DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 321 671 HE 023 689

AUTHOR Matier, Michael W.
TITLE Recruiting Faculty: Complementary Tales from Two Campuses. AIR 1990 Annual Forum Paper.
PUB DATE May 90
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (30th, Louisville, KY, May 13-16, 1990). For a related document, see "Retaining Faculty: A Tale of Two Campuses" (ED 308 786).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Choice; College Faculty; *Decision Making; Employment Opportunities; *Evaluative Thinking; *Faculty Recruitment; Fringe Benefits; Higher Education; Institutional Research; *Occupational Information; Research Universities; Teacher Employment Benefits
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum

ABSTRACT

The responses from questionnaires (N=182) given to 201 individuals who were provided an opportunity to join the faculty of two research universities (one rural, one urban) were analyzed to determine the factors influencing their decisions to join or not join. Interviews with 60% of the respondents were conducted to gather further information. Particular attention was paid to the relative weight and importance placed on the tangible, intangible, and non-work related benefits in the decision making process. Comparisons were drawn from previous faculty recruitment studies and to the complementary retention study, as well as between the urban and rural subject universities. In all, of the ten most influential factors found in the decision making process, eight were intangible benefits of employment and present in all analyses: institutional, department and associates reputations; research opportunities; teaching assignments/opportunities; career advancement opportunities, congeniality of associates; and rapport with departmental leaders. The ninth common factor was the tangible benefit "teaching/research load," and the uncommon factor found in the top ten of one of the universities was the tangible benefit of "library facilities"; in the other university it was "research funding." (19 references) (GLR)

Recruiting Faculty: Complementary Tales from Two Campuses

Michael W. Matier

Associate Director

Institutional Planning and Research

Cornell University

440 Day Hall

Ithaca, NY 14850-2801

Presented at the 30th Annual Forum

of the Association for Institutional Research

Louisville, Kentucky -- May 13 - 16, 1990

Running Head: Recruiting Faculty: Comp' nentary Tales from Two Campuses

for Management Research, Policy Analysis, and Planning

This paper was presented at the Thirtieth Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held at The Galt House, Louisville, Kentucky, May 13-16, 1990. This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC Collection of Forum Papers.

Jean Endo
Chair and Editor
Forum Publications Editorial
Advisory Committee

Abstract

This paper--a complement to "Retaining Faculty: A Tale of Two Campuses," (Matier, 1990) initially presented at the 1989 AIR Forum in Baltimore--examines the factors influencing individuals with firm offers to join the faculty at two research universities. Particular attention is paid to the relative weight and importance placed on the tangible, intangible, and non-work related benefits in the decision making process. Comparisons are drawn to previous faculty recruitment studies and to the complementary retention study, as well as between the urban and rural subject universities. Given that faculty are an institution's most valuable asset, and that in some fields they are either already in short supply or will be soon, the methods and findings of this research should interest those concerned with developing and maintaining a quality faculty.

RECRUITING FACULTY: COMPLEMENTARY TALES FROM TWO CAMPUSES

The trends have been evident for at least a decade. The large cohort of faculty hired during the massive growth of higher education subsequent to World War II are marching inexorably on toward retirement, whether or not you attempt to discount the effects lifting mandatory retirement will have at the end of 1993. At the same time, the customary training and development pipeline of the next generation of faculty has been running at less than optimal levels. And just over the horizon is a new "mini-baby-boom" that portends to once again swell the ranks of the "traditional" undergraduate student population, creating an instructional need that is in large part normally addressed by faculty. Hence, if you put any credence whatsoever in the maxim that an institution of higher education's greatest asset is its faculty, then Bowen and Schuster (1986) were not sounding a hollow alarm when they claimed that America's faculty are a "national resource imperiled." Bowen and Sosa's (1989) more recent explication of the impending shortage of faculty in the Arts and Sciences serves primarily to heighten a more broad awareness of the phenomenon, rather than to herald the approach of the unexpected.

Since Caplow and McGee's landmark study, The Academic Marketplace, was published in 1958, there has been considerable attention paid to the academic labor market. In earlier works I reviewed a large portion of the "retention" literature and reported the results of investigations I conducted on two cohorts of faculty with firm offers to change jobs (Matier, 1986, 1988 and 1990). Though my two cohorts displayed some dissimilarities with respect to the relative proportions of faculty who chose to leave their incumbent institution to pursue firm offers, there was a great deal of correspondence with the findings of others that the tangible benefits of a particular employment situation tended not to be as important as the intangible and non-work related benefits. In this paper I will report the complementary findings of what influenced the decisions of individuals being recruited for tenure stream faculty positions at the same two institutions I most recently reported about (Matier, 1990).

Much of the "recruitment" literature, reiterating a claim made by Caplow and McGee (1958), has focused on the "prestige system" that appears to explain in large part where faculty--particularly new faculty--are hired. Burke (1988) has recently replicated Caplow and McGee's work and found that though there have been significant changes in the hiring processes--in a sense "opening" them up more in a response to affirmative action and equal opportunity--the prestige of the institution or department granting the candidate's terminal degree is still quite operative. In the intervening years others, particularly those studying the career paths of academic scientists, have continuously found prestige, or what Merton (1968) called the Matthew effect, to be a significant influence on the faculty hiring process (Zuckerman, 1976; Long, 1978; Reskin, 1979; Long, Allison and McGinnis, 1979; Youn and Zelterman, 1988 and McGinnis and Long, 1988). This phenomenon, and the fact that such a relatively few institutions produce the vast majority of the supply of potential academics, has lead one team of researchers to posit an inverse "Peter Principle:" that academic scientists sink to their level competence (Cole and Cole, 1973).

Whereas much of the retention literature has an institutional-level focus and follows a deductive path to reach conclusions about what are the major influences in a hiring decision, this research is more inductive and individually focused. Though not ignoring the role of prestige, this research focuses instead on a broader spectrum of potentially influencing factors in an individual's decision making process.

More pointedly, this is a study of individuals recruited to join the faculty at one of two, public, Research I universities for the 1988-89 academic year and is an example of what can be learned about why academics make the choices they do. As with its complementary retention tale (Matier, 1990), it serves as an example primarily because its methodological, theoretical, and analytical underpinnings suggest how this same information can be collected, analyzed, and applied in other settings. It is also an example of the wide range of factors exerting influence on the decision makers and how the

sometimes small particulars of competing institutions' offers affects the decision making process.

The two institutions are designated in this paper only as Wyandot and Manada Universities. Wyandot University is an urban university located in the midst of one of the nation's fifteen largest standard metropolitan statistical areas. Manada University is nestled in a community of less than 150,000 people, two to three hours removed from any major metropolitan area.

Methodology

Lazarsfeld and Rosenberg's (1958) "empirical analysis of action" or 'accounting scheme" methodology was employed to collect the data for this investigation, since the subjects of this research were queried approximately six months after their decisions were made and could be expected to engage in some "social information processing" (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1978) to rationalize their particular decisions. By indirectly asking about a wide variety of possible considerations than they may have volunteered, it was hoped a more comprehensive picture of the factors affecting their decisions might be obtained. As well, the subjects were induced to consider the influence of certain factors they may have otherwise forgotten or suppressed.

A population of 201 individuals who were offered the opportunity to join the faculty at either Wyandot or Manada for the 1988-89 academic year were identified. As with the retention study (Matier, 1990) each individual was sent a questionnaire accompanied by a cover letter explaining the scope of the project, that it would take approximately 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire, and that each respondent would be asked to participate in a 20 minute follow-up interview. A second mailing followed about eight weeks later for those who had not yet responded.

Questionnaires returned as undeliverable or noting that the recipient was not formally offered a tenure track position at either subject institution were discarded. This left a total working population of 182. An overall response rate of slightly more than 70%

was obtained, with roughly equivalent response rates for each campus (67% at Wyandot, 73% at Manada).

Follow-up interviews were conducted in person or by telephone with 60% of the respondents to gather further information concerning their ease of movement and perceived desirability of moving.

Findings

The relative proportions of assistant professors, associate professors, and professors were similar among the working subject pool and the questionnaire respondents, demonstrating representativeness. More than 90% of the offers made by Wyandot and nearly 80% of those at Manada were extended at the assistant professor level. Burke (1988) found a similar three-fourths of all new hires at her six subject institutions to be at the assistant professor level. This pattern would appear to indicate that both Manada and Wyandot were consciously looking to fill positions at the junior rank. This differs markedly with the distribution of individuals who were being recruited away from these two institutions during the same year, where 38% were assistant professors, 37% were professors, and 25% associate professors (Matier, 1990). Overall, slightly less than 60% of all individuals who were extended offers accepted them, with Wyandot having a slightly better acceptance ratio (62%) than Manada (56%).

Another demographic criteria for which data were available for a sizable proportion of the total working subject pool, gender, also indicated representativeness among those who returned questionnaires. Offers to males outnumbered those to females by an approximate three to one ratio at each institution. Wyandot was extremely successful in attracting the females to which they made offers (14 out of 15, 93%) while for males they attracted only slightly better than 50%. At Manada, there was little difference in acceptance rates based on gender, with 56% of the females and 59% of the males accepting offers tendered. Overall, 46% of the new hires at Wyandot were female, while 27% of those who accepted offers at Manada were women. This corresponds to Burke's (1988) finding of

26% of new hires being women, a major improvement over the 4% reported by Caplow and McGee (1958) and the 12% reported by Stecklein and Lathrop (1960) nearly three decades earlier.

Race/ethnic classification also was representative through the working subject pool, questionnaire respondent and interview stages of the research. Over 90% of the offers made by Manada were to whites, while Wyandot made nearly 17% of their total working population offers to minorities. Though the total number of minorities offered positions was small, neither institution was able to attract more than half of the minorities offered positions to accept (three of six at Wyandot, two of five at Manada). This meant that 10% of the new hires at Wyandot were minorities, while at Manada the figure was 6%. Comparatively, Burke (1988) found 7% of new hires were minorities, while thirty years earlier Caplow and McGee (1958) found only 1%.

The average age of the individuals interviewed at Wyandot was just under 34 years, and nearly 36 years at Manada. This is consonant with the fact that so many of the offers were tendered at the rank of assistant professor. In fact the offers were extended to individuals seeking their first professional position in nearly 50% of the cases at Wyandot and 37% at Manada. Stecklein and Lathrop (1960) had earlier found only 20% of the new hires in their study to be accepting their first professional post.

Offers/Inducements

The vast majority of the respondents to the questionnaire who had a competing offer (95% at Wyandot and 85% at Manada) indicated it was from another institution of higher education. At Wyandot, 37 individuals had an alternative offer from another college or university (88%), 3 had offers from government employers, one had an offer from the private sector, and one an offer from an institution of secondary education. At Manada, 68 individuals had an alternative offer from another college or university (90%), 5 had offers from the private sector, and 2 had offers from government employers.

Respondents reporting the nine-month equivalent salary tendered with their alternative offer for the Wyandot cohort indicated that on average the Wyandot offer was greater than the alternative regardless of which they chose to accept. The same was true at Manada. Nevertheless, 15 of 32 individuals (46%) with an offer from Wyandot and 20 of 70 (28%) at Manada accepted the offer tendered with the lower salary. Too much should not be inferred from this since the offers were not adjusted for cost of living. Additionally, this takes into account only nine month equivalent salaries and not total compensation.

Beyond salary enhancements, offers from both subject institutions and their competitors typically included provisions to defray moving expenses, both one-time and recurring research and equipment support, and in some instances the alternative opportunity also offered mortgage supplements. Comparison of moving expenses is problematic given that some individuals were being recruited whose alternative opportunity was to remain with their incumbent employer. As well, even for those considering a move it is highly unlikely that either Wyandot or Manada would be equidistant from where the move would originate as the best alternative.

Nevertheless, when dollar amounts to defer moving expenses were detailed by the respondents, the average per offer for the alternative opportunity was more than the average offered at either subject institution. At Wyandot, compensation for moving expenses averaged just under $2,000 per offer while the alternative opportunities averaged $2,500 per offer. At Manada, the difference is far more dramatic with the cost to Manada being again slightly less than $2,000 per offer, while the alternative offers averaged nearly $3,500. This appears to be an area where, with the appropriate changes, additional leverage could be exerted by both Manada and Wyandot in the negotiation stage of bargaining with prospective faculty. It is interesting to note that 30 years earlier, Stecklein and Lathrop (1960) reported that faculty being recruited by the University of Minnesota were most often expected to cover their own moving expenses.

Research and equipment support offered to faculty from both Wyandot and Manada and the alternative institutions ran the gamut from significant start-up funds to establish a laboratory, to pledges to remodel space, to yearly travel and research stipends, to guaranteed summer salary support (typically for one to three years), to lines for new assistants and postdoctoral fellows, to lower teaching loads, to personal computers and workstations. In most cases the subject institutions and the competing offers were fairly close to one another in their offers, though in a few cases the differences that existed may have in fact been a deciding factor in the final decision.

Mortgage assistance was reported as part of the alternative offer package by six individuals at Manada and three at Wyandot. When a description of the assistance was provided, the offering institution either offered to subsidize lower than market interest rates on home mortgages or to provide a lump sum toward either the closing costs or the down payment on the purch of a home. As a matter of policy, neither Wyandot or Manada at the time of this investigation would provide mortgage assistance of any type to faculty.

Perceived Desirability of Moving

As with the retention cohort (Matier, 1990), numerical data relevant to an individual's perceived desirability of moving were collected in the questionnaire where individuals were asked to designate the degree of enticement each of 33 factors had both to accept the subject institution's offer as well as to pursue their self described best alternative offer. Two types of analysis were performed. First, comparisons between the enticement to remain and the enticement to leave for each factor were considered. Second, by aggregating the data for each factor, across the participants, it was possible to determine the relative importance of each factor in the cohort's decision making process.

Comparison of Enticements

Table 1 provides a comparison of the enticement to join the subject institutions and the enticement to pursue the best alternative opportunity for each of the factors. There was considerable correspondence among the most highly ranked enticements either when

comparing the subject institution's offer and the alternative, or when making comparisons between the rankings for Manada and Wyandot. As was the case with the retention cohort (Matier, 1990), the intangible benefits were found in abundance among the highest ranked enticements to either join the faculty at Wyandot or Manada, or to pursue an alternative opportunity.

For those who received an offer from Wyandot, eight of the top ten ranked factors to accept the offer were intangible benefits. Only "teaching/research load" (a tangible benefit) and "cultural, recreational, and social opportunities" (a non-work related benefit) also ranked among the top ten. Among the top ten enticements to accept the alternative offer, seven were intangible benefits. The other three were the tangible benefits "teaching/research load," "cash salary" and "income potential." The seven intangible benefits common to both rankings for those receiving offers at Wyandot were:

Research opportunities
Congeniality of associates
Reputation of associates
Reputation of institution
Rapport with departmental leaders
Career advancement opportunities
Reputation of department

At Manada, eight of the top ten enticements to join the faculty were intangible benefits. The other two top enticements were the tangible benefits of "library facilities" and "teaching/research load." Of the top ten enticements to pursue the rival opportunity, seven were intangible benefits. Two of the remaining three (ranked second and third respectively) were the non-work related benefits of "cultural, recreational, and social opportunities" and "geographic considerations," the third was the tangible benefit "cash salary." The seven intangible benefits listed above were also common to both the top ten ranked enticements to join the Manada faculty and the enticements to pursue the alternative opportunity.

Given this degree of similarity, it appears clear that to make a difference in individual's choices the areas where there is a discrepancy between the degree of

enticement needs to be a focus of the recruitment and negotiation processes. At Wyandot, this is a sword that cuts both ways, because one of the factors that makes moving there an enticement--the cultural, recreational, and social opportunities available in this major metropolitan area--also makes it a terribly expensive place to live (this may help to explain why though salary offers were generally higher in dollars at Wyandot, lower salary offers at the rival opportunities were ranked higher as an enticement to pursue the alternative opportunity). The converse is true at Manada: a far more affordable place to live, but generally geographically isolated and culturally perceived as socially less robust. Manada's "problem" may on the surface seem somewhat more easy to address through enhanced marketing of cultural, recreational, and social opportunities than Wyandot's economic "problem." However, given the relatively unchangeable nature of geography and the seemingly equally unchangeable legislative fiscal policies faced by Wyandot and Manada, both are equally "problems" that are likely "here to stay."

When comparing the recruitment and retention cohorts' ranking of particular factors, the rankings of "benefit package" stood out as somewhat anomalous. As Table 2 indicates, for the recruitment cohort there was only a marginal difference in the ranking of this factor's enticement to accept the subject institution's offer and the alternative at each institution, with both being of a middle rank. However, for the retention cohort (Matier, 1990), "benefit package" ranked among the top ten enticements to pursue the alternative offer and quite near the bottom among enticements to remain at the subject institutions. This was somewhat surprising as there was not much difference in the range of institutions making competing offers to the recruitment and retention cohorts.

There are a variety of plausible explanations for this difference. First, since the retention cohort is made up of so many individuals at the early stages of their career this may not be an issue they considered too closely. A second explanation may be that it is not until individuals join the faculty at one of the subject institutions that they learn the extent of their benefit deficiency when compared to typical peer benefit packages. Both conjectures

find some company with Stecklein and Lathrop's (1960) notation that over half the new hires in their study knew nothing of, or were not concerned with, the institution's benefit program at the time of their hiring. Regardless. at least at Wyandot and Manada, "benefits" do not appear to be as much of a stumbling block to hiring new faculty as they are to retaining faculty once they arrive.

Relative Importance of Factors

Using the values assigned by the participants for each factor, it was possible to determine which factors were the most important in determining perceived desirability of moving in the same fashion as with the data from the retention cohort (Matier, 1990, pp. 53-55). Table 3 summarizes the results of this analysis.

Of the ten most important factors at each of the subject institutions, nine were common to both. Of these, eight were intangible benefits:

Reputation of institution	Teaching assignments/opportunities
Reputation of department	Career advancement opportunities
Reputation of associates	Congeniality of associates
Research opportunities	Rapport with departmental leaders

The remaining common factor was the tangible benefit "teaching/research load," ranked number three at Wyandot and number eight at Manada. The "uncommon" factor ranked in the top ten at Wyandot was the tangible benefit "research funding" (ranked number nine). At Manada, it was the tangible benefit "library facilities" (ranked number seven). No non-work related benefit ranked among the top ten factors of relative importance at either campus.

Discussion

The intangible benefits of employment were the most important factors in the decision making process, but they also tended to be nearly as equally attractive (at the aggregate level) for both the subject institutions and the competing alternatives. Stecklein and Lathrop (1960) similarly found that reputation, prestige and research opportunities

(what would here be called intangible benefits) were highly important in the decisions of those they investigated. Burke (1988) found a corresponding significance for "intangibles," with the addition of geographic location as an important factor, similar to what Matier (1986, 1988) found among the cohort of faculty he studied at the University of Oregon.

Two considerations that have not been discussed in any detail to this point need some attention: prestige and spousal employment. Using the Jones et al. (1982) ratings of graduate programs as a proxy for departmental quality, an attempt was made to determine the influence of prestige on the decisions of individuals in this investigation. However, because of the small number of cases where departmental ratings were available for the subject institution, alternative offer institution and doctoral granting institution (less than ten from either subject institution cohort) it was not possible to make any substantive conjectures. However, the high relative importance rankings of the "reputation of institution," "reputation of department" and "reputation of associates" factors would suggest the matter of prestige was given serious consideration by the individuals recruited by both Manada and Wyandot.

Secondly, today's conventional wisdom and Burke's (1988) study suggest that employment opportunities for spouses/partners is a major influence on the decision making process for dual-career, and particularly dual-academic-career, couples. In the course of this research, however, spousal career opportunities did not appear to be as critical an issue, reaching no higher than the twentieth position on any of the rankings of factors (see Tables 1 and 3). During the interviews this predicament often found its way into the discussion and the expected "problem" situations were recounted. However, all had at least been temporarily resolved by the time this investigation commenced and that may begin to explain the tempering of their influence as recounted in the questionnaire data. Regardless, Wyandot by virtue of its location in a major metropolitan area with a host of other higher education institutions and major governmental, business and industry

employees near at hand had a distinct advantage with respect to readily available spousal employment opportunities than did Manada. Nevertheless, it was surprising that this did not explicitly influence more decisions at each institution.

Overall, the vast majority of the participants in the study reported receiving offers from the subject institutions and competing offers that would have provided a generally equivalent salary (unadjusted for cost of living). They also reported a somewhat more favorable set of other tangible benefits at the alternative institution. They typically reported that the facilities and support structure in which they would be working at either institution would be close to the same. More than half of all individuals to whom an offer was extended, at both subject institutions, chose to accept it.

On the whole, for Wyandot and Manada, it appears that final decisions were swayed on relatively minor differences at the margins, and these differences were most often of the tangible and non-work related benefit type, notwithstanding their relative lack of importance when compared to the intangible benefits. Thus, the institutions' ability to make offers more attractive along these fronts--though seriously constrained by accidents of geography and the unfortunate realities of legislative funding lethargy toward both institutions--would appear to be the key to becoming more successful in the recruiting process, if slightly less than a 60% success rate in recruiting new faculty is not acceptable.

References

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

Bowen W. G. and Sosa, J. A. (1989). Prospects for Faculty in the Arts and Sciences: A Study of Factors Affecting Demand and Supply, 1987 to 2012. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

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

Caplow, T., and McGee, R. J. (1958). The academic marketplace. New York: Basic Books.

Cole, J. R. and Cole, S. (1973). Social Stratification in Science. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jones, L. V., Lindzey, G. and Coggleshall, P. E. (eds.) (1982). An Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States. Washington: National Academy Press.

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

Long, J. S. (1978). Productivity and academic position in the scientific career. American Sociological Review 43: 889-908.

Long, J. S., Allison, P. D. and McGinnis, R. (1979). Entrance into the academic career, American Sociological Review 44: 816-830.

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

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

Matier, M. W. (1990). Retaining faculty: A tale of two campuses. Research in Higher Education 31: 39-60.

McGinnis R. and Long, J. S. (1988). Entry into academia: Effects of stratification, geography and ecology. In D. W. Breneman and T. I. K. Youn (eds.), Academic Labor Markets and Careers (pp. 28-51). Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.

Merton, R. K. (1968). The Matthew effect in science. Science 159 (no. 3810): 56-63.

Reskin, B. (1979). Academic sponsorship and scientist careers. Sociology of Education 52: 129-146.

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

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

Youn, T. I. K. and Zelterman, D. (1988). Institutional career mobility in academia. In D. W. Breneman and T. I. K. Youn (eds.), Academic Labor Markets and Careers (pp. 52-73). Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.

Zuckerman, H. (1970). Stratification in American science. In E. O. Laumann (ed.), Social Stratification (pp. 235-257). Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Table 1

Enticement of perceived desirability of moving factors

		Wyandot						Manada					
	Type* of Benefit	Enticement to Accept Wyandot Offer Rank	N	Mean	Enticement to Accept Alternative Offer Rank	N	Mean	Enticement to Accept Manada Offer Rank	N	Mean	Enticement to Accept Alternative Offer Rank	N	Mean
1. Reputation of Institution	I	10	44	3.0	4	42	3.3	1	87	4.1	8	73	3.3
2. Reputation of Department	I	7	44	3.4	8	42	3.1	3	87	3.8	6	73	3.4
3. Reputation of Associates	I	3	44	3.6	3	42	3.3	4	86	3.7	7	73	3.4
4. Congeniality of Associates	I	2	43	3.7	1	42	3.6	6	86	3.5	1	72	3.7
5. Rapport with Dept. Leaders	I	4	43	3.6	10	42	3.0	9	87	3.3	5	73	3.4
6. Career Advancement Opps.	I	6	44	3.4	7	42	3.2	8	87	3.3	9	73	2.9
7. Teaching Assign/Opps.	I	8	43	3.3	13	42	2.9	10	87	3.1	12	73	2.7
8. Research Opportunities	I	1	44	3.8	2	42	3.5	2	85	3.9	4	72	3.4
9. Loyalty to Institution	I	31	43	0.7	29	42	1.2	32	86	1.0	32	73	1.4
10. Loyalty to Dept./Program	I	30	43	0.8	30	42	1.1	29	86	1.1	26	72	1.7
11. Influence in Department	I	27	43	1.4	25	42	1.6	25	85	1.5	22	73	2.0
12. Influence in Institution	I	29	43	1.2	28	42	1.5	31	85	1.1	31	72	1.5
13. Promotion/Added Responsib.	T	19	43	2.1	20	40	2.2	22	87	1.9	30	72	1.5
14. Cash Salary	T	11	43	3.0	6	42	3.2	12	87	2.9	10	71	2.8
15. Benefit Package	T	16	43	2.4	11	42	3.0	17	86	2.2	13	72	2.7
16. Income Potential	T	14	42	2.5	9	41	3.0	18	86	2.2	18	73	2.5
17. Teaching/Research Load	T	5	44	3.5	5	42	3.3	7	87	3.4	14	73	2.7
18. Research Funding	T	12	44	2.9	12	42	2.9	11	86	3.0	15	73	2.7
19. Library Facilities	T	22	44	2.0	18	42	2.4	5	86	3.7	16	73	2.6
20. Lab/Research Facilities	T	17	44	2.4	19	42	2.4	15	85	2.5	24	71	2.0
21. Office Facilities	T	15	43	2.4	14	42	2.7	20	86	2.0	17	73	2.5
22. Secretarial Support	T	23	44	1.9	23	42	2.1	23	86	1.8	25	73	1.9
23. Sabbatical, Leave, Travel	T	20	42	2.1	21	41	2.1	14	85	2.5	19	73	2.3
24. Reduced Tuition for Family	T	33	43	0.3	33	40	0.7	33	82	0.7	33	69	0.9
25. Consulting Opportunities	N	24	43	1.9	24	42	1.8	28	84	1.3	29	73	1.5
26. Spouse Career Opportun.	N	21	44	2.1	26	42	1.6	21	85	2.0	20	73	2.1
27. School Situation of Children	N	32	43	0.6	32	41	0.8	24	85	1.6	27	73	1.6
28. Geographic Considerations	N	13	43	2.7	15	42	2.7	19	85	2.1	3	73	3.5
29. Climate of Region	N	25	44	1.7	22	41	2.1	26	85	1.5	11	73	2.8
30. Cult., Rec., Social Opps.	N	9	43	3.3	16	42	2.6	16	86	2.4	2	73	3.5
31. Housing Costs	N	18	44	2.2	17	42	2.5	13	86	2.8	23	73	2.0
32. Family Living Locally	N	28	43	1.4	31	42	1.1	27	86	1.5	28	73	1.6
33. Local Network of Friends	N	26	43	1.5	27	42	1.5	30	85	1.1	21	73	2.1

*I = Intangible Benefits of the Job
T = Tangible Benefits of the Job
N = Non-work Related Benefits

Table 2

Comparison of enticement rankings of "benefit package"

	Recruitment Cohort Ranking		Retention Cohort Ranking	
	Accept Subject Institution Offer	Accept Alternate Offer	Remain at Subject Institution	Pursue Alternate Offer
Wyandot	16	11	27	4
Manada	17	13	24	7

Table 3

Relative importance of perceived desirability of moving factors

No.	Factor	Type* of Benefit	Wyandot N=44 Rank	Wyandot N=44 Mean	Manada N=88 Rank	Manada N=88 Mean
1.	Reputation of Institution	I	8	3.7	1	4.3
2.	Reputation of Department	I	7	3.8	3	4.2
3.	Reputation of Associates	I	4	4.0	4	4.1
4.	Congeniality of Associates	I	1	4.3	5	4.0
5.	Rapport with Dept. Leaders	I	5	4.0	6	3.9
6.	Career Advancement Opps.	I	6	3.9	9	3.6
7.	Teaching Assignments/Opps.	I	10	3.6	10	3.6
8.	Research Opportunities	I	2	4.3	2	4.2
9.	Loyalty to Institution	I	31	1.3	32	1.4
10.	Loyalty to Dept./Program	I	30	1.3	29	1.7
11.	Influence in Department	I	27	1.9	25	2.1
12.	Influence in Institution	I	28	1.7	31	1.4
13.	Promotion/Added Responsib.	T	20	2.6	23	2.2
14.	Cash Salary	T	11	3.6	14	3.3
15.	Benefit Package	T	14	3.2	16	2.9
16.	Income Potential	T	15	3.2	18	2.7
17.	Teaching/Research Load	T	3	4.1	8	3.7
18.	Research Funding	T	9	3.7	12	3.5
19.	Library Facilities	T	19	2.6	7	3.8
20.	Lab/Research Facilities	T	17	3.0	20	2.6
21.	Office Facilities	T	18	3.0	21	2.6
22.	Secretarial Support	T	21	2.5	24	2.1
23.	Sabbatical, Leave, Travel	T	23	2.4	17	2.8
24.	Reduced Tuition for Family	T	33	0.6	33	1.0
25.	Consulting Opportunities	N	25	2.1	30	1.7
26.	Spouse Career Opportunities	N	22	2.4	22	2.5
27.	School Situation of Children	N	32	0.8	28	1.9
28.	Geographic Considerations	N	13	3.3	11	3.6
29.	Climate of Region	N	24	2.3	19	2.7
30.	Cult., Recreat., Social Opps.	N	12	3.5	13	3.5
31.	Housing Costs	N	16	3.1	15	3.0
32.	Family Living Locally	N	29	1.7	27	2.1
33.	Local Network of Friends	N	26	2.1	26	2.1

*I = Intangible Benefits of the Job
T = Tangible Benefits of the Job
N = Non-work Related Benefits