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ABSTRACT

Organizational Commitment and Generational Differences in Nursing Faculty

by

Lara Lynn Carver

Dr. Lori Candela, Examination Committee Chair
Associate Professor of Nursing
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

We are in the midst of a well-documented worldwide shortage of nurses due, in part to a shortage of nursing faculty to educate them. The causes of the faculty shortage are complex including more attractive career opportunities for women, low compensation, and increasing faculty retirements. The shortage is expected to worsen in coming years.

Aggressive efforts to recruit faculty at a younger age while retaining older faculty have resulted in four generations in the workforce. As recruiting and retention efforts continue, the concept of organizational commitment across generations is important to consider. Research has demonstrated that organizational commitment leads to improved employee job satisfaction, productivity, longevity, and well-being, while also decreasing absenteeism and turnover.

The purpose of this study was to describe organizational commitment and generational differences in nursing faculty. The study provides a first-time examination of generational differences in nursing faculty and how this may impact their
organizational commitment in an academic environment. The study also provides new
knowledge on generational differences among nursing faculty with regard to other
measures of work that may influence organizational commitment.

A national survey measuring organizational commitment, work values, job
satisfaction, perceived person to organization fit, developmental experiences, perceived
organizational support and selected demographics was conducted using a cross-sectional,
descriptive design with random, stratified sampling procedures. The 75-item electronic
survey was analyzed using descriptive and ANOVA statistics to answer the following
questions:

1. Does organizational commitment in nursing faculty differ by generation?
2. Do work values in nursing faculty differ by generation?
3. Does nursing faculty perception of organizational support differ by generation?
4. Does nursing faculty perception of “fit” with an organization differ by
generation?
5. Do developmental experiences of nursing faculty differ by generation?
6. Does job satisfaction in nursing faculty differ by generation?
7. Do selected demographics of nursing faculty differ by generation?

Major findings in this study demonstrated that significant differences do exist
between the generations of nursing faculty regarding organizational commitment and
related measures, with the exception of perceived organizational support.
Recommendations for practice are provided along with recommendations for further
research.
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CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

We are in the midst of a chronic, worldwide shortage of nurses. At least 57 countries have reported critical shortages (Christmas & Hart, 2007). It is projected to worsen well into the future. These dire predictions have resulted in much needed public attention to the problem. The registered nurse (RN) shortage is occurring at the same time as an even worse shortage among nursing faculty is beginning to emerge. Although it has not received the attention of the RN shortage, the lack of faculty is finally being recognized as a major issue directly impacting the ability to prepare adequate numbers of students for the nursing workforce. The National League for Nursing (NLN) (2006) reported a serious shortage of nursing faculty and alarming trends regarding nursing faculty. The major factors reported as contributing to the nursing faculty shortage are: "an increase in the percentage of part-time faculty, aging of the nursing faculty population, and a decrease in doctorally prepared faculty" (NLN, p. 7). LaRocco (2006) reported that the average age of PhD prepared nurse educators is 54; emphasizing the importance of encouraging doctoral education for younger nurses, as is done in other disciplines. The American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) (2006) attributes the faculty shortage to a variety of causes including more attractive career opportunities for women, low compensation, and increasing faculty retirements.
The demographics of nursing faculty are changing as more faculty members live and continue to work into their 7th decade. Many faculty actually begin teaching later in their nursing careers; resulting in fewer years to work in academia. According to the AACN, the median age of full-time nurse faculty is 51.5 years, and the average age at retirement is 62.5 years (American Association of Colleges of Nursing, 2006, Factors Contributing to the Faculty Shortage, para. 2). It is critical that the nursing profession address the issue of shifting demographics of nurse educators, by recruiting and retaining younger faculty to replace those retiring at record pace (Berlin & Sechrist, 2002).

Efforts are increasing to both recruit and retain nursing faculty (Gazza & Shellenbarger, 2005; O'Brien-Pallas, Duffield & Alksnis, 2004). As a result, for the first time in history, the span of nursing faculty covers four distinct generations. As these efforts expand across generations, the concept of organizational commitment and what it means to each of these groups is important to consider. This can be instrumental in providing information to employers that can be translated into strategic efforts to increase commitment to the academic organization based on individual generational needs. It will not be enough to just recruit and retain the nursing faculty members, but we need to understand what fosters organizational commitment in these employees to ensure they are happy, productive and motivated to remain within the organization. Ultimately, this knowledge may affect both recruitment and retention strategies for nursing academic administrators. It is essential that nursing education administrators understand generational differences in nursing faculty to better meet their needs and understand what motivates them and how their sense of organizational commitment can be fostered.
Statement of the Problem

The NLN 2006, Faculty Census reported that there are 1,390 full-time unfilled nursing faculty positions nationwide (p. 2). This indicates a 32% increase in the nursing faculty vacancy rate since 2002. Research on nursing programs in the United States in 2004, indicated a 69.7% increase in the number of student applications to all types of nursing programs, with 125,037 qualified applicants being rejected (National League for Nursing, 2004, Highlights of Survey, para. 3). The same research profile released a year later, in 2005, indicated 147,465 qualified nursing school applicants were turned away (National League for Nursing, 2005, Highlights of Survey, para. 3). Students seeking admission to nursing programs have increased, while the nursing programs have not been able to keep up with the increased pace, due to lack of space in their programs and/or lack of nursing faculty (American Association of Colleges of Nursing, 2006, Factors Contributing to the Faculty Shortage). As indicated by the numbers above, the two shortages are inextricably linked.

The NLN Board of Governors released a position statement in 2006, and stressed that it is difficult to maintain qualified and experienced nursing faculty due to an increase in retirement and faculty leaving to higher-paying positions (NLN, p. 110). This problem is expected to worsen as retirements and resignations are projected. Some two-thirds of the current nursing faculty workforce is aged 45 – 60 years old and expected to leave their positions in the next twenty years (Kovner, Fairchild, & Jacobson, 2006, p. 4). More studies are being done to understand the problem of recruitment and retention of nursing faculty and what the best practices will be in human resource management for nursing education administrators. Simultaneous efforts to both recruit faculty members at a
younger age and also retain older faculty have resulted in four generations in the nursing faculty workforce. Despite this growing age spread among nursing faculty, no literature can be found that specifically explores them from a generational perspective.

Over the past 30-40 years, the concept of organizational commitment has been studied in the sociology and psychology fields. Organizational commitment is a multidimensional concept, which is supported by a theoretical framework based on social exchange theory (Blau, 1964). Organizational commitment research has demonstrated that several factors contribute to an employee being committed to his/her organization. Additionally, there are different forms of commitment, leading to a general definition of the employee possessing a "bond" to the organization. Several years of research has shown that organizational commitment leads to improved employee job satisfaction, productivity, longevity, and employee well-being; while also decreasing employee absenteeism and turnover (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002; Zangaro, 2001).

It is safe to assume that employers want the most productive and committed workforce as possible to cut down on both turnover and negative work behaviors that impact the organization. Employers need to understand that retention of employees just for the sake of retention does not assure the best workforce is available to do the job. It is important to understand which needs of the nursing faculty affect organizational commitment and how that may or may not differ by generation. An extensive review of the literature was conducted but failed to yield any information on organizational commitment and generational differences among nursing faculty.
There is a need to conduct further research to measure factors affecting organizational commitment of nursing faculty. Much research has been done in business management (Coyle-Shapiro & Morrow, 2006; Goulet & Frank, 2002) and education (Buck & Watson, 2002; Smeenk, Eisinga, Teelken & Doorewaard, 2006; Somech & Bogler, 2002) regarding organizational commitment and related factors. Some of these tools have been applied to the nursing shortage in clinical environments; however, the nursing faculty shortage has not been widely studied in relation to organizational commitment in the current nursing faculty workforce.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this descriptive study is to describe organizational commitment and generational differences in nursing faculty. The four different generations currently in the workforce have been described in the literature and nursing research has been done in regard to management of the various cohorts in the work environment (Anthony, 2006; Gerke, 2001; Sherman, 2006; Ulrich, 2001; Weston, 2001, 2006). However, no literature could be found on generational differences in nursing faculty and how this may impact organizational commitment in an academic environment. Additionally, this study will provide new knowledge on the employee-organization relationship in the context of generational differences and with regard to work values, perceived organizational support, perceived person-organization fit, developmental experiences, and global job satisfaction among nursing faculty.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Generational Theories

A few theories have been advanced to help us understand people from a generational perspective. The concept of generations has been addressed by various theorists over the ages. The most clear, early definition was offered by Karl Mannheim, a German sociologist, in his essay, “The Problem of Generations” (Mannheim, 1952). Mannheim equated generational cohorts to socio-economic "classes" found in society while noting some specific distinctions. People are usually born into class status and develop a particular view of the world based on the lens through which they experience life, just as people are born into a generation, which also colors their perspectives on their lived experiences. However, it is possible to move from one class status to another, voluntarily or not, thus providing the individual with a different perspective based on life experiences. Unlike class status, the generation one is born into is unalterable. In order to comprehend the perspective of people born in another generation, one must attempt to view it from the outside; knowing that true and total understanding is impossible. Ultimately, placement in a given generation should be considered a “particular type of social location” (Mannheim, p. 291). Researchers have noted that not all members of
each generation will be exactly the same. There are certain qualities inherent in the majority of the group that develop based on their collective life experiences.

Further discussion of the concept of generation is central to understanding the uniqueness of each group. Two main definitions come to mind when referring to a generation of people, and it is important to distinguish between a familial generation and a cohort generation. In terms of a familial generation one can examine the genealogy of a family and know that each group is separated by parent-child linkages. It is then easy to determine first, second, and third generations within a family group. The people born into a single generation of a family may be separated by several years and therefore have little in common with one another compared to those born into the same birth-year cohort. When referring to cohort generations, one must think in terms of people born at the same point in time regardless of family ties. The generation then becomes a generation of peers who share similar life experiences due to the timing of their birth. Eyerman and Turner (1998) suggest that a generational cohort survives “by maintaining a collective memory of its origins, its historic struggles, its primary historical and political events, and its leading characters and ideologists” (p. 97).

Strauss and Howe (1991) propose a modern generational theory based on the writings of Auguste Comte, John Stuart Mill, Emile Littré, Giuseppe Ferrari, Wilhelm Dilthey, François Mentré, José Ortega y Gasset and Karl Mannheim. Strauss and Howe compare the relationship of cohort generations in societies to the familial generations of families (p. 437); defining generation as “a cohort-group whose length approximates the span of a phase of life and whose boundaries are fixed by peer personality” (p. 60). To study a society, an understanding of the generational cohorts of that society is crucial.
Edmunds and Turner (2005) suggest a new research agenda that focuses on global generations instead of being bound by national borderlines. They propose that media and communications technology will create the formation of global generations in the coming years.

Various authors have used different terminology to label the generations over the years. Adding to the confusion over the four cohorts is disagreement over the boundaries of each generation. A generational cohort is bounded by time, usually about 22 years (the time it takes for one group of children to reach adulthood). Four generations make up the modern workforce: the Veterans, Baby Boomers, Generation X, and the Millennial Generation. Each of these generational cohorts has unique qualities to describe their values and what motivates them in the workforce.

The concept of generational differences has been discussed in the multidisciplinary literature with increasing frequency over the past several years (Borges, Manuel, Elam & Jones, 2006; Howell, Servis & Bonham, 2005; Johnston, 2006). Most of the descriptive articles include the basic definitions of the generational cohorts. The literature paints various, but generally consistent pictures of each generational cohort and the values and needs that dominate each group. The generational differences have been described in terms of medical students and their responses to developing professionalism (Johnston, 2006); personality differences (Borges, Manuel, Elam & Jones, 2006); and work values and expectations (Howell, Servis & Bonham, 2005). The 2004 Presidential Address for the Central Association of Obstetricians and Gynecologists described the various qualities of the different generations and urged awareness and tolerance of the differences to promote recruitment and retention of future medical students into OB/GYN
specialty practice (Berenson, 2005). Bickel and Brown (2005) relate the importance of awareness of differences in Boomers and Generation X when attempting to recruit new faculty for academic medicine and suggest strategies to deal with intergenerational differences. Laudicina (2001) describes differences in the generations working together in the clinical laboratory setting and how the mentoring relationship can be enhanced by awareness of generational differences. Another perspective on generational differences is presented in the context of social-change organizations. Kunreuther (2003) interviewed workers in these social-change organizations from different generations and found many similarities, but primarily three differences. These differences were: (1) entry to the work was driven by different motivating factors for Baby Boomers and Generation X; (2) younger workers were just as likely to work long hours, but expressed more conflict regarding work and family life responsibilities; (3) younger directors were more likely to try new approaches to management of the organizations.

Generational Literature in Nursing

Several studies have been done on generational issues in nursing and provide an extensive array of articles and books regarding the different generations in the workforce today. Generational diversity has been approached from the perspective of managers leading a diverse workforce consisting of four generational cohorts (Kupperschmidt, 2000; Parsons, 2002; Pelletier, 2005; Sherman, 2006; Wieck, 2005). Recruitment and retention of these generational cohorts has also been addressed, citing research into what individual motivators each generation prefers (Cordeniz, 2002; Hart, 2006). Apostolidis and Polifroni (2006) examined nursing work satisfaction and generational differences in 98 nurses from the Baby Boomer and Generation X cohorts. Additionally, there has been
a great deal of research devoted to the inevitable conflict and communication challenges that arise with four generations working side by side for the first time in history (Kupperschmidt, 2006; Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Swearingen & Liberman, 2004; Weston, 2006). However, the majority of the literature available is descriptive in nature; providing information about the different generations and how their presence will impact the workforce, while attempting to foster understanding and improve communication between the generations (Altimier, 2006; Anthony, 2006; Deluane, 2002; Dorman, 2005; Martin & Tulgan 2002; Stuenkel, Cohen & de la Cuesta, 2005).

The nursing education literature has even addressed generational differences in students and faculty. Some studies have reported that learning styles and teaching approaches are different for students from the four generations (Billings, Skiba & Connors, 2005; Henry, 2006; Johnson & Romanello, 2005; Skiba, 2005). Other studies are also beginning to acknowledge that there are generational differences in the newest faculty members, the Millennials (Kelly, 2007). The suggestion has been made that nurse educators should be aware of these generational differences and consider implementing different retention strategies based on generational cohorts in an effort to decrease the impact of retirements (O'Brien-Pallas, Duffield & Alksnis, 2004). Additional generational considerations should be considered when trying to recruit new nursing students (Wieck, 2003). Further research is needed into strategies specific to the generational needs of these groups to determine which methods are most effective.

The following sections describe each of the four generations providing a context for understanding the members of each generational cohort.
The Veteran Generation

The Veteran generation, sometimes referred to as the Silent Generation, was born between 1925 and 1942. In their lifetime the world underwent dramatic events and the resulting consequences impacted the lives of those in this generation. The Great Depression and World War II called on people of all ages to make various sacrifices, some through rationing of goods and services for those at home, and some experienced the ultimate sacrifice through their family members and friends who fought and died in service to their country. This generation was too young to serve in World War II, but was influenced by the adults who served in that war and by the Great Depression. The people of this generation grew up instilled with strong values of sacrifice for the greater good, loyalty and hard work. In turn, this impacted the way these people viewed the world of work (Martin & Tulgan, 2002; Strauss & Howe, 1991).

The Baby Boomer Generation

The Baby Boomer generation born between 1943 and 1960 included the largest number of births, 80 million, ever seen in our history. By sheer numbers, this generation has influenced all aspects of society. At each step of their development, society has had to shift resources and priorities to address the needs of this extremely large group of people. The Baby Boomers were raised in an era of post-war prosperity and their parents were able to ensure that those children would have a better life than any generation before them. Events like the assassination of President Kennedy and Martin Luther King had a great impact on the Baby Boomers, as did other events such as man landing on the moon, and the Vietnam War (Martin & Tulgan, 2002; Strauss & Howe, 1991).
Currently, there is much discussion about the Baby Boomers beginning turning 60 and looking forward to retirement. This is wonderful for them because they have put in their time and worked hard all these years to deserve a good retirement, they have taken care of themselves better than any previous generation, and they can look forward to the longest life expectancy of any previous generation (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Stumbo, 2007). However, the downside of this is that America’s healthcare system and retirement systems are not going to be able to deal with the burden. A big part of the dismal predictions regarding the healthcare system shortage of nurses is due to the fact that the Baby Boomers are reaching the age where they will be accessing healthcare more frequently and there are not enough nurses to address this increase in need.

People in the Baby Boomer generation are generally described as having a strong work ethic and being process-oriented. They are patient and are willing to “pay their dues” in the workplace before expecting recognition or rewards. Sometimes accused of being materialistic and self-centered, they have been known for putting their work first, sometimes at the expense of family and a personal life (Martin & Tulgan, 2002, 2006).

The Baby Boomers in positions of management need to begin planning for their retirement in the years to come and should begin succession planning to ensure a smooth transition for the next generation of leaders. “Generation X may find it difficult to advance on the job as Boomers, working well into their sixties, clog the ranks of upper management” (Generation X, 2006, p. 177). Generation X has always lived in the shadow of the Baby Boomer generation and now they are eager to step into those positions of management. Baby Boomer managers need to begin grooming prospective future leaders to transition into those positions.
Generation X

The generation that follows the Baby Boomers has been labeled Generation X. This cohort-group was born from 1961 to 1981 and consists of the smallest generational cohort at only 49 million. They account for only 17 percent of the United States population. Surrounded by the two largest generations, 80 million Boomers and 75 million Millennials, Generation X is expected to account for only 15 percent of the population in 2020 (Generation X, 2006, p. 218). Although Generation Xers are highly educated, they are also “the first generation in America to be likely to have a standard of living below that of their parents” (Ansoorian, Good & Samuelson, 2003, p. 35).

One of the major differences between Generation X and the Baby Boomer generation is how they value work. This is important for nursing managers to understand because their personal values may be in conflict with younger workers and lead to misunderstandings. “Baby Boomers often ‘live to work’, and define their identity by their occupation and level of success”, whereas, “Generation X ‘works to live’, and seek to balance their roles as employees, spouses and parents” (Ansoorian, et al. p. 35; Kunreuther, 2003).

This distinction was noticed throughout the literature as a source of clashing values, with older workers perceiving that younger workers are lacking work ethics, loyalty, and commitment (Apostolidis & Polifroni, 2006; Kupperschmidt, 2001). Nurse managers must recognize these as differences in priorities for the younger generation, not view them as character flaws. Generation X should not be expected to change their values; rather other generational groups should try to view their values in a positive light. (Kupperschmidt, 1998)
The shift in priorities is a result of life experiences for Generation X that resulted in them being the most under protected generation of children; expected to be self-reliant from an early age and pragmatic in their thinking about the world. The basic employment contract underwent a dramatic change during the coming of age for Generation X, as they saw downsizing, widespread lay-offs and corporate scandals. No longer were employers honoring the ‘unwritten contract’ of previous generations: work hard, be loyal, and work your way up the ladder and you will be rewarded financially and have job security. The new contract for Generation X is for the employer to encourage and provide for the development of transferable skills, listen to their needs, provide competent managers who give specific direction without micromanaging, a flexible work environment, and provide a fair wage. Members of Generation X, more so than Baby Boomers, are less likely to stay in a job that doesn’t ‘fit’ with their needs, or shows no potential for growth (Shelton & Shelton, 2005; Twenge, 2006).

The Millennial Generation

The Millennial Generation is the group born from 1982 to the present time. The youngest Millennials should have been born around 2000-2003, however at this time there is no descriptive data on what the next generation holds after the Millennials. “Much as American Millennials share a national location in history, kids around the world today share a global one, based on both cultural and family trends as well as changes in geopolitics and technology” (Howe & Strauss 2000, p. 288). Howe and Strauss explain that certain countries in the rest of the world are in sync with the generational patterns of the United States, but others are behind by about five years. They further explain that this is because the socio-economic impact of World War II affected each country differently.
Therefore, globally there are ‘post-war’ Baby Boomers, but their birth-year boundaries are different depending on which country you examine.

Expected to be the next great generation, reminiscent of the G.I. Generation that fought in World War II, the Millennial Generation offers hope for the future. These young people are just beginning to enter the workforce and are more technologically savvy than any other generation before them. They are civic-minded and grew up in a more ‘child-friendly’ society than previous generations. These “children were raised in a period of prosperity, pluralism, interactive media, increased federal spending on children, and societal focus on family values and child safety devices” (Kupperschmidt 2001, p. 570).

Unlike Generation X (which had to adapt to computer technology) this generation has always had computers around, in the classroom, and at home; technology is an expected part of life for them. Millennial Generation “employees will not tolerate coworkers and managers who refuse to master and effectively use cutting edge technology” (Kupperschmidt 2001, p. 572). Downing (2006) identifies the historical events that shaped the Millennial Generation: the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks and war on terror, Persian Gulf wars, natural disasters around the globe, and widespread use of technology, including the Internet and cell phones. “Leaders need to understand that different motivators are at work in terms of a Millennial’s commitment to work” (p. 6). Millennials want their work to be meaningful and contribute to a greater purpose, and prefer to work in teams. Like their Generation X elders, the Millennials want flexible working arrangements and to achieve a work-life balance.

Millennials are accustomed to working in teams and having more supervision and structure than Generation X workers. When dealing with Millennials, managers should
know that they will expect more extensive orientation time than the more independent, “just tell me the bottom line” Generation X employee (Clausing, Kurtz, Prendeville & Walt, 2003). Altimier (2006) lists five things that Millennials have identified as important qualities in employers: “a fun environment, opportunities for growth, variety of work projects, chances to learn new skills and flexible work schedules” (p. 8). Overall, this new generation of workers has a lot to offer the healthcare environment. They will embrace a rapidly changing workplace and technological advancements. However, if not challenged and supported by the work environment, they will not be afraid to move to another place of employment. So far, the Millennial Generation appears to be a good fit for the nursing profession, team players who want to make a difference in the world, and are techno-literate.

The next two sections describe the literature on the nursing shortage and the nursing faculty shortage. Shortages in nursing seem to be cyclical in nature and the literature abounds with information regarding the global nursing shortage from every possible angle. The nursing faculty shortage has only started to receive the attention it deserves in the last few years. The discussion of the overall nursing shortage will provide a context for understanding factors related to those entering and deciding to leave work settings.

Nursing Shortage

All projected nursing workforce estimates point to a severe, global nursing shortage. Causes of this shortage are complex, such as: decreased interest in young people entering the profession due to more lucrative opportunities in other areas; nurse job dissatisfaction; changes in the healthcare system; aging workforce; and poor working
conditions. Recent nursing literature has examined the critical nursing shortage from various perspectives and proposed a number of suggestions to increase the ranks of nurses. Work environment has been examined in relationship to job satisfaction and retention naming leadership and management qualities, participation in decision-making for nurses, staffing and resources, and interpersonal relationships as major areas for improvement (Acree, 2006; Flynn, 2005; Gordon, 2005; Jasper, 2007; VanOyen Force, 2005). Retention of older more experienced nurses by modifying their work environments to decrease physical strain, providing flexible work schedules and part-time opportunities, and encouraging delayed retirements (Cohen, 2006; Curran, 2006; O'Brien-Pallas, Duffield, & Alksnis, 2004). Retention of nurses has been studied in the context of turnover concepts: intent to remain employed (Tourangeau & Cranley, 2006); intent to leave (Larrabee, Janney, Ostrow, Withrow, Hobbs, & Burant, 2003; McCarthy, Tyrrell, & Lehane, 2007); job embeddedness (Holtom & O'Neill, 2004); educational level (Rambur, McIntosh, Val Palumbo, & Reinier, 2005) and age, developmental and job stages (McNeese-Smith, 2000; McNeese-Smith & van Servellen, 2000). Recent studies have investigated organizational and professional commitment in nurses to attempt to understand the antecedents and consequences of commitment in nurses and propose changes in administrative policies, orientation programs, and continuing education for nurses to improve staff's employment experience (Gould & Fontenla, 2006; Stinglhamber, Bentein, & Vandenberghhe, 2002).

The problem of the nursing faculty shortage is a component of the nursing shortage that has been overlooked in the efforts to increase the nursing workforce. By increasing enrollments in nursing programs across the country, the problem has evolved
into a shortage of nursing faculty (Stuenkel, et al., 2005). Just as a continuous feedback loop; this problem feeds on itself. The shortage of faculty means having no one available to teach the nursing students, which means not enough nurses to care for patients or continue on with their education to become nursing faculty. It is important to understand the significance of the nursing shortage in order to place the nursing faculty shortage in perspective.

Related Studies on Nursing Faculty

Reasons for the nursing faculty shortage have been proposed by several authors over the last few years with suggestions on how to increase faculty through recruiting new faculty members and retaining the seasoned veterans of nursing education. Several studies have focused on job satisfaction in nurse educators (Disch, Edwardson & Adwan, 2004; Gormley, 2003; Moody, 1996; Sarmiento, Laschinger & Iwasiw, 2004; Snarr & Krochalk, 1996). These studies demonstrate that low levels of job satisfaction occur when nurses perceive that their employers do not care about them, which leads to low levels of organizational commitment. While the importance of job satisfaction should not be underestimated, it is considered an antecedent to organizational commitment, which in turn is a better predictor of positive behavioral outcomes in employees.

Other studies stress mentoring as a strategy to increase recruitment/retention. Horton (2003) stressed the importance of providing mentoring while recruiting and retaining junior faculty members, explaining the mentoring role and potential conflicts that may occur. Hessler and Ritchie (2006) offer ideas for recruiting and retaining potential faculty from Generation X, explaining how their motivations and expectations differ from previous generations. Finally, the NLN/Carnegie National Survey (2007).
indicated that one of the primary reasons for the nurse educator shortage is compensation. The survey determined that faculty salaries are unable to compete with salaries for graduate prepared nurses in clinical settings. Additionally, and perhaps even more shocking, is that nursing faculty salaries are at 76% of United States faculty salaries with nurse educator salaries drastically lower than educators in other academic disciplines (Kaufman, 2007).

Organizational Commitment Theory

Organizational commitment theory is based on Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964; Emerson, 1976) and the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960). Reciprocity is a social norm or value that "(1) people should help those who have helped them, and (2) people should not injure those who have helped them" (p. 171). This is applied to the employee-organizational relationship in the exchange of resources, symbolic or tangible, between employee and employer. Each party gets something out of the relationship or the relationship will cease to exist. Various theorists have labeled the resources exchanged in these relationships in discipline specific ways. For this discussion of organizational commitment the resources will be referred to as symbolic and tangible (Foa & Foa, 1980). Although this exchange of resources can be considered a universal concept, the context of the relationship or degrees of expectation may vary by person within that reciprocal relationship and may vary across cultural, or even, generational lines (Coyle-Shapiro & Shore, 2007; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005).

Commitment has been defined in several ways and from various perspectives over the years. Commitment can be thought of as a promise to continue in an activity despite difficulty or adversity. The promise may be verbal or non-verbal or perhaps even an
unconscious negotiation between the self and another. Commitment can be to a person, group or team of people, an organization, goal or idea. Often commitment is aligned with something that is valued by the individual person.

Organizational commitment is a complex concept that has been studied in the sociology literature for the last several decades. Early studies focused on commitment of the individual to the organization, while more recent studies are beginning to focus on leader-member exchange and multiple commitment theory (Cohen, 2003, Redman & Snape, 2005; Wayne, Shore & Liden, 1997). Research has also been reported in business and management literature regarding employee commitment to the organization (Benkhoff, 1997; Coyle-Shapiro & Morrow, 2006; Goulet & Frank, 2002). Tools have been developed to measure organizational commitment and have been used extensively and correlated to many other factors, such as perceived organizational support and job satisfaction (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982). The two tools that are most often used to determine organizational commitment are the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (1982), developed by Mowday, Porter and Steers, and the Three-Component Model Employee Commitment Survey (1997) developed by Meyer and Allen.

Mowday, et al. determined that organizational commitment is a better predictor of turnover and group level performance than job satisfaction (Mowday, Porter and Steers, 1982). The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) has been used to measure organizational commitment in several studies. A meta-analysis of organizational commitment conducted by Mathieu and Zajac (1990) found that 103 of the 174 studies reviewed used the OCQ. The meta-analysis separated the studies into the classifications of
antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. There were high correlations between organizational commitment and the antecedents and correlates summarized, but lower correlations for the consequences in the studies. The authors suggested that consequences of organizational commitment are highly influenced by mediating and moderating factors (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). However, some authors have suggested that the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire is too simplistic to capture the multi-dimensionality of organizational commitment (Benkhoff, 1997; Koslowsky, Caspy & Lazar, 1990).

Meyer and Allen (1997) took several models and definitions of commitment, combined them and determined the underlying themes which led them to construct their Three Component Model of Commitment. Meyer and Allen defined commitment as a "psychological state linking an employee to an organization" (1997). They identified three different components of commitment which contribute to overall organizational commitment: affective, normative and continuance commitments. Organizational commitment is a multidimensional construct that has been examined and studied to determine its antecedents, process, types of commitment and consequences. Characteristics of the work environment, management practices, socialization experiences, personal characteristics and organizational characteristics impact on work experiences, role states and psychological contracts. These, in turn, develop into the three components of commitment outlined by Meyer and Allen. The consequences of all these factors are retention, productive behavior and employee well-being.

More recent literature has taken this theory a step further to propose that there are multiple commitments in the workplace (Cohen, 2003; Redman & Snape, 2005).
Employees may be committed to other individuals, supervisors, work teams, upper level managers and the overall organization. Potentially, each type of commitment could be measured in relationship to the various targets of commitment. Meyer and Allen suggest that research into general commitment to the organization does not necessitate measurement of each commitment to each target. They caution that the multiple commitments in the workplace may impact overall organizational commitment scores. The purpose of understanding organizational commitment is to predict behavioral outcomes associated with various commitment scores. To understand how to improve commitment one must acknowledge the multiple factors that influence commitment in positive or negative ways.

The following section defines the three components of the Meyer and Allen Commitment model. Affective commitment pertains to the employees who are there because they want to be, so one would expect them to be present at work and motivated to perform their best. This would lead to decreased turnover, absenteeism and increased productivity. The majority of the literature has explored affective commitment more closely than the normative and continuance components described by Meyer and Allen. Normative commitment refers to the group of employees who feel like they should stay with the organization out of a sense of obligation. Antecedents to normative commitment may involve pre-employment socialization of the primary family and social relationships of the employee, but can also be influenced by the socialization process that occurs at entry to the organization and during employment. Continuance commitment describes the employees who are committed because they believe the costs associated with leaving are too high, so they stay. Antecedents to continuance commitment were described in two
general categories: investments and alternatives (Meyer & Allen, 1997). "Investments" refer to what the employee believes they have invested in the job (time, effort, money) and do not want to lose if they were to leave. "Alternatives" refers to the employee perception of what is, or is not, available to them in terms of alternative employment opportunities. Both of these categories require the employee to be cognizant of the factors before they are considered antecedents of continuance commitment. However, behavioral outcomes at work will differ in highly continuance committed employees because they may feel trapped in the job and only produce the minimum necessary to keep the job. Continuance commitment has few positive relations with performance indicators. Several positive consequences of organizational commitment have been identified, such as retention of valued employees, productive behaviors from employees and feelings of well-being for the employee.

As it has already been stated, commitment is a very complex, multi-dimensional concept. Several factors contribute to organizational commitment. Some factors are unchangeable such as personal characteristics of the employee or organization. Examples for the employee are: age, personal values, and demographic variables. Factors that are not easily changed in the organization are: size of organization and nature of the work. Some factors can be adjusted to improve organizational commitment such as socialization experiences, management practices, and environmental conditions.

Another antecedent to organizational commitment is the actual work experiences of the employee. These experiences may lead to positive or negative expectations of the employee/employer relationship. In every organization people are in roles and create psychological contracts (Rousseau, 1989) which will also act as antecedents to
organizational commitment. For example, an organization may offer release time for conducting research as a recruitment tool when hiring new faculty, creating an increased sense of commitment in the new employee. In this sense, the perceptions and the expectations of the employee are difficult to change once established in an organization. Mir, Mir & Mosca (2002) propose that the relationship between employees and organizations is changing which has created a new employee “contract” due to downsizing, and restructuring of organizations. The authors present propositions about organizational commitment with this “new age employee” and suggest strategies for human resource management in this new work environment.

Organizational Commitment Studies

Hartmann and Bambacas (2000) used the Meyer and Allen (1990) three part commitment scale in a study of part-time female academic staff workers in Australia. They hypothesized that the three components of organizational commitment would measure low in casual “part-time” workers. The results indicated that the Meyer and Allen scale was measuring multidimensional concepts of commitment to the organization, and they found a positive correlation between the casual workers and low levels of affective commitment. Lower levels of normative commitment indicated that changing jobs is more acceptable than it was in past years. Further, they state that “different work circumstances might involve different types of commitment” (p. 102). For example, a part-time worker may be working part-time to spend more time with small children and feels grateful and supported by the employer and therefore is more committed to the job. Whereas, another part-time worker may be in the job to supplement another full-time job, and their primary commitment is to the full-time job. Part-time workers and full-time workers may have
different commitment scores based on their individual situations. This would also explain the inconsistent findings of organizational commitment across age groups, job classifications, and tenure when studied from the perspective of different types of work.

McGuinness (1999) studied the effect of generation group identification on organizational commitment in Baby Boomers and Generation X employees working in child care agencies in New York and Connecticut. The study used the Meyer and Allen Organizational Commitment Scale and determined that there was no significant difference in organizational commitment between the two groups. Limitations of this study were the small sample size (n=150) of non-profit sector child care agencies and that the overall scores of all types of commitment were low in the child care workers. The suggestion was made to include Millennials in future studies in organizational commitment and generational differences.

Studies of Factors Related to Organizational Commitment

Numerous studies have been conducted to determine what factors could be considered antecedents or consequences of organizational commitment (Meyer, Irving & Allen, 1998; McNeese-Smith & Crook, 2003; Smola & Sutton, 2002). An antecedent is something that is present prior to the development of organizational commitment, such as age, tenure, work values, job satisfaction, perceived organizational support, or person-job fit (Meyer & Allen, 1997). A consequence of organizational commitment is the outcome of an employee achieving organizational commitment. These outcomes are often behavioral responses, such as increased productivity, decreased absenteeism, and decreased turnover, but can also be symbolic, such as increased loyalty to the organization (Meyer & Allen,
1997). The next section describes several studies that were conducted using organizational commitment in relationship to these antecedent and consequence related factors.

Meyer, Irving and Allen (1998) conducted a study to address the previous findings that situational characteristics (i.e. job characteristics, roles) had more impact on organizational commitment than personal characteristics (i.e. demographics, personality). Meyer, et al. proposed that different forms of commitment will have different types of antecedents, again supporting the theory that multiple types of commitment can be demonstrated in workers. An example of this would be the layers of commitment an employee may feel toward co-workers, supervisors, upper management, and the organization as a whole. This may, in part, explain what, if any, differences exist across generations both in terms of antecedents and overall commitment to the organization. The theoretical framework for this study used organizational commitment theory and the combined influence of work values and work experiences to predict organizational commitment in 257 recent university graduates. The Work Values Inventory originally developed by Mandhardt (1972) was modified and subdivided into three subscales to measure the following components of work values: comfort and security, competence and growth, and status and independence. The participants completed the Work Values Inventory at the beginning of the study and then completed work experience measures at 1 month and 6 months. Subsequently, the participants were given the TCM commitment scale at 6 months and 12 months. They found competence related work experiences were rated of higher importance than the comfort related work experiences. The results indicated that those workers who had positive early work experiences had stronger affective commitment scores. The degree of impact of early work experiences on the three
components of work values was dependent upon the value the worker placed on the experience. Meyer, et al. concluded that work values and experiences operate together to influence the employee commitment to the organization, and that this relationship is more complex than previously assumed (p. 50). Further studies of organizational commitment, work values, work experiences and person-job fit interactions were suggested.

A related study of nursing work values and job stages examined whether work values differed by age, generation or job stages, and how that contributed to job satisfaction and organizational commitment in nurses (McNeese-Smith & Crook, 2003). The authors suggested that work values of different generations contribute to different levels of commitment. McNeese-Smith and Crook sampled 412 registered nurses using measures of work values, job stage, job satisfaction, productivity, and organizational commitment. The comparison of work values by generation indicated significant differences between the three generations included in the study (Silent Generation, Baby Boomers, and Generation X).

Another study examined the generational cohorts of Baby Boomers, Generation X and Millennials using the Protestant Work Ethic measure of work values to compare results to a study done in 1974 (Smola & Sutton, 2002). The results indicated a significant difference between Generation X and Baby Boomer work values and that values have changed with cohorts over time suggesting the psychological contract of work has changed. The authors called for further research to support their findings that differences in work values do exist between the generations. Future longitudinal studies could be used to determine if work values change within the same individuals over time and nationwide research would determine if there are regional differences in work values across the nation.
Verplanken (2004) described values in the context of personal, social and professional domains when examining value congruence and job satisfaction in nurses. Results of the study indicated that value congruence between the employee and the work environment led to increased job satisfaction and that attention should be paid to how much the employee's expectations match up with the work environment they are experiencing. This study touches on the concept of person-organization fit as a component in the complex concept of organizational commitment. A meta-analysis was done on person-organization fit and behavioral outcomes and determined that measures of perceived person-organization fit were moderately related to behavioral outcomes (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006). Results also indicated that person-organization fit is an important predictor of employee turnover, and can be useful, when measured objectively, in pre-employment screenings. Person-organization fit is considered an antecedent to organizational commitment, in the sense that if a person feels they "fit" with the organization, then they are more likely to align themselves with the goals and values of the organization and therefore be more affectively committed.

In examination of the employee-organization relationship it is important to remember this is an exchange relationship and the exchange of resources goes both ways. The employee receives tangible resources (pay, benefits) from the employer in exchange for tangible resources (work productivity) provided to the employer. Additionally, the employee receives symbolic resources (status, positive affective feelings) from the employer in exchange for symbolic resources (loyalty, effort) provided to the employer. It is therefore important for the employer to understand which employee perceptions motivate his or her behavior. Perceived organizational support (POS) is another variable
that can provide insight into the perceptions of the employee and gauge the condition of
the employee-organization relationship. The relationship cannot be viewed simply as
organization to employee exchanges, but also must be viewed as employee to
organization exchanges.

Perceived organizational support is often studied in tandem with organizational
commitment (Currie & Dollery, 2006; Makanjee, Hartzer & Uys, 2006; Rhoades,
Eisenberger & Armeli, 2001) and has been found to be highly correlated as an
antecedent, and as a consequence to organizational commitment. However, in the current
study it will be considered as an antecedent. Laschinger, Purdy, Cho and Almost (2006)
tested the validity of the theory of perceived organizational support offered by Rhoades
and Eisenberger (2002) using the tool developed by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison
& Sowa (1986). The authors examined the antecedents and consequences of perceived
organizational support in nurse managers. The findings of their study indicated that job
satisfaction and organizational commitment are strongly correlated to perceived
organizational support, with POS/commitment being the stronger of the two. They also
found that POS can be a mediator between the organizational conditions and negative
health outcomes related to burnout and stress. The authors suggested that POS is
interpreted to be the organization’s commitment to the employee, which results in the
employee developing a deeper bond with the organization and desire to reciprocate. In
turn, this leads to greater organizational commitment for the employee and the resultant
positive behavioral outcomes.

Another study of nurse managers examined the effect of empowerment and
perceived organizational support on satisfaction with work roles (Patrick & Laschinger,
The sample included 84 nurse managers and found that perceived organizational support was strongly related to role satisfaction. The authors reported the study was conducted during the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) outbreak in Ontario. They identified the timing of the study and the cross-sectional design as potential limitations.

Organizational commitment is often studied in terms of its relationship with other variables of interest to employers. Employers are interested in the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment in order to improve the behavioral outcomes of their employees resulting in improved productivity and efficiency in the workplace. Studies have been conducted on various segments of workers in regard to work values, perceived organizational support, person-job fit, age, job stages, job satisfaction and work roles as reviewed above. The next section will discuss organizational commitment in nurses.

Organizational Commitment in Nurses

Several studies have been conducted in the nursing literature to understand organizational commitment in nurses (Ingersoll, Olsan, Drew-Cates, DeVinney & Davies, 2002; McNeese-Smith & Crook, 2003; Nogueras, 2006). Ferreira (2007) examined organizational commitment in nurses and found that gender was a statistically significant indicator of organizational commitment, with commitment to the organization being higher in females than males. In their discussion they point out that gender is built by society not only by biological design. This could be considered similar to a form of location in society; much like generational placement. Most of this research has been a quest to discover what
keeps nurses satisfied in their jobs to improve retention of employees and defend against the perils of the nursing shortage.

In a study of 171 nurse educators and registered nurses in Ontario, Canada, Knoop (2001) studied the relationship between job involvement, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Using Mowday, Steers and Porter's (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, Knoop found that there was a high degree of relationship between satisfaction and commitment, a negligible relationship between satisfaction and involvement, and a moderate relationship between involvement and commitment. Knoop concluded that nurses may "be committed to their organization because they chose nursing as a profession; the particular hospital they are employed in may not mean as much as the profession itself" (p. 648).

Gould and Fontenla (2006) conducted a qualitative study of 27 nurses to determine what impact did nurses' job satisfaction, continuing professional education, and having an innovative or traditional post have on professional and organizational commitment. They pointed out the significance of organizational commitment to building a stable workforce in relationship to the global nursing shortage. The findings suggested that nurses who hold more innovative or novel positions in the organization demonstrated higher levels of satisfaction and organizational commitment than nurses in more traditional roles. Additionally, those holding these innovative positions had more flexibility in work scheduling, more autonomy, and "family-friendly" policies. The study supports the literature distinguishing between professional commitment and organizational commitment and may suggest a more customized approach to benefits offered by organizations.
Lynn and Redman (2005) also studied organizational commitment in nurses with the purpose of determining if "organizational commitment, work satisfaction, and professional satisfaction predict intent to leave the current position or nursing as a career" (p. 267). Using the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire to measure "loyalty to the organization, willingness to achieve organizational goals, and acceptance of the organization’s values", they found that "organizational commitment was predictive of intention to leave the current position but not of intention to leave nursing" (pp. 266, 268). They reported that the typical respondent from their 787 subject sample was a 44-year-old, European-American, Bachelor’s prepared staff nurse. Further study of the sample could determine if generational differences existed in organizational commitment based on birth-year cohort. The age range captured in this study was from 21-57 years old, with 1 month to 42 years in their current position. Unfortunately, the study did not publish a breakdown percentage by age group for further analysis of the data.

Organizational Commitment in Faculty

Although organizational commitment has not been studied in nursing faculty there are a few studies that were conducted on faculty members in other disciplines. Job satisfaction is often studied in correlation to organizational commitment although the two concepts are distinct. Tarter’s (1993) dissertation research hypothesized that job satisfaction is determined by job characteristics and less by personal characteristics as in organizational commitment in university faculty. The outcome of the study found support for the job satisfaction research, but did little to contribute to organizational research. The author suggested that job satisfaction should be included as a dependent variable in future organizational research.
Flynn (2000) studied a national sample of pharmacy faculty (n=262) using the Meyer and Allen TCM commitment scale in relation to tenure, performance and turnover intention. Findings suggested the concept of normative commitment may vary with populations of employees, and suggested that further research should be done on faculty commitment.

Another study regarding faculty commitment examined it in terms of commitment to the university (Fjortoft, 1993). The effects of faculty rank, satisfaction with salary, working conditions, institutional participation and perceived governance were studied in 4,925 faculty members. The author found that rank was related to increased organizational commitment with full professors demonstrating the highest levels of organizational commitment, and that increased levels of perceived participation led to increased organizational commitment scores. The suggestion was made that further development and testing of models for faculty organizational commitment should be conducted, instead of relying on tools that have been developed and tested in the business sector.

Finally, organizational commitment was studied in a sample of chiropractic faculty (n=609) in relation to demographics and workplace variables (Marchiori & Henkin, 2004). This study found no additional predictors of organizational commitment other than those already reported in the literature. However, they did find that gender was correlated; with women demonstrating higher levels of normative commitment than the men, whereas continuance commitment was correlated with age and tenure. Suggestions were made for further research in other health professions.

It is imperative that health care organizations and the nurse managers of those organizations understand what makes their work environment desirable to the nurse
seeking employment. Not all potential employees are interested in the same things that an employer may have to offer, and it is important that nursing administrators become aware of what those employees are seeking in an organization. By understanding the needs of the current workforce, the employers can improve organizational commitment and improve recruitment and retention of their nursing workforce. Employers need to reexamine the benefits packages available to their workers and think creatively about ways to make the benefits more desirable to these workers. There is a need for further research into the factors that contribute to organizational commitment of the different generational cohorts.

In summary of this extensive review of the literature, there are several theories surrounding aspects of the employee-organization relationship, one such theory describes organizational commitment and the related social exchange theoretical concepts. There are several studies regarding organizational commitment, but none have been done on nursing faculty from the generational perspective. Additionally, there are existing generational theories with limited studies on the unique characteristics of each cohort. Researchers have studied the nursing shortage and faculty shortage in an attempt to understand what factors contribute to nurses choosing to stay in their jobs or leave. When examining organizational commitment it is also important to look at perceived organizational support. The two constructs are closely related, and provide different perspectives of the employee-organization relationship. This study will combine aspects of these various theories in an attempt to describe organizational commitment and generational differences in nursing faculty.
CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK GUIDING THE STUDY

This study will attempt to better understand the employee-organization relationship within a theoretical framework based on social exchange theory, organizational commitment theory and generational theory. Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) describes the exchange of tangible or symbolic (Foa & Foa, 1980) resources between two parties in the form of transactions. Tangible resources are economic in nature, such as pay or benefits in exchange for work. Symbolic resources are more socio-emotional in nature, such as esteem derived from working for a successful company, or loyalty to the employer. For this study, the majority of the tools will measure the symbolic exchanges and two of the tools (developmental experiences, and work values inventory) will primarily measure the tangible exchanges between the employee and the organization. Either way, the flow of resources must go back and forth or the relationship will cease to exist. The norm of reciprocity, (Gouldner, 1960) another part of the social exchange framework, pertains to the social interaction “norm” that if one does something for someone else, the receiver of the exchange should reciprocate. Social exchange theory and the norm of reciprocity are relevant to organizational commitment because the employee and the organization participate in this exchange relationship. Social exchange theory has been used to understand and predict behaviors in personal and work
relationships, between individuals and groups. In terms of organizational commitment, if the employee or employer's needs are not being met then they will withdraw their resources from the relationship.

Organizational commitment theory, as previously noted, examines the employee-organization relationship in terms of social exchange theory. A reciprocal relationship exists between the employee and the organization for the exchange of symbolic and tangible resources. As the exchanges occur, the employee develops a commitment to the organization. A high level of organizational commitment may result in positive outcomes for both parties if they match in terms of resource exchanges.

Generational theory states that people are born into social cohorts based on their year of birth. The fact that these people live through similar experiences at the same life stages results in a generational identity for the group. Due to the differences from one generation to the next, each group approaches the employee-organization relationship from a different perspective. Tables were created to illustrate the differences between these four cohorts. (Appendix A)

Placing social exchange theory and organizational commitment theory within the context of generational theory provides a different view of how the process works. This unique perspective may offer new insight into improving the employee-organization relationship by awareness of generational needs in the work environment. Foa and Foa's (1980) model of resource theory "allows for different sorts of resources to be exchanged in different sorts of relationships" (as cited in Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005).

This research will be approached using a novel theoretical perspective of measuring organizational commitment across generations. A model was created
(Appendix B) to help illustrate the interaction of the generations at work and how those interactions can shape organizational commitment in different ways. Each of the four generations and their unique organizational commitment profile is depicted by the large circle. Within that circle is the overlap of tangible and symbolic resources that will be exchanged with the organization and other generations. The amount of overlap and interaction of those two types of resources will determine what organizational commitment looks like for that generation. The solid arrows depict the lines of exchange and the mutuality of that exchange. The dashed lines represent exchanges that occur between the generational groups in the work environment that do not involve the organization. These exchanges are important to the organization and the employees because they can foster positive or negative feelings regarding the work environment. An example would be a Millennial assisting a Veteran with computer technology in exchange for a mentoring or coaching relationship. Each generation brings its own special skills to the workplace and participates in the exchanges with the organization and the other people in the organization. The zone of reciprocity represents the domain of the exchanges that occur in the workplace; some of the exchanges are with the organization and others are a result of being in the organization. The combination of well established theories into this unique model will help to describe organizational commitment and generational differences in nursing faculty.

Research Questions

1. Does organizational commitment in nursing faculty differ by generation?
2. Do work values in nursing faculty differ by generation?
3. Does nursing faculty perception of organizational support differ by generation?
4. Does nursing faculty perception of "fit" with an organization differ by generation?

5. Do developmental experiences of nursing faculty differ by generation?

6. Does job satisfaction in nursing faculty differ by generation?

7. Do selected demographics of nursing faculty differ by generation?

Operational Definitions

*Nursing Faculty*

For the purposes of this study, nursing faculty are defined as those faculty members teaching in any level of RN nursing programs. This includes full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty in associate, diploma, or bachelor's programs in the United States. Nursing faculty are instructors or educators of post-secondary education for nursing programs. These faculty members may be affiliated with undergraduate or graduate programs, as well as, diploma, associate level, community college and/or technical college programs. Faculty can be called instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, full professors, deans, directors, coordinators, program chairs, in addition to any number of other titles assigned to those faculty members who educate nursing students.

*Veteran Generation (VG)*

People born between 1925 and 1942.

*Baby Boomer Generation (BB)*

People born between 1943 and 1960

*Generation X (GX)*

People born between 1961 and 1981
Millennial Generation (M)

People born between 1982 and 2002

Organizational Commitment (OC)

The definition of organizational commitment is the promise, verbal or non-verbal, of an employee to continue in the organization, even in light of difficulty or adversity.

Affective Commitment (AC)

The definition of affective commitment refers to “wanting to stay”. An employee who is affectively committed is there because he/she wants to be there, they have a high degree of attachment to the organization because positive feelings are associated with the commitment.

Normative Commitment (NC)

The definition of normative commitment is “moral obligation” to stay or feeling of obligation to the organization. The employee feels like he/she would be letting the organization, family, and/or co-workers down if they left, so they are committed out of guilt.

Continuance Commitment (CC)

The definition of continuance commitment is “have to stay”, because it would be more difficult to leave than it would be to stay; the “cost” is too high. Costs can refer to loss of income, benefits, or lack of alternative employment opportunities.

Work Values (WV)

The importance one attaches to the job characteristics of comfort and security, competence and growth, and status and independence in the workplace.
Comfort and Security (C/S)

The importance one attaches to feeling comfortable and secure in the workplace, such as having a regular routine, job security, and a comfortable working environment.

Competence and Growth (C/G)

The importance one attaches to feeling competent and having an opportunity to grow in the workplace, such as providing skills development, a sense of accomplishment and intellectual stimulation.

Status and Independence (S/I)

The importance one attaches to feelings of status and independence in the workplace, such as supervising other employees, high income earning potential, and an ability to work on important assignments.

Perceived Organizational Support (POS)

The perception, from the perspective of the employee, that the organization is willing to make an investment in the employee, and values their contribution to mutual goals.

Perceived Person-Organization Fit (PPOF)

This is defined as how well an employee’s values and goals are in congruence with the organization and the people in that environment, such that the employee feels they are a part of a mutual relationship.

Developmental Experiences (DE)

This is defined as an employee’s formal and informal opportunities for development in a particular job, as well as, an employer’s willingness to invest in the employee in terms of formal and informal training and support.
Global Job Satisfaction (GJS)

This is defined as an employee’s general satisfaction about their job without any references to specific aspects of the job.
CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to describe organizational commitment and generational differences in nursing faculty. As a first time examination of these variables, this study aimed to provide new knowledge on generational differences in organizational commitment among nursing faculty with regard to work values, perceived organizational support, perceived person-organization fit, developmental experiences and global job satisfaction. This study was approached using a novel theoretical perspective of organizational commitment in attempting to answer questions related to generational effects on organizational commitment.

Description of the Research Design

The study is a cross-sectional descriptive survey of a national random sample of nursing faculty. A national sample is a preferred sampling strategy in order to increase representation of the nurse faculty population. There may be regional, state, or institutional variations that should be included in the data. A random stratified sample was indicated because of the different levels of the groups. The nursing faculty can be from associate, diploma or baccalaureate programs in a variety of academic institutions across the nation. The population is not evenly distributed across the different types of faculty and programs, so to ensure a representative sample, each strata of the sample was
randomly selected to ensure a proportionate sample at each level (Nardi, 2003). The survey included 75-items covering six measures and a demographic tool.

Sampling Procedures

The target population for the study was nursing faculty teaching in academic settings in the United States. Inclusion criteria for the participants were: (1) currently teaching at an approved nursing education program listed in the National League for Nursing (NLN) Guide to Approved Schools of Nursing –RN (2006) full-time or part-time; (2) able to read and write English; (3) able to access the Internet for email and survey completion. Those surveys that were not completed and/or returned were excluded from the survey. Further, nursing education institutions that the author has attended and is currently employed by were excluded from the survey to avoid any potential bias. Finally, faculty members from selected schools that did not provide email addresses on the Internet were excluded from the sample.

The sampling method involved dividing the population into strata to create homogenous groups. “Stratified sampling can guarantee the appropriate representation of different segments of the population” (Polit & Beck, 2004, p. 297). The National League for Nursing (NLN) Guide to State Approved Schools of Nursing (RN) 2006 was utilized to obtain a random sample of schools from which the faculty members were drawn. The book contains all state approved schools with RN programs by type of program (diploma, associate, baccalaureate) and is organized by geographic state with a map in the front of the manual indicating which region of the country each state falls (Western, Southern, North Atlantic, Midwestern). The NLN book contains 1,585 schools listed by program type and state. The method of random sampling began with numbering all the nursing
schools in the NLN book sequentially. Using an online random number generator (http://www.random.org/integers/), 317 schools were selected, representing 20% of all schools. Twelve of these were diploma, 186 were associate, and 119 were baccalaureate programs. For the states in which there was only one nursing program in a particular category, that school was selected, so that all the states were represented. The list was reviewed to ensure there were no repeated schools on the list due to multiple types of programs in one institution. The website for each nursing school was visited to obtain faculty email addresses. The school websites that did not include email addresses were discarded from the sample, except for the diploma programs. Owing to the small number of diploma programs, if email addresses were not listed, then an alternate diploma program was selected to obtain the email addresses of the faculty. The resulting database included the email address, last name, first name and school name for each faculty member. A list of email addresses for the entire faculty from each school was compiled. The total sample consisted of 5,251 randomly selected nursing faculty from nursing programs across the United States. See Appendix C1 for more specific information regarding school representation by program level and region of the country. Once the schools were selected, all nursing faculty from those schools were invited to participate in the survey. An initial email invitation to participate in the research study was sent. See Appendix D1 for the format of the invitation sent to participants.

Instruments Used in the Study

The independent variables (i.e., grouping factors) were the different generational cohorts to which the participants belonged. These were: the Veteran Generation (VG), the Baby Boomer Generation (BB), Generation X (GX), and the Millennial Generation
(MG), each of which was defined in Chapter 2. The returned surveys were divided into these categories based on the year of birth reported by the participant.

The dependent variables included six instruments which have been proven to be valid and reliable, and one demographic tool. The measures included in this study, in addition to the demographic tool were: Three Component Model of Commitment: Affective, Normative, and Continuance; Work Values Inventory; Perceived Organizational Support; Perceived Person-Organization Fit; Developmental Experiences; and Global Job Satisfaction. A copy of the survey tool is located in Appendix E. The following section describes each of the instruments that were included in the survey tool.

Demographic Tool

A demographic tool consisting of 14 multiple-choice questions was developed to collect information on the nursing faculty participating in the study. Items were developed by the researcher, and reviewed by four faculty members for clarity and relevance to the study. Minor revisions were made based on their suggestions. The demographic section requested the information necessary to describe the respondents in terms of their year of birth (to determine generational cohort), gender, marital status, gross annual salary, rank, tenure status, race/ethnic origin, and time in the United States if born in another country. The rationale for asking about how long they have lived in the United States was to determine if they experienced the same cultural milieu as the other participants in the same generation. The basis of generational theory is that a generational cohort is formed by people born in a set time period who experience similar cultural events, thereby forming the "lens" through which they view the world. These experiences are expected to vary by country of origin based on sociological, cultural, and political
climates. Finally, questions were developed to ascertain information relevant to their current job and plans for work in the future.

Three Component Model of Commitment: Affective, Normative and Continuance

The construct of organizational commitment was measured using the Three Component Model (TCM): Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment tool developed by Meyer and Allen (1997). Because organizational commitment is a complex concept, Polit and Beck (2004) suggest administering multiple measures that are positively correlated on the same construct. For this reason, Perceived Organizational Support, Work Values Inventory, Perceived Person-Organization Fit, Developmental Experiences, and Global Job Satisfaction were also measured.

The TCM Employee Commitment Survey is divided into three subscales to measure the affective, normative, and continuance domains of organizational commitment. This tool has been widely used in the organizational commitment literature and coefficient alpha values have been reported for each of the subscales: 0.77 to 0.88 for affective commitment (AC); 0.65 to 0.86 for normative commitment (NC); and 0.69 to 0.84 for continuance commitment (CC) (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The survey was originally 24 items – 8 questions on each subscale. Researchers have since revised the tool to include 18 of the original items. Studies with this revised tool continue to have high alpha levels.

Work Values Inventory

Work Values Inventory (Meyer, Irving and Allen, 1998) is another tool that has been positively correlated to organizational commitment (Fields, 2002). This measure assesses the importance of 21 different job characteristics from three dimensions. The
three dimensions and related subscales are: comfort and security, competence and
growth, and status and independence. Values related to the three areas have been reported
to correlate to length of time on the job and the subscales of the Three Component Model
of organizational commitment (Fields, 2002, p. 268). Meyer, Irving and Allen reported
the values of the coefficient alpha on the subscales as follows: 0.63 – 0.72 for comfort
and security; 0.65 – 0.80 for competence and growth; and 0.62 – 0.68 for status and
independence.

*Perceived Organizational Support*

Perceived Organizational Support is a tool developed by Eisenberger, Huntington,
Hutchison & Sowa (1986) to measure the employee’s perception of organizational
support from the employer. It has been found to be positively correlated to organizational
commitment and has been used extensively in conjunction with the TCM Organizational
Commitment tool. Perceived organizational support has been reported as an antecedent
and a consequence of organizational support and is a good way to measure the
employee’s perceptions of being supported in the workplace. Coefficient alphas have
ranged from 0.74 to 0.95 on this nine item measure.

*Perceived Person-Organization Fit Scale*

Perceived Person-Organization Fit Scale (Cable & Judge, 1996) is a tool that
“measures the employee’s perception of his or her fit with the organization” (Fields,
2002, p. 227). This is important for the generations who are looking for the right fit
between an organization and themselves. A decreased score on this measure may indicate
decreased organizational commitment and intention to leave the organization. This has
been found to positively correlate to employee perception of job satisfaction and
organizational commitment. Cable and Judge reported a 0.87 coefficient alpha for this three item tool.

\textit{Developmental Experiences Tool}

The Developmental Experiences Tool was developed by Wayne, Shore, and Liden (1997) to describe the formal and informal developmental experiences a job affords an employee. It has been positively correlated to perceived organizational support, affective commitment, intentions to quit, and organizational citizenship behavior. Wayne, Shore and Liden obtained a 0.87 coefficient alpha with this four item tool.

\textit{Global Job Satisfaction Tool}

Global Job Satisfaction was originally developed by Quinn and Shepard (1974) and has been revised by Pond and Geyer (1991) to measure an employee’s feelings about his or her job without referring to any specific aspect of the job (Fields, 2002). Global job satisfaction has been positively correlated with affective commitment to occupation and organization, and negatively with continuance commitment and turnover. Pond and Geyer (1991) obtained a coefficient alpha of 0.89 for their six-item measure of global job satisfaction.

\textbf{Pilot Study of the Survey}

A pilot study was conducted to test the tool prior to administration to the full sample. A random sample of 20 nursing faculty was selected from the two home schools that had been excluded from the larger sample due to author affiliation. The pilot tool included a comment box at the end for comments about content and clarity of the tool, as well as amount of time (in minutes) required for completion. The average time for
completion of the pilot tool was used to inform the full study participants of how much time they could expect to require for completion of the survey. Informing participants of the number of questions and an estimate of required time for completion should improve the response rate (Schonlau, Fricker & Elliott, 2002). Additionally, the survey itself has a progress bar across the top noting what percentage of completion the participant has completed. The pilot study included informed consent information for the participants (Appendix D2), and was open for five days to collect evaluation and timing feedback from participants. The pilot survey was open for five days in November, 2007, after first receiving approval from the university Institutional Review Board.

Data Collection Procedures

The electronic survey platform used for the survey was Survey Monkey. Survey Monkey is often utilized for large samples. Some advantages of using an electronic survey for this study were the decreased time involved in fielding the survey and follow-up for non-responses; decreased economic cost due to electronic version instead of using a pen/paper/postage survey tool; and decreased labor cost because the data can be transferred directly into a statistical software program for analysis (Dillman, 2007; Schonlau, et.al., 2002). This program tabulates the respondents' survey information as it is completed and filters out the participants who wish to be removed from the mailing list. A link is included at the bottom of all emails sent from Survey Monkey stating if a participant wants to “opt-out” of the study and be removed from all future mailings, they only need to click the link.

An invitation email (Appendix D1) providing an introduction to the research study was sent out to the faculty selected to participate in the survey. Research indicates
that an introduction/invitation letter followed by the survey a few days later increases the response rate from the participants (Dillman, 2007). The informed consent email (Appendix D3) was sent two days later with instructions for completion of the survey. The email also included a link to take the participant directly to the survey if they agreed to participate. Sending the invitation by email informed the participant that the survey was coming and allowed those who preferred to opt-out of the survey the opportunity to do so before more emails were sent out. The actual survey (Appendix E) was emailed five days after the invitation to 4,886 participants with two reminder emails (Appendix D4) sent out over a two week period.

The 75-item electronic survey was distributed to a random sample of 4,886 nursing faculty in the United States, representing 20% of the nursing schools in the 2006 NLN Guide to State Approved Schools of Nursing. The emails were sent out in December, 2007, following IRB approval. The Survey Monkey program has the capability to track which surveys have been completed and which ones have not. Two follow up emails were sent five days apart as a reminder and to ensure the highest possible response rate to the survey. The survey was closed after a two week collection period and all the data associated with the survey was transferred to SPSS 14.0 for analysis.

As the purpose of the survey was to compare the generational differences in nursing faculty on the various measures, returned surveys were separated into the generational cohorts and then evaluated for sample size equivalence among the four groups. When the generational groups were found to be unequal in size, random selection
from the useable data was used to ensure equality of the generational groups to ensure adequate power.

**Statistical Analyses**

Once the survey was closed and all data had been collected it was screened for missing data. Missing data were replaced with blank spaces, not the integer 0 to prevent miscalculations when the descriptive statistics were calculated. The descriptive statistics included representations of mean, median, mode, standard deviation, and frequency. The assumption of normality when participants are grouped applies to the sampling distributions of means of variables and was assessed with statistical and graphical methods (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Frequency histograms in SPSS 14.0 allow for assessing normality. Shapiro-Wilk's Tests of Normality were done and determined that the generational groups were not normally distributed. The original plan was to analyze the data using MANOVA, but due to violation of the assumption of normality this plan was modified to use one-way ANOVAs for each comparison. The power analysis determined that a design with four groups (VG, BB, GX, and M) with unequal sample sizes would detect a difference in mean scores of a conservative 2.5% using Wilk's Lambda approximate F-test (assuming a 5% error) with a power exceeding 80% if sample size was 100 participants for each group.

The data was screened for outliers and issues of multicollinearity and singularity. Four items on the continuance commitment scale of organizational commitment were reverse scored as indicated by the testing manual. The scores on the subscales of the organizational commitment tool and work values inventory were calculated. Additionally, an average score was calculated for each of the other tools to determine a
score on each measure for each participant. These calculated scores were transferred to SPSS 14.0 for further analysis. The means, variances, standard deviations, and Cronbach’s-alpha scores for each of the tools used in the study are included in Appendix C2.

The following statements indicate the comparisons that were made with the ANOVA procedure.

1. By generation (VG, BB, GX, M): score on TCM of commitment to organization by subscales (AC, NC, CC)
2. By generation (VG, BB, GX, M): score on WVI by subscales (C&S, C&G, S&I)
3. By generation (VG, BB, GX, M): score on POS
4. By generation (VG, BB, GX, M) score on PPOF
5. By generation (VG, BB, GX, M) score on DE
6. By generation (VG, BB, GX, M) score on GJS
7. By generation (VG, BB, GX, M) score on demographics

Ethical Considerations

Institutional Review Board approval was obtained from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) Office of the Protection of Research Subjects prior to the pilot study and prior to beginning any data collection. The use of an electronic survey method was used to assure a more geographically diverse sample, confidentiality for respondents, decreased data entry time, decreased missing data due to computer prompting, and increased convenience for the participants because they could choose when to take the survey when it was convenient for them (Dillman, 2007). Consent to participate in the
study was included in the email, and return of the survey also constituted consent for participation and use of data for research study.

Permission to use the tools for data collection was requested and licenses were received from each of the copyright holders. (Appendix F) Data were collected through Survey Monkey and coded immediately upon receipt to remove any identifying information from the database, and then transferred to SPSS version 14.0 for analysis. The data will be stored according to the university protocols for storage of data, and destroyed after three years.

Study Limitations

There was a risk of response bias or social desirability response bias due to the nature of some of the questions; however, with confidentiality assured this issue should not be problematic. The questions were on five and seven point Likert scales which is beneficial in offering a variety of choices with a set midpoint.

If the nursing faculty chose to not accept emails from persons they do not know, there is a possibility that the survey response was lower due to spam blockers or suspicion associated with email from an unknown sender. The invitation email prior to survey delivery should have helped in decreasing some of this risk. All recipients had the opportunity to opt-out of the survey by clicking on a link at the bottom to remove their names from further emails related to this study. The Survey Monkey program eliminates email addresses from people who have previously “opted-out” of participating in their surveys, so this helped reduce the possibility of multiple emails to people not wanting to participate.
The possibility of a low response rate would be a limitation for this study. However, the power analysis indicated a minimum of 100 responses per generational cohort (total of 400) would give .80 power. A return of at least 400 surveys would be about an 8% return rate, other survey studies with nurses have reported return rates of 20-50% (Lynn & Redman, 2005; Lynn, Redman, & Zomorodi, 2006; McNeese-Smith & Crook, 2003; Moody, 1996; Snarr & Krochalk, 1996).
CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The findings of the research study are presented in this chapter in three sections. The first section begins with a description of the sample and the demographic characteristics of each generational group. The second section reports the reliability of the research instruments and results of the following measurements: Three Component Model of Commitment broken down by subscale; Work Values Inventory by subscale; Perceived Organizational Support; Perceived Person-Organization Fit; Developmental Experiences; and Global Job Satisfaction. The third section addresses the findings of the research questions of the study. An analysis of the reported results can be found in the following chapter.

Procedures for Handling Data

After the initial input of the 5,251 email addresses, fifty-seven participants were automatically dropped because they had opted out of previous studies with Survey Monkey. Following the initial email invitation to participate in the study, several emails were returned as "undeliverable". Of the returned emails, 308 participants were deleted from the list because they had incorrect email addresses, or an automatic reply message that the participant had moved, retired, or was on academic leave. For the emails that were returned as address undeliverable due to typographical error, the address was
verified, corrected as needed and the email was resent. Twenty participants contacted the researcher stating they were teaching in support courses and unsure if they should participate or not. If not currently teaching nursing students, they were dropped from the study, in accordance with the inclusion/exclusion criteria. The participants dropped from the sample list were removed from all future mailings.

The above measures yielded a useable sample of 4,886. Of those, 1,518 surveys were returned resulting in a 31% response rate. Twenty-six of the surveys returned were labeled as incomplete by Survey Monkey, as the respondents did not click the submit button. This resulted in a final total sample of 1,492.

The responses were separated by generational cohort according to the year of birth indicated on the survey. There were 88 in the Veteran Generation, 1,045 in the Baby Boomer Generation, 357 in Generation X, and two in the Millennial Generation. The initial power analysis to detect a difference in mean scores of a conservative 2.5% using Wilk’s Lambda approximate F-test (assuming a 5% error) suggested that if the sample was equally distributed then 50 participants from each generation would achieve a power of 80%. However, the four generations were not equally distributed and it was necessary to obtain 100 participants for each of the four groups. With 88 participants in the Veteran Generation and only 2 in the Millennial Generation, the decision was made to remove the Millennial Generation from the study and randomly select 100 participants from both the Baby Boomer Generation and Generation X to achieve a study sample of 288 participants (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Participants were able to skip questions they did not wish to answer, so some responses had missing data. The data was manually screened for missing values. One hundred and thirteen missing values were found out of 6,912 possible values,
or 1.63% of the sample. These missing values were not considered problematic as the number was very small and occurred in a random pattern (Munro, 2001).

Further information on the total sample (n=1,518) is included in 13 comparison tables in Appendix G. These tables have been included to demonstrate how closely related the total sample and study sample were in terms of frequencies and percentages suggesting a high degree of representativeness of the population of nursing faculty. The next section describes the demographics of the study sample (n=288).

Demographics of Study Sample

The overwhelming majority of the sample was female (95%), with five percent (72) of the respondents being male. The majority of the respondents reported their race/ethnic origin as Caucasian 265 (92%), with 11 (4%) self-identified as Black, 4 (1.4%) Asian/Pacific Islander, 3 (1.0%) Hispanic, 3 (1.0%) Other, and 1 (0.3%) Native American/Eskimo. Marital status reflected 209 (73%) were married, 35 (12%) were single, 30 (10%) were divorced, 12 (4%) were widowed, and 0.3% percent separated.

In regard to academic rank, the majority were at the Assistant Professor rank. Twelve percent (33) reported their rank as “Other” and included titles such as Director, Chair, Dean, Clinical Faculty, Adjunct, Course Coordinator, Affiliate, or visiting lecturer, to name the most common titles provided. The majority of the respondents are in non-tenure type of positions in their organizations. (Appendix C3)

The respondents were asked to report the type of nursing program in which they teach. They were able to mark multiple levels of programs as a means to accommodate those faculty teaching in more than one type of program at a time (Appendix C4). All
levels of programs were represented in the sample with the majority (37.8%) of the educators teaching in baccalaureate programs.

The respondents were asked to report the length of time they have spent as a nurse educator. Nearly half of the sample (48%) have been nurse educators for 15 years or more; 22% of those working as a nurse educator for 30 years or more. On the other end of the spectrum there were 14% with 3 years or less experience. Forty-one percent of the sample has worked in their current organization six years or less. (Appendix C5)

The majority (37%) of the participants reported a gross annual salary of $50,000 - $70,000. Appendix C6 reports the gross annual salary information for the study sample. It should be noted that some respondents reported via written email response that their salaries may appear inflated because they maintain their own clinical practice, such as nurse practitioners, staff nurses, or private consultants in their area of expertise.

Respondents were asked to indicate what year they came to the United States to determine how much of their early experiences and influences were part of the larger social experience of the generation to which they belong (Appendix C7). This question was to determine how much influence historical events might have on their generational socialization. The ten respondents who indicated they did not grow up in the United States were not excluded from the study and a more specific description of this group follows. There were two in the Veteran Generation, who came to the U.S. at age 23 and 24; three in the Baby Boomer generation, who came to the U.S. at age 18 and 27 (one did not indicate the year); and five were in Generation X, coming to the U.S. at ages 13, 23, 24, and 26 (one did not indicate the year). Of those ten individuals two identified themselves as Asian/Pacific Islander, one Black, one Hispanic, and six were Caucasian.
The low numbers and variability in terms of age, gender, race, etc. between these individuals did not appear to skew the data.

The respondents were asked to indicate their year of birth in order to determine which generational cohort they belonged to for the purposes of this study. The year of birth indicated by the sample ranged from 1927 to 1980. The most frequent year of birth was 1942 for the Veteran Generation, 1953 for the Baby Boomers and 1961 for Generation X. (Appendix C8) It was noted that for the Veterans the most frequent year was the last year of the cohort range, whereas for Generation X, the most frequent year was the first year of the cohort range. The Baby Boomers most frequent year of birth was in the middle of the birth year range.

Reliability of Survey Tools

The tools in the study were tested for reliability using Cronbach's-alpha. The alphas obtained for this study were all within or above the previously reported alpha values on these tools. The values ranged from 0.82 to 0.95. (Appendix C2)

Statistical Methods Used

Following screening for accuracy of data entry, missing data, and missing values, testing was done to determine if the assumptions of multivariate analysis had been met. Shapiro-Wilk's Tests of Normality were conducted on all tools using SPSS version 14.0. (Appendix C9 and C10) Due to the fact that the sample was not normally distributed, a primary assumption of multivariate normality had been violated (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Therefore, the proposed MANOVA statistical method could not be used and instead one-way ANOVAs were conducted on ranked data to determine the relationships between the variables (Polit & Beck, 2004; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). One-way
analysis of variance is used when comparing the means of two or more groups. The ANOVA indicated there were differences between the groups, and post-hoc Tukey HSD test comparisons were conducted to indicate which of the three groups had the differences (Pallant, 2005). This study used between group independent samples since each respondent answered only one time and was independent of all other respondents. The nonparametric tests were conducted on ranked data.

The initial analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for each survey instrument between the generational groups. Appendix C1 lists the results of the initial ANOVA tests and indicates which instruments had statistically significant findings. This table also indicates the differences in the means between the generational cohorts on those subscales that had significant findings. The rank of affective commitment between the generational groups was significant \(F=4.60, df=2, p=0.01\) indicating that there was a difference between the mean scores on the affective commitment scales between the three generations tested. The rank of Competence and Growth was statistically significant \(F=4.93, df=2, p=0.01\) indicating differences between the generational groups on this subscale of the Work Values inventory. Additionally, ranks of Perceived Person Organization Fit \(F=4.18, df=2, p=0.02\), Developmental Experiences \(F=6.18, df=2, p=0.00\), and Global Job Satisfaction \(F=8.29, df=2, p=0.00\) were statistically significant.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of generational cohort on affective commitment, as measured by the Three Component Model of Commitment. Participants were divided into three generational groups according to their year of birth (Veterans, Baby Boomers, and Generation X). There was a statistically significant difference at the \(p<.05\) level in affective commitment.
scores for the three generational cohorts \( F(2, 283) = 4.60, p = .01 \). The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .03 indicating a small to medium effect. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for Generation X was significantly different from Veterans and from Baby Boomers. (Appendix C12) The mean scores of Veterans were higher than Generation X, and the mean scores of the Baby Boomers were higher than Generation X.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of generational cohort on competence and growth, as a subscale of the Work Values Inventory. Participants were divided into three generational groups according to their year of birth (Veterans, Baby Boomers, and Generation X). There was a statistically significant difference at the \( p < .01 \) level in competence and growth scores for the three generational cohorts \( F(2, 279) = 4.93, p = .01 \). The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .034 indicating a small to medium effect. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for Veterans was significantly different from Baby Boomers and from Generation X. (Appendix C13) The mean scores of the Veterans were higher than the Baby Boomers and Generation X.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of generational cohort on Perceived Person Organization Fit, as measured by the scale of the same name. There was a statistically significant difference at the \( p < .05 \) level in Perceived Person Organization Fit scores for the three generational cohorts \( F(2, 274) = 4.18, p = .02 \). The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .03 indicating a small to medium effect. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for Baby Boomers was significantly different from Veterans. Generation
X did not differ significantly from either Veterans or Baby Boomers. (Appendix C14) The mean scores of the Baby Boomers were higher than the Veterans for Perceived Person-Organization Fit.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of generational cohort on Developmental Experiences as measured by a scale of the same name. There was a statistically significant difference at the $p<.01$ level in developmental experience scores for the three generational cohorts [$F(2, 275)=6.18$, $p=.002$]. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .04 indicating a small to medium effect. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for Generation X was significantly different from Baby Boomers and from Veterans. (Appendix C15) The mean scores of the Veterans were higher than Generation X and the mean scores of the Baby Boomers were higher than those of Generation X.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of generational cohort on job satisfaction as measured by the Global Job Satisfaction Scale. There was a statistically significant difference at the $p<.01$ level in global job satisfaction scores for the three generational cohorts [$F(2, 272)=8.29$, $p=.000$]. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .06 indicating a medium effect. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for Veterans ($M=165.47, SD=76.68$) was significantly different from Baby Boomers and from Generation X. (Appendix C16) The mean scores of the Veterans were higher than the Baby Boomers and the Veterans were higher than Generation X.

Finally, chi-square non-parametric statistics were done for demographic variables and generation. There were several areas that indicated a significant relationship between
generational cohort and the demographic information gathered on the respondents. Significant chi-square results were noted with regard to length of time as a nurse educator, length of time working in the organization, rank, tenure status, year of birth, marital status, and those teaching in masters or doctoral programs. (Appendix C17)

The vast majority of the sample (79.2%) indicated they were not planning to leave their organizations. Six options were provided to indicate the reason for planning to leave the organization. Appendix C18 lists the reasons that were provided and the frequency distribution of each of those reasons.

Testing of Research Questions

Data analysis for each of the research questions is presented in this section.

Question 1: Does organizational commitment in nursing faculty differ by generation?

According to the TCM of commitment, there are three categories of commitment. The results were broken down by generation for each type of commitment using ranked scores and analysis of variance with post hoc Tukey HSD tests. The affective commitment subscale produced a significant response ($F=4.60$, $df=2$, $p=0.011$), while the normative and continuance commitment scores were not significant. This indicated that the affective commitment measures in nursing faculty did differ by generation. More specifically, the Tukey HSD tests revealed a significant difference between the Veterans and Generation X ($M=32.29$, $p=0.02$), and the Baby Boomers and Generation X ($M=28.80$, $p=0.03$). No significant differences were found between the Veterans and the Baby Boomers on affective commitment. There were no significant findings on the Tukey HSD tests for normative or continuance commitment between the generations.
Question 2: Do work values in nursing faculty differ by generation?

The Work Values Inventory is broken down into three subscales: Comfort and Security, Competence and Growth, and Status and Independence. Competence and Growth was the only subscale to indicate a significant difference between the generations in work values ($F=4.93, df=2, p=0.008$). Tukey HSD testing revealed that the most significant differences were between the Veterans and the Baby Boomers ($M=29.09, p=0.04$) and the Veterans and Generation X ($M=34.93, p=0.01$) for Competence and Growth. The other two subscales did not show any significant results to differences between the generations.

Question 3: Does nursing faculty perception of organizational support differ by generation?

While perception of organizational support approached significance, it was not able to achieve <.05 significant value of differences between the generations. ($F=2.89, df=2, p=0.057$).

Question 4: Does nursing faculty perception of “fit” with an organization differ by generation?

An analysis of variance was conducted on the ranked scores of Perceived Person Organization Fit and determined there was a significant difference between the generations of nursing faculty ($F=4.18, df=2, p=0.016$). On this measure, the post hoc Tukey HSD tests revealed that the biggest significant difference was between the Veterans and the Baby Boomer generations ($M=-30.70, p=0.02$). No differences were found between any of the other generations.
Question 5:  Do developmental experiences of nursing faculty differ by generation?

The measure of Developmental Experiences is to determine if the organization is providing a variety of challenging experiences and presenting opportunities for employees to develop professionally in the workplace. The ranked scores of Developmental Experiences had a significant difference between the generations ($F=6.18$, $df=2$, $p=0.002$). Tukey HSD testing revealed that the greatest significant differences were between the Veterans and Generation X ($M=39.95$, $p=0.00$) and the Baby Boomers and Generation X ($M=27.41$, $p=0.04$). There were no significant differences noted between the Veterans and the Baby Boomers.

Question 6:  Does job satisfaction in nursing faculty differ by generation?

An analysis of variance for the ranked scores of Global Job Satisfaction was done to determine if differences existed between the generations on Global Job Satisfaction ($F=8.29$, $df=2$, $p=0.000$). Tukey HSD testing determined that the significant differences between the generations were between the Veterans and Baby Boomers ($M=39.08$, $p=0.00$) and the Veterans and Generation X ($M=42.81$, $p=0.00$). No significant differences were found between the Baby Boomers and Generation X on Global Job Satisfaction.

Question 7:  Do selected demographics of nursing faculty differ by generation?

The chi-square analysis provided significant findings in the areas of length of time as a nurse educator, type of program taught in, specifically master’s and doctoral programs, length of time working in the current organization, marriage, tenure, rank, year of birth, and race/ethnic origin. These findings indicated that there is a relationship between these demographic variables and generational cohort. One of the trends
associated with these findings was that age of the generational cohort was a factor in
differences between the expected count and the actual count on certain variables. For
example, there was less than expected Generation X nursing faculty teaching in doctoral
programs. Another example was the academic rank of nursing faculty in Generation X.
There were more than expected Generation X faculty at the lower ranks, and less than
expected at the higher ranks. Again, this could be a factor of age, or time in the
institution, or a result of not staying in one organization long enough to rise in the ranks
of faculty.

Summary

This chapter presented the results of data analysis for this study. The demographic
profile of the sample was described. The reliability of the research instruments, as well
as, descriptive statistics for the Three Component Model of Commitment scale, Work
Values Inventory, Perceived Organizational Support, Perceived Person Organization Fit,
Developmental Experiences, and Global Job Satisfaction responses were presented.
Explanation of the statistical methods chosen and results are presented. Tests of the
research questions were analyzed and generational differences among nursing faculty
were discussed.
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes a summary of the study research and purpose, discussion of the findings, recommendations for practice, and study limitations. The final section provides recommendations for further research.

Summary of Research Purpose and Method

The purpose of this study was to describe organizational commitment and generational differences in nursing faculty. An additional purpose of the study was to provide new knowledge on the employee-organization relationship in the context of generational differences and with regard to the related factors of work values, perceived organizational support, perceived person-organization fit, developmental experiences, and global job satisfaction. It was anticipated that differences would be demonstrated on the various instruments between the three generations studied: Veterans, Baby Boomers, and Generation X.

The theoretical foundation for the study was based on social exchange theory, organizational commitment theory and generational theory. Social exchange theory and the norm of reciprocity underlie organizational commitment theory as the employee-organization relationship is based on reciprocal exchanges between the employee and the organization. The exchanges may consist of symbolic or tangible resources. Generational
theory states that people are born into social cohorts based on their year of birth. It was proposed that different groups would have different needs in this social exchange with the organization based on their particular generational cohort. Placing social exchange theory and organizational commitment theory within the context of generational theory provides a different way to view the social exchanges that occur in the workplace. The researcher hoped this would lead to insights of how to individualize approaches to human resource management and improve faculty recruitment, retention and organizational commitment.

The review of the literature demonstrated that organizational commitment has been addressed regarding nurses in general (Ingersoll, Olsan, Drew-Cates, DeVinney & Davies, 2002; McNeese-Smith & Crook, 2003; Nogueras, 2006). A limited number of studies were found regarding generational differences in nurses (Apostolidis & Polifroni, 2006; Kupperschmidt, 2000; Parsons, 2002; Pelletier, 2005; Sherman, 2006; Wieck, 2005). The majority of the nursing generational literature is descriptive in nature (Altimier, 2006; Anthony, 2006; Deluane, 2002; Dorman, 2005; Martin & Tulgan, 2002; Stuenkel, Cohen & de la Cuesta, 2005). A comprehensive literature review failed to yield any studies examining the relationship between organizational commitment and generational differences in nursing faculty.

The protracted national nursing faculty shortage, particularly in light of their generational spread, has added to the importance of better understanding which factors may foster nursing faculty commitment to the organization. A consensus of findings indicates that organizational commitment leads to increased employee productivity and retention. An understanding of generational differences in organizational commitment
may help determine the best practices to increase recruitment and retention of nursing faculty during this time of severe shortage.

The population for this study consisted of a national random, stratified sample representing 20% of the nursing faculty teaching in RN programs in the United States. The electronic survey was originally sent out to 4,886 nursing faculty, 1,518 were returned (31%). The total number of usable surveys was 1,492, resulting in a 98.3% completion rate.

The electronic survey consisted of a demographic section and the following six instruments to measure the related variables: Three Component Model of Commitment, Work Values Inventory, Perceived Organizational Support, Perceived Person-Organization Fit, Development Experiences, and Global Job Satisfaction. The analysis of the data was accomplished through the use of descriptive and inferential statistical methods. The findings were presented in detail in the previous chapter.

Discussion of the Findings

Interpretations of the results of the research study are presented in this section in eight parts. The first provides an overview of the demographic information of the study sample. The following seven sections relate to the research questions and are discussed in individual sections along with possible conclusions to explain the findings.

Interpretation of Demographic Information

The study participants completed basic demographic information as part of the survey questionnaire. The demographic information obtained is included in Appendix C. This section will examine the results of the current nursing faculty study and note similarities and differences with two other nursing faculty studies in terms of
demographic information. The first study, by the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) (Berlin, Wilsey, & Bednash, 2005) was entitled, “Salaries of Instructional and Administrative Nursing Faculty in Baccalaureate and Graduate Programs in Nursing 2004-2005” (N=10,967). The second study was “Nurse Educators 2006: A Report of the Faculty Census Survey of RN and Graduate Programs”, published by the National League for Nursing (n=801) (Kovner, Fairchild & Jacobson, 2006).

The sample in the current study was asked about their faculty rank. The most frequent response was “Assistant Professor” (29%). This was similar to the AACN study findings, in which 37% of the respondents indicated a rank of Assistant Professor. While these both represent the highest frequency reported, the difference in the values may be explained because the current study included nursing faculty from associate and diploma programs and the rank of Lecturer was included in the current study and not in the AACN study. Regarding tenure status, the profiles of faculty between the current and AACN studies were different. In the current study, the majority of respondents (46%) indicated that they are not in a tenured position. The AACN study reported that 38% of respondents were on non-tenure tracks and an additional 10% reported that there is no tenure system in place in their organization. The differences between these groups could reflect the different types of institutions that were surveyed or may reflect a changing organizational structure moving away from having full-time, tenured positions to hiring more part-time faculty (Kovner, et al., 2006).

The highest percentage of respondents in the current survey indicated they teach in a baccalaureate program (38%), compared to the AACN study (51%). These
differences are likely due to the AACN sample not including associate and diploma programs.

The current study inquired as to length of time as a nurse educator and length of time working in the current organization. It is logical to assume that length of time in these roles may have an impact on organizational commitment. The literature suggests that nurses often gravitate to faculty positions later in life. The most frequently reported length of time as a nurse educator was “greater than 30 years” (22%), with the second most frequent being “more than 3 years, but less than 6 years” (15%). This finding suggests that many nurses have been educators for lengthy periods of time. Their departure through retirement will leave a significant void.

The distinction between time as a nurse educator and time in current organization was intended to illustrate whether or not nursing faculty are staying in their positions for long periods of time, or if they are changing organizations during their career. The most frequent response to length of time working in current organization was “more than 3 years, but less than 6 years” (20%). The second most frequent response was 17% indicating “more than one year, but less than 3 years”. Only 7% of the study sample reported working in their current organization for “greater than 30 years”. This may be due to the large number of nurse faculty openings. In some areas of the country the vacancy rate is as high as 8.1% (Kovner, et al., 2006). This has created an “employee’s market” in which potential employees can more easily job-hop to the next best place of employment.

The study sample was asked to indicate their gross annual salary range. The highest percentage of nursing faculty (37%) indicated their salary in the range of
$50,000-$70,000. The AACN study was directed toward faculty salaries and therefore asked more explicit questions and reported more specific data. These data can not be compared against each other because of the manner in which the salaries were broken down for the AACN study. The NLN study compared median nine-month salaries and broke them down by rank in the organization. “The median nine-month salary for full-time nursing faculty at the rank of professor stood at $65,000 with a range of $36,792 to $116,000, while the median for assistant professors was $47,435” (Kovner, et al., p.5). This would indicate that the majority of the current study sample is comparable to the larger NLN study.

Ninety-six percent of the sample reported growing up in the United States; however, this particular question was not included in the AACN or NLN surveys. Gender was identified in the study sample as 95% of the respondents being female and 5% male. The AACN study reported 95.6% female and 4.4% male, indicating that the study sample was representative of the nursing faculty population for gender.

Participants in the current study were asked to self report race/ethnic origin. The majority of the respondents reported their race/ethnic origin as Caucasian 265 (92%), with 11 (4%) self-identified as Black, 4 (1.4%) Asian/Pacific Islander, 3 (1.0%) Hispanic, 3 (1.0%) Other, and 1 (0.3%) Native American/Eskimo. The AACN report had similar results with 90% White, 6% Black or African American, 1.7% Hispanic or Latino, 1.6% Asian, 0.3% American Indian/Alaskan Native, and 0.3% Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander. These demographic statistics indicate that nursing educators are not a very ethnically diverse group and the current study is similar to findings from the AACN study three years ago, with little change noted. More work needs to be done to recruit a more

The current study of nursing faculty examined generational differences based on birth year cohort. This information was obtained via a question on year of birth, which was then extrapolated to provide current age. The calculated mean and range of ages was compared to the results from the AACN survey. For the current study, the respondent age ranges were from 27 to 80 years old, and for the AACN study the age range was 25 to 79 years old. The mean age of the current sample of nursing faculty was 54 years old, with a mean age of 51.6 years in the previous study. Two things are noted regarding this data. First, there is a wide range of ages for nursing faculty members for both studies, indicating that there are four generations in the nursing education workforce. Secondly, in the past three years the mean age of nursing faculty has increased by almost three years, further evidence of the “graying” of our faculty (Berlin, Wilsey, & Bednash, 2005). It was also interesting to note in the current study, the most frequent ages for each generation. The Veteran generation had the highest frequency of the study sample for birth year groups (age 65 – 23%; age 66 – 18%; age 67 – 13%; age 68 – 12%). The Baby Boomers generation’s two highest frequencies for birth year groups were age 54 (12%) and age 59 (10%). Finally, Generation X had three birth year groups with high frequencies (age 46 – 16%; age 43 – 14%; age 45 – 13%). Studying these frequencies further illustrates that those from the Veteran generation are still working and make up a large percentage of the nursing faculty population.
The current study also asked the respondents to indicate if they were planning to leave the current organization and indicate the reason why from a list of six choices. All but six respondents provided a response to the question about plans to leave the organization, with 79.5% indicating they plan to stay in their organization. Twelve percent indicated they plan to retire, and 5% indicated they are seeking employment in another academic institution. This indicates that most of the anticipated nursing faculty losses will be a result of retirements, which could be influenced by attempting to retain these faculty members longer. However, since a number of the faculty are expected to work past the typical age of retirement already (Boychuk Duchscher & Cowin, 2004), continued retention beyond this may be difficult. With six percent of the anticipated losses in the study sample being due to seeking employment somewhere else or leaving nursing education all together, these types of faculty losses could be addressed through changes in human resource management in nursing programs. More discussion about the implications of this research study on these areas will be addressed in this chapter, in the section entitled, “Recommendations for Practice”.

The current study on nursing faculty analyzed survey responses from 288 nursing faculty and found that the study sample was representative of the total sample and also representative of the nursing faculty population. For further information on the total sample demographics compared to the study sample demographics, see Appendix G.

Organizational Commitment

In response to the first research question, does organizational commitment in nursing faculty differ by generation; the tool used to measure organizational commitment was broken down into its subscales for analysis. The Three Component Model of
Commitment has three subscales: affective, normative and continuance commitment. For this study, nursing faculty demonstrated a statistically significant difference between the generations on the affective commitment subscale and not on the other two subscales.

The ANOVA testing revealed the biggest differences between the generations on this measure were between Generation X and the other two. A possible reason for the differences between the groups is the fact that Generation X employees have been known to have a personal agenda in regard to work (Greene, 2005). Instead of affective commitment measuring, “I’m there because I’m happy and want to be there”, it could be for Generation X that, “I’m there until something better comes along”.

In affective commitment the employee is committed to the job because they enjoy the job and believe that the organization has similar values and goals to the employee. Post hoc Tukey HSD tests indicated that the significant differences were between Generation X and both Baby Boomers and Veterans, with Generation X having lower mean scores than the other two. A possible reason for these findings is that Generation X employees have not been in the organization long enough to have determined if their values are in alignment with the organization. Generation X members have been described as cynical and independent, and these findings may demonstrate a decreased level of “buy-in” to the organizational mission and goals for that group (Boychuk Duchscher & Cowin, 2004).

The normative commitment scale indicates the employee is committed to the organization due to feelings of obligation or guilt associated with leaving the organization. The fact that this measure did not have significant findings could indicate that, in general, employees have less guilty feelings about leaving an organization in
today's workplace. Smola and Sutton (2002) suggested that work values of generational cohorts has changed over time, lending support to the fact that the psychological contract of work has changed over time as well.

Hartmann and Bambacas (2000) obtained low levels of normative commitment in their study of part-time, female academic staff workers in Australia. They concluded that changing jobs is more acceptable than it has been in past years and suggested that commitment scores may vary between part-time and full-time workers. Flynn (2000) also suggested that normative commitment may vary with populations of employees.

Some of the nursing faculty in this study indicated that they maintain more than one job due to low salaries and the majority of the study sample indicated they are in non-tenured positions. These factors may have accounted for differences in affective commitment scores across the generations.

Work Values

The second research question was, do work values in nursing faculty differ by generation, and was measured by using the Work Values Inventory. Of the three subscales: comfort and security, competence and growth, and status and independence, the nursing faculty of this study demonstrated statistically significant differences on the competence and growth subscale and not on the other two. The competence and growth subscale relates to the job characteristics of encouraging continued development of skills, providing a feeling of accomplishment, and providing change and variety in activities among other factors. The comfort and security subscale refers to job characteristics such as having a comfortable work environment and job security. The status and independence
subscale includes supervision of other employees, opportunities for high income, and assignments important to the organization.

Meyer, Irving and Allen (1998) studied organizational commitment and work values in recent university graduates hoping to predict that work values contribute to organizational commitment. They found that competence related work experiences were more important to the participants than comfort related work experiences and concluded that work values and experiences operated together to contribute to organizational commitment. The suggestion was made for further study into organizational commitment, work values, work experiences, and person-job fit interactions. Additionally, McNeese-Smith and Crook (2003) and Smola and Sutton (2002) found significant differences in work values between the generations in separate studies. They reported statistically significant differences in work values among the generational cohorts included in the two studies.

These findings are consistent with the findings of this study of nursing faculty on the competence and growth subscale, indicating that there are differences between the generations on the work value of competence and growth. Post-hoc Tukey HSD testing revealed the Veteran generation varied significantly from Baby Boomers and Generation X for competence and growth, with Veterans having the higher mean scores of the three groups. A possibility that may explain these findings is that the Veteran generation has less of a need for competence and growth in their position. Being a seasoned educator might lead them to believe they have achieved competence in their positions and no longer have a desire to grow or change because they will be retiring soon, or are only working part-time. On the other hand, the Baby Boomer generation would be motivated
by continued intellectual stimulation and feelings of accomplishment which describe the work value of competence and growth. Baby Boomers derive a great deal of self-esteem from a job well done and competence in their chosen profession (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002). Also under competence and growth is the development of new skills which would be attractive to the Generation X employees attempting to build their résumé. A possible explanation for this is that competence and growth provides the employee with additional skills and resources, so the Generation X employee doesn't feel like the cost of leaving is too high if they get to bring an enhanced skill portfolio with them to the next job.

**Perceived Organizational Support**

Research question three was, does nursing faculty perception of organizational support differ by generation, and was measured by the Perceived Organizational Support tool. Perceived organizational support indicates the employee's perception of being supported by the organization. For this study, there were no significant findings in differences between the generations on the measure of perceived organizational support. The ANOVA for this measure approached significance, although it was not achieved. This indicates that there were slight differences between the generations; just not very broad differences. Possible explanations for this lack of difference may be that questions on the tool were interpreted differently by respondents or not specific enough to draw out the differences in POS. Perceived organizational support has been used extensively with the TCM tool and has been reported as an antecedent to organizational commitment. As an antecedent, there were only slight differences between the generations, but the levels of affective commitment were significantly different. It may be possible that POS affects each generation in varying degrees as an antecedent to organizational commitment.
Another explanation may be that perceived organizational support is relatively consistent across the generations. In a time of shrinking budgets and limited resources nursing faculty may be left with the perception that the organization can only offer a limited amount of support, which is consistent across the generations.

*Perceived Person-Organization Fit*

The fourth research question was, does nursing faculty perception of "fit" with an organization differ by generation, and was measured using the Perceived Person-Organization Fit instrument. Perceived Person-Organization Fit has been found to have a positive correlation to employee perception of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, which was demonstrated in this study.

This study of generational differences in nursing faculty found statistically significant differences between the generational groups on the perceived person-organization fit measure. This was consistent with those findings with a relationship noted between person-organization fit and generational differences in nursing faculty. Post-hoc Tukey HSD testing revealed that Veterans and Baby Boomers varied significantly from each other, but not from Generation X nursing faculty. The mean scores of Baby Boomers were higher than those of the Veterans. An explanation for this finding is that Baby Boomers are currently in positions of authority in the organizations and restructuring may make Veterans feel like they no longer "fit" in the organization.

Verplanken (2004) concluded that person-organization fit is an important predictor of employee turnover and an antecedent to organizational commitment. Leading one to conclude that person-organization fit would be a useful measure of one's employees to predict intention to turnover. This measure would provide additional
information that would be useful to the nurse faculty administrator regarding the work environment. The more a person perceives a fit between themselves and the organization, the more committed they will be to the organization and therefore, have higher levels of affective commitment. Results were approaching the level of significance to demonstrate a difference between Generation X and the Baby Boomers. Possible explanations for these differences between Veterans and Baby Boomers may be due to restructuring of organizations with curriculum changes, changes in requirements of research activity and teaching assignments, and budget cuts. The Veterans have been in education and organizations for the longest time period and have seen many changes happening over the years. This may be leading them to feel less of a “fit” within an organization as changes are implemented.

Developmental Experiences

Research question five: do developmental experiences of nursing faculty differ by generation was measured using the tool Developmental Experiences previously used in a study about perceived organizational support. Wayne, Shore and Liden (1997) hypothesized that employees who are offered more challenging assignments and training opportunities would have higher levels of POS. The developmental experiences instrument was developed by the authors and found to have a high Cronbach’s-alpha coefficient of 0.87. The outcome of the study indicated that developmental experiences were positively related to POS. Employees who participated in more formal and informal training experiences reported higher levels of perceived organizational support.

The ANOVA testing in the current study found significant differences between the generations on the developmental experiences measure. Post-hoc Tukey HSD testing
revealed that Generation X varied significantly from Veterans and Baby Boomers on the developmental experiences measure. The mean scores of Veterans were higher than Generation X, and the mean scores of Baby Boomers were greater than Generation X.

Logically, if an organization offers the employee something outside the typical benefits of working in the organization, then the employee will perceive that the organization values and supports the employee. Personalized benefits may include opportunities for professional development or time off to pursue educational goals. These types of developmental experiences are a part of the social exchange between the organization and the employee. The organization offers tangible or symbolic resources to the employee and the employee reciprocates by increased affective commitment and job satisfaction. The increased affective commitment and job satisfaction translate into increased productivity and lower turnover rates for the organization.

Veterans and Baby Boomers may feel like developmental experiences are not necessary for them because they are nearer to retirement. The descriptive literature has stated that Generation X employees are always trying to improve their résumés and skill base, so if they are receiving adequate developmental experiences in their organization that would be a valuable resource to this generation, therefore making them feel that the cost of leaving is higher than the cost of staying because they would lose out on those developmental experiences.

_Global Job Satisfaction_

The sixth question: does job satisfaction in nursing faculty differ by generation was addressed using the Global Job Satisfaction instrument. A number of studies have looked at job satisfaction in nurse educators, as well as, examining organizational
commitment (Disch, Edwardson & Adwan, 2004; Gormley, 2003; Knoop, 2001; Moody, 1996; Sarmiento, Laschinger & Iwasiw, 2004; Snarr & Krochalk, 1996). It has been found that when employees feel that the organization does not care about them, they demonstrate low levels of job satisfaction which leads to low levels of organizational commitment. Other researchers have made the distinction between job satisfaction and commitment to the profession of nursing versus commitment to the organization (Knoop, 2001; Lynn & Redman, 2005).

This study found that there were significant differences between the generational groups and that the Veterans varied significantly from the Baby Boomers and Generation X. When examining the mean scores for the different groups it was noted that the Veteran generation had higher mean scores for global job satisfaction than Baby Boomers or Generation X. Possible explanations for these findings are that those Veterans who are still working as nursing faculty truly enjoy their work, feel like they are supported by the organization and are still contributing to the goals of the organization. Most likely these nursing faculty will continue to work as long as they are physically able due to these indicators of organizational commitment.

Selected Demographics

The seventh research question: do selected demographics of nursing faculty differ by generation was measured using a demographic questionnaire. Much of the demographic information and analyses were reported in the previous section entitled, "Interpretation of Demographic Information". This section will discuss the results of chi-square testing done to determine if there were differences between the generations on demographic indicators.
In this study, several of the significant findings above can be related to differences in age across the different generations. The age range of 26-80 indicates that the participants are at all different developmental points in their lives which helps to explain the differences in rank, tenure status, length of time as a nurse educator and length of time in organization. Findings from this study reveal that Generation X has more ethnic diversity than the other two generational groups. This is to be expected as our nation has become more ethnically diverse over the years and efforts have been focusing on increasing ethnic diversity in nursing in general.

Discussion of the Model of the Relationship between the Organization and Generations of Employees in Terms of Organizational Commitment

A model was created to help illustrate the interactions of the generations at work and how those interactions can shape organizational commitment in different ways (Appendix B). The model was used as a reference while analyzing the findings of this research. Because differences were found between the generations on the majority of the measures, this research study lends support to the model as it is. The model could be used for further testing of the theoretical framework proposed in this study. Unfortunately, this study was not able to obtain enough respondents from the Millennial generation of nursing faculty to have them included in these reported findings. Future research should continue to include this next generation of nursing faculty, to understand emerging trends in generational differences.

Longitudinal studies are needed in terms of Generation X. These individuals have been noted to be different than the other generations on several measures, but this may be a factor of age or career stage, not only generational cohort. Another study of the
Generation X nursing faculty in a few years when they are in the Baby Boomer position/career stage may reveal changes in their overall responses to work values and other work-related perceptions, or they may continue to display the same characteristics. A study of this nature would contribute to testing the validity of generational differences theory.

Recommendations for Practice

The findings of this study indicate that there are differences between the generations on key indicators of organizational commitment and factors known as antecedents to organizational commitment. These antecedents may affect one's commitment to the larger organization. The context in which these antecedents occur in the workplace is demonstrated through relationships between employee and employer as well as employee to employee. Mutually acceptable exchange relationships are based on trust and positive relationships in the workplace and are important to organizational commitment. The following section offers recommendations for practice in the work environment to improve organizational commitment through sensitivity to differences between generations.

The recognition that generational differences exist in the workplace is the first step toward creating mutually satisfying reciprocal relationships between employees and organizations. Nursing faculty and the organizations that employ them need to consider the following and how they can be utilized in the workplace to improve organizational commitment across the generations.

Increased awareness of generational differences and improved communication between the generations of nursing faculty with sensitivity to each other's differences
would go a long way to improving the workplace environment for everyone. Establishing mentoring relationships can be a valuable tool for improved interpersonal relationships in the workplace. Pairing employees from different generations who have complementary skill sets can improve productivity and communication between the groups.

Employee trust of supervisors is more likely in organizations in which an ethical climate is present. “Ethical climate refers to an employee’s perceptions about the organization’s practices, procedures, norms and values within an ethical context”. (Mulki, Jaramillo & Locander, 2008, p. 559) Three key factors in building trust are showing interest, supporting others, and working to maintain transparency in the organization (Tennant, 2007). Employers and supervisors can foster a climate of trust with the employees by showing genuine interest in their wants, needs and expectations of the workplace.

Employers able to use coaching skills can go a long way in building positive relationships with employees; which, in turn, can lead to increased productivity and satisfaction. Coaching in the workplace “is the process of open communication and feedback between the manager-coach and employee”. (DeMarco, 2007, p. 37) This can be accomplished using five coaching strategies. The first is to build trust by encouraging and empowering employees. An example would be encouraging further education by providing flexible scheduling to assist with studies and offering incentives for continued education. The second is to use clear communication as to expectations and provide feedback which is specific, positive, and descriptive versus judgmental. Next, employers need to be motivators and cheerleaders by focusing on the positive, praising employee efforts often, and giving ownership to the faculty member. The fourth area is being a
good listener. The more the employee talks, the better the understanding of what is needed and wanted in the workplace. The use of several listening skills, such as clarifying, encouraging, checking perceptions and feelings, and summarizing will assist in both drawing out the thoughts of the faculty member and keeping the conversation focused. The final strategy is to ask good questions, both closed and open to obtain information.

One way to begin to understand the type of commitment a person has to the organization (affective, normative, continuance) is through questioning. Positively framed, open ended questions can be used, such as "what do you think are the best things about working here?" and "what can we do to make it even better for you to work here?" can serve to draw out the employee and make them a partner in creating a better workplace. An employee with a high level of affective commitment would respond with answers highlighting commonalities between him/herself and the organization in terms of vision, values and purpose. An employee with a high level of normative commitment may respond by saying they feel like part of a family in the organization and would feel bad leaving them short-handed if he/she were to quit. An example of a highly continuance committed employee would be one who believes he/she would not be capable of finding a better salary or benefits package somewhere else. To strengthen affective commitment, assure that the employee expectations (particularly for new or recent hires) are being met. Additionally, measures to promote health workplace relationships based on trust and open communication are vital (Manion, 2004).

Work environments that foster respect and trust stand a greater chance of having employees that are loyal. This includes considering each employee individually with
regard to policies and operations. This is important in demonstrating that the organization is truly focused on what each faculty needs and values. Additionally, employers need to communicate openly and create an environment in which feedback is welcomed from each employee. By truly listening to feedback and responding to suggestions employees feel valued (Buhler, 2007).

Ultimately, organizations must realize that different generations of employees have different expectations of the work environment and of the organizations that employ them. Open communication, trust, mentoring, coaching and improving interpersonal relationships are ways that leaders of organizations can understand the needs and values of the employees and attempt to foster improved organizational commitment from their employees. Anticipating that different generations will have different values, needs and motivations will assist leaders in reaching the goal of improved organizational commitment.

Study Limitations

As with any research study there are limitations related to interpretation of the study results based on unexpected flaws in the research design or method that can be improved upon with future research in the same area.

A major limitation of this study was the individual participants’ interpretation of the term “organization”. The academic setting consists of multiple organizational layers and the “organization” could have been defined differently by individual participants in the study. The following layers of organizational structure could have been used by the participants while thinking of their answers: university, college, school, department, program, immediate supervisors or administrators within their programs. Some study
participants recognized this as they completed the survey and felt compelled to write an
e-mail to the researcher to explain their answers and define what “organization” meant to
them. It was noted that the organization as a whole was initially thought to be the
University, and that the school or program of nursing education was independent of the
university, so the participants thought in terms of the nursing school or program where
they work. This was the intention of the researcher at the time, but future studies should
clearly define organization for the study participants to decrease any confusion and
clarify the subject of their responses.

The fact that the entire sample was not accessible to the researcher was a
limitation. Numerous e-mails were sent back as “undeliverable” due to spam blocks, auto
out of office replies, or the person was no longer employed in the organization.

Another limitation noted was that the Millennial Generation was not able to be
included in the study sample due to only two responses from nursing faculty in the
Millennial Generation. There are three possible explanations that the response rate was
low for that group. First, the oldest members of the Millennial Generation were 26 years
old at the time of the study. What we know about the Millennial Generation is that they
take their time to select and settle into their careers and it is possible that 26 is too young
for nurses to have attended undergraduate and graduate nursing education allowing them
to be eligible for nursing faculty positions. Second, it is possible that there were more
Millennial Generation nursing faculty out there, but the random, stratified sampling
method didn’t access these faculty members. Finally, the Millennial Generation could
have been invited to participate in the study and chose not to, based on personal reasons
such as, lack of interest in the topic, refusal to participate in electronic surveys, or being too busy in their role as nursing faculty to have the time to participate.

Another limitation of the study was the timing of the distribution of the survey. The survey was released in the last few weeks of the semester right before the winter break. Some participants replied that they would not be able to participate due to the timing of the survey. They cited end-of-semester evaluations and final grading responsibilities as reasons for not being able to participate in the study. For future research with nursing faculty, the timing of the study should be taken into account to increase the response rate. Although, nursing faculty are always busy, mid semester might be perceived to be a less hectic time for this activity.

Additionally, the nursing faculty may be experiencing saturation with surveys and external requests via email which may have prevented some from participating in this study. Some of the demographic data regarding salary may be distorted because there was not a question about length of contract (9 month vs. 12 month) or full-time versus part-time status. Future studies should include additional demographic information to further separate the specific faculty situations better.

Recommendations for Future Research

The findings of this study warrant the need for further research in the following areas:

1. Qualitative studies with each generational group of nursing faculty to harvest the essence of the needs and experiences of these groups.

2. Further statistical analysis of the data obtained from each generational cohort, to provide more specific insight into the need/wants of each group.
3. Secondary analysis of the data using different grouping patterns, such as by program type, or generational groups using the full study sample, to determine homogeneity of the study population.

4. Replication of this study providing more specific interpretations regarding definition of the term organization. Due to the multi-layered organizational structure in nursing academia, more specificity in the survey questions would further define the antecedents of organizational commitment in nursing faculty.

5. Recommendations for improving the online survey tool. Include more specific questions about employment status, such as full-time, part-time, adjunct, shared contract, etc. and include an open-ended question for respondents to include any comments at the end of the survey.

6. Replication of the study in five years to see if there have been changes in characteristics of each generational cohort over time and to capture the Millennial Generation of nursing faculty.

Summary

This chapter presented a summary of the study, findings and conclusions, recommendations for practice, study limitations and suggestions for further research. The descriptive research design was utilized to describe differences between organizational commitment and three generations of nursing faculty. Major findings in this study demonstrated that significant differences do exist between the generations of nursing faculty regarding organizational commitment and related measures, except for perceived organizational support.
The data from the study supports the notion that the concepts of organizational commitment and generational differences are related. Each generational cohort has its own unique profile of organizational commitment and further study should be conducted to define what individuals in each generation need or want to increase organizational commitment in the workplace.
APPENDIX A

TABLES OF SELECTED GENERATIONAL DIFFERENCES
Table A1

*Generational Differences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Age (born between)</th>
<th>Defining Life Events</th>
<th>Sacrifice for the Greater Good</th>
<th>Expectations of Employer</th>
<th>Comfort with Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>1925-1942</td>
<td>World War II Depression Prohibition Women won right to vote Household appliance more common</td>
<td>High value</td>
<td>If I work hard, am loyal to organization, I can expect a good pension/retirement at age 65 Expect more social security support</td>
<td>Mass production of automobiles Household appliances more common “Not comfortable with technology”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>1943-1960</td>
<td>Korean War, Vietnam War and Cuba Crisis Watched moon landing Assassinations of JFK and MLK College campus war protests</td>
<td>Moderate value</td>
<td>If expect to be rewarded with increased pay, benefits and recognition for a job well done Expect to need some social security support</td>
<td>78s and LPs Vacuum tubes Mainframe computers “Not comfortable with rapidly changing technology”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>1961-1981</td>
<td>Cold War Watched first launch of space shuttle Divorce rates increased More women in the workforce Iranian Hostage Crisis</td>
<td>Low value</td>
<td>I expect to gain portable skills and knowledge to improve résumé Understand necessity of retirement planning</td>
<td>8 track and cassettes VCRs Calculators Cable TV Atari “Willing to adapt to technology”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A2

*Suggestions for Fostering Organizational Commitment for each Generation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Generation</td>
<td>Respect the wisdom of knowledge and experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(born 1925-1942)</td>
<td>Seek historical perspective/advice on challenging situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belief in traditional values of loyalty, hard work and sacrifice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer Generation</td>
<td>Ergonomic support for physical aspects of the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(born 1943-1960)</td>
<td>Most comfortable with consensus building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Want to be respected for their contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>Desires balance between work and home life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tell them what needs to be done and don’t micromanage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial Generation</td>
<td>Enjoys working in groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(born 1982-2002)</td>
<td>May want more lengthy orientation training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desires frequent, constructive feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
MODEL OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ORGANIZATION AND GENERATIONS OF EMPLOYEES IN TERMS OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT
Relationship Between the Organization and Generations of Employees in Terms of Organizational Commitment

- Veteran Generation (VG)
  - Economic Resources
  - "Tangible" Exchanges
  - "Symbolic" Exchanges
  - Commitment
- Baby Boomer Generation (BB)
  - Economic Resources
  - "Tangible" Exchanges
  - "Symbolic" Exchanges
  - Commitment
- Generation X (GX)
  - Economic Resources
  - "Tangible" Exchanges
  - "Symbolic" Exchanges
  - Commitment
- Millennial Generation (MG)
  - Economic Resources
  - "Tangible" Exchanges
  - "Symbolic" Exchanges
  - Commitment

Organization

Zone of Reciprocity
APPENDIX C

TABLES RELATED TO STUDY SAMPLE
Table C1

*Number of Schools Randomly Selected from each Geographic Region by Program Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>North Atlantic</th>
<th>Southern</th>
<th>Mid-Western</th>
<th>Western</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table C2

*Reliability of Survey Tools*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Reported Alpha</th>
<th>Achieved Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment (AC)</td>
<td>30.88</td>
<td>73.39</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>0.77-0.88</td>
<td>0.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment (NC)</td>
<td>26.43</td>
<td>67.03</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>0.65-0.86</td>
<td>0.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment (CC)</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td>60.99</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>0.69-0.84</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort and Security (C/S)</td>
<td>26.89</td>
<td>35.03</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>0.63-0.72</td>
<td>0.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence and Growth (C/G)</td>
<td>29.40</td>
<td>40.10</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>0.65-0.80</td>
<td>0.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status and Independence (S/I)</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>37.80</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>0.62-0.68</td>
<td>0.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support (POS)</td>
<td>38.83</td>
<td>117.41</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>0.74-0.95</td>
<td>0.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Person Organization Fit (PPOF)</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Experiences (DE)</td>
<td>20.29</td>
<td>38.88</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Job Satisfaction (GJS)</td>
<td>22.65</td>
<td>55.616</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C3

*Faculty Rank and Tenure Status (n=287)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your rank in the organization?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a tenured position?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already Achieved Tenure</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Tenure Track</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Tenured Position</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C4

Type of Nursing Program in which Participants Teach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents could choose more than one answer
Table C5

Length of Time as Nurse Educator and Length of Time in Organization (n=288)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Time as Nurse Educator</th>
<th>Time working in current organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 mths and less than 12 mths</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one year, but less than 3 yrs</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3 yrs, but less than 6 yrs</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 yrs, but less than 10 yrs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 yrs, but less than 15 yrs</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 yrs, but less than 20 yrs</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 yrs, but less than 25 yrs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 25 yrs, but less than 30 yrs</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 30 years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C6

*What is your Gross Annual Salary? (n=283)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $30,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$50,000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$70,000</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000-$90,000</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000-$110,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$110,000-$120,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$120,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C7

*Did you Grow up in the United States? (n=280)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table C8**

*What Year Were you Born? Displayed by Generational Cohort (n=288)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1925-1942)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1943-1960)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1961-1981)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C9

Shapiro-Wilk's Tests of Normality by Generation (n=288)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How long have you been a nurse educator?</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long have you worked in your current organization?</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Veteran</th>
<th>Baby Boomer</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your rank in the organization?</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>0.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a tenured position?</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>0.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>0.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your gross annual salary?</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>0.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your Race/Ethnic Origin?</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you grow up in the United States?</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you plan to stay in your current position in this organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C10

*Shapiro-Wilk’s Tests of Normality by Generation (n=288)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort and Security</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence and Growth</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status and Independence</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>Generation X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Person- Organization Fit</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Experiences</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C11

*Analysis of Variance for Generations (between groups)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Generational Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Affective Commitment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.595</td>
<td>0.011*</td>
<td>V&gt;GX; B&gt;GX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Normative Commitment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.931</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Comfort and Security</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.436</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Competence and Growth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.927</td>
<td>0.008**</td>
<td>V&gt;BB; V&gt;GX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Status and Independence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.315</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.886</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Perceived Person Organization Fit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.182</td>
<td>0.016*</td>
<td>BB&gt;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Developmental Experiences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.178</td>
<td>0.002**</td>
<td>V&gt;GX; B&gt;GX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Global Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.293</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>V&gt;BB; V&gt;GX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01
Table C12

*Tukey HSD: Rank of Affective Commitment-Generation X Varied Significantly from Veterans and Baby Boomers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Generation</th>
<th>(J) Generation</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>32.29</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>-3.49</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>-28.80</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>-32.29</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>-28.80</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Table C13

*Tukey HSD: Rank of Competence and Growth-Veterans Varied Significantly from Baby Boomers and Generation X*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Generation</th>
<th>(J) Generation</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>29.09</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>34.93</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>-29.09</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>-34.93</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>-5.84</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
Table C14

*Tukey HSD: Rank of Perceived Person Organization Fit-Veterans and Baby Boomers Varied Significantly From Each Other but Not from Generation X*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Generation</th>
<th>(J) Generation</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>-30.70</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>-5.51</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>30.70</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>25.18</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>-25.18</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Table C15

*Tukey HSD: Rank of Developmental Experiences-Generation X Varied Significantly from Veterans and Baby Boomers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Generation</th>
<th>(J) Generation</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>39.95</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>-12.54</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>27.41</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>-39.95</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>-27.41</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05 **p < .01
Table C16

Tukey HSD: Rank of Global Job Satisfaction—Veterans Varied Significantly from Baby Boomers and Generation X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Generation</th>
<th>(J) Generation</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>39.08</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>42.81</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>-39.08</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>-42.81</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>-3.73</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< .05  **p< .01
Table C17

Chi-Square Results for Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How long have you worked as a nurse educator?</td>
<td>196.715</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Program</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>5.498</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>4.454</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>7.641</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>7.771</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.021*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long working in organization?</td>
<td>113.219</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank in organization</td>
<td>79.477</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Status</td>
<td>55.301</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>632.000</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>4.518</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>29.470</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Salary</td>
<td>20.485</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>24.527</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you grow up in the United States?</td>
<td>1.933</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<.05$  ** $p<.01$
Table C18

*Frequency of Reasons Given for Leaving Organization (n=282)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons provided for leaving organization</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Planning to Leave</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking employment at another academic institution</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving nursing education for another nursing position</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving position to take care of children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving position to take care of other family members</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving position, but staying in the organization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning to Retire</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C19

*Intercorrelations Among the Study Instruments for Study Sample*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>C/S</th>
<th>C/G</th>
<th>S/I</th>
<th>POS</th>
<th>PPOF</th>
<th>DE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>.487**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.192**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>.135*</td>
<td>.168**</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>.323**</td>
<td>.192**</td>
<td>-.156**</td>
<td>.266**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/I</td>
<td>.202**</td>
<td>.167**</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.277**</td>
<td>.401**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>.524**</td>
<td>.406**</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.279**</td>
<td>.344**</td>
<td>.374**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPOF</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>.400**</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.154*</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.142*</td>
<td>.493**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>.542**</td>
<td>.302**</td>
<td>-.138*</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.408**</td>
<td>.294**</td>
<td>.524**</td>
<td>.465**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJS</td>
<td>.658**</td>
<td>.414**</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.178**</td>
<td>.390**</td>
<td>.183**</td>
<td>.590**</td>
<td>.494**</td>
<td>.549**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  ** p<.01
APPENDIX D1

STUDY ANNOUNCEMENT

Dear Faculty Member (Name will be automatically inserted with survey monkey)

In the next few days, you will be receiving an e-mail inviting you to participate in a doctoral nursing research study entitled *Organizational Commitment and Generational Differences among Nursing Faculty*. The purpose of this study is to provide a first-time examination of organizational commitment and generational differences in nursing faculty. We now have four generations of faculty working in academic settings. This trend is likely to persist into the foreseeable future. However, no research has focused on how each of these generations views commitment to the academic organization. Your participation in this study will provide valuable insight into this area. The study will be conducted by electronic survey and should only take about 10 minutes to complete. An e-mail with more information and the survey will be forthcoming.

Thank you:

Lori Candela, Ed.D., RN
Principal Investigator

Lara Carver, MSN, Ph.D.(c), RN
PhD Doctoral Student Investigator
APPENDIX D2

INFORMED CONSENT FOR THE PILOT STUDY

Dear Faculty Member (Name will be automatically inserted with survey monkey)

You are invited to participate in a pilot survey for an upcoming doctoral research study. The purpose of this study is to provide a first-time examination of organizational commitment and generational differences in nursing faculty. We now have four generations of faculty working in academic settings. However, no research has focused on how each of those generations views commitment to the academic organization. Your participation in the study will be valuable in learning more about this area.

You are being asked to participate in the pilot study because you are a nursing faculty member. The pilot study is being conducted to ascertain how long the survey will take the actual study participants and to evaluate the effectiveness of the survey collection methods.

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following:

• Click on the link provided in this email and complete a 75 item questionnaire.
• Please note the time (in minutes) it takes for you to complete the survey at the end and provide any comments or feedback on the survey tool.
• Click the submit button at the end of the survey.

If you agree to participate in the survey, we would appreciate it if you could complete the survey within 5 days of receipt of this email. There may be no direct benefits to you as a participant in this study. However, we hope to learn more about what fosters organizational commitment among different generations of nursing faculty.

There are risks involved in all research studies. This study may include only minimal risks, such as you may be uncomfortable when answering some questions. There will not be financial cost to you to participate in this study. You will not be compensated for your time.

If you have any questions or concerns about the study, you may contact my Dissertation Chair Lori Candela at 702-895-2443 or Lara Carver at 702-531-7831. If you are interested in knowing the final results of the study, you may contact Lara Carver at the number above after June 30, 2008. For questions regarding the rights of research subjects, any complaints or comments regarding the manner in which the study is being conducted you may contact the UNLV Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at 702-895-2794.
Your participation in this pilot study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in this study or in any part of this study. You may withdraw from the study at any time (by clicking the X button at the top right of the survey screen) without effect to your relations with the university. All information gathered in this study will be kept confidential. No reference will be made in written or oral materials that could link you to this study. All records will be stored in a locked facility at UNLV for 3 years after completion of the study. After the storage time the information gathered will be destroyed.

By clicking on the following link you indicate that you have read the above information and agree to participate in this study. You are at least 18 years of age. A copy of this email will serve as your copy of this form.

Click on the following link to enter the survey
Thank you for your participation:

Lori Candela, Ed.D., RN
Principal Investigator

Lara Carver, MSN, Ph.D.(c), RN
PhD Doctoral Student Investigator
INFORMED CONSENT FOR STUDY PARTICIPANTS

Dear Faculty Member (Name will be automatically inserted with survey monkey)

You are invited to participate in a doctoral nursing research study entitled *Organizational Commitment and Generational Differences among Nursing Faculty*. The purpose of this study is to provide a first-time examination of organizational commitment and generational differences in nursing faculty. We now have four generations of faculty working in academic settings. However, no research has focused on how each of these generations views commitment to the academic organization. You are being asked to participate in the study because you are a nursing faculty member. Your participation in the study will be valuable in learning more about this area.

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following:

- Click on the link provided in this email and complete a 75 item questionnaire which should take approximately 10 minutes.
- Click the submit button at the end of the survey.

If you agree to participate in the survey, we would appreciate it if you could complete the survey within 5 days of receipt of this email.

There may be no direct benefits to you as a participant in this study. However, we hope to learn more about what fosters organizational commitment among different generations of nursing faculty.

There are risks involved in all research studies. This study may include only minimal risks, such as you may be uncomfortable when answering some questions.

There will not be financial cost to you to participate in this study. The study will take about 10 minutes of your time. You will not be compensated for your time.

If you have any questions or concerns about the study, you may contact my dissertation chair Lori Candela at 702-895-2443 or Lara Carver at 702-531-7831. If you are interested in knowing the final results of the study, you may contact Lara Carver at the number above after June 30, 2008. For questions regarding the rights of research subjects, any complaints or comments regarding the manner in which the study is being conducted you may contact the UNLV Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at 702-895-2794.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in this study or in any part of this study. You may withdraw at any time without effect to your relations with the university. You may withdraw from the study at any time (by clicking the X button at the top right of the survey screen) without effect to your relations with the university.
All information gathered in this study will be kept confidential. No reference will be made in written or oral materials that could link you to this study. All records will be stored in a locked facility at UNLV for 3 years after completion of the study. After the storage time the information gathered will be destroyed.

By clicking on the following link you indicate that you have read the above information and agree to participate in this study. You understand you have the ability to ask questions about this before beginning the survey. You are at least 18 years of age. A copy of this email will serve as your copy of this form.

Click on the following link to enter the survey

Thank you for your participation.

Lori Candela, Ed.D., RN
Principal Investigator

Lara Carver, MSN, Ph.D.(c), RN
PhD Doctoral Student Investigator
APPENDIX D4

FOLLOW-UP EMAIL REMINDER

Dear Faculty Member (Name will be automatically inserted with survey monkey)

A few days ago you received an e-mail inviting you to participate in a doctoral nursing research study entitled Organizational Commitment and Generational Differences among Nursing Faculty.

If you already responded, thank you for your participation and please disregard this message.

If you have not had a chance to respond yet, the survey will be open for a few more days and you can still access it at the link included in this email.

As a reminder, the purpose of this study is to provide a first-time examination of organizational commitment and generational differences in nursing faculty. We now have four generations of faculty working in academic settings. This trend is likely to persist into the foreseeable future.

However, no research has focused on how each of these generations views commitment to the academic organization.

Your participation in this study will provide valuable insight into this area. The study will be conducted by electronic survey and should only take about 10 minutes to complete.

Click on the following link to enter the survey.

Thank you:

Lori Candela, Ed.D., RN
Principal Investigator

Lara Carver, MSN, Ph.D.(c), RN
PhD Doctoral Student Investigator
APPENDIX E

SURVEY TOOL
Organizational Commitment and Generational Differences in Nursing Faculty

I appreciate you taking the time to participate in this survey about nursing faculty.

There are 75 items and it should take about 10 minutes to complete. The survey begins on the next page. Just click on the "next" button at the bottom of this screen to continue. A progress bar at the top of your screen will indicate what percentage you have completed.
What is your Gender?
- Male
- Female

Marital Status:
- Single
- Married
- Separated
- Divorced
- Widowed

What is your gross annual salary?
- less than $30,000
- $30,000 - $50,000
- $50,000 - $70,000
- $70,000 - $90,000
- $90,000 - $110,000
- $110,000 - $120,000
- > $120,000

What is your Race/Ethnic Origin?
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Black
- Caucasian
- Other (please specify)
- Hispanic
- Native American/Eskimo

Did you grow up in the United States?
- Yes
- No

If you answered no, please indicate what year you came to the United States.

Do you plan to stay in your current position in this organization?
- Yes
- No
If you answered no, please indicate the reason you are not planning to stay in your current position.
(Mark all that apply.)

☐ Seeking employment at another academic institution
☐ Leaving nursing education for another nursing position
☐ Leaving position to take care of children
☐ Leaving position to take care of parents or other family members
☐ Leaving position, but staying in the organization
☐ Planning to retire
Affective, Normative, and Continuance Commitment Scale

Use of the TCM Employee Commitment Survey, authored by John Meyer and Natalie Allen, was made under license from the University of Western Ontario, London, Canada. (1997)

Please rate the following statements on a scale of 1 - 7.  
1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree.

### Affective Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel a strong sense of &quot;belonging&quot; to this organization.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel &quot;emotionally attached&quot; to this organization.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel like &quot;part of the family&quot; at my organization.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Normative Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization deserves my loyalty.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I owe a great deal to this organization.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuance Commitment

Right now staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.

It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.

Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.

I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.

If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.

One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.
Please rate the following statements about different job characteristics for your current job.
1 = Unimportant and 5 = Very Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permits a regular routine in time and place of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides job security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has clear-cut rules and procedures to follow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides ample leisure time off the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides comfortable working conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires meeting and speaking with many other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is intellectually stimulating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires originality and creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make a social contribution by the work you do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfies your cultural and aesthetic interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages continued development of knowledge and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits you to develop your own methods of doing the work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides a feeling of accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides change and variety in duties and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits advancement to high administrative responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides the opportunity to earn a high income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires supervising others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is respected by other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits working independently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires working on problems of central importance to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives you the responsibility for taking risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Listed below is a series of statements that represent possible feelings that individuals might have about the company or organization for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the particular organization for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking one of the seven alternatives below each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The organization strongly considers my goals and values.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help is available from the organization when I have a problem.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization really cares about my well-being.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization is willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if I did the best job possible, the organization would fail to notice.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization cares about my general satisfaction at work.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization shows very little concern for me.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization cares about my opinions.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceived Person-Organization Fit

Reprinted from Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, Vol 67, Daniel Cable & Timothy Judge, Person-Organization Fit, Job Choice Decisions, and Organizational Entry, 294-311, Copyright 1996, with permission from Elsevier.

Respond to each statement on a 5 point Likert scale where 1 = not at all and 5 = completely.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel your values &quot;match&quot; or fit this organization and the current employees in this organization?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My values match those of the current employees in this organization.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the values and &quot;personality&quot; of this organization reflect your own values and personality?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Developmental Experiences


**Respond to each statement on a 7 point Likert scale.**

1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the positions that I have held at this organization, I have often been given additional challenging assignments.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the positions that I have held at this organization, I have often been assigned projects that have enabled me to develop and strengthen new skills.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Respond to each statement on a 7 point Likert scale.**

1 = not at all and 7 = a very large extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A small extent</th>
<th>Below average extent</th>
<th>Average extent</th>
<th>Above average extent</th>
<th>A large extent</th>
<th>A very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Besides formal training and development opportunities, to what extent have your managers helped to develop your skills by providing you with challenging job assignments?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regardless of this organization's policy on training and development, to what extent have your managers made a substantial investment in you by providing formal training and development opportunities?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Global Job Satisfaction


Please rate the question on a 5 point Likert scale.
1 = definitely not take the job and 5 = definitely take the job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely not take the job</th>
<th>Maybe not take the job</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Maybe take the job</th>
<th>Definitely take the job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide?

Please rate the question on a 5 point Likert scale.
1 = not recommend at all and 5 = recommend strongly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not recommend at all</th>
<th>Maybe not recommend</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Maybe recommend</th>
<th>Recommend strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a friend asked if he/she should apply for a job like yours with your employer, what would you recommend?

Please rate the question on a 5 point Likert scale.
1 = very far from ideal and 5 = very close to ideal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very far from ideal</th>
<th>Moderately far from ideal</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Close to ideal</th>
<th>Very close to ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How does this job compare with your ideal job?

Please rate the question on a 5 point Likert scale.
1 = not at all like I wanted and 5 = just like what I wanted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all like I wanted</th>
<th>Almost like what I wanted</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Close to what I wanted</th>
<th>Just like what I wanted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How does your job measure up to the sort of job you wanted when you took it?

Please rate the question on a 5 point Likert scale.
1 = not at all satisfied and 5 = completely satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all satisfied</th>
<th>A little satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Moderately satisfied</th>
<th>Completely satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All things considered, how satisfied are you with your current job?

Please rate the question on a 5 point Likert scale.
1 = not at all and 5 = a great deal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank You!

I appreciate you taking the time to participate in this study. Your responses will be invaluable to further understanding organizational commitment and generational differences in nursing faculty.

Electronic submission of this survey indicates your consent to participate in this research pilot study. All responses will remain confidential and will not be linked to you in any way.

Sincerely,
Lara Carver, MSN, RN
PhD Doctoral Candidate
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

If you have any questions or need to contact me, please email:
LCarver529@aol.com
APPENDIX F

LICENSES/PERMISSIONS TO USE COPYRIGHTED TOOLS
Dear Lara Carver

We have no objection in your using the tool in an online survey for dissertation research. Please find below our permission grant.

---

Dear Lara Carver

We hereby grant you permission to reproduce the material detailed below in print and electronic format at no charge subject to the following conditions:

1. If any part of the material to be used (for example, figures) has appeared in our publication with credit or acknowledgement to another source, permission must also be sought from that source. If such permission is not obtained then that material may not be included in your publication/copies.

2. Suitable acknowledgement to the source must be made, either as a footnote or in a reference list at the end of your publication, as follows:

   “This article was published in Publication title, Vol number, Author(s), Title of article, Page Nos, Copyright Elsevier (or appropriate Society name) (Year).”

3. This permission is granted for non-exclusive world rights in all languages.

4. Reproduction of this material is granted for the purpose for which permission is hereby given, and includes use in any future editions.

Yours sincerely

Jennifer Jones
Rights Assistant

Please note if you are including the tool in your dissertation, then you need to go through Copyright Clearance Center's Rightslink service to obtain permission.

Rightslink® it's faster and easier than ever before to obtain permission to use and republish material from Elsevier.
License Agreement

As posted on November 19, 2004:

IMPORTANT: The Questionnaire you seek to use is licensed only on the condition that you are a Student and agree with the terms and conditions set forth below. THIS LICENSE IS LIMITED TO THE USE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN A SINGLE STUDENT RESEARCH PROJECT. ACADEMIC USE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE REQUIRES A RENEWAL LICENSE. PLEASE CAREFULLY READ THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE LICENSE AGREEMENT.

IF YOU AGREE TO BE BOUND BY THE TERMS OF THIS AGREEMENT, YOU MUST CLICK ON THE "I Accept" BOX AT THE BOTTOM OF THIS AGREEMENT. IF YOU DO NOT AGREE TO THE TERMS OF THIS AGREEMENT, YOU ARE NOT AUTHORIZED TO DOWNLOAD OR USE THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

DEFINITIONS

In this agreement, the following words, when capitalized, have the indicated meanings:

"Inventors" indicate the authors, Dr. John Meyer and Dr. Natalie Allen, School of Nursing, University of Western Ontario.

"Questionnaire" indicates the TCM Employee Commitment Survey, Academic Use of the Survey in a Single Student Research Project (Academic Use Version), 2004 developed by the Inventors. The Questionnaire includes the User Guide and can be downloaded from this website as a single PDF file.

"Student" indicates a person registered and enrolled in an academic institution.

Educational Request Form

First Name: Lara
Last Name: Carver
Street Address: 7720 Robinglea Avenue
City: Las Vegas
State: NV
Zip Code: 89131
Country: USA
Contact Phone Number: 702-363-6292
Fax: 702-531-7894
E-mail Address: lcarver529@aol.com

Wiley product/title from which you’d like to photocopy: Journal of Organizational Behavior – Work Values Inventory Tool

Book or Journal: Journal
Author: Meyer, J.P., Irving, P.G., & Allen, N.J.
Journal Month: unknown
Journal Year: 1998
Journal Volume: 19
Journal Issue: not listed

Specific pages or range of pages or figure numbers you wish to copy: Table 1, page 35-36
Maximum estimate of the number of copies you’ll need: 2

Will the material be posted on a website or intranet site? No
What is the url where the material would be located? Surveymonkey.com

Is the web site where the material will be posted password protected, or is access to the site limited in any way? Yes, the participants will receive a link to the survey in their email.
How many users would have access? I will be sending out surveys to 5,350 subjects to complete the tool.

How long will the material be posted (not to exceed a two year limit)? From: 9/1/07 To: 1/1/08

Total length of time posted will be two weeks during the above timeframe.

Name of your University or Institution: University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Course Name and Number: NUR 794 and NUR 797 Dissertation and Research Seminar for PhD in Nursing
Term: Fall 2007
Instructor: Lori Candela, Ed.D., RN

Is the book the required textbook for the class? No
Are you a Wiley author? No

Please indicate any unusual circumstances regarding this request.
I would like to use the Work Values Inventory tool in this journal article for my PhD dissertation. I will be sending out an email survey on “survey monkey” to a national sample of nursing faculty. Data collection is expected to take about two weeks.
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APPENDIX G

TABLES RELATED TO THE TOTAL SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS
Table G1

*How Long Have You Been a Nurse Educator?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=1515)</th>
<th>Study Sample (n=288)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 months and less than 12 months</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one year, but less than 3 years</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3 years, but less than 6 years</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 years, but less than 10 years</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years, but less than 15 years</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years, but less than 20 years</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years, but less than 25 years</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 25, but less than 30 years</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 30 years</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table G2

*Please Indicate the Type of Nursing Program in Which You Teach*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th></th>
<th>Study Sample</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents could select more than one answer.
Table G3

*How Long Have you Worked in your Current Organization?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=1514)</th>
<th>Study Sample (n=288)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 months and</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one year, but</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3 years, but</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 6 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 years, but</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 10 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years, but</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 15 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years, but</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 20 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years, but</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 25 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 25, but less</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than 30 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 30 years</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table G4

*What is Your Rank in the Organization?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=1514)</th>
<th>Study Sample (n=287)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table G5

Is This a Tenured Position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=1507)</th>
<th>Study Sample (n=286)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already Achieved Tenure</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Tenure Track</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Tenured Position</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table G6

*What Year were you Born? Displayed by Generational Cohort*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=1492)</th>
<th>Study Sample (n=288)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Generation (1925-1942)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers (1943-1960)</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X (1961-1981)</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial Generation (1981-2003)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table G7

*What is Your Gender?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=1456)</th>
<th>Study Sample (n=283)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table G8

*What is your Marital Status?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=1503)</th>
<th>Study Sample (n=287)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table G9

*What is your Gross Annual Salary?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=1494)</th>
<th>Study Sample (n=283)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $30,000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$50,000</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$70,000</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000-$90,000</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000-$110,000</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$110,000-$120,000</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$120,000</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table G10

*What is your Race/Ethnic Origin?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=1505)</th>
<th>Study Sample (n=287)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Eskimo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table G11

*Did you Grow Up in the United States?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=1499)</th>
<th>Study Sample (n=280)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1441</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table G12

Do you Plan to Stay in your Current Position in this Organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=1510)</th>
<th>Study Sample (n=286)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table G13

If you Answered No, Please Indicate the Reason you Are Not Planning to Stay in Your Current Position. (Mark all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=284)</th>
<th>Study Sample (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking employment at another academic institution</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving nursing education for another nursing position</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving position to take care of children</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving position to take care of parents or other family members</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving position, but staying in the organization</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning to retire</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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