fewer persons left and that the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover was weakened. Muchinsky and Morrow interpreted this to mean
that most persons would rather remain on a job than face unemployment even though they may have a low level of job satisfaction with the job.

Mowday et al. (1982) stated that individuals who remained on a job with which they had low satisfaction had negative organizational commitment, reduced career mobility, and advancement. This was also related to reduced self-development that created individual stress and family tension.

Organizational-social

Organizational-social consequences of turnover were reported by Muchinsky and Morrow (1980). Organizational-social consequences of turnover included formalization, integration, innovation, morale and centralization.

As turnover increased, formalization (more rules) within an organization increased. To address these problems created by turnover, Wolf (1981) and Price and Mueller (1986) advocated that the duties, responsibilities, and the authority of the position be presented to the nurse during the initial interview.

Integration was defined as the "degree to which the members have close friends in their immediate work units" (Price & Mueller, 1986, p. 11). In 1975, Gowler and Legge found that higher amounts of turnover produce lower amounts of integration (cited in Muchinsky & Morrow,
A solution to the consequence of turnover creating low integration was for hospitals to hire nurses from the local area who have the same cultural background (Price & Mueller, 1986).

Innovation increased with turnover of managerial staff according to Muchinsky and Morrow (1985). However, Muchinsky and Morrow reported that the "degree of empirical support for this proposition is not as strong as one might suspect" (p. 281).

The consequences of morale and centralization have received a limited amount of study. Price and Mueller defined centralization as the "degree to which power is concentrated in an organization" (1986, p. 11). However, Price and Mueller (1986) offered the following solutions to these problems caused by turnover: refresher courses or internships for nurses who felt inadequate in their present preparation and professional career ladder for nurses.

**Organizational economic**

Organizational-economic consequences of turnover (Dalton & Todor, 1982; Muchinsky & Morrow, 1980) often involved lower payroll and fringe benefit cost, but this was more than offset by the increased cost of administration, recruitment, and training.
In 1984, Lowery and Jacobsen reported recruitment and training costs for a staff nurse was $2,000. In 1991, Curran reported that it cost $10,000 to recruit one new staff nurse and another $5,000 to orient a new nurse. "For approximately 70,000 new nursing graduates, employers spend $1,050,000,000. If half of them [nurses] turnover, we lost $525,000,000 (Curran, p. 220).

Muchinsky & Morrow (1980) found turnover was a cause of lower organizational productivity. However, other researchers (Dalton and Todor, 1982; Del Bueno, 1990; Lowery and Jacobsen, 1984) disagreed with this. Lowery and Jacobsen found that while operational disruption was a cause of turnover, it was less likely with the loss of lower level and less skilled personnel.

Dalton and Todor (1982) emphasized that turnover was not inherently a negative phenomenon. "To the extent that turnover is not excessive, that is, its costs do not exceed its benefits, a large amount of money might be saved each year by reasonable levels of turnover" (p. 216). Programs to reduce employee turnover might not be appropriate for organizations in which training requirements are minimal and experience might not lead to appreciably higher levels of performance. However, there might be a level at which turnover becomes unmanageable. Therefore, Dalton and Tudor proposed that organizations
need to determine the impact of turnover rather than study antecedents and determinants.

Del Bueno (1990) stated that retention was both problematic and desirable in a hospital nursing staff. It depended on who left, who stayed, why they stayed, why they left, and when they leave. Retaining the wrong individuals may not only cost more but will obstruct changes that may be necessary for the survival of the organization.

Societal

Bowen and Schuster (1986) felt that there was indeed a bigger picture to consider especially as related to turnover of faculty. About a third to a half of every age group of young people was directly influenced by the nation's faculties. Faculty members train virtually the entire leadership of the society in the professions including government officials, teachers, clergy, journalist, physicians, and others whose main function is the shaping of human development. In addition, the faculties have done much of the basic research and scholarship. The faculties, through both their teaching and research, are enormously influential in the economic progress and cultural development of the nation.

In short, the faculties are a major influence upon the destiny of the nation, and the nation
has a clear and urgent interest in assembling and maintaining faculties having adequate numbers of talented, well-trained, highly motivated, and socially responsible people (Bowen & Schuster, 1986, p. 3).

Since 1985, the conditions and expectations of faculties are correspondingly bleak. Fewer persons are opting for academic careers. Neglecting to revitalize faculties may do irreparable damage to the nation (Bowen & Schuster, 1986).

In summary, various authors (Dalton & Tudor, 1982; Lowery & Jacobsen, 1984; Mowday et al., 1982; Muchinsky & Morrow, 1980; Price, 1977; Wolf, 1981) have presented evidence confirming the framework of the four consequences (individual, organizational-social, organizational-economic, and societal) on the impact of intention to leave. The individuals who leave will have changes in their lives related to their choice and the organization may or may not benefit from the individual leaving. Del Bueno (1990) stated turnover could cost the institution money and/or affect morale. Dalton and Todor reported that the organization may grow because of the particular individual who left or the individual who becomes the replacement. However, Dalton & Todor also reported that depending on the number and quality of individuals who
leave or the individuals who remain, the organization, and even society could suffer.

**Analysis of Intention to Leave Questionnaires**

Intention to remain had been measured on questionnaires ranging from lengthy to a single item. Internal consistency estimates of reliability were not reported in most identified studies. No questionnaires had been used specifically with nursing faculty. Koroloff's three questions had an alpha coefficient estimate of reliability of .25. Muchinsky and Tuttle (1979) reported, after reviewing 150 studies, that "several studies have reported that the response to a single item or a few items predicted turnover as well as more elaborate devices" (p. 64). "Atchison and Lefferts (1972) reported that response to a single behavioral intention item predicted turnover as well as responses to Herzberg's motivator/hygiene questionnaire" (cited in Muchinsky & Tuttle, p. 64). Several studies (Bowles, 1983; Kraut, 1975; Newman, 1974) have acknowledged the validity of a single item question to predict turnover. Mobley, et al. (1978) identified four withdrawal cognitions including: thinking of quitting, intention to search, probability of finding an acceptable job, and intention to leave. Studies (Abelson, 1987; Mobley, 1978;
Rossano, 1985; Smart, 1990) have used lengthy questionnaires including these withdrawal components.

**Projections for the Future**

No one knows the future, but projections can be made. Projections have been made regarding the number of nurses nationally and in Louisiana. In addition, figures for faculty have been reported. These findings are reported in this section.

The Seventh Report (The Seventh Report) to the President and Congress on the Status of Health Personnel in the United States (USDHHS, 1990) stated,

The size of the RN population is a function of the number of new licenses (and therefore new graduates) who have entered the profession and the number of registered nurses who failed to maintain their license for whatever reason (net loss) or have died (mortality). As long as the total loss (net loss plus mortality) is less than the new licensees, the RN population will continue to grow. Then these numbers come into balance, the RN population will remain constant, and when the total loss exceeds the number of new licensees the RN population will decline . . . the projected decrease of new licensees and increase in net loss cause the total loss
and new licensee input to balance in 2009, each reaching a value of approximately 60,000, at which time the RN population attains its maximum value of 2,534,600 licensees. As the total loss exceeds the new licensees over the remainder of the projection period, the RN population declines to 2,313,600 licensees in 2020 (p. VIII-26).

Nationwide, in March 1988, there was an estimated 2,033,032 individuals licensed to practice nursing in the United States (USDHHS, 1990). It was projected that the supply of RNs per 100,000 will increase through 2000. The national average projected 713 RNs per 100,000 population with the District of Columbia having 1,483 RNs per 100,000 population. The national average was projected to decline to 558 RNs per 100,000 by 2020. Other projections are that nurses with masters and doctorates will decrease from 13.6% of the registered nurses to 5.16% of the registered nurses (USDHHS, p. VIII-28) between 1990 and 2020.

The Seventh Report (1990) stated,

The nursing education area shows the smallest absolute and relative increase: 3,900 and 17.2 percent. The number of full-time equivalent RN educators required is very sensitive to enrollment levels in each educational program.
Enrollment numbers can be gauged by numbers of graduations, which peak in the 1995-2000 period and then decline until 2020. Therefore, enrollment levels can be expected to follow a similar course, peaking early in the projection period and then declining. Nurse educators required, following the same pattern, reach a maximum in the 1995-2000 period and decline, but remain above 1990 levels (p. VIII-33).

Since the above figures are in the distant future, projected figures for this decade are reported for Louisiana. The total RNs projected to be available in The Seventh Report (USDHHS, 1990) for December 31, 2000 in Louisiana will be 14,100. In Louisiana, there will be 357 RNs per 100,000 population. This was projected to be the smallest ratio in the continental United States.

Additional projections of The Seventh Report (1990) for the year 2000 included 1,460 (9.65%) will be prepared at the Masters or higher educational level. This can be compared to a total of 25,769 nurses registered in Louisiana with 1,566 (16.45%) having obtained Masters or higher educational levels in December 1990 (Adams, 1991).

The Louisiana State Board of Nursing reported in The Examiner (1992) that 17 baccalaureate nurse educator positions were filled with nurse educators who were not
minimally prepared with a Masters of Nursing degree. In addition, twelve other positions in other Louisiana programs (Associate Degree or Diploma) were not filled with minimally prepared nurse educators. On March 22, 1991 the Louisiana State Board of Nursing (LSBN) issued a Position Statement Relative to the Shortage of Registered Nurse Services in Louisiana (The Examiner, 1991). This statement said the shortage of RNs "... may also be having a negative impact on quality of patient care" (p. 2). Along with other issues, the LSBN asked that faculty shortages and faculty salaries be addressed. This issue was addressed by the Louisiana State Legislature in 1991 by creating the Nursing Supply and Demand Commission.

Bowen and Schuster (1986) gave a low and a high estimate for college faculty attrition. The low rate would be four percent between 1985 and 2010. This included 1.3% for retirement and morality and 2.7% for other types of attrition. A higher estimate was between four percent and six percent between 1985 and 1994 with a six percent rate between 1995 and 2010. This six percent represented 2.75% for retirement and mortality and 3.25% for other types of attrition.

In summary, the national average of RNs per 100,000 population was projected to decline to 558 RNs per 100,000 by 2020. Other projections are that nurses with masters
and doctorates will decrease from 13.6% of the registered nurses to 5.16% of the registered nurses (USDHHS, p. VIII-28) between 1990 and 2020. In addition, Bowen and Schuster (1986) predicted a faculty attrition rate between four percent and six percent.

**General Factors Influencing Intentions to Leave**

Various factors have been found to influence intention to leave. These variables included personal characteristics, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The following was a synopsis of some factors that authors have discussed in the literature.

Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974) studied the relationship of job satisfaction and organizational commitment to turnover for a sample of psychiatric aides. This was a longitudinal study in which organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and intention to leave measures were conducted at four different times. They found the relationship between the variables and turnover strongest at points in time closest to when an individual leaves an institution. Organizational commitment was found to discriminate between stayers and leavers. Satisfaction with opportunities for promotion and satisfaction with the work itself were the components of job satisfaction which were most related to turnover. This was in contrast to Porter and Steers (1973)
comprehensive review of the literature that found job satisfaction to be consistently inversely related to turnover. One of these reports was that of Katzell's (cited in Porter et al.) research that studied two thousand student nurses. Findings of this study included a negative relationship between job satisfaction and turnover.

After reviewing 150 studies, Muchinsky & Tuttle (1979) stated that job dissatisfaction, tenure, family responsibilities, and unmet expectations have been found to be associated with turnover. However, they reported that intention to leave was the most valid predictor of turnover.

Bluedorn (1982) included the following variables in an equation to predict turnover: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job search, intent to leave, equity, organizational information, age, promotion opportunities, potential role conflict, education, routinization, environmental opportunities, and foregone environmental opportunities. According to Bluedorn (1982) the determinants of turnover were environmental opportunity, intention to stay or leave, routinization, and age.

Lowery and Jacobsen (1984) found that the variables that best differentiated between stayers and leavers in
nursing practice were the variables interest, motivation, and age. In this study, younger, less motivated, less interested nurses were the ones who left a metropolitan teaching hospital.

Cotton and Tuttle (1986) conducted a meta-analysis of 26 variables in at least 130 studies focussed on turnover. These 26 variables were divided into external correlates, work-related correlates, and personal correlates. The external correlates (presence of a union and employment perception) were strongly correlated with turnover. Met expectations, behavioral intentions, and organizational structure, organizational commitment, job characteristics, employee population, size and type of industry, nationality, and perceived economic alternatives were not found to be significantly related, but deserving of further investigation (Cotton & Tuttle).

Cotton and Tuttle (1986) found the following personal correlates were strongly related to turnover: age, tenure, education, number of dependents, biographical information, met expectations, and behavioral intentions.

Cotton and Tuttle (1986) reported the following work related correlates of job satisfaction (satisfaction with the work itself, satisfaction with salary, satisfaction with supervision, and organizational commitment were variables) were highly related to turnover. Other work-
related correlates (job performance, satisfaction with co-workers, satisfaction with promotion, and role clarity) were also related to turnover, but not as highly related as the other work-related variables. According to the researchers, investigation was needed to determine whether variables are causally linked to turnover, and how these links are moderated by other variables (Cotton & Tuttle).

After studying practicing Louisiana nurses, Prestholdt, Irving, and Mathews (1988) identified feelings about resigning from the hospital, social pressures from important people, and the nurse's feelings of moral obligation to remain on the hospital staff as three factors that could correctly identify 85% of the nurses who eventually resigned. In addition, the researchers identified categories of beliefs about the consequences of resigning or staying. The categories were nursing practice, alternative options, work environment, economics and physical/emotional costs, including stress.

Hale (1991) also studied Louisiana nurses. She found significantly lower scores on satisfaction with work, professional nursing, and nursing education for "other minorities" than the scores of blacks and whites. There was no difference between males and females on the variable satisfaction with work. Nearly one fourth of the respondents stated that they would not choose nursing as a
profession again. The negative comments were related to increased responsibilities, increased stress, shortage of professional nurses, lack of administrative support, and physician–nurse conflict.

Zey-Ferrell (1982) developed and tested a model to explain exit intention for faculty. The nine general dimensions included: personal traits, early childhood parental influence and socialization, higher education socialization, occupational status, personal values, general attitudes, professionalism, dissatisfaction with the employing organization, and support for collective bargaining. The methodology involved interviews and questionnaires. The first four variables, attitudinal support for collective bargaining and dissatisfaction with medical coverage index II, sex, and age accounted for 23% of the variance. This model had not been tested.

Bowles (1983) examined the relationship of intrinsic and extrinsic facets of satisfaction, expressed satisfaction, and organizational commitment with a variable designed to predict turnover of faculty. Smart (1991) stated employee turnover for faculty had at least three sets of determinants: individual characteristics reflecting demographic and work factors, contextual variables reflecting individuals' stature in and
adjustment to the work environment, and external conditions.

Several authors (Brown, 1986; Matier, 1985; Smart, 1990; Torbert, 1987; Zey-Ferrell, 1982) who have studied research productivity of college faculty have found that those who stay are usually inclined to be research oriented. This variable had not been studied for nurse educators.

In summary, variables that have been shown to predict intention to leave were personal characteristics, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Several other variables such as dissatisfaction with medical coverage and attitudinal support for collective bargaining although explaining large amounts of the variance in particular studies do not seem of interest to the population being studied. For instance, nurse educators who work for the State of Louisiana had access to the choice of several different health maintenance organizations and a group insurance coverage. In addition, the personal characteristics included age, gender, and work related variables. Due to the nature of expectations of higher education, research productivity by nursing faculty will be a variable of investigation.
Variables of Importance

Variables of importance will be discussed in detail. These variables will include job satisfaction, organizational commitment, age, ethnic group, marital status, family responsibilities, educational level, professionalism, and employment alternatives. Findings will be reported for those subjects in general, for those in the nursing profession, and those in higher education.

Job Satisfaction

Definition. "Job satisfaction is defined as the feelings a worker had about his or her job experiences in relation to previous experiences, current expectations, or available alternatives." (Balzer, Smith, Kravitz, Lovell, Paul, Reilly, & Reilly, 1990, p. 6). The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) expresses five primary facets of job satisfaction: work itself, supervision, pay, promotion and co-workers.

Findings related to the impact of job satisfaction on intention to leave in general. Various authors (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Flowers & Hughes, 1973; Mobley et al., 1978; Mowday et al., 1984; Muchinsky & Tuttle, 1979; Porter & Steers, 1973; Porter et al., 1974; Rossano, 1985; & Tanaomi, 1991) have found job satisfaction to be related to intention to leave. Findings for these individual studies will be discussed.
Flowers and Hughes (1973) found leavers are those persons who are dissatisfied with their jobs and have few internal or external environmental pressures to keep them. Porter et al. (1974) reported that organizational commitment (OCQ) was a better predictor than JDI for turnover for a group of psychiatric aides.

At least two groups of researchers (Porter & Steers, 1973; Muchinsky & Tuttle, 1979) reported that attitudes related to job satisfaction were associated with turnover. Populations studied were life insurance agents, female clerical employees, nurses, student nurses, military personnel, and certified public accountants. Mowday et al. (1984) found job satisfaction had an indirect effect on turnover. Cotton and Tuttle (1986) found job satisfaction to be strongly negatively correlated with turnover. Mobley et al. (1978) tested a heuristic model in which the most probable consequence of job dissatisfaction was to elicit a cognitive process of thinking of quitting. The sample consisted of 203 hospital employees. Rossano (1985) found county agents in Ohio indicated a moderate level of job satisfaction; although, overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with co-workers, age, and self rating of job performance were the best predictors of intention to leave. Tanaomi (1991) found age and job satisfaction predicted 31% of intention
to turnover for employees at a university including administrative, classified, and faculty. Jenkins (in press) found job satisfaction was a better predictor than organizational commitment of turnover for a group of government industrial workers who had a high self-monitoring personality trait. In addition job satisfaction accounted for 15% of the variance with organizational commitment adding only 3% to the variance in the equation predicting intention to leave.

Findings related to job satisfaction on intention to leave in practicing hospital nurses. Several authors (Abelson, 1987; Hale, 1991; McCloskey, 1990; Kramer & Schmalenberg, 1991; Seybolt, Pavett, & Walker, 1978; Price & Mueller, 1981) have found job satisfaction to be related to the intention to leave for nurses. Findings related to these studies will be presented.

Seybolt et al. (1978) studied nurses working in a hospital. They found the satisfaction level of the leavers was significantly different from the stayers. The leavers had lower scores for overall satisfaction and satisfaction with supervision, satisfaction with the chance to use one's ability, and satisfaction with the freedom from tension and pressures. Abelson (1987) found levels of satisfaction differentiated stayers and unavoidable leavers from avoidable leavers.
In 1981, Price and Mueller tested Price's causal model of turnover with over 1,000 registered nurses. Job satisfaction was related to intent to stay and turnover. Job satisfaction had the strongest influence for nurses indicating an intention to stay. Job satisfaction was an important mediator between determinants and turnover. For example, pay, kinship responsibilities, routinization, instrumental communication, promotional opportunity, and participation had little total effects. That is, they did have an impact on turnover through the intervening variables of job satisfaction and intent to stay.

McCloskey (1990) studied autonomy and social integration. When these variables were perceived to be low, the nurses reported low job satisfaction and work motivation. In addition, the nurses reported poor commitment to the organization and less intent to stay on the job.

Hale (1991) found significantly lower scores on satisfaction with work for "other minorities" than the scores of blacks and whites. There were no differences between males and females on the variable satisfaction with work. Nearly one-fourth of the respondents stated that they would not choose nursing as a profession again. The negative comments were related to increased responsibilities, increased stress, shortage of
professional nurses, lack of administrative support, and physician-nurse conflict.

Kramer and Schmalenberg (1991) studied nurses in hospitals that had a high retention rate of nurses. The nurses ranked satisfiers in the following order: organizational structure, professional practice, management style, quality of leadership, and professional development. Although these attributes were very important, the nurses did not seem satisfied with the satisfiers in their hospital. Most of the nurses were only fairly satisfied with the variable job satisfaction.

Findings related to job satisfaction on intention to leave in higher education. Several authors (Bowles, 1983; Hill, 1984; Smart, 1990; Tanaomi, 1990) have studied the relationship of job satisfaction and intention to leave for college faculty. Bowles found those faculty members with higher scores on the job satisfaction questionnaire were more likely to remain than those who scored lower. This was verified by Hill in 1984. Hill reported that total job satisfaction had an inverse relationship with intention to leave with community college faculty in New York. Job satisfaction (Tanaomi) predicted 31% of intention to turnover for faculty, administrative employees, and classified employees in an institution of higher education. In a national survey, Smart found that
higher levels of satisfaction are negatively associated with intentions to leave.

**Components of Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction can be broken into five facets. These facets are working conditions, promotion, co-workers, supervision, and salary. For the purposes of this research the findings related to the individual facets will be presented. The findings will be presented under the headings, findings in general and findings in higher education.

**Working Conditions**

**Definition.** Balzer et. al. (1990) stated work concerns the employee's satisfaction with the work itself. . . . various attributes of work that may be related to satisfaction, including opportunities for creativity and task variety allowing an individual to increase his or her knowledge, and changes in responsibility, amount of work, autonomy, job enrichment, and job complexity (p. 44).

**Findings related to working conditions on intention to leave in general.** At least four authors (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Porter et al., 1974; Prestholdt et al., 1988; Tanaomi, 1990) have reported a relationship between working conditions and intention to leave. Porter et al.
reported satisfaction with the work itself was the third variable of importance in discriminating between stayers and leavers. Prestholdt et al. found that beliefs about rewards from the practice of nursing and the actual work could distinguish between stayers and leavers. Cotton and Tuttle conducted a meta-analysis and found that satisfaction with the work itself was highly inversely related to turnover. For all university employees, Tanaomi found the mean scores for promotion satisfaction and pay satisfaction were much lower than the mean scores for work, supervision, and co-workers.

Findings related to working conditions on intention to leave for faculty in higher education. Past research (Bowles, 1983; Brown, 1986; Koroloff, 1985; Smart, 1990; Tanaomi, 1990) indicated a relationship between working conditions and intention to leave for faculty in higher education. Recognition/status, advancement, and growth in the job contributed to positive feelings about the job for faculty with high intent to remain scores according to Bowles. Bowles did not find salary, achievement, work itself, responsibility, supervision, personal life, job security, working conditions, relationship with superiors, relationship with co-workers, relationship with subordinates, policy and administration related to intention to leave. Koroloff found that working
conditions was inversely related to intention to leave; however, this correlation was low ($r = -.24$). Brown reported that satisfaction with the work itself was a significant contributor to the prediction of commitment to stay in one of the two universities studied. In addition, the greater the scores for one university on satisfaction with research support, role expectations, and team teaching, the lower the commitment to stay score. Tanaomi stated that work satisfaction was the second best predictor of faculty's intention to turnover. Smart stated that those tenured faculty "who spend more time on teaching tend to have lower levels of organizational satisfaction, which, in turn, increases their intention to leave" (p. 416). Tanaomi found that for faculty members, the mean score for pay satisfaction was much lower than the mean scores for promotion, work, supervision, and co-workers satisfaction.

Findings related to working conditions in nursing education. Only descriptive research (Feldman & Keidel, 1987; Hawkins, Bower, Fairchild, Koudakjian, & Simon, 1987) was reported for working conditions in nursing education. Feldman and Keidel reported major sources of job satisfaction were liking their work and having a feeling of achievement. Hawkins et al. reported that
part-time faculty had a commitment of 18 hours a week while full-time faculty had 25 hours a week.

**Promotions**

A limited amount of research (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Muchinsky & Tuttle, 1979; Porter et al., 1974; Price and Mueller, 1981; Tanaomi, 1990) was reported for the variable satisfaction with promotions. Therefore, all the research will be presented under this heading. Porter et al. found satisfaction with opportunities for promotion was the second variable that entered the discriminant analysis which discriminated between stayers and leavers. Satisfaction with promotion was found to be the predictor variable for turnover for nurses (Saleh, et al., 1965 cited in Muchinsky & Tuttle). Cotton and Tuttle in the meta-analysis and found that satisfaction with promotion was inversely related to turnover. Tanaomi found that faculty members were significantly more satisfied than both administrative and classified employees relative to promotion. Price and Mueller found that opportunity and promotional opportunity had a significant influence on intent to stay for nurses.

**Co-workers and Supervision**

A limited number of studies indicated a relationship of the variable co-worker or supervision to leave. Therefore, these variables will be discussed together.
Cottons and Tuttle's (1986) meta-analysis indicated satisfaction with co-workers was inversely related to turnover. They also reported that satisfaction with supervision was highly inversely related to turnover.

Rossano (1985) reported overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with co-workers, age, and self rating of job performance were the best predictors of intention to leave. Brown (1986) reported that satisfaction with co-workers was a significant contributor to the prediction of commitment to stay in one of the two universities studied.

Salary

SREB-State Data Exchange, the American Association of University Professors, and SREB higher state agencies (cited in Smith, 1991) reported the following salaries. Nationally, the average faculty salary for 1989-90 was $42,518; for SREB states, $40,010; Louisiana, $33,015. By rank, the following salaries for SREB states (excluding Louisiana) were presented: Instructor, $25,244; new Assistant Professor, $31,170; Assistant Professor, $32,933; Associate Professor, $38,835; and Professor, $45,637 (cited in Smith).

Findings related to working conditions on intention to leave in general. Research (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Muchinsky & Tuttle, 1979; Porter et al., 1974; Prestholdt et al., 1988; Tanaomi, 1990) that related salary or pay to
intention to leave had been reported. Porter et al. found psychiatric aides who stayed and left had similar salaries. Attitude about salary was a predictor variable for turnover for nurses (Saleh et al., 1965 cited in Muchinsky & Tuttle). Cotton and Tuttle found that satisfaction with pay was highly inversely related to turnover. This variable was highly significant in 29 of 32 data sets reviewed. In addition, turnover was less reliably tied to pay for blue collar workers and nonmanagerial employees; however, pay was strongly related to turnover for both professionals and nonprofessional. In studying intention to leave, Rossano found the 4-H youth agents in Ohio had significantly lower levels of satisfaction with pay. Tanaomi studied 99 full time faculty, 105 administrative employees, and 145 classified employees. Employees, as a whole, at LaVerne are less satisfied with promotional opportunity and pay than any other subscale of job satisfaction. They feel underpaid. Prestholdt et al. found that beliefs about salary, fringe benefits, and job security could distinguish between stayers and leavers in nurses in Louisiana. Price and Mueller (1981) found nurses with the highest pay indicate an intent to stay.
Findings related to salary on intention to leave for faculty in higher education. Brown, (1986), Caplow and McGee (1958), Smart (1990), Tanaomi (1990), and Matier (1985) have studied the relationship of salary to intention to leave. Descriptive data was reported in the 1950s. In the 1980s and 1990s, multivariate data was reported.

Caplow and McGee (1958) reported that only 18% of those that departed were dissatisfied with their salaries; but 58% moved to jobs with higher salaries. Twenty-one percent of the replacements reported that they were unhappy with their former salary. Caplow and McGee compared the salaries of the four universities with the lowest salaries. Eleven percent of the assistant professors in the lowest paid schools were dissatisfied as compared to 33% of those in the highest paid schools. Twice as many (8%) of the full professors in the higher paid institutions were dissatisfied as compared to the 4% in the lower paid institutions. Approximately the same percentage of associate professors were dissatisfied in each category of institutions.

Three more recent studies confirm the findings of dissatisfaction with salary. Brown (1986) reported that satisfaction with salary was a significant contributor to the prediction of commitment to stay in one of the two
universities studied. Tanaomi (1990) reported that satisfaction with pay was the best predictor of faculty's intention to turnover in one university. In a national study, Smart (1990) found salary level had an influence on nontenured faculty to leave when controlling for all other variables.

In comparison, Matier (1985) studied 37 "star" faculty. "Star" faculty were defined as an individual who enjoys a national or international reputation as a scholar, and whose presence at the University of Oregon redounds positively on the institution's reputation" (p. ii). Findings included that some faculty members have remained at the institution even though they had been offered other jobs. Intangible benefits and nonwork related benefits were important in their decision to remain in comparison to tangible benefits. However, five individuals did leave.

Findings related to salary in nursing education. Research (Feldman & Keidel, 1987; Hawkins et al., 1987) reported relating salary to nursing education indicates two different findings. Feldman and Keidel reported 61% of part-time nursing faculty felt their salary was equitable. The amount of the salary was related to the satisfaction level; that is, the higher the salary the greater the percentage of satisfied faculty. Hawkins et
al. reported that part-time nursing faculty were dissatisfied with their salary, rank and fringe benefits. **Organizational Commitment**

**Definition.** Koroloff (1985) defined organizational commitment as "feelings of loyalty and commitment to the goals and values of the organization" (p. 22).

Findings related to organizational commitment on intention to leave in general. Abelson (1987), Cotton and Tuttle (1986), Jenkins, (in press), Mowday et al. (1984), Mowday and Lee (1986), Porter et al. (1974) have studied the influence of organizational commitment on intention to leave. Porter et al. found organizational commitment was strongest at points in time closest to when an individual leaves an institution and could discriminate between stayers and leavers. Mowday et al. organizational commitment appeared to have an indirect effect on turnover. Mowday and Lee found commitment was related to turnover at a high level of significance at the beginning of basic Air Force cadet training. Cotton and Tuttle found that organizational commitment was highly inversely related to turnover. Abelson found organizational commitment differentiated stayers and unavoidable leavers from avoidable leavers in a group of nurses and aides. Jenkins found commitment was a better predictor than job satisfaction of turnover for a group of government...
industrial workers who had a low self-monitoring personality trait.

Findings related to organizational commitment on intention to leave in higher education. Several studies (Bowles, 1983; Brown, 1986; Hill (1984); Koroloff, 1985; Smart, 1990) have studied intention of faculty to leave the field of higher education. Bowles found faculty members with high scores on the organizational commitment questionnaire had a significantly higher expressed intent to remain than those with lower organizational commitment scores. Hill reported that organizational commitment had an inverse relationship with intention to leave with community college faculty in New York. Koroloff found organizational commitment inversely and significantly associated with intent to leave the university. In addition, Koroloff stated that the beta weight for organizational commitment was the largest beta weight in the multiple regression. It also accounted for 11% of the explained variance. Koroloff stated that organizational commitment was not an intervening variable but rather an antecedent of the same order as faculty's age, university, perception of employment alternatives, and relationship with co-workers and institutional support. In one university in Oregon, Brown (1986) found that the greater the intent to leave, the lower the organizational
commitment. This was not found to be true in the second group of faculty from another university studied while doing that same research. Smart found tenured and nontenured faculty with lower levels of organizational commitment were more likely to leave their institutions.

Heckman (1989) studied faculty commitment in medium sized universities in Kansas. Using the faculty commitment questionnaire, he found eleven factors accounted for 66% of the variance. Factor I contributed 28% of this variance. Since the table was unclear, one can not accurately identify Factor I. However, the narrative stated that "the strongest loading on Factor I was a .39 for the item which referred to "exerting a great deal of effort for the organization" (p. 75). The School of Nursing ranked second by mean in faculty commitment. He stated that the highly committed faculty was more likely to be tenured, employed over 15 years, older, a full professor, a member of the School of Law, and earns over $35,000.

In summary, researchers have found organizational commitment to be related to intention to leave. This variable had been studied in academic and non-academic settings. Some researchers have reported direct and indirect influence of this variable.
Personal Characteristics

Age

Findings related to age on intention to leave in general. The majority of researchers have found age to be related to turnover. Porter et al. (1974), Cotton and Tuttle (1986), Tanaomi (1990), and Jenkins (in press) found older persons tended to stay. Abelson (1987) found age was not significantly different between avoidable leavers and avoidable leavers in a group of nurses and aides. However, Seybolt et al. (1978) found younger nurses who had been in the hospital shorter periods of time were more likely to leave. Mobley et al. (1978) age exhibited a weak but still significant coefficient. Rossano (1985) found age was one of the best predictors of intention to leave for county agents in Ohio.

Findings related to age on intention to leave in higher education. Bowles (1983), Koroloff (1985), Smart (1990), Zey-Ferrell (1982) have reported varied findings related to age and intention to leave. Bowles found age not to be significantly related to intention to leave. In contrast, Zey-Ferrell found that as age increased faculty members were more likely to leave. In fact, age entered the stepwise multiple regression equation fourth. Koroloff's findings confirmed that age was significantly related to intent to leave. He also described faculty as
generally being about 44 years old. However, Smart found younger faculty at institutions that have experienced decline and institutions with more autocratic forms of governance, and faculty members with lower levels of organizational and career satisfaction were more likely to leave their institutions.

Gender

Findings related to gender on intention to leave in general. Porter et al. (1974) found no difference between gender for intention to leave. Cotton and Tuttle (1986) found that women tended to turnover in most of the studies reported.

Findings related to gender on intention to leave in higher education. Bowles (1983) and Koroloff (1985), Smart (1990), Zey-Ferrell (1982) reported varied findings related to the gender of faculty in higher education. Bowles and Koroloff did not find gender to be significantly related to intention to leave. Zey-Ferrell found that females were more willing to exit and gender entered the stepwise multiple regression equation third. Smart found tenured men have stronger intentions to leave than tenured women.
Educational Level

Findings related to educational level on intention to leave in general. Cotton and Tuttle (1986), Hale (1991), Porter et al. (1974), and Price and Mueller (1981) reported varied findings relating educational level to intention to leave. Porter et al. found no difference between educational level for psychiatric aides and intention to leave. However, Cotton and Tuttle found that educational level was strongly related to turnover. Hale found significantly lower scores on satisfaction with nursing education for "other minorities" than the scores of blacks and whites. Price and Mueller reported that educational level was the third most important variable in the Price's causal model for nurses. It had direct and indirect effects on turnover.

Findings related to educational level on intention to leave in higher education. Two studies (Bowles, 1983; Koroloff, 1985) reported findings that were not significant. Koroloff found an inverse relationship between level of education and intent to leave. However, these findings were not significant. Bowles (1983) found no significant difference for level of education.
Tenure or Length of Service

Findings related to tenure or length of service on intention to leave in general. Varied findings have been reported relating tenure or length of service to turnover. Muchinsky and Tuttle (1979) reported tenure was related to turnover. Price and Mueller (1981) reported that length of service had an indirect influence on intent to turnover. However, Abelson (1987) found tenure was not significantly different between avoidable leavers and avoidable leavers in a group of nurses and aides. Mobley et al. (1978) reported tenure exhibited a weak but still significant coefficient.

Findings related to tenure or length of service on intention to leave in higher education. Several researchers (Koroloff, 1985; Heckman, 1989; Hill, 1984; Smart, 1990) have found an inverse relationship between length of service and intent to remain for faculty members in higher education. Koroloff found years of service appeared to be an important variable in predicting intent to leave. Those faculty members who had been at the university longest were more committed and more likely to leave. Hill reported that length of service had an inverse relationship with intention to leave with community college faculty in New York. Heckman stated that the length of service was positively related to
desire to remain at the institution. Bowles (1983) found length of service was not significantly related.

In 1983, Bowles found tenured faculty tended to indicate the intention to remain. In 1990, Smart stated tenured faculty who spend more time on research activities and who have productive research have a tendency to leave. In addition, Smart reported that length of service for tenured and nontenured faculty was the only variable that had a significant direct effect on the intention to leave.

Employment Alternatives

Definition. Koroloff (1985) defined employment alternatives as a "faculty members's perception of his or her employability in other settings and his or her willingness to move to other locations. Perception of employment alternatives was measured by a set of three items developed by the researcher to address the following areas: availability of employment opportunities with other academic institutions availability of employment opportunities outside of academe, difficulty of moving from geographic area" (p. 26).

Findings related to employment alternatives on intention to leave in general. Cotton and Tuttle (1986) found that employment perception was positively related to turnover in most of the studies reported in their meta-analysis. Price and Mueller (1981) reported nurses who
perceived the greatest employment opportunities outside the hospital and perceived limited promotional opportunities were least likely to stay. It was the second most important determinant after intent to stay in predicting turnover. Prestholdt et al. (1988) confirmed these findings regarding alternative opportunities and career advancement distinguishing between stayers and leavers in nurses in Louisiana.

Findings related to employment alternatives on intention to leave in higher education. Koroloff (1985) found that employment alternatives were directly and significantly related to intention to leave.

Ethnic Group, Marital Status, and Family Responsibility

A few studies reported findings for the following three variables: ethnic group, marital status, and family responsibility. Therefore, all the findings for the individual variable will be grouped together.

Ethnic Group

Findings related to ethnic group intention to leave in general and in higher education. Hale (1991) and Keim (1989) reported descriptive findings related to ethnic group among nurses and college faculty. Hale found significantly lower scores on job satisfaction, professional nursing, and nursing education for "other minorities" than the scores of blacks and whites in
Louisiana nurses. Keim found most two-year college faculty members were caucasian. No studies related ethnic group to intention to leave.

Marital Status

Findings related to marital status on intention to leave in general and in higher education. Cotton and Tuttle (1986) found that married persons tend not to turnover in most of the studies reported in their meta-analysis. Two authors (Bowles, 1983; Smart, 1990) did not find marital status to be significantly related to intention to leave for college faculty.

Family Responsibilities

Definition. Family responsibility according to Muchinsky and Tuttle (1979) meant various things from "family reasons" for quitting to age of youngest child.

Findings related to family responsibility on intention to leave in general and in higher education. Alexander (1986), Brown (1986), Cotton and Tuttle (1986), Muchinsky and Tuttle (1979), and Tanaomi (1990) have reported findings relating to family responsibilities to turnover. Muchinsky and Tuttle reported family responsibilities was related to turnover in at least six studies. Tanaomi found that for all employed mothers (some were faculty members), 45% of the variance toward intention to turnover could be explained by supervision,
pay, and wage earner status. Cotton and Tuttle found that number of dependents was inversely related to turnover. Alexander (1986) stated that females with no children were more likely to leave teaching vocational post-secondary education courses. Although no studies related intention to leave of faculty to family responsibilities, Brown found that faculty with children living at home had the highest score on organizational commitment in one of the two university faculties studied.

Rank, Scholarly Productivity and Institution

The following variables are specific to higher education: rank, scholarly productivity, and institution. Since findings related to these variables were limited to the academic setting only those studies will be reported. Some variables might have been studied that relate to intention to leave for faculty, some of these variables will be briefly mentioned.

Rank

Findings related to rank on intention to leave in higher education. Rank was a variable specifically associated with higher education; and limited findings have been reported regarding the variable. Caplow and McGee (1958) studied nine universities, they found that assistant professors were most likely to resign. Full professors were more likely to resign than associate
professors. The mean ages at which professors left the institution were as follows: full professor, 55; associate professor, 45; and assistant professor, 37. Bowles (1983) found no relationship between faculty rank and intention to leave.

**Scholarly Productivity**

**Definition.** Research and other scholarly productivity components of professional climate (Torbert, 1987). Other components of professional climate include: faculty control of curricular decision-making, institutional encouragement of faculty members, and availability of faculty travel funds. Zey-Ferrell (1982) included commitment of research and scholarly productivity, number of articles written in past three years, number of books written or edited in past three years, number of external research grants in past three years, number of internal research grants in past three years, as a component of professionalism. Other components included commitment to peers, commitment to students, commitment to the university, commitment to the discipline, departmental assessment of teaching, number of memberships in professional organizations, number of offices held in professional organizations, number of memberships in academic organizations, number of offices held in academic organizations.

Blackburn and Havinghurst (1979) conducted a study of faculty born in the early 1900s. They reported that male social scientists who published, earned their PhD's at a younger age and began working in a research university early in their careers. This trend to publish continued through the respondent's retirement.

Brown (1986) reported from her study of organizational commitment that activities related to publishing and doing research were not related at a significant level with commitment to stay at one university in Oregon. However, at another university the importance of the library facility was listed as the third significant variable with commitment to stay at that
university. At one university, the greater the satisfaction with research support, role expectations, and the greater the importance of team teaching, the lower the commitment to stay score.

Matier (1985), Torbert (1987), and Zey-Ferrell (1982) have studied "star" faculty. Torbert studied star faculty in small colleges and their commitment to the organization; whereas, Matier studied faculty in the Arts and Science College of a large University. "Star" faculty were defined as those faculty members who had earned doctorates and had either recent publications or grants. Matier found that "star" faculty remained because their colleagues were top-notch and personable and they enjoyed the environment in which they lived. Torbert found that there was no significant difference between organizational commitment between "stars" and "nonstars". However, talks with the college president, research, home ownership, community involvement, not teaching in the social sciences or education, and ability to obtain leave, and curriculum control entered the equation that could predict organizational commitment. In contrast, the variables entering the equation to predict organizational commitment for "nonstar" faculty were the following: curriculum control, availability of travel funds, community involvement, faculty cutbacks, age, talks with the
president of the university, and research. Zey-Ferrell (1982) found that the following professional variables entered fifth through ninth into a stepwise multiple regression equation: number of books written in past three years, the number of articles written or edited in past three years, commitment to peers, number of offices held in academic organizations, and the number of offices held in professional organizations. But each of these variables only added from one to two percent of the variance, in contrast with age (5%) and gender (6%).

The Pew Health Professions Commission (1991) reported that research was the primary interest of 30% of all faculty. Seventeen percent of faculty from liberal arts colleges primary interest was in research. In addition, 26% of faculty report that the emphasis of their institution has shifted from teaching and service to research.

Smart (1990) reported tenured faculty who report higher levels of research productivity may appear to be more inclined to leave on the surface. However, their higher levels of satisfaction with the organization and their careers diminish their intentions to leave their current institutions.

Williams (1989) investigated the 1984 Carnegie Foundation data and did a secondary survey from the 5000
respondents. This study compared a disproportionate number of nurses to the non-nursing faculty. Nevertheless, she found twice the percentage of nursing faculty reported spending no time on research as compared to non-nursing faculty. Twenty-five percent of the non-nursing faculty reported spending over 21 hours a week on research as compared to 7% of the nursing faculty who spend over 21 hours on research a week.

Williams (1989) also compared the number of articles written by degree for nursing faculty, non-nursing faculty, and female non-nursing faculty. At the Master's level, 42% of both non-nursing faculty and female non-nursing faculty reported publishing one to ten articles, while 64% of nursing faculty had published one to ten articles. The percentage of doctoral faculty publishing one to ten articles was 43% for nursing faculty, 50% for non-nursing faculty, and 61% of female non-nursing faculty. However, the percentage of doctoral faculty publishing over eleven articles was 54% for nursing faculty, 40% for non-nursing faculty, and 21% of female non-nursing faculty. She also reported the number of nursing faculty publishing articles grew substantially in the last two years before the survey.

Keim (1989) reported that only 32% of the full-time two-year college faculty had published articles. Twenty-
nine percent of part-time nursing faculty reported publishing in journals or books (Feldman & Keidel, 1987). Hawkins et al. (1987) reported dissatisfaction with the lack of time to do research and publish for part-time nursing faculty.

Farren (1991) reported that of nurses with doctoral degrees, 47% of the respondents holding the PhD and 42% of the respondents holding the Doctorate of Nursing Science (DNS) were in the top research producing group. Farren found that release time, clerical, financial, and people support made differences in scholarly productivity.

Institution/University

Definition. Koroloff (1985) defined support as referring to adequacy of financial resources, equity of distribution of financial resources and administrative support. The four levels were: (a) individual faculty member, (b) the professional school or college, (c) the university and (d) the public.

Findings related to institution/university on intention to leave in higher education. Caplow and McGee (1958), Koroloff (1985), and Smart, (1990) have studied the influence of the institution on intention to leave. Caplow and McGee stated that Sorokin and Anderson studied faculty mobility in four institutions in 1931. They reported turnover declines with increasing institutional
age and size. Koroloff reported that the influence of support for higher education seems to be the most important factor in the decisions to leave the university. Smart found younger faculty at institutions that have experienced decline and institutions with more autocratic forms of governance had expressed intent to leave.

Theoretical Models of Intention to Leave

General Models of Intention to Leave

Numerous models (Alexander, 1986; Bluedorn, 1976, 1982; Mobley, 1977; Mobley et al., 1978; Mobley et al., 1979; Morita et al., 1989; Mowday et al., 1982; Mowday et al., 1984; Muchinsky & Morrow, 1980; and Price, 1977; Steers & Mowday, 1981) have been proposed in an attempt to explain intention to leave. These models have been tested using a wide range of subjects, especially the military.

Mobley (1977) suggested several intermediate steps in the withdrawal decision process. The steps included evaluation of existing job, experienced job satisfaction-dissatisfaction, thinking of quitting, evaluation of expected utility of search and cost of quitting, intention to search for alternatives, search for alternatives, evaluation of alternatives, comparison of alternatives versus present job, intention to quit/stay which leads to quitting or staying. Mobley based these steps on various models. The first two steps have been explained by the
Value-Percept Discrepancy Model developed by Locke (cited in Mobley), the Instrumentality-Valence Model developed by Vroom (cited in Mobley), the Met-Expectations Model developed by Porter and Steers (cited in Mobley), and the Contribution/Inducement Ratio Model developed by March and Simon (cited in Mobley). Mobley recommended that this model be studied in its entirety as only parts have been studied in the past.

In 1979, Mobley et al. developed a model which proposed individual choice behavior was important to the turnover process. From their comprehensive review of the literature and research findings, they developed a model of primary variables and process of employee turnover. This model also differentiates between satisfaction (present time orientation) and attraction/expected utility (future time oriented). The primary determinants were satisfaction (present time oriented), attraction of the expected utility of present the job (future time oriented), and the attraction of expected utility of alternative jobs or roles (future time oriented). They suggested that longitudinal multivariate research was needed that concurrently assesses values, job-related perceptions, external perceptions, personal characteristics, job related perceptions, nonwork
consequences, external perceptions, and labor market perceptions.

Muchinsky and Morrow (1980) proposed a model of employee turnover based on substantial research from psychology, sociology, and economics. The processual model was divided into determinants and consequences. The three determinants were individual factors, work-related factors, and economic opportunity. The four consequences were individual consequences, organizational consequences-social, organizational consequences-economic, and societal consequences. Research was provided for each subsection of the determinants and the consequences. "It was hypothesized that the determinants existed in a dynamic relationship, with the economic determinant serving to control the degree of predictability accorded the individual and work-related determinants" (p. 274). "It was also hypothesized that individual and work-related variables have an interactive effect on turnover" (p. 277). "Future research should focus on both classes of variables simultaneously, using experimental designs and statistical analyses that permit decomposition of effects" (p. 277).

Mobley et al. (1978) tested a heuristic model in which the most probable consequence of job dissatisfaction was to elicit a cognitive process of thinking of quitting.
The sample consisted of 203 hospital employees. This research found that the single significant regression coefficient with turnover was intention to quit. Intention to search exhibited the strongest coefficient with intention to quit, with age-tenure exhibiting a weaker, but still significant coefficient. Job dissatisfaction was associated with thinking of quitting and intentions rather than turnover. The model based on three theories: Locke's (cited in Mobley et al.) theory of task motivation, Fishbein's (cited in Mobley et al.) theory of attitudes, intentions and behavior, and March and Simon's (cited in Mobley et al.) theory of job satisfaction stimulated by thoughts of quitting. This model was determined to be too simple. The authors stated a need for more multivariate research on linkages in the withdrawal decision process.

Price (1977) developed a causal model including determinants, intervening variables, and turnover. Pay, integration, instrumental communication, and formal communication are positive variables that lead to satisfaction. Centralization ("degree to which power is concentrated in a social system" [p. 76]) was a negative variable that leads to the variable satisfaction. Satisfaction and opportunity are intervening variables that lead to turnover. Weak determinants noted by Price
were routinization, professionalization, promotional opportunities, and distributive justice.

Bluedorn (1976), under the direction of J. L. Price, used the Price causal model to do his dissertation. After studying nearly 6,000 U. S. Army officers, Price's model was revised. The three exogenous variables in the model were centralization, opportunity structure, and involuntary accessions. These variables affect turnover through the intervening variable satisfaction. Multicollinearity might have existed between pay and upward vertical mobility causing these variables not to be supported. In addition, work commitment was unsupported.

Bluedorn (1982) synthesized a model from the Price Model, the Mobley Model, and the Organizational Commitment Model. Then he conducted a longitudinal study of a sample composed of over 92% women insurance company workers. His findings supported the unified model. Centralization, pay, marital status, member integration, and length of service were not related to turnover at a significant level. According to Bluedorn the determinants of turnover are environmental opportunity, intentions to stay or leave, routinization, and age. Cross-validation was more successful in reproducing the original explained variance for job search, organizational commitment, and intent to leave. The attempt to predict job satisfaction was less
successful. He stated that a model had been developed. Variables in the equation were job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job search, intent to leave, turnover, equity, organizational information, age, promotion opportunities, potential role conflict, education, routinization, environmental opportunities, and foregone environmental opportunities.

Mowday et al. (1984) investigated the validity of Mobley's 1977 Model of the intermediate linkages in the turnover decision process. A conclusion was that "the general patterns of results found within each sample, when variables were considered individually or in sets, were consistent with the basic predictions of the model" (p. 90). However, there was a failure to cross-validate the regression equation either within or between samples. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment appeared to have an indirect effect on turnover. Organizational commitment was the only variable that cross-validated.

Steers and Mowday (cited in Mowday et al., 1982) proposed a model including the following major components: individual characteristics, job expectations and job attitudes, job attitudes and intent to leave, and intent to leave, available alternatives, and actual turnover. No research was found testing this model.
Morita et al. (1989) incorporated variables used in linear models and the statistical method of survival analyses to introduce the proportional hazard model. The research used was based on subjects who were in a military academy. The independent variables were military performance average, grade point average, leadership potential, propensity to become committed. The dependent variable, turnover, was measured at different intervals. The researchers recommend using this method to analyze data obtained from longitudinal studies.

Alexander (1986) studied intention to turnover of vocational instructors in Nebraska. She developed a model that successfully predicted turnover. Those who left were younger, female, and married with no children. They had baccalaureate degrees, expressed intention to leave, and had expressed dissatisfaction with their jobs.

Theoretical Models of Intention to Leave in Nursing Practice

Models (Price & Mueller, 1981, 1986; Seybolt, 1978) have been proposed in an attempt to explain why nurses intend to leave. The following is a brief discussion of these models.

Seybolt et al. (1978) developed an expectancy theory model. The satisfaction level of the leavers was significantly different from the stayers. The leavers had
lower scores for overall satisfaction and satisfaction with supervision, satisfaction with the chance to use one's ability, and satisfaction with the freedom from tension and pressures. Younger nurses who had been in the hospital shorter periods of time were more likely to leave. Educational level was not related to turnover. Motivation contained the most compelling reason for turnover. Leavers also valued high performance less than those who stayed.

Price and Mueller (1981, 1986) used not only the strong and weak determinant's in the Price model but added kinship, educational level, and intent to stay. For the groups studied in 1981, the explained variance for the model was 18%. The researchers recommended adding organizational commitment, size of organization, organizations in urban and rural areas, varied educational levels, and gender to the model. For the groups studied in 1986, 43 percent of the explained variance was accounted for by the model. The variables that had been recommended by the previous studies were added to the research design.

Theoretical Models of Intention to Leave in Higher Education

Hill (1984), Smart (1990), and Zey-Ferrell (1982) developed models to predict intention to leave for members
of the faculty in higher education. Significant factors will be presented. No specific models were found for nurse educators.

Zey-Ferrell (1982) developed and tested a model to explain exit intention for faculty at one university. The nine general dimensions included: personal traits, early childhood parental influence and socialization, higher education socialization, occupational status, personal values, general attitudes, professionalism, dissatisfaction with the employing organization, and support for collective bargaining. The explanatory power of the overall stepwise regression equation was 40% of the variance. The first nine variables explained 30% of the variance at \( p = <0.0001 \). These nine variables in order were the following: attitudinal support for collective bargaining, dissatisfaction with medical coverage index II, sex, age, number of books written or edited in past three years, number of articles written in past three years, commitment to peers, number of offices held in academic organizations, and number of offices held in professional organizations.

In 1984, Hill developed a model to predict propensity to leave among two-year college instructors of developmental courses. Limited lengths of service, general dissatisfaction, and decrements in organizational
commitment were found to directly affect propensity to leave. General dissatisfaction and self-role incongruence were indirectly related to propensity to leave.

Smart (1990) proposed a causal model of faculty turnover intentions. Parts of this model came from economist, psychologist, and sociologist. Employee turnover had at least three sets of determinants: individual characteristics reflecting demographic and work factors (career age, gender, marital status, teaching time, research time, organizational decline, campus governance), contextual variables reflecting individuals' stature in and adjustment to the work environment (governance participation, governance influence, research productivity, salary), dimensions of faculty job satisfaction (organizational satisfaction, salary satisfaction, career satisfaction), and intention to leave current institution (intention of faculty to leave). The variables above in parenthesis explain 13% of the variance in tenured faculty member's intention to leave. (direct effects) and 14% of the variance in nontenured faculty members intention to leave (direct effect). These variables ranked as the primary influence on both tenured and nontenured faculty: career age, organizational decline, campus governance, organizational satisfaction, and career satisfaction. Smart obtained data from the
One hundred ninety institutions and 2,648 doctoral faculty participated in this study. Younger faculty at institutions that have experienced decline and at institutions with more autocratic forms of governance, and those faculty with lower levels of organizational and career satisfaction were more likely to leave their institutions. Salary level had an affect on nontenured faculty. Tenured faculty who spend more time on research activities and who have productive research have a tendency to leave. However, "research productivity appears to enhance satisfaction with the current institution and campus efforts to support faculty research opportunities appear to be important both to the development and retention of competent faculty" (p. 420).

Although these models existed, the researcher felt that the findings could not be generalized to nurse educators in Louisiana. For example, Zey-Ferrell (1982) studied faculty in only one institution and did not report the type. Hill (1984) studied two year college instructors of developmental courses. Although Smart (1990) studied faculty from a wide range of institutions, only doctoral faculty participated. In addition, Smart was only able to predict 13% of the variance in tenured faculty member's intention to leave and 14% in nontenured faculty member's intention to leave.
Summary

In conclusion, Cotton and Tuttle (1986) stated, "Overall, research in employee turnover had been especially prolific, yet there are no firm conclusions as to the turnover process (p. 66). Several researchers (Cotton & Tuttle; Muchinsky & Morrow, 1980; Muchinsky & Tuttle, 1979) have reported in depth reviews of literature of persons in various occupations including health care workers, insurance salesmen, factory workers, and the military.

Price and Mueller's (1981, 1986) models of nurses predicted up to 43% of the explained variance of intention to leave of nurses. This model that was done on nurses did not include the variables rank and scholarly productivity that are specific to higher education.

A limited number of studies (Hill, 1984; Smart, 1990; Zey-Ferrell, 1982) have studied faculty members intention to leave and three models have been found for this group. Zey-Ferrell did not report the type of institution that was studied. Smart's model was not able to predict a substantial amount of the variance. Hill's Model was done using self-role congruence as one of the factors influencing intention to leave for community college instructors in developmental courses. This variable had not been proven to be of substantial importance.
In addition, no acceptable intention to leave instrument was identified. The most widely used instrument of job satisfaction was JDI and JIG. The widely used instrument of organizational commitment was the OCQ.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Procedures

This exploratory study examined factors that influenced the intentions of faculty to leave nursing education positions in higher education. Principal factors selected for investigation included job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and selected personal and professional demographic characteristics. This chapter presents information regarding the procedures used in conducting the study. Topics specifically addressed included: the population and sample, instrumentation, the data collection procedures, and the data analysis.

Population and Sample

The target population for this study was defined as full-time nurse educators in baccalaureate degree nursing programs. The accessible population was defined as the full-time nurse educators who taught nursing in baccalaureate degree nursing programs in Louisiana higher education during the Spring 1992 semester.

In order to establish the frame of the accessible population, the researcher attempted to obtain a list of
higher education faculty who taught nursing in Louisiana in the Spring, 1992. This was deemed by the researcher to be the most accurate method to determine the actual faculty employed.

In January, 1992, a list of full time faculty was requested from the deans/directors of the 12 baccalaureate nursing programs approved by the Board of Nursing in Louisiana (see Appendix A). A follow-up letter was sent in February, 1992, to the deans who did not respond to the original request (see Appendix B). In addition, follow-up phone calls were made.

Ten of the 12 deans and directors responded to the request after three contacts. Of the two institutions for which no response was received, one dean/director indicated an intention to respond, but the response was never received. The other dean/director indicated a willingness to participate in the study, but refused to provide the list of current faculty. The faculty lists for the two institutions from which a list could not be obtained after the three contacts were obtained from the Louisiana State Board of Regents office.

These 12 institutions consist of one private university, two religious affiliated universities, and nine public universities. All universities offer four
year baccalaureate degree nursing programs. The programs are in rural and urban areas.

The frame established from the two sources identified above included 228 nurse educators from the 12 institutions. The sample size was determined using Cochran's sample size determination formula for continuous data (Snedecor & Cochran, 1980). The information used in the formula was a seven point Likert-type response scale, a two percent acceptable margin of error, a calculated estimate of the population standard deviation (1.0), and a five percent risk that the actual margin of error exceeded the acceptable margin of error. Using the formula, the minimum required sample size was determined to be 108. A 90% response rate was anticipated, therefore, a decision was made to select 125 nurse educators. Then a simple random sample of 125 was drawn from the established population frame. In addition, ten alternates were randomly selected to use in the event of frame errors or refusals.
Equation \[ n_o = \frac{t^2 \cdot s^2}{d^2} \]
\[ n_o = \frac{(2.0)^2 \cdot (1)^2}{(.14)^2} \]
\[ n_o = 205 \]
\[ n = \frac{n_o}{1 + \frac{n_o}{N}} \]
\[ n = \frac{205}{1 + \frac{205}{228}} \]
\[ n = \frac{205}{1.9} \]
\[ n = 108 \]

Legend for Cochran's sample size determination formula:

- \( d^2 \) = acceptable margin of error of \( \pm 2\% \)
  
  \( (.02 \times 7 \text{ point Likert-type scale}) \)

- \( s^2 \) = the estimated variance (1)

- \( t^2 \) = risk willing to take

  \( (t \text{ at } .05 \text{ for } N = 228 \text{ is about } 2.0) \)

- \( N \) = population size

- \( n_o \) = unadjusted sample size

- \( n \) = adjusted sample size

Instrumentation

A four-part instrument was used to collect data in this study (see Appendix C). Part I contained the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job in General (JIG). The Job Descriptive Index (JDI Revised) introduced in 1987 by
Balzer et al., (1990) was used to measure job satisfaction in Part I. Permission to use this instrument was obtained from Bowling Green State University (see Appendix D). The JDI was originally developed by Smith, Kendall, & Hulin in 1969. Balzer et al. (1990) reported the following regarding the internal consistency of the instrument:

The number and areas of the facets of satisfaction, as well as the number of items included on each facet subscale, remain the same. . . . Scale reliabilities remain impressively high, with an average internal consistency (alpha) of .88 across six samples (p. 49).

The JDI measured the five components of job satisfaction. The five components of job satisfaction were satisfaction with work, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with co-workers, satisfaction with supervision, and satisfaction with promotions. High internal consistency estimates of reliability were reported for each of the scales: "work (.84), pay (.80), promotion (.86), supervision (.87), and co-workers (.88)" (Kerr, 1985, cited in Mitchell, p. 755).

The JIG component "reflects individuals' general feelings toward their jobs, encompassing all aspects of job satisfaction " (Balzer, p. 9). "Coefficient alpha
reliability estimates exceeded .90." for the JIG (Balzer, p. 52).

In addition, the instruments, JDI and JIG, were practical and simple. It has been administered to subjects with a third grade reading level and takes about five minutes to answer. The JDI and JIG were the "most popular standardized measure of job satisfaction" (Balzer, p. 48).

Scoring procedures for the JDI and JIG have been established by the instrument developers (Balzer, 1990). These procedures involve an overlay scoring key which is used to hand score each subscale. Since this scoring process yields a single score for each job satisfaction component, the coefficient alpha internal consistency estimates of reliability for the data in this study were not calculated.

Part II of the instrument consisted of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) which was used to measure organizational commitment. Most of the research reviewed used the OCQ. The nine item positively written Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979) was selected because the short form was reported to have an internal consistency estimate of reliability equal to the 15 positive and negative item questionnaire. The coefficient alpha internal consistency
estimates of reliability for the OCQ short form ranged from 0.84 to 0.90 for the previous groups studied. The OCQ uses a seven point Likert-type response scale.

From the data collected in this study, the computed coefficient alpha internal consistency estimate of reliability for the OCQ was found to be $\alpha = 0.89$.

Part III of the instrument measured intention to leave. This scale was researcher developed since no instrument was available in the literature which measured nurse educator's intention to leave higher education. Therefore, the researcher designed an instrument including 14 items across four withdrawal cognitions: thinking of quitting, intention to search, probability of finding an acceptable alternative job, and intention to leave (Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth (1978). The 14 item questionnaire, Intention to Leave, used a seven point Likert-type response scale. "I intend to" began each item. The content validity was established by a panel of experts consisting of five faculty at Louisiana State University and four graduate school nurse educators in Louisiana.

From the data collected in this study, the computed coefficient alpha internal consistency estimate of reliability for the Intention to Leave questionnaire was found to be $\alpha = .87$. 
Part IV of the instrument contained information related to personal and professional demographic characteristics. The content validity was established by a panel of experts consisting of five graduate school faculty at Louisiana State University and four graduate school nurse educators in Louisiana.

Data Collection

In order to collect the data, a cover letter (see Appendix E), questionnaire, and stamped, self-addressed envelope were sent to each selected sample member on March 27, 1992. The letter and directions for completing the questionnaire contained an assurance of, and respect for, anonymity and confidentiality. Following Dillman's (1978) nonresponse procedure, nonrespondents (n = 50) were sent a card (see Appendix F) about two weeks after the initial mailing to further solicit their participation. About four weeks later, an additional questionnaire, a request for participation (Appendix G), and another stamped self-addressed envelope was sent to the remaining nonrespondents (n = 19). The 90% preset response rate was reached. Planned nonresponse follow-up involved a telephone survey of nonrespondents if less than 90% of the drawn sample was delivered. Since 115 usable questionnaires were received, yielding a 92% response rate, the telephone follow-up was not required.
During the data collection process four alternates were selected from those previously drawn at random. These were chosen to replace two subjects identified to be frame errors and two who returned the questionnaire blank with a note indicating that they would not participate.

Five persons did not complete all the sections of the questionnaire. When the situation was identified, the researcher sent a letter (Appendix H) to the five respondents requesting that the missed information be supplied. All of these persons completed and returned the missing information.

Data Analysis

The alpha level was set at .05 a' priori. Procedures for statistical analysis are discussed by objective.

Objective one was to describe nurse educators in Louisiana higher education on selected personal and professional characteristics. The characteristics included the following: age, gender, ethnic origin, marital status, kinship responsibility (number of dependent children and number of other significant individuals depending on faculty), educational level, certification status, health status, alternative employment options, years experience as a nurse, years experience as a nurse educator, years of experience as a nurse educator at their current university, academic rank,
tenure status, employment status, amount of time for association with co-workers, membership in professional organizations, scholarly productivity (articles and grants), moonlighting status, amount of moonlighting, status in retirement systems, number of years in retirement systems (Teacher Retirement System, Social Security System, and other retirement systems, and salary (teaching & total).

Variables which were measured on a categorical scale of measurement, that is, nominal and ordinal scales of measurement, were summarized using frequencies and percentages. Those variables that were measured on a nominal scale were ethnic origin, marital status, certification status, tenure status, scholarly productivity status, moonlighting status, and status in retirement systems. Those variables that were measured on an ordinal scale included number of children, number of other significant individuals depending on faculty, educational level, academic rank, employment status, amount of time for association with co-workers, membership in professional organizations, number of grants, number of articles, amount of moonlighting, years in retirement systems (Teacher Retirement System, Social Security system, and other retirement systems), salary (teaching and total).
Variables which were measured on a continuous scale of measurement, that is, the interval scale of measurement, were summarized using means and standard deviations. These variables included age, years experience as a nurse, years experience as a nurse educator, and years of experience as a nurse educator at their current university.

Objective two was to describe nurse educators in Louisiana higher education on the following psychological measures: job satisfaction as measured by the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job in General (JIG), organizational commitment as measured by the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), and intention to leave as measured by a researcher designed instrument (ITL). These variables were measured on an interval scale and summarized with means and standard deviations.

Objective three was to determine if a relationship existed between job satisfaction (measured by the JDI) and intention to leave (measured by ITL) of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education. This objective was accomplished using the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient.

Objective four was to determine if a relationship existed between the components of job satisfaction,
(satisfaction with salary, co-workers, supervision, present job, and promotional opportunities), as measured by the scales of JDI, and intention to leave of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education. These relationships were analyzed using Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient.

Objective five was to determine if a relationship existed between job satisfaction (as measured by the JDI and JIG) of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education and selected demographic characteristics. For the variable, marital status, which was measured on a nominal scale and had three or more categories, one way analysis of variance was used. For variables that were measured on a nominal scale and had two categories, the Point Biserial correlation coefficient was used. Those variables were tenure status, scholarly activity status, status in other retirement systems, and moonlighting status. For variables that were measured on an ordinal scale, the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient was used. Those variables were educational level, number of grants, number of articles, and years in retirement systems (Teacher Retirement System, Social Security System, and Other Retirement System). For variables that were measured on an interval scale, Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient was used. Those variables were
years experience as a nurse, years experience as a nurse educator, years of experience at their current institution.

Objective six was to determine if a relationship existed between organizational commitment (as measured by the OCQ) and intention to leave (as measured by ITL) of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education. This objective was accomplished using Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient.

Objective seven was to determine if a relationship existed between organizational commitment (as measured by the OCQ) of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education and selected demographic characteristics. For the variable, marital status, which was measured on a nominal scale and had three or more categories, one way analysis of variance was used. For variables that were measured on a nominal scale and had two categories, the Point Biserial correlation coefficient was used. Those variables were tenure status, scholarly activity status, status in other retirement systems, and moonlighting status. For variables that were measured on an ordinal scale, the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient was used. Those variables were educational level, number of grants, number of articles, and years in retirement systems (Teacher Retirement, Social Security system, and
other retirement systems). For variables that were measured on an interval scale, Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used. Those variables were years experience as a nurse, years experience as a nurse educator, and years of experience as a nurse educator at their current university.

Objective eight was to determine if a model existed which explains a significant portion of the variance in intention to leave of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education from the following measures: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, age, gender, ethnic origin, marital status, kinship responsibility (number of dependent children and number of other significant individuals depending on faculty), educational level, certification status, years experience as a nurse, years experience as a nurse educator, years of experience as a nurse educator at their current university, academic rank, tenure status, employment status, amount of time for association with co-workers, membership in professional organizations, scholarly productivity (articles and grants), moonlighting status and amount of moonlighting, status in other retirement systems, number of years in retirement systems (Teacher Retirement System, Social Security System, and other retirement systems) and salary (teaching and total).
Objective eight was accomplished using multiple regression analysis with intention to leave as the dependent variable. The other variables were treated as independent variables and entered for stepwise analysis because this was an exploratory study. In this regression equation significant variables were added that increased the variance by .01 as long as the complete regression equation remained significant.

The interpretation of the correlation coefficients was based on the following set of descriptors by Davis: .7 or higher—very strong relationship; .50 to .69—substantial relationship; .30 to .49—moderate relationship; .10 to .29—low relationship; and .09 or lower—negligible relationship (Davis, 1971).
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

Findings of the study are presented in this chapter. The results are organized by the objectives of the study.

Objective One

Objective one was to describe nurse educators in Louisiana higher education on selected personal and professional characteristics. The characteristics included the following: age, gender, ethnic origin, marital status, kinship responsibility (number of dependent children and number of other significant individuals depending on faculty), educational level, certification status, health status, alternative employment options, years experience as a nurse, years experience as a nurse educator, years of experience as a nurse educator at their current university, academic rank, tenure status, employment status, amount of time for association with co-workers, membership in professional organizations, scholarly productivity (articles and grants), moonlighting status, amount of moonlighting, status in retirement systems, number of years in retirement systems (Teacher Retirement System, Social Security System, and other retirement systems) and salary (teaching & total).
Variables which were measured on a categorical scale, that is nominal and ordinal scales of measurement, were summarized using frequencies and percentages. Those variables that were measured on a nominal scale were ethnic origin, marital status, certification status, tenure status, scholarly activity, moonlighting status, and status in retirement systems. Those variables that were measured on an ordinal scale included number of children, number of other significant individuals depending on faculty, educational level, academic rank, employment status, amount of time for association with co-workers, membership in professional organizations, amount of scholarly activity, amount of moonlighting, number of years in retirement systems (Teacher Retirement System, Social Security System, and other retirement system), and salary (teaching and total).

Variables that were measured on a continuous scale, that is, an interval scale of measurement, were summarized using means and standard deviations. These variables included age, years experience as a nurse, years experience as a nurse educator, and years of experience as a nurse educator at their current university.

Age of Respondents

Respondents were asked to indicate their age at their last birthday. Of the 111 nurse educators responding to
this question, the mean age was 44.5 years ($SD = 7.8$).
The ages of the respondents ranged from 30 years to 64 years.

**Gender of Respondents**

Of the 114 nurse educators responding to this item, 96.5% ($n = 110$) were female and 3.5% ($n = 4$) were male.
One person chose not to give his or her gender.

**Ethnic Origin of Respondents**

The majority of the nurse educators responding were white ($n = 101$ or 90.2%). The other nurse educators were black ($n = 11$ or 9.8%). Three persons chose not to respond to this question.

**Marital Status of Respondents**

Concerning the marital status of the nurse educators, 73.0% ($n = 84$) were married, while 14.8% ($n = 17$) were single. Only two (1.7%) of the nurse educators reported being widowed, while 12 (10.5%) reported being divorced.

**Kinship Responsibility of Respondents (Number of Dependent Children and Significant Individuals in the Community)**

In this study, kinship responsibility was considered to include dependent children and other significant individuals (i.e., grandchild(ren), parent(s), in-law(s), etc.) in the community for which the nurse educator felt responsible for helping at least weekly. Therefore, kinship responsibility was measured by two questions. One
question asked the number of dependent children including all children for which the nurse educator felt at least partially financially responsible. The other question asked the number of significant individuals (i.e. grandchild[ren], parent[s], in-law[s], etc.) in the community for which the nurse educators felt responsible for helping at least weekly.

For the 115 nurse educators responding, the most frequent number of dependent children reported (35 or 30.4%) was zero. An additional 33 (28.8%) nurse educators reported having two dependent children. The smallest response category was 3 or more children with 19 (16.5%) indicating that response (see Table 1).

Examination of data in Table 1 showed that more than half of responding nurse educators (n = 63 or 55.3%) did not feel that they had a significant other individual in the community that they felt responsible for checking on at least weekly. However, 23 nurse educators (20.2%) felt that they had one significant individual that they were responsible for helping at least weekly. In addition, approximately one fourth (n = 28) felt they were responsible for helping two or more significant other individuals a week.
Table 1

Kinship Responsibility of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Dependent children</th>
<th>Significant individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One respondent did not answer this question.

Health Status of Respondents

Concerning the health status of 115 respondents, 51.3% (n = 59) considered their health status to be excellent, while 41.7% (n = 48) considered that they had good health. Only eight (7.0%) nurse educators considered their health to be fair and no nurse educators considered their health to be poor.

Educational Level of Respondents

Nurse educators were asked to indicate their highest level of education completed. The choices included the following: less than Masters in Nursing with no graduate
course credits, less than Masters in Nursing with graduate 
credits in Nursing presently being obtained, Masters in 
Nursing with no graduate credits or no graduate credits 
attempted in over two years, Masters in Nursing with 
graduate credits attempted within the last two years that 
could be applied to doctorate, Doctorate in Nursing, 
Doctorate other than Nursing, and Other. 

None of the respondents chose the two response 
categories which specified less than a Masters degree. 
Therefore, all nurse educators indicated a minimum 
educational level of a Masters Degree. Almost one-half of 
the Masters prepared nurse educators (n = 56 or 49.1%) who 
responded indicated that they had a Masters in Nursing 
with no course work toward the doctoral degree within the 
last two years. However, 41 (36.0%) reported having an 
Masters in Nursing with graduate credits attempted in the 
last two years that could be applied to a doctoral degree. 
Twelve (10.5%) responding nurse educators that had 
completed a doctorate in Nursing or another field. For 
"Other", five persons indicated having two masters degrees 
or being very close to achieving the doctorate (see Table 
2).
Table 2

Educational Level of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than Masters Degree in Nursing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters with no course work in last 2 years</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters with course work in last 2 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate in Nursing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate other than nursing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other b</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One respondent did not answer this question.

b Others included two Masters Degrees or PhD candidate.

Certification Status of Respondents

Of the 115 nurse educators responding, 40% (n = 46) reported that they were certified by a professional nursing organization. Sixty-nine (60%) of the nurse educators indicated that they were not presently certified by a professional nursing organization.

Alternative Employment Options

Nurse educators were asked "Do you feel you have alternative employment options?" All 115 (100%) indicated a "Yes" response.
Years of Service as a Nurse of Respondents

The nurse educators were asked to respond to "How many years of service as a nurse (including all full-time and part-time employment) other than teaching do you have?" Of the 115 nurse educators responding, the length of time ranged from two years to 42 years of service. The mean number of years for the group was 15.3 years ($SD = 8.5$).

Total Years as a Nurse Educator of Respondents

One hundred fifteen nurse educators responded to "How many TOTAL years of service as a nurse educator do you have?" The mean number of years was 11.0 ($SD = 7.0$). The length of time ranged from one year to 30 years of experience as a nurse educator.

Years as a Nurse Educator at Their Current University of Respondents

Analysis of the responses "How many years of service as a nurse educator AT YOUR CURRENT UNIVERSITY do you have?", indicated a mean of 7.1 years ($SD = 6.1$). The length of time ranged from one year to 25 years of teaching experience at their current university.

Academic Rank of Respondents

Of the 115 nurse educators responding, the majority ($n = 78$ or 67.8) indicated that they were Assistant Professors. In addition, there were 22 (19.1%)
Instructors, 14 (12.2%) Associate Professors, and one (0.9%) Professor.

Tenure Status of Respondents

Forty-seven (40.9%) of the 115 nurse educators indicated that they were not tenured, but were in a tenure tract. Thirty (26.1%) stated that they were not tenured and were not in a tenure tract position. Thirty-three percent (n = 38) reported that they were tenured.

Employment Status of Respondents

Nurse educators were asked to indicate their employment status. The choices included the following: full-time teaching load, part-time teaching load, part-time teaching load and administrative duties, full-time plus overload in teaching, and other. Seventy-four (64.9%) nurse educators responding reported a full-time teaching load. Twenty seven (23.7%) reported an overload with their full-time teaching loads. Eleven nurse educators (9.6%) reported part-time teaching loads and part-time administrative duties. Two (1.8%) indicated that they were full-time administrators. None of the 114 respondents indicated that they had part-time teaching loads.
Amount of Time for Association with Co-workers of Respondents

The amount of time for association with co-workers was measured by the percentage of the work week that the respondent indicated that they could see colleagues from the School or College of Nursing. Of the 112 nurse educators responding, 66 (59%) indicated that they could see their colleagues less than 41% of the time. Only 24 (21.4%) nurse educators indicated that they could see their colleagues more than 60% of the time (see Table 3).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time for association with co-workers</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20% or less</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% to 40%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41% to 60%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81% to 100%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112*</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Three respondents did not answer this question.
Respondents Membership in Professional Organizations

All 115 nurse educators responded to statements regarding their professional memberships. One hundred and thirteen (98.3%) nurse educators indicated that they belonged to one or more professional nursing organizations. Eighty-eight (76.5%) nurse educators indicated that they belonged to American Nurses Association (ANA), Louisiana State Nurses Association (LSNA), and their local district nurses association. Approximately eighty-one percent (n = 93) of the nurse educators indicated that they were members of other nursing organizations. Forty-four (38.3%) of the 115 nurse educators indicated that they belonged to additional professional organizations outside of nursing (see Table 4).

Table 4
Membership in Professional Organizations of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Organization</th>
<th>n'</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belong to nursing organizations</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA, LSNA, local district</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nursing organizations</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional non-nursing organizations</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percentages do not sum to 100 since respondents were asked to check all that apply.
* n is the number of yes responses.
Scholarly Productivity of Respondents

Scholarly productivity of respondents was measured in this study by journal articles and funded grants. Nurse educators were asked to indicate the number of manuscripts they had submitted, the number of manuscripts that were accepted for publication, the number of funded grants they had applied for, and the number of funded grants they had received. Forty (35%) of the nurse educators reported that they had submitted one or more manuscripts. Of the 40 nurse educators that had submitted articles, 29 (25.2%) indicated that one or more of them was accepted for publication. Therefore, 72.5% of those 40 nurse educators who submitted articles had one or more accepted.

Regarding grant applications, 34 (29.6%) respondents reported having applied for one or more grants. However, only 18 (15.7%) of the nurse educators had received one or more grants. Therefore, of the respondents who had applied for grants, just over one-half (18 of 34 or 52.9%) had received one or more (see Table 5).

Moonlighting Status of Respondents

Eighty-six (74.8%) nurse educators reported than they moonlighted in other nursing jobs (either routinely or sporadically). Twenty-nine (25.2%) of the nurse educators responded that they did not moonlight in other nursing jobs.
Table 5

**Scholarly Productivity of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts Submitted</th>
<th>Manuscripts Accepted</th>
<th>Manuscripts Applied</th>
<th>Grants Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** One hundred fifteen responding to questions.

**Amount of Moonlighting of Respondents**

Of the 115 nurse educators responding, forty (35.1%) reported that in a two week period they did not routinely work any hours at other nursing jobs. However, 74 (64.9%) nurse educators reported working moonlighting hours on a routine basis every two weeks. Seventeen (14.9%) nurse educators reported working over 16 hours every two weeks. Over one-fifth of the nurse educators (n = 25 or 21.97%) worked nine to sixteen hours during a two-week period (see Table 6).
Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than four hours</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five to eight hours</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine to sixteen</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over sixteen hours</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One respondent did not answer this question.

**Status in Retirement System of Respondents**

Respondents were requested to indicate the retirement systems in which they participated. Ninety (78.3%) reported membership in Teacher Retirement System. In addition, 83.5% (n = 91) of nurse educators who responded to this item indicated that they had participated in the Social Security System (see Table 7).
Table 7

Participation in Retirement Systems of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retirement systems</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers retirement system</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security system a</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other retirement systems b</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percentages do not sum to 100 since respondents were asked to check all that apply.

a Six respondents did not answer the question.
b Eight respondents did not answer the question.

Number of Years in Retirement Systems of Respondents

Ninety nurse educators reported from one year to over 21 years in the Teacher Retirement System. About one-fourth (n = 28 or 24.3%) of the nurse educators reported two to five years in the Teacher Retirement System. Nineteen (16.6%) nurse educators reported more than fifteen years in Teacher Retirement System.

Regarding number of years in the Social Security System, twenty-eight (24.3) reported more than fifteen years in the Social Security System. The largest response category for the Social Security System was two to five years with 25 or 21.7% of respondents indicating this category.
Thirty-two (27.8%) reported two to ten years in other retirement systems. Sixteen (13.9%) nurse educators had more than ten years in other retirement systems (see Table 8).

Table 8

Number of Years in Retirement Systems of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Retirement systems</th>
<th>TRS</th>
<th>SSS</th>
<th>ORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or less</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two to Five</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six to Ten</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven to Fifteen</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixteen to Twenty</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty &amp; over</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Teacher Retirement System.
b Social Security System.
c Other retirement systems.
d Six respondents did not answer the question.
e Eight respondents did not answer the question.
Salary (University Nine Month and Total Yearly) of Respondents

The 115 respondents were asked to identify their nine month university salary and their total yearly salary from all jobs for 12 months.

For nine month university salary, almost one-half (n = 54 or 47.4%) of the nurse educator's responses were in the $25,001 to $30,000 category. In addition, over one-third (n = 43) of the nurse educators indicated their salary category was $30,001 to $35,000 for nine months from the university. Therefore, 85.2% of nurse educators reported salaries between $25,001 and $35,001 for nine months from the university.

For total yearly income from all jobs, the largest response category, with almost one-third (n = 36 or 32.7%) responding, was $35,001 to $40,000. Almost one-half (n = 49 or 44.6%) of nurse educators reported making over $40,001 from all jobs (see Table 9).
Table 9

Salary (University Nine Month and Total Yearly Salary) of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Nine Month</th>
<th>Total Yearly Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 or less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001 TO $25,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,001 TO $30,000</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001 to $35,000</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,001 to $40,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001 to $45,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,001 to $50,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over $50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One respondent did not answer this question.

b Five respondents did not answer this question.

Objective Two

Objective two was to describe nurse educators in Louisiana higher education on the following psychological measures: job satisfaction as measured by the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job in General (JIG), organizational commitment as measured by the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), and intention to leave as measured by a researcher designed
instrument (ITL). These variables were measured on an interval scale and summarized with means and standard deviations.

**Job Satisfaction of Respondents**

The JDI contains five job satisfaction components: work on the present job, present pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, and people on your present job. Because the sections of the JDI could not be averaged, the Job in General section was used to reflect overall satisfaction of nurse educators (Balzer et al., 1990).

Regarding the overall job satisfaction, the mean JIG score was 40.7 (SD = 9.2) for the 113 responding nurse educators. The JIG was measured on a scale with a possible range from 0 to 54 and the actual range of scores was from a low of 0 to a high of 54.

Each component of job satisfaction as measured by JDI subscores was also assessed in this study. Each component was measured on a scale with a possible range of from 0 to 54. The components of job satisfaction on which nurse educators had the highest mean score was co-workers with a mean of 40.5 (SD = 11.9). Components with which nurse educators had the lowest satisfaction scores were pay (M = 17.29, SD = 12.7) and opportunities for promotion (M = 15.3, SD = 13.8). All job satisfaction component mean scores are reported in Table 10.
Table 10

Job Satisfaction of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of job satisfaction</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>LO</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>MDN</th>
<th>P*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present job</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scale values include: Yes, No, and Undecided.

* Percentile.

b The norms are unavailable.

Perhaps a more meaningful way to examine job satisfaction scores than using raw scores is through comparison with established normative data. Balzer et al. (1990) recommends that the appropriate norm group for nurses is the scale based on data from men. In addition, Balzer et al. emphasizes that to examine norms the median, rather than the scale mean, should be utilized. When examining the data from nurse educators in Louisiana higher education, the component with the highest percentile (P) score was co-workers (MDN = 45, P = 50).
The component with the lowest percentile score was pay
(MDN = 16, P = 20).

Balzer et al. suggest that to interpret job satisfaction of respondents that those between the 25th and 75th percentile are considered to be satisfied. Those above the 75th percentile are considered highly satisfied while those below the 25th percentile are considered to have low satisfaction. Based on this interpretation nurse educators in Louisiana had low satisfaction on the component of pay and were satisfied on the other four components of job satisfaction.

The data related to the number of nurse educators at each of the three levels of satisfaction (high, satisfied, and low) for each component of job satisfaction are presented in Table 11. The greatest number of nurse educators (n = 72 or 63.8%) were in the level "Satisfied" with present job. The lowest level was a "High" satisfaction for the component pay (n = 4 or 3.6%); however the majority of nurse educators (n = 69 or 61.6%) were in the "Low" satisfaction category for pay. Regarding opportunities for promotion, half (n = 58 or 51.3%) of the nurse educators were in the "Satisfied" category. The largest group of nurse educators (n = 48 or 42.5%) were "Satisfied" with supervision. Regarding co-
workers, the largest group of nurse educators were in the
category "Satisfied".

The "norms for the JIG are currently being developed
and are unavailable at this time" (Balzer et al., 1990, p. 52).

Table 11
Level of Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF SATISFACTION</th>
<th>High(^{a})</th>
<th>Satisfied(^{b})</th>
<th>Low(^{c})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job component

| Present job | 14 | 72 | 27 | 12.3 | 63.8 | 23.9 |
| Pay        | 4  | 39 | 69 | 3.6  | 34.8 | 61.6 |
| Opportunities for promotion | 12 | 58 | 43 | 10.6 | 51.3 | 38.1 |
| Supervision | 39 | 48 | 26 | 34.5 | 42.5 | 23.0 |
| Co-workers | 32 | 44 | 37 | 28.3 | 38.9 | 32.8 |

\(^{a}\) Below 25\(^{a}\) Percentile  
\(^{b}\) 26-74 \(^{a}\) Percentile  
\(^{c}\) Above 75\(^{a}\) Percentile
Organizational commitment was measured using the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) by Mowday et al. (1979). The OCQ includes nine positively written items on organizational commitment which use a seven-point Likert-type response scale. Higher values indicate higher commitment levels. To measure organizational commitment the mean of the nine items was computed for each respondent. These scores ranged from 1.6 to 6.7. For the 115 nurse educators, the overall mean on the questionnaire was 4.70 (SD = 1.0). This OCQ score (4.7) was compared to the norms presented by Mowday et al. (1979). The nurse educators mean score (4.7) was determined to have a percentile score of 41.4. using female norms. The authors suggested these norms be used with caution because of the limited data upon which the norms were based (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979).

The number of nurse educators for the three levels of satisfaction (high, satisfied, and low) for organizational commitment was calculated. Approximately one-half of the nurse educators (n = 63 or 54.8%) were in the level satisfied. The smallest group of respondents was in the high level of commitment (n = 19 or 16.5%). Thirty (28.7%) of the nurse educators indicated a low level of commitment.
Intention to Leave (ITL) of Nurse Educators

A fourteen item researcher designed questionnaire was used to measure intention to leave. Examination of the data from the scale led the researcher to realize that one item was inconsistent with the remainder of the scale. The decision was reached based on the following criteria: when the internal consistency of the instrument was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, one item was shown to decrease the internal consistency of the scale. In addition, the scale was factor analyzed and results revealed that the same item would not load satisfactorily with any other scale items. Based on these findings, the item, "I intend to live in this area when I retire," was deemed to be a poor item and was eliminated for subsequent data analysis.

The thirteen negatively written items on the Intention to Leave (ITL) questionnaire were measured on a seven-point Likert-type scale. Higher values indicated a higher degree of intention to leave. An overall intention to leave score was computed as the mean of the 13 items. For the 115 nurse educators, the overall mean ITL score was 3.7 (SD = 1.1). The overall ITL score ranged from 1.6 to 5.8. Since "4" on the response scale indicated neutral or undecided, this result would fall into the neutral category of 3.51 to 4.49. Therefore, nurse
educators were considered neutral in their decision on intention to leave.

In order to determine the number of nurse educators in each category of intention to leave, the following scale was developed: scores 2.5 or less indicated a low level of intention to leave, scores between 2.51 and 5.49 indicated an undecided level of intention to leave, and scores 5.5 or more indicated a high level of intention to leave. Most nurse educators indicated that they were undecided about their intention to leave (n = 94 or 81.7%). In addition, four (3.5%) nurse educators indicated a high intention to leave (see Table 12).

Table 12
Intention to Leave Scores of Nurse Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5 or less</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51 - 5.49</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective Three

Objective three was to determine if a relationship existed between job satisfaction (measured by the JDI) and
intention to leave (measured by ITL) of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education. Because the sections of the JDI could not be averaged, the Job in General (JIG) section was used to reflect overall satisfaction of nurse educators. These relationships were measured using Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient.

**Relationship Between Job Satisfaction (JIG) and Intention to Leave of Nurse Educators**

For the 113 nurse educators responding to both the job satisfaction and intention to leave sections of the questionnaire, the calculated correlation between the variables was \( r = -0.35, (p = .01) \). This indicates a moderate negative relationship (Davis, 1971). Therefore, nurse educators who had higher overall job satisfaction scores tended to have lower intention to leave scores.

**Objective Four**

Objective four was to determine if a relationship existed between the components of job satisfaction (satisfaction with salary, co-workers, supervision, present job, and promotional opportunities), as measured by the scales of JDI and intention to leave of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education. Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient was used.
Relationship Between the Components of Job Satisfaction and Intention to Leave of Nurse Educators

When the components of job satisfaction were correlated with ITL, the component which was most highly related was satisfaction with present job ($r = -0.36, p < .001$). Using Davis' descriptors (1971) this correlation would be classified as a moderate negative relationship indicating respondents with higher satisfaction with present job tended to have lower ITL scores. One other job satisfaction component, opportunities for promotion, was moderately related to ITL ($r = -0.30, p = .001$).

However, one job satisfaction component was not significantly related to ITL. This component was satisfaction with co-workers and had a computed coefficient of $r = -.15, (p = .11)$ (see Table 13).
Table 13

Relationship Between the Components of Job Satisfaction and Intention to Leave of Nurse Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction Component</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present job</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective Five

Objective five was to determine if a relationship existed between job satisfaction (as measured by the JDI and JIG) of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education and selected demographic characteristics. For the variable, marital status, which was measured on a nominal scale and had three or more categories, analysis of variance was used. For variables that were measured on a nominal scale and had two categories, the Point-Biserial correlation coefficient was used. Those variables were tenure status, scholarly productivity, status in other retirement systems, and moonlighting status. For variables that were measured on an ordinal scale, the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient was used.
Those variables were educational level, number of grants, number of publications, and years in retirement systems (Teacher Retirement System, Social Security System, and other retirement system). For variables that were measured on an interval scale, the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient was used. Those variables were years experience as a nurse, years experience as a nurse educator, years of experience as a nurse educator at their current university.

Relationship Between Marital Status and Job Satisfaction

For ease of interpretation, the decision was made to examine the relationship between components of job satisfaction and marital status by comparing job satisfaction measures by the four categories of the variable marital status using analysis of variance. For nurse educators in Louisiana higher education, the four categories were single, married, widowed, and divorced. No significant differences were found among the categories of marital status on job satisfaction components (see Table 14).
Table 14
ANOVA of Job Satisfaction by Marital Status of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction components</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Job</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. One hundred-twelve responded to all of the comparisons, except 111 responded to pay and marital status.

Relationship Between Tenure Status and Job Satisfaction

The relationship between whether or not respondents were tenured and their job satisfaction was measured using the Point Biserial correlation coefficient. Tenure status was coded such that "1" represented tenured and "2" represented not tenured. Examination of computed coefficients revealed that only one job satisfaction component was significantly related to tenure status. This component was opportunities for promotion ($r = .01$, $p = .93$). The relationship was described as negligible Davis' (1971) descriptors. The derived relationship indicated that non-tenured nurse educators tended to have
higher scores on the opportunities for promotion component of job satisfaction (see Table 15).

Table 15

Relationship Between Tenure Status and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction Component</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present job</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job In General</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.

Relationship Between Educational Level and Job Satisfaction

Nurse educators were asked to indicate their educational level by making the most appropriate choice of the following categories: less than Masters in Nursing with no graduate course credits, less than Masters in Nursing with graduate credits in Nursing presently being obtained, Masters in Nursing with graduate credits attempted within the last two years that could be applied to the doctorate, Masters in Nursing with no graduate credits or no graduate credits attempted in over two
years, Doctorate in Nursing, Doctorate other than Nursing, and other. The first two categories were not selected by the respondents. Five people responded to "other" by stating that they had either completed two Masters degrees or were currently a PhD candidate. To determine the relationship between the variable educational level, the researcher arranged the categories of the variable, educational level, in the following order: Masters in Nursing with no graduate credits or no graduate credits attempted in over two years, Masters in Nursing with graduate credits attempted within the last two years that could be applied to the doctorate, completed two Masters degrees or a PhD candidate, Doctorate in Nursing, and Doctorate other than Nursing.

The researcher used the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient to measure the relationship between educational level and job satisfaction. Only one job satisfaction component was significantly related to educational level. This component was present job ($r = -0.20, p = 0.03$). Using Davis' descriptors (1971) this correlation was classified as a low negative relationship. This meant that nurse educators who had a lower education level tended to score higher on satisfaction with the present job (see Table 16).
Table 16

Relationship Between Educational Level and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction Component</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present job</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job In General</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.

Scholarly Productivity

Four questions were asked about scholarly productivity. The questions were the following: "How many manuscripts have you submitted for consideration for publication in the last three years?, How many articles have you had accepted for publication in professional journals?, How many grants have you applied for in the last three years?, and How many grants have you received?". The response scale for each of these questions was: zero, one, two to five, and more than five. Therefore, Spearman rank order correlation coefficients
were used to measure the relationships between each of these measures and the components of job satisfaction.

Relationship Between Manuscripts Submitted and Accepted and Job Satisfaction. When the relationships between job satisfaction and number of manuscripts submitted in the last three years was examined, no significant correlations were found (see Table 17).

No significant correlations were found when the relationship between job satisfaction and number of articles accepted for publication was assessed (see Table 18).

Relationship Between Grants Submitted and Received and Job Satisfaction. When the relationship between job satisfaction and number of grants submitted in the last three years was examined, no significant correlations were found (see Table 19).
Table 17

Relationship Between Manuscripts Submitted and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction Component</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job In General</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present job</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values. Scale values 0 manuscripts submitted = 1, 1 manuscript submitted = 2, 2 to 5 manuscripts submitted = 3, more than 5 manuscripts submitted = 4.
### Table 18

**Relationship Between Articles Accepted and Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction Component</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>( \bar{p} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JIG</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present job</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Two-tailed \( p \) values. Scale values 0 articles accepted = 1, 1 article accepted = 2, 2 to 5 articles accepted = 3, more than 5 articles accepted = 4.
Table 19

**Relationship Between Grants Submitted and Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction Component</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present job</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIG</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Two-tailed p values. Scale values 0 grants submitted = 1, 1 grant submitted = 2, 2 to 5 grants submitted = 3, more than 5 grants submitted = 4.
No significant correlations were found when the relationship between job satisfaction and number of grants received was assessed (see Table 20).

Table 20

Relationship Between Grants Received and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction Component</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present job</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job In General</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values. Scale values 0 grants received = 1, 1 grants received = 2, 2 to 5 grants received = 3, more than 5 grants received = 4.

Relationship Between Scholarly Productivity and Job Satisfaction. To further examine the relationship between scholarly productivity and job satisfaction, data were recoded to present two dimensions of productivity. The first of these was attempts at publishing and grant writing. To measure this aspect, nurse educators were classified as having attempted scholarship if they reported that they had either submitted one or more manuscript or applied for one or more grants or both...
(coded as "2"). If they indicated that they had neither submitted manuscripts nor applied for grants, they were classified as not having attempted scholarship (coded as "1"). The Point Biserial correlation coefficient was then used to measure the relationship between attempted scholarship and components of job satisfaction. No significant correlations were found between attempted scholarship and job satisfaction (see Table 21).

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction Component</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Attempts</th>
<th>Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job In General</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present job</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.

The second of these dimensions was successful attempts at publishing and grant writing. To measure this aspect, nurse educators were classified as having had successful scholarship if they indicated that they had
either published one or more articles or received one or more grants or both (coded as "2"). If they indicated that they had neither published an article nor received a grant, they were classified as not having successful scholarship (coded as "1"). The Point Biserial correlation coefficient was then used to measure the relationship between successful scholarship and components of job satisfaction. No significant correlations were found between successful scholarship and job satisfaction (see Table 21).

**Relationship Between Moonlighting Status and Job Satisfaction**

The respondents were asked to respond "yes" or "no" to "Do you moonlight in any nursing jobs (routinely or sporadically)?" The Point-Biserial correlation coefficient was used to measure the relationship between whether or not they moonlighted and their job satisfaction. The computed correlation coefficients are presented in Table 22. No significant correlations were found between tenure status and job satisfaction.
Table 22

Relationship Between Moonlighting Status and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction Component</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Job</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job In General</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values. Scale values included: Yes = 1, No = 2.

Relationship Between Status in Retirement Systems and Job Satisfaction

Status in retirement systems was established by asking nurse educators "Do you have any time in other retirement systems (other than Teacher Retirement System)?" The answers to choose from were "yes" (coded as "2" and "no" (coded as "1"). One component of job satisfaction was found to be significantly correlated with status in retirement systems and job satisfaction. This component was opportunities for promotion ($r = -.26$, p .006). The correlation was classified as low negative relationship using Davis' descriptors (1971). The
association was such that nurse educators that had years in another retirement system were less satisfied with opportunities for promotion (see Table 23).

Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction Component</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present job</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job In General</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.

Number of Years in Retirement Systems

Three questions were asked about years in retirement systems. These questions were as follows: "How many years do you have in the Teacher Retirement System?, How many years do you have in Social Security?", and "How many years do you have in other retirement programs?" Response categories to chose from for each of these were none, one year, two to five years, six to ten years, eleven to fifteen years, sixteen to twenty years, and over twenty
years. Spearman rank order correlation coefficients were used to measure the relationship between years in retirement systems and job satisfaction.

**Relationship Between Years in Teacher Retirement System and Job Satisfaction**

Correlations between components of job satisfaction and years in the Teacher Retirement System were measured using the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient. One component of job satisfaction was found to be significantly correlated with years in retirement systems and job satisfaction. This component was opportunities for promotion ($r = -.29, p = .002$). The correlation was classified as a low negative relationship (Davis, 1971). The association was such that nurse educators with more years in Teacher Retirement System tended to be less satisfied with opportunities for promotion (see Table 24).

**Relationship Between Years in Social Security System and Job Satisfaction**

Correlations between components of job satisfaction and years in Social Security were measured using the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient. None of the components of job satisfaction were found to be significantly related to years in the Social Security System (see Table 25).
### Table 24

**Relationship Between Years in Teacher Retirement System and Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction Component</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job In General</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present job</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Two-tailed p values.

### Table 25

**Relationship Between Years in Social Security and Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction Component</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present job</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job In General</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Two-tailed p values.
Relationship Between Years in Other Retirement Systems and Job Satisfaction

Correlations between components of job satisfaction and years in other retirement systems were measured using the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient. One component of job satisfaction was found to be significantly correlated with status in other retirement systems. This component was satisfaction with pay ($\rho = .25, p = .02$). Using Davis' descriptors (1971) this indicated a low positive relationship. The association was such that nurse educators with more years in other retirement systems were more satisfied with pay (see Table 26).

Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction Component</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\rho$</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present job</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job In General</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.
Relationship Between Years of Experience as a Nurse and Job Satisfaction

Respondents were asked "How many years of service as a nurse (including ALL part-time and full-time employment) other than teaching do you have?" To determine if a relationship existed between job satisfaction and years of experience as a nurse, the researcher used the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient statistical procedure. One component of job satisfaction was found to be significantly correlated with years of experience as a nurse. This component was opportunities for promotion ($r = -.20, p = .04$). Using Davis' descriptors (1971) this was classified as a low relationship. The association was such that nurse educators with more years of experience as a nurse tended to have lower satisfaction scores on the opportunities for promotion component (see Table 27).
Table 27

Relationship Between Years of Experience as a Nurse and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction Component</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job In General</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present job</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.

Relationship Between Total Years of Experience as a Nurse Educator and Job satisfaction

Nurse educators were asked to respond to "How many TOTAL years of service as a nurse educator do you have?". The Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient was used to determine if a relationship existed between total years of experience as a nurse educator and components of job satisfaction. The job satisfaction component that was most highly related to years experience as a nurse educator was opportunities for promotion (r = -.33, p < .001). This relationship was classified as a moderate negative relationship (Davis, 1971).
Three other job satisfaction components were found to be significantly related to years experience as a nurse educator. These components were present job, Job in General, and supervision. All of these significant correlations were negative indicating that respondents with more years of experience as a nurse educator tended to have lower satisfaction scores (see Table 28).

Table 28

Relationship Between Total Years of Experience as a Nurse Educator and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction Component</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present job</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.

Relationship Between Years of Experience as a Nurse Educator at Their Current University and Job Satisfaction

Nurse educators were asked to respond to "How many years of service as a nurse educator at YOUR CURRENT UNIVERSITY do you have?" To determine if a relationship
existed between the years of experience as a nurse educator at their current university and job satisfaction. The Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient was used. One component of job satisfaction was found to be significantly correlated with years of experience as a nurse educator at their current university. This component was opportunities for promotion (r = -.27, p = .003). This correlation was classified as a low negative relationship (Davis, 1971). The association was such that nurse educators with more years of experience as a nurse educator tended to have lower satisfaction scores on the opportunities for promotion component (see Table 29).

Table 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction Component</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present job</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job In General</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.
Objective Six

Objective six was to determine if a relationship existed between organizational commitment (as measured by the OCQ) and intention to leave (as measured by ITL) of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education. This objective was accomplished using the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient.

Relationship Between Organizational Commitment and Intention to Leave

The calculated coefficient between intention to leave and organizational commitment was $r = -.23$ ($p = .01$). This correlation was classified a low association (Davis, 1971). This indicated that nurse educators with lower organizational commitment tended to have higher intention to leave.

Objective Seven

Objective seven was to determine if a relationship existed between organizational commitment (as measured by the OCQ) of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education and selected demographic characteristics. For the variable, marital status, which was measured on a nominal scale and had three or more categories, analysis of variance was used. For variables that were measured on a nominal scale and had two categories, the Point-Biserial correlation coefficient was used. Those variables were
tenure status, scholarly productivity, status in other retirement systems, and moonlighting status. For variables that were measured on an ordinal scale, the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient was used. Those variables were educational level, number of grants, number of publications, and years in retirement systems (Teacher Retirement System, Social Security System, and other retirement systems). For variables that were measured on an interval scale, Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient was used. Those variables were years experience as a nurse, years experience as a teacher, and years of experience as a nurse educator at their current university.

Organizational commitment was measured by summarizing the nine items on the OCQ. Each of these items were measured on a seven-point Likert-type scale. This variable was called organizational commitment.

**Relationship Between Marital Status and Organizational Commitment**

For ease of interpretation, the decision was made to examine the relationship between organizational commitment (as measured by the OCQ) and marital status by comparing organizational commitment by the four categories of the variable marital status using analysis of variance. For nurse educators in Louisiana higher education, the four
categories were single, married, widowed, and divorced. No significant differences were found in organizational commitment among the categories of marital status ($F = 1.06, p = .37$).

Relationship Between Tenure Status and Organizational Commitment

The relationship between whether or not respondents were tenured and their organizational commitment was measured using the Point Biserial correlation coefficient. Tenure status was coded such that "one" represented tenured and "two" represented not tenured. Examination of the computed coefficient revealed that no significant correlation was found ($r = .04, p = .66$).

Relationship between Educational Level and Organizational Commitment

Nurse educators were asked to indicate their educational level by making the most appropriate choice of the following categories: less than Masters in Nursing with no graduate course credits, less than Masters in Nursing with graduate credits in Nursing presently being obtained, Masters in Nursing with graduate credits attempted within the last two years that could be applied to the doctorate, Masters in Nursing with no graduate credits or no graduate credits attempted in over two years, Doctorate in Nursing, Doctorate other than Nursing,
and other. The first two categories were not selected by the respondents. Five people responded to "other" by stating that they had either completed two Masters degrees or were currently a PhD candidate. To determine the relationship between the variable educational level, the researcher arranged the categories of the variable, educational level, in the following order: Masters in Nursing with no graduate credits or no graduate credits attempted in over two years, Masters in Nursing with graduate credits attempted within the last two years that could be applied to the doctorate, completed two Masters or PhD candidate, Doctorate in Nursing, and Doctorate other than Nursing.

When the relationship between organizational commitment and education was examined, no significant correlation was found ($r = .0003$, $p = .997$).

Scholarly Productivity and Organizational Commitment

Four questions were asked about scholarly productivity. The questions were the following: "How many manuscripts have you SUBMITTED for consideration for publication in the last three years?, How many articles have you had accepted for publication in professional journals?, How many grants have you applied for in the last three years?, and How many grants have you RECEIVED?". The response scale for each of these
questions was: zero, one, two to five, and more than five. Therefore, Spearman rank order correlation coefficients were used to measure the relationships between each of these measures and organizational commitment.

**Relationship Between Manuscripts Submitted and Accepted and Organizational Commitment.** There was a low negative relationship (Davis, 1971) between manuscripts submitted and organizational commitment ($r = -.19, p = .05$). This meant that nurse educators that submit more articles tended to score lower on the organizational commitment questionnaire.

When the relationship between organizational commitment and number of articles accepted in the last three years was examined, no significant correlation was found ($r = .04, p = .67$).

**Relationship Between Grants Submitted and Grants Received and Organizational Commitment.** When the relationship between organizational commitment and number of grants submitted in the last three years was examined, no significant correlation was found ($r = -.12, p = .20$).

No significant correlation was found between grants received and organizational commitment ($r = .07, p = .44$).
Relationship Between Scholarly Productivity and Organizational Commitment. To further examine the relationship between scholarly productivity and organizational commitment data were recoded to present two dimensions of productivity. The first of these was attempts at publishing and grant writing. To measure this aspect, nurse educators were classified as having attempted scholarship if they indicated that they had either submitted one or more manuscript or applied for one or more grants or both (coded as "2"). If they indicated that they had neither submitted manuscripts nor applied for grants, they were classified as not having attempted scholarship (coded as "1"). The Point Biserial correlation coefficient was then used to measure the relationship between attempted scholarship and organizational commitment.

When attempted scholarship was correlated with organizational commitment, a low negative relationship was found ($r = -0.23, p = .01$) (Davis, 1971). This meant that those nurse educators who had attempted scholarship tended to score lower on the organizational commitment questionnaire.

The second of these dimensions was successful attempts at publishing and grant writing. To measure this aspect, nurse educators were classified as having had
successful scholarship if they indicated that they had either published one or more articles or received one or more grants or both (coded as "2"). If they indicated that they had neither published an article nor received a grant, they were classified as not having successful scholarship (coded as "1"). The Point Biserial correlation coefficient was then used to measure the relationship between successful scholarship and organizational commitment.

When successful scholarship was correlated with organizational commitment, no significant relationship was found (r = .03, p = .77).

**Relationship Between Moonlighting Status and Organizational Commitment**

The respondents were asked to respond "yes" or "no" to "Do you moonlight in any nursing jobs (routinely or sporadically)? The results of the Point-Biserial correlation coefficient between moonlighting status and organizational commitment revealed no significant correlation (r = -.01, p = .88).

**Relationship Between Status in Retirement Systems and Organizational Commitment**

Status in retirement systems was established by asking nurse educators "Do you have any time in other retirement systems? (other than the Teacher Retirement
The answers to choose from were "yes" (coded as "2") and "no" (coded as "1"). No significant correlations were found ($r = .03$, $p = .75$) between status in retirement systems and organizational commitment.

**Number of Years in Retirement Systems and Organizational Commitment**

Three questions were asked about years in retirement systems. The questions were as follows: "How many years do you have in Teacher Retirement System?", "How many years do you have in Social Security?" and "How many years do you have in other retirement programs?" Response categories to choose from for each of these were none, one year, two to five years, six to ten years, eleven to fifteen years, sixteen to twenty years, and over twenty years. Spearman rank order correlation coefficients were used to measure the relationship between years in retirement systems and organizational commitment.

**Relationship Between Years in Teacher Retirement System and Organizational Commitment**

The relationship between organizational commitment and years in the Teacher Retirement System were measured using the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient. No significant correlation was found ($r = - .05$, $p = .60$).
Relationship Between Years in Social Security System and Organizational Commitment

The relationship between organizational commitment and years in the Social Security System were measured using the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient. No significant correlation was found ($r = .02, p = .88$).

Relationship Between Years in Other Retirement System and Organizational Commitment

The relationship between organizational commitment and other retirement system were measured using the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient. No significant correlation was found ($r = .04, p = .67$).

Relationship Between Years of Experience as a Nurse and Organizational Commitment

Respondents were asked "How many years of service as a nurse (including ALL part-time and full-time employment) other than teaching do you have?" To determine if a relationship existed between organizational commitment and years of experience as a nurse, the researcher used the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient statistical procedure. No significant correlation was found ($r = -.08, p = .36$).
Relationship Between Total Years of Experience as a Nurse Educator and Organizational Commitment

Nurse educators were asked to respond to "How many TOTAL years of service as a nurse educator do you have?". The Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient was used to determine if a relationship existed between organizational commitment and total years of experience as a nurse educator. The calculated correlation between the variables was \( r = -0.19, p = 0.04 \). Using Davis' (1971) descriptors this was classified as a low negative relationship. Therefore, nurse educators with fewer years of experience as a nurse educator tended to have higher scores on the organizational commitment questionnaire.

Relationship Between Years of Experience as a Nurse Educator at Their Current Institution and Organizational Commitment

Nurse educators were asked to respond to "How many years of service as a nurse educator at YOUR CURRENT UNIVERSITY do you have?" To determine if a relationship existed between years of experience as a nurse educator at their current university and organizational commitment the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient was used. No significant correlation was found \( r = -0.02, p = 0.87 \).
Objective Eight

Objective eight was to determine if a model existed which explains a significant portion of the variance in intention to leave of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education from the following measures: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, age, gender, ethnic origin, marital status, kinship responsibility (number of dependent children and number of other significant individuals depending on faculty), educational level, certification status, years experience as a nurse, years experience as a nurse educator, years of experience as a nurse educator at their current university, academic rank, tenure status, employment status, amount of time for association with co-workers, membership in professional organizations, scholarly productivity (articles and grants), moonlighting status and amount of moonlighting, status in other retirement systems, number of years in retirement systems (Teacher Retirement System, Social Security System, and other retirement systems) and salary (teaching and total).

This objective was accomplished using multiple regression analysis with intention to leave as the dependent variable. The other variables were treated as independent variables and stepwise entry of the variables was used because of the exploratory nature of the study.
In this regression equation variables were added that increased the explained variance by one percent or more as long as the regression equation remained significant.

In analyzing the data, five variables were constructed from data collected. The first of these was whether or not the respondent belonged to professional nursing organizations. If the nurse educators indicated that they belonged to ANA, LSNA, and local district nursing organization, or other professional nursing organizations the response was interpreted to mean that they belonged to professional nursing organizations and was coded "2". If nurse educators responded that they did not belong to either category of professional nursing organization this was coded "1".

If respondents indicated they belonged to professional organizations outside of nursing, this was interpreted as meaning that they belonged to other professional organizations and was coded "2". If they did not belong to professional organizations outside of nursing, this variable (other professional organizations) was coded "1".

For the variable marital status, dummy coding was used to construct three "yes or no" variables. Variables created were whether or not respondents were single, whether or not respondents were married, and whether or
not respondents were widowed or divorced. In each instance, yes was coded as "2" and no was coded as "1".

Employment status was another variable recoded. Essentially a variable was created which had the levels full-time and full-time plus overload. Part-time teaching load and administrative duties, department heads, and full-time teaching load were recoded as a number "1". Full-time plus overload in teaching was coded as a "2".

To enter the variable scholarly productivity into the regression analysis the dichotomous measurements of the two dimensions of scholarly productivity as established previously were used. These two dimensions of productivity were established with the following procedures. The first of these was attempts at publishing and grant writing. To measure this aspect, nurse educators were classified as having attempted scholarship if they indicated that they had either submitted one or more manuscript or applied for one or more grants or both (coded as "2"). If they indicated that they had neither submitted manuscripts nor applied for grants, they were classified as not having attempted scholarship (coded as "1")

The second dimension was success at publishing and grant writing. To measure this aspect, nurse educators were classified as having successful scholarship if they
indicated that they had either published one or more manuscript or received one or more grants or both (coded as "2"). If they indicated that they had neither successfully published articles nor received grants, they were classified as not having successful scholarship (coded as "1").

Table 30 presents the results of the multiple regression analysis. A variable was included in the model if it contributed one percent or more to the explained variance. The variable which entered the regression model first was satisfaction with present job. Considered alone, this variable explained 12.9% of the variance in the intention to leave of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education.

Ten additional variables explained an additional 22% of the variance in the intention to leave model. These variables were the following: job satisfaction with pay, job satisfaction with opportunities for promotion, number of years employed full-time in their current university, attempted scholarship, significant dependent others, successful scholarship, employment status, total years experience as a nurse educator, years in other retirement systems, and years in Teacher Retirement System.
These eleven variables explained a total of 35% of the variance in the intention to leave of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education (see Table 30).
### Table 30

**Multiple Regression Analysis of Intention to Leave**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Variables in the Equation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Multiple R2</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present job</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att. Schol</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dep Oth</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suc Schol</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp Stat</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Yrs NE</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs Oth Ret</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs TRS</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Variables not in the equation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Org Commit</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job In General</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonlite</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonlite Hrs</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dep Children</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ status</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wid./Div.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
### Variables not in the equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Oth</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oth Ret</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs Soc Sec</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ Salary</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Salary</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs Nurse</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **a** Job satisfaction with present job.
- **b** Job satisfaction with pay.
- **c** Job satisfaction with opportunities for promotion.
- **d** Years as a nurse educator at their current university.
- **e** Number of attempts at submitting manuscripts and grants.
- **f** Number of dependent significant others (besides children).
- **g** Number of successful grants or articles submitted.
- **h** Employment status.
- **i** Total years as a nurse educator.
- **j** Years in other retirement systems.
- **k** Years in Teacher Retirement System.
- **l** Mean score for Organizational Commitment Questionnaire.
- **m** Job in General.
- **n** Moonlighting status.
- **o** Number of hours moonlight.
- **p** Tenure status.
- **q** Job satisfaction with supervision.
- **r** Job satisfaction with co-workers.
- **s** Number of dependent children.
- **t** Educational level.
- **u** Single.
- **v** Married.
- **w** Widowed or divorced.
- **x** Certification status.
- **y** Percentage of time can see colleagues.
- **z** Status in professional nursing organizations.
- **aa** Status in professional organizations other than nursing.
- **bb** Status in Retirement systems.
- **cc** Years in Social Security System.
- **dd** University salary for nine months.
- **ee** Total salary for all jobs for 12 months.
- **ff** Age in years.
- **gg** Years as a nurse.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to determine what factors influenced the decision of nurse educators to leave their current teaching position at the university level in Louisiana. In addition, this study described nurse educators in Louisiana on selected personal and professional demographic characteristics.

The specific objectives of this study were:

1. Describe nurse educators in Louisiana higher education on selected personal and professional characteristics. The characteristics included the following: age, gender, ethnic origin, marital status, kinship responsibility (number of dependent children and number of other significant individuals depending on faculty), educational level, certification status, health status, alternative employment options, years experience as a nurse, years experience as a nurse educator, years of experience as a nurse educator at their current university, academic rank, tenure status, employment status, amount of time for association with co-workers, membership in professional organizations, scholarly productivity (articles and grants), moonlighting status, amount of moonlighting,
status in retirement systems, number of years in retirement systems (Teacher Retirement System, Social Security System, and other retirement systems, and salary (teaching & total).

2. Describe nurse educators in Louisiana higher education on the following psychological measures: job satisfaction as measured by the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job in General (JIG), organizational commitment as measured by the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), and intention to leave as measured by a researcher designed instrument (ITL).

3. Determine if a relationship existed between job satisfaction (measured by the JDI) and intention to leave (measured by ITL) of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education.

4. Determine if a relationship existed between the components of job satisfaction, (satisfaction with salary, co-workers, supervision, present job, and promotional opportunities), as measured by the scales of JDI and intention to leave of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education.

5. Determine if a relationship existed between job satisfaction (as measured by the JDI and JIG) of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education and selected demographic characteristics.
6. Determine if a relationship existed between organizational commitment (as measured by the OCQ) and intention to leave (as measured by ITL) of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education.

7. Determine if a relationship existed between organizational commitment (as measured by the OCQ) of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education and selected demographic characteristics.

8. Determine if a model existed which explains a significant portion of the variance in intention to leave of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education from the following measures: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, age, gender, ethnic origin, marital status, kinship responsibility (number of dependent children and number of other significant individuals depending on faculty), educational level, certification status, years experience as a nurse, years experience as a nurse educator, years of experience as a nurse educator at their current university, academic rank, tenure status, employment status, amount of time for association with coworkers, membership in professional organizations, scholarly productivity (articles and grants), moonlighting status and amount of moonlighting, status in other retirement systems, number of years in retirement systems.
(Teacher Retirement System, Social Security System, and other retirement systems) and salary (teaching and total).  

**Procedures**

The target population for this study was defined as full-time nurse educators in baccalaureate degree nursing programs. The accessible population was defined as the full-time nurse educators who were teaching nursing in baccalaureate degree nursing programs in Louisiana higher education during the Spring 1992 semester.

A four-part instrument was used to collect data. Part I of the instrument contained the Job Descriptive Index (JDI Revised) which (Balzer et al., 1990) was used to measure job satisfaction. The JDI was originally developed by Smith, Kendall, & Hulin in 1969. Part II of the instrument was the short form of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) by Mowday, Steers, & Porter (1979). Part III was the researcher developed Intention to Leave (ITL) Questionnaire and Part IV was questions related to demographic characteristics. Content validity of Part III and IV was established through a review by a panel of experts.

The completed instrument was distributed to a random sample of 125 nurse educators in Louisiana higher education as a mailed questionnaire. Nonresponse follow-up procedure utilized included reminder postcard and a
second mailing of the instrument. The total number of nurse educators responding to the questionnaire was 115 (92%). All questionnaires were usable.

Findings

Objective One

1. The majority of the nurse educators were white (n = 101 or 90.2%).

2. Regarding kinship responsibility, the majority had children (70% or n = 80) and 45% (n = 51) had dependent significant others.

3. Each of the nurse educators surveyed had a Master's Degree. Almost one-half (n = 56) of the nurse educators reported that they had a Masters degree in Nursing and had not taken any course work in the last two years. However, 41 (36%) reported they had taken course work in the last two years that could be applied to the doctorate. Twelve (10.5%) had doctoral degrees.

4. Regarding years experience, nurse educators in Louisiana reported an average of 15.3 (SD 8.5) years of service as a nurse, 10.9 (SD = 6.9) years as a nurse educator, and 7.1 years (SD = 6.1) as a nurse educator at their current university.

5. Regarding scholarly productivity, the majority (n = 75 or 65%) of the nurse educators reported that they had not submitted a manuscript. Nineteen (17%) had one article
published. Ten (9%) had 2 to 5 published. Eighty-one percent had not submitted a grant proposal; however, 14 (12%) had received one grant and four (3.5%) had received two to five grants.

6. Regarding retirement, ninety (78.3%) nurse educators were members of Teacher Retirement System and 83.5% of nurse educators belonged to the Social Security System. Nurse educators with over sixteen years of service were reported for the following retirement systems: Teacher Retirement System (n = 19 or 17%), Social Security system (n = 28 or 26%), and other retirement systems (n = 6 or 5%).

7. Regarding moonlighting, 86 (74.8%) nurse educators report that they moonlight. Twenty-five (21.9%) nurse educators moonlight 9 to 16 hours every two weeks routinely.

8. Regarding salary, 54 (47.4%) reported their nine month salary from the university between $25,001 and $30,000. However, one third (n = 36) of the nurse educators reported their annual income for all jobs to be between $35,001 and $40,001. Although only three (2.7%) nurse educators reported that they made over $40,000 for nine months, 49 (44.6%) reported that they made over $40,000 annually from all their jobs.
Objective Two

1. The highest means on the JDI and JIG for nurse educators in Louisiana were for the components JIG ($M = 40.7$, $SD = 9.2$) and co-workers with ($M = 40.5$, $SD = 11.9$). The lowest scores were on satisfaction with opportunities for promotion ($M = 15.3$, $SD = 13.8$) and satisfaction with pay ($M = 17.3$, $SD = 12.7$).

   For responding nurse educators, the job satisfaction component pay had the lowest percentile score ($P = 20$) and co-workers had the highest percentile score ($P = 50$).

2. The overall mean on the OCQ questionnaire was 4.7 ($SD = 1.0$) for the 115 nurse educators.

3. The overall mean for the ITL was 3.73 ($SD = 1.1$).

Objective Three

1. For the 113 nurse educators responding to questionnaire, a moderate negative relationship ($r = -0.35$, $p = .01$) existed between scores on The Job in General component of the JDI and scores on Intention to Leave.

Objective Four

1. For the five components of the JDI, the component present job ($r = -0.36$, $p = .001$) and the component opportunities for promotion ($r = 0.30$, $p = .001$) had moderate negative correlations (Davis, 1971) with intention to leave. The components pay ($r = -0.27$, $p =$
.004) and supervision ($r = -0.22$, $p = 0.019$) had low negative correlations (Davis) with intention to leave.

**Objective Five**

1. The results revealed that the job satisfaction component opportunities for promotion, showed a low positive relationship with tenure status ($r = 0.23$, $p = 0.01$).

2. Nurse educators had a low inverse relationship between satisfaction with the present job and educational level ($r = -0.20$, $p = 0.03$).

3. A low inverse relationship existed between years in teacher retirement system and opportunities for promotion ($r = -0.28$, $p = 0.002$).

4. The variable opportunities for promotion had a low inverse relationship with years of experience as a nurse ($r = -0.20$, $p = 0.04$).

5. A moderate negative relationship existed with years experience as a nurse educator and the variables opportunities for promotion ($r = -0.33$, $p < 0.001$), present job ($r = -0.27$, $p = 0.004$), Job in General ($r = -0.23$, $p = 0.012$), supervision ($r = -0.21$, $p = 0.023$).

6. Opportunities for promotion ($r = -0.27$, $p = 0.003$) had a low inverse relationship with years of experience at their current university.
Objective Six

1. A low relationship existed between intention to leave and organizational commitment ($r = -.23, p = .01$).

Objective Seven

1. There was a low inverse relationship between manuscripts submitted and organizational commitment ($r = -.19, p = .05$) for 115 nurse educators.
2. A low negative relationship existed between organizational commitment and attempted scholarship ($r = -.23, p = .01$).
3. A low negative relationship existed with years experience as a nurse educator and organizational commitment ($r = -.19, p = .04$).

Objective Eight

1. A significant model was found explaining a significant portion of the variance in Intention to Leave of nurse educators ($F = 5.07, p < .001$). Eleven variables met the criteria for entry into the significant model. These variables were: job satisfaction with present job, job satisfaction with pay, job satisfaction with opportunities for promotion, number of years of employed full-time in their current university, attempted scholarship, significant dependent others, successful scholarship, employment status, total years experience as a nurse educator.
educator, years in other retirement systems, and years in Teacher Retirement System.

The total amount of variance explained by these eleven variables was 35% in the intention to leave of nurse educators in Louisiana higher education.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions and recommendations were developed by the researcher.

Conclusions for Objective One

1. The majority of nurse educators in Louisiana were white.

   Nurse educators' race paralleled previous studies of college faculty and nurses (Keim, 1989, USDHHS, 1990).

2. The majority of nurse educators in Louisiana have kinship responsibilities, including dependent children and dependent significant others.

   This is based on the finding that 70% (n = 80) of the nurse educators responding had children and 45% (n = 51) of the nurse educators responding had dependent significant others.

3. Relatively few nurse educators in Louisiana surveyed had doctoral degrees.

   This is based on the finding that 10.5% of respondents reported having completed a doctorate.
This was consistent with the findings of a previous study which reported that 11% of nurse educators had doctoral degrees (USDHHS, 1990).

4. Nurse educators in Louisiana were experienced nurses and educators.

   This was based on the findings that respondents reported an average of 15 years of service as a nurse, 11 years as a nurse educator, and 7 years as a nurse educator at their current university.

5. Nurse educators in Louisiana were novices in pursuit of scholarly productivity.

   This is based on the finding that the majority of nurse educators reported that they had not submitted a manuscript (65%) or grant proposal (81%) and only 29 (25.2%) nurse educators had one or more articles published and 18 (15.7%) nurse educators had received one or more grants.

   Findings reported by Williams (1989) show that nationally nurse educators publish more articles than Louisiana nurse educators reported in this study.

6. The majority of nurse educators belong to more than one retirement system and a large group of nurse educators can retire either now or in the next four years with 20 or more years of service.
This is based on the finding that 83.5% of nurse educators belong to the Social Security System and 78.3% belong to the Teacher Retirement System. Nurse educators with sixteen or more years in the various retirement systems are as follows: Teacher Retirement System \((n = 19\) or 17%), Social Security system \((n = 28\) or 26%), and other retirement systems \((n = 6\) or 5%).

7. A majority of nurse educators routinely work in other nursing jobs.

This is based on the finding that 86 (74.8%) nurse educators report that they moonlight. Twenty-five (21.9%) nurse educators moonlight 9 to 16 hours every two weeks routinely.

8. Nurse educator salaries in Louisiana are relatively low.

This is based on the finding that 54 (47.4%) respondents reported their nine month salary from the university was between $25,001 and $30,000.

Findings reported by SREB-State Data Exchange, American Association of University Professors (cited in Smith) show for 1989-90 nine month salaries that the national average was $42,518, SREB average of $40,010, and Louisiana average of $33,015. In addition, the mean SREB salary for assistant professors was $31,170 (cited in Smith).
Recommendations for Objective One

Based on these findings and conclusions, with reference to nurse educators, the researcher recommends the following:

a. Higher education in Louisiana should make salary adjustments for the present nurse educators to match the national average for educators in four year institutions. This recommendation is consistent with the Interim Report to the Joint Legislative Committee on Health and Welfare from the Nursing Supply and Demand Commission (1992, March) and Curran (1991), editor of Nursing Economics who reported [for staff nurses] "we should not put any new dollars into starting wages; all new dollars must go into the experienced end of the wage pyramid" (p. 231).

b. To meet the needs of present nurse educators regarding scholarly productivity, higher education in Louisiana should offer sabbaticals for the present nurse educators to obtain advanced degrees and offer continuing education workshops to nurse educators regarding publishing and grant writing.

c. To meet the needs of present nurse educators' regarding scholarly productivity, higher education in Louisiana should offer release time, money, and support services needs to be allocated to nurse educators to
conduct the research. This recommendation is consistent with previous research of nurse educators (Farren, 1991).

d. Because of the number of nurse educators who can retire in the next several years, long term planning for the educational needs of students in baccalaureate degree nursing education programs needs to be done.

Recommendations include the following: detailed exit interviews regarding job satisfaction and organizational commitment, professional demographics, and personal characteristics; utilization of exit interviews, stipends for potential new nurse educators; and/or capping enrollment of students; and enrollment and retention of qualified students. This recommendation is consistent with the Interim Report to the Joint Legislative Committee on Health and Welfare from the Nursing Supply and Demand Commission (1992, March).

Conclusions for Objective Two

1. Nurse educators in Louisiana had a low level of job satisfaction on the component of pay and were satisfied on the other four components.

   This was based on comparisons of current data to the norms reported by Bowling Green State University (Balzer, 1990). For responding nurse educators, the job satisfaction component pay had the lowest percentile score ($P = 20$) and co-workers had the highest percentile score.
(P = 50). Those above the 75 percentile are considered highly satisfied while those below the 25 percentile are considered to have low satisfaction (Balzer, 1990).

2. Nurse educators in Louisiana have a moderate level of organizational commitment.

This is based on the finding that the mean Organizational Commitment Questionnaire score (4.7) was at the 41.4 percentile when compared to other females.

This is based on the norms in the literature for OCQ (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979); however, the authors suggested these norms be used with caution because of the limited data upon which the norms were based.

3. In general, nurse educators were considered neutral in their intention to leave higher education based on the ITL scores.

Recommendation for Objective Two

Based on these findings and conclusions, with reference to nurse educators, the researcher recommends further research to determine perceptions of nurse educators who indicate high intention to leave in order to identify specific reasons they intend to leave higher education in Louisiana.

Conclusions for Objective Three

1. Nurse educators who had higher job satisfaction tended to have lower intention to leave.
This was based on the finding that a moderate negative relationship ($r = -0.35$, $p = .01$) existed between scores on The Job in General component of the JDI and scores on Intention to Leave.

These findings were consistent with Bowles (1983), Hill (1984), Rosanno (1985), Smart (1990) who have studied educators in higher education and Seybolt (1978), Abelson (1987), and Price and Mueller (1981) who have studied hospital nurses.

Conclusions for Objective Four

1. Nurse educators with higher satisfaction with present job and opportunities for promotion tended to have lower intention to leave.

This conclusion was based on the findings that a moderate negative correlation (Davis, 1971) existed between intention to leave and the variables present job ($r = -0.36$, $p = .001$) and opportunities for promotion ($r = 0.30$, $p = .001$). The components pay ($r = -27$, $p = .004$) and supervision ($r = -.22$, $p = .019$) had low negative correlations (Davis, 1971) with intention to leave.

These findings were consistent with Cotton and Tuttle (1986), Muchinsky and Tuttle (1979), Porter et al. (1974), Prestholdt et al. (1988) who studied hospital nurses and Bowles (1983), Brown (1986), Caplow and McGee (1958),
Koroloff (1985), Smart (1990), and Tanaomi (1990) who studied faculty in higher education.

**Recommendation for Objective Four**

The researcher recommends that the institutions of higher education in Louisiana do the following:

a. Investigate the criteria used for opportunities for promotion of nurse educators in Louisiana.

b. Examine the needs of the students, citizens, and society and compare this with the mission and scope of the universities and the role of nurse educators.

c. Follow the advice of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. This report "calls for a new pragmatic definition of scholarship as a four-part entity involving the discovery of knowledge, the integration of knowledge, the application of knowledge, and teaching. Faculty would be rewarded for activities in all four areas" (p.84). Medical schools have already established programs to encourage the development of and reward for teaching (Tolteson, 1990, cited by the Pew Health Professions Commission).

**Conclusions for Objective Five**

1. Non-tenured nurse educators tended to be more satisfied with opportunities for promotion.
This conclusion was based on the findings that the job satisfaction component opportunities for promotion, showed a low positive relationship with tenure status ($r = .23, p = .01$).

2. Nurse educators with lower educational level tended to be more satisfied with the present job.

   This conclusion was based on the findings that the nurse educators had a low negative relationship between satisfaction with the present job and educational level ($r = -.20, p = .03$).

3. Nurse educators with more years in Teacher Retirement System tended to be less satisfied with opportunities for promotion.

   This conclusion was based on the finding that a low negative relationship existed between years in teacher retirement system and opportunities for promotion ($r = -.28, p = .002$).

4. Nurse educators with more years of experience as a nurse tended to be less satisfied with opportunities for promotion.

   This conclusion was based on the finding that the variable opportunities for promotion had a low negative relationship with years of experience as a nurse ($r = -.20, p = .04$).
5. Nurse educators with more years of experience as a nurse educator tended to be less satisfied with opportunities for promotion.

This conclusion was based on the findings that a moderate negative relationship existed between years experience as a nurse educator and the variables opportunities for promotion ($r = -0.33, p < 0.001$), present job ($r = -0.27, p = 0.004$), job in general ($r = -0.23, p = 0.012$), and supervision ($r = -0.21, p = 0.023$).

6. Nurse educators with more years of experience as a nurse educator at their current university tended to be less satisfied with opportunities for promotion.

This conclusion was based on the finding that a low negative relationship existed between years of experience at their current university and opportunities for promotion ($r = -0.27, p = 0.003$).

**Recommendation for Objective Five**

Based on these findings and conclusions, with reference to nurse educators, the researcher recommends that a research study be undertaken to investigate nurse educators' perception regarding opportunities for promotion in their positions.

**Conclusions for Objective Six**

1. Nurse educators with lower organizational commitment tended to have higher intention to leave.
This conclusion was based on the findings that a low negative relationship existed between intention to leave and organizational commitment ($r = -.23, p = .01$).

This is consistent with research reports by Abelson (1987), Jenkins (in press), Mowday and Lee (1986), Porter et al. (1974) who have studied turnover for nurses and in general. Bowles (1983), Brown (1986), Hill (1984), Koroloff (1985), and Smart (1990) found organizational commitment related to intention to leave for educators in higher education.

Conclusions for Objective Seven

1. Nurse educators who submitted more manuscripts have lower organizational commitment.

   This conclusion was based on the findings that a low negative relationship between manuscripts submitted and organizational commitment ($r = -.19, p = .05$) for 115 nurse educators.

2. Nurse educators who did not submit grants or manuscripts had higher organizational commitment.

   This conclusion was based on the findings that a low negative relationship existed between organizational commitment and attempted scholarship ($r = -.23, p = .01$).

3. Nurse educators had fewer years of service as a nurse educator had higher organizational commitment.
This conclusion was based on the findings that a low negative relationship existed with years experience as a nurse educator and organizational commitment ($r = -0.19$, $p = 0.04$).

**Conclusions for Objective Eight**

1. A significant explanatory model was found for intention to leave among nurse educators in Louisiana higher education.

   This was based on the finding that a model was found explaining a significant portion of the variance (35%) in Intention to Leave of nurse educators ($F = 5.07$, $p < 0.001$).

2. The eleven variables which entered the model included satisfaction with present job, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with opportunities for promotion, years experience as a nurse educator at their current university, number of attempts at submitting manuscripts and grants, number of significant dependent others besides children, number of successful grants or articles published, employment status, total years as a nurse educator, years in other retirement systems, and years in Teacher Retirement System.

   This was based on the finding that the eleven variables identified added one percent or more of
explanatory power to the model and the model remained significant.

3. The three most important factors in explaining intention to leave of nurse educators were the following components of job satisfaction: satisfaction with present job, satisfaction with pay, and satisfaction with opportunities for promotion.

This was based on the finding that the first three variables that entered the equation were satisfaction with present job, satisfaction with pay, and satisfaction opportunities for promotion.

Recommendation for Objective Eight

Based on these findings, the researcher recommends the following:

a. that research be done to test the model.

b. that research be conducted to identify other important factors important in explaining intention to leave.

Summary of Recommendations for Future Research

Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and intention to leave of nurse educators has not been previously reported in the literature. Therefore, this study provides a foundation for future research studies of intention to leave, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction of nurse educators. Some recommendations regarding future research are offered in this section.
The model needs to be tested with other data to further assess the model's explanatory power in other states or regions and with baccalaureate nurse educators. Through further examination of the model and variables potentially contributing to nurse educators' intention to leave, a better understanding of nurse educators could evolve. A solution to the shortage of nurse educators could help alleviate the impact on the future nursing shortage in Louisiana and the nation.

A second recommendation would be to study intention to leave, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction of nurse educators in other types of nursing programs (diploma, associate degree, and graduate programs). As a result of findings from these studies, variables of importance could be compared by nurse educators. Therefore, nurse educators might be able to choose positions where they will be more satisfied.

A follow-up study should be done in one year and three years to determine if actual turnover of nurse educators was related to the high intention to leave scores found in this study.

In addition, research needs to be conducted to determine the antecedent conditions leading to intention to leave and subsequent turnover.
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APPENDIX A

Initial Personal Communication to
Deans of Schools of Nursing
January 16, 1992

Dear

The nursing profession is faced with an increasingly serious shortage of qualified nurses to fulfill the needs of society for several years. More recently, concern has been expressed that a shortage of nursing educators is rapidly developing. If this shortage continues to progress, it could have a dramatic effect on the already inadequate numbers of nurses.

A study is currently being conducted by a faculty member of Southeastern Louisiana University who is working on her dissertation at Louisiana State University. The study will attempt to move toward a solution to this potentially serious problem. The purpose of this study is to examine nursing educators in Louisiana regarding their intention to leave the field of Nursing Education and to investigate the influence of certain factors on their intentions to leave. Factors to be studied include organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and selected demographic characteristics.

To successfully conduct this study, your help is needed. The first step in this process is to identify the currently employed teaching faculty in Louisiana. This group will serve as the population from which a sample can then be selected. Dr. Ellienne Tate, Dean of Nursing at Southeastern Louisiana University, suggested the best procedure to identify the members of this population was to ask the Deans of Louisiana Nursing programs to provide a list of all faculty employed to teach Nursing in the Spring, 1992. We felt that this would be the best way to get the most accurate list, since you are the individuals who ultimately make decisions about staffing classes. Since we want to be as comprehensive as possible, please include in your list all full and part time faculty. In addition, please indicate the status (full time or part time) of each member of your faculty. Although individual names are requested, their responses will be confidential and anonymous. Employment addresses will be used; therefore, if the faculty member’s address is different from the nursing department address above, please supply the correct address.

When the study is completed, we will be happy to share with you a summary of the findings. If you would like this information, please indicate on the enclosed form.

We feel this study has great potential for contributing to a reduction of the nursing shortage problem, but we can’t get it done without your help. Thank you in advance for your help in accomplishing this worthwhile project and for your continued interest in advancing the Nursing profession. If you have any questions, please call me at (504) 765 2324.

Sincerely yours,

Catherine B. Holland, MN, MS, RNC
Assistant Professor
Southeastern Louisiana University

Michael F. Burnett, PhD
Professor
Louisiana State University
APPENDIX B
Second Personal Communication
to Deans of Schools of Nursing

194
February 19, 1992

Dear

Recently you received a letter requesting help from a doctoral student at Louisiana State University conducting a study. The study will attempt to move toward a solution to the potentially serious problem of a nursing educator shortage. The purpose of this study is to examine nursing educators in Louisiana regarding their intention to leave the field of Nursing Education and to investigate the influence of certain factors on their intentions to leave. Factors to be studied include organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and selected demographic characteristics.

The first step in this process is to identify the currently employed teaching faculty in Louisiana. This group will serve as the population from which a sample can then be selected. Dr. Ellienne Tate, Dean of Nursing at Southeastern Louisiana University, suggested the best procedure to identify the members of this population was to ask the Deans or Directors of Nursing programs in Louisiana to provide a list of all faculty employed to teach Nursing in the Spring, 1992. We felt that this would be the best way to get the most accurate list, since you are the individuals who ultimately make decisions about staffing classes. I have not received your list of faculty names. In order for your faculty to be included in the accessible population, please send me your faculty names by March 1, 1992. Since we want to be as comprehensive as possible, please include in your list all full and part time faculty. In addition, please indicate the status (full time or part time) of each member of your faculty. Although individual names are requested, their responses will be confidential and anonymous. Employment addresses will be used; therefore, if the faculty member's address is different than the nursing department address above, please supply the correct address.

When the study is completed, we will be happy to share with you a summary of the findings. If you would like this information, please indicate on the enclosed form.

We feel this study has great potential for contributing to a reduction of the nursing shortage problem, but we can't get it done without your help. Thank you in advance for your help in accomplishing this worthwhile project and for your continued interest in advancing the Nursing profession. If you have any questions, please call me at (504) 765 2324.

Sincerely yours,

Catherine B. Holland, MN, MS, RNC
Assistant Professor
Southeastern Louisiana University

Michael F. Burnett, PhD
Professor
Louisiana State University
APPENDIX C

Instruments: General Direction, Part I, Part II, Part III, and Part IV
GENERAL DIRECTIONS:

This questionnaire contains four parts. Please respond to each part. If at all possible, please complete questionnaire within two weeks.

By returning the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope, you will be granting the researchers permission to report the findings as group data. Your individual responses will be anonymous and confidential. THANK YOU for your participation.
Part I: The Job Descriptive Index and Jobs in General

Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, write

Y for "Yes" if it describes your work
N for "No" if it does NOT describe it
? if you can not decide

WORK ON PRESENT JOB

Fascinating
Routine
Satisfying
Boring
Good
Creative
Respected
Uncomfortable
Pleasant
Useful
Tiring
Healthful
Challenging
Too much to do
Frustrating
Simple
Repetitive
Gives sense of accomplishment

Think of the pay you get from THIS UNIVERSITY. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your present pay? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, write

Y for "Yes" if it describes your pay
N for "No" if it does NOT describe it
? if you can not decide

PRESENT PAY

Income adequate for normal expenses
Fair
Barely live on income
Bad
Income provides luxuries
Insecure
Less than I deserve
Well paid
Underpaid

Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have at THIS UNIVERSITY. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, write

Y for "Yes" if it describes your opportunities for promotion
N for "No" if it does NOT describe it
? if you can not decide

OPPORTUNITIES

Good opportunities for promotion
Opportunities somewhat limited
Promotion n Ability
Dead-end job
Good chance for promotion
Unfair promotion policy
Infrequent promotions
Regular promotions
Fairly good chance for promotion
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Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe this? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, write

_ Y_ for "Yes" if it describes the supervision
_ N_ for "No" if it does NOT describe it
_ ?_ if you can not decide

SUPERVISION
___ Asks my advice
___ Hard to please
___ Impolite
___ Praises good work
___ Tactful
___ Influential
___ Up-to-date
___ Doesn’t supervise enough
___ Has favorites
___ Tells me where I stand
___ Annoying
___ stubborn
___ Knows job well
___ Bad
___ Intelligent
___ Poor planner
___ Around when needed
___ Lazy

Think of the majority of the people you work with now or the people you meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe this? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, write

_ Y_ for "Yes" if it describes the people you work with
_ N_ for "No" if it does NOT describe it
_ ?_ if you can not decide

PEOPLE ON YOUR PRESENT JOB
___ Stimulating
___ Boring
___ Slow
___ Helpful
___ Stupid
___ Responsible
___ Fast
___ Intelligent
___ Easy to make enemies
___ Talk to much
___ Smart
___ Lazy
___ Unpleasant
___ Gossipy
___ Active
___ Narrow interest
___ Loyal
___ Stubborn

Think of your job in general. All in all, what is it you like most of the time? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, write

_ Y_ for "Yes" if it describes your job
_ N_ for "No" if it does NOT describe your job
_ ?_ if you can not decide

JOBS IN GENERAL
___ Pleasant
___ Bad
___ Ideal
___ Waste of time
___ Good
___ Undesirable
___ Worthwhile
___ Worse than most
___ Acceptable
___ Superior
___ Better than most
___ Disagreeable
___ Makes me content
___ Inadequate
___ Excellent
___ Rotten
___ Enjoyable
___ Poor
Part II: Organizational Commitment Questionnaire

Listed on this page is a series of statements that represent possible feelings that a nursing educator might have about the University where he/she is presently employed. With respect to your own feelings about your University, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by marking one of the seven alternatives. Your responses will remain anonymous and confidential. The findings will be reported as group data.

1 = Very Strongly Disagree (VSD), 2 = Strongly Disagree (SD), 3 = Disagree (D), 4 = Neutral (N), 5 = Agree (A)
6 = Strongly Agree (SA), 7 = Very strongly Agree (VSA)

1. I am willing to put a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization.
2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.
3. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.
4. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.
5. I am proud to tell others that I am a part of this organization.
6. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.
7. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over those others I was considering at the time I joined.
8. I really care about the fate of this organization.
9. For me, this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.

Please Continue
Part III. A. Intention to Leave Nursing Education

Listed on this page is a series of statements that represent possible feelings that a nursing educator might have about the University where he/she is presently employed. With respect to your own feelings about your University, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by marking one of the seven alternatives. Your responses will remain anonymous and confidential. The findings will be reported as group data.

1 = Very Strongly Disagree (VSD), 2 = Strongly Disagree (SD), 3 = Disagree (D), 4 = Neutral (N), 5 = Agree (A), 6 = Strongly Agree (SA), 7 = Very Strongly Agree (VSA)

1. I intend to leave BACCALAUREATE nursing education in Louisiana within six months to one year.

2. I intend to seek support for my thoughts about quitting this job with a person who is important in my personal life.

3. I intend to seek advice about leaving MY UNIVERSITY faculty teaching position from people I respect in my professional life (ex. nursing leaders or financial advisors).

4. I intend to search for a job outside BACCALAUREATE degree nursing education in the next year.

5. I intend to search for another job in BACCALAUREATE or ASSOCIATE degree nursing education in Louisiana in the next year.

6. I intend to search for another job in BACCALAUREATE OR ASSOCIATE degree nursing education outside Louisiana in the next year.

7. I intend to search for a job in MASTERS OR DOCTORAL degree nursing education in the next year.

8. I intend to stay well-informed of alternative employment opportunities for the next two to three years.

9. I intend to interview with any employer making a reasonable offer of comparable money in alternative employment.

10. I intend to interview with any employer making a reasonable offer of comparable time (hours and schedule) in alternative employment.

11. I intend to have a current vitae available upon request from any potential employer.

12. I intend to leave nursing education in Louisiana within the next two to three years.

13. I intend to retire from higher education as soon as I become eligible.

14. I intend to live in this area when I retire.

Please Continue
Part III. B. Intention to Leave Nursing Education

15. ANSWER the following open ended statement: (Some comments will be quoted verbatim in the report. Confidentiality and anonymity will be maintained.) I intend to leave my job as a nurse educator in this institution because

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Part IV: Personal Characteristics

Part IV. A. Please answer the following questions about yourself by checking the appropriate space.

1. What is your employment status in this university?
   __ Full-time teaching load
   __ Part-time teaching load
   __ Part-time teaching load and administrative duties
   __ Full-time plus overload in teaching
   __ Other (Please specify ______________________)

2. What is your gender?
   __ Male
   __ Female

3. What is your ethnic origin?
   __ White
   __ Black
   __ Native American
   __ Oriental
   __ Hispanic
   __ Asian
   __ Other (Please specify ______________)
4. What is your marital status?
   — Single
   — Married
   — Widowed
   — Divorced

5. How many dependent children do you have?
   (Include all children for which you are at least partially financially responsible.)
   — 0
   — 1
   — 2
   — 3
   — 4 or more

6. How many other significant individuals (ex. grandchild(ren), parent(s), in-law(s), etc.) are you responsible for helping at least weekly in the community?
   — 0
   — 1
   — 2
   — 3 or more

7. Do you consider your health to be ____?
   — Excellent
   — Good
   — Fair
   — Poor

8. Are you CERTIFIED by a professional nursing organization?
   — Yes
   — No

9. Do you FEEL you have alternative employment options?
   — Yes
   — No

10. What is your academic rank?
    — Instructor
    — Assistant Professor
    — Associate Professor
    — Professor

11. What is your tenure status?
    — Tenured
    — Non-tenured, in a tenure tract
    — Non-tenured, not in a tenure tract

12. What percentage of your work week for the School/College of Nursing ARE YOU ABLE TO SEE your colleagues from the School of Nursing?
    — 20% or less
    — 21% to 40%
    — 41% to 60%
    — 61% to 80%
    — 81% to 100%
13. Do you moonlight in any nursing jobs (either routinely or sporadically)?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No

14. How many hours in a 2 week period, do you ROUTINELY work at other nursing jobs.
   ___ Not applicable
   ___ Less than 4 hours
   ___ 5 - 8 hours
   ___ 9 - 16 hours
   ___ over 16 hours

15. How many manuscripts have you SUBMITTED for consideration for publication in the last three years?
   ___ 0
   ___ 1
   ___ 2 - 5
   ___ more than 5

16. How many articles have you had ACCEPTED for publication in professional journals?
   ___ 0
   ___ 1
   ___ 2 - 5
   ___ more than 5

17. How many grants have you APPLIED for in the last three years?
   ___ 0
   ___ 1
   ___ 2 - 5
   ___ more than 5

18. How many grants have you RECEIVED?
   ___ 0
   ___ 1
   ___ 2 - 5
   ___ more than 5

19. What is YOUR salary for nine months from the University for 1991? (Please subtract pay received for the summer even if routinely employed during the summer.)
   ___ $20,000 or less
   ___ $20,001 - 25,000
   ___ $25,001 - 30,000
   ___ $30,001 - 35,000
   ___ $35,001 - 40,000
   ___ $40,001 - 45,000
   ___ $45,001 - 50,000
   ___ over $ 50,000
20. What is YOUR annual salary (1991) from all jobs for twelve months?

- $20,000 or less
- $20,001 - 25,000
- $25,001 - 30,000
- $30,001 - 35,000
- $35,001 - 40,000
- $40,001 - 45,000
- $45,001 - 50,000
- over $50,000

21. To which of the following professional organizations do you belong? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- Do not belong to any professional nursing organizations
- Belong to ANA, LSNA, & local district nursing organization
- Membership in NURSING organizations OTHER THAN ANA, LSNA, and local district nursing organizations
- Belong to professional organizations outside of nursing (ex. educational organizations)

22. What is your educational level?

- Less than Masters in Nursing with no graduate course credits
- Masters in Nursing with graduate credits in Nursing presently being obtained
- Masters in Nursing with graduate credits attempted within the last two years that could be applied to doctorate
- Masters in Nursing with no graduate credits or no graduate credits attempted in over two years
- Doctorate in Nursing
- Doctorate other than Nursing
- Other (please specify ______________________)

23. How many years do you have in the TEACHER Retirement Systems?

- Not applicable
- 1 year or less
- 2 - 5 years
- 6 - 10 years
- 11 - 15 years
- 16 - 20 years
- 21 - 25 years
- over 25 years

24. Do you have any time in other retirement systems?

- Yes = If the answer is YES, please ANSWER Questions 25 and 26, then continue with Part IV. B. (or Question 27).
- No = If the answer is No, continue Part IV. B. (or Question 27).

25. How many years do you have in Social Security?

- 1 year or less
- 2 - 5 years
- 6 - 10 years
- 11 - 15 years
- 16 - 20 years
- 21 years and over
26. How many years do you have in other retirement programs because of your time served in that organizations? (ex. Armed Forces, hospital, another educational system)

   Not applicable
   1 year or less
   2 - 5 years
   6 - 10 years
   11 - 15 years
   16 - 20 years
   21 years and over

   PLEASE CONTINUE

Part IV. B. Personal Characteristics

Please answer the following questions about yourself by filling in the blank.

27. What was your age at your last birthday?

   __________

28. How many years of service as a nurse (including ALL part-time and full-time employment) other than teaching do you have?

   __________

29. How many years of service as a nurse educator at YOUR CURRENT UNIVERSITY do you have?

   __________

30. How many TOTAL Years of service as a nursing educator do you have?

   __________

31. Comments:

   ____________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________

   THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
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APPENDIX D

Permission to Use Job Descriptive Index and Job In General
April 24, 1992

Catherine B. Holland
14151 Glen Ellis
Walker, LA 70785

Dear Ms. Holland:

This letter is to authorize you permission to document the JDI in your dissertation research provided you include the notation "Copyright, 1985, Bowling Green State University."

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Patricia C. Smith, Ph.D.
Professor Emerita

sp
March 25, 1992

Dear

The Seventh Report to the President and the Congress on the Status of Health Personnel in the United States projected that the severe shortage of nurses would become even worse in the next decade. This is especially significant in Louisiana where the shortage already ranks Louisiana last in the number of qualified nurses. As a nursing educator at Southeastern Louisiana University and a clinical nurse specialist, I am extremely concerned about this problem.

A study is currently underway at LSU which will attempt to examine one aspect of the nursing shortage, namely the shortage of nursing educators. You have been RANDOMLY SELECTED as a member of a small group of nursing educators to participate in this study. The study will examine factors which may influence nursing educators' intention to leave higher education. Your participation in this study is critical to its success.

Please be assured that your responses will be reported only as group data. At no time will your answers be identified with your name. Identification numbers on questionnaires will only be used to follow up those who do not respond to the initial survey.

Thank you in advance for your help. Please accept the enclosed LSU zipper pouch as a small token of appreciation for your participation in the study. If you find that you will definitely be unable to participate, please let me know by returning the enclosed questionnaire in the stamped addressed envelope. A replacement will be selected if you can not participate. If you have any questions, please call me at (504) 765-2324 (work) or (504) 664-9968 (home) or Mike Burnett at (504) 388-5753.

Sincerely yours,

Catherine B. Holland, RNC, MN, MS
Assistant Professor
Southeastern Louisiana University

Michael F. Burnett, PhD
Professor
Louisiana State University
APPENDIX F

Follow-up Post Card
Dear Colleague:

Approximately two weeks ago you should have received a questionnaire designed to measure job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention to leave nursing education. If you have already returned the questionnaire, I sincerely appreciate your response. If you have not yet responded, please do so by APRIL 23, 1992. If you did not receive a questionnaire or have misplaced your copy, please call me at (504) 765-2324 (work) or (504) 664-9968 (home) and I will send you a replacement. If you can not participate, please let me know so an alternate can be chosen. Thank you very much for your participation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Catherine B. Holland, RNC, MN, MS
APPENDIX G

Follow-up Instrument Cover Letter
April 24, 1992

Dear

About two months ago a study was begun which is attempting to examine factors which may influence nursing educators' intention to leave higher education. The large number of questionnaires returned is very encouraging. However, we have not yet received your completed questionnaire. To describe accurately how Louisiana baccalaureate nursing educators feel on these important issues depends upon you and the others who have not yet responded. This is because our past experience suggest that those of you who have not yet sent in your questionnaire may hold quite different views than those who have responded.

This is the first statewide study of this type in Louisiana. Therefore, the results are of particular importance in order to meet the needs of nursing educators, students, other higher education faculty, and society. The usefulness of our results depends on how accurately we are able to describe what the nursing educators of Louisiana feel is important.

If you have recently returned your questionnaire, please accept this note as our thanks. In case you did not receive the previous copy or your copy has been misplaced, another questionnaire is enclosed for your convenience. May I urge you to complete and return it as quickly as possible in the enclosed envelope.

Please be assured that your responses will be reported only as group data. At NO TIME will your answers be identified with your name. Identification numbers on questionnaires will only be used to follow up those who do not respond to the initial survey.

Thank you in advance for your help. Your contribution to the success of this study will be appreciated. If you find that you will definitely be unable to participate, please let me know by returning the enclosed questionnaire in the stamped addressed envelope. A replacement will be selected if you can not participate. If you have any questions, please call me at (504) 765-2324 (work) or (504) 664 9968 (home) or Mike Burnett at (504) 388-5753.

Sincerely yours,

Catherine B. Holland, RNC, MN, MS
Assistant Professor
Southeastern Louisiana University

Michael F. Burnett, PhD
Professor
Louisiana State University
APPENDIX H

Follow-up Letter for Missing Data
May 5, 1992

Dear

Recently you completed a questionnaire designed to measure job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention to leave of baccalaureate nursing educators. I appreciate your speedy response to the questionnaire. However, I think some pages may have been stuck together so that the attached page was not completed on your questionnaire. If you would like to complete this page, so that the data would be included, please mail it back to me by May 20, 1992.

If you have any questions, I can be reached at (504) 765-2324 (work) or (504) 664-9968 (home).

Sincerely,

Catherine B. Holland RN, MN, MS
Assistant Professor
Southeastern Louisiana University
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