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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to investigate the relationship between perceptions of organizational culture and affective, continuance, and normative commitment among counselors and related administrators in higher education Comprehensive Support programs for at-risk students. The population under consideration was from colleges and universities primarily in the western United States (California) and the eastern United States (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania). Organizational Commitment has been a popular area of research for the past twenty-five to thirty years. In general, researchers have determined that a high level of organizational commitment contributed to behavior favorable to organizational effectiveness. Organizational commitment has been conceptualized and measured in a wide variety of ways. This research utilized Meyer, Allen, and Smith’s (1993) scales to measure three components of organizational commitment. According to Meyer and Allen (1991), organizational commitment consists of three basic themes: affective, continuance, and normative commitment. They defined affective commitment as an emotional attachment to the organization; continuance commitment as the perceived cost of leaving the organization; and normative commitment as a sense of loyalty or moral obligation to remain with the organization. Organizational culture was measured utilizing an instrument developed by Kalliath, Bluedorn and Strube (1999). The primary basis for their instrument was the Competing Values Framework, which was initially developed to measure organizational effectiveness but was later considered a viable instrument for analyzing various aspects of and levels in organizations, including organizational culture. Associated with the framework are labels that provide characteristics of four types of organizational culture. This study chose the labels so designated by Cameron and Quinn (1999, 2006): clan,adhocracy, hierarchy, and market. Briefly, they described the clan culture as consisting of collaboration, similar to a family unit; in the adhocracy culture, flexibility is a
characteristic; the hierarchy culture is a structured environment with rules and regulations; and the market culture focuses on a strong presence in a competitive environment. Variables also included characteristics of the academic administrators such as age, gender, education level, experience in current role, and ethnicity. Educators at the community college, college, and university levels were selected. Three hundred and thirteen program directors were sent e-mails requesting their program participation in this study; ninety-six returned usable surveys. This study used a correlational research design and the data were analyzed using a hierarchical regression analysis. The data offered significant results for both affective and normative commitment. For affective commitment, the merging of culture and the demographic variables indicated that clan culture was a strong predictor of affective commitment. For normative commitment, the merging of culture and the demographic variables with normative commitment led culture—again, particularly clan culture—to emerge as a strong predictor of normative commitment.
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Chapter 1

In the book *Counseling across cultures* (2008), Pedersen acknowledged in chapter 1 the importance of culture in counseling, stating that “culture controls our lives and defines reality for each of us, with or without our permission and/or awareness” (p. 5). He also noted that “a culture-centered” approach to counseling recognizes culture as central and not marginal, fundamental and not exotic, for all appropriate counseling interventions” (p. 5). In addition, Pedersen indicated that “all behaviors are learned and displayed in a cultural context. Behaviors can be measured more accurately, personal identity becomes more clearly defined, the consequences of problems are better understood, and counseling interviews become more meaningful in their cultural context” (p. 6).

Peterson and Spencer (1990) viewed counseling environments as consisting of two dimensions: culture and climate. They noted, however, that in higher education settings, these terms are often used interchangeably. They distinguished between the two concepts, and in accord with other researchers (e.g., Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Schein, 1984; Smircich, 1983; Tierney, 1988), identified factors such as beliefs, values, assumptions, and ideologies as distinct characteristics of organizational culture. Dennison (1996) stated that organizational culture refers to beliefs and values, and stressed that such characteristics remain constant over a period of time. Other researchers (e.g., Schein, 1990) included an organization’s mission, tangible objects such as artifacts, and distinct languages in their taxonomy of organizational culture. In contrast, Berger and Milem (2000) provided a way to make a distinction between culture and climate by defining climate as current perceptions and attitudes. Dennison (1996) stated that perceptions of traditions that are readily apparent in an organization are ordinarily associated
with climate research. The present study was concerned with perceptions founded on organizational beliefs and values that have remained constant over time.

The focus of the present study was the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational culture. According to Meyer and Allen (1991), organizational commitment is a psychological state that determines whether a member of an organizational community will remain with an organization, and also includes to some extent the employee’s decision-making in this regard. In organizational research, the term ‘member’ is often used to identify an individual in an organization. In this research the term employee was used to describe such individuals. Marchiori and Henkin (2004) suggested that “commitment develops naturally and contributes positively to the organization, and may be considered a value-added factor in work environments” (p. 353).

Earlier researchers, such as Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972), stressed that very little attention has been given to the study of workplace conditions that lead to organizational commitment, especially on the part of professional employees in organizations. According to Hrebiniak and Alutto, even in research that has explored the impact of workplace conditions; the relationship initially considered was that between organizational commitment and “perceptions of authority” (p. 555). Researchers such as Henriksen and Trusty (2005), in discussing models of pedagogy designed to address multicultural counseling competency, suggested that competency among professionals who focus on multiculturalism inheres not only in a standard code of ethics but in individual attitudes and commitments. In the organizational literature, the study of organizational commitment has over time become more prominent. This is due in part to the vast body of research which has shown that organizational commitment is related to
factors such as organizational effectiveness, characteristics of employees’ jobs and roles, and employees’ personal characteristics.

According to Reyes (1990a), although a considerable number of studies have focused on workplace commitment, these have tended to overlook the educational environment as a unit of analysis. Referring to teachers in schools, Reyes argued that the reason may be that teachers are viewed as individuals who in creating a supportive atmosphere for learning necessarily evince a strong, or at least acceptable, sense of commitment. For Reyes, though, teachers, like members of other organizations, choose to remain in schools for various reasons. And, if this is so, the factors that tend to encourage or discourage commitment are important to ascertain in educational settings. Perhaps the same reasoning then can be fairly applied to college and university professionals—including college counselors of at-risk students.

Among the few researchers to provide descriptions of at-risk counselors, Blustein (1981) identified several responsibilities of this group, including: (a) sustaining students’ motivation, (b) encouraging levels of student independence, (c) providing financial guidance, and (d) contributing to bridging the gap between comprehensive support programs and the university environment. Several researchers (C. L. C. Kulik, J. A. Kulik & Schwalb, 1983; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Swail, 2000) have characterized the programs in which these professionals work as comprehensive support programs developed to meet the needs of at-risk college students. They include study skills instruction, tutorial services, developmental courses, personal counseling, academic counseling, career information workshops, mentoring, language-proficiency skills in English, and various services for students with disabilities.

According to Jones and Watson (1990), higher education administrators consider at-risk populations in higher education as extensions of at-risk populations in society in general.
Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen (1998) suggested that at-risk students, in keeping with others, arrive on campuses with their own sense of identity and purpose shaped by their parents, communities, and religions. The National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students (1999), which is part of the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Educational Research and Improvement, has characterized the at-risk student “as one who—because of limited English proficiency, poverty, race, geographic location or economic disadvantage—faces a greater risk of low educational achievement or reduced academic expectations” (p. 1).

**Statement of the Problem**

Given that counselors are understood by researchers to be functioning within organizational systems and according to certain policies, it is appropriate to expand the research on organizational environments to assess the specific relationships that exist between counselors and advisors and their organizational environments. Although the importance of environment in counseling practice has long been accepted, Sue (1995) argued that very little consideration has been given to the impact of the setting in which counselors conduct the counseling process. Sue suggested that counselors sometimes accept a narrow view of counseling and are not prepared to work with organizations and larger social systems (p. 474), and that although the development of individual interventions skills has been the main focus in counselor training programs, little emphasis is given to other roles, activities, or settings (p. 475). Sue further stated that counselors are often perceived by society as functioning in the sanctity of their offices. Yet, Herr (1999) emphasized that the ways in which counselors function is to some degree representative of the “characteristics and missions of the settings in which they work” (p. 329). Likewise, according to Sue, “it is becoming clear that what counselors can or cannot do is often dictated by the rules
and regulations of their employing agencies (length of sessions, maximum number of sessions, types of problems treated, definition of counseling role, limits of confidentiality, etc.)” (p. 475).

Toporek and Reza (2001) discussed context as a critical dimension of multicultural counseling. They referred to institutional context “as a person or professional working within and representing their institutions of work or local, state, or national organizations” (p. 20), and that “part of becoming multicultural competent involves learning systems and organizational approaches” (p. 21). Additionally, their work emphasized that “counseling professionals may use the system to accomplish goals as well as to understand and to communicate the institutions formal and informal rules, its methods of support and resistance, and its decision-making processes” (p. 22).

Tatar and Bekerman (2002) suggested that the “theoretical rhetoric of counseling” has evolved into “counseling in context” (p. 375). From their perspective, culture in counseling is based on two viewpoints, the first of which is multicultural centered. This view recognizes the variety of ethnic cultural backgrounds among those involved in the counseling session. In the counseling field this viewpoint has been the subject of study in numerous investigations (Arredondo, Toprek, Brown, Jones, Locke, Sanchez, & Stadler, 1996; Petersen, 1990; Pope-Davis, 1997; Sue, 1995). The focus of the second point-of-view is the influence of an institution’s organizational culture, particularly the setting or context in which it occurs. Tatar and Bekerman emphasize that although counselors can select from a wide variety of counseling-related theories, it is important to realize that they inherit values and personal beliefs that have evolved in context. They further stated that organizational culture “provides an identity for its members, generates commitment to the organization’s mission, and contributes to the clarification and reinforcement of particular standards of behaviour” (p. 377), suggesting that a
counselor’s responsibilities involve adapting to the culture of the institution in which they practice, which generally means that they are expected to adjust their counseling strategies to the culture of the working environment in which they operate.

Poppens (2000) indicated that the extent to which an institution appeals to any given individual is based on the extent to which the institution and the individual hold similar values. Therefore, a person who perceives an institution as having values that differ from his/her own may not be very committed to that institution. Poppens suggested that focusing on the influence of organizational culture may assist higher education professionals in considering a match among the organizational culture, their personal interests, and their commitments.

Keeton and Mengistu (1992) stressed that assessing perceptions of an organization’s cultural values is essential to achieving and maintaining open lines of communication among all levels of employees. It is accordingly important to fully understand how higher education professionals experience organizational culture. In an analysis of the organizational cultures of several community colleges, Abungah (1996) suggested that community colleges concentrate on criticizing management skills and controls in difficult times. He suggests that in trying to understand and contain disruptions, that rather than targeting mismanagement, individuals might find a “lack of unifying systems of beliefs, norms and values” a more appropriate focus (p. 10). He further stated that shared beliefs and norms lead to organizational integration and stability.

According to Keeton and Mengistu (1992), in many definitions, culture is understood as “a set of values held by all individuals in an organization” (p. 205). They further suggested that such definitions do not account for “the extent to which the culture is accepted and practiced on a widespread basis by the organization’s membership” or the extent to which varying perceptions of culture coexist (p. 205). Although counselors across higher education settings
generally have similar academic goals for their students, primarily based on their institutions’ specific policies and procedures, how they work toward them may be based on different institutional perceptions. Peterson and White (1992) argued that common goals do not always evolve from similar perceptions of the environment: “different constituent groups may reflect more than just [differing views] and may reflect different ‘implicit models’ of how their institutions functions” to achieve such goals (p. 178). In their view, it is important for leaders to recognize that faculty and administrative involvement in institutions may be based on different ideas about the institution.

**Research Question**

What are the relationships among affective, continuance, and normative commitment scores when examined by organizational culture type, while simultaneously controlling for individual characteristics such as years of experience in current role, highest education level, gender, age, and ethnicity?

**Significance of the Study**

Little research has been conducted on college and university administrators and their relationships with their institutions. Studies mostly focus on describing the programs that these administrators work within. A study of this kind adds to the body of literature on higher education administrators’ experiences within their organizational culture. The challenges faced by underprepared (at-risk) students, for example, invariably place additional responsibilities on the college counselors who assist them. In addition to providing advising and counseling to the students, these counselors are also likely to become advocates for them. Thus, they are important to the students’ success on a number of levels. Wallace, Ropers-Huilman, and Abel’s (2004) research provided insights into the work environment-related attitudes of professionals...
who assist at-risk students. The researchers assessed TRIO professionals’ views of the relative importance of their work and how their perspectives on the workplace affect their ability to implement their services. (Federal TRIO Programs are designed to help first-generation, low-income students enroll and succeed in higher education.) Wallace et al.’s findings indicated that while professionals in the TRIO programs believed that the programs’ existence indicated their institutions’ attempts to meet the needs of diverse groups, these individuals felt like outsiders at their institutions. They expressed the view that, occasionally, university administrators did not understand the mission or outcomes of their work. In situations in which there was a sense of understanding, however, they felt like valued, viable members of the institutional culture.

In summary, various reasons have been provided by organizational leaders for remaining conscious of their cultural environments. Referring to educational communities, Austin (1984) stated that senior administrators must articulate the essence of their organizational culture, including beliefs, values, and missions, to enhance commitment among professional employees. Tierney (1988) suggested that organizational culture is always being re-created, which brings new challenges to organizations. Foster (2007) argued that external and internal factors can create differences between an organization’s culture and how it functions. Foster implied that an organization’s functions can be based on different perceptions of groups within that organization. Foster further stated that for educational leaders to fulfill their leadership roles they must “gain insights that will help them improve the adaptive capacity of their organizations” (pp. 15–16).

The present study was interested in the extent to which differences in college counselors of at-risk students’ perceptions of college/university cultures related to different types of organizational commitments. This focus responded both to Austin’s (1984) claim that
“commitment to an institution’s mission by those who work in it is vitally important to the organization’s effectiveness and quality” (p. 4) and to Lok, Westwood, and Crawford’s (2005) suggestion that individuals’ perceptions of organizational cultures provide the basis for organizational commitment.

**Delimitations**

This study’s population was limited to counselors and advisors of at-risk college/university students. Numerous titles were used to designate the professionals who performed such responsibilities. As a result this study may have eliminated some participants who should have been included. In addition, the instruments selected for this study have primarily been used for research with industrial organizations. Given that a number of researchers (e.g., Besse, 1973; Tierney, 1988) have commented on important similarities between industry and educational institutions, the use of such instruments was warranted. Besse, for example, stated that there is a resemblance between the management practices used in industrial organizations and those used in institutions of higher education; Tierney pointed to their similarities in terms of board room activities.

However, others (e.g., Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley, 1977; Berger & Milem, 2000; Besse, 1973) have cited differences, noting that whereas industrial organizations generally sell products, educational institutions provide services. In addition, Kuh (1996) suggested that educational institutions are influenced by identifiable groups, including students, faculty members, and administrators. All of these include members of historically underrepresented groups who provide input on decisions affecting the campus environment. Kuh acknowledged that external constituencies such as legislative bodies, state education commissions, and corporate foundations also exert an influence on educational institutional settings. In Peterson’s
(1985) view, regardless of the complex functions of educational institutions, these characteristics generate a desire to understand organizational behavior in educational institutions.

**Definitions of Terms**

The definitions used throughout this study were as follows:

**Organizational culture.** In general, noted researchers in the field (Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Schein, 1984) have defined organizational culture as the shared ideologies, values, and assumptions that bind individuals together and account for the behavior of individuals in organizations. Organizational culture was analyzed here in terms of cultural types. The literature indicates that organizational cultures are thought to be easily distinguishable when cultural types are the main focus of analysis. A description of organizational culture applicable to this study was based on the four culture types posited by Cameron and Quinn (1999, 2006): clan, adhocracy, hierarchy, and market. These were the independent variables. The culture types were operationalized based on scales for each culture type in the Competing Values Instrument as developed by Kalliath, Bluedorn, and Strube (1999).

**Organizational commitment.** Organizational commitment is considered a psychological state that clarifies the relationship of the individual to an organization and provides a justification for that individual to remain with that organization. Affective, continuance, and normative (Meyer & Allen, 1997) were the organizational commitment types used in this study, and the Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment instrument scale (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993) operationalized this concept. These were the dependent variables.

**Summary**
Organizational commitment and organizational culture have been the subjects of scrutiny in the industrial arena. These concepts have also been studied in the education field. In this chapter, a background and rationale for continuing to explore these two concepts in higher education was provided. The chapter emphasized the importance of the relationship between organizational culture and organizational commitment in a continually changing academic environment. While in earlier research the focus in terms of these concepts was on the managers in organizations, the present research suggested that a more comprehensive approach in higher education would be to view this relationship from the perspective of higher education professionals. Central to this research was the opinion that counselors who advise at-risk students partake in relationships between organizational commitment and culture, and accordingly their perceptions of and relationships with the institutions for which they work were investigated here.

In chapter 2, the literature review provides background on the organizational culture and commitment concepts. The recognition of these terms in the industrial field is discussed and how such research is relevant to higher education is also considered. The review provides a discussion of the importance of culture within an organization, and a discussion of the framework used for analysis is evaluated and justified as the best method for studying organizational culture. Organizational commitment is recognized as a stabilizing force in institutions that thereby contributes to the performance of institutions. It is described as consisting of components derived from the perceptions of organizational members.

In chapter 3, the research methodology and research question are discussed. In addition, in this chapter the survey design and distribution are discussed and the analytic approach to answering the research question is explicated. Chapter 4 comprises a discussion of the results of
the quantitative analysis. In chapter 5, conclusions are given and the implications of the research study are discussed.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

The purpose of this literature review is to discuss research relevant to theorized connections between organizational commitment and perceptions of organizational culture among higher education professionals, specifically college counselors and advisors of at-risk students. Given the nature of their work responsibilities, these professionals devote considerable energy to understanding both the institutions in which they work and how the environments created by those institutions impact the students with whom they work. Most of the research on organizational commitment and organizational culture focuses on defining the concepts; therefore, this review begins by providing information on their development.

Some of the earliest and most extensive research (e.g., Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979) on organizational commitment focused on organizational commitment in the workplace, often referring to it as highly important in the context of employees’ work behavior. Organizational commitment was the dependent measure in the present research study. Considerable significance has been placed in earlier studies on whether the concept is properly understood as one-dimensional or multidimensional. Most research on this question embraces a multidimensional perspective; therefore, in this review several components of organizational commitment are described.

The present study utilized Meyer and Allen’s (1991) Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment based on its ability to delineate the multidimensional nature of the commitment construct. The Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment as developed by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) was utilized to measure aspects of organizational
commitment. According to Allen and Meyer (1990), organizational commitment is a mindset that can be divided into three components—affective, continuance, and normative commitment—each of which is described in this literature review. Although the models used in the research studies discussed here have extensive histories in the industrial field, their adaptation to other fields is ongoing.

A section of this literature review provides information on the development of organizational culture, the independent variable in this research. The focus on organizational culture, according to some researchers (e.g., Denison & Mishra, 1995; Masland, 1985; Ouchi & Wilkins, 1985; Tierney, 1988), became centrally important as a result of three publications written for industrial managers: Ouchi’s Theory Z (1981), Deal and Kennedy’s Corporate Cultures (1982), and Peters and Waterman’s In Search of Excellence (1982).

The Competing Values Instrument’s measure of culture types was utilized in this study to measure aspects of organizational culture. The primary use of the Competing Values Framework here was to identify characteristics that describe particular types of organizations. According to Denison and Spreitzer (1991), few models have supported a measure of organizational culture. However, their research included the Competing Values Framework. The Competing Values Model was created by Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981) as a framework for understanding organizational effectiveness. Based on their findings, Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981, 1983) identified three primary dimensions as organizational value levels: (a) internal versus external organization orientation, (b) stable versus flexible organization, and (c) the state of production in the organization. The dimensions represented competing values. Denison and Spreitzer stated that the “model makes the assumption that organizations can be characterized according to cultural traits or dimensions common to all human organizations” (p. 7).
One explanation for the increased interest in the corporate culture boom of the 1980s was the “view of corporate culture as a universal tool for competitiveness and ‘excellence’ ... due partly to the fertile ground created by the boom experienced by Japanese companies and the corresponding difficulties for U.S. and other Western economies at that time, and partly to the skillful exploitation of pop-management authors and consultants” (Alvesson, 2013, p. 7). Industries were drawn to the study of culture and all types of relationships. The applications of the instruments used in this study have a considerable presence in both domestic and international industry. Researchers used Meyer and Allen’s (1990) organizational commitment scales and organizational culture instruments based on the Competing Values Framework (Cameron & Quinn, 1999) or related instruments. Numerous studies (Acar, 2012; Ch, Zainab, Maqsood, & Sana, 2013; Gregory, Way, Lefort, Barrett, & Parfrey, 2007; Kirkman & Shapiro, 2001; Padma & Nair, 2009; Simosi & Xenikou, 2010; Tripathi, Kapoor, & Tripathi, 2000; Wasti, 2003) have been conducted on these subjects in a number of different countries. Acar (2012) collected data from employees in logistics firms in Turkey. He found positive effects between clan andadhocracy cultures and affective and normative commitments. Wasti (2003), in one of two studies, examined the influence of individualistic and collectivist values and organizational commitment and turnover intentions among forty-six private sector organizations in Turkey. The results suggested that individualistic values moderated the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intentions (p. 311). Tripathi, Kapoor, and Tripathi (2000) examined organizational culture and its relationship to organizational commitment among ten different organizations in northern India. Their results indicated a strong correlation between participative culture and identification; involvement and manipulative culture had a positive relationship with calculative commitment and loyalty. Ch, Zainab, Maqsood, and Sana
(2013) analyzed the relationship among employees in the banking industry in Pakistan. They found a significant relationship between the clan culture and commitment compared to adhocracy, hierarchy or market cultural dimensions. Kirkman and Shapiro (2001) conducted research to determine how cultural values and job satisfaction and organizational commitment were influenced by employee resistance among employees from four countries (Belgium, Finland, United States, Philippines). They found that resistance behavior accounted for some, if not all, of the variance between cultural values and both satisfaction and commitment (p. 564).

Research on organizational commitment and organizational culture was viewed in this research in terms of their standing in higher education. In this research organizational commitment was regarded initially as being independent of organizational culture primarily due to the sparse literature on the relationship between organizational commitment and culture. Second, this perspective indicated how the research relating to both organizational culture and organizational commitment in higher education has materialized.

Organizational Commitment

Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment has been differentiated from such related factors, including job satisfaction (e.g., Brooke, Russell, & Price, 1988; Meyer et al., 1993; Mowday et al., 1979; Mueller, Wallace, & Price, 1992). In distinguishing organizational commitment from job satisfaction, researchers have designated the former as a global concept that affects the organization as a whole, whereas the latter has been shown to focus on issues associated with a particular position in the organization. Most research concerning organizational commitment has centered on whether it is behavioral or attitudinal. Many researchers (e.g., Aven, Parker, & McEvoy, 1993; Brown, 1996; Cohen, 1993; Dunham, Grube, & Castañeda, 1994; Jaros, Jermier,
Koehler, & Smircich, 1993; McGee & Ford, 1987; Meyer & Allen, 1997) have noted that these two themes have dominated the research on organizational commitment; therefore, both warranted attention within the context of the present study.

**Two approaches to commitment: Behavioral and attitudinal.** Generally, researchers (e.g., Meyer & Allen, 1997; Mowday et al., 1979) have considered behavioral commitment to be a process in which individuals become bound to a particular course of behavior. Becker’s (1960) *side bet* conceptualization of commitment is an early representation of the behavior associated with commitment and is widely cited in the literature (e.g., Jaros et al., 1993; Mowday et al., 1979; Powell & Meyer, 2004). Becker suggested that an individual’s behavior results from making side bets. If, for instance, an employee decides to stay with an organization rather than relocate to another which would offer higher benefits, that employee knows he/she will become eligible for retirement, vacation time, raises, promotions, and even tenure (Becker, 1960; Brown, 1996). This theory is associated with the employee’s anticipated loss of assets such as retirement benefits should he/she leave the organization. Behavior commitment is concerned with repeated actions to secure desired outcomes. Similar to Becker (1960), Mowday et al. (1979) suggested that behavioral commitment can result from beliefs associated with *sunk costs*. Over time individual employees are thought to make investments of time and energy in a particular organization that they believe will result in valuable returns. An individual may decide to forgo an opportunity to become a member of another organization that would offer an opportunity, such as to learn a different skill that enables the member to advance his/her career in a particular area.

Attitudinal commitment is essentially an extension of behavioral commitment, and as such it has garnered more attention in the literature on organizational commitment than that on
behavioral commitment. According to Mowday et al. (1979), organizational commitment is not only based on an individual’s behavior, but also on the individual’s beliefs and opinions about an organization. The most commonly accepted conceptualization of attitudinal commitment was developed by Mowday et al. (1979), who described organizational commitment as consisting of three primary characteristics:

1. A strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values.
2. A willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization.
3. A strong desire to maintain membership in the organization. (p. 226)

Billingsley and Cross (1992) clarified the attitudinal and behavioral commitment connection by referring to a cyclical relationship “in which commitment attitudes lead to committing behaviors, which in turn reinforce commitment attitudes” (p. 2). For instance, organizational members develop opinions about the mission of an organization and decide to work toward the goals of that particular organization. However, members constantly re-evaluate their opinions about the mission and either decide to continue to work toward the goals of the organization or decide that a change in direction is necessary. If they decide on the latter, the result is a change in behavior, and thus a cyclical relationship arises.

In their later, more generalized definition of organizational commitment, Meyer and Allen (1997) combined behavioral and attitudinal commitment. The authors described this combination as:

A *psychological state* that can develop retrospectively (as justification for an ongoing course of action) as proposed in the behavioral approach, as well as prospectively (e.g., based on perceptions of current or future conditions of work within an organization) as advocated in the attitudinal approach. (p. 10)
**Dimensional qualities of organizational commitment.** In the literature, Mowday et al.’s (1979) conceptualization of organizational commitment is representative of one-dimensional qualities of the concept, encompassing the desire to stay in the organization and work diligently to accomplish its goals. Although many researchers have adhered to the conceptualization of organizational commitment developed by Mowday et al. (1979), others (e.g., Jaros, 1995; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002; Somers, 1995) have argued that Allen and Meyer’s (1990) three-component conceptualization of attitudinal commitment is the most well-known. Jaros et al. (1993) emphasized the growing agreement among researchers who have considered attitudinal commitment to be a multidimensional concept, a position with which the present research was also in accordance.

Based on a comprehensive review of organizational commitment concepts, Meyer and Allen (1991) identified three components of organizational commitment: affective, continuance, and normative. They concluded that employees who exhibit affective commitment remain with an organization because of a strong desire to do so, and as a consequence they engage in behavior that promotes the goals and ideas of that organization. This relationship evolves as the relationship between the organization and the individual matures; that is, over time, such employees are more inclined to participate willingly in daily activities sponsored by the organization and come to feel a sense of fulfillment as true contributors to the organization. Some researchers (e.g., Allen & Meyer, 1990; Bergman, 2006) have described this relationship as entailing an emotional attachment to the organization and have assumed it to be highly desirable to employers. Meyer and Allen (1997) commented that affective commitment is the most widely researched kind of commitment, and it is recognized by many researchers (e.g.,
Meyer & Allen, 1997; Ritchie, 2000; Somers, 1995) as a strong predictor of employee retention resulting in continued service to the organization.

Continuance commitment has a very different focus than affective commitment. It is associated with Becker’s (1960) side bet theory in that individuals with continuance commitment remain with the organization because of the costs connected with leaving. These costs range from loss of vacation time to loss of benefits. Individuals may not necessarily feel a sense of fulfillment from being connected with the organization and are not inclined to participate in organizational activities unless they anticipate gaining some definite benefit. Meyer and Allen (1991) suggested that individuals with continuance commitment stay with the organization because they believe they have to do so.

Finally, organizational employees with strong normative commitment remain with an organization because they feel a sense of obligation to do so. Meyer and Allen (1997) indicated that normative commitment can develop from the individual’s family or organizational socialization wherein beliefs, values, and attitudes are formed that compel an individual to stay with an organization on moral reasons. Along these lines, Wiener (1982) summarizes normative commitment as “internalized normative pressure, such as personal moral standards” (p. 418). In Boehman’s (2007) view, the organizational commitment of student affairs practitioners constitutes a kind of calling. According to some researchers (Boehman, 2007; Duffy, Allan, Autin and Bott, 2013) a calling refers to the idea that a person either believes that he/she has been chosen by some external source to work in a particular field or place or that the person feels that they have strong skills, interests, and values for certain work. According to Meyer and Allen (1997), normative commitment is the least empirically researched type of commitment.
According to several researchers (e.g., Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer, Irving, & Allen, 1998; Powell & Meyer, 2004), investigators should be mindful that, individually, these components provide the basis for employee’s’ different reasons for deciding to remain with an organization. However, they maintained that all three kinds of commitment contribute to individuals remaining with an organization. Furthermore, Meyer and Allen (1991) emphasized that studies analyzing affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment simultaneously provide more insight about the relationship between organizations and their employees than do studies focusing on only one of these.

Meyer and Allen (1997) observed that although there appears to be a growing consensus among commitment researchers on the multidimensionality of the organizational commitment construct, there is less agreement on the specific components themselves. For example, O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) stated that an individual’s attachment to an organization is based on three distinct components: compliance, identification, and internalization. Similar to Meyer and Allen’s (1991) continuance commitment, compliance refers to attitudes and behavior that result from the anticipation of specific rewards. The remaining two components are similar to Meyer and Allen’s (1991) affective commitment: identification is based on a sense of affiliation and respect for the values of the organization, and internalization refers to a similarity between an individual’s values and those of the organization. According to O’Reilly and Chatman, there are considerable differences in how research has approached the subject of commitment but they suggest that there is a common theme that has evolved which indicates that commitment is an “individual’s psychological attachment to an organization—the psychological bond linking the individual and the organization” (p. 492).
According to Peterson and Martin (1990), given the importance attributed to organizational commitment, there is an impetus to expand research on this topic in higher education. The literature in this area encompasses a range of relationships in which primarily related to the organizational commitment of faculty members in both community colleges and universities. While research involving faculty has focused on the relationship between organizational commitment and leadership (Armon, 1994; Fjortoft, 1993), tenure and non-tenure (Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, & Staples, 2006; Brookover, 2002; Marchiori & Henkin, 2004), and job satisfaction (Lambert, 2006), very little research has considered other employees in higher education. Nonetheless, Austin (1984) emphasized that college and university administrators have key roles in achieving the goals of their institutions. Austin further suggested that administrators’ decisions to a large extent influence “not only the daily operations of a college or university but also its future” (p. 1).

Organizational Commitment Examined in Higher Education

Taking into account the variability of research encompassing organizational commitment in higher education, this review focused on relationships in which factors relating to organizational commitment and work-related, personal, and job characteristics are primary considerations. Steers (1977) identified such factors as a way to systematically approach the topic of organizational commitment. These factors, although identified, are in most instances interpreted as they apply to a particular study, a practice that limits generalizability. As such, in this review work-related characteristics included leadership support, role conflict, and role ambiguity. Job characteristics included autonomy, feedback of individual organizational employees, and social relations. Personal characteristics included gender, age, education level, and ethnicity.
This discussion now moves to a number of related studies (e.g., Blackhurst, Brandt, & Kalinowski, 1998a, 1998b; Chieffo, 1991; Boehman, 2007; Exum, 1998; Knudsen, Johnson & Roman, 2003; Murphy, 1987; Schroder, 2008). Murphy for example, focused on determining the effects of role stress on administrator’s commitment in higher education institutions. Few studies have focused on entry- and lower-level administrators in academic institutions, and even fewer have expanded existing investigations to focus on these particular groups and their institutions (p. 3). Specifically, Murphy explored the impact of role stress on commitment in such institutions in regard to two forms of role stress: role conflict and role ambiguity. According to Murphy, each has been “associated with negative effects on both the individuals and organizations involved” (p. 2). Other variables considered were the personal characteristics of individual institutional members and organizational characteristics. Murphy stated that the selection and measurement of the variables were based on “an integrated theoretical framework which incorporated theory and concepts from role theory and organizational commitment, as well as research on administrator roles” (p. 126). The findings resulted in five variables as significant predictors of organizational commitment: age, gender, organizational role orientation, and role stress.

Similar to Murphy (1987), Blackhurst, Brandt, and Kalinowski (1998b) assessed the influence of work-related and personal attributes on what they referred to as life satisfaction and organizational commitment among female student affairs administrators. Work-related attributes consisted of role conflict and role ambiguity, and personal attributes consisted of organizational and professional role orientations and locus of control. The sample was selected based on position titles at the level of assistant director and above. A questionnaire using the Organizational Commitment Scale developed by Murphy, Owen, and Gable (1988) was used to
collect data. Role conflict and role ambiguity were significantly correlated with low levels of organizational commitment. The findings also suggested a relationship between both organizational and professional role orientations and organizational commitment; student affairs professionals who identified with their administrative roles in their institution were more committed to their organization than those who identified with student affairs professionals outside of their institutions.

According to Boehman (2007), high attrition is an area of concern among student affairs administrators. As a result, his studies focused on factors that influence commitment. Boehman assessed the relationship among overall job satisfaction, perceived organizational support, organizational politics, work/nonwork activities, and affective commitment among student affairs administrators. Organizational support was analyzed as it pertains to “a direct or next-level supervisor” (p. 310). Affective commitment was conceptualized in accord with Meyer and Allen’s (1991) three-component model of commitment. The study’s results showed positive correlations between affective commitment and the following: perceived organizational support, overall job satisfaction, and marital status; they showed negative correlations between affective commitment and the following: organizational politics and work/nonwork activities. Boehman suggested that organizational support may have the best predictive value for affective commitment. In addition, he expressed the opinion that understanding what constitutes a supportive work environment is critical to understanding how to increase organizational support thereby increasing commitment to the organization. Similar to Boehman (2007), Parker Ayers (2010) investigated whether or not a significant relationship existed among job satisfaction, job involvement, perceived organizational support and organizational commitment among educators.
Data were analyzed using three hierarchy multiple regressions. The researcher found a significant relationship among job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment.

Exum (1998) evaluated the institutionalized tactics of organizational socialization and commitment, job satisfaction, and role orientation of new student affairs professionals. Data were collected using a survey instrument designed to include the variables of interest. Exum’s study used Van Maanen and Schein’s (1979) six-dimension model of institutionalized tactics of organizational socialization. Results suggested that though organizational socialization activities are important to job satisfaction, they have little effect on organizational commitment or on role orientation. Schroder (2008) sought to determine whether a relationship exists between job satisfaction and religious commitment and organizational commitment among university faculty members, administrators, and staff at a private Christian university. Unlike other work-related characteristics considered in previous studies, findings based on university administrators’ responses were as follows: growth, 39.6%; religious commitment, 13.6%; responsibility, 7.7%; and job security, 4.6%—all percentages indicated the variance in organizational commitment (p. 91). Social relationships with students accounted for 5.3%.

A study conducted by Blackhurst, Brandt, and Kalinowski (1998a) analyzed the relationship between career development factors and the life satisfaction/organizational commitment of female student affairs administrators. Career development factors included age, position title, education level, years employed in higher education, and years in current position. The sample was composed of female student affairs administrators identified as holding as senior student affairs officer or assistant director of student affairs. A questionnaire was used to collect data that included measures for organizational commitment, life satisfaction, and career development demographic variables. The findings indicated a relationship between life
satisfaction and organizational commitment and the following: education level, tenure, and number of years in current position. Several patterns based on position levels also were found. For example, senior student affairs officers who had held their positions for fewer than five years conveyed higher levels of organizational commitment than did those who had held such positions for five years or longer. Based on their findings, Blackhurst et al. pointed to the importance of investigating “the personal, institutional, and job-related variables influencing work and life satisfaction for women in student affairs” (p. 32).

Chieffo (1991) also investigated factors contributing to job satisfaction and organizational commitment; however, he assessed their relationship to the “worklife of community college administrators” (p. 15). More specifically, the independent variables included factors associated with leadership behavior, job or role characteristics, personal characteristics, and organizational characteristics. A survey was designed that encompassed statements relevant to their particular subject of interest. The participants were all administrators from several community college leadership teams, and these teams excluded chief executive officers. Examples of chief executive officers in community colleges include the chief academic officer, academic vice-president, academic dean vice-president for instruction and chief academic. The results of a primary analysis indicated that while leadership behavior and job or role characteristics, specifically role clarity (commonly referred to negatively as role ambiguity), contributed to both job satisfaction and organizational commitments, specific correlations were higher for organizational commitment. A secondary analysis indicated that leadership accounted for a significant amount of the variance for both job satisfaction and organizational commitment, explaining 31% and 49% of the variance, respectively.
In a related study outside of academia, Knudsen, Johnson, and Roman (2003) examined the relationship between leadership support and the counseling staff’s intention to quit among counselors in substance abuse treatment centers. According to Knudsen et al., the loss of counseling staff has the potential to threaten the survival of such centers. Leadership support was defined as an association with job-related characteristics such as autonomy and rewards given based on performance and creativity. These variables were based on the premise that the “process underlying the relationship between job characteristics and turnover intention may be such that positive features of work enhance organizational commitment, which in turn reduces intention to quit” (p. 130). Personal characteristics included such factors as age, gender, education level, ethnicity, work status, certification, salary, and tenure. Data were collected in a 1997–1998 National Treatment Center Study of 345 centers; results suggested a positive relationship between job autonomy and commitment and a negative relationship between job autonomy and turnover intention. Additionally, a positive relationship was found among support for creativity, work rewards and commitment. Counselors who were older, had held their positions longer, and/or had full-time status reported greater commitment. Approximately 75% of the counselors were over age 40 and 8% had been at the same center for 12 years or more (p. 132). Counselors with certification in addiction counseling and educational degrees reported greater turnover intention than those without such education and certification (p.133). Ethnic minority counselors also conveyed greater turnover intention than Caucasian counselors (p. 133). Knudsen et al. commented that the implementation of “several basic management practices can either directly influence turnover intention or indirectly affect it by enhancing organizational commitment” (p. 133).
The trend in higher education research and the study of organizational commitment has been described in one sense as assessing relationships between organizational commitment and variables related to work, job, personal characteristics, and social relations. The relationships have been substantiated to a relative extent. However, other variables such as organizational culture—the area of interest in this study—have not been found to have a strong relationship in the context of higher education. Similar to organizational commitment, this study initially considered the conceptual development of organizational culture prior to discussing specific research findings. Also, since organizational commitment was initially discussed independent of organizational culture, the following discussion focuses on organizational culture.

**Organizational Culture**

**Organizational Culture Concept Development**

A review of the literature on organizational culture in general suggests a gradual progression compared to that of organizational commitment. As stated, a considerable amount of the research on organizational commitment and organizational culture has centered on defining the concepts. Goodman, Zammuto, and Gifford (2001), for example, commented that the majority of studies focusing on organizational culture have been conceptual and theoretical.

A number of researchers (e.g., Schein, 1984; Smircich, 1983; Trice & Beyer, 1993), especially in the industrial field in which the concept has a more prominent foundation, described organizational culture as shared values, assumptions, beliefs, or ideologies among organizational employees. Trice and Beyer (1993) commented that ideologies are at the core of any culture. In their view, life entails economic, political, and social changes and culture is a way to manage them; that is, individuals and groups develop and refer to ideologies or belief systems to guide their decision-making in difficult and unpredictable circumstances. Smircich
(1983) argued that how researchers view organizational culture depends on their assumptions about organizations and culture. Moreover, Schein (1984) provided one of the most in-depth definitions of organizational culture, in which the emphasis is placed on assumptions and values:

The pattern of basic assumptions that a given group has invented, discovered, or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, and that have worked well enough to be considered valid, and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 3)

In Schein’s view, the factors governing beliefs and behaviors in organizations are generally based on espoused values. Schein further emphasized that behavior, both individual and organizational, is also affected by values that are unconscious—that is, by engrained values that may even occur naturally in an individual.

Other researchers with a focus on the industrial field (e.g., Glick, 1985; Hofstede, 1998; Scott, Mannion, Davies, & Marshall, 2003; Trice & Beyer, 1993) have also offered rather narrow definitions of organizational culture, casting it as elusive and an abstraction. Schneider (1988) described organizational culture as ‘vague’ and Smircich (1983) believed that some may think of it as just a common-sense term and miss its true meaning entirely. Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv, and Sanders (1990) commented that overall it has been difficult to agree on what constitutes organizational culture, but that researchers might agree that it is “holistic, historically determined, related to anthropological concepts, socially constructed, soft, and difficult to change” (p. 286).

Schein (1990) stated that when referring to organizational culture, there has been “little agreement on what the concept does and should mean, how it should be observed and measured,
how it relates to more traditional industrial and organizational psychology theories, and how it should be used in our efforts to help organizations” (p. 109). In the business field, organizational culture has been historically defined by researchers (Schein, 1984; Smircich, 1983) as shared values, assumptions, beliefs and ideologies among organizational employees. From this group of characteristics researchers have selected specific values such as assumptions and values as the defining element in organizational culture. The development of the concept in academia can be viewed in relation to the development of the concept in the industrial field. Just as Schein (1984) focused on assumptions and values in the industrial field, Masland (1985) in the academic arena viewed institutional culture as the values and beliefs of the institution’s members. He stated that all one has to do is look at the daily life of the institution and one can infer something about its culture. Likewise, Peterson and Spencer (1990) described organizational culture as values and beliefs and suggested that these provide a sense of identity and guide the behavior of institutional members. They maintained that certain values can go unchallenged amidst other beliefs and values that shape individual behavior. Kuh and Whitt (1988) provided one of the most insightful conceptualizations of organizational culture relative to higher education. In keeping with Schein (1984), Kuh and Whitt (1988) incorporated assumptions and beliefs as the core of culture, and they defined culture as:

The collective, mutually shaping patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that guide the behavior of individuals and groups in an institute of higher education and provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of events and actions on and off campus (p. 12).

A few researchers (Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Rhoads & Tierney, 1992) in the educational field have also offered generalizations about organizational culture. For example, Rhoads and
Tierney (1992) suggested that organizational culture is “the glue that holds the institution together” (p. 9). According to Kuh and Whitt (1988), organizational culture is historical and influenced by the founding principles of an institution. Similarly, other researchers (e.g., Pettigrew, 1979; Schein, 1984) agreed that culture is influenced by an organization’s past, present, and future. Schein (1984) indicated that organizational culture takes on characteristics of its own and its meaning is tied to a certain period in time and the specific context of events. Clark (1972) depicted the academic environment as a saga, and according to Masland (1985), a saga represents institutional beliefs and values in story form and is tied to the organization’s historical development.

**Challenges of Studying Organizational Culture**

A number of barriers inhibit the study of organizational culture, many of which begin with the term’s definition. An ongoing discussion relating to the study of organizational culture centers on determining the best methods for studying it. Ouchi and Wilkins (1985) summarized the options for studying organizational culture as field observations or multivariate statistical analysis. Other researchers (Cooke & Roussau, 1988; Denison, 1996; Kwan & Walker, 2004; Xenikou & Furnham, 1996) provided specific reasons for selecting methods for investigating organizational culture. Denison (1996), in an examination of research on organizational culture and climate, suggested that the cultural perspective is best presented by book-length ethnographies (p. 622), while Cooke and Roussau (1988) asserted that the advantage of using qualitative methods in measures of organizational culture is that individuals can use their own words to describe the functioning of the organization. Xenikou and Furnham (1996) suggested that the primary reason for recommending qualitative research in studies of organizational culture is that this method provides access to the unconscious qualities of culture and an
accurate understanding of any given organization’s unique culture. However, according to Kwan and Walker’s (2004) view, although qualitative research may be able to approach the embedded, unconscious nature of culture, it may also produce an unrealistic view of culture. Denison (1996) indicated that it is unusual to apply quantitative methods to the measurement of culture, and that to do so would imply that culture is the same as climate. Several researchers (e.g., Cooke & Roussau, 1988; Xenikou & Furnham, 1996) have taken the position that quantitative research may be more appropriate in studying organizational culture when comparing the results of research across organizations and departments, as well as when conducting intra-organizational comparisons. Denison emphasized that the deliberations over which kind of research is appropriate in studying culture and climate should “assume a secondary role, subordinate to the primary goal of understanding the evolution and influences of social contexts in organizations” (p. 647).

Different perspectives also are in evidence in discussions about whether the study of organizational culture should focus on the contributions of individuals or shared meanings derived from a group. Individuals and groups are understood to have varying opinions about what constitutes culture (Minor & Tierney, 2005). Chaffee and Tierney (1988) viewed organizational culture as essentially assumptions shared by members of the organization. According to Harris (1994), although most research on organizational culture has focused on culture at the group level, organizational culture is “manifested in and maintained by the sensemaking efforts and actions of individuals” (p. 310). Bergquist (1992), in summarizing several definitions of organizational culture, concluded that culture creates a bond among individuals and “instills in them an individual and collective sense of purpose and continuity” (p. 2).
According to Quinn and Spreitzer (1991), organizational culture is characterized in terms of descriptive characterizations based on decision-making structure, leadership approach, values recognized by members, success of goals, external environmental relationships, and other factors that impact the cultural dynamics of the organization. Models evaluating culture seem to consist of a number of these elements. In this research researchers’ categorizations of culture types influenced discussions and served as a reference point in chapter 3.

**Types of Organizational Culture**

In a discussion on postsecondary organization theory and research, Peterson (1985) indicated that during the mid-1900s there were basically three models of organizations: “bureaucracy or formal-rational and goal models; collegial and professional community models; and political and public bureaucracy models” (p. 6). He further explained that they were “internally oriented and used to analyze the prevailing governance issues” (p. 6). Peterson claimed that later models emerged as a result of “technology, the environment, or the emergent social structure as the major determinants of action” (p. 7).

Several organizational typologies have been proposed in higher education to represent similar characteristics influencing organizational behavior. Birnbaum (1988), for instance, developed a five-part typology in higher education consisting of collegial, bureaucratic, political, anarchical, and cybernetic institutions. Collegial institutions are distinguished from the others based on informal interactions and consensus desired during decision-making. Organizational employees support viewpoints that have been diligently deliberated. Hierarchy is not a primary focus for collegial organizations (pp. 87–88). In contrast, bureaucratic institutions are defined by lines of authority in communication. Rules and regulations are designed and implemented relative to specific routine occurrences; how individuals respond to each other is based on their
respective roles in the organization; and the structure of the organization coincides with meeting the goals of the organization (p. 111). In contrast, political institutions center on power and competition among organizational members. In this context, groups confront each other in order to secure desired resources, and decisions remain firm unless other issues arise that make alternatives more desirable (p. 132). In the prior discussion institutional types appear rather steadfast in their mode of operation whereas changes occur regularly in anarchical institutions. In anarchical institutions, goals tend to be established after the fact (pp. 155–156). Birmbaum combined the four types as characterized and proposed a cybernetic institution consisting of subsystems that interact and form the basis for decision-making and goal-setting in the institution. These subsystems function as self-correcting mechanisms that can automatically correct a function that is not proceeding as planned (pp. 180–196).

Berquist (1992) proposed a four-part typology of organizational culture identified as collegial, managerial, negotiating, and developmental. The characteristics that are descriptive of these types focus on faculty members. Collegial culture is represented by faculty in varying fields who emphasize teaching, research, and governance. The setting is informal, respectful of independent work ethics, and includes involvement in faculty-related activities when needed (p. 17). The objective of the managerial culture is to ensure that goals are met. Faculty members in this culture form bonds through formal lines of authority, and their opinions change based on the position of power in the organization (pp. 58–83). The primary emphasis is on educating students and helping them to become responsible citizens. Of great importance in the negotiating culture is fairness and equality among its members. For example, faculty groups seek better working conditions and institutional governance for everyone through collective bargaining. This cultural function is based on unbiased policies and procedures for distributing
resources and benefits to individuals within the organization (pp. 152–153). In a developmental culture, personal and professional growth is supported among all students, faculty, and administrators in the collegiate environment—at least this is the avowed intention. Unlike the collegial, managerial, and negotiating cultures that offer a mixture of ideas about organizational life in a college or university, the development culture is thought to be more precise (pp. 101–102). Rationality, having choices, and collaboration hold prominent places in this culture. A connection between the individuals and the organization is promoted through professional growth plans. Teaching and learning are key interests in this culture.

According to Denison and Spreitzer (1991), researchers have been reluctant to study organizational culture because “few models of organizational culture have found much appreciation within the organizational development research literature” (p. 2). Berger and Milem (2000) suggested that to alleviate some of the difficulty associated with the study of organizational culture, past studies should examine organizational culture in higher education based on the effects of different types of campus environments on their populations. Birnbaum (1988) suggested that types of culture form models based on idealistic versions of institutions that resemble real institutions as closely as possible, and that no one model in and of itself represents the true functioning of an organization.

However, Denison and Spritzer (1991) stated that “one approach that has shown promise for application is the competing values model” (p. 2). Although given primary consideration in the industrial field, the present study used the four-part typology presented by Cameron and Quinn (1999, 2006) as adapted from the Competing Values Framework of Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983). The Competing Values Model, created by Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981) as a framework for understanding organizational effectiveness, has been used in several studies as a
method of analyzing organizational culture. Denison and Spreitzer indicated that the “model makes the assumption that organizations can be characterized according to cultural traits or dimensions common to all human organizations” (p.7). The Competing Values Framework was chosen for this study because of its use as a measurable base for organizational culture. In order to understand the approach taken in this study, an explanation of the Competing Values Framework is provided.

**Competing Values Framework**

During the development of the Competing Values Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981) refined a list of thirty indicators presented by Campbell, Brownas, Peterson, and Dunnette (1974) to define organizational effectiveness. Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s objective was to identify all of the principle variables in this list of thirty that identify effectiveness and to then ascertain how these variables are related. Seventeen variables remained on the list. Members of organizations were then requested to pair the variables according to how similar or dissimilar they were to organizational effectiveness. Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s (1981, 1983) findings resulted in three primary dimensions, which they identified as value levels associated with an organization. The values represented competing values. One dimension focuses on internal verses external organization orientation. The second pertained to stable verses flexible organization. The third dimension referred to the state of production in the organization. Quinn and Rohrbaugh stated that when the three value dimensions are combined, they provide four basic models of organizational effectiveness: human relations, open system, rational goal, and internal process models (see Figure 2.1). In Figure 2.1, each model is represented by a quadrant.
that possesses characteristics that are opposite to or shared by the other three quadrants.

**Human Relations Model**

Flexibility

Means: Cohesion; morale

Ends: Human resource development acquisition

**Open System Model**

Means: Flexibility; readiness

Ends: Growth; resource

**Internal Process Model**

Means: Information management; communication

Ends: Stability; control

**Rational Goal Model**

Means: Planning; goal setting

Ends: Productivity; efficiency

**Figure 2.1.** Spatial model, adapted from R. E. Quinn & J. Rohrbaugh (1983), A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis (Management Science, 29, p. 369). Copyright 1983 by the Institute of Management Sciences. Adapted with permission from the authors.

According to Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983), both the human relations and the open system model focus on retaining flexibility in the organization. The internal process and the rational goal model emphasize an overall level of control in the organization. The human relations and internal process models emphasize an internal focus on the organizational environment and the open system and rational goal models emphasize an external focus on the organizational environment. Quinn and Rohrbaugh described the models accordingly:
The human relations model stresses such criteria...as cohesion and moral (as means) and human resource development (as an end). The open system model stresses such criteria...as flexibility and readiness (as means) and growth, resource acquisition, and external support (as ends). The rational goal model stresses the effectiveness criteria...of planning and goal setting (as means) and productivity and efficiency (as ends). The internal process model stresses the role of information management and communication (as means) and stability and control (as ends). (p. 371)

The Competing Values Framework was the basis for the culture survey in this research. Different labels have been used to characterize the four basic models described in Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s (1983) Competing Values Approach (e.g., Cameron & Ettington, 1988; Cameron & Quinn, 1999, 2006; Faerman & Quinn, 1985; Zammuto & Krakower, 1991). However, Cameron and Quinn (2006) suggested that the clan, hierarchy, adhocracy, and market culture types are representative of organizational forms that have developed over time in the organizational field (see Figure 2.2), and that these same types represent organizational quality, effective leadership strategies, and organizational accomplishments. This study used the Cameron and Quinn descriptions as the basis for describing the characteristics of culture types.

Although the labels themselves change relative to a given study, specific characteristics of the four cultures have remained consistent based on their link to the Competing Values Framework.
Cameron and Quinn (2006) described the *hierarchy culture* as a structured organization. This organization’s administration occurs through rules and regulations believed to hold the organization together and govern what people do. Leaders are characterized as individuals with expertise in organizing and priority is given to ensuring that the organization runs smoothly. Long-term issues include permanence and staying well organized. The *adhocracy culture* is somewhat opposite to the hierarchy culture and is considered more representative of the world of the twenty-first century. The basis of its existence is the ability to be flexible in a rapidly changing society. The goal of this culture is to support efficient adaptation. Roles and
responsibilities change based on need during a particular period. *Market cultures* focus on the exchange of goods and services and on creating a strong presence in a competitive environment. The core value of the market culture includes competition, strategic planning, and developing products. Accordingly, the goals are making a profit, developing products, and securing customer relationships. Finally, the *clan culture* is described as being similar to a family unit. There is a sense of commitment among organizational members and the organization itself: leaders are described as mentors and parent figures, and individuals are connected to the organization through the shared beliefs, values, and practices of the organization. This culture encourages individuals to work in teams and to participate in collective decision-making.

Smart (2003) stated that numerous studies in higher education have demonstrated that the effectiveness of higher education institutions is related to their dominant culture and as a result the research tends to reflect a “three-tier order, with institutions that have a dominant clan or adhocracy culture as the most effective, followed by institutions with a dominant market culture in the middle tier of effectiveness, and those with a dominant hierarchy culture being the least effective” (p. 680).

According to Lahiry (1994), an understanding of the organizational culture concept provides an avenue through which to initiate changes in behavior and attitudes in order to generate desired outcomes (p. 50). The study of organizational culture focuses on one of a number of relatively diverse dimensions from “observable phenomena … to “abstract ideas” (Jung, et.al., 2009, p. 1087). Hoover (2010), for example, explored the relationship among organizational culture perceptions, values, and managerial moral reasoning. Hoover’s study looked at what fosters ethical decision-making, defined as cognitive development among leaders and managers at work (p. 5). Data were collected from managers from a variety of industrial
organizations. Hoover utilized a Competing Values Framework (CVF) Likert-scale developed by Quinn and Rohrbaugh, (1983) to measure organizational culture perceptions along with two additional surveys to measure values and managerial moral judgment. However, study findings indicated statistical significance between values and organizational culture perceptions and moral reasoning at work. Stevens (1996), in another study, assessed corporate written ethical codes and “how codes relate to the culture of the organization…with what language strategies are codes expressing values and beliefs?” (p. 74). University faculty members and undergraduate research assistants were trained to assess criteria based on the Competing Values Framework (Quinn, Hildebrandt, Rogers, Thompson., 1991), an empirical model applicable to presentational communication. One of the findings from the Stevens study was “that codes are not providing strong guidance to employees about potential ethical dilemmas” suggesting “that codes often do not focus on community, personal character issues, or values” (p. 79).

Other examples of varying focuses on organizational culture include those of Chin-Loy and Mujtaba (2007) and Vallet (2010). Chin-Loy and Mujtaba stated that “there is a growing sense of urgency among executives about the practicality of leveraging knowledge” (p. 15). They assessed the moderating effect of organizational culture, knowledge management and organizational benefits utilizing Quinn and McGrath’s (1985) Competing Values Framework and Lawson’s (2002) Knowledge Management Assessment Instrument. Data were collected from leading companies known for “excellence in knowledge management” (p. 16). Study results indicated a positive relationship between organizational culture types and knowledge management. Vallett (2010) examined the relationship between organizational virtuousness and organizational culture within one public and one private university unit. In that study, virtues were described as “rooted in the human fabric and are enduring” (p. 131). Vallett continued to
state that “virtues can be considered character states… and that “organizational virtuousness then is the manifestation of virtues within an organization… (p. 131). Virtuousness was assessed utilizing the Survey of Organizational Virtuousness (Cameron, Bright, & Caza, 2004). Organizational culture types were assessed by utilizing an organizational culture instrument based on the Competing Values Framework (Yeung, Brockbank, & Ulrich, 1991). The results indicated that given correlations between virtuousness and culture that the strength of the correlations varied based on any given culture type (p. 134).

Although the focus on organizational culture has a complicated history, Smart and Hamm (1993) emphasized that the single most fundamental construct associated with the challenges facing higher education is that of organizational culture and that a clear understanding of this concept is essential in order to improve managerial and organizational effectiveness (p. 97). A review of the literature on organizational culture indicated that a significant body of research relating to organizational effectiveness was developed during the 1990s. A review of organizational culture and organizational effectiveness, although indirectly related to this research, provides specific insight into how organizational culture is examined in higher education research, thus providing a foundation for the relationship of organizational culture to other variables such as organizational commitment.

Organizational Culture and Organizational Effectiveness in Higher Education

Specific studies (e.g., Clott & Fjortoft, 1998; Dela Cruz, 2011; Fjortoft & Smart, 1994; Smart, 2003; Smart & Hamm, 1993; Smart, Kuh, & Tierney, 1997) have assessed the relationship between organizational culture and effectiveness in two-year and four-year colleges and universities. Smart and Hamm (1993) sought to determine the extent to which the effectiveness of two-year colleges is linked to a dominant culture. Participants included full-
time administrators and faculty members. The Institutional Performance Survey (IPS) was used to determine the dominant cultures and effectiveness was measured based on items from both the IPS instrument and Cameron’s (1978) nine dimensions of organizational effectiveness. Their findings suggest that there are extensive differences in respondents’ perceptions of organizational effectiveness based on their principal culture type. Accordingly, Smart (2003), assessed the relationship between perceptions of organizational cultures and leadership role performance and organizational effectiveness among senior campus administrators in community colleges. His study used a survey that consisted of three sets of variables: Cameron’s (1978) nine dimensions of organizational effectiveness, Cameron and Ettington’s (1988) descriptions of four types of organizational culture, and the general leadership role performances proposed by Hart and Quinn (1993). According to Smart, considerable research indicates that organizational effectiveness in higher education is contingent upon a dominant culture. Unlike that of Smart and Hamm (1993), Smart’s (2003) research is based on the idea of the existence of an overall culture. An overall organizational culture and a dominant culture were not perceived as the same. Smart stated that an overall organizational culture “requires leadership behaviors that encompass disparate roles that may on the surface appear to be competing or paradoxical in nature” (p. 679). Findings in the study indicated a strong positive relationship between perceptions of overall campus cultures and leadership role performance and effectiveness.

Smart, Kuh, and Tierney (1997) suggested that the effectiveness of an institution is based on the interaction between the internal and external environments associated with that institution. They investigated the relationship between institutional culture and decision-making and organizational effectiveness in two-year colleges. This study included Cameron and
Ettington’s (1988) four types of organizational culture, rational/collegial and autocratic/political decision approaches, and a global measure that incorporated Cameron’s (1978, 1986) nine dimensions of organizational effectiveness. The sample included full-time faculty members and administrators at 30 two-year colleges. Results indicated that for faculty and administrators, the external environment, institutional culture, and preferred decision-making approaches had significant influence on organizational effectiveness. Abungah (1996) investigated some of the same key factors in community colleges, using a sample consisting of full-time faculty and administrators. The study utilized the Institutional Performance Survey (IPS) culture types in addition to Cameron’s (1978, 1986) nine dimensions of organizational effectiveness as criteria. Abungah also assessed the extent to which personal characteristics such as age, gender, education level, position and employment tenure influence organizational effectiveness. The results also indicated a significant relationship between organizational culture types, including clan, adhocracy, and market cultures and organizational effectiveness. Among the personal characteristics, only employment position had a significant relationship with effectiveness.

According to Fjortoft and Smart (1994), the study of organizational effectiveness stems from organizations’ attempts to cope with “external environments that are increasingly characterized by turbulent change, unpredictability, competitiveness, information overload, declining revenues, and uncertainty” (p. 429). Fjortoft and Smart assessed perceptions of dominant organizational culture types and level of mission agreement and perceptions of organizational effectiveness in four-year colleges and universities. Data were obtained from the 1985 national study on organizational effectiveness conducted with 334 four-year colleges and universities by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS). Similar to previously referenced studies, this study used Cameron’s (1978) nine dimensions of
organizational effectiveness. Participants included trustees, administrators, and department chairpersons. Findings indicated that only two of the nine measures of organizational effectiveness (i.e., professional development and quality of faculty, system openness and community interaction) supported interactive effect between mission agreement and organizational culture. When assessed in terms of levels of mission agreement, “institutions in which respondents report a high level of mission agreement are perceived to be significantly more effective than those in which they report medium and low levels of agreement on a majority of five effectiveness dimensions. In addition, “the importance of mission agreement on the effectiveness of institutions … is conditional on the dominant culture type of the institution” (p. 439).

Clott and Fjortoft (1998) emphasized that changes in the “larger world environment have required substantial effort on the part of all organizations to survive, remain viable, and demonstrate their strategic effectiveness in the face of increasing uncertainty and public scrutiny” (p. 3). Clott and Fjortoft investigated the effects of organizational culture and managerial strategy and the relationship to organizational effectiveness within several higher education business schools. Participants included academic deans from 340 business schools whose roles were considered reflective of management at the institutions. Again, Cameron’s (1978) dimensions of organizational effectiveness were of central importance in this study. Jung’s (1923) and Quinn’s (1988) clans, markets, and hierarchies constituted the culture types. The management strategic types used were active and passive strategies representative of the research of Miles and Snow (1978). Study results suggested significant main effects between organizational culture and both managerial strategy and organizational effectiveness; however, there was no significant interactive effect between organizational effectiveness and either
organizational culture or managerial strategy. Somewhat similarly, Dela Cruz (2011) assessed the relationship between organizational culture, management strategy, and decision-making and organizational effectiveness. A modified version of the Institutional Performance Survey (IPS) for four-year institutions was the main instrument used to collect data from faculty at public higher education institutions. Faculty was selected due to the “unique role they play in designing, implementing, and evaluating institutional effectiveness activities” (p. 80). The instrument consisted of 6 sections that were applied to Dela Cruz’s research such as General Type of Institution used to assess organizational culture and Institutional Strategy used to assess management strategy. A group of 78 faculty members completed the survey. Overall, among the findings established was a relationship between organizational culture and management strategies and organizational effectiveness. In addition, results showed that market culture was the best predictor of institutional effectiveness while adhocracy, bureaucracy and clan cultures were the least effective predictors of institutional effectiveness (p. vi). The study also indicated a relationship between gender and institutional effectiveness.

Smart and St. John (1996) investigated whether culture strength and culture types are independent or dependent in relation to organizational effectiveness and performance in four-year colleges and universities. Similar to the approach taken in previous studies, organizational culture types were categorized according to Cameron and Ettington’s (1988) taxonomy of clan, adhocracy, hierarchy, and market cultures. Also in keeping with previous studies, data were obtained from the NCHEM’s1985 national study of four-year colleges and universities. Respondents included presidents, student affairs officers, trustee administrators, and department chairpersons. The researchers’ findings suggested that “when considering some culture types culture strength plays an influential role in the hypothesized link between organizational culture
and performance “(p. 220). In Smart and St. John’s account, irrespective of culture type, colleges and universities must have strong cultures in order to be effective and culture types influence the direction of effectiveness and performance among strong and weak cultures. They suggested that in order to meet its goals, an institution would be well-advised to establish shared organizational values, beliefs, and norms and ensure that management policies and practices align with them (p. 220).

Overall, this chapter thus far has focused on a review of literature from several researchers regarding the factors they consider to be highly important in assessing independently organizational culture and organizational commitment. In certain situations, researchers’ considerations of these factors are interpreted as they apply to a particular study—a practice that limits its applicability across studies. Increased knowledge of those factors thought to be crucial among researchers is considered necessary for continued growth in organizations.

The literature relevant to an association between organizational culture and organizational commitment tends to be scattered across organizations—little focuses directly on relationships in colleges and universities, which is the reasoning behind the prior discussion on organizational culture and commitment independently. This also supports a perspective on relationships that this research intended to study. As this is the case, the following discussion includes literature on educational institutions and pertinent literature focusing on other spheres.

**Organizational Culture and Organizational Commitment**

Runge, Hames, and Shearer (2004) stated that organizational culture is an important factor in shaping an individual’s commitment to organizations. According to Peterson and Martin (1990), each relationship between an individual and an organization is unique and
contingent on cultural elements believed to contribute to a sense of commitment to the institution.

Considerable research in the educational arena on connections between organizational culture and commitment has focused on elementary and secondary teachers’ perceptions of the school culture and its impact on commitment. Although not in the sphere of higher education, a review of the research associated with schools is relevant to the higher education context, as there are some clear similarities in terms of both mission and practice. With each such study, an aspect of organizational culture defines the nature of organizational culture. In Ritchie’s (2000) view, “organizational culture maintains influence over its members through the development of values acceptable to the organization” (p. 1).

The value orientation of organizational culture has been utilized in several studies (e.g., Niehoff, 1997; Reyes & Pounder, 1993; Shaw & Reyes, 1992). For example, Shaw and Reyes, (1992) considered values to be the “essence of organizational culture” (p. 296). They suggested that school systems have two value systems: normative and utilitarian. Normative value orientation represents the symbolic aspects of the school environment, whereas the utilitarian value orientation represents the materialistic aspects of the school environment. The utilitarian system focuses on written rules and regulations, whereas the normative system is less dependent on written policies. The researchers compared these two value systems as they relate to teacher commitment in elementary and secondary schools. The value orientations were measured with the Organizational Value Orientation Questionnaire (Reyes, 1990b), and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979) provided the measure for organizational commitment. Shaw and Reyes considered organizational commitment to be an outcome of the organizational culture and the attitudes of the institutional employees. Their
findings supported a difference in organizational value orientation and organizational commitment and school types. For example, elementary schools had higher levels of organizational commitment and a slightly higher normative value orientation than secondary schools. A similar study conducted by Reyes and Pounder (1993) explored whether there was a difference in value orientation between public and private (religious) schools and how school type influenced job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Their findings indicated a significant difference between teachers in public and private schools in terms of commitment and job satisfaction. Private school teachers were shown as experiencing a normative value orientation and had higher organizational commitment and job satisfaction than did teachers in public schools.

Anderman, Belzer, and Smith (1991) examined the relationship between elementary teachers’ perceptions of school culture and three factors—school leadership, job satisfaction, and institutional commitment. Job satisfaction and institutional commitment are critical elements in the effective management of a school. Anderman et al. stated that when considering both satisfaction and commitment, it is important to consider the teachers’ “subjective interpretation” of the school context (p. 4). The study assessed the “contextual influences [of schools] on teachers” (p. 5). A single survey, including items that focused on school-culture, perception of principle leadership, job satisfaction, and institutional commitment, was administered to elementary teachers across three states in the United States. The results suggested a strong relationship between school culture and teachers’ job satisfaction and commitment to the school.

Jones (1998) evaluated educators’ organizational commitment in relation to the organizational culture of high schools that employed them. Jones stated that especially during
times of change in public schools, there is a “strong need to determine the organizational commitment of educators” (p. 5). Several measurements were taken utilizing Mowday, Steers, and Porters (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, Meyer and Allen’s (1984) Affective and Continuance Commitment Scales, and Taylor and Bowers (1972) Organizational Climate Questionnaire. Surveys were sent to high school administrators, including teachers, administrators, department heads and supervisors, and guidance personnel at twelve different schools in a state in the United States. Jones’ study demonstrated a relationship between organizational commitment and organizational culture.

As noted in this chapter, considerable research relating to organizational culture and commitment has been conducted based on school systems; within higher education, however, such research has been minimal to date. In Poppens’s (2000) account, organizational culture and organizational commitment are likely to be related in that organizational culture, consisting of norms and values, shapes commitment. In a study of faculty members and administrators at several religious-affiliated private colleges, Poppens compared perceived and preferred organizational culture types on the basis of their relationship with organizational commitment. The perceived culture type was defined as what is observed, and the preferred culture type is defined as what is desired. The perceived and preferred culture types were measured using the Institutional Performance Survey developed by Krakower and Niwa, (1985) and commitment was measured utilizing Mowday, Steers, and Porter’s (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). This study also included comparisons among faculty members and administrators on the basis of gender, age, and tenure at the institution. Findings indicated that participants who agreed on perceived and preferred organizational culture types showed stronger commitment to the institution. In addition, administrators (presidents, vice presidents,
deans, directors, department chairs) who exhibited more agreement between perceived and preferred culture types revealed higher commitment levels than did faculty members. No significant relationship emerged between age and commitment and commitment levels for males and females were approximately the same.

In a related study, Lemaster (2004) stressed that leaders’ actions based on knowledge of the culture of an institution positively influence the actions of the employees of the institution: in essence, individuals become committed and leaders are considered more effective. The relationship assessed considered the overall university and work-unit sub-cultures of the universities. Lemaster examined the relationship between individual-culture congruence and commitment in Christian colleges and universities. Individual-culture congruence was defined as the difference between an individual’s perceived actual culture type and preferred ideal culture. The study sample included full-time members of the faculty, staff, and administration from eight institutions in the Western United States. Krakower and Niwa’s (1985) IPS instrument provided the measurement for individual–culture congruence, and organizational commitment was assessed using Meyer and Allen’s (1997) affective, continuance, normative, and organizational commitment components. Study results indicated a relationship between individual-culture congruence and both affective commitment and normative commitment at the university- and work-unit levels. Continuance commitment was found at the university level.

Short (2013) assessed the degree of relationship among the clan culture, leader-member exchange, and affective organizational commitment. The focus was on organizations consisting of managers “with the competency to manage interpersonal relationships” (p. 1). It was suggested that such managers fostered a clan culture with employees who exhibited an affective commitment. The research was conducted among employees at community colleges. The
Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) developed by Cameron and Quinn (2006) was used to assess the clan culture. The affective committee scale designed by Allen and Meyer (1990) was used to measure affective commitment. A Leader-Member Exchange questionnaire was utilized to evaluate leader-member exchange. Findings indicated that employees who perceived the organizational culture to be a clan culture had greater levels of affective commitment and leader-member exchange than those who perceived the organizational culture otherwise (pp. 55–56).

Niehoff (1997) analyzed the links among job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and mission value congruence among several hundred employees at a religious-affiliated university. Data were collected based on age, gender, job level, tenure, religious affiliation, and marital status. Findings from the survey used in this study suggested a small but significant relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction and mission value congruence and several demographic variables, such as job level, age, and tenure in varying combinations. The results also suggested that religious-affiliated groups had a significant relationship with both mission value congruence and organizational commitment. The study also suggested that such a relationship could be the result of personal and religious values that are important to the members of a religious-affiliated university.

Several studies (Lok & Crawford, 1999, 2001; Lok, Westwood, & Crawford, 2005) outside the academic arena support the idea that a significant relationship exists between organizational culture and organizational commitment and help to clarify its relevance. Lok and Crawford (1999, 2001) examined the relationship between organizational culture and the factors of subculture, leadership style, job satisfaction and commitment among hospital administrators. In this study, unlike some others, subcultures were shown to be significant, such that the
“existence of subcultures can thus be regarded as a normal occurrence in organizations” (Lok & Crawford, 2001, p. 596). Also included were employee characteristics such as tenure, education level, and age. Their studies were conducted with nurses from general, private, and psychiatric hospitals. A questionnaire was used to collect data on all variables. Lok and Crawford (1999, 2001) found that subcultures (here meaning hospital wards or work units) had a greater effect on commitment than did the overall culture of the hospital. There were also positive relationships between leadership style and the job satisfaction, age, and commitment factors. Tenure was found to have a slightly negative effect on commitment. In a later study, Lok et al. (2005) confirmed a relationship between organizational cultures and subcultures and leadership styles and commitment.

Goodman, Zammuto and Gifford (2001) sought to determine the relationship of work life measures identified as organizational commitment, job satisfaction, job involvement, empowerment and intent to turnover with differences in cultural profiles or types using the Competing Values Framework. A group of nurses from seven different hospitals participated in the study. The results indicated that culture types, described in this study as ‘group values’, are positively related to work life measures. Specifically, hierarchical culture type was negatively related to work life measures and positively related to intent to turnover. Overall, the results supported a relationship between different culture types and quality of work life.

Sikorska-Simmons (2005) examined the relationship among organizational culture, job satisfaction, individual personal characteristics and commitment among human service agency staff. Staff in assisted living residences constituted this study’s sample. The Sikorska-Simmons study was initiated based on a concern for turnover in resident positions and the idea that a “knowledge of how organizational factors and staff characteristics are related to organizational
commitment will be useful in improving the quality of the work environment for staff” (p. 198). Continually emphasized was the possibility that increased turnover would affect morale and increase the costs associated with the training of new staff. Organizational commitment was assessed using Cook and Wall’s (1980) measure of affective commitment, that is, an employee’s emotional attachment to the organization. Cook and Wall’s instrument was designed to measure identification, involvement in, and loyalty to an organization. The Organizational Culture Survey (OCS) developed by Glaser, Zamanou, and Hacker (1987) was used to measure organizational culture. Other variables considered were personal characteristics of the staff, including marital status, gender, age, tenure, and religiosity. Their findings indicated that organizational culture, job satisfaction, and education level are strong predictors of organizational commitment with organizational culture showing the strongest impact.

Garr (1997) examined whether types of commitment vary across culture patterns. Differences between real and ideal culture profiles were also measured. Myer and Allen’s (1984) three-Component Model of Commitment was utilized as a measure of organizational commitment. Cooke and Lafferty’s (1987) Organizational Culture Inventory was utilized as the measure for organizational culture. Participants were employees from varying workplaces. The results indicated that types of cultures accounted for varying amounts of variance given a specific kind of commitment. For example, “Constructive cultures were related to higher levels of Affective commitment” (p. 2).

Model to be Tested

As discussed, the research on organizational culture and organizational commitment has primarily evolved in the industrial field. Given a review of a considerable amount of the literature on this subject, management felt a need to acquire a better understanding of how
organizations function in order to improve their performance. It was determined that such knowledge could increase employee commitment. This literature review primarily considered studies focusing on educational institutions; however, few such studies provide empirical evidence in support of the relationships considered herein. As a result, a summary of the model to be tested is appropriate. Tatar and Bekerman (2002) suggested that organizational culture guides behavior that generates commitment to an organization. They emphasized the importance of understanding the values that govern an institution and their influence on individuals. As noted earlier in this chapter, organizational culture is the independent variable and organizational commitment is the dependent variable. These variables were chosen for two reasons: (a) their potential importance in higher education, and (b) the minimal amount of research in this area especially in regards to college and university administrators. The primary focus of the present study was to determine the relationship between organizational culture and organizational commitment among college counselors and advisors who provide services to at-risk college students. The question asked was: “Specifically, do designated components of commitment vary predictably across culture types?” To answer this question, Allen, Meyer and Smith’s (1993) Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment was used because of its extensive use in prior research and its division of commitment into three useful components: affective, continuance, and normative. Kalliath, Bluedorn, and Strube’s (1999) Competing Values Instrument measure of culture types was used to assess organizational culture. Chapter 3 provides a description of the ways in which these instruments have been used in prior research.
Chapter 3

Methodology

In their research, Lok, Westwood, and Crawford (2005) indicated that interest in the impact of organizational culture over the years has led to a considerable number of general statements about organizational culture and its relationship to other variables. Lok et al. believed that it is time to move away from making general statements about the relationships—it may be more important to question the relationship between types of organizational culture and various variables. Based on their reasoning, to a certain extent, this study examined individual perceptions about organizational culture forms and the connection to certain kinds of organizational commitments. This chapter provides a discussion of the instruments used to measure types of organizational culture and its relationship to organizational commitment. This chapter also describes the participants, data collection methods, and data analysis procedures in the study.

Research Question

The following specific question guided this research:

What are the relationships among affective, continuance, and normative commitment scores when examined by organizational culture type, while simultaneously controlling for individual characteristics consisting of years of experience in the current role, highest education level, gender, age, and ethnicity?

Participants

Participants in this study consisted of community college, college and university counselors, advisors and related administrators in comprehensive support programs for at-risk higher education students primarily in the eastern United States (Pennsylvania, New York, and
New Jersey) and the western United States (California). These states were chosen because they have specific programs for at-risk higher education students. Related programs were also found in Maryland, Wisconsin, and Oregon and were included in this study. Although these programs are similar, only the programs in eastern and western United States are so described. The programs are the Higher Education Equal Opportunity (Act 101) in Pennsylvania; Educational Opportunity Fund Program in New Jersey; Educational Opportunity Program and Higher Education Opportunity Program in New York; and the Educational Opportunity Programs in California. The purpose of each comprehensive support program is to provide educational assistance to disadvantaged or at-risk students.

One such support program is the Higher Education Equal Opportunity Program (Act 101) in Pennsylvania. This program has been in effect since 1971 and has served over 14,000 students (Pennsylvania Department of Education, n.d., para. 2). The program exists in 37 institutions. According to the 2011 guidelines established by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, academic institutions that have ACT 101 programs are expected to provide quality academic services, adequate financial aid packages, and counseling services to ensure the success of students. Specific to counseling, the guidelines include an expectation of “learning and special counseling services” (p. 7). Also included is a broad description for “program staff” that accounts for institutions determining their own staffing needs and qualifications.

Another program is the Educational Opportunity Fund, established in New Jersey in 1968. This program is governed by a Board of Directors appointed by the State Governor (Educational Opportunity Fund Program Description, n.d., para 3), and includes 42 participating institutions (Educational Opportunity Fund Program Description, n.d., para 2). Within the Educational Opportunity Fund, Administrative Procedures and Policies, Chapter 11 (2007), a
recommendation is made to provide counseling programs designed to help students realize their educational, career, and personal goals. Within its vision, mission, and goals for the Educational Opportunity Fund, the State of New Jersey Commission on Higher Education specifies that counseling in the future should focus on developing workplace skills including “leadership and communications, interpersonal relations, and teamwork” (State of New Jersey Commission on Higher Education, Education Opportunity Fund, n.d., para 6).

The New York Education Opportunity Program was approved by the New York State Governor and the Legislature in 1966 (HEOP WORKS, n.d., Introduction). The program exists on 45 campuses (Guidelines for the Operation of the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), p. 2). In the EOP guidelines, it is recommended that counseling services “focus on adaptation to the campus environment, goal development, academic planning, and problem resolution techniques” (p. 5). The state of New York established a similar program, the Higher Educational Opportunity Program, in 1969. The HEOP program provides opportunities at independent colleges and universities in New York. HEOP programs exist on 45 campuses in New York (HEOP WORKS). Administrators in these programs were also included as participants in this study.

In 1969, the California Legislature passed the Hammer Bill (Senate Bill 1072) which eventually established approximately 29 Educational Opportunity Programs in higher education institutions in California. In community colleges, there are 113 Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS). Approximately 142 campuses provide access and support services for students who meet the criteria established as disadvantaged or at-risk students.
Sample Size

The samples were developed through purposeful, criterion-based sampling. The population for this study was a targeted group rather narrowly defined by a criterion. Approval for this research from the Office for Research Protections at the researcher’s institution required contacting the directors or so designated persons of each program for permission prior to contacting the counselor or advisor. From web directories, emails (see Appendices B and C) were sent to 84 program directors in New York, 32 in New Jersey, 43 in Pennsylvania, 29 in California, and one program each in Wisconsin, Maryland and Oregon. In addition, similar emails were sent to directors of identified community college programs in California. An appeal was made in the email for the directors of each program to support this research and to forward the email, consent form, and surveys to the counselors, advisors, or related administrators in their programs that assist at-risk students. The emails were sent to the community colleges and additional states to help maximize the number of completed surveys.

Research Design Framework

This study represents a correlational research design. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), the advantages of using correlational research are that it enables relationships among many variables in a study, and provides information on the degree of the relationships being studied. Gall, Gall, and Borg (2005) emphasized that while a relationship may be established, its cause remains unclear and chance findings are possible. Multivariate analysis and related data analysis regression techniques were utilized to investigate the relationship between the dependent variables—affective, continuance and normative commitment means—and the independent variables—clan, hierarchy, adhocracy and market culture type value. This was done while accounting for the influence of individual characteristics such as gender, age,
ethnicity, years of experience, and education level. Hair, Black, Babin, and Anderson (2010) stated that “multivariate analysis refers to all statistical techniques that simultaneously analyze multiple measurements on individuals or object under investigation” (p. 4).

An array of instruments exist that have their own scope, ease of use, and scientific properties for researchers interested in studying organizational commitment and culture (Scott, Mannion, Davies, & Marshall, 2003), p. 923). Such instruments have been mostly designed for use in organizational theory and management studies (Maassen, 1996). In the study of organizational culture the focus has been on the effectiveness and increased manipulation of organizational culture to achieve a goal—for this and related reasons, interest has transferred to higher education. Maassen (1996) emphasized that the management revolution in higher education in the 1980s caused a shift in the attention of administrators and research funding agencies in the U.S. Organizational culture became a “critical element like in organization studies in general” (p. 155). Scott et al. (2003) indicated that many instruments examine employees’ perception of their working environments but few except for the Competing Values Framework examine “values and beliefs that inform those views” (p. 928). This framework has been developed extensively in the field of business and is presumed to be the most commonly used in this area. It has been used as a tool to examine all aspects of organizations, at all levels (Cai, 2008). While higher education research on organizational commitment is sparse, the organizational and management field is flourishing with such research. The three-component model of commitment developed by Meyer and Allen (1990) is said to dominate organizational research (Jaros, 2007). It has also been used as a tool to examine commitment among many organizations, including higher education. Their model proposes that organizational commitment is experienced by the employee as three simultaneous mindsets: affective,
continuance, and normative commitment. Not unlike organizational culture, the question that arose primarily in the industrial field was: how do you attract individuals who identify with and eventually remain with the organization? Building commitment in an institution was thought to be a useful means of enhancing organizational efficiency. The instruments in this research underwent considerable scrutiny. The final selection, according to Scott et al., was determined by how organizational commitment and culture are conceptualized, the purpose of the research, intended use of the results, and availability of resources (p. 923).

**Instrumentation**

Two instruments were used in the present study: the Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment (revised version; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993), and the Competing Values Framework Instrument).

**Purpose and Format of the Commitment Measures**

Allen and Meyer (1990) suggested that when defining organizational commitment the focus should be on the differences in the conceptualizations of commitment. Their work resulted in the Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment, an instrument used to measure one to three forms of employee commitment to an organization: affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Affective commitment measures an emotional attachment to the organization; continuance commitment involves remaining with an organization due to the cost associated with leaving it; and normative commitment is based on an obligation to remain with an organization. Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) provided a six-factor solution for the three organizational commitment measures (p. 258). Their Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment (revised version) was used in this study with the authors’ permission. For each commitment scale, there are six items each for a total of 18 items (see
Appendix D). Participants were requested to rate these items on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The three components were the dependent variables in this study. Descriptions of each component are described in detail in chapter 2. According to Allen and Meyer (1990), this instrument independently links to variables associated with organizational commitment—it was determined to be an acceptable instrument for this study. The following is an examination of the research associated with the validity of the TCM organizational commitment instrument as developed initially and as it relates to this research.

Validity of the Organizational Commitment Scales

Meyer and Allen (1984) initially recommended an evaluation between the affective and continuance commitment components. McGee and Ford (1987) conducted research to examine the validity of these two scales utilizing confirmatory and exploratory factor analysis. Data were collected from 997 faculties at four-year higher education institutions in Canada and the United States. The affective and continuance commitment scales consisted of 8 items each. In a two-factor solution, eight items loaded on the affective commitment scale and only six items loaded on the continuance commitment scale. Given the results, McGee and Ford indicated that these results supported the scale dimensionality. In a second factor analysis four factors emerged, one factor of which was considered uninterruptable. Of the remaining three, seven of the eight affective-commitment items loaded on factor one and six items loaded on the continuance commitment scale and divided into two subscales for the second and third factor. This indicates that one unitary scale may not exist for the continuance commitment scale. Correlations among the commitment scales resulted in a correlation of \( r = .08 \) between the affective and continuance commitment scales, indicating a lack of relationship between the two scales. Examination of
continuance commitment when divided into the two subscales created a negative relationship with one scale and a positive relationship with the other scale. Findings specified that the “subscales were significantly, though differentially, related to affective commitment” (p. 640).

Karim and Noor (2006) sought to establish the construct validity of Allen and Meyer’s three-component organizational commitment measures. Data were collected from 139 academic librarians from nine international universities. Similar to McGee and Ford (1987), only the measures for affective and continuance commitment were incorporated in their questionnaire. Exploratory factor analysis using “maximum likelihood analysis” was utilized to analyze the data. Findings resulted in two factors with eigenvalues of more than one (p. 93). An orthogonal rotation using varimax rotation resulted in two factors providing evidence of both convergent and discriminant validity. Each factor explained about 16% of the total variance in the overall organizational commitment scale for a total of 32.61% explained variance. To further substantiate evidence of convergent and discriminate validity, a correlation analysis was utilized between items measuring affective and continuance commitment. Those findings substantiated convergent and discriminate validity.

Meyer and Allen (1987) later added a third component, normative commitment, to their commitment scales. Allen and Meyer (1990) assessed whether the three components of organizational commitment represented distinct psychological states or constructs. They constructed three scales consisting of eight items each. Data were collected from 256 administrators in two manufacturing firms and a university. An exploratory factor analysis utilizing the principal components method was performed. The items loaded highest on the factors representing the appropriate constructs. Allen and Meyer also examined the relationships between the various organizational commitment dimensions in their instrument along with
Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian’s (1974) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. Findings revealed a relative independence of the continuance commitment scale (CCS) from the affective (ACS) and normative scales (NCS) and a significant correlation between Porter et al.’s Organizational Commitment Questionnaire and the affective commitment scale. They indicated that such findings are an indication of convergent and discriminate validity.

The psychometric property of the Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment measured by Allen and Meyer (1990) continued to receive extensive research interest. Dunham, Grube, and Castañeda (1994), for example, examined the relationship of the Allen and Meyer scale dimensions and a number of antecedents. Their study consisted of 2,734 individuals in nine samples from a wide range of fields, including education. Confirmatory factor analysis was used to examine the factor structure of the scales. Results indicated that the three- and four-factor models were more representative of the three scales. Similar to Allen and Meyer, Dunham et al. paired the Organization Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) with Allen and Meyer’s three commitment scales. Confirmatory factor analysis was used to access the extent to which the “OCQ converged with the AC scale and diverged from the NC and the CC scales” (p. 373). A confirmatory factor analysis combining the questionnaire items “supported a priori hypotheses regarding convergence of OCQ and AC [affective commitment scale], divergence of OCQ and NC [normative commitment scale], and divergence of OCQ and CC [continuance commitment scale]” (p. 374).

Allen and Meyer (1996) conducted a study assessing the construct validity of the affective, continuance and normative commitment scales by examining the findings in other research. The Social Science Citation Index, Dissertations Abstracts International, and direct contacts with primary authors were the sources of published and unpublished works. Their data
were based on more than 16,000 employees from various organizations and occupations. Based on their results, they “suggest[ed] that the three commitment measures are distinguishable from other commonly used work attitude measures” (p. 271).

Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, and Topolnytsky (2002) conducted a meta-analytic analysis of the variables identified in the three-component model. Their study used resources from several databases and material obtained from presentations at conferences. They concentrated on research utilizing the affective, continuance, and normative commitment scales so designated by two groups of researchers (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993). Data were collected from 155 independent samples containing what was identified as usable data. They conducted separate correlation analyses for 6-item and 8-item versions of the three-component model. Of relevance to this study are the results of the findings from the 6-item version. They found that the correlation between affective and normative commitment was considered substantial (ρ = .77), suggesting some overlap in the two constructs (p. 28). In their study, the correlations between continuance commitment and both affective (ρ = -.04) and normative (ρ = .11) were in accord (p. 28). The researchers specified that to some extent the results of some studies indicate non-zero correlation among the three commitments, especially affective and normative commitment. They further suggested that the relationships with commitment are determined by its relationship to the constructs under study.

Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) assessed the generalizability of Meyer and Allen’s (1991) three-component model of commitment, including affective, continuance, and normative commitment to occupations (p. 539). They expected to be able to apply the three-component model to other domains (p. 539). Participants in their study included student nurses and registered nurses. Confirmatory factor analyses were conducted; it was determined that the three
commitment scales measured distinct constructs (p. 542) and that the three-factor solution provided the best fit to the data (p. 543). Irving, Colman, and Cooper (1997) investigated the overlap between organizational commitment and occupational commitment and indicated that these commitment forms are similar in meaning to their organizational counterparts. They assessed the factor structure of the Meyer, Allen and Smith’s (1993) measure of occupational commitment. Their participants included 232 regional employees. Confirmative factor analysis suggested that affective, continuance, and normative are distinguishable across occupations. The researchers stated “that as was the case for organizational commitment, occupational commitment may take different forms” (p. 445).

Reliability of the Commitment Scale Summated Scores

Table 3.1 summarizes Allen and Meyer’s reliability organizational commitment data as presented by several researchers in their studies, including Allen and Meyer. The data are from 1987 and represent 22,665 responses.

Table 3.1

Summary of Allen and Meyer Organizational Commitment Instrument results (Cronbach’s Alpha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of individuals</th>
<th>Reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha) for Commitment Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Meyer</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Meyer</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Meyer, &amp; Smith</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunham, Grube, &amp; Castañeda</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2734</td>
<td>.74-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving, Coleman, &amp; Cooper</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
McGee and Ford (1987) found that the continuance commitment scale, when examined separately, provided two subscales with coefficient alphas of CCS (.72) and CCS (.71). Dunham, Grube, and Castañeda (1994) also found two commitment subscales with coefficient alphas ranging from .54–.75 for the CC-PS measure and .58–.78 for the CC-LA measure. Similar Hackett, Bycico and Hausdorf (1994) provided two subscales with coefficient alphas of .70 for the CC:LoAlt measure and .72 for the CC: HiSac measure. These researchers found their results for the continuance commitment scale with two subscales to be a better fit to the data.

**Competing Values Framework: As a Measurement for Organizational Culture**

**Purpose and Format for the Competing Values Framework Instrument**

The independent variable in this study was organizational culture. Just as considerable focus has been directed toward defining organizational culture and how to study it, instruments designed to measure it have received similar attention. One quantitative approach used repeatedly to assess culture in organizations is the Competing Values Framework (CVF) which was the basis for this study. According to Cameron and Freeman (1991), the CVF is believed to form the basis of a typology of organizational culture (described in detail in chapter 2).

Numerous instruments have evolved that are based on the CVF, some specific to various industrial sectors and the educational field. Vallett (2010) emphasized that the CVF model has been “tested thoroughly in terms of validity and reliability and has been used with over 1,000 organizations” (p. 132).

Several researchers (Krakower & Niwa, 1985; Quinn & Spreitzer, 1991, Zammuto & Krakower, 1991) have undertaken studies to assess the validity and reliability of the CVF as it
has been incorporated in the Institutional Performance Survey (IPS). Although the IPS instrument was not used in this study, examining its use in earlier research provides insight into the progression of the measurement of organizational culture. The Institutional Performance Survey (IPS) is one of the initial instruments that demonstrated the Competing Values Framework’s impact in higher education. The IPS instrument was developed at the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS). One component of the IPS instrument was designed to measure four culture types based on the CVF: clan, emergent system, hierarchy, and market. As previously stated, various labels have been applied to these culture types.

Validity of the Competing Values Framework

Krakower and Niwa (1985) conducted an assessment of data drawn from the Institutional Performance Survey (IPS). Participants included 3,406 individuals in 334 four-year higher education institutions. Usable data were obtained from 3,002 individuals, of whom 39% were administrators, 34% faculty and 27% trustees. Among other forms of validity, researchers assessed the construct validity of the instrument. Krakower and Niwa (1985) pointed to the difficulty of assessing the construct validity of the Institutional Performance Survey (IPS) due to the large number of constructs in the instrument; however, with culture measurements, questions measuring the same culture should be highly correlated. They conducted two different measures of correlation. Of interest in this study is the intraclass correlation (ICC) for the cultural types, which is calculated at the respondent level. This is a measure of how different the respondent’s scores are for each cultural type. Overall, up to 19 respondents completed the survey for each institution. Their results suggested higher correlations within culture types than between them at this level (p. 72). Zammuto and Krakower (1991) conducted a similar study.
consistent with the data drawn from the NCHEMS national study and the use of the culture measures in the Institutional Performance Survey (IPS). They chose culture types as defined by Quinn and Kimberly (1984): group, developmental, hierarchical and rational. Although these labels are different than those recognized by Krakower and Niwa (1985), their descriptions are similar. Their findings were the same as Krakower and Niwa in that “correlations of items within cultural types were higher than the correlations between cultural types” (p. 92).

Quinn and Spreitzer (1991) conducted a psychometric analysis of the Competing Values Framework by examining two forms of the Institutional Performance Survey instrument (IPS) and the analysis of organization. One form utilizes scenarios as the basis for the results generated in the instrument. With this type of instrument, respondents divide 100 points among four scenarios in a question. This instrument produces what the researchers refer to as “ipsative” data that is based on “fixed choices” which affect the validity and reliability of the results. The second instrument is a modified version that utilized Likert response scales. The researchers indicated that the use of the Likert scales “allows more realistic relationships to hold among the culture quadrants: that is, all the culture quadrants may be rated high, low, or any combination thereof” (p. 119).

Quinn and Spreitzer (1991) administered the two instruments to a sample of 796 executives in a program at a major university. Both Multitrait-multimethod analysis and multidimensional scaling were used to assess the convergent/divergent validity of the Competing Values Framework. The Multitrait-multimethod analysis measured the four culture scales and the two instruments independently. The researchers compared the results. In the analysis for convergent validity, “scales of the same culture quadrant … [resulted in] correlations which are significantly different from zero and of moderate magnitude” providing
evidence of convergent validity (p. 121). A measure of discriminate validity resulted in “scales of the same culture quadrants [correlating] higher with each other than … [with] scales of different culture quadrant measured by separate methods” (p. 121). This also occurred when measured by the same method. The analyses provided evidence for the convergent/discriminant validity of the two instruments. Multidimensional scaling also provided evidence of convergent and divergent validity for both instruments. According to Quinn and Spreitzer’s (1991) findings regarding convergent validity, the two scales for each culture type map closer to each other than they do to scales of different culture types (pp. 122–125). With regard to discriminant validity, each of the culture scales map into distinct quadrants in the two-dimensional space. The scaling indicates that the culture type dimensions are separate and distinct concepts (p. 125).

Kalliath, Bluedorn, and Gillespie (1999) utilized the structural equations modeling (SEM) approach to test and refine the Competing Values Framework—specifically, the four culture types: internal process (hierarchy), open systems (adhocracy), rational goal (market), and human relations (clan). They collected data from 300 hospital managers and supervisors, using a modified version of the 16-item instrument developed by Quinn and Spreitzer (1991) (p. 149). Findings indicated support for the four-factor structure of the Competing Values framework. This research utilized the Competing Values Framework instrument developed by Kalliath, Bluedorn, and Strube (1999). In their study, they investigated the relationship between organizational and individual value congruence and the effect of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. They measured the four culture types with a 7-point Likert response scale survey ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Their instrument used 32 items to measure the competing values dimensions. This instrument was a modified version incorporating additional items to increase the internal consistency of the scales (p. 1182).
Their findings indicated that value congruence “did not contribute meaningfully” to organizational commitment and job satisfaction (p. 1196).

**Reliability of the Organizational Culture Measures**

Reliability coefficients for the scales from the Likert instrument are shown in Table 3.2. This table represents data from the study initiated by Krakower and Niwa (1985) and others.

**Table 3.2**

*Summary Organizational Culture Type Results (Cronbach Alpha)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of individuals</th>
<th>Reliability (Cronbach Alphas) for Culture type scale scores.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalliath, Bluedorn &amp;</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strube</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krakower &amp; Niwa</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>3,002</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinn &amp; Spreitzer</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zammuto &amp; Krakower</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3,002</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relationship of Allen and Meyers Commitment Scales to Demographic Variables**

Analyses of demographic variables also occurred in the current study. Hackett, Bycio, and Hausdorf (1994) analyzed the relationship of age and tenure to each of Allen and Meyers’ (1990) commitment scales. Intercorrelations of the data suggested that age and organizational tenure were positively related to all three scale scores. When analyzed independently with the continuance commitment scale and its two subcomponents, a relationship was identified with tenure but not age. Correlations identified among age, tenure, and affective commitment were identical (r = .08, p < .01). The correlation of tenure with NC, with age held constant (r = .14, p < .01), was stronger than that between NC and age, with tenure held constant (r = .06, p < .01) (p. 20).
Data Collection Procedures

Prior to the collection of the data, the Pennsylvania State University Human Subjects Committee was contacted for approval of the project. Once the Human Subjects Committee approved the data collection protocol, an e-mail followed by a phone call were used to contact the state representative of each designated State office to their request participation in this study. State representatives indicated that such requests should be forwarded to the directors of each program.

An initial email was sent to approximately 200 college administrators in comprehensive programs. The email explained the purpose of the study and included the necessary statements about voluntary participation and confidentiality, and a link to the on-line survey (i.e., Qualtrics, Provo, UT, USA). In the same email (see Appendix B), participants were notified that their participation and completion of the survey served as their informed consent.

Approximately three weeks after the initial email was sent to the counselors and advisors, a follow-up email was sent expressing appreciation to those who had completed the survey and encouraging those who had not to complete the survey (see Appendix C). Due to the small rate of return a $50 double award was added to a third email. Included in all emails was a new link survey and informed consent notice. After six weeks, a final email was sent that included a request to participate. Data collected were stored under appropriate security conditions and password-protected so that only the researcher had access to the data.

Demographic Information

Demographic variables such as age, gender, ethnicity, level of education, and years of experience were obtained from a self-report section of the electronic survey (see Appendix D).
Data Analysis

As discussed earlier in this chapter, the independent variable was perceptions of organizational culture (clan, adhocracy, hierarchy, market) in higher education institutions. Cameron and Quinn (2011) described these cultures as follows: In the clan culture there is a family-like environment in which employees readily participate in achieving the goals of the organization. The adhocracy culture is described as being responsive to a changing environment through “adaptability, flexibility, and creativity” (p. 49). The hierarchy culture is characterized by “clear lines of decision-making authority” (p. 42). The marked culture is dominated by “competitiveness and productivity” (p. 44). The dependent variable is the organizational commitment (affective, continuance, normative) of college advisors and counselors who provide support to at-risk college students. Meyer and Allen (1990) described commitment as follows: Affective commitment is the identification and emotional attachment to an organization; continuance commitment is based on investments such as retirement benefits that make it difficult for an employee to leave an organization; and normative commitment is staying with the organization because it is the right thing to do. The purpose of this study was to investigate the following research question:

1. Is there a relationship between perceptions of organizational culture and affective, continuance, or normative commitment to their respective higher education institutions among college counselors and advisors who provide counseling and advising to at-risk college students in the Western and Northeastern United States?

Exploratory Data Analysis

Once the raw data were downloaded from the Qualtrics website the following sequence was employed in analyzing the data to answer the research question. SPSS was used to complete
exploratory data analysis and to clean the data. Exploratory data analysis was used to examine the data for abnormalities, including missing data, out of range responses and normality of interval scaled variables, as well as to develop a thorough understanding of the data received.

Missing data were a primary issue, with 43 of 143 respondents not answering any of the items for both organizational culture and organizational commitment. In addition, four of the respondents did not answer any of the organizational commitment items. Since 47 respondents’ data would not provide any meaningful information about organizational cultures and/or commitment, those respondents were excluded. Ultimately, data for 96 individuals were deemed acceptable for inclusion in the analysis. Further analysis of the data for the 96 individuals indicated missing data for some items. The number of items for which there were no responses ranged from 1 to 3 on the organizational cultures and organizational commitment scales.

In consultation with personnel at the Statistical Consulting Center at Penn State (March 11, 2014), missing data for the organizational culture items and missing data for the organizational commitment variables were replaced.

According to McDonald, Thurston, and Nelson (2000), deleting observations with missing data inevitably represents a loss of information which decreases the statistical power of the analysis. An alternative to deleting such individuals was to replace the missing values. According to Huisman (2000), imputation is a popular missing data replacement procedure because it allows the use of standard complete-data methods of analysis with the filled-in data (p. 331). Huisman stated that such procedures can also bias results so that care must be taken to preserve the relationships among items (p. 333).

McDonald et al. (2000) discussed five commonly utilized missing data replacement procedures. The item mean substitution procedure replaces missing values with the mean of the
item across the observations (p. 74). Accordingly, it “reduces variance in the item because all substituted values are equal to a constant” (p. 74). In consultation with personnel at the Statistical Consulting Center at Penn State, a decision was made to use the *random item mean substitution* to replace the missing values. According to McDonald et al., this method overcomes variation reduction problems in the item mean substitution but does not greatly increase the random error as the random number is located all around the mean. This procedure was conducted through the use of *R*, an integrated suite of software facilities for data manipulation, calculation and graphical display.

The data were subsequently analyzed using block regression, where block one consisted of demographic factors and block two consisted of organizational culture subscale scores. These scores represented summated Likert scale values and were treated as approximating interval scale values.

Statistical assumptions for using multiple regression (ordinary least squares) were examined using the SPSS Explore program which provides information regarding skewness and kurtosis values for distributions in addition to box plots for identification of outliers. Distributions for interval scale variables were found to be acceptably normal with no outliers noted. Collinearity diagnostics were examined when the regression analysis results were obtained, and no collinearity issues were apparent when examining tolerance values and condition index information, per guidelines suggested by Tabachnick and Fidel (2007).
Chapter 4

Results

As stated in earlier chapters, the purpose of this study was to examine the nature of the relationship between each of four organizational culture components (clan, hierarchy, adhocracy, market) and three organizational commitment subscale values in a sample of academic administrators from Educational Opportunity Programs whose roles included counseling and advising. In addition, this study examined the influence of personal characteristics on the relationships between organizational culture and commitment. Educational Opportunity Programs are designed to provide services to students who may need additional support to succeed in a higher education environment. The results presented in this chapter are in response to the following overarching research question:

What are the relationships between affective, continuance, and normative commitment scores when examined by organizational culture type, while simultaneously controlling for individual characteristics consisting of years of experience in the current role, highest education level, gender, age, and ethnicity?

This study utilized online surveys delivered through Qualtrics, an internet-based resource for collecting data. This chapter includes a summary of the data analysis results from the online survey. These data were analyzed further and summarized as: (a) characteristics of respondents, (b) summary descriptive statistics for the variables utilized in the analysis, and (c) bivariate relationships between the variables. The final data analysis includes hierarchical multiple regression analyses.
Characteristics of Respondents

An overall descriptive profile of the study respondents is provided in Table 4.1. A majority (68.8%) were female. With regard to the ethnicity of respondents, about one-third (35.4%) were Caucasian and one-third (34.3%) were African American. Approximately one-third (36.5%) were 53–65 years of age and one-third (31.3%) were 37–45 years old. About two-thirds (65.6%) reported a master’s degree as their highest level of education and 21.9% held a doctoral degree.

Table 4.1

Descriptive Profile of Participants (n = 96)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–36 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37–45 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46–52 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53–65 years</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 years or older</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America Indian or Alaska native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian or White</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Descriptive Statistics for Organizational Commitment and Culture

Summary information for perceived organizational commitment and organizational culture appears in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2

*Overall Descriptive Summary of Organizational Culture and Commitment (n = 96)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and Subscale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhocracy</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Scale: 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = somewhat disagree; 4 = neither agree or disagree; 5 = somewhat agree; 6 = agree; and 7 = strongly agree.

The mean values for the four organizational culture subscales were relatively similar, ranging from the value for open culture (m= 4.94, sd = 1.42) to a high for rational culture (m =
5.36; \( sd = 1.19 \)). In general, the mean values for the four culture subscales clustered around a “somewhat agree” response on the response scale. The three commitment subscale means ranged from a low for continuance commitment \( (m = 3.88; sd = 1.36) \) to a high for affective commitment \( (m = 4.72; sd = 1.36) \).

A contingency table provides the number and percentage of participants classified into subgroups across multiple variables (see Table 4.3). The subscale in which a respondent was placed by the researcher was based on one criterion. Simply, the researcher consulted the *TCM Employee Commitment Survey Academic Users Guide 2004*, which stated that for each person the commitment subscale for which the respondent had the highest scores indicated stronger commitment. The same general criterion was used in deciding in which organizational culture subscale a respondent would be placed. O’Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991) indicated that “the ability to assess relevant aspects of both person and culture is at the center of a controversy over the degree to which personality or context variables explain attitudes and behavior” (p. 488). This research was based on a sub-group of higher education administrators across colleges and universities numbering one or more in various institutions. In most measures of culture, stronger emphasis was shown to exist, with more or less emphasis among the four culture types. The cultures with the highest scores were of interest in this study. The basis for the values acquired was the Competing Values Framework as developed by Kalliath, Bluedorn and Strube (1999). All means were calculated by dividing the sums of the individual scale item by the number of items in each scale. However, the intention was not to categorize individuals into only one of four culture types (A. C. Bluedorn, personal communication, January 21, 2014).

Typically, organizational culture helps differentiate the culture of the overall organization from the values, preferences, and inclinations of individuals (personal culture) and
from the language, norms, and philosophies of a nation or civilization (societal culture). Most organizational cultures are like holograms. In each separate element in a holographic image, unique information exists that differentiates that particular element from all others. Yet each element also contains common information from which the entire organizational image can be reproduced. The current study did not develop an overall organizational profile of the organizational profile. Organizational culture as used in the context of this study simply is the individual’s personal perception of the culture in the organization for which they work.

Table 4.3

*Contingency Table for Organizational Culture and Commitment (n = 96)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Continuance</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within commitment</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhocracy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within commitment</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within commitment</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within commitment</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within commitment</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the contingency table, for example, a total of 20 individuals were of the clan culture and primarily affective commitment components—that is 47% of all affective individuals. Overall, the most common organizational commitment type was affective and the most common organizational culture type was clan. The most common combination was affective – clan. The continuance and normative individuals were primarily evenly distributed in terms of numbers in each group (27 and 26, respectively); however, 41% of the continuance individuals were of the market culture and 46% of the normative individuals were of the clan culture. Additionally, someone in a continuance commitment is unlikely to be in the hierarchy culture. Data regarding a breakdown in organizational commitment across respondents’ background variables are summarized in Tables 4.4 and 4.5.

Table 4.4

Descriptive Statistics for Organizational Commitment Scales by Experience and Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristic</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Continuance</th>
<th>Normative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years’ Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.06 (2.24)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 5 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.57 (.806)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.22 (1.44)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 20 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.05 (1.29)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – or more</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.89 (1.02)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Education Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.33 (–)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.81 (1.47)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>(−)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All survey questions are evaluated based on a 1-7 discrete scale. Response Scale for Commitment Subscales: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Slightly Disagree; 4 = Undecided; 5 = Slightly Agree; 6 = Agree; 7 = Strongly Agree.

In Table 4.4, looking at the mean affective commitment score for those with 10–20 years of work experience, the mean (5.05) was higher than for those with 1–3 years of experience (4.06), with respective standard deviations of 2.24 and 1.29, respectively. This same group of participants with 10 to 20 years of work experience also averaged a higher normative commitment score (4.71) with a standard deviation of 1.10. Participants with 5 to 10 years of experience (4.71) had the highest average continuance score (4.15) with a standard deviation of 1.00.

Also in Table 4.4, participants with Bachelor’s degrees scored slightly higher on average (4.81) than participants with Master’s degrees (4.71) for affective commitment and both had similar standard deviations (1.47 and 1.19) respectively. Those with Bachelor’s degree had higher mean normative scores (5.02) than those with Doctorate degrees (4.02) though they have similar spread (sd = 1.21). Participants with associates and professional degrees were not considered in this chart because the numbers of responses were low.

Data regarding the composition of those who responded to the survey instruments arranged by gender, age, and racial and ethnic identity are presented in Table 3.
Table 4.5.

_Descriptive Statistics for Organizational Commitment Scales by Gender, Age and Ethnicity_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristic</th>
<th>Commitment Subscales</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affective N Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Continuance N Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Normative N Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29 4.47 (1.40)</td>
<td>29 3.74 (1.38)</td>
<td>29 4.08 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66 4.82 (1.35)</td>
<td>66 4.01 (1.19)</td>
<td>66 4.52 (1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 29</td>
<td>4 4.63 (1.06)</td>
<td>4 2.88 (1.01)</td>
<td>4 5.13 (.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 36</td>
<td>8 4.74 (.835)</td>
<td>8 3.86 (.982)</td>
<td>8 4.11 (.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 – 45</td>
<td>30 4.44 (1.34)</td>
<td>30 4.04 (1.04)</td>
<td>30 4.20 (.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 – 52</td>
<td>15 4.90 (1.09)</td>
<td>15 4.46 (.907)</td>
<td>15 4.56 (.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 – 65</td>
<td>35 4.91 (1.40)</td>
<td>35 3.69 (1.08)</td>
<td>35 4.45 (.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 years and older</td>
<td>3 4.40 (2.01)</td>
<td>3 3.00 (1.42)</td>
<td>3 4.22 (.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial/Ethnic Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or</td>
<td>2 5.42 (.118)</td>
<td>2 5.00 (.471)</td>
<td>2 4.53 (.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6 4.50 (1.87)</td>
<td>6 4.17 (1.22)</td>
<td>6 4.39 (1.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>33 4.49 (1.93)</td>
<td>33 3.46 (1.32)</td>
<td>33 4.28 (1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian or White</td>
<td>34 5.01 (1.27)</td>
<td>34 4.25 (1.05)</td>
<td>34 4.58 (1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>14 4.76 (1.46)</td>
<td>14 3.57 (1.50)</td>
<td>14 4.14 (1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>7 4.33 (1.32)</td>
<td>7 4.14 (.915)</td>
<td>7 4.21 (1.58)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All survey questions are evaluated based on a 1-7 discrete scale. Response Scale for Commitment Subscales: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Slightly Disagree; 4 = Undecided; 5 = Slightly Agree; 6 = Agree; 7 = Strongly Agree.

According to Table 4.5 females had a slightly higher affective commitment mean (4.82) than males (4.47) and they had similar standard deviations (1.35 and 1.40, respectively). Females also scored higher on average (4.52) than males (4.08) for normative commitment, with
similar standard deviations (1.17 and 1.21, respectively). Both females (4.01) and males (3.74) had low continuance commitment scores, with standard deviations of 1.19 and 1.38, respectively.

Participants between the ages of 46 and 65 scored slightly higher on average (4.90 for 46 to 52 years, and 4.91 for 53 to 65 years) than participants aged 65 and over (4.40) for affective commitment. The mean continuance commitment score was higher for those in the 46 to 52 age group (4.42) than for those who ranged in ages from 25 to 29 (2.88) with similar standard deviations (.907 and 1.01, accordingly). For all age groups, normative scores ranged from 4.1 to 4.5 with standard deviations ranging from 1.07 to 1.31.

Looking at racial and ethnic identity, Caucasian participants scored higher on average (5.01) than the Multiracial group (4.33) for affective commitment with similar standard deviations (1.27 and 1.32, respectively). Caucasian participants also scored slightly higher on average (4.58) than Hispanic or Latino (4.15) participants for normative commitment.

**Bivariate Correlations between Organizational Culture and Commitment**

The bivariate relationships between organizational culture subscale values and organizational commitment subscale values were examined using Pearson correlation. Pearson correlation was used because subscale scores were considered to be approaching the interval scale of measurement data (Huck, 2008). Relationships between nominal scale of measurement variables, such as gender, and the subscale scores were analyzed using point biserial correlation (Warner, 2013). The results of the Pearson correlations and point biserial correlations are reported in Table 4.6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Clan Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Market Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Adhocracy Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Hierarchy Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Affective Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Continuance Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Normative Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Educational Level Correlation</th>
<th>Gender Point Biserial Correlation</th>
<th>Ethnicity Point Biserial Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>.778*</td>
<td>.815*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhocracy</td>
<td>.878*</td>
<td>.727*</td>
<td>.516*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>.539*</td>
<td>.727*</td>
<td>.516*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>.408*</td>
<td>.365*</td>
<td>.365*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.240*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.230*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>.363*</td>
<td>.248*</td>
<td>.258*</td>
<td>.207*</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level (0=MS or Lower and 1 = PhD and Professional)</td>
<td>Point biserial Correlation</td>
<td>-.202*</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>-.176*</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (0=Male and 1=Female)</td>
<td>Point biserial Correlation</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.202*</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (0 + All others and 1=African American)</td>
<td>Point biserial Correlation</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.270*</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>-.238*</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).
Bivariate Correlations between Culture and Commitment Subscale Scores

The results of the bivariate correlation analysis revealed the direction and magnitude of relationships according to guidelines developed by Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1988). Pearson correlations were completed among the three organizational commitment (affective, continuance, and normative) scales and the four organizational culture (clan, market, adhocracy, hierarchy) scales on data for 96 college and university administrators. Affective commitment scores were significantly (p < .001) positively correlated at moderate levels with scores on the four culture subscales (clan = .41; market = .37; adhocracy = .37 and hierarchy = .24). Normative commitment subscale scores were significantly (p < .05) positively correlated with the four culture subscales (clan = .36; market = .25; adhocracy = .26 and hierarchy = .21). This means, for example, that as the overall scores for affective commitment increase, the overall scores for the clan, market, adhocracy and hierarchy cultures increase. The same reasoning was applied to normative commitment. Continuance commitment subscale scores were not significantly (p > .05) correlated with any of the four organizational subscale scores.

Bivariate Correlations between Respondent Background Factors and Commitment

Point biserial correlations were completed among three organizational commitment (affective, continuance, and normative) scales and education level on data for 96 college and university administrators. There were no statistically significant (p > .05) point biserial correlations between highest education level completed and affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment scores (Table 4.6). This means that there was no evidence that a relationship existed between organizational commitment and education level. The same correlation was completed among the three organizational commitment scales and gender. There were no statistically significant (p > .05) point biserial correlations between
gender and affective commitment and continuance commitment scores. There was a significant
correlation between gender and normative commitment (point biserial = .20, p < .05). This
means that as the scores increase for normative commitment, the scores increase for gender.
Females tended to have higher normative commitment scores as compared to males. Point
biserial correlations were completed among the three organizational commitment scales and
ethnicity. Ethnicity was not significantly correlated (p > .05) with either affective commitment
or normative commitment. There was an inverse relationship between ethnicity and continuance
commitment (point biserial = -.23, p < .05). This means that as the scores decreased for
continuance commitment, the scores decreased for ethnicity. African American respondents
tended to report lower continuance commitment scores as compared to all other ethnicities.

**Bivariate Correlations between Respondent Background Factors and Culture**

Point biserial correlations were completed among four organizational culture (clan, market, adhocracy, hierarchy) scales and education level on data for 96 college and university administrators. The results indicated an inverse relationship between education level and the clan (point biserial = -.20, p < .05) and adhocracy (point biserial = -.18, p < .05) cultures. This means that as the scores decreased for the clan and adhocracy cultures, the scores for education level decreased, too.

Using the guidelines from Hinkle et al., there were relatively moderate to high
correlations among the four types (sub scales) of organizational culture. For example, there was
a positive, high correlation between the clan culture score and the adhocracy culture score (r = .88, p < 0.001) and a positive, moderately high correlation between adhocracy culture scores and hierarchy culture scores (r = .52, p < 0.001). So, those who had high adhocracy scores tended to have high scores for the clan and hierarchy cultures as well.
Regression Analysis Examining Influence of Demographic and Culture Variables on Commitment

Block regression, a class of hierarchical multiple regression, was used to assess the interactive influence of demographic variables (Block 1) and culture variables (Block 2) on the three commitment subscale scores. This strategy was used to isolate the significance of the influence of culture and the demographic variables on each of the commitment subscales (affective, continuous and normative commitment). Table 4.7 summarizes the results for each of the three regression models developed.
Table 4.7. Regression Results for Commitment Subscale Scores Regressed on Demographic and Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block &amp; Variable</th>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
<th>Continuance Commitment</th>
<th>Normative Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta (sig)</td>
<td>Beta (sig)</td>
<td>Beta (sig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (YRS)</td>
<td>.036 (.818)</td>
<td>.039 (.733)</td>
<td>.080 (.609)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (YRS)</td>
<td>.212 (.141)</td>
<td>.226 (.088)</td>
<td>-.032 (.828)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (0=All Others; 1=African American)</td>
<td>-.099 (.428)</td>
<td>-.127 (.259)</td>
<td>-.271 (.034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level (0=MS or less; 1=Ph.D. &amp; professional)</td>
<td>-.026 (.849)</td>
<td>.185 (.144)</td>
<td>-.067 (.627)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (0=Male; 1=Female)</td>
<td>.178 (.099)</td>
<td>.187 (.052)</td>
<td>.044 (.684)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education x Ethnicity</td>
<td>-.082 (.571)</td>
<td>-.270 (.046)</td>
<td>.042 (.776)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>.588 (.008)</td>
<td>.100 (.694)</td>
<td>.894 (&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>.196 (.350)</td>
<td>.232 (.343)</td>
<td>-.138 (.520)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhocracy</td>
<td>-.241 (.272)</td>
<td>-.263 (.304)</td>
<td>-.459 (.044)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>-.015 (.916)</td>
<td>.022 (.897)</td>
<td>.092 (.531)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.494</td>
<td>4.240</td>
<td>.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.494</td>
<td>4.240</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td>1.519</td>
<td>3.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


First, affective commitment was regressed on the two respective blocks of variables. Demographic variables when entered by themselves did not explain a significant amount of the difference in affective commitment scores (F=1.494, p = .190). When culture (block 2) was added to the demographic variables the model was statistically significant (F=4.240, p = .001). The combined effect of education and ethnicity (beta -.270), and clan culture (beta .588) significantly influenced affective commitment scores. The demographic variables alone explained 9.5% of the variability in affective commitment. When the four culture variables were added to the equation (Block 2), they explained an additional 24.9% of the variability in affective commitment. Together, the demographic and culture variables explained 34.4% (9.5 + 24.9 = 34.4) of the variability in affective commitment. Thus, the culture variables were a relatively strong predictor of affective commitment, and the culture variable with the strongest prediction was clan culture. When the education levels and ethnicity are further analyzed and their combined interactions to affective commitment are taken into consideration, African Americans with Masters and Ph.D.’s have lower scores for affective commitment than White individuals. This relationship is shown in Figure 4.1.
Second, normative commitment was regressed on the two respective blocks of variables. Demographic variables when entered by themselves did not explain a significant degree of the difference in normative commitment scores (F=1.519, p = .182). When culture (block 2) was added to the demographic variables the model was statistically significant (F=3.561, p = .001). Years of experience (beta = .290), gender (beta = .265), clan culture score (beta = .894) and market culture score (beta = -.459) statistically influenced normative commitment scores. Specifically, for the dummy coded variable gender, females when compared to males had higher normative commitment.
scores when accounting for the influence of other variables. The demographic variables alone explained 9.7% of the variability in normative commitment. When the four culture variables were added to the equation (Block 2), they explained an additional 20.8% of the variability in normative commitment. Together, the demographic and culture variables explained 30.5% (9.7 + 20.8 = 30.5) of the variability in normative commitment. Thus, the culture variables were a relatively strong predictor of normative commitment, and the culture variable with the strongest prediction was clan culture.

A suppressor variable in multiple regressions typically has a fairly low or no significant bivariate correlation value with the dependent variable. A suppressor variable also frequently changes the direction of the relationship (positive or negative correlation value) in the bivariate analysis with the dependent variable when compared to the direction of the relationship between the same two variables in the regression analysis. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007, p. 154) indicated that a suppressor variable is “defined not by its own regression weight, but by its enhancement of the effects of other variables in the set of IVs.” The suppressor variable usually is highly correlated with one or more of the predictor variables and will suppress irrelevant variance in the predictor variable(s).

In this current analysis adhocracy culture scores represented a suppressor variable when examined in the analysis with the dependent variables related to organizational commitment. This was especially the case when examining normative commitment. A follow-up examination revealed that adhocracy culture scores were highly correlated with another independent variable, human culture scale scores (r = .878, p <.001). Although the regression analysis diagnostics indicated no collinearity issue, the reality is that there was a suppressor variable influence. The suppressor effect existed between the adhocracy
culture scores and human culture scores. When the human culture variable was removed, adhocracy no longer was a suppressor variable; however, the model R square value for normative commitment decreased by about 12%.

**Differentiation between Affective Commitment and Normative Commitment**

Some believe (Bergman, 2006; Meyer & Parfyonova, 2010) that the affective commitment and the normative commitment subscales have not been as empirically differentiated as would be theoretically expected. In repeated studies the discriminant validity between affective and normative commitment has been clouded, and according to Bergman the related literature has inadequately addressed many issues relating to construct differentiation. In this study a high linear relationship occurred between the affective commitment subscale values and the normative commitment subscale values ($r = .744$). Obviously there was a fairly large amount of shared variance between these two psychological constructs (R square = .554).

In summary, this study was designed to ascertain how perceptions of organizational cultural influence organizational commitment, especially among counselors and related administrators who provide educational support for at-risk students. The data for this analysis produced significant results for both affective and normative commitment. The clan culture, education and ethnicity yielded a significant relationship with affective commitment. Years of experience, gender (especially women), and clan culture were all predictors of normative commitment. Chapter 5 provides the implications of these results.
This chapter presents a summary, interpretations and conclusions, followed by recommendations for future research and practice.

**Summary**

Herr (1999) in his book, *Counseling in a Dynamic Society*, emphasized that how counselors function is to some degree representative of the “characteristics and missions of the settings in which they work” (p. 329). In this study the culture of interest was that experienced by academic administrators, specifically counselors and advisors or related administrators in Comprehensive Support Programs. This group of administrators assists at-risk students who have limited wealth and who benefit from academic support. Moxley, Najor-Durack, and Dumbrigue (2013) stated that such administrators assist students in “defining a life and career direction through higher education … and moving into adulthood as a contributing citizen” (p. 2). According to Thayer (2000), such students are among the “least likely to be retained through degree completion” (p. 3).

The aim of this study was to provide insight into the constructs of organizational commitment and culture and to assess the feasibility of a relationship between the two among higher education administrators. Many researchers (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Lok & Crawford, 1999; Schneider, 1990; Tierney, 1988; Trice & Beyer, 1993) have noted the extensive examination of organizational culture and commitment. The research involving both has varied, however, primarily convincingly about the role of each in institutions. The two concepts have proven to be difficult to define although organizational commitment is shown to
have a greater progressive conceptualization. According to Allen and Meyer (2000) the concept of organizational commitment began to have a strong presence in the 1980s based on a universal consensus among many researchers on the multidimensionality of commitment and increased interest in the subject. Viewing organizational commitment as multidimensional provides several possibilities as to why individuals become committed.

In general researchers have agreed that organizational culture consists of all or some variations of norms, values, assumptions, and beliefs shared by organizational members, considered a challenge due to the abstract nature of these elements. Maasson (1996) defined an academic culture as a set of “attitudes, beliefs, and values that integrate a specific group of academics” (p. 158). Among areas of application, he stated that an understanding of a definition can contribute to relationships between institutional administration and academic decision-makers in universities and colleges. Schein (2010), in chapter 1 of his book, *The Concept Of Organizational Culture: Why Bother?* on organizational culture and leadership, indicated the power of cultural forces and the need to understand the implications of these forces both within the organization and in ourselves (p. 7). He further indicated that throughout life we deal with organizations and groups and at times “we continue to find it amazingly difficult to understand and justify much of what we observe and experience in our organizational life” and that the concept of culture helps to explain all of these phenomena and to “normalize” them (p.7). According to Alvesson (2013), “managerial work ... calls for careful consideration of those interacted with and communicated to” (p. 13).

In addition to defining the concepts of organizational commitment and culture, questions about how to measure the concepts are being constantly debated. Commonly used research methods are in-depth interviews and participation observation and quantitatively oriented
research involving questionnaires with the debate frequently ending in whatever basically encourages organizational members to interpret their organizations’ culture.

The sample for this study consisted of 96 counselors, advisors, or related administrators; 69% were female while 30% were male. The respondents primarily ranged between 37 and 65 years of age. Approximately one-third each were Black or African American and Caucasian or White. The final one-third consisted of American Indian or Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders, Asian and Multiracial.

A class of hierarchical multiple regression, block regression, was conducted to determine the relationship between organizational culture and affective, continuance and normative commitment and demographic variables. The results identified a number of significant findings between organizational commitment and culture and years’ experience, gender and education and ethnicity; however, in the regression analysis there was a suppressor variable influence. This effect is discussed in detail in chapter 4. Even given this influence this study contributes to understanding of how perceptions of organizational culture impact organizational commitment. This study expanded the understanding of college and university organizational culture and its impact on commitment to an institution among academic administrators.

Conclusions

In this study, the model for the investigation of organizational commitment was based on Allen and Meyer’s (1990) and Meyer and Allen’s (1991) three components of organizational commitment—a multidimensional approach. As described they are: (1) affective attachment or a desire to remain with an organization, (2) continuance—perceived cost associated with leaving the organization and (3) normative—an obligation to remain with the organization. In general, Meyer and Allen (1991) described commitment as a psychological state (“i.e., feelings
and/or beliefs concerning the employee’s relationship with an organization”) (p. 62). Although members of an organization can experience all three components to varying degrees, they are also expected to exert different effects on work behavior (Ashkanasy, Broadfoot, & Falkus, 1993).

This study was further based on the typology developed by Cameron and Quinn (1999, 2006) because of its rich history. The basis for their typology was the Competing Values Framework which was initially developed by Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981) to measure organizational effectiveness. This device can be applied to work in organizations at multiple levels. It has been expanded to assess such topics as organizational culture because it is assumed to represent individuals’ beliefs about organizations. According to Cameron and Quinn (1999), it contains fundamental values that exist in organizations. Cameron (2008) described the four cultures within this framework as: (1) clan – like an extended family, organization held together by “loyalty, tradition, and collaboration”, (2) adhocracy – characterized as a “dynamic entrepreneurial, and creative workplace” (3) market – “results oriented” and (4) hierarchy – described as “formalized and structured” (pp. 433–434).

Helfrich, Li, Mohr, Meterko, and Sales (2007) indicated that “one expects the dominant culture to manifest itself in the view of employees at all levels of the organization” (p. 2).

A significant relationship was found in this study between affective commitment and the clan culture and education and ethnicity. The association was found in a positive direction with affective commitment (Beta=.588) and a negative direction with education and ethnicity (Beta= -.270). A considerable amount of research suggests a relationship between affective commitment and the clan culture. It is considered the most desirable relationship for high-performance institutions. The clan culture has qualities that include being warm and caring,
loyalty and tradition, and innovation and development (Helfrich et al., 2007). Affective commitment has long been the focus of business leaders and organizational scholars due to the belief that employees with affective commitment are much more productive and less likely to leave an organization (Morrow, 2011, p. 20). Affective commitment as one of the three forms of commitment included in Meyer and Allen’s (1991) three-component model refers to a “desire to maintain membership in the organization that develops largely as the result of work experiences that create feelings of comfort and personal competence” (p. 82, in summary). Together, given the frameworks of interest in this study, the fact that Comprehensive Studies Program administrators indicated relationships between the clan culture and affective commitment suggests their belief that they work in a family-like atmosphere and experience a sense of belongingness and identification with their institution. The occurrence of studies in higher education indicating such a relationship is sparse.

Related studies that focused on organizational culture and commitment viewed organizational commitment according to one of two approaches; unidimensional (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1979) or multidimensional (Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997). Poppens ((2000), for example, assessed the relationship between a unidimensional definition of organizational commitment utilizing the instrument developed by Mowday, Porter, and Steers, and organizational culture among faculty in private colleges. She found a relationship between both organizational commitment and culture.

Few studies indicated a multidimensional approach in higher education. Of the few, Lemaster (2004), utilizing Meyer and Allen’s (1997) three-component commitment model found a relationship between organizational culture and affective and normative commitment at the university level among faculty, staff, and administration. Short (2013) assessed the
degree of relationship among clan culture, leader-member exchange, and affective organizational commitment and found those relationships to be statistically significant. She also indicated that in assessing the degree of relationship between the clan and adhocracy culture, no differences were evident in their relationship to affective commitment.

In this study, when education years and ethnicity and organizational commitment were assessed separately; there were no significant relationships. When the variables were combined there was a significant negative relationship with affective commitment. Engle (2010) indicated a significant relationship between age and education level and all three commitment components for both full- and part-time faculty in community colleges. Niehoff (1997) assessed the relationship among job satisfaction, organizational commitment and mission values congruence among university faculty. The instrument included a constructed measure for mission values congruence. He found a relationship between organizational commitment and age, length of employment and religious affiliation.

This assessment also found a significant relationship between normative commitment and clan and adhocracy cultures and years of experience. The association was in a positive direction with normative commitment and the clan culture (Beta = .894) and a negative direction with the adhocracy culture (Beta= -.459). The adhocracy culture emphasizes flexibility, encourages broad participation by employees, and emphasizes teamwork and empowerment. (Helfrich et al., 2007, p. 3). Normative commitment, as one of the three forms of commitment included in Meyer and Allen’s (1991) three-component model, “reflects an obligation to remain resulting from internalization of a loyalty norm and/or the receipt of favors that require repayment” (Helfrich et al., 2007, p. 3) Lemaster (2004) found a relationship between organizational culture and normative commitment at the university level.
with faculty, staff, and administration. Findings also included significant relationships between years of experience and gender and normative commitment. In Niehoff’s (1997) study, when gender was combined with either age or years of employment, the relationship was significant. The directions of the associations were both positive (Beta = .290) (Beta = .265).

In higher education as in most research on this subject, research has basically spanned concepts thought useful in a particular field. Keller (2012) conducted research on organizational commitment and employee position. Participants were university employees including faculty, staff, and other administrators. Analysis of variance identified significant relationships among affective, continuance, and normative commitment and position. Baker-Tate (2010) explored the relationship between organizational patterns in higher education among student services professionals. This qualitative study examined factors that influence mid-level student professionals’ decision to remain with an organization. Using phenomenological analysis, the results indicated a need for open dialogue between these professionals and university administrators. Although not necessarily in higher education, McInnis, Meyer and Feldman (2008) conducted research on psychological contract features and affective and normative commitment. Psychological contract was defined as “individual’s belief in the terms and conditions of a reciprocal exchange agreement between the focal person and another group” (p. 166). Commitment was measured utilizing Meyer and Allen’s (1991) three-component model. Across two diverse samples, they found “patterns of relations between the perceived features of the psychological contract and employee’ affective and normative commitment to the organization” (p. 176).
Recommendations

Recommendations for Further Study

Studies suggest a link between perceptions of organizational culture and affective and normative commitments to an institution. This study reaffirmed the research to an extent and also supplemented research by providing data on the underlying dimension of organizational culture and organizational commitment. Given the results of the literature search and the findings from this study, several recommendations can be made for further studies.

1. Organizational culture theories can be diverse and complex. Implications for further research may bring into question other theories and practices. Different theories have different purposes and as a result different validity criteria and implications. In this study commitment manifested itself through organization culture. However, it could have resulted from the influence of environmental contingencies such as the sharing of cultural bonds with other members of their programs or across programs. Consider, for example, Bacharach and Lawler (1980) and their perspective on the power of politics in organizations. One of the two mentioned foundations for understanding organizational politics was coalitions. They defined coalitions as “the organizational groupings around which politics are carried out within organizations” (p. 213). Reichers (1985) contended that organizational commitment is identification with the goals of internal and external groups connected to an organization. Central to his view about commitment is that it consists of multiple commitments that stem from an individual’s connection to various groups. Bristor (1988) indicated that coalitions are informal groups that utilize their influence to achieve departmental as well as personal goals (p. 563). Through these coalitions members in the organizations
become more secure in their environment. An established “comfort level” formed by coalitions could impact the commitment of members to an organization. Dutton and Webster (1988) suggested that it is implied within coalition theories that a collective interest provides the opportunity to combine resources which improves the “knowledge and influence base for resolving an issue” (p. 664). The strength of such coalitions formed over time may act as a moderating influence on one’s commitment to an organization.

2. The participants were a group of college and university administrators who specifically provided educational services to students from low socioeconomic families. In one particular state involved in this study, the number of such programs decreased by approximately 50%. According to a Postsecondary Report, Mortenson (1998) stated that in the 1960s and 1970s disparities in poverty and higher education systems were observed, but since then we lost interest and commitment. Both loss of budgets and positions may have impacted interest among some participants in this research.

3. According to Randall, Fedor, and Longenecker (1990), “different conceptualizations of organizational commitment may have quite different implications for on-the-job behavior” (p. 214). Hence behavioral outcomes previously selected for study may or may not accurately reflect the ways employees express commitment. Randall et al. implied that the “selection of outcome variables reflects what researchers think should relate to the organization construct. Organizational commitment and organizational culture conceptualizations were thought to be best conceptualized via Meyer, Allen, and Smith’s (1993) three-component commitment survey and Cameron
and Quinn’s (2006) Competing Values Framework as developed by Kalliat, Bluedorn, and Strube (1999) — both widely used instruments. Some participants may have felt that the survey items were not precisely applicable to their environments, thus accounting in part for the low number of responses. Cox (1991) indicated that organizations are becoming increasingly diverse in terms of ethnicity (p. 34). Further, individuals are being advised to create “multicultural” organizations (p. 34). His question was: “what are the characteristics of such organizations...? (p. 34). He provided examples, including pluralism, full structural and informal networks, absence of prejudice and discrimination (p. 39). It is important to have the correct method and instrument because they provide important information about the theories under study.

**Recommendations for Practice**

An important overall finding is that a favorable attitude toward an institution may maximize energies toward reaching goals and engaging in institutional values. Counselors and advisors in Comprehensive Support Programs face considerable challenges in their roles with faculty, staff, students and other administrators. Baker-Tate (2010) carefully identified several frustrations associated with the roles and responsibilities attributed to these positions. They included: (1) conveying the importance of their efforts to the larger university community, (2) lack of recognition of their abilities from various administrators, (3) support for career development, and (4) student demands for additional programs and services. (p. 4).

When working in this career field some years ago, the same descriptions offered by Baker-Tate (2010 were found among administrators observed by this researcher. This
group evinced a tireless effort to engage students wholeheartedly in their academic surroundings. Baker-Tate suggested that individuals who have chosen careers in helping fields have different motivations that influence their commitment levels. Yet this study, similar to others, revealed that affective and normative commitments are related to perceptions of culture. Essentially, environments of a clan nature, described as open, friendly and more like a family, with leaders who acted as mentors, were found to be related to affective and normative commitment. The benefits of such commitments have been expressed in a number of ways. Meyer and Parfyonova (2010) indicated that normative commitment was viewed as a “strong moral underpinning” that transcends self-interest and benefits the broader collective and that authentic transformational/charismatic leaders can do a great deal to facilitate this process (p. 292). Concealed in such a search is the notion of the level at which such commitment exists. Clearly, low levels of commitment can facilitate the accomplishment of goals but high levels of commitment can propel institutions beyond their goals to join the higher ranks of their fellow institutions. Parker Ayers (2010) pointed to the need for organizations to evaluate what has bearing on an individual’s decision to make a commitment (p. 5). Morrow (2011) identified a number of tactics under study that influenced affective commitment and a personal attachment to the organization, including encouraging managers to focus on the role of organizational socialization and engagement in social support and mentoring-type activities (p. 24). Another area identified as having a strong bearing on affective commitment was organizational support for personal goals. Others included perceived organizational support, the “extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being” (p. 28). Thayer (2000) stated that
“institutions have opportunities to design environments and activities that are supportive of particular subpopulations” (p. 4).

In the United States higher education has been considered to be in a transitional state throughout its existence. During these times colleges and universities have worked to restructure their policies and procedures to accommodate a changing environment. What does this mean during times of transition for college counselors and advisors similar to those in comprehensive support programs? The general nature of programs within organizational settings is to have members work within their particular group—this is basically the way educational institutions are set up and the way things get done; somewhat in isolation. College and university counselors and advisors and related administrators must continue to find ways to impact those policies and procedures and position themselves to best contribute to the university community, a task that is not always easy for administrators who work with impoverished students. Knowing that these administrators’ existence in an institution depends on their contributions to programmatic successes cannot be understated. We cannot lose track of our positions in the overall mission of the institution even as transitions in higher education are currently more dramatic and decisions are made without our knowledge. Demanding responsibilities cannot be allowed to divert the focus from knowing how one’s organizational attitudes and commitments impact these responsibilities. In the more progressive units policies are being renewed, theories are being developed, and procedures are being implemented. The current era requires our diligent attention to the environment around us—in this research, that includes the community in higher education.
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Appendix A

**Informed Consent Document**

**Title of Investigation:** The Relationship between Perceptions of Organizational Culture and Organizational Commitment among College and University Counselors Who Provide Academic Support and Programs to At-Risk Students

**Investigator:** Shenetta J. Selden  
(814) 360-2854  
Email sjs27@psu.edu

**Purpose of the Study**
The purpose of this study is to determine if there is a relationship between perceptions of organizational culture and organizational commitment among college and university counselors who provide support to at-risk students in state comprehensive support programs. These programs are generally recognized as providing such services as study skills instruction, tutorial services, developmental courses, academic counseling, personal counseling, and career information workshops.

**Procedures**
You will be requested to complete three online surveys. Two surveys consist of a total of 50 statements and the third survey consists of 8 questions.

**Duration**
It will take approximately 30 minutes to complete the surveys.

**Statement of Confidentiality**
Your participation in this research is confidential. All data collected will be used to support the completion of my doctoral dissertation in Counselor Education. Only members of my dissertation committee will have access to the completed surveys. In the event of a publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared.

**Voluntary Participation**
Participation is voluntary. As a participant you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You may also refuse to answer any questions you do not want to answer.

**Contact for Questions**
Please contact Shenetta Selden at (814) 360-2854 or email at sjs27@psu.edu with questions or concerns about this study and your rights as a participant.

**Benefit**
It is unlikely that you will benefit directly from participation in this research; however, the research will support an understanding of the organizational behavior of counselors and advisors who assist at-risk university and college students.

**Consent Statement**

☐ I have read and understand the information in this form. Informed consent for this study is implied by the submission of the completed surveys.
Email to Program Directors

To All: Higher/Educational Opportunity and Educational Opportunity Fund Program (H/EOP/EOF) Directors and Related Administrators

I am currently a Doctoral student at The Pennsylvania State University conducting a study on perceptions of organizational culture and its impact on organizational commitment among Higher Education Opportunity, Educational Opportunity, and Educational Opportunity Fund Program (HEOP, EOP, and EOF) counselors and advisors and related administrators. This study is important because institutional culture affects our work and personal life and it is a determining factor in the success of an organization. How educational opportunity program administrators interpret institutional culture impacts the success of such institutions.

As a former Educational Opportunity Program counselor, I clearly understand the pivotal role counselors and advisors and related administrators provide in the access, retention, and graduation of program students. My dissertation acknowledges the role of H/EOP/EOF counselors and advisors and related administrators and it emphasizes the value of their work. I am conducting this study in several states including California, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.

I am requesting your assistance with surveying the counselors, advisors and related administrators in your program. Please forward this website directly to your counselors/advisors or related administrators.

https://pennstate.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_824udXas3fbQM9T

If notified, I will be glad to send the surveys directly to the administrators. Please note that their participation is completely voluntary and all responses will be kept confidential. My sincere hope is that the final results of this study add to the body of research directed toward educational opportunity program administrators in colleges and universities and that it adequately represents each of the intended states. If I can provide you with any additional information regarding my study, please contact me at (XXX) XXX-XXXX or szs7@psu.edu.

Thank you in advance for your support of this study.

Sincerely,

Shenetta Selden
Doctoral Candidate in Counselor Education
Appendix C

Email to Program Directors

To All: Higher/Educational Opportunity and Educational Opportunity Fund Program (H/EOP/EOF) Counselors/Advisors and Related Administrators

I am currently a Doctoral student at The Pennsylvania State University conducting a study on perceptions of organizational culture and its relationship to organizational commitment specifically among Higher/Educational Opportunity and Educational Opportunity Fund Program (H/EOP/EOF) Counselors/Advisors and related administrators. As a former Educational Opportunity Program Counselor, I clearly understand the pivotal role you provide in the access, retention, and graduation of students in higher education institutions. I am conducting this research as part of the requirements for my Ph.D. in Counselor Education and I am inviting you to participate as a member of this group of administrators. This research has been approved by the Office for Research Protections at Penn State.

Your participation will involve taking three surveys, including one demographic questionnaire. Each survey should take no more than 15 minutes each to complete. Please use the following anonymous link to access the survey.

https://pennstate.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_824udXas3fbQM9T

All responses completed by September 27, 2013 will be included in this study. Responses will be completely confidential; however, you do not have to answer any questions that you do not wish to. The results of the study may be published; however, your name will not be used.

Your participation in this study is voluntary and there are no direct benefits or risks in participating. Although, there may be no direct benefits to you by participating in this study, there may be some benefit in generating insight into perceptions of organizational culture as experienced by administrators who provide services specifically to educational opportunity college students. If you have any questions about this study, please contact me at xxx-xxx-xxxx or email me at szs7@psu.edu.

Thank you in advance for your participation in this study.

Sincerely,
Shenetta Selden
Doctoral Candidate
in Counselor Education

REWARD NOTIFICATION

As my appreciation for your completion of the research surveys, I am providing an opportunity for you to participate in a double drawing in the amount of $50.00 each. To be eligible, please submit via email your name and mailing address to szs7@psu.edu.

You will be notified on or shortly after October 1, 2013 if your contact information was selected for one or both of the drawings.
Appendix: D

Demographic Questionnaire

This questionnaire requests demographic information. Please click the box for the response option that represents your selection for each item.

1. What is your gender
   - Male
   - Female

2. To which age group do you belong?
   - 18-24 year olds
   - 25-29 year olds
   - 30-36 year olds
   - 37-45 year olds
   - 46-52 year olds
   - 53-65 year olds
   - 66 years and older

3. Please specify your racial/ethnic identity.
   - American Indian or Alaska Native
   - Asian
   - Black or African American
   - Caucasian or White
   - Hispanic or Latino
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

Multiracial

4. What is your highest level of education completed?

- Associate degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Doctorate degree
- Professional degree

5. Please identify your type of institution.

- Community College
- Private—4 year school
- Public—4 year school

6. What title best describes your role?

- Counselor
- Advisor
- Student Development Specialist
- Admissions Counselor
- Financial Aid Counselor
- Other

   Other
7. What best represents the primary basis for your role performance?

- Formal training
- Theoretical orientation
- Senior colleague mentoring
- Other

8. How long have you worked with comprehensive student programs?

- 1-3 years
- 3-5 years
- 5-10 years
- 10-20 years
- More than 20 years

---

The New Competing Values Scale (32-item version)

Entire groups often think positively of specific beliefs, customs, and behaviors. When these positive feelings are strong, such things are said to be valued. A group or an entire organization may have specific values if the people agree on the values.

What follow are many things that might be values in your organization. Please use the following scale to describe the extent to which each of the following possible values are operating and emphasized in your organization as a whole.

Please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking the box of one number using the 1 to 7 scale below for each item.

NOT VALUED AT ALL 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 HIGHLY VALUED
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Centralization (Where only one or a few people make most of the decisions) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2. Flexibility (making exceptions to rules) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3. Empowerment of employees to act (Allowing employees to take the initiative) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4. A task focus |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5. Efficiency, productivity, and profitability |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 6. Predictable outcomes (being confident about knowing what will happen if certain actions are taken) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 7. Participation and open discussion |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8. Outcome excellence and quality |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9. Innovation and change |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 10. Employee concerns and ideas |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 11. Human relations, teamwork and cohesion |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 12. Stability and continuity |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 13. Expansion and growth |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 14. Rules and procedures |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 15. Setting objectives and clarifying goals (stating a clear direction) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 16. Creative Problem solving |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 17. Decentralization (where many people have a say in decision making) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 18. Getting the job done |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 19. Morale |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 20. Controlling the work process |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 21. Risk Taking |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 22. Loyalty |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 23. Goal achievement |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 24. Order |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 25. Maintaining the existing system and structure |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 26. Providing the newest services, products, and techniques |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 27. Trust and openness |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 28. Hard-driving competitiveness |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 29. New Ideas |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 30. Dependability and reliability |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 31. Doing one's best |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 32. Friendliness |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
Permission is granted for the use of this instrument by Allen C. Bluedorn.

TCM Employee Commitment Survey

Instructions: Listed below is a series of statements that represent feelings that individuals might have about the organization for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the particular organization for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking the box of one number using the 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree) scale below for each item.

With respect to your own feelings about the particular organization for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking the box of one number using the 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree) scale below for each item.

(1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Slightly disagree, 4 = Undecided, 5 = Slightly agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I owe a great deal to my organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I do not feel &quot;emotionally attached&quot; to this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This organization deserves my loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I do not feel like &quot;part of the family&quot; at my organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I would feel guilty if I left my organization now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I do not feel a strong sense of &quot;belonging&quot; to my organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now
14. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me
15. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now
16. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own
17. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer
18. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire

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

Thank you for participating in the survey.

Your participation is very much appreciated!
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