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Abstract

Due to the significant nursing faculty shortage and the probable impact on healthcare, it is imperative to expand the available literature on the nursing faculty shortage. The descriptive data in this study highlight the critical nature of the aging and retiring nursing faculty body. The statistics available in this study regarding this are quite alarming. The Northeast may be looking at a mass exodus of nursing faculty in the next 5 years with up to 70 percent of the faculty leaving their current position. Another alarming factor is the significant level of inexperience the remaining faculty may have and the prospect of this effecting student outcomes.

In regard to workload, it is evident that it affects job satisfaction. It is also evident that job satisfaction affects the timing of leaving of nursing faculty. In order to minimize the dwindling nursing faculty it is imperative for administrators to employ initiatives to help retain faculty and increase their job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction significantly impacts the timing of leaving of nursing faculty from their current position. This is another reason why policy and initiatives must be developed and research to help slow the inevitable draining of the nursing faculty pool. Role conflict on the other hand, was not a factor in the timing of leaving. Perhaps researchers would be better suited focusing on other contributors to the nursing faculty shortage. Overall this study contributed to the body of knowledge on the nursing faculty shortage but the question still remains as to why faculty are leaving. It is evident that job satisfaction is a factor as well as workload. Role conflict did not have the impact that the literature implies.
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CHAPTER ONE: THE PROBLEM

Introduction

It has been documented that in the near future there would be more than one million vacant positions for registered nurses due to growth in demand and retirement of the current workforce. Due to the increasing need for baccalaureate and master’s prepared nurses, one can postulate that there will be an increased need for nursing faculty. The double edged sword is that one of the main contributing factors to the nursing shortage is the dramatic shortage in nursing faculty. One of the biggest problems in satisfying that demand is the dearth of qualified nursing faculty. This is partially related to accredited nursing programs mandating strict student-faculty ratios in clinical settings. Program growth is in effect limited by the availability of faculty.

The NLN fact Sheet in the year 2007 stated that there were 1,900 nursing faculty vacancies affecting thirty-six percent of nursing programs across the country. In AACN survey, schools described the need for an additional 43 faculty positions which were in need of creation due to increased student demand. This translates to a vacancy rate of 8.8% or 2.2 faculty vacancies per school.

There are many reasons that have been documented as the cause of the nursing faculty shortage. These factors can attribute to a supply and demand issue in addition to retention difficulties. Issues with job satisfaction emerge as the number one concern in relation to the nursing faculty shortage. There are several studies documenting decreased job satisfaction as cause for nursing faculty to leave the academic role or to seek a position in another institution. With retention of nursing faculty being such an issue, this is a significant finding.
One of the most frequently cited references on the nursing faculty shortage is the National League for Nursing (NLN) National Study of Faculty Role Satisfaction (NLN, 2003). This study was developed by an NLN task group on recruitment and retention of nurse educators and the purpose of the study was to obtain information about individual, institutional, and leadership factors affecting work satisfaction and productivity. Work satisfaction and productivity can be considered a significant factor in the retention of nursing faculty, The theoretical framework which guided the study conforms that institutional and leadership factors influence satisfaction and productivity in senior faculty members (Bland, 1997). It has long been demonstrated that job satisfaction is a key factor influencing the nursing faculty retention.

The NLN faculty satisfaction survey yielded 5,561 responses over approximately five months. Full time faculty teaching in any type of nursing program, spanning associate degree to doctoral degree programs were eligible. The survey itself was developed by the taskforce and posted on the NLN website. Invitations to participate in the survey were communicated through the NLN website, email notification, flyers, and verbal communication at NLN meetings. It is important to note that all full-time nursing faculty are automatically members of the NLN and enrolled through their respective institutions so it is safe to assume that essentially all eligible nursing faculty were invited to participate in the survey.

With specific regard to job satisfaction, it seems that job satisfaction had an effect on faculty retention. Results of the survey indicate that one in every three nursing faculty members reported that if they had the choice they would choose a different field, discipline, or profession. Another nineteen percent neither agreed nor disagreed with this survey item. This may be
indicative of respondents who are pondering leaving the academic profession therefore effecting retention and indicating intent to leave. The authors also concluded that nearly fifty percent of respondents stated they would like to leave their current place of employment for opportunity in another higher education institution, again indicating intent to leave. When asked why they would choose to leave respondents most frequently cited salary and workload as the most significant contributing factors. This may be an indicator of job dissatisfaction, but not career dissatisfaction.

In 2006, the NLN combined with the Carnegie Foundation developed a survey to evaluate in part nursing faculty workload, compensation, and teaching practice. An attempt was made to invite an estimated 32,000 faculty members. Remarkably, the survey yielded nearly 8,500 responses accounting for nearly 25 percent of the current nursing faculty available. Results demonstrated that nine of ten nursing faculty report working full time. This may be indicative of an increased workload specific to the field of nursing education. When compared to other academics, as reported in NSOPF, 57 percent report working full time. Another interesting finding was 9 percent of nursing faculty hold another paid job indicating that nursing faculty hold multiple professional roles. To further support this statement, 62 percent of nursing faculty reported working in a setting outside of their primary academic institution adding on average seven additional work hours per week (Kauffman, 2007).

In addition to holding positions outside of their primary academic institution, 40 percent of nursing faculty held additional positions within their institution and 25 percent were
Nursing Faculty
department chairs. This data indicates the demand of multiple roles on nursing faculty combined with increased workload, may contribute to decreased job satisfaction. This decreased satisfaction may be a contributing factor to retention and intent to leave of nursing faculty. With specific regard to workload results of the Carnegie survey reported that nursing faculty work on average 56 hours per week. If they held the department chair an additional two hours per week were worked. This translates to 25 percent of the nursing faculty workforce working 58 hours per week. Another significant finding is that two out of three nursing faculty stated that their actual workload well exceeded their anticipated workload expectations (Kauffman, 2007). As stated by Kauffman (2007), excessive workload puts a significant damper on job satisfaction among nurse educators, and overwork appears to be undermining faculty retention.

Another aspect that must be examined when evaluating retention of nursing faculty is whether or not the type of institution effects retention rates. Results of the NLN national study of faculty role satisfaction survey (2003) inferred that institutional commitment increased when the respective schools had less than 200 students. Specifically, faculty in smaller schools were more likely to feel a sense of community, believe their opinions are seriously considered, and believe senior faculty keep the vision of the school visible.

It is also notable in relation to retention of nursing faculty, that nursing faculty differ from other disciplines in the fact that they migrate in and out of academia. In other words, it is not uncommon for nursing faculty to leave academia for a clinical position and then return at a later date. It was noted in the Survey of Post secondary Faculty (2004) that the majority of nursing faculty had previous work experience described as both in and out of academia. This is quite different from other disciplines in that other disciplines including education, humanities,
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and other health sciences either had their first job in academia or their only previous work experience was within academia.

Another major factor affecting retention is the aging population. AACN has reported that the average age of nursing faculty which are doctorally prepared is approximately 55 years. The average age for Master’s prepared faculty is again 55 years. The NLN faculty census survey (2009) demonstrated that nursing faculty ages 30 to 45 and 46 to 60 both dropped 3 percent when compared to 2006. This may further highlight retention in this age group is a growing problem for nursing faculty. In addition, the percentage of full time faculty over the age of sixty grew from 9 percent in 2006 to nearly 16 percent in 2009. There is an expected wave of nursing faculty retirement in the near future (www.aacn.nche.edu/IDS). The average age of retirement for nursing faculty was reported by Berlin and Sechrist (2002) to be 62.5 years. The authors project that between the years of 2003-2012 there will be between 200-300 doctorally prepared nursing faculty and between 220-280 masters prepared faculty who will be eligible for retirement. When compared to other disciplines, as described the NLN/Carnegie project, 48 percent of nursing faculty are over the age of 55 compared to 35 percent of US academics as a whole. In addition, only 29 percent of health sciences faculty are over the age of 55.

In addition to an aging nursing faculty population, the mean age of recipients of nursing doctoral degrees is higher than that of other research doctoral degrees awarded. Berlin and Sechrist (2002) reported that in 1999 there were 365 nursing doctoral degrees awarded. The mean age of the recipients was 46 years. The mean age of other research doctoral degrees awarded was 33.7 years. This lessens the years of productive teaching of nursing faculty due to advanced age at graduation.
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In addition to age effecting retention by being a key factor in retirement, it was also identified as a key factor in aspects that may effect job satisfaction. Results of the NLN job satisfaction survey (2003) indicated that age was positively correlated with faculty believing there is a fair process for promotion and tenure, having input on how they spend their time, having opinions frequently sought and seriously considered, and understanding requirements of promotion and tenure, to name a few. All of these factors may be contributing to decreased retention of younger faculty.

Another documented factor contributing to the nursing faculty shortage is the significant salary differential between clinical positions of advanced practice nurses and nursing faculty. This aspect affects all aspects of the nursing faculty shortage including supply, demand, and retention. According to a published report in ADVANCE for Nurse Practitioners, the average national salary of a master’s prepared nurse practitioner was $81,517. Salaries were significantly higher in the northeast region and California. The average salary for a nursing faculty position with a master’s degree was $66,588. This amounts to a $15,000 salary differential. The NLN/Carnegie study reported nurse faculty salaries ranked eighth out of eleven for salaries for Master’s prepared nurses. It has also been documented that schools of nursing are reporting difficulty in offering competitive salaries. The NLN Nursing Data Review 2006-2007 reported 34 percent of schools of nursing offering baccalaureate degrees cited an inability to offer competitive salaries. The NLN/Carnegie study found nursing faculty earn 76 percent of the salaries obtained by other academic disciplines. Again, salary may be affecting retention of nursing faculty, particularly advanced practice nurses who have high earning potential in clinical practice.
Nursing Faculty

Though it is clear that there is a significant nursing faculty supply shortage, nursing is not the only discipline in which limited faculty are available. It has been documented that accounting may be facing a crisis in the near future related to a shortage of qualified faculty. The Plumlee Report (2006), was a research report developed by an ad hoc committee of the American Accounting Association. In this report, the authors concluded there are only approximately half of the required qualified accounting faculty available to meet the needs of the profession. Similar to nursing, the supply of doctorally prepared accounting majors is lacking. Eaton, (2007) reported 70 institutions granting PhDs in accounting in 1994. This number dropped to 38 in 2003 and 42 in 2004. These data indicate there are less qualified faculty to fill needs because institutions are producing less candidates. Another important statistic was reported by Rayburn, (2005). The overall membership in the American Accounting Association has dropped eighteen percent in the past decade. This could be linked to a faculty shortage and an inability of institutions to produce graduates.

There are other similarities noted between the nursing and accounting disciplines and their faculty shortages. Like nursing, many of the accounting faculty are baby boomers. With this increase in faculty age comes an increase in faculty retirement. This produces vacancies in colleges of business for accounting faculty. Salary is another aspect of the faculty shortage that accounting has in common with nursing. There are many external incentives available for accounting doctorates which are accompanied by a lucrative salary. This may sway graduates away from academia into a corporate environment with large monetary rewards that are not available in academia at this present time (Eaton, 2007).
Similar to the effect of regulations of accrediting bodies in nursing, there are accrediting bodies in accounting which are affecting the demand of accounting faculty. In nursing, restrictions dictate a ratio of not more than one instructor per 8 students in a clinical setting. In some states like New York it is more restrictive. In accounting, the association to advance collegiate schools of business also has restrictions on instructor to student ratios. This has required institutions seeking accreditation to hire more accounting faculty (Eaton, 2007). In addition, whenever you are evaluating a shortage of faculty it is always prudent to consider the effect of tenure. Like most disciplines, accounting and nursing are shifting their focus onto research when awarding tenure. This takes the emphasis off teaching. By doing this, institutions are increasing the need and limiting the supply of faculty (Chang & Sun, 2008).

**Significance of the Problem**

The scope of the nursing faculty shortage is astounding. According the American Association of the Colleges of Nursing (AACN) 2007-2008 enrollment bulletin, 40,285 qualified applicants were turned away from undergraduate nursing programs. Though the reasons were multi-factorial, the faculty shortage played a key role. In a survey compiled by the AACN in 2007, almost three quarters of the nursing schools who responded described a shortage of qualified faculty as a barrier to student enrollment ([www.aacn.nche.edu/IDS](http://www.aacn.nche.edu/IDS)). If the documented nursing faculty shortage continues, so will the overall nursing shortage. This will translate to a significant healthcare disparity and possibly an overall healthcare crisis. In addition, the notion of national healthcare may leverage this shortage and crisis even further. It is imperative for universities and schools of nursing to implement initiatives to recruit and retain qualified nursing faculty.
Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework chosen for this study is role conflict theory. There is clear evidence in the nursing faculty shortage literature, which demonstrates that role strain, ambiguity, and transition difficulties have emerged as primary contributing factors to the faculty shortage. Gross et. Al (1958), described role conflict as the degree of incompatability of expectations communicated to a person by its sender. In more simplistic terms, it can be described as the degree of compatibility or incompatibility.

Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman, (1970) described four types of role conflict which can be easily applied to the key concepts of the nursing faculty shortage. The first is the conflict between the internal standards of the faculty and the defined role. This may be a contributing conflict as nurses may have difficulty transitioning to the faculty role particularly if their primary function had been as a clinician with direct patient care. The second type of conflict is described as the conflict between time, resources, and capabilities of the focal person and the defined role. This type of conflict is clearly documented in the literature in the form of credit overload and clinical hours required by nursing faculty related to the current nursing faculty shortage combined with the scholarly requirements for tenure. The third type of conflict is when the focal person encounters conflict between several roles which require different behaviors. This can be encountered by nursing faculty when they are required to teach overload, produce scholarly research and also serve on school and university committees. Lastly, according to Rizzo et. Al, role conflict can occur when there are incompatible policies and demands combined with incompatible forms of evaluation.
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Research Questions

In light of the above, the over-riding research question in this study is: How does role conflict, and workload effect job satisfaction and the timing of departure of nursing faculty from their current faculty position?

Subsidiary Questions:

1. How does workload effect job satisfaction (JS) and role conflict (RC) among nursing faculty when controlling for years of experience as a faculty member?
2. How does job satisfaction and role conflict among nursing faculty predict the timing of faculty departure from their current faculty position?

Methods

To answer the research questions, a quantitative research method was chosen to analyze the data. A cross-sectional survey method will be utilized to obtain the desired data. A Cross-sectional survey method was chosen to enable both descriptive and correlational analysis (Babbie, 1998). Questions regarding information pertaining to faculty and institution demographics along with questions specifically analyzing role conflict in relation to intent to leave of nursing faculty will be included. The survey will be e-mailed to faculty of colleges of Nursing via Survey Monkey a web-based service which allows professionals to elicit surveys and analyze data.

Significance of the Study

As previously stated, the scope of the nursing faculty shortage is astounding. Each year, students are unable to enroll in nursing school due to the fact that there are no faculty to teach them. This in turn contributes to the overall nursing shortage. The available literature on the nursing faculty shortage is sparse but has been increasing over the past 5-10 years. The available
literature demonstrates that job satisfaction and role conflict are the two most cited topics in the nursing faculty shortage. There are also a few studies documenting increased workload for nursing faculty as a contributing factor. This study aims to determine if workload contributes to job satisfaction and role conflict. In addition, it aims to identify if these themes predict the timing of departure of nursing faculty from their current position. If in fact, any of these variables contribute to the departure of faculty leaving their current position, recommendations may be able to be made to develop interventions to aid in the current faculty shortage. This could ultimately provide guidance for interventions and future research to further clarify identifiable interventions for policy and for administrators to implement and help retain faculty.

**Summary**

Overall, the nursing faculty shortage is a significant concern for overall healthcare as it impacts the overall nursing shortage. The NLN has been investing a significant amount of effort into researching the nursing faculty shortage in addition to gaining grounds on measuring the overall job satisfaction of nursing faculty. This has improved the overall literature available on this topic by highlighting its importance. The available literature on the nursing faculty shortage remains somewhat sparse but there are trends that are identifiable. Job satisfaction and role conflict are commonly cited theses within the body of literature related to the nursing faculty shortage. This study aims to answer questions which specifically evaluate the relationships between workload, job satisfaction, and role conflict on the timing of departure of nursing faculty from their current faculty position. If this knowledge is gained, it may enable recommendations for interventions which can help to alleviate the nursing faculty shortage.
CHAPTER 2

Review of the Literature

A thorough review of the literature was performed utilizing multiple databases. The first database utilized was Proquest multiple databases. Keywords searched in the advanced mode were nursing faculty and shortage. With a scholarly article only filter in place, the search yielded 346 references. The second database utilized was the Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL). Again, the keywords searched in advanced mode were nursing faculty and shortage. This database search yielded 202 references. There were also 46 dissertations and theses focusing on the nursing faculty shortage identified in the Proquest dissertation and thesis database. Additionally, there is an inordinate amount of literature on the general nursing shortage. These studies were excluded from this literature search because aside from affecting the supply of available nurses eligible to attend graduate school, the reasons for the nursing faculty shortage and general nursing shortage are vastly different as are the recommended solutions.

Causes of the Nursing Faculty Shortage: It is not Just About Supply

When analyzing the literature available on the nursing faculty shortage, four subcategories become quite evident. These subcategories include; recruitment, retention, solutions, and causes of the nursing faculty shortage. To set the context of the nursing faculty shortage it is beneficial to first analyze the literature available focusing on the causes. To further dissect this data, it is important to note that within this subcategory, difficulty with job satisfaction was the number one cited reason for the nursing faculty shortage. One of the most frequently cited references on the nursing faculty shortage is the National League for Nursing
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(NLN) National Study of Faculty Role Satisfaction (NLN, 2003). This study was developed by an NLN task group on recruitment and retention of nurse educators and the purpose of the study was to obtain information about individual, institutional, and leadership factors affecting work satisfaction and productivity. The theoretical framework which guided the study supports that institutional and leadership factors influence satisfaction and productivity in senior faculty members (Bland, 1997). It has long been subscribed that job satisfaction is a key factor influencing the nursing faculty shortage.

The NLN faculty satisfaction survey yielded 5,561 responses over approximately five months. Full time faculty teaching in any type of nursing program, spanning associate degree to doctoral degree programs were eligible. The survey itself was developed by the taskforce and posted on the NLN website. Invitations to participate in the survey were communicated through the NLN website, email notification, flyers, and verbal communication at NLN meetings. It is important to note that all full-time nursing faculty are automatically members of the NLN and enrolled through their respective institutions so it is safe to assume that essentially all eligible nursing faculty were invited to participate in the survey. Though the survey yielded a significant number of responses, it is important to also note that there were a significant number of skipped items in the survey. The numbers who responded to each question varied from 78 to 93 percent. This may affect the ability to generalize the results. Due to this limitation, the authors did provide the ‘n’ for each item in the questionnaire.

With specific regard to job satisfaction, results of the survey indicate that one in every three nursing faculty members reported that if they had the choice they would choose a different field, discipline, or profession. Another nineteen percent neither agreed nor disagreed with this
Nursing Faculty

survey item. This may be indicative of respondents who are pondering leaving the academic profession. The authors also concluded that nearly fifty percent of respondents stated they would like to leave their current place of employment for an opportunity in another higher education institution. This may be an indicator of job dissatisfaction, but not career dissatisfaction.

Prior to the NLN faculty role satisfaction survey, Gormley (2003) published a meta-analysis on the available literature evaluating factors affecting job satisfaction in nurse faculty. Inclusion criteria for the study were keywords of job satisfaction, faculty, nursing, and research. The literature search was restricted to research articles only. CINAHL yielded six studies published between 1976 and 1996. All studies were published in established refereed journals. The author concluded that eight predictor variables were evident in regard to nursing faculty job satisfaction. They included: professional autonomy, leader expectations, role conflict, role ambiguity, consideration of the leader, initiating structure behavior of the leader, organizational climate, and organizational characteristics.

Evidence suggested that of these six predictor variables perception and expectation of the leader’s role significantly affected job satisfaction. The author concluded that this indicated the dean or chairperson’s behavior strongly influenced job satisfaction. Role conflict and role ambiguity also had significant effect sizes at .806 and .588 respectively. Interestingly, there was a low to moderate effect size for organizational characteristics and climate which include salary, program size, tenure, and supervision (Gormley D., 2003). These predictors had little or no predictive power on job satisfaction. This is somewhat contradictory to studies that will be described later in the literature review citing compensation as one of the major causes of the nursing faculty shortage. One explanation could be the age of the studies analyzed in this meta-
analysis compared to the cited studies described within this literature review. There is essentially a ten year difference in time frame between the studies described.

There is further data available to support the notion that job satisfaction has influence on the nursing faculty shortage. Spurlock (2008), performed a quantitative descriptive correlational study evaluating the relationship between stress, hardiness, and burnout among nursing faculty. Other variables analyzed within the study included job satisfaction and intent to leave their current faculty position within two years. An online survey was utilized via surveymonkey. After the author received permission from Deans of nationally accredited colleges of nursing, faculty from those institutions were invited to participate. One hundred one schools were included in the study and a total of 2,105 emails were included in the database. An email was sent on day one of the study with a reminder on day eight. The study yielded 436 respondents of the 1,906 emails which were deliverable for a twenty-three percent response rate.

With specific regard to job satisfaction, results indicated that twenty percent of the study population were either very dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or neutral in job satisfaction. Interestingly, this study supported the results of the NLN faculty satisfaction survey in that nearly sixty percent of the study population were either very likely or somewhat likely to leave their current position within the next two years (39.5 and 20.3 percent respectively). An additional 13.7 percent of the study population were neutral in their decision to leave their current position within the next two years. This intent to leave was significantly higher than the noted job dissatisfaction (Spurlock, 2008). Again, these results were similar to those noted in the NLN study. The question then remains; if nursing faculty are not dissatisfied with their field or discipline, then why are such a disproportionate number of nursing faculty considering leaving
their current positions? Perhaps the current nursing faculty vacancies can be addressed by initiating significant retention initiatives.

Though it seems the results of this study validate the NLN study, there were significant limitations that need to be considered. First is the utilization of online surveys. As previously stated the mean age of the current nursing faculty workforce is approximately 55 years. There is question as to whether the aging nursing faculty would be comfortable with the technology of a web based survey. The author reported that the majority of respondents were between the ages of 50-59 which is reflective of the overall nursing faculty population. The question that remains is how many more faculty would have responded to a traditionally mailed survey? Another important limitation to mention is that the author acquired permission from the Dean of the schools prior to sending an email request to the study participants. One could question this method as perhaps Deans who have or promote a hostile work environment may avoid participating in a study evaluating job satisfaction.

Garbee (2006) specifically evaluated factors influencing intent to stay of nursing faculty in selected schools of nursing in sixteen states within the southern region. A quantitative research design was employed. Surveys were emailed via surveymonkey over a six week period. A random cluster sample was chosen and after schools were chosen a letter of support was sent to the Deans of the chosen schools. The initial sample consisted of twenty-five schools of nursing with 494 potential respondents. The particular research question of interest in this study evaluated the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to stay in nursing education. This research question specifically addresses the relationship between job satisfaction and its influence on the nursing shortage.
Results demonstrated that there is a moderately positive correlation between intent to stay one year and job satisfaction indicating a significant linear relationship. In addition, there was a moderately positive correlation between intent to stay five years and job satisfaction with a $p < .001$. Pearson correlations were also calculated evaluating the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to leave in one, three and five years. A significant weak negative correlation was noted between job satisfaction scores and intent to leave for both three and five years (Garbee, 2006). These results indicate that higher job satisfaction significantly effects whether nursing faculty are planning on leaving their current positions. Again, these results reinforce the two previously described studies.

Limitations in this study were similar to those in Spurlock (2008). Though the use of web based surveys have become more prevalent, there is question as to their validity as compared to traditionally mailed surveys. Considering the mean age of nursing faculty is fifty-five this may be particularly significant as older faculty may not be comfortable filling out email based surveys. In addition to emailing surveys, the author had a particularly difficult time accruing the sample. Three rounds of surveys were e-mailed to accrue the appropriate number of subjects to provide the adequate power for the study. This fact again brings in to question whether emailing surveys was the best method for this population.

The last study analyzed specific to job satisfaction and the nursing faculty shortage evaluated the relationship between course delivery methodology and faculty satisfaction (McInnis, 2005). This study was particularly interesting because it evaluated the nursing faculty shortage and job satisfaction from a completely different perspective. In addition it complemented the previously described studies in that it sought to analyze why nursing faculty
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may not be happy in their current position as opposed to the discipline as a whole. The research study utilized a quantitative research design. The questionnaire used was the Nursing Faculty Satisfaction Questionnaire which was developed and validated by Connie Martin in 1991. Again, an email based survey manager was used to solicit participation in the study. A random sample of approximately fifteen percent of accredited American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) schools was chosen. One thousand nine hundred and thirty-five faculty members were then sent a request to participate in the study.

The study yielded 457 (22.6%) responses. Results demonstrated that compared to faculty who teach online or in a hybrid format, faculty who teach solely in the classroom have a higher job satisfaction score (McInnis, 2005). A question for further research is whether or not the advent of distance learning has added a level of dissatisfaction for nursing faculty and how this has impacted the nursing faculty shortage.

In review of the literature specific to job satisfaction, there seems to be sufficient evidence to support the claim that job satisfaction does in fact have an influence on intent to stay in nursing faculty. There is strong evidence to suggest that nearly twenty to thirty percent of nursing faculty are not currently satisfied in their careers. There was also evidence to suggest that nearly fifty percent of nursing faculty are either not satisfied with their current place of employment or pondering leaving their current positions for other opportunities at other institutions within academia. This could translate into many nursing faculty vacancies within academia.

The second concept to be analyzed in regard to causes of the nursing faculty shortage is how age and plans for retirement affect the shortage. The second most commonly cited reference
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on the nursing faculty shortage is an article written by Berlin & Sechrist (2002). The title of the article speaks volumes: “The Shortage of Doctorally Prepared Nursing Faculty: A Dire Situation”. In this article age and retirement data were summarized from surveys conducted by the AACN and other national sources. Linear regression was used to determine average change in age and retirement year. The purpose of the study was to evaluate the impact of faculty age and retirement plans on the future supply of nursing faculty. The authors cite AACN data summarizing the numerous nursing faculty vacancies. The authors highlighted that though there are many contributors to the nursing faculty shortage, the influence of faculty age and retirement plans are inevitable and quite devastating.

The authors reported the mean age of doctorally prepared faculty has increased from 49.7 years in 1993 to 53.3 years in 2001. Additional data that is impactful is nursing faculty retire at age 62.5 and only three percent of nursing faculty are above age 65. Those numbers are very significant when you think about the productive years left in the current nursing faculty workforce. This is evidenced by the fact that the proportion of faculty over the age of 50 has increased from 50.7 percent in 1993 to 70.3 percent in 2001. The article also projects that this current year 2010 will be the year with the most expected nursing faculty retirements. In addition to the productive years remaining in the current faculty workforce, advanced age at terminal degree obtainment for nursing faculty is also an issue. The median age for recipients of nursing doctoral degrees is approximately 46 years compared to other research degrees where the median age of degree completion is 33.7 years. You can think of that as a teaching deficit of nearly 13 years meaning on average, nursing faculty have 13 less productive teaching years than other disciplines. The authors also concluded that though the number of universities granting nursing
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doctoral degrees has increased from 54 in 1992 to 79 in 2001, graduates from these programs have decreased over the same time period. This indicates a decrease in the pool of qualified graduates to enter into the nursing faculty role (Berlin, 2002).

To further support the notion that age and retirement plans affect the nursing faculty shortage, Kowalski, Dalley, & Weigand (2006) performed a study analyzing when faculty will retire and factors that influence retirement decisions of nurse educators. The authors designed a cross sectional study and surveyed 129 nurse educators teaching in sixty-one schools of nursing. After the educators agreed to participate in the study, they were then emailed the survey. This method yielded a 37.6 percent response rate. Demographics for the respondents were provided and they were described as fifty-two year old Caucasian females with a PhD in nursing. Results indicated that the respondents mean age of anticipated retirement was 64.4 years but their optimal age of retirement was 62.2 years. Factors identified which influenced retirement decisions included financial concerns, workplace issues, personal and family health, and attitudes about retirement. The most influential factor on retirement decision making was financial status (Kowalski, 2006). The results reported support the finding previously described by Berlin & Sechrist (2002). Although the authors did note that in this particular study, the mean age of anticipated retirement was approximately two years older. This is good news for the nursing faculty workforce in that years of productivity may work out to be two years longer than previously thought.

In addition to reinforcing the data described by Berlin & Sechrist, this study provided insight as to what factors influence retirement decisions. This can be very beneficial when administrators are evaluating initiatives to retain the current nursing faculty workforce. Of
particular note, the authors concluded that one of the workplace issues that effects retirement planning is job satisfaction. In fact 100 of the 129 respondents indicated that job satisfaction was the most important or very important factor influencing plans for retirement. This correlated directly with the previously described studies regarding job satisfaction.

To further support the impact of aging faculty on the faculty shortage, in 2006 the NLN performed a nursing faculty census survey. This survey was sent to 1,374 nursing programs and yielded a fifty-eight percent response rate which is quite notable. Results demonstrated that a mean of 1.4 full time faculty members per school left positions in nursing education. The range in programs was zero to ten. Remarkably, retirement was the most commonly reason cited for departure at twenty-four percent (NLN, 2006).

The previously described studies highlight the impact that the aging nursing faculty workforce has on the current shortage crisis. Considering the mean age of the current workforce, retirement can further deplete the pool of available faculty. These numbers are also representative of the current general population and aging baby boomer generation. What compounds this problem is as stated by Berlin and Sechrist (2002), the nursing PhD programs are not replenishing the pool of academics with new graduates in fact, the numbers of graduates are waning over the years. All of the studies described are pointing to the need for aggressive recruitment and retention initiatives which will be discussed and analyzed in later sections of the literature review.

The next concept documented that affects the nursing faculty shortage is compensation. In the 2006 NLN census survey; schools of nursing described salary issues as a reason for more than fifteen percent of their faculty departures. They also reported that in 2006 the median nine-
The median salary for assistant professors was $47,435. When you compare that to the median salary of a registered nurse in 2004 of $56,784 it is easy to see there is a significant salary differential. When you compare salaries of nurses with advanced degrees, especially advanced practice nurses the salary differential skyrockets. As described by Campbell & Filer (2006), when viewed from a financial perspective, there is essentially no incentive for advanced practice nurses to enter into academia.

In the previously described 2003 NLN national study of role satisfaction, it was noted that feelings of frustration and dissatisfaction were evident in regard to equal compensation. The study provides a quote “We can’t attract faculty at salaries that are equal or less than graduate nurse salaries”. The AACN reported in 2005, that salary is an influential factor in employment decisions in those completing graduate school. When comparing workload, responsibilities and salaries associated with other employment opportunities for nurses with doctoral degrees, academia may seem less appealing. The AACN (2005) also reports that clinical salaries continue to rise on a yearly basis where academic salaries have remained flat. Another factor to consider is the financial burden of taking time off from work to pursue studies.

It is obvious that salary is an influential factor that is affecting the nursing faculty shortage. Though it is documented in the literature, most of the data available are through national organizations who elicited surveys through schools of nursing. The literature and research need to be expanded and evaluated to ensure this factor is having the effect that the nursing community assumes. In addition, it would be beneficial to compare and contrast this cause of the nursing faculty shortage with other suspected causes such as job satisfaction.
Retention and Nursing Faculty: Job Satisfaction Again Arises as the Most Common Theme

The available literature on the nursing faculty shortage specific to retention is certainly not abundant, but more literature is becoming available in recent years. Gazza (2005), wrote an interesting article entitled: “Successful Enculturation Strategies for Newly Hired Nursing Faculty”. The author made a profound statement by saying that although the nursing faculty shortage negatively impacts the overall nursing shortage, it facilitates nursing faculty mobility. The author stressed the importance of retaining qualified faculty in this climate and made recommendations on how to accomplish this task. Recommendations included a formal orientation process, connecting with people including a mentor, navigating the political structure, functioning efficiently, and reflective practice.

Navigating the political structure was described as teaching newly hired faculty key factors that may influence their growth and development in the institution. One of the key factors identified was the political structure within higher education and the fact that politics are very powerful in this arena. This may be a very important aspect for newly hired nursing faculty, especially if this is their first position in academia. The political structure in higher education is very different than that of healthcare. Therefore, an orientation to this subject may be very beneficial and prevent instances that can effect job satisfaction. In this same vein, functioning efficiently primarily was described as streamlining activities and managing competing demands for time. The work activities in academia vary greatly from that of clinical practice. Though clinical practice also involves a large amount of multi-tasking, the academic setting has many new facets that need to be learned. In addition, the faculty role is multi-faceted and involves
much more than simply teaching. New faculty in nursing need tools to succeed in this environment in order to increase retention (Gazza E. &., 2005).

The recommendations made in this article were straightforward and seemed very reasonable. The one significant critique of this article is the recommendations seem to be the opinion of the author. Other than statistics provided on the nursing faculty shortage and statistics from the NLN faculty census survey, there seems to be very little referenced research.

There was an additional article written by Bartels (2007), which also highlighted the importance of role preparation for academia for nursing faculty. The author describes many important facets of the academic role specific to nursing faculty. Recommendations were also made on how to support faculty so they can succeed in their mission of teaching the next generation of nurses. Boyer’s dimensions of scholarship were utilized to suggest the structure for the nursing faculty role. One important point the author makes is though the current recommendation is for faculty to have a PhD to be nursing faculty, the question remains as to whether a PhD fully prepares an individual for a faculty role. There is question as to whether the PhD is too research intensive not providing enough focus on teaching, curricular planning, service to the college, and collegial evaluation. The author cites Boyer (1990) as saying:

*Increasingly professors were expected to conduct research and publish results.*

*Promotion and tenure depend on such activity, and young professors seeking security and status found it more rewarding to deliver a paper at a national convention than to teach undergraduates back home. (p12)*

Bartels questions whether this emphasis on research has caused a lack of knowledge and preparation for the faculty role.
The author recommends that in preparation of the faculty role, faculty should be provided with the understanding of the conceptual basis for higher education and the needs of students which include specific teaching methodologies. Specific recommendations for retaining faculty included formal professional development, support from administration for recognition of accomplishments, and maximizing faculty strengths and interests by synergizing research, teaching, and practice (Bartels, 2007). This article supports the claims made by Gazza (2005), that in the current climate of the significant nursing faculty shortage it is imperative to retain qualified nursing faculty. Role strain caused by dramatic differences between clinical practice and academia may cause mobility in nursing faculty. To decrease this mobility, institutions should initiate interventions to reduce role strain and aid in a smooth transition from clinician to academic to decrease turn-over and increase retention.

Anderson (2009), further supported the notion of supporting the transition from clinician to novice academic in efforts to increase retention of qualified nursing faculty. One important difference to mention in this particular article is the author focused on Master’s prepared novice educators in nursing programs. Current statistics indicate that approximately forty-five percent of the current nursing faculty workforce are master’s prepared (American Association of Colleges of Nursing, 2005). The purpose of the study was to describe the work-role transition of clinical experts who become novice educators. A serious concern was cited in the text of the article stating that nurses accept positions as faculty members without fully understanding the role as academic educators. A naturalistic inquiry for a descriptive explanatory study was utilized. Within this paradigm, individuals construct realities through their experience and researchers synthesize these experiences to form an aggregate depiction of the phenomenon (Anderson,
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2009). A purposive maximum variation sample of eighteen participants from fourteen AACN accredited nursing programs were enrolled in the study after IRB approval. These participants needed to be first or second year full-time faculty with no formal preparation in education.

Results of the study identified six patterns of commonality in regard to work-role experience. The author described these patterns with the metaphor of a mermaid swimming in a sea of academia. The reason for this is the commonalities were described as: sitting on the shore, splashing in the shallows, drowning, treading water, beginning strokes, and throughout the waters. Sitting on the shore was described as the time during the actual transition of clinician to academic. Emotions described were fear and excitement. Splashing in the shallows was described as participants getting lighter workloads to ease them into academia. Drowning was the feeling of being completely overwhelmed. Treading water was described as simply trying to keep your head above water to prevent yourself from drowning. Beginning strokes was referred to as moving from surviving to thriving. Lastly, throughout the waters was described as continually striving throughout the role transition for excellence, seeking answers, and reacting to students (Anderson, 2009).

Essentially this article was a descriptive analysis of the transition that takes place when an experienced master’s prepared clinician transitions into the novice nursing faculty role. Some of the commonalities described were a bit concerning such as drowning and treading water. One could question if these feelings could contribute to young faculty leaving the academic profession. If in fact they do, administrators could implement initiatives to support young faculty through these difficult times to aid in retaining them long term. This was a small study, therefore the results need to be further studied and validated.
Further evidence is available suggesting role conflict affects commitment to stay in an institution. Gormley & Kennerly (2010), performed a nonexperimental descriptive study with a purpose of examining how organizational commitment is influenced by organizational climate and work role in departments of nursing. A sample of full time, tenure track, nursing faculty in public and private Carnegie Doctoral/Research Universities were enrolled in the study. Email requests were sent to subjects asking them to participate in the study and in order to be included at least five faculty members from any given institution were required to allow for nesting of school and faculty data analysis. Conventional mail was used to send an initial request to the dean or chairperson of the program and a signed agreement from these individuals triggered the email process to the faculty.

Results demonstrated that fifty-five percent of the schools contacted agreed to participate. They were widely dispersed across twenty-six states with the majority in the southeast (35.6%). Three hundred sixteen participants enrolled in the study of the 535 eligible subjects for a representation of fifty-nine percent. Over eighty-five percent were tenured with the remaining sample on tenure track. The mean age of the faculty was fifty-two years. Results also demonstrated that as role ambiguity and role conflict increased, dimensions of organizational commitment were influenced negatively. The authors suggested that developing work environments that are conducive to positive working relationships both with peers and administrators, along with clarification of work roles will increase intent to stay in nursing faculty translating into a higher retention rate (Gormley D. K., 2010).

This article provides additional support of the concept of role strain negatively impacting the retention of nursing faculty. The study was designed well but there were limitations that need
to be considered. The most significant limitation is the sample. The sample for this study was comprised of faculty that were doctorally prepared and the majority were tenured. As previously described, only slightly more than half of the general nursing faculty population have an earned doctorate. It is also well documented in higher education literature that part-time and adjunct faculty continue to play an increasing role in the education of undergraduate students. Therefore, it would be difficult to generalize these results to the nursing faculty population at large as this particular sample is not representative of the population. In addition the sample in this study was restricted to research intensive universities further restricting the generalizability of the results. Recommendations for future research would be to expand the study to include a more representative sample.

Recognizing the difficulty with the role transition from clinician to educator, Penn, Wilson, & Rosseter (2008) published an article providing practical advice on how to transition into the role successfully. First the authors give a detailed overview of the academic environment as to familiarize novice educators with the higher education system. The overview included topics such as faculty responsibilities, promotion system, faculty development and educational policies.

In addition to an overview on the topics, the authors provided recommendations to help in the transition from clinician to faculty member. In regard to faculty responsibilities the authors highlighted suggestions to decrease difficulty with the role transition. The authors further support the notion previously documented in the literature review that new faculty may be under the assumption that the faculty role is primarily comprised of teaching. Providing new faculty with information about the full scope of the faculty role may help them better prepare and prevent
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transition difficulties. With respect to educational policies the authors recommend new faculty
familiarize themselves with the faculty guide for their respective institutions. The authors also
strongly recommend attending any faculty development offerings specific to teaching and
learning. This may alleviate some the anxiety associated with being new to the classroom. In
addition faculty development seminars offer opportunity for networking particularly with more
experienced educators (Penn, 2008).

Penn, Wilson, and Rosseter (2008), provide an excellent overview of concepts specific to
higher education. This can be particularly useful and educational for individuals who are new to
the academic role. As for recommendations for transitioning into the academic role, the
information provided was a bit elementary and vague. Specific recommendations were not
offered and again there was no research cited on which these recommendations were based other
than opinion.

In an article written by Schumacher, Risco, & Conway (2008), the authors developed a
model to foster excellence in nursing scholarship and for recruiting and grooming new faculty.
This was the only theory focused article identified within the literature specific to the nursing
faculty shortage. Historically, nurses have had the reputation of “eating their young”. This seems
counterintuitive considering the foundations of the profession. The authors postulate that
providing mentorship to novice faculty will ensure growth of the workforce. This may seem
quite simplistic but the authors provide detailed recommendations. Within the model there are
novice and seasoned faculty. In addition, nursing students are incorporated into the model to
build relationships that will foster future entry into academia as faculty. In order for the model to
be successful the organization must completely buy in to the model. Novice and seasoned faculty
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need to pair and work together on projects and committees to capitalize on each other’s strengths. An example provided by the authors included how the clinical expertise of a novice faculty member paired with an experienced faculty member who is adept at grant writing can make quite a synergistic relationship for research development (Schumacher, 2008).

This model is an example of how currently available resources can be utilized to recruit and also retain the nursing faculty workforce with little or no cost to the institution. By providing mentorship to novice faculty and nursing students, role strain and ambiguity may be lessened. In addition, this mentorship model may lessen the strain of transitioning from clinician to novice faculty member. Also, as previously stated the aging faculty workforce is a major contributor the nursing faculty shortage. Perhaps pairing novice faculty with more seasoned faculty may result in a higher job satisfaction for both groups. To this point, more research needs to be done to determine the outcome of implementing this model.

Mentorship has been described in the literature as being one of the most influential factors in retaining and developing new nursing faculty (Dunham-Taylor, Lynn, Moore, McDaniel, & Walker, 2008). Durham-Taylor et al., (2008) describe mentoring as an upward spiral of success and if not implemented the reverse happens; a downward spiral. The causes of the nursing faculty shortage as previously described are also highlighted in the article in addition to information which was obtained through interviews with new nursing faculty. Several new nursing faculty in various setting were interviewed and all expressed a need for information with specific regard to the technical aspects of teaching, skills to develop and organize syllabi and objectives, knowledge about technology utilized in academic settings, rotation through all classes, an overview of the whole semester, and the outcome at the end of the course before
teaching. Other faculty members expressed concern about how to deal with conflict with students.

The authors suggest developing an official mentoring program at all institutions. They further support as previously described, the notion that new faculty need socialization and enculturation into the faculty role in order to reduce role strain and stress. They cite the vast differences in the faculty role as compared to the clinical setting as one of the key reasons for needing mentorship. The role strain caused by the two different roles is described as daunting and leads to the ultimate lack of retention of qualified nursing faculty. Mentoring may alleviate or decrease feelings of isolation, confusion, frustration and ultimately improve job satisfaction (Dunham-Taylor, 2008).

Workload considerations were another aspect documented as a consideration for increasing nursing faculty retention. Durham, Merritt, & Sorrell (2007) highlighted recommended initiatives to ensure equity among nursing faculty by recognizing teaching, scholarship, and service contributions of all faculty. The authors state that favorable perceptions of workload may result in an increase in job satisfaction among nursing faculty. They also summarized studies which recommend incorporating workload equity into departments of nursing in efforts of increasing morale of nursing faculty and perhaps increasing retention. To determine initiatives that would promote workload equity, the authors formed a task force to determine the current workload in their college. Eight principles guided the task force which developed a faculty workload survey. The survey requested that faculty keep track of their time spent on different activities that are required of nursing faculty. In essence this was a diary of time spent on work-related activities. There was a ninety percent response rate for the surveys.
After analysis of the surveys, the taskforce developed a workload formula that defined what would constitute a workload unit which essentially would be equal to one credit hour of teaching. The authors state this workload formula enables the department to address diverse teaching loads and incorporates all the aspects of faculty responsibilities including but not limited to teaching, advising, service, communication with students, grant writing, scholarly endeavors, and administrative responsibilities. The workload formula has been implemented in their college and has been running successfully providing equitable workloads for two semesters. The authors concluded that implementing a workload formula may decrease job dissatisfaction and increase morale of faculty which may translate into retention of faculty members. The authors make special note, that because of the current significant nursing faculty shortage, this formula may not be possible in all institutions especially if unexpected needs arise and faculty are required to accept an increased workload (Durham, 2007).

There was one article found within the literature review that was specific to retaining adjunct nursing faculty. Forbes, Hickey, & White (2010), designed a study with the purpose of determining the needs and identified problems of adjunct faculty related to their teaching role with the aim of developing strategies to meet their needs ultimately increasing job satisfaction and retention. The study population was comprised of 132 adjunct faculty at Adelphi University. Adelphi is considered to be a Carnegie doctoral/research institution. The surveys were mailed to each of the adjunct faculty’s home with a stamped return envelope. There was a request in a welcome letter that the surveys be returned within three weeks. At the three week period forty-five surveys were returned. In efforts to increase the return rate the survey and welcome letter
were then e-mailed to the subjects. This process yielded twenty more surveys for a total of sixty-five respondents.

Demographically the respondents primarily worked full time in another position ($n=59$) which was usually an acute care setting. The mean number of years as an RN was 23.8 and the range was 4-46 years. Teaching experience ranged from less than 1 year to 40 years with a mean of 7.3 years. It is important to highlight that 32 of the 65 respondents had only taught at Adelphi. Most of the respondents had no formal teaching or education courses. There were common themes that were identified in the surveys. The theme of role expectations predominated specifically, adjuncts wanted clear expectations. Another common theme was the feeling of marginalization, therefore, integration was recommended. Other recommendations included a formal orientation process, centralizing the coordination of adjuncts, providing staff support, and integrating adjunct faculty into the schools total faculty including faculty development. One of the conclusions made by the authors is that because of the significant nursing faculty shortage, institutions may need to rely more heavily on adjunct faculty. Providing support to ensure job satisfaction in this population may increase retention and soften the effects felt by the shortage (Forbes, 2010).

There were significant limitations of this study that need to be considered. The sample was comprised of faculty from one single institution therefore it would be impossible to generalize the results. In addition, the majority of respondents worked full-time in an acute care setting. This further restricts the generalizability of the study. One attribute to this particular study was there survey method. First, surveys were mailed, when they did not achieve the return they had anticipated they then changed methods and e-mailed the survey possibly capturing
respondents through a different method. That being said, it is impossible to know whether or not a faculty member filled out the survey twice.

When analyzing the available literature on retaining qualified faculty it is quite evident that role transition was the primary focus. Several articles claimed that role strain and role ambiguity were a major contributing factor in attrition of nursing faculty. Several recommendations were made to help aid in this issue but little research based evidence was available. It is evident that this is the major knowledge gap on this subject.

**Recruitment and Retention may not be Mutually Exclusive**

There is also a small body of literature available evaluating recruitment and retention strategies contained within the same article. Gazza (2009), published the results of a hermeneutic phenomenology evaluating the experience of being a full-time nursing faculty member in a baccalaureate nursing program. Due to the qualitative design of the study a sample of eight faculty members teaching in the Eastern half of the United States was chosen. The mean number of years of experience teaching was 6.1 years and the mean number of years of experience prior to obtaining a full-time faculty position was 13.4 years. Five themes evolved as the author interviewed the faculty. The themes included: making a difference in the student, being a gatekeeper to the profession, trying ways to balance multiple roles, support is vital, and workplace relationships both good and bad.

Recruitment and retention initiatives were then recommended based on these five identified themes. Examples of initiatives included; incorporating time involved with student remediation and advising in workload calculations, assisting faculty in finding balance in their multiple roles, celebrating program outcomes such as graduation rates and passing of licensure
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examinations, and establishment and utilization of conflict management protocols. As stated within the text of the article, this is the first study evaluating the experience of being a full-time nursing faculty member (Gazza E., 2009). This article provides an excellent foundation for future studies on this topic. It also provides a frame of reference as to which initiatives may be implemented to recruit and retain qualified faculty. Again, the recruitment and retention initiatives are recommendations and there is no established data to support or evaluate these methods.

Brendtro & Allen (2000), stated attracting nurses into the academic world is one of the most significant barriers contributing to the nursing faculty shortage. In order to further evaluate this statement, the authors designed a survey to specifically address recruitment and retention issues. There were four main questions the authors wanted to answer: how does the age of nursing faculty compare to graduate nurses employed in nonacademic settings, what positions to graduate nurses currently hold and how satisfied are they, what incentives could be employed to attract and retain faculty, and what ideas to graduates have to increase the numbers of nursing faculty.

The survey was mailed to one hundred percent of registered nurses holding a graduate degree in one rural mid-western state. Results of the survey demonstrated that the mean age of nursing faculty compared to graduate nurses in other settings were essentially identical when compared to national data. Three of every four nurses with graduate degrees were satisfied with their current position with no difference between faculty and nurses in other settings. Recommendations by respondents made for recruiting and retaining faculty included; closer proximity to work, better compensation, more realistic role expectations and support of.
continued clinical practice while holding a faculty position. Four recurring themes emerge in the narrative section as to how to increase the numbers of nursing faculty. These four themes were described as: ground educators in clinical practice, provide scholarships for advanced study, improve faculty salary and benefits, and increase access to doctoral and master’s education (Brendtro, 2000). The results of this study further support initiatives that have been previously described in the literature on recruitment and retention of qualified faculty. The significant attribute of this particular study is they specifically asked all registered nurses with advanced degrees within a state what would make a faculty career more attractive. The responses were congruent with previous recommendations. Of course the major limitation of this study is that it was confined to one state severely restricting the ability to generalize the results.

One of the only articles specifically evaluating recruitment and retention initiatives was written by Allan & Aldebron (2008). The authors performed a literature search utilizing the keywords of nurse educator shortage and nursing faculty shortage. This particular literature review was not restricted to scholarly or peer reviewed journals. The authors support the claims of this current literature review by stating “the bulk of the literature did not describe or evaluate strategies but, rather, focused on the nature and ramifications of the problem”. The authors also stated “We found very few articles describing the implementation or evaluation of strategies confronting the nursing faculty shortage”. These statements further support the described significant knowledge gap in this crucial aspect of the nursing faculty shortage.

The results of the literature identified four strategic domains that included: advocacy, educational partnerships, academic innovation, and external funding. Advocacy was described as raising public awareness. Mass media was described as an effective vehicle for advocacy and the
Johnson and Johnson campaign for nursing’s future was the primary example. Educational partnerships were described as coalitions to increase the capacity to educate nursing students. This could be accomplished by a number of nursing schools banding together or by nursing schools partnering with outside clinical institutions. Academic innovation incorporated the use of technology to expand education capacity or by the use of non-traditional nurse educators. Finally, external funding was described as state and federal funds to support education expansion by increasing nursing faculty. The final recommendations made by the authors were to encourage publications of research on the subject, develop a national central agency or clearinghouse to collect and disseminate data, and establish and build upon current models that will be sustainable and replicable (Allan, 2008).

Ganley & Sheets (2009) published an article specifically evaluating a program which was implemented in the San Francisco Bay area in California to increase the pool of qualified nursing faculty. Both authors are faculty members at Dominican University. The authors received funding from the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation to create a geriatric clinical nurse specialist educator program. This initiative was promoted by the school having to restrict admission of undergraduate students into their nursing program specifically because of not having enough faculty to teach them. Upon graduation, if graduates agreed to teach in the San Francisco Bay area for five semesters their loans would be completely forgiven. During the fourth year of the program, three graduates were already teaching at the university and 11 more were slated to begin teaching for at least five semesters (Ganley, 2009).

This publication specifically evaluates initiatives that were implemented to increase recruitment and retention of qualified faculty at one university in the San Francisco Bay area.
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Not only did they increase the pool of qualified nurse educators, they also forgave loans if they agreed to teach for a certain number of semesters. This loan forgiveness may in turn increase retention by decreasing the financial burden of obtaining an advanced degree. This can be particularly helpful considering the salary differential between clinical advanced practice nurses and nursing faculty.

Yucha & Witt (2009) published an article summarizing how the University of Las Vegas at Nevada (UNLV) tackled the need for recruiting and retaining qualified faculty. The population in Nevada has had an enormous boom over the past twenty years. There has been approximately a 74 percent increase in the residents within the state. This has caused an increased need for nurses in the state translating into a dire need for nursing faculty. In response to this need the state of Nevada mandated nursing schools double their enrollment. In order to address the need to enroll more nursing students and to hire and retain more nursing faculty UNLV raised its pay scale to be one of the highest paying institutions for nursing faculty in the nation. The funding for this was provided by student tuition and reallocating funds within the institution from other departments.

The authors state that after initiating higher salaries, they have been able to be more selective in their hiring process, fill vacant positions, and retain faculty that would have otherwise left for more lucrative clinical positions. The faculty did however have to switch to a twelve month contract, enroll new students three times per year, and teach on a trimester basis. Due to the twelve month contract the authors do question if they will be able to retain faculty long term.
Faculty Retention Difficulties in Disciplines Outside of Nursing in Academia

When analyzing the nursing faculty shortage literature, one must keep in mind that nursing faculty are very unique in regard to demographics and education. First, they are a professional entity who often have a clinical practice outside of academia. Other factors that must be considered is the fact that they are more than ninety percent female, are older than the average faculty member in academia, and are quite inexperienced. Though their uniqueness is established in the literature, it is prudent to consider how other academic disciplines retain their faculty and if in fact other disciplines have difficulty retaining faculty at all.

When performing a literature search related to faculty retention specific to certain disciplines, again the literature available was not abundant. For the purposes of this literature review, the disciplines of social work, engineering, accounting, medicine, and pharmacy were considered. Other categories such as minority faculty and gender were also analyzed. Social work was chosen due to the fact that is a professional field and is predominantly female. Unfortunately, there were no articles available on this topic. The literature search yielded articles focusing on student retention not faculty retention. This was the same result when researching pharmacy faculty retention.

With regard to engineering, there were few articles available on retaining faculty and also retaining female faculty which will be discussed in more detail. This trend was similar within the literature for medicine. Literature regarding retention of faculty as a whole was not available but a few articles were available regarding retaining female and minority faculty. This literature will be discussed in more detail. Accounting has available literature in regarding to retaining faculty as there is also a current accounting faculty shortage which was discussed in the introduction of
this study. The important aspect to consider when examining the accounting faculty literature, is that nursing faculty and accounting faculty vary greatly in that accounting faculty is predominantly male.

Retaining minority faculty was a theme that emerged not only in the general faculty realm but also within medicine. The demographic landscape within the United States has changed drastically in the past ten years as reported by the United States Census. African Americans comprise 12.3 percent, Hispanics 12.5 percent totaling nearly 25 percent of the population. It has been reported that minorities comprise only 7.2 percent of full time medicine faculty. This highlights the underrepresentation of minorities in this field of academia. In addition to low numbers of minority faculty, these faculty are primarily concentrated at the rank of assistant professor (Daley, 2006). Recommendations are available in the literature suggesting recommendations for retaining these underrepresented faculty. These primarily focused on faculty development programs to help minority faculty progress to the professor rank. In a study conducted by Daley et.al, a professional development program was implemented for minority faculty. One aspect was to address the disproportionate obligation to serve on committees, mentor difficult students, and engage in community service and provide junior faculty with information about institutional culture. In the end results demonstrated that retention rated of minority faculty were equal to non-minority faculty (Daley, 2006). This type of intervention would translate nicely into the nursing faculty body considering it has been documented that transitioning into the faculty role from clinician is quite difficult for nursing faculty.

In regard to the engineering discipline, the National Science Foundation has reported that female faculty are leaving their positions at a higher rate than male faculty. This is significant
when considering that females are an underrepresented student and faculty population in the STEM majors. Some literature suggested that gender is related to job satisfaction in the engineering faculty role. Callister, 2006 suggests that this is related to the climate of the university and it being male predominated. Results also demonstrated that women had lower job satisfaction scores and had a higher intent to quit than their male counterparts. The authors suggested changing the climate of the department to aid in retaining female faculty. Climate in this study was defined as; people involvement and interpersonal or social relationships. They further described the affective climate as; quality of relationships, psychological safety, pessimism toward change, and feelings of isolation. The authors concluded that changing the department climate will in essence improve job satisfaction and decrease intent to leave. Again, this study translates nicely into the nursing faculty shortage. Improving the relationships between groups in theory will have a positive effect on the working environment therefore increasing job satisfaction. It is also important to note that this study focused on the female faculty population in engineering and as previously stated, the nursing faculty is greater than 90 percent female.

In addition to nursing, accounting may be facing a crisis in the near future related to a shortage of qualified faculty. The Plumlee Report (2006), was a research report developed by an ad hoc committee of the American Accounting Association. In this report, the authors concluded there are only approximately half of the required qualified accounting faculty available to meet the needs of the profession. Similar to nursing, the supply of doctorally prepared accounting majors is lacking. Eaton, (2007) reported 70 institutions granting PhDs in accounting in 1994. This number dropped to 38 in 2003 and 42 in 2004. These data indicate there are less qualified faculty to fill needs because institutions are producing less candidates. Another important
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statistic was reported by Rayburn, (2005). The overall membership in the American Accounting Association has dropped eighteen percent in the past decade. This could be linked to a faculty shortage and an inability of institutions to produce graduates.

There are other similarities noted between the nursing and accounting disciplines and their faculty shortages. Like nursing, many of the accounting faculty are baby boomers. With this increase in faculty age comes an increase in faculty retirement. This produces vacancies in colleges of business for accounting faculty. Salary is another aspect of the faculty shortage that accounting has in common with nursing. There are many external incentives available for accounting doctorates which are accompanied by a lucrative salary. This may sway graduates away from academia into a corporate environment with large monetary rewards that are not available in academia at this present time (Eaton, 2007).

Similar to the effect of regulations of accrediting bodies in nursing, there are accrediting bodies in accounting which are affecting the demand of accounting faculty. In nursing, restrictions dictate a ratio of not more than one instructor per 8 students in a clinical setting. In some states like New York it is more restrictive. In accounting, the association to advance collegiate schools of business also has restrictions on instructor to student ratios. This has required institutions seeking accreditation to hire more accounting faculty (Eaton, 2007). In addition, whenever you are evaluating a shortage of faculty it is always prudent to consider the effect of tenure. Like most disciplines, accounting and nursing are shifting their focus onto research when awarding tenure. This takes the emphasis off teaching. By doing this, institutions are increasing the need and limiting the supply of faculty (Chang & Sun, 2008).
Summary

The available literature on the nursing faculty shortage is certainly not abundant. That being said, there has been a noticeable increase in the number of publications over the past five to seven years. Perhaps this is related to the increased awareness and the inability to enroll the needed nursing students into colleges of nursing. While reviewing the literature on the nursing faculty shortage there are evident themes that emerge. The primary theme that emerges in relation to retention of nursing faculty is job satisfaction.

There is clear documentation of the suspected causes of the nursing faculty shortage. They have been described as a lack of supply, aging of the nursing faculty workforce, compensation issues, workload and job satisfaction. Issues with job satisfaction and role conflict emerge as the most frequently cited concern in relation to the nursing faculty shortage. There are several studies documenting decreased job satisfaction as cause for nursing faculty to leave the academic role or to seek a position in another institution. With retention of nursing faculty being such an issue this is a significant finding. The overall critique of the body of literature available on this topic is with the sampling methods. In each study, the authors sought permission from Deans of the schools and colleges prior to inviting faculty to participate in their respective studies. This method could have possibly excluded a proportion of faculty who are dissatisfied with their current positions particularly because of difficulties with leadership or a hostile work environment. Another sampling concern was that most surveys were emailed. Considering the mean age of nursing faculty, there could be question as to the comfort level of the respondents in relation to electronic surveys.
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Recruitment is the next theme which emerged in the literature. The literature available on this topic was somewhat sparse especially compared to other themes. Recruitment concerns that emerged in the literature were the lack of available supply of qualified applicants and compensation issues. Authors also attempted to make recommendations to alleviate some of the barriers to recruiting faculty but these were solely based on opinion and had very little research cited to support these recommendations. There is a blaring knowledge gap evident and future research needs to be focused on describing and quantifying the current initiatives being utilized and their success rate.

With specific regard to retention, the literature is much more robust when compared to recruitment. Again, common themes emerge when reviewing the literature. Role transition, role strain, and role ambiguity clearly emerge as the primary difficulty with retaining nursing faculty. Many authors claim clinical nurses are not fully prepared for the multi-faceted responsibilities that embody the faculty role. Mentorship, faculty development, and formal orientation programs are frequently recommended solutions to this identified problem. Again, the knowledge gap within this theme is there is little research to base these recommendations and essentially no evaluative research on the recommended solutions. Therefore, future research needs to be focused primarily on implementation of initiatives and evaluation of effectiveness.

In conclusion, the literature available on the nursing faculty research is increasing. There are significant knowledge gaps primarily in implementation and evaluation of initiatives for solutions of this crisis. It is clear that both the nursing and nursing faculty shortage is increasing. It is a healthcare imperative that we find solutions that are feasible and replicable to solve this crisis.
Chapter 3
METHODOLOGY

This chapter will highlight the research methodology that was utilized to answer the specific research questions. The purpose of the study along with the research questions will be described in detail. The procedures of the study will be explained along with the data analyses. This will include the procedures for analyzing the descriptive data along with specific data analyses procedures to answer each of the research questions.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to examine the relationships between role conflict, workload, and job satisfaction and the timing of nursing faculty leaving their current position. In addition, other factors which may contribute to role conflict and job satisfaction will be analyzed including personal demographics, and institution characteristics.

Research Questions

Over-riding Question: How does role conflict, and workload affect job satisfaction and the timing of departure of nursing faculty from their current faculty position?

Subsidiary Questions:

1. How does workload effect job satisfaction (JS) and role conflict (RC) among nursing faculty when controlling for years of experience as a faculty member?

2. How does job satisfaction and role conflict among nursing faculty predict the timing of faculty departure from their current faculty position?

Research Hypotheses

Over-riding Hypothesis: Nursing faculty that report lower levels of job satisfaction and/or higher levels of role conflict will have a higher likelihood of leaving their current faculty position.
1. There will be a negative relationship between workload and job satisfaction among nursing faculty, i.e. the higher the workload, the lower the satisfaction.
2. There will be a positive relationship between workload and role conflict among nursing faculty, i.e. the higher the workload, the higher the reported role conflict.
3. Faculty will have a higher propensity to leave their current faculty position when experiencing higher levels of role conflict and lower levels of job satisfaction.

Research Design

The study utilized a quantitative cross sectional survey design to enable analysis of descriptive and correlational data. Data were collected via an online survey vehicle, survey monkey, over a four week period. The hypothesized relationships between data and constructs were guided by role conflict theory as originally described by Rizzo et al. (Rizzo et al, 1970) 1970 and were analyzed using descriptive, factorial ANOVA, and logistic regression techniques. Personal, demographic, and institution characteristics were also considered in a descriptive analysis.

Target Population and Sample Selection

The population of interest for the described study are nursing faculty currently teaching in a CCNE accredited institution that grants bachelor of science in nursing degrees in the Northeastern United States. All faculty in these institutions will be included and identified. These will include: full time, tenured, non-tenured, undergraduate, graduate and clinical faculty.

Procedures

Sample Selection

Subjects for the study were recruited from accredited nursing schools that grant bachelor of science in nursing degrees in the Northeastern United States. A list of institutions was compiled from the CCNE list of accredited nursing schools. After colleges of nursing were
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compiled in a list by state as found on the CCNE website, each school website was visited to ensure that faculty e-mails were available. Once these websites were visited an excel spreadsheet was compiled with each available e-mail address for faculty on the official college of nursing website. Through this process, 3340 e-mails of nursing faculty were compiled. After approval from the Seton Hall University IRB was obtained, an initial e-mail was sent (N= 3340) directly to nursing faculty as to avoid any undue coercion by administration. E-mail addresses were obtained from the Colleges of Nursing websites. An initial e-mail containing a link to the survey was sent to the faculty via survey monkey along with an informed consent and introductory email. After one week, a request will be e-mailed to non-responders and as a reminder at one week intervals for a total of 4 e-mails. Five weeks will be allotted for return of surveys.

**Instruments**

There were two instruments utilized within the context of this study to measure predictor variables. The first instrument was developed and guided by Role conflict theory originally described by Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman in 1970. Within this study the authors developed a questionnaire to specifically measure aspects of role conflict and role ambiguity. The survey developed and implemented in this study included items specific only to role conflict using a 5 point likert scale. Questions one through fifteen in the included survey relate specifically to role conflict (appendix A). The items in this survey have been validated numerous times and replicated in numerous studies in the literature.

The second instrument utilized in this study was the Index of Job Satisfaction (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951). The items on the survey within this study specific to job satisfaction are also rated using a 5 point likert scale providing continuity between items. Sixteen items on the survey
were related to JS. Items 32-50 were questions specific to demographics (appendix A). Items specific to job satisfaction have also been validated numerous times in the literature. Due to the age of both of these instruments and their availability in the public domain, permission was not needed to incorporate them into this study. It is estimated that study participants will take 20 minutes to complete the survey.

Data Analyses

Data Reduction

To reduce the number of separate items related to job satisfaction and role conflict for the subsequent ANOVA analysis, a factor analysis was employed. This was performed to determine if there were a reduced number of latent elements that, in fact, accounted for most of the variance in all the items related to job satisfaction and role conflict, respectively. The factor analysis tested whether a greatly reduced number of items could account for most of the variance. The factor analysis was completed using a principle components analysis with varimax rotation. Factors with eigenvalues above 1 were selected and items that loaded above .6 on each of these factors were used to build a scale for that factor. This process also may remove multicolinearity. If you have two or more variables that are highly correlated, principal components analysis may reduce the correlated variables into principal components that can be used to generate a component score which can be used in lieu of the original variables (https://statistics.laerd.com/premium/pca/pca-in-spss.php, 2015). Cronbach’s alpha was computed for each potential scale in order to test its additivity. A Cronbach’s alpha of .7 was minimum acceptable level.
After the variables were reduced into dimensions multiple cronbach's alpha were run to test whether the items loading > .7 constituted an additive scale. Thus, the fifteen items from the role conflict and sixteen items from job satisfaction were effectively reduced to three newly created variables. These were based on the three dimensions that emerged from the principal component analysis. (https://statistics.laerd.com/premium/ca/cronbachs-alpha-in-spss.php, 2015

**Research Question 1**

Research Question 1: How does workload effect job satisfaction and role conflict among nursing faculty when controlling for years of experience as a faculty member? This question explores the relationship between faculty workload, job satisfaction and role conflict. To assess the relationship between workload and job satisfaction controlling for years of experience as a faculty member, a factorial ANOVA model was used to analyze data. This model was chosen because it allows the investigator to understand if there is an interaction between two independent variables on the dependent variable. It also provides a separate understanding of each predictor while controlling for the effects of the other predictors which are being analyzed within the context of this study.

**Research Question 2**

Research question 2: How does job satisfaction and role conflict among nursing faculty predict the timing of faculty leaving their current faculty position? This question explores the relationship between job satisfaction and role conflict. To assess the relationship between job satisfaction, role conflict and the timing of faculty leaving their current faculty position. A Logistic regression model was used to analyze data. This model was chosen because it is able to predict the probability that an observation falls into one of two categories of a dichotomous
dependent variable based on one or more independent variables. It also provides a separate understanding of each predictor while controlling for the effects of the other predictors which are being analyzed within the context of this study. The timing of leaving variable will need to be dummy coded into a dichotomous variable of leaving in 0-5 years or 6 or more years. This decision was supported by the distribution of respondents.

**Summary**

To determine the relationships between role conflict, workload, and job satisfaction and the timing of nursing faculty leaving their current position and evaluate covariates which may contribute to role conflict and job satisfaction a quantitative cross sectional survey design was chosen enable analysis of descriptive and correlational data. The study population included nursing faculty currently teaching in a CCNE accredited institution that grant bachelor of science in nursing degrees in the Northeastern United States. This included; full time, tenured, non-tenured, undergraduate, graduate and clinical faculty. Faculty were e-mailed directly avoiding any undue coercion from college of nursing administrators.

Two instruments were chosen to measure the predictor variables. These instruments were research based and validated in the literature. The instruments measured job satisfaction and role conflict. They were combined into one survey which was distributed to study participants to measure the variables of interest. After data were collected, the large number of items describing the basic constructs of job satisfaction and role conflict independent were reduced utilizing a factor analysis. After the factor analysis, scales were constructed to reflect the dimensionality of the two major constructs and their additivity were tested via Cronbach’s alpha.
To answer the research questions at hand, two distinct statistical analyses were chosen. To answer research question one, a factorial ANOVA was chosen to allow the investigator to understand the interaction between the two independent variables of workload and years of experience as a faculty member on the dependent variables of role conflict and job satisfaction. It also provided a separate understanding of each predictor while controlling for the effects of the other predictors which are being analyzed within the context of this study. To answer research question two, a logistic regression model was chosen to allow prediction of the probability that an observation falls into one of two categories of the dichotomous independent variable of timing of leaving of nursing faculty. It also provided a separate understanding of each of the predictor variables of role conflict and job satisfaction.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS

This chapter provides a summary of the statistical results of the study. Characteristics of the sample are described as well as the results of the principal components analysis applied to the large number of survey items measuring the two major constructs of job satisfaction and role conflict. The results of the statistical analyses testing the research questions will be discussed in detail. Research question one was analyzed utilizing a factorial ANOVA and research question two will be analyzed with a logistic regression.

Characteristics of the Sample

The sample for this study was selected from nursing schools in the Northeastern United States who are accredited by CCNE and bestow BSN degrees. States included in the sample were Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont for a total of 131 nursing schools. A total of 3440 subjects were solicited for the study. Subject e-mails were obtained directly from the school of nursing website and an e-mail was sent directly to them via survey monkey.

The survey was administered online through Survey Monkey. The original request was sent on March 31, 2014. An introduction e-mail obtaining the consent was sent with the original request for participation and with each reminder e-mail (appendix B). Weekly reminders were sent via e-mail until the survey was closed on April 28, 2014. Results yielded 774 survey responses. Responses were completely anonymous.

In terms of demographics, 93.2 percent of the 774 respondents were female. This is not surprising insofar as it reflects the nursing faculty population as a whole as reported by the National League for Nursing. In regard to age, as shown in Table 1 below, subjects were
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primarily between the ages of 46 to 65 with the majority of respondents between the ages of 56 to 60 at 26.6 percent. With specific regard to age, it is interesting to note that over 70 (N=548) percent of respondents were over the age of 50 with the largest percentage between the ages of 56-60 (N=206) at nearly 27 percent. This seems congruent with the recent 2009 survey by the NLN that reports 63 percent of nursing faculty in the entire United States are between the ages of 46-60. The total respondents in this survey aged 46-60 (N=461) were nearly 60 percent. Respondents in this survey over the age of 60 were approximately 24 percent (N=187), slightly lower than the NLN reported at 30 percent. Overall the data collected in this survey are congruent with demographic data available in the literature suggesting that there is no obvious and large sample bias, at least with respect to the basic demographics of age and gender.

With specific regard to rank, the majority of faculty were Assistant Professors accounting for 41.7 percent followed by Associate Professor and Professor at 18.6 and 13.8 percent respectively. It is interesting to note, the majority of faculty are assistant professors. One could speculate that these faculty are relatively inexperienced as assistant professor is usually the starting rank of a faculty member who is doctorally prepared. Tenure data were also obtained, only 24.4 percent of faculty were tenured and 40.9 percent were on a tenure track. The large majority of faculty were full-time accounting for 89.0 percent of the sample.

When analyzing the data in regard to years of experience as a faculty member, as seen in Table 6, the majority of the sample had 5 years or less years of experience at 27.3 percent. Approximately 50 percent of the sample had 10 or less years of experience. This is particularly interesting when analyzing intent to leave data as approximately 50 percent of the sample plan on leaving their current position in 5 years or less with a majority leaving for retirement. This
causes one to speculate that within 5-10 years the nursing faculty in the Northeast will be quite inexperienced as a whole. The years of experience as a faculty member was designed as a categorical variable. This variable was item number 41 on the survey and read as: How many years have you been in a faculty role? The definition of categories were: 0-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, and >20. Overall it is evident with the results of this study that nursing faculty in the Northeast are older than the general population of faculty, inexperienced, and non-tenured as indicated in Table 1.

Table 1 Frequency Distributions of Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as Faculty</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Nursing Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Prof</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Tenure         | Non-Tenure | 585 | 75.6 |

In analysis of data available for how many years faculty have been in their current position, it is interesting to note that nearly 54 percent of faculty surveyed have been in their current position for 5 or less years and nearly 25 percent have been in their current position for 6-10 years. This accounts for nearly 79 percent of the sample. When comparing the frequency distribution of this particular item compared to years of experience as a faculty member which will be discussed later, one can surmise that due to the fact that nearly 50 percent of the sample have 10 or less years of experience the majority of current nursing faculty are in their first position as a faculty member. Again, raising concern regarding what the impact will be in 5-10 years after the faculty retire and what level of experience remains in the body of nursing faculty.
In regard to educational preparation for their faculty role, as seen in Table 2, the majority of faculty in the sample were doctorally prepared with 42.1 percent holding the PhD. The total proportion of doctorally prepared faculty including PhD, EdD, and DNP was 63.4 percent, which is higher than reported by the National League for Nursing in a 2009 faculty census survey which reported 25 percent. This could be partially explained by the increase in numbers of Doctor of Nursing Practice programs which were previously unavailable. In addition, this sample population also only accounted for faculty in the Northeastern United States where the NLN survey accounted for the population in the entire United States. Master’s prepared faculty accounted for 35.9 percent.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNP</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nursing Faculty

When analyzing data for what type of role faculty were in, in their previous position, it is interesting to note that nearly 53 percent were in a clinical role. This may further support the notion that the current nursing faculty in the Northeast is quite inexperienced.

Table 4

Frequency Distributions of Sample for Previous Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Institution</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Role</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Data Reduction

In an effort to reduce the number of separate items related to job satisfaction and role conflict for the subsequent ANOVA analysis, a factor analysis was employed. This was performed to determine if there were a reduced number of latent elements that, in fact, accounted for most of the variance in all the items related to job satisfaction and role conflict, respectively. The factor analysis tested whether a greatly reduced number of items could account for most of the variance. The factor analysis was completed using a principle components analysis with varimax rotation. Factors with eigenvalues above 1 were selected and items that loaded above .6 on each of these factors were used to build a scale for that factor. Cronbach’s alpha was computed for each potential scale in order to test its additivity. A Cronbach’s alpha of .7 was minimum acceptable level. Thus, the fifteen items from the role conflict and sixteen items from job satisfaction were effectively reduced to three newly created variables. These were based

Table 5

Principal Component Analysis of Job Satisfaction Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>40.50</td>
<td>40.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>49.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>57.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

Principal Components Analysis of Role Conflict Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>34.09</td>
<td>34.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>43.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>53.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the principal component analysis, three distinct dimensions emerged for both job satisfaction and role conflict accounting for more than half the variance in each. Dimensions for job satisfaction were defined as overall job satisfaction for job satisfaction 1, job satisfaction in
teaching for job satisfaction 2, and satisfaction with current nursing faculty role compared to other roles outside of academia for job satisfaction 3. Specific to job satisfaction 1 any item with a rotated component matrix above 0.7 was considered and then a Chronbach’s Alpha was performed to determine additivity. Items for job satisfaction with a rotated component matrix above 0.7 were items 20, 21, 23, 25, and 31. These items were retained to ensure the highest Chronbach’s score and ensure scale additivity. The Chronbach’s Alpha for job satisfaction 1 was 0.9.

Table 7
Rotated Component Matrix for Job Satisfaction 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Rotated Component Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item # 20</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # 21</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # 23</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # 25</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # 31</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific to job satisfaction 2 any item with a rotated component matrix above 0.6 was considered and then a Chronbach’s Alpha was performed to determine scale additivity. Items for job satisfaction 2 with a rotated component matrix above 0.6 were items 18, 19, and 27. These items were chosen to retain the highest Chronbach score. The Chronbach’s Alpha for job satisfaction 2 was 0.78.
For job satisfaction 3 or job satisfaction with current role compared to roles outside of academia, two items with a rotated component matrix of greater than or equal to 0.8 were retained to maintain the highest chronbach’s to ensure additivity. The results yielded a chronbach’s of 0.8. It is important to note that though the chronbach’s was acceptable at 0.80, one must question the validity of this dimension due to the fact that there were only two items included in this dimension.

Based on these varimax solutions, the three dimensions of role conflict dimensions were defines as; role conflict between groups for role conflict 1, role conflict within teaching for role
conflict 2, and role conflict between time and resources for role conflict 3. All the items in the survey were a 5 point likert scale. For the purpose of congruency, items that were negative were reverse coded to insure easier interpretation. Therefore, higher scores in the job satisfaction items revealed higher job satisfaction, higher scores for role conflict revealed less role conflict.

With specific regard to RC1 any item with a rotated component matrix above 0.62 was considered and then a Chronbach’s Alpha was performed to determine additivity. Items for role conflict 1 with a rotated component matrix above 0.73 were items 11, 14, and 15. These items were retained to ensure the highest chronbach’s alpha and ensure the additivity of items to form a scale. The Chronbach’s Alpha for role conflict 1 was 0.82.

Table 10
Rotated Component Matrix for Role Conflict 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Rotated Component Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item #11</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #14</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #15</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For role conflict 2 any item with a rotated component matrix above 0.57 was considered and then a Chronbach’s Alpha was performed to ensure additivity. Items for role conflict 2 with a rotated component matrix above 0.57 were items 1, 2, and 7. These items were retained to ensure the highest chronbach’s alpha. The Chronbach’s Alpha for role conflict 2 was 0.68. Though the chronbach’s was below 0.7 these items were retained for consistency between job satisfaction and role conflict due to the teaching dimension.
Specific to role conflict 3 any item with a rotated component matrix above 0.82 was considered and then a Chronbach’s Alpha was performed to ensure additvity. Items for role conflict 3 with a rotated component matrix above 0.82 were items 5 and 8. These items were retained to ensure the highest chronbach’s alpha and ensure additivity. The Chronbach’s Alpha for role conflict 3 was 0.83. It is important to note that similar to job satisfaction 3, though the chronbach’s was acceptable at 0.83, one must question the validity of this dimension due to the fact that there were only two items included in this dimension.

Overall, six dimensions were identified. Three for each of job satisfaction and role conflict. The chronbach alpha scores were all well above 0.7 with the exception of role conflict
Nursing Faculty

2. As previously mentioned, this dimension was retained to ensure consistency between dimensions as teaching was a common dimension in both job satisfaction and role conflict.

Table 13

Chronbach’s Alpha for Six Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th># of Items</th>
<th>Chronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive Data for Timing of Leaving for Nursing Faculty and Workload

Comparing the total sample in regard to workload as defined by hours worked per week, the most commonly cited response was 41-50 hours at 35.79 percent. Interestingly, the second most cited response was 51-60 hours per week. Of note, 77.26 percent of faculty work over 40 hours per week, and 41.47 percent more than 50 hours per week. Nearly half of the sample held a concurrent clinical position outside of academia at 47.93 percent. Workload was item number 40 in the survey. This item read as: Including all of your responsibilities how many hours per week do you work? The available responses were 0-10, 11-20, 21-30, 41-50, 51-60, and >60. The variable that measured the timing of leaving of faculty from their current faculty position was
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item number 43 in the survey. This item read as: In how many years do you plan on leaving your current position? The responses available were 0-2, 3-5, 6-9, and >10.

Table 14

Frequency Distributions of Participants for Hours Worked per Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timing of faculty leaving their current faculty position was defined as in how many years do faculty plan on leaving their current position. Interestingly, as previously mentioned 51.0 percent of faculty plan on leaving their current position within the next five years and 23.1 percent of these plan on leaving within two years. Another interesting fact is that 33.2 percent of respondents plan on leaving in 10 or more years which was the largest group represented in the sample.

Table 15

Frequency Distributions of Sample for Number of Years Faculty are Planning on Leaving Current Faculty Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The reason most frequently cited as the reason for leaving their current position is retirement at 69.1 percent. Nearly one quarter of the respondents at 23.5 percent will be leaving to go to another institution and only 7.4 percent will be leaving for a clinical role. This number may negate the notion that faculty have high mobility in and out of academia, at least in the Northeast. Though of note, 53.0 percent of the sample cited a clinical role as their most recent position before their current faculty role. Again, supporting the notion that the level of experience in the faculty specifically in the Northeast is low.

In addition to frequency distributions for the main variables in the study, cross tabulations were also obtained. The first to be reported is displayed in table (18). The respondents were nearly evenly distributed as a whole between the two groups of planning on leaving within 5 years and after more than 5 years. What is interesting to note, is when looking at the years of experience as a faculty member, when faculty had 0-10 years of experience, the majority of respondents plan on leaving their current position in greater than 5 years. This is encouraging considering the amount of faculty as a whole who are planning on leaving their current position within 5 years. What is concerning though is that approximately 50 percent of faculty with 11-20 years of experience are planning on leaving their current position within five years. This may translate into a large majority of the more experienced faculty leaving an inexperienced faculty body. The faculty who have 11-20 years are the smallest sample and nearly half of this sample plan on leaving their current position within 5 years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>&gt;20</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 Years</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(10.6)</td>
<td>(10.2)</td>
<td>(5.8)</td>
<td>(5.7)</td>
<td>(15.5)</td>
<td>(47.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5 Years</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(16.8)</td>
<td>(13.4)</td>
<td>(7.2)</td>
<td>(5.8)</td>
<td>(8.9)</td>
<td>(52.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(27.4)</td>
<td>(23.6)</td>
<td>(13.0)</td>
<td>(11.5)</td>
<td>(24.4)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regard to timing of leaving of nursing faculty and workload it is again noted that as a whole the sample is nearly evenly distributed between the two groups of timing of leaving their current faculty position. This supports the notion that nursing faculty are leaving their current positions regardless of their experience. In the workload groups it is interesting to note that the group who reported working 41-50 hours have the highest number of respondents in addition to the highest number of respondents planning on leaving within 5 years. The next highest workload group reporting on leaving within 5 years are those who work 51-60 hours.
Nursing Faculty

Table 17

Crosstabs of Timing of Leaving of Nursing Faculty and Workload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>WL</th>
<th>0-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>51-60</th>
<th>&gt;60</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 yrs</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>(1.6)</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
<td>(6.0)</td>
<td>(17.3)</td>
<td>(11.9)</td>
<td>(8.3)</td>
<td>(47.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5 yrs</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>(18.5)</td>
<td>(13.8)</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>(52.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.8)</td>
<td>(3.7)</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
<td>(13.6)</td>
<td>(35.8)</td>
<td>(25.7)</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With specific regard to workload and years of experience as a faculty member, it is interesting to note that 71 of 212 respondents who have 5 or less years of experience work greater than 50 hours per week. This is a significant percentage of this inexperienced group. This group is second only to faculty who have greater than 20 years of experience. This group had 100 respondents who work greater than 50 hours per week. Again accounting for a significant percentage of the sample for this category of years of experience. It is also clear that the majority of respondents in all the years of experience categories work 41-50 hours per week.
Table 18

Crosstabs of Workload and Years of Experience as a Faculty Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>&gt;20</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WL</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(1.8)</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>(3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
<td>(1.9)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>(1.9)</td>
<td>(13.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(9.3)</td>
<td>(8.0)</td>
<td>(6.0)</td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
<td>(8.4)</td>
<td>(35.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(6.0)</td>
<td>(6.8)</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
<td>(2.8)</td>
<td>(7.8)</td>
<td>(25.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(3.1)</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
<td>(1.9)</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>(5.2)</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>212</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(27.4)</td>
<td>(23.7)</td>
<td>(13.0)</td>
<td>(11.5)</td>
<td>(24.4)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptive Statistics for Job Satisfaction and Role Conflict**

With data reduction achieved, it became possible to economically describe the major independent and dependent variables: job satisfaction and role conflict. The proceeding paragraphs will describe in detail the descriptive statistics results specific to the three scales of job satisfaction and role conflict. Results were obtained via a factorial ANOVA. It is evident that job satisfaction scores were noted to be highest in the job satisfaction 1 dimension with a mean
of 20.28 and a standard deviation of 4.14. In remembering that the higher scores were associated with lower levels of role conflict, it is clear that the least amount of role conflict is noted in the role conflict 2 dimension or role conflict in teaching with a mean of 19.33 and a standard deviation of 3.12.

Table 19

Descriptive Statistics for Six Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 1</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 2</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 3</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict 1</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict 2</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict 3</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics demonstrated, with regard to job satisfaction factor 1, that regardless of years of experience as a faculty member, once faculty work more than 60 hours per week their mean JS scores decrease.
Table 20

Descriptive Statistics for Job Satisfaction 1 for Faculty Working >60 Hours Per Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload</th>
<th>Years Experience</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>18.08</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>18.22</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>19.93</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td>19.68</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21

Descriptive Statistics For Job Satisfaction 1 For Years of Experience as a Faculty Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Experience</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>20.44</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>20.12</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics demonstrated, with regard to job satisfaction factor 2 revealed again that faculty with more than 20 years of experience seemed to have the highest level of job satisfaction with a mean of 13.2 and a SD of 1.94. Interestingly there was one exception to this, in the group that worked 11-20 hours faculty with more than 20 years of experience were the
least satisfied with a mean of 11.9 and a SD of 2.51. Workload did not seem to be a factor for this dimension.

Table 22

Descriptive Statistics for Job Satisfaction 2 for Years of Experience as a Faculty Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Experience</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics for job satisfaction factor 3 revealed that job satisfaction scores were relatively equal between all levels of years of experience as a faculty member. Slight differences in means were noted in the group of faculty who had 16-20 years of experience in the workload group of 31-40 hours with a mean of 6.6 and SD of 1.17.

Descriptive statistics for RC 1 demonstrated that faculty with 0-5 years and more than 20 years had the least amount of role conflict with means of 16.77 and 16.35 respectively. Items were reverse coded in the analysis therefore the higher mean equaled less role conflict.

Means for the remaining groups were essentially equal. The highest mean noted was in the group of faculty who worked 0-10 hours per week and had 6-10 years of experience as a faculty member with a mean of 20.25.
Table 23

Descriptive Statistics for Role Conflict 1 for Years of Experience as a Faculty Member (Higher Mean=Decreased Role Conflict)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Experience</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>15.86</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics for role conflict 2 also demonstrated that faculty with more than 20 years had the least amount of role conflict with a mean of 20.35. Means for the remaining groups were essentially equal. The role conflict 3 model was not valid so those results are not reportable.

Table 24

Descriptive Statistics for Role Conflict 2 for Years of Experience as a Faculty Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Experience</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>18.96</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td>20.35</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Questions

Research Question 1

How does workload effect job satisfaction and role conflict among nursing faculty when controlling for years of experience as a faculty member? To answer this question, each of the three factors of JS and RC with the covariate of years of experience as a faculty member were analyzed via a two way ANOVA.

There was homogeneity of variances as assessed by Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variances (p=.065). A two-way analysis of variance yielded a main effect for workload, $F(6,4) = 2.72$, $p < .05$, indicating that different levels of workload statistically significantly changed the mean scores of Job Satisfaction ($M = 20.28\%$, $SD = 4.14$). Post hoc analyses were conducted using Tukey's post-hoc test. The faculty who worked more than sixty hours had significantly lower Job satisfaction compared to those that worked 31-40 hours ($M = -1.78$, $SD = .55$) and 41-50 hours ($M = -1.54$, $SD = .45$) The remainder of workload groups did not differ significantly. The main effect of years of experience as a faculty member yielded an $F$ ratio of $F(6,4)= 1.01$, $p =.402$, indicating that years of experience as a faculty member did not significantly change Job satisfaction. The interaction effect was non-significant, $F(10,22) = .53$, $p =.96$. 
Table 25

Factorial ANOVA Workload x Years of Experience as a Faculty Member for JS 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>46.54</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Exp</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>17.21</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLxYrs Exp</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>741</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was homogeneity of variances as assessed by Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variances (p=.100). A two-way analysis of variance yielded a main effect for workload, $F(6,4) = 2.27, p = .948$, indicating that workload did not significantly change Job Satisfaction 2 ($M = 12.78\%$, $SD = 1.96$). The main effect of years of experience as a faculty member yielded an F ratio of $F(6,4) = .47, p = .759$, indicating that years of experience as a faculty member did not significantly change Job satisfaction. The interaction effect was non-significant, $F(10,22) = 1.14, p = .298$.

Table 26

Factorial ANOVA Workload x Years of Experience as a Faculty Member for JS 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Exp</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLxYrs Exp</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>741</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was homogeneity of variances as assessed by Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variances (p = .106). A two-way analysis of variance yielded a main effect for workload, $F(6,4) = 1.18, p = .317$, indicating that workload did not significantly change Job Satisfaction 3 ($M = 7.16\%, SD = 1.72$). The main effect of years of experience as a faculty member yielded an F ratio of $F(6,4) = .47, p = .791$, indicating that years of experience as a faculty member did not significantly change Job satisfaction 3. The interaction effect was non-significant, $F(10,22) = 1.14, p = .737$.

Table 27
Factorial ANOVA Workload x Years of Experience as a Faculty Member for JS 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$MS$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Exp</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLxYrs Exp</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>741</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was homogeneity of variances as assessed by Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variances (p = .139). A two-way analysis of variance yielded a main effect for Role Conflict 1, $F(6,4) = 4.40, p < .001$, indicating that different levels of workload statistically significantly changed Role Conflict 1 ($M = 16.22\%, SD = 4.2$). Post hoc analyses were conducted using Tukey's post-hoc test. The faculty who worked 51-60 hours had significantly more role conflict compared to those that worked 0-10 hours ($M = -3.39, SD = 1.14$). The faculty who worked more than sixty hours had significantly more role conflict compared to those that worked 0-10 hours.
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hours ($M = -4.59, SD = 1.17$), 11-20 hours ($M = -2.95, SD = .85$), 31-40 hours ($M = -2.28, SD = .55$), and 41-50 hours ($M = -1.7, SD = .45$) The remainder of workload groups did not differ significantly. The main effect of years of experience as a faculty member yielded an $F$ ratio of $F(6,4) = .66, p = .623$, indicating that years of experience as a faculty member did not significantly change role conflict 1. The interaction effect was non-significant, $F(10,22) = 1.14, p = .821$.

Table 28

Factorial ANOVA Workload x Years of Experience as a Faculty Member for RC 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$MS$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>75.22</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Exp</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLxYrs Exp</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>741</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was homogeneity of variances as assessed by Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variances ($p = .38$). A two-way analysis of variance yielded a main effect for Role Conflict 2, $F(6,4) = 2.27, p < .05$, indicating that different levels of workload statistically significantly changed Role Conflict 2 ($M = 16.22\%, SD = 4.2$). Post hoc analyses were conducted using Tukey’s post-hoc test. The faculty who worked more than sixty hours had significantly more Role Conflict compared to those that worked 41-50 hours ($M = -1.11, SD = .36$) and 51-60 hours ($M = -1.33, SD = .38$) The remainder of workload groups did not differ significantly. The main effect of years of experience as a faculty member yielded an $F$ ratio of $F(6,4) = 2.66, p < .05$.  
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indicating that years of experience as a faculty member statistically significantly changed the Role Conflict 2. The interaction effect was non-significant, $F(10,22) = .57, p = .943$. 

Table 29

Factorial ANOVA Workload x Years of Experience as a Faculty Member for RC 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$MS$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>24.26</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Exp</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>28.62</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLxYrs Exp</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>741</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With specific regard to role conflict 3, there was not homogeneity of variances as assessed by Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variances ( $p = .002$). Therefore the model is not valid meaning the factorial ANOVA could not be included in the statistical analysis.

**Research Question 2**

How does job satisfaction and role conflict among nursing faculty predict the timing of faculty leaving their current nursing faculty position? To answer this question, each of the three factors of job satisfaction and role conflict were analyzed with a logistic regression.

A logistic regression was performed to ascertain the effects of the three factors of both job satisfaction and role conflict on the timing of nursing faculty leaving their current faculty position. The logistic regression model was statistically significant, $\chi^2(4) = 130.92, p < .0005$. The model explained 21% (Nagelkerke $R^2$) of the variance in timing of leaving of nursing faculty and correctly classified 69.3% of cases. Sensitivity was 78.5%, specificity was 59.2%. Of the six
predictor variables only two were statistically significant: job satisfaction 1 and job satisfaction
3. Factor 2 role conflict was nearly significant p=.077.

Faculty with lower job satisfaction 1 had 1.2 times higher odds in leaving their current faculty position in less than five years than leaving in greater than 5 years. Faculty with lower job satisfaction 3 had 1.23 times higher odds in leaving their current faculty position in less than five years than leaving in greater than 5 years. In regard to role conflict 2 which was nearly significant, Faculty with increased role conflict 2 had .95 times higher odds in leaving their current faculty position in less than five years than leaving in greater than 5 years.

Table 30

*Logistic Regression Based on Likelihood of Faculty Leaving in Less Than Five Years Based on JS1, JS2, JS3, RC1, RC2, RC3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>dF</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Odds</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>for Odds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS1</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>31.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS2</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS3</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC2</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC3</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary

To correctly analyze the data within the context of this study, several statistical techniques were utilized. First, the data on job satisfaction and role conflict, the principal constructs of this study, was reduced into 6 distinct dimensions. This was accomplished by utilizing principal component analyses followed by validating each dimension with cronbach’s alpha. Once these dimensions were defined and validated the additional statistical analyses to answer the research questions were performed. To answer research question one, a factorial ANOVA was utilized. Results revealed that workload was a significant factor in regard to job satisfaction 1. Faculty who worked more than sixty hours per week had significantly lower job satisfaction scores. Workload was not a factor for job satisfaction two or three. With specific regard to years of experience as a faculty member, this covariate was not a significant factor, nor was there an interaction effect for any of the job satisfaction dimensions. In analyzing the role conflict dimensions, workload was a significant factor in the role conflict 1 and role conflict 2 dimensions. Faculty who worked more hours had lower role conflict scores. This variable was reverse coded meaning that lower scores revealed more role conflict. Years of experience as a faculty member was significant in regard to role conflict 2 indicating that years of experience as a faculty member statistically significantly changed the mean score of Role Conflict 2. The interaction effect was non-significant.

Research question 2 was analyzed utilizing a logistic regression. Faculty with lower job satisfaction 1 scores had 1.2 times higher odds in leaving their current faculty position in less than five years than leaving in greater than 5 years. Faculty with lower job satisfaction 3 scores had 1.23 times higher odds in leaving their current faculty position in less than five years than
Nursing Faculty leaving in greater than 5 years indicating job satisfaction significantly impacts the timing of leaving of nursing faculty from their current position. Role conflict did not significantly predict the timing of leaving of nursing faculty from their current faculty position.
Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter will provide an analysis and synthesis of the findings within the context of this research study. The purpose of the study is to examine the relationships between role conflict, workload, and job satisfaction and the timing of nursing faculty leaving their current position. Descriptive data will be analyzed evaluating demographic data which was captured. In addition, the analysis of the data to answer the research questions will be analyzed. The first question will be analyzed utilizing a factorial ANOVA and the second question will be analyzed utilizing a logistic regression. Strengths and limitations will be discussed along with implications for future research and policy development.

Descriptive Data Analysis

Of the 774 respondents, it is not surprising that over 93 percent were female as this is representative of the nursing faculty population. With specific regard to age, it is interesting to note that over 70 (N=548) percent of respondents were over the age of 50 with the largest percentage between the ages of 56-60 (N=206) at nearly 27 percent. This seems congruent with a recent 2009 survey by the NLN that reports 63 percent of nursing faculty in the entire United States are between the ages of 46-60. The total respondents in this survey aged 46-60 (N=461) were nearly 60 percent. Respondents in this survey over the age of 60 were approximately 24 percent (N=187), slightly lower than the NLN reported at 30 percent.

Again these results, verify the fact that nursing faculty are an aging profession. It is significant to consider that respondents in this survey aged 45 or under only totaled 16 percent (N=126) of the respondents. Though this number is quite low, it is slightly higher than the NLN survey at just over 6 percent for faculty under 45 years of age. This is quite alarming when you
consider the demographic data regarding retirement which will be discussed shortly. These data will raise the question of what level of experience nursing faculty will have as a profession in the near future when a large majority of the current faculty body are planning on retiring in less than 10 years. Perhaps more important, is to consider the outcomes of students in nursing programs with this level of inexperience in the faculty body.

To further support the notion of having a very inexperienced nursing faculty body in the near future, respondents who had 0-5 years of faculty experience accounted for the largest percentage of the study sample at nearly 28 percent (N=212). Respondents who had 6-10 years of experience represented nearly 24 percent (N=183) of the sample. These two groups accounted over 51 percent of the population sampled. It is astounding to think that over one half of the faculty in the Northeastern United States have 10 or less years of experience as a faculty member. What may be more alarming is over 24 percent (N=189) of the sample had over 20 years of experience raising the concern of a large portion of experienced faculty retiring in the near future. This presents a possible scenario in the near future, when only slightly over 24 percent of the nursing faculty in the Northeast will have 11-20 years of faculty experience.

One other factor to consider when analyzing the current level of faculty experience within this survey how many years nursing faculty have been in their current faculty role. It is of particular interest when compared to the data representing the type of previous nursing position held. Nearly 54 percent of the sample have been in their current faculty position for 0-5 years. It is interesting to note that nearly 53 percent of the sample were in a clinical role immediately prior to their current position. This could infer that this large percentage of faculty are in their first faculty position.
When considering the experience of nursing faculty one must evaluate rank. An overwhelming majority of respondents described their rank as Assistant Professor or lower accounting for nearly 67 percent (N=523). Only nearly 14 percent were at the professor rank (N=107). Again, validating the lack of experience in the current nursing faculty of the Northeast considering Assistant Professor tends to be the entry rank for doctorally prepared faculty. Faculty at the Assistant professor were the largest majority at nearly 42 percent (N=323).

What may be the most alarming data represented in the results that may influence the nursing faculty shortage were the data collected on the timing of leaving of nursing faculty from their current faculty position. Over 50 percent (N=417) of the sample plan on leaving their current faculty position within 5 years. When you add in the nearly 19 percent plan on leaving within 6-9 years, you are met with a staggering 70 percent (N=607) of nursing faculty leaving their current faculty position within 9 years. Of the total sample, over 69 percent of these faculty plan on leaving for retirement. Again, pointing out the concern for the level of experience in the faculty body and verifying the importance of retaining faculty to prevent a critical shortage in our near future. In addition, faculty retention will help to avoid an overall very inexperienced faculty body.

**Research Question 1**

*How does workload effect job satisfaction and role conflict among nursing faculty when controlling for years of experience as a faculty member?*

To answer this question, each of the three factors of job satisfaction and role conflict with the covariate of years of experience as a faculty member were analyzed with a two way ANOVA. As stated in the review of the literature, the two most cited trends in the literature
related to the nursing faculty shortage are job satisfaction and role conflict. Though the available literature on the nursing faculty shortage is not overly abundant, there are studies that suggest that there is a relationship between increased workload and decreased job satisfaction. Durham, Merritt, & Sorrell (2007) suggested that favorable perceptions of workload may result in an increase in job satisfaction. Results of this study support this notion. Descriptive statistics demonstrated that once faculty work more than 60 hours per week their mean job satisfaction scores decrease.

With specific regard to job satisfaction 1, or overall job satisfaction, faculty who worked more than 60 hours had significantly lower job satisfaction scores than those that worked between 30 and 50 hours. Job satisfaction 2 or job satisfaction with teaching was not significantly affected by workload. Job satisfaction 3 or job satisfaction specific to being satisfied in a faculty role as compared to other nursing positions was also non-significant. Years of experience as a faculty member was not significant for any of the three JS factors.

Due to the fact that job satisfaction is frequently cited as one of the causes of the nursing faculty shortage, it is interesting to note that workload had a significant effect on overall job satisfaction. Just as interesting, is that it did not effect job satisfaction with teaching or other roles that faculty could obtain outside of academia. This brings several questions to the forefront.

First, if workload is not affecting faculty satisfaction with teaching than what is? Perhaps if faculty could spend more time teaching then perhaps they would be more satisfied with their faculty role. In addition, if research or administrators could pinpoint what is causing the decrease in satisfaction and address the issues they may be able to better retain faculty. As previously
stated, perhaps the other faculty requirements such as service, research, and committee work are what are truly affecting job satisfaction.

Role conflict is much more prevalent in the literature than job satisfaction in regard to the nursing faculty shortage. Gormley (2010) suggested that as role conflict increased organizational commitment decreased. In addition, several studies in the literature suggest that transitioning into the faculty role has a large impact on role conflict (Gazza 2005, Anderson 2009, Bartels 2007). Interestingly, descriptive statistics provided by a factorial ANOVA demonstrated for role conflict 1, or role conflict between groups, faculty with 0-5 years of experience had the least amount of role conflict. Perhaps this is because newer faculty are required to do less work on committees, or are perhaps doing less research because they are not on tenure lines.

Results demonstrated that faculty who work more than 60 hours had significantly more role conflict 1 than those that worked 50 hours or less. There was no significant difference noted for role conflict 1 in the group that worked 51-60 hours which is not surprising considering that is well over the typical 40 hour work week.

When you think about the different groups that nursing faculty may work with, the examples are numerous. They may be working with administration, other faculty, students, advisors, university committees, and clinical sites to name a few. In one instance they may need to be a clinician and in another an educator. Being a nursing faculty member is quite different than many other disciplines because of its clinical nature and it requires interaction with outside groups such as hospitals, clinics, and patients. Years of experience as a faculty member was not a significant factor for role conflict 1.
Role conflict 2, or role conflict within teaching, demonstrated that faculty with more than 20 years of experience had the least amount of role conflict. The faculty who worked more than 60 hours per week had significantly more role conflict 2 than those that worked 41-60 hours. This may indicate that nursing faculty have difficulty with wearing several hats as a faculty member, particularly when they are working more hours. Perhaps their multiple commitments to committees, teaching, research, and service are impacting their perception of role conflict 2. What is interesting to note, is that workload did not affect job satisfaction in teaching. This may indicate that teaching more hours may not effect overall job satisfaction but adding additional responsibilities outside of teaching is a factor.

**Research Question 2**

*How does job satisfaction and role conflict among nursing faculty predict the timing of faculty leaving their current nursing faculty position?*

To answer this question, each of the three factors of job satisfaction and role conflict were analyzed with a logistic regression. When analyzing the results of the logistic regression, it was noted that the job satisfaction 1 and job satisfaction 3 variable were more likely to predict the timing of leaving of nursing faculty. Specifically faculty with lower job satisfaction 1 scores, were 1.20 times more likely to leave their current position within 5 years. Faculty with lower job satisfaction 3 scores, were 1.23 times more likely to leave their current position within 5 years. Job satisfaction 2 or satisfaction with teaching was not significant. This again validates that the aspect of teaching does not seem to be a factor in the nursing faculty shortage. In fact it seems that teaching tends to be an aspect that could be looked into in efforts to retain faculty. As previously stated, workload did not affect job satisfaction with teaching.
With regard to job satisfaction 1 or overall satisfaction, it is concerning that faculty who have less overall job satisfaction are more likely to leave their current position. With the aging nursing faculty and the prospect of large retirements in the near future, it is imperative to retain qualified faculty who will spend many years in the role. It is also concerning that JS3 is a factor in the timing of leaving of nursing faculty. This places a spotlight on the fact that the perception of having a more satisfying job outside of academia is affecting the faculty shortage. This supports the notion that nursing faculty have a great deal of mobility in and out of academia. Nurses have multiple opportunities in many industries and perhaps, at least to nursing faculty, these are seeming to be more appealing.

It is interesting to note that workload was not a factor in regard to job satisfaction 3. This raises the question what is? Exactly what is it about the nursing faculty role that is making faculty feel as though a role outside of academia would be a better option. There is little literature available to answer this question. As previously stated, role conflict was the number one cited reason for the nursing faculty shortage. Within the context of this study role conflict did not impact the timing of leaving of nursing faculty when controlling for job satisfaction. Few studies cited salary as a factor in the nursing faculty shortage (Ganley & Sheets 2009, Yucha & Witt 2009). Perhaps this factor needs more evaluation.

**Strengths and Limitations**

There were several strengths and limitations to the current research study. One of the strengths which impacted the results perhaps the most was the sampling method. Though quite labor intensive, going directly to nursing school websites ensured the most up to date e-mail list of the current faculty body. This also ensured a large population and an adequate number of
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responses to power the statistical analysis. It also allowed for excellent representation of all types of faculty including full-time, part-time, tenure, and non-tenure lines. It also had representation from many different sized nursing programs from large to small. Another strength was the vast information gained through the developed survey. Secondary analyses will indeed be fruitful considering the amount of available data. In addition, the items and topics were guided by the available literature on the nursing faculty shortage.

Though an inordinate amount of information was gained within the context of this study, unfortunately there are some questions that remain. For instance it may have been beneficial to have asked specifically if this was the first nursing faculty position for the respondents. This could have better highlighted the experience level of the sample. This also could have further evaluated the overall level of experience of the participants not just how long they have been in their current faculty position. It was evident that overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with their current position compared to other nursing roles is a factor in predicting the timing of leaving of nursing faculty. Workload only effected overall job satisfaction so the question still remains what is effecting job satisfaction 3 if it is not workload? And though workload was significant with job satisfaction 1, it failed to be significant along with years of experience as a faculty member for all other factors. Again, if it is not workload what could it be and could it have been included in the survey.

Though it was evident that workload had an effect on role conflict, role conflict did not seem to be a factor with the timing of leaving of nursing faculty. This is somewhat contradictory to the available literature. Though this exact study design is not available in the literature, many studies exist linking role conflict with the nursing faculty shortage. In fact, it is the most cited
reason available in the literature. When evaluating these findings it is important to highlight that the role conflict 3 dimension included only two items in the survey instrument. Because the findings are not congruent with findings in the literature, it begs the question as to whether the instrument was valid. Lastly, this study was conducted solely in the northeast. This somewhat limits its generalizability outside of this geographic area.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Based on the limitations of this study, there are several recommendations for future research. The first concept to further expand upon in the literature is workload within the context of the nursing faculty shortage. Though over the past few years the literature is increasing, the available literature remains sparse. Expanding in this area would be beneficial in developing initiatives to help alleviate the nursing faculty shortage.

The descriptive data obtained in this study raised a red flag as to the level of experience of the faculty in the Northeast and possibly in the United States. It would be helpful to obtain more information on this variable and expand on the knowledge surrounding this. Perhaps focusing on providing support for new faculty will help increase retention in the near future. It would also be helpful to expand studies to evaluate specifically if experience has an impact on the timing of leaving of nursing faculty.

With regard to role conflict not having an effect on timing of leaving, this is somewhat contradictory to the literature. As previously described, one could question the validity of the instrument used within the context of this study. Therefore, it would be prudent to expand the research validating the instrument. In addition to adding research on validating the current instrument, perhaps expanding on the items specific to the nursing faculty shortage would be
helpful. Having an instrument specific to nursing faculty is warranted because nursing faculty as a discipline are very unique as compared to other academic disciplines. This could greatly impact the future direction of research on the cause of the nursing faculty shortage. Due to the fact that role conflict is one of the most cited reasons associated with the nursing faculty shortage, it is imperative to expand research in this area. It is evident that nursing faculty experience role conflict but perhaps it does not affect them wanting to leave the profession. Perhaps research needs to further clarify what is causing faculty to leave and focus more on these factors moving away from role conflict as a contributor.

Implications for Policy and Practice

It is clear within the context of this study that workload effects overall job satisfaction and a decrease in overall job satisfaction causes faculty to be more likely to leave their current position within 5 years. It is the nature of the beast that due to the nursing faculty shortage, nursing faculty are forced to carry more credit hours and overload. Particularly in a tuition driven industry, it may cause a lot of pressure for faculty to teach overload. Clinical nursing faculty have strict student to faculty ratios governed by their state. If there were a policy similar to this limiting the credit hours a faculty teaches, perhaps workload could be controlled and made less of a factor in the faculty shortage.

The level of experience of the current nursing faculty body also raises a policy issue. Again, if we consider workload and job satisfaction, it may be beneficial to limit the credit hours an inexperienced nursing faculty teaches. This will allow for transition into the role to help ensure student outcomes. Unfortunately non-tenure lines tend to have the most teaching credit burden.
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When considering role conflict and policy, combined with inexperience of the faculty body, it may benefit universities to try to attract more clinical lines that offer tenure. This may alleviate some of the burden of the time associated with committee work and research for example. Now that clinical doctorates are becoming more prevalent, this may allow for expansion of this faculty line.

Conclusion

Due to the significant nursing faculty shortage and the probable impact on healthcare, it is imperative to expand the available literature on the nursing faculty shortage. The descriptive data in this study highlight the critical nature of the aging and retiring nursing faculty body. The statistics available in this study regarding this are quite alarming. The Northeast may be looking at a mass exodus of nursing faculty in the next 5 years with up to 70 percent of the faculty leaving their current position. Another alarming factor is the significant level of inexperience the remaining faculty may have and the prospect of this effecting student outcomes.

In regard to workload, it is evident that it affects job satisfaction. It is also evident that job satisfaction affects the timing of leaving of nursing faculty. In order to minimize the dwindling nursing faculty it is imperative for administrators to employ initiatives to help retain faculty and increase their job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction significantly impacts the timing of leaving of nursing faculty from their current position. This is another reason why policy and initiatives must be developed and research to help slow the inevitable draining of the nursing faculty pool. Role conflict on the other hand, was not a factor in the timing of leaving. Perhaps researchers would be better suited focusing on other contributors to the nursing faculty shortage. Overall this study contributed to
the body of knowledge on the nursing faculty shortage but the question still remains as to why faculty are leaving. It is evident that job satisfaction is a factor as well as workload. Role conflict did not have the impact that the literature implies.
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Appendix A

Dear Nursing Faculty,

I am a doctoral student in the Higher Education Leadership, Management, and Policy program at Seton Hall University conducting a survey in partial fulfillment of my doctoral degree. I am asking you to complete this survey evaluating the relationship between role conflict and job satisfaction on intent to leave. This survey should take approximately 20 minutes to complete and is completely voluntary. The answers are confidential and anonymous. Any information obtained in this study will be maintained on a secure server: Survey Monkey. There will be no identifiable data to link you to your response to the survey. This survey was approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board, any questions should be directed to irb@shu.edu. Thank you for your support of this activity.

Sincerely,

Sherri H. Suozzo
Doctoral Candidate, Seton Hall University  
https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx
https://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I teach classes that are too easy or boring.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I have to use teaching methodologies that should be done differently.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I work on unnecessary things such as committee work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I perform work that suits my values.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I have enough time to complete my work including; teaching, research, and committee work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I receive a teaching assignment without the manpower to complete it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I receive teaching assignments that are within my training and capabilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I have just the right amount of work to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I receive a teaching assignment without adequate resources and materials to execute it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I am able to act the same regardless of the group I am with.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I work with two or more groups that operate quite differently.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I work under incompatible policies and guidelines.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I have to buck a rule or policy in order to carry out a teaching assignment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I receive incompatible requests from 2 or more people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Part B**
The statements in Part B concern your opinion about Job Satisfaction in your Nursing Faculty Role. Using a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 represents Strongly disagree and 5 represents strongly agree. Circle the number that most closely reflects your views regarding the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. My job is like a hobby to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My job is interesting enough to keep Me from getting bored</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I seem my friends are more interested in their jobs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I consider my job rather unpleasant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I enjoy my work more than my leisure time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I am often bored with my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I feel fairly well satisfied with my current job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Most of the time, I have to force myself to go to work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I am satisfied with my job for the time being</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I feel my job is no more interesting than others I could get</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I definitely dislike my work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I feel that I am happier in my work than most other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Each day of work seems like it will never end.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I like my job better than the average worker does.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highest degree held:  BSN_____ MSN______ PhD_____
DNsC_____DNP_____EdD _______

My current faculty rank: Instructor_____ Clinical Instructor _______ Assistant professor ________ Associate Professor _________ Professor _________

I am: Tenured ___________ Non-tenured ____________

I am currently on: Tenure line ___________ Non-tenure line _______

I currently work:  Full Time __________ Part-time __________ Adjunct __________

I currently am responsible for administrative duties Yes_________ No __________

Hours per week I currently work including all teaching, research, class prep and other assigned duties:  0-10 _________ 11-20 _______ 21-30 _______ 31-40 _______ 41-50 _______ 51-60 _______ More than 60 ____________

I have been in the faculty role:  0-5 yrs _____ 6-10 yrs _______ 11-15 yrs _______ 16-20 yrs _______ 20+yrs _______

I have been at my current institution:  0-5 yrs _______ 6-10 yrs _______ 11-15 yrs _______ 16-20 yrs _______ 20+ yrs _______

I plan to leave my current position in:  0-2 yrs _____ 3-5 yrs _______ 6-9 yrs _____

This will be for:  retirement ____ Another institution _____ Clinical position ______

My last position was in an _______Academic Institution _______Clinical Position ________N/A

I have a clinical position outside of academia  yes_______ no_______

My current institution is classified as a:  Teaching _______ Research _________

My current Institution is _______Private ________ Public

My current Institution is _______Urban _________ Suburban _________Rural
The current student enrollment in my nursing program is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>