Research in Higher Education, Vol. 31, No. 1, 1990

RETAINING FACULTY: A TALE OF TWO CAMPUSES

Michael W. Matier

The results of a study examining factors influencing the decisions of faculty with firm offers to leave two universities are discussed. Particular attention is paid to the relative weight and importance faculty placed on the tangible, intangible, and nonwork-related benefits of the incumbent and offering employment situations. Comparisons are drawn to previous studies of this genre, as well as between the urban and rural universities represented in the study. The methods and findings of this research should be of special interest to those from institutions concerned both with attracting and retaining a quality faculty.

It has been said that "a university is its faculty" and that the "excellence of a university is the excellence of its faculty" (Smith, 1978, p. 1). Bowen and Schuster (1986) were probably closer to the mark when they stated that the "excellence of higher education is a function of the kind of people it is able to enlist and retain on its faculties" (p. 3). Either way, the ability not only to attract top-quality and promising faculty but also to retain those currently employed has been, and will continue to be, of paramount importance to institutions of higher education concerned with developing and maintaining quality programs. The importance of understanding the matrix of factors affecting faculty migration increases exponentially at a time when the demand for faculty in particular disciplines is already exceeding supply, and when the prospect of more difficult supply problems loom in the not-too-distant future. Examples of the former include engineering and the sciences where starting salaries for individuals with bachelor's degrees often surpass those available to established faculty. The latter is anticipated in response to the impending

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 29th Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Baltimore, April 30–May 3, 1989.

Michael W. Matier, Office of Institutional Planning and Research, Cornell University, 440 Day Hall, Ithaca, NY 14850-2801.

0361-0365/90/0200-0039$06.00/0

retirement of the large cohort of faculty hired to serve the swelling ranks of academe following the post World War II baby boom, regardless of the ending of mandatory retirement in 1994.

This study of faculty at two public Research I universities and the factors they weighed when faced with opportunities to change jobs during the 1987–88 academic year is an example of what can be learned about why faculty make the choices they do.[1, 2] It serves as an example primarily because its synthetic methodological, theoretical, and analytical underpinnings suggest how this same information can be collected, analyzed, and applied in other settings. However, it is also an example of the wide range of factors exerting influence on the decision makers and how the local milieu of each institution affects the decision-making process.

The two subject institutions were selected for study because both had experienced rapid diminishment in general state support for their operations, leading to similar conditions of fiscal stress. Both institutions responded to less than adequate legislative appropriations with sharp tuition increases and realignment of current resources to meet unavoidable cost increases, but both were unable to provide general salary increases for continuing faculty in FY 1988. The two institutions are designated in this article only as Wyandot and Manada Universities. Wyandot University is an urban university located in the midst of one of the nation's fifteen largest standard metropolitan statistical areas. Manada University is nestled in a community of less than 150,000 people, two to three hours removed from any major metropolitan area.

Throughout the 1980s, Manada had conducted annual exit surveys of faculty who resigned and was aware that their faculty loss rate in FY 1988 was about double what it had been two years earlier. Wyandot had not previously kept systematic centralized data on faculty migration.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A review of the literature found three types relevant to this investigation. First, there were previous faculty mobility and attrition studies showing a degree of correspondence to the present research (Caplow and McGee, 1958; Stecklein and Lathrop, 1960; Blackburn and Aurand, 1972; Solomon, 1978; Toombs and Matier, 1981; Gartshore, Hibbard, and Stockard, 1983; and Burke, 1988). The second type of relevant literature related to the typical methodologies employed in research concerning job satisfaction and its potential consequences (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1977, 1978). The third type of relevant literature was organizational equilibrium and commitment research that builds a more detailed theory for understanding the potential influences and motivations involved with an individual's decision to remain at or leave a particular place of employment (March

and Simon, 1958; Flowers and Hughes, 1973; and Steers, 1977). Employing the most salient features from each strand of the literature, a synthetic model was developed to assist in understanding and explaining the decisions made by the subject faculty in the present research.

Based on the review of the literature, it was clear that the method of inquiry and explanation employed in this research would have to take into consideration four somewhat overlapping factors. First, it was important that the methodology acknowledge and incorporate a wide variety of factors that could influence a particular faculty member's decision to remain at or leave an institution.

Second, a more specific aspect of the first consideration was that the method employed would need to look at more than just those factors directly tied to the internal, micro-work environment. As Salancik and Pfeffer (1977, 1978) suggested, allowance must be made for the possibility that individuals might rationalize and "cognitively reconstruct" their environments in order to be at peace with their particular decisions.

Third, though a strong majority of previous mobility research cited the internal push as more operative than the external pull in an individual's decision, both factors play a part in the decision-making process. In addition, it seemed intuitive that pushing and pulling could take place on the part of both the offering and incumbent institutions. For instance, while an individual's current salary might constitute a push, the degree of autonomy experienced in his or her present position might be considered a pull. As well, a generous salary offer from another employer may be considered a pull, but the offering institution's geographic location could be a push to remain with the incumbent employer. Thus, the method of explanation and data collection employed in this research needed to be flexible enough to account for this expanded notion of the push-pull metaphor.

Fourth, as well as discerning the perceived desirability of movement, the ease of movement also needed to be woven into a workable method of understanding how decisions were made.

Drawing most heavily on the work of March and Simon (1958) and Flowers and Hughes (1973) to set the general framework, the major elements involved in an individual's choice to remain at or leave a particular employment situation were defined to be (a) the individual's ease of movement, (b) the perceived desirability of moving, (c) the inducements/contributions balance the individual rationalized as his or her due based on the first two elements, and (d) the particular decision made by the individual to remain or leave.

To determine an individual's ease of movement, various personal demographic information was analyzed, as well as information concerning how visible the individual was to the academic community beyond the employing institution, and the individual's propensity to seek out employment opportunities. To determine an individual's perceived desirability of moving, both

internal and external environmental factors were considered. In conceptualizing the relationship between the internal and external environments, Flowers and Hughes' (1973) notion of the relation of job satisfaction to environmental factors was used as a model.

The internal environmental factors consist of two main types: intangible benefits of the job and tangible benefits of the job. The choice in terminology and how it was operationalized is a departure from both Flowers and Hughes (1973), who spoke of job satisfaction/motivation and maintenance factors, and Herzberg (1968), who talked of motivator and hygiene factors. Yet, the categorization employed in this analysis is similar, especially in terms of the correspondence between what are here called the tangible benefits of the job and what Flowers and Hughes and Herzberg term maintenance and hygiene factors respectively. Nevertheless, the intangible/tangible distinction is more representative of the type of benefit individuals derive from their work association. The intangible benefits include such factors as personal and institutional reputation, autonomy, influence, and sense of belonging. The tangible benefits include wages, facilities, work rules, and fringe benefits. The external environmental factors are nonwork-related benefits. These include quality of life, family, friendships, and nonjob-related financial considerations.

Based on the interrelationship between the internal and external environments, only those individuals with a perception of low internal and external environmental benefits were expected to perceive a desirability of moving and potentially terminate their present employment situation. The other three possible combinations (high internal and low external benefits, low internal and high external benefits, and high internal and high external benefits) represent individuals who are more likely to remain in their present position.

It is at the level of the inducements/contributions balance where individuals weigh ease of movement along with perceived desirability of moving and develop a rationalization about whether they are being adequately compensated. A perceived desirability of moving (denoted by low internal and external environmental reasons for remaining) without a concomitant ease of movement was understood to suggest the individual will likely remain and have to reconstruct his or her cognitive understanding of the various environments to rationalize this continued employment. Likewise, someone with an ease of movement and strong internal environmental reasons to do so will likely remain if the external environmental reasons suggest a desirability to remain rather than move. Only when individuals have an ease of movement and perceive both internal and external environmental factors as denoting a desirability to move were they expected to move to a different position.

Inertia, as suggested by Flowers and Hughes (1973), is the operative principle. Once ensconced in a particular position, it virtually takes a three-pronged force—an ease of movement along with low internal and external

environmental benefits—to make the stationary body actually move. One or two prongs may exert force to the point of causing it to be uncomfortable to remain, but the synthetic model posits that it takes all three to induce movement.

METHODOLOGY

The review and synthesis of relevant literature also led to the selection of Lazarsfeld and Rosenberg's (1958) "empirical analysis of action" or "accounting scheme" methodology to solicit the information germane to this investigation. In the majority of previous mobility studies, individuals were asked to define the particular set of reasons behind their decision to leave for another job. In some instances, researchers also attempted to discern an individual's degree of satisfaction with various aspects of both the previous and present places of employment.

However, since the individuals in this research would be queried approximately six months after their decision was made, and could thus be expected to engage in some "social information processing" (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1978) to rationalize their particular decisions, it seemed inappropriate to directly ask the subjects to provide a list of motivations for their behavior. Rather, by indirectly asking about a broader spectrum of possible considerations than they may have volunteered, it was hoped that a more comprehensive picture of the factors affecting their decisions might be obtained. Second, by the same process, the subjects would be induced to consider the influence that certain factors had on the decision-making process that they may have otherwise forgotten or suppressed.

A population of 239 tenure-stream faculty from all disciplines at Wyandot and Manada, who had firm opportunities to leave their respective universities during academic year 1987–88, was identified. Excluded from the population were faculty who were denied tenure during the year under investigation, as well as faculty that deans or department heads identified as either not likely to attain tenure, or who simply would not be missed. Each faculty member identified as having received a firm offer was sent a questionnaire that was accompanied by a cover letter from the chief academic officer of the incumbent institution requesting their participation in a study of the factors affecting faculty migration at Wyandot and Mananda. As well, a memo from the author also accompanied the questionnaire explaining the scope of the project and an indication that it would take approximately 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire and that each respondent would be asked to participate in a 20-minute follow-up interview. A second mailing followed about eight weeks later to those who had not yet returned the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was designed to elicit information concerning both ease of

movement and perceived desirability of moving, with emphasis on the latter. The first part of the questionnaire sought information concerning the offering institution and the particulars of the best firm offer during the year in question. The second section asked the recipients to designate the degree of enticement a series of factors had on their particular decisions. For each factor, they were instructed to designate the degree of enticement it provided to remain with the incumbent university and the degree of enticement the factor provided to leave for the firm offer.

Questionnaires returned as undeliverable, or noting that the recipient either was not in a tenure track position at the incumbent university or that a firm offer to leave was never received, were discarded from the study, leaving a total working population of 221. An overall response rate of 64% was obtained, with roughly equivalent response rates for each institution (Wyandot, 60%; Manada, 66%).

Follow-up interviews were conducted in person or by telephone with 62% of the respondents to gather further information concerning their ease of movement and perceived desirability of moving. All respondents were called at least once to set up interviews. Though only a small handful directly refused to be interviewed, the majority of the 48% of the respondents who were not interviewed tacitly refused an interview by not returning telephone messages. When the interview was scheduled, the faculty were asked to provide a copy of their curriculum vita to expedite collection of the information covered in the interview. The interview agenda was designed to gather demographic and biographical information not readily attainable through a questionnaire format as well as amplification of information provided on the questionnaire.

FINDINGS

Beyond the 64% response rate as an indicator of the representativeness of the respondents, two demographic criteria for which data were available for all or most of the total working subject pool also suggested the respondents bore a reasonable resemblance to those receiving the questionnaire: academic rank and gender. Though there was some minor variation, the relative proportions of assistant professors, associate professors, and professors were similar among the working subject pool and the questionnaire respondents. Overall, assistant professors accounted for the most firm offers followed by professors and associate professors. However, there was a difference between the institutions, in that at Manada offers to professors outnumbered those to assistant professors. At Wyandot, assistant professors received over half the offers to the working subject pool. Nevertheless, since assistant professors at Wyandot responded at a rate of only 50% they were somewhat underrepresented among the total number of respondents.

The other demographic criterion for which data were available for most of the total working subject pool, gender, also indicated representativeness. At Wyandot males outnumbered females two to one and at Manada the ratio was approximately three to one.

Two other demographic criteria were requested only of the respondents interviewed: race/ethnic classification and age. At both institutions, nearly 90% of the individuals interviewed were white. Of the remainder, five individuals were of Asian heritage, three were black, and one was Hispanic. The average age of the faculty interviewed at both institutions was slightly less than 42 years.

Offers/Inducements

The vast majority of the respondents to the questionnaire (89%) received firm offers from other institutions of higher education. Proportionally more faculty at Wyandot entertained offers from the private sector, but this situation is largely attributable to the fact that this university offers a full range of medical and other health profession programs. Of the ten offers from the private sector at Wyandot, eight were to physicians, nurses, and pharmacists who often have a much more natural and direct link to the private sector than many other faculty groups.

All faculty at Manada who listed the name of the institution making the competing offer would have been forced to relocate to pursue their firm offer. Given Manada's somewhat isolated geographic location this was not surprising. At Wyandot—the urban university—nearly 23% (10 of 44) of the faculty reporting the alternative offering institution could have avoided uprooting themselves (and their immediate families) had they changed positions.

Faculty reporting the salary tendered with their firm outside offer at Wyandot indicated they would see an average increase of slightly more than 40% for nine-month equivalent salaries. At Manada this average increase was just under 30%. Full professors at both institutions reported the "smallest" average percentage increases (26% at Wyandot; 25% at Manada). The rank of faculty reporting the largest potential increases at Wyandot was assistant professors with increases averaging nearly 50%, and at Manada associate professors would have seen the largest average potential increases at 35%. Actual realized salary increases will be discussed later.

Average anticipated salary increases from higher education institutions (42%, $n = 34$) and from the private sector (45%, $n = 10$) for faculty at Wyandot were virtually the same. At Manada there was a large discrepancy with respect to offered salary increase favoring a move to the private sector (55%, $n = 5$) over a move to another institution of higher education (28%, $n = 89$), but the small number of offers from the private sector may have skewed these results.

Beyond salary enhancements, the outside offers often included provisions to defray moving expenses, both one-time and recurring research and equipment support, and in some instances mortgage supplements. Roughly three-quarters of those reporting firm outside offers at Wyandot indicated the offering institution would cover all or a part of their moving expenses. For the 23 individuals who reported an actual dollar amount the average came to approximately $4,700 per offer. At Manada, 87% of those receiving offers indicated they would receive compensation for the costs of moving personal and professional belongings. The average compensation of a possible move was just under $4,100 for the 51 faculty who designated such a figure.

Research and equipment support offered to faculty from both Wyandot and Manada ran the gamut from over $1 million in start-up funds to establish a laboratory, to pledges of hundreds of thousands of dollars to remodel space, to yearly travel and research stipends of up to $40,000, to guaranteed summer salary support, to promises to provide permanent lines for research assistants and postdoctoral fellows, to lower teaching loads, to personal computers, to clerical support.

Mortgage assistance was reported as part of the offer package by fourteen faculty at Manada and seven at Wyandot. Four of these came from institutions in the private sector, and the remaining from other institutions of higher education. Four of the higher education offers of mortgage assistance came from private universities including two Ivy League schools. Of the thirteen mortgage assistance offers from public institutions, seven were from institutions in the University of California System and three were from Big Ten institutions.

In ten of the cases of mortgage assistance, the offering institution offered, in one fashion or another, to subsidize or provide lower than market interest rates on home mortgages. In an additional five cases closing costs on the purchase of a home or a cash payment toward a down payment were extended by the offering institution.

Action on Offers

As Table 1 indicates, 46% of all respondents resigned to pursue the offer they described in the questionnaire. An additional 14% initially took a leave without pay (LWOP) to accept their firm offer, and subsequently decided not to return to the incumbent university, bringing the total loss rate to 60%. The total loss rate at Wyandot was 69% and at Manada 56%, though Manada's initial resignation rate was only 39%.

Overall, 36 of 53 assistant professors (68%), 29 of 52 professors (56%), and 19 of 35 associate professors (54%) eventually resigned, giving credence to the general suggestion of Caplow and McGee (1958) that full professors are more

TABLE 1. Decision by FY 1988 Rank

	Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		All Ranks	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Wyandot								
Reamin	6	46.2%	4	30.8%	3	23.1%	13	28.9%
Resign	3	11.1	6	22.2	18	66.7	27	60.0
LWOP								
Return	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.2
Resign	3	75.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	4	8.9
Undecided	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Subtotal	13	28.9%	11	24.4%	21	46.7%	45	100.0%
Manada								
Remain	13	36.1%	11	30.6%	12	33.3%	36	37.9%
Resign	14	37.8	8	21.6	15	40.5	37	38.9
LWOP								
Return	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	1.1
Resign	9	56.3	4	25.0	3	18.8	16	16.8
Undecided	3	60.0	0	0.0	2	40.0	5	5.3
Subtotal	39	41.1%	24	25.3%	32	33.7%	95	100.0%
Both Institutions								
Remain	19	38.8%	15	30.6%	15	30.6%	49	35.0%
Resign	17	26.6	14	21.9	33	51.6	64	45.7
LWOP								
Return	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	2	1.4
Resign	12	60.0	5	25.0	3	15.0	20	14.3
Undecided	3	60.0	0	0.0	2	40.0	5	3.6
Total	52	37.1%	35	25.0%	53	37.9%	140	100.0%

mobile than associate professors, but less mobile than assistant professors. However, this was not the case at Manada, where there were more full professor (23 of 39, or 59%) than assistant professor resignations (18 of 32, or 56%).

A promotion in rank and/or administrative responsibilities was reported by 26 of the 59 (44%) faculty who chose to pursue their firm offer either through resigning or taking a LWOP from Manada. Of those at Manada who chose to remain, 27% (10 of 37) realized such a promotion. At Wyandot, the ratios were more equivalent, with 34% of those who left (11 of 32) and 31% of those who decided to stay (4 of 13) receiving a promotion. These promotions took the form of direct promotions in rank (e.g., from assistant professor to associate

professor), through taking on departmental headship responsibilities, or some combination of the two. Additionally, three individuals, two from Manada and one at Wyandot, resigned to become deans at their offering institutions.

With respect to salary increases realized as a result of their decisions, faculty at Wyandot who chose to remain with the institution averaged a salary increase of 29% for FY 1989. Those who took a LWOP saw an average increase of approximately 19%, and those who resigned averaged an increase in nine-month equivalent salaries of slightly more than 44%. These increases compare very favorably with an average increase from FY 1988 to FY 1989 of 6.8% for the whole of the continuing faculty at Wyandot.

At Manada, faculty receiving a firm outside offer who chose to remain with the institution saw increases averaging slightly under 19%, those on a LWOP for FY 1989 realized a 23% increase at the institutions of their firm offer, and those who resigned averaged more than a 29% increase. In sharp contrast, the average salary increase for all continuing faculty at Manada was only 7.9%.

Clearly, securing an outside offer—whether or not it was accepted—had a significant effect on an individual's compensation. Administrators at both Wyandot and Manada, in anticipation of "raiding" during a bad budget year, had at least informally initiated practices of attempting to meet market demand pressures by matching firm outside offers in an attempt to retain faculty. This was a matter of concern to many of those interviewed for one of two reasons. First, if an outside offer was not matched (at least in part) this often came as a surprise to individuals who were simply "playing the game" as they were led to believe they were supposed to in order to receive a salary increase. Second, for a much larger group of faculty at each institution, there was concern that this practice was promoting and encouraging disloyalty to the institution, which in turn was fracturing faculty morale at both the institutional and departmental levels.

Ease of Movement

As an outgrowth of the review of the literature, an individual's ease of movement was understood to comprise three sets of factors: (a) personal characteristics, (b) visibility in the academic community outside one's own institution, and (c) an individual's propensity to search for other employment opportunities.

There were five personal characteristics assumed to influence an individual's ease of movement: age, marital status, spousal employment situation, dependent financial support, and length of service. Four tangible ways in which individual faculty members could demonstrate their visibility outside the confines of their own institution were considered: publishing, presenting, editing, and involve-

ment in professional organizations. With respect to the propensity to search for other employment opportunities, five factors were considered: nominations or solicitations to apply for positions, applications initiated by the individual faculty members, participation in job interviews, job offers tendered, and the transferability of ongoing research. These data were collected from vitae or in the course of the follow-up interviews. Based on the information provided, individuals were scored positively (demonstrating an ease of movement) or negatively (lack of ease of movement) for each factor.

For each subset of factors (personal characteristics, visibility, and propensity to search), individuals were determined to have an ease of movement if they demonstrated an ease of movement on more than half the factors in the subset. Overall ease of movement was assumed if an individual displayed ease of movement in at least two of the three subsets of factors.

Approximately 79% of the faculty interviewed at Wyandot and 86% of those at Manada displayed an overall ease of movement (see Table 2). Note, however, that a few individual factors and one of the composite subscores were far below these overall ratios. For instance, at both institutions the majority of faculty were married and had individuals dependent on them for financial support, thereby exhibiting a lack of ease of movement on these criteria.

As well, less than half the faculty interviewed at Manada initiated search activities or were tendered more than one offer, and barely more than half participated in more than one interview—all deemed to indicate an absence of ease of movement. This situation contributed to a majority demonstrating a lack of ease of movement on the propensity to search subscore. In general, faculty at Manada indicated in the course of their interview that they were not proactively engaged in trying to move, but they were willing to selectively listen when approached with an opportunity. This was particularly true of associate and full professors, but also true of a surprising number of assistant professors. And, as the earlier discussion of decisions suggests, a significant number did eventually choose to leave. A common refrain in the interviews, particularly with senior faculty, was that in previous years they had simply dismissed unsolicited offers on the spot, but that in the current year they began to listen, given the unstable financial environment the university had been experiencing, typified by the fact that there had been no salary increases for the 1987–88 academic year.

The same general propensity to search phenomena were in evidence at Wyandot, though not to the same extremes. This is likely to be explained more by the larger proportion of assistant professors in the Wyandot cohort than by a difference in fiscal environments since Wyandot was experiencing virtually equivalent fiscal constraints.

Generally speaking, however, faculty at both institutions demonstrated an ease of movement with respect to their personal characteristics, visibility to the outside labor market, and their own propensity to search for opportunities. Given the

TABLE 2. Ease of Movement

	Wyandot					Manada				
	Ease of Movement			No Ease of Movement		Ease of Movement			No Ease of Movement	
	N	*n*	%	*n*	%	*N*	*n*	%	*n*	%
Personal Characteristics										
Age	28	28	100.0%	0	0.0%	57	55	96.5%	2	3.5%
Marital Status	28	6	21.4	22	78.6	57	10	17.5	47	82.5
Spousal Employment	28	21	75.0	7	25.0	57	50	87.7	7	12.3
Years of Service	28	23	82.1	5	17.9	57	50	87.7	7	12.3
Dependant Financial Support	28	6	21.4	22	78.6	57	20	35.1	37	64.9
Composite Subscore	28	21	75.0%	7	25.0%	58*	47	81.0%	11	19.0%
Visibility										
Actively Publishing	26	24	92.3%	2	7.7%	56	53	94.6%	3	5.4%
Actively Presenting	26	26	100.0	0	0.0	56	53	94.6	3	5.4
Journal Editor/ Referee	26	21	80.8	5	1.2	56	44	78.6	12	21.4
Professional Org. Involvement	26	21	80.8	5	19.2	56	46	82.1	10	17.9
Composite Subscore	26	23	88.5%	3	11.5%	56	49	87.5%	7	12.5%
Propensity to Search										
Nominations/Solicitations	28	27	96.4%	1	3.6%	58	44	75.9%	14	24.1%
Initiated Applications	28	16	57.1	12	42.9	58	23	39.7	35	60.3
Participated in Interviews	28	20	71.4	8	2.6	58	31	53.4	27	46.6
Offers Tendered	28	19	67.9	9	32.1	58	28	48.3	30	51.7
Transferability of Research	28	21	75.0	7	25.0	58	46	79.3	12	20.7
Composite Subscore	28	20	71.4%	8	28.6%	58	34	58.6%	24	41.4%
Ease of Movement	28	22	78.6%	6	21.4%	58	50	86.2%	8	13.8%

* The *N* of the composite subscore is greater than any individual *N* because there were individuals who did not provide data for each criterion.

inertial nature of the decision-making process assumed for this study, it is suggested that for the vast majority of faculty interviewed, ease of movement was not a factor that would contribute to their remaining with their incumbent employer.

Perceived Desirability of Moving

Data relevant to an individual's perceived desirability of moving were

collected in the questionnaire where faculty were asked to designate the degree of enticement each of 33 accounting scheme factors had both to remain with the incumbent institution as well as to leave to pursue the firm offer. The answers were designated using a scale ranging from "1" (no enticement) to "5" (a very high degree of enticement) with two other options available: "NA" for not applicable and "?" designating they had no way of telling how a particular factor may have enticed them. In scoring responses, both "NA" and "?" were scored as zero to designate an absence of enticement, causing the scale to range, for analytic purposes, from 0 to 5.

Three types of analysis were performed. First, comparisons between the enticement to remain and the enticement to leave for each factor were considered. Second, by aggregating the data for each factor, across the participants, it was possible to determine the relative importance of each accounting scheme factor in the cohort's decision-making processes. Third, by analyzing how the participants differentially applied various weights to the set of accounting scheme factors, it was possible to test whether their final decisions matched what would be expected, based on both their ease of movement and perceived desirability of moving.

Comparison of Enticements

Using the internal/external environmental categorization the 33 accounting scheme factors were designated as affecting either the internal or external environment. The internal environmental factors were subdivided into intangible and tangible benefits of the job. Table 3 provides a comparison of the enticement to remain and the enticement to leave for each of the factors with respect to faculty from Wyandot and Manada.

Intangible benefits account for at least half of the top ten benefits either to remain or leave at both institutions. Intangible benefits "research opportunities," "reputation of associates," and "congeniality of associates" were in the top ten ranked factors of both the remain and leave categories at each institution. At Wyandot the top ten for both remain and leave also included "reputation of department," while at Manada they also included "rapport with departmental leadership."

Tangible benefits were more prevalent in the top ten factors to leave at both institutions than in the top ten factors to remain. The tangible benefits of "cash salary," "income potential," and "benefit package" ranked in the top ten factors to leave for both institutions.

Nonwork-related benefits never appeared more than twice among the top ten of any category, though "cultural, recreational, and social opportunities" was the highest ranked factor to remain at Wyandot (it ranked 22nd on Wyandot's

TABLE 3. Enticement of Perceived Desirability of moving Factors

	Type* of Benefit	Wyandot						Manada					
		Enticement to Remain			Enticement to Leave			Enticement to Remain			Enticement to Leave		
		Rank	*N*	Mean	Rank	*N*	Mean	Rank	*N*	Mean	Rank	*N*	Mean
1. Reputation of Institution	I	9	42	2.4	11	43	3.0	1	92	3.7	17	90	2.5
2. Reputation of Department	I	10	41	2.4	8	45	3.1	3	92	3.4	15	89	2.7
3. Reputation of Associates	I	4	41	2.7	10	44	3.0	4	91	3.3	10	91	2.9
4. Congeniality of Associates	I	8	41	2.5	9	45	3.1	6	89	3.1	4	92	3.4
5. Rapport with Dept. Leaders	I	5	41	2.6	6	44	3.2	7	90	2.8	2	92	3.4
6. Career Advancement Opps.	I	16	42	1.9	2	44	3.6	23	89	1.8	8	93	3.1
7. Teaching Assign/Opps.	I	7	42	2.5	14	43	2.7	17	89	2.1	16	91	2.5
8. Research Opportunities	I	2	42	3.0	7	44	3.2	5	91	3.1	9	92	3.1
9. Loyalty to Institution	I	14	42	2.1	32	44	0.8	11	91	2.4	33	91	0.9
10. Loyalty to Dept./Program	I	3	42	2.8	31	44	1.0	9	92	2.5	31	91	1.2
11. Influence in Department	I	13	41	2.1	23	45	1.9	19	91	2.1	13	92	2.8
12. Influence in Institution	I	25	42	1.5	25	44	1.6	25	91	1.6	19	92	2.3
13. Promotion/Added Responsibilities	T	29	42	1.4	18	44	2.3	31	88	1.1	23	91	2.2
14. Cash Salary	T	17	42	1.8	1	44	3.9	18	89	2.1	1	92	3.6
15. Benefit Package	T	27	42	1.5	4	44	3.3	24	89	1.8	7	93	3.1
16. Income Pontential	T	30	40	1.3	3	44	3.3	21	88	1.8	3	92	3.4
17. Teaching/Research Load	T	6	42	2.5	13	44	2.8	12	90	2.3	14	91	2.8
18. Research Funding	T	19	42	1.8	5	44	3.2	10	91	2.5	12	92	2.8
19. Library Facilities	T	12	42	2.2	19	44	2.3	2	90	3.5	26	91	1.8
20. Lab/Research Facilities	T	20	42	1.7	16	44	2.4	13	91	2.2	20	93	2.3
21. Office Facilities	T	21	41	1.7	12	45	2.8	22	90	1.8	22	93	2.2
22. Secretarial Support	T	28	41	1.4	15	44	2.6	20	90	2.0	21	94	2.3
23. Sabbatical, Leave, Travel	T	15	42	1.9	17	44	2.3	15	90	2.1	25	93	2.1
24. Reduced Tuition for Family	T	33	42	0.5	28	43	1.3	33	90	0.5	28	93	1.5
25. Consulting Opportunities	N	23	42	1.6	27	43	1.4	29	90	1.3	27	93	1.7
26. Spouse Career Opportun.	N	24	42	1.6	26	44	1.5	27	89	1.4	18	94	2.4
27. School Situation of Children	N	31	42	1.1	30	44	1.2	30	90	1.2	30	93	1.3
28. Geographic Considerations	N	18	40	1.8	20	42	2.3	26	90	1.5	6	93	3.3
29. Climate of Region	N	32	41	1.0	24	44	1.9	28	89	1.4	11	93	2.9
30. Cult., Rec., Social Opps.	N	1	42	3.1	22	44	2.0	16	90	2.1	5	93	3.3
31. Housing Costs	N	22	42	1.6	21	44	2.1	8	90	2.6	24	93	2.1
32. Family Living Locally	N	26	42	1.5	33	43	0.7	32	91	1.0	32	92	1.0
33. Local Network of Friends	N	11	42	2.4	29	44	1.2	14	90	2.2	29	93	1.5

*I = Intangible benefits of the job
T = Tangible benefits of the job
N = Nonwork-related benefits

ranking of factors to leave). At Manada—the rural university—this same factor was ranked 16th among enticements to remain, but 5th among those to leave. This ranking, no doubt, is a reflection of the location of these universities and the relative abundance of these opportunities available in the population centers where they are located.

The top ranked factors to remain ("cultural, recreational, and social opportunities" at Wyandot and "reputation of institution" at Manada) are not found in the top ten ranked factors to leave. Vice versa, the top ranked factor to leave ("cash salary" at both institutions) ranked no higher than 17th at either institution when considered as enticements to remain.

At Wyandot, the top seven ranked enticements to leave have a higher mean score than any of the enticements to remain, leaving the general impression that the faculty who received offers viewed the offering institutions somewhat more favorably than the incumbent institution. At Manada, there was more general correspondence between the means of the highest ranking factors, indicating less of an immediate discrepancy between the incumbent and offering institutions.

Relative Importance of Factors

Using the values assigned by the participants for each factor, it was possible to determine which factors were the most important in determining perceived desirability of moving. The relative importance of each factor was determined by comparing the raw enticement to stay values with the raw enticement to leave values, designating the higher score as the level of importance of that factor, and then tallying the responses for all participants. For example, if for "reputation of institution" an individual assigned a value of "4" as the degree of enticement to stay and a value of "3" as the degree of enticement to leave, the relative importance of that factor was set at "4."

Table 4 summarizes the results of this analysis. Note that 17 of the factors at Wyandot had a weighted mean greater than 3.0 (moderately important), while 16 did so at Manada. There were seven factors with a mean of 3.5 or greater at Wyandot, and 9 such factors at Manada.

Of the top ten most important factors at each institution, seven were common to both. Of these seven, six were intangible benefits ("congeniality of associates," "rapport with departmental leadership," "research opportunities," "reputation of department," "reputation of institution," and "reputation of associates"). The remaining common factor was the tangible benefit "cash salary," ranked most important at Wyandot and number six at Manada. Only one nonwork-related benefit ranked in the top ten at either institution: "cultural, recreational, and social opportunities" being 8th at Manada.

TABLE 4. Relative Importance of Perceived Desirability of Moving Factors

No.	Factor	Type of Benefit	Wyandot $N = 45$ Rank	Wyandot $N = 45$ Mean	Manada $N = 95$ Rank	Manada $N = 95$ Mean
1.	Reputation of Institution	I	7	3.5	2	3.9
2.	Reputation of Department	I	6	3.6	4	3.8
3.	Reputation of Associates	I	8	3.4	5	3.8
4.	Congeniality of Associates	I	3	3.8	1	4.0
5.	Rapport with Dept. Leaders	I	4	3.7	3	3.9
6.	Career Advancement Opps.	I	2	3.9	14	3.2
7.	Teaching Assign/ Opps.	I	11	3.3	19	2.9
8.	Research Opportunities	I	5	3.7	7	3.7
9.	Loyalty to Institution	I	28	2.1	28	2.4
10.	Loyalty to Dept./Program	I	18	2.8	22	2.7
11.	Influence in Department	I	19	2.7	16	3.1
12.	Influence in Institution	I	27	2.1	24	2.6
13.	Promotion/Added Responsibilities	T	23	2.6	29	2.3
14.	Cash Salary	T	1	4.0	6	3.7
15.	Benefit Package	T	13	3.2	13	3.3
16.	Income Pontential	T	12	3.3	9	3.5
17.	Teaching/Research Load	T	10	3.3	15	3.2
18.	Research Funding	T	9	3.4	12	3.3
19.	Library Facilities	T	16	3.0	10	3.4
20.	Lab/Research Facilities	T	22	2.7	20	2.9
21.	Office Facilities	T	15	3.2	27	2.5
22.	Secretarial Support	T	17	3.0	21	2.8
23.	Sabbatical, Leave, Travel	T	20	2.7	23	2.6
24.	Reduced Tuition for Family	T	33	1.4	32	1.5
25.	Consulting Opportunities	N	29	2.0	30	1.9
26.	Spouse Career Opportun.	N	26	2.2	25	2.6
27.	School Situation of Children	N	31	1.6	31	1.6
28.	Geographic Considerations	N	21	2.7	11	3.4
29.	Climate of Region	N	30	1.9	17	2.9
30.	Cult., Recreat., Social Opps.	N	14	3.2	8	3.5
31.	Housing Costs	N	25	2.5	18	2.9
32.	Family Living Locally	N	32	1.6	33	1.3
33.	Local Network of Friends	N	24	2.6	26	2.5

*I = Intangible benefits of the job
T = Tangible benefits of the job
N = Nonwork-related benefits

Weight of Factors in the Decision Process

Using the raw desirability of moving and remaining scores designated by each participant, it was also possible to determine an individual's perceived desirability of moving. By squaring the enticement to remain and enticement to leave scores for each factor, taking the difference between the two squared scores, and summing the differences among the intangible, tangible, and nonwork-related benefits, the individual participant's perceived desirability of moving was determined.[3] In equation form the relationship is:

$$S_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{m} ((R_{ijk})^2 - (\mathrm{L}_{ijk})^2)$$

where R = weight of enticement to remain; L = weight of enticement to leave; i = 1 to n (respondent); n = number of respondents; j = 1 to 3 (class of factor); and k 1 to m_j (the number of factors in class j).

A negative score designated a likelihood of moving on the basis of those factors, and a positive score a likelihood to remain. Table 5 summarizes the perceived desirability of moving data for each institution.

At Wyandot, the majority of faculty saw the intangible and tangible benefits favoring the outside firm offer, with 80% deeming the tangible benefits better elsewhere. However, 60% of the faculty at Wyandot designated the nonwork-related benefits as favoring remaining where they were. At Manada, the tangible benefits (71%) and particularly the nonwork-related benefits (83%) were seen by the faculty as favoring pursuing their firm offer. The intangible benefits proved to be a virtual toss-up with roughly half the faculty citing them as desirable to move and half as desirable to remain.

Summing the tangible and intangible benefits scores for each individual produced an internal environmental score. The nonwork-related benefit score served as the external environmental score. Based on the principle of inertia, only those scoring negatively on both the internal and external environmental scores were assumed to indicate a desirability of moving. Overall, 60% of the faculty at Manada scored a desirability of moving, whereas only 38% did so at Wyandot.

Combining the desirability of moving data with the ease of movement data for the 85 individuals for which both sets of data were available, it was possible to compare actual final decisions with those anticipated using the inertial synthetic model described earlier. It was expected that an individual would chose to move only if he or she perceived a desirability to move (indicated by negative scores on both the internal and external environmental factors) *and* had an ease of movement. The participants' final decision about whether to remain at the incumbent university, or to leave for their reported firm

TABLE 5. Desirability of Moving

	N	%	Mean	Maximum
Wyandot				
Intangible Benefits				
Desirable to stay	17	37.8%	48.2	170
Desirable to move	28	62.2	−67.2	−160
Tangible Benefits				
Desirable to stay	9	20.0	24.5	61
Desirable to move	36	80.0	−101.3	−224
Nonwork Benefits				
Desirable to stay	27	60.0	34.2	74
Desirable to move	18	40.0	−36.6	−107
Manada				
Intangible Benefits				
Desirable to stay	48	50.5	58.7	254
Desirable to move	47	49.5	−62.4	−189
Tangible Benefits				
Desirable to stay	28	29.5	31.5	143
Desirable to move	67	70.5	−66.2	−224
Nonwork Benefits				
Desirable to stay	16	16.8	18.6	96
Desirable to move	79	83.2	−41.1	−115

offer, conformed reasonably well with the anticipated decision as depicted in Table 6.

Overall, and summatively at both universities, the inertial model correctly explained about two-thirds of the final decisions. Note that at Wyandot the model's anticipated decision corresponded exactly when the actual decision was to remain with the incumbent university. However, when the actual final decision was to leave the university, the model only captured 44% of the actual decisions. At Manada, the opposite relationship existed between the model's efficacy in anticipating those who would actually stay and leave. The model more accurately explained the actual final decisions to leave than the decisions to stay, though there was not the drastic difference between the two as found at Wyandot.

DISCUSSION

The vast majority of the participants in this study reported firm offers that would have provided a sizable increase in salary and a more favorable set of

TABLE 6. Comparison of Actual Decision with Anticipated Decision

	Wyandot		Manada		Both Institutions	
	N	%	*N*	%	*N*	%
Stay						
Anticipate: Stay	12	100.0%	14	58.3%	26	72.2%
Anticipate: Leave	0	0.0	10	41.7	10	27.8
	12	100.0%	24	100.0%	36	100.0%
Leave						
Anticipate: Leave	7	43.8%	22	66.7%	29	59.2%
Anticipate: Stay	9	56.2	11	33.3	20	40.8
	16	100.0%	33	100.0%	49	100.0%
Overall						
Correct	19	67.9%	36	63.2%	55	64.7%
Incorrect	9	32.1	21	36.8	30	35.3
	28	100.0%	57	100.0%	85	100.0%

other tangible benefits. They typically reported that the facilities and support structure in which they would be working at the offering institutions would be better equipped and/or more consistently maintained, and would require less personal cost intervention, than what they were experiencing at their incumbent institution. Approximately six of every ten respondents at both institutions chose to sever their ties with the incumbent university in favor of the firm offer they reported.

Blackburn and Aurand (1972) argued that faculty members' main concern is with their work environment. Though the participants of this study were concerned with their work environment, the caveat must be added that it tended to be the intangible benefits associated with the work environment that were most important to them.

Stecklein and Lathrop (1960) suggested that the intangible and nonwork-related benefits (which they called personal characteristics) were not extremely important in the decision-making process. Matier (1986, 1988) found the exact opposite to be the case for the limited group of faculty in his study. This research found elements of both to be true. It agrees with Matier that the intangible benefits play a key role in the decision-making process. But it also sides with Stecklein and Lathrop when it comes to the lack of impact and influence of nonwork-related benefits.

Caplow and McGee (1958), Toombs and Marlier (1981), and Gartshore, Hibbard, and Stockard (1983) have all argued that individuals leave jobs mostly because of an internal push rather than an external pull. Generally speaking, the situation among the participants of this study seems to correspond with their

findings, though the present research would tend to suggest there is more of a link between the two. For the faculty in the current research, the internal push appeared to prime individuals to give serious consideration to the external pulls available to them. More than one faculty member interviewed who chose to remain with the incumbent institution stated they did so primarily because the offer wasn't the "right" one, which suggests that though the internal push was operative, the external pulls were not (yet) sufficient to cause movement. Or, put another way, without strong internal pushes to invite individuals seriously to consider external offers, lavish external pulls are typically not sufficient in and of themselves to disengage a faculty member.

A majority of the participants of this study chose to pursue their firm offer because the pulls to leave for another position and the pushes to leave their present employment situation—which tended to be of the tangible benefit type—were sufficient to move an ensconced body. The minority who chose to remain with the incumbent employer tended to do so because the external pulls and internal pushes were insufficient to move them. Flowers and Hughes' (1973) notion of inertia was operative among these individuals.

The particular results of this research are not immediately transferable to many other higher education settings, for the present findings are highly contextualized by the type, cultural milieu, and geographic location of the institutions under investigation. Longitudinally following these two institutions through the peaks, as well as the valleys, of the typical roller coaster of legislative support to higher education would provide a more definitive means of determining how much of a role fiscal stress plays in the decision making of faculty. Another means of addressing the transferability question would be to expand the study to include a greater variety of institutions based not only on financial health but also on the basis of geographic location and type of institution.

Nevertheless, the method of gathering information and explaining the decision-making process (though not infallible) is transferable and would benefit institutions interested in attracting and maintaining a quality faculty. This is particularly so inasmuch as the methodology and analysis pay serious attention to the variety of "qualitative" factors that often are the determining components in an individual decision. Further, to the degree that this type of analysis makes those decision makers integrally involved in the recruitment and retention process more aware of the range of factors they need to balance, the more likely they will realize their desired ends.

NOTES

1. This is a replication of the methodology and a significant enlargement of the scope of a study previously conducted by the author (Matier, 1986). Portions of the "Theoretical Framework" and

"Methodology" sections in this article come from an unpublished paper delivered at the 28th Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held May 15–18, in Phoenix, Arizona (Matier, 1988).

2. This article reports on only half of a larger study that looked at the full migration cohort at the two subject institutions. For this article only the retention cohort—those incumbent faculty who had firm offers to leave the institution and either chose to remain or leave—are analyzed. A future article will deal with what was found among the recruitment cohort—those individuals successfully and unsuccessfully recruited by the subject institutions.
3. Squaring the individual scores was done to differentiate between the relative difference between a score of 5 to stay and 4 to leave on one factor and a score of 4 to stay and 3 to leave on another.

REFERENCES

Blackburn, R. T., and Aurand, C. H. (1972). *Mobility Studies on Academic Men: Some Methodological Concerns and Substantive Findings*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 065 092.

Bowen, H. R., and Schuster, J. H. (1986). *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Burke, D. L. (1988). *A New Academic Marketplace*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, Inc.

Caplow, T., and McGee, R. J. (1958). *The Academic Marketplace*. New York: Basic Books.

Flowers, V. S., and Hughes, C. L. (1973). Why employees stay. *Harvard Business Review* 4 (July–Aug.): 49–60.

Gartshore, R. J., Hibbard, M., and Stockard, J. (1983). *Factors Affecting Mobility at the University of Oregon*. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.

Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review* 1 (Jan.–Feb.): 53–62.

Lazarsfeld, P. F., and Rosenberg, M. (1958). The empirical analysis of action: Introduction. In P. F. Lazarsfeld and M. Rosenberg (eds.), *The Language of Social Research: A Reader in the Methodology of Social Research* (pp. 387–391). New York: The Free Press.

March J. G. and Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Matier, M. W. (1986). Factors influencing "star" faculty attrition at institutions of higher education: An analysis of the University of Oregon's faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences, 1976/77–1984/85 (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1985). *Dissertation Abstracts International* 46: 3266A.

Matier, M. W. (1988). *Factors Influencing Faculty Migration*. Paper presented at the annual forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Phoenix, AZ (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 298 846).

Salancik, G. R., and Pfeffer, J. (1977). An examination of need-satisfaction models of job attitudes. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 22: 427–456.

Salancik, G. R., and Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 23: 224–253.

Smith, D. K. (1978). Faculty vitality and the management of university personnel policies. In W. R. Kirschling (ed.), *Evaluating Faculty Performance and Vitality*. New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 20. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Solmon, Lewis C. (1978). *Grant Economics in Faculty Mobility: Some Initial*

Interpretations. Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles, Higher Education Research Institute (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 171 173).

Stecklein, J. E., and Lathrop, R. L. (1960). *Faculty Attraction and Retention: Factors Affecting Faculty Mobility at the University of Minnesota*. Minneapolis: Bureau of Institutional Research, University of Minnesota.

Steers, R. M. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 22: 46–56.

Toombs, W., and Marlier, J. (1981). Career change among academics: Dimensions of decision. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Received December 4, 1989