3-22-2013

Exploring Community Psychology Value Congruence in Academic Setting

Olya Glantsman

DePaul University, oglantsm@depaul.edu

EXPLORING COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY VALUE CONGRUENCE IN
ACADEMIC SETTINGS

A Dissertation

Presented in

Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

BY

OLYA GLANTSMAN

FEBRUARY, 2013

Department of Psychology

College of Science and Health

DePaul University

Chicago, IL

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

Leonard A. Jason, Ph.D.

Chairperson

Joseph R. Ferrari, Ph.D.

Douglas Cellar, Ph.D.

Corinne L. Benedetto, Ph.D.

Rev. Anthony J. Dosen, Ph.D., S.T.L, C.M.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without the guidance and the help of several individuals who, in one way or another, contributed and extended their valuable assistance in the preparation and completion of this project.

First and foremost, my utmost gratitude goes to my Dissertation Chair, Dr. Leonard Jason, for his mentorship throughout this project. I owe the completion of my dissertation and, hence my degree, to his encouragement and guidance over the years. I could not have imagined having a better advisor and mentor and I can only hope that, one day, I would become as good an advisor to my students as Dr. Jason has been to me.

I would also like to acknowledge my committee members Dr. Joseph R. Ferrari, Dr. Douglas Cellar, Dr. Corinne L. Benedetto, and Rev. Anthony J. Dosen for their flexibility, valuable feedback, and support. Special thank you goes to DePaul's department of psychology, especially the Community Psychology faculty for their patience and encouragements.

I would also like to thank my mom for always believing in me and inspiring me to aim for the stars. This dissertation is dedicated to my husband, Mike, and our children, Nicholas and Katherine, who had to share me with it over the years. Thank you for your endless love and support.

Last, but not least, I would like to thank my colleague and friend, Daphna Ram, who is humble enough not to expect to see her name here, for her support and assistance with this work.

VITA

Olya Glantsman (formerly Olya Rabin-Belyaev) was born in Kiev, Ukraine,

December 20, 1978. She graduated from Glenbrook North High School,

received her Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology and Sociology &

Anthropology from Lake Forest College in 2001, and a Master of Arts degree

in Community Psychology from DePaul University in 2005.

OVERVIEW

Value congruence between employees and their workplace is an important dimension of an individual's fit with a work environment. The level of congruence between the values of employees and their employing organization and the relation of value congruence to satisfaction, commitment, and willingness to recommend the department were examined. This study focused on the relationship of value congruence between the individuals who belong to the field of community psychology and their workplace in relation to the aforementioned work-related outcomes in an academic setting. Results show that departments rated higher on community psychology values had a greater number of faculty possessing values similar to those of the field of Community Psychology. In addition, better value fit predicted higher job satisfaction scores and higher organizational commitment scores, as well as a stronger willingness to recommend their department as a good place to work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

An individual's fit with a work environment has been shown to affect work-related attitudes and behaviors (Boxx, Odom, & Dunn, 1991; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). Additionally, many studies found a positive relationship between an individual's fit with his or her work environments and a number of specific attitudes, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Amos & Weathington, 2008; Boxx et al., 1991; Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1990; Edwards, 1991; Kristof, 1996; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003). In turn, both job satisfaction and organizational commitment were related to positive organizational and personal outcomes such as organizational effectiveness, employee turnover, as well as employee well-being (Howard & Frink, 1996; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Rehman & Waheed, 2011).

Values are a central factor in one's fit with his or her work environment. Values are defined as stable perspectives or attitudes that serve as guiding principles in one's life (Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 1994). One's value system is relatively stable (Jin & Rounds, 2012; Lusk & Oliver, 1974), and may shape and influences one's behavior (England, 1967; Rokeach, 1973). Schwartz (1999) also suggested that values are drivers of workplace behavior. Thus, values may offer an insight into human beliefs and behavior, including in relation to work.

Values are often a central part of an organizational culture (i.e., values that most members of an organization agree on: Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989). Organizational work values are related to job choice decisions (Judge & Bretz, 1992) and potential superior corporate performance (e.g., financial gains, improved communication system) (Barney, 1986).

According to *Person-Environment (P-E) Fit Theory* (Kroeger, 1995), individuals are naturally drawn to settings that reflect components of their personalities, including values. Additionally, when there is compatibility between one's personality characteristics and the situation they are in, a person tends to experience more positive affect such as happiness, joy, enjoyment, and pleasure and less negative affect such as depression, unhappiness, frustration, anger, and worry (Diener, Larson, & Emmons, 1984). Compatibility between one's personality characteristics and the setting they are in also may be translated to the workplace in a form of *Person-Organization (P-O) Fit* (Amos & Weathingtin, 2008). Cable and Judge (1996) suggested that potential employees' perception of (P-O) fit depends on the match between their perceptions of values of the organization and their own values. When such match between employees' and an organization values exists, the values are said to be congruent.

According to Schneider's (1987) *Attraction-Selection-Attrition* (ASA) framework, value congruence is related to the type of organization an individual will choose (i.e., Attraction), get hired by (i.e., Selection), and remain (i.e., Attrition). Specifically, Schneider (1987) suggested that

individuals may be inclined to choose an organization whose goals, culture, structure, and processes match their personality. Furthermore, the author suggested that individuals will be selected by the organization based on the set of specific characteristics of those individuals that are perceived as desirable by the organization (i.e., recruiters, employers). Finally, according to Schneider (1987), individuals who do not fit a work environment are more likely to leave it. This literature review will focus on the *Attraction* (i.e., desirability of potential workplace) and *Attrition* (i.e., intent of turnover) components of this model, as these two components are within control of the individual.

When individuals seek employment, they recognize an organizational culture (i.e., characteristics such as what the organizations reward, support, and expect) and use these characteristics to identify the value congruence (Schneider, 1987). Thus, individuals try to find a match between their personal values and the values of the institutions in which they choose to work (Cable & Judge, 1994; Chatman, 1989, 1991; Judge & Bretz, 1992; Tom, 1971). In addition, those individuals who do not perceive value congruence with their organization are at a higher risk of turnover (Amos & Weathington, 2008; Cable & Judge, 1996, O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991).

Thus, if someone is "money-oriented," he or she may be drawn to a setting that will provide them with monetary awards and potentials for increased in financial rewards. If a person is other-oriented, he or she may be drawn to a field that matches such values. For example, values of altruism

might lead one to work for a non-for-profit organization where the focus is not on a monetary gain, but rather on helping those in need. Additionally, those individuals who place value on money might choose a workplace that will provide them with an opportunity for monetary gain over other gains such as, for example, pride in the company's name or satisfaction with the quality of product created by the company. In turn, value incongruence (such as, working for a large for-profit corporation while holding altruistic values) may drive such an individual to leave the organization and search for one that is more value congruent to his or her personal values (e.g., altruism).

The relationship of value congruence between individuals and their settings extends beyond job selection and turnover to work-related attitudes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Job satisfaction includes employee feelings about both intrinsic and extrinsic elements of his or her job (Howard & Frink, 1996). Job satisfaction measures provide an indicator of the employees' affective responses to their job (i.e., the extent to which individuals like or are satisfied with versus dislike or are dissatisfied with their jobs). Organizational commitment includes believing in and accepting the goals and values of the organization one is a part of, a willingness to exert significant effort on behalf of the organization, as well as a strong desire to stay a member of an organization (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Typically, measures of organizational commitment require employees to respond to statements or questions that represent their beliefs and attitudes

about their relationship with the organization for which they work (Fields, 2002).

Individuals may choose and report being more satisfied with and committed to work settings that match their own values (Adkins, Ravlin, & Meglino, 1996; Amos & Weathingtin, 2008; Arciniega & Gonzalez, 2005; Bretz & Judge, 1993; Cable & Judge, 1996; Chatman, 1989, 1991; Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1990; Edwards, 1991; Kristof, 1996; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meglino et al., 1989; O'Reilly, et al. 1991; Verquer et al., 2003). In addition, those individuals who are more satisfied with and are more committed to the organizations tend to perform better, thus increasing the organization's effectiveness. For instance, if persons are more other-oriented (e.g., altruistic, not for materialistic gains), they may be more likely to report being satisfied in and committed to a work setting that matches those values (e.g., working for a non-profit organization). Finally, those individuals who are committed to the organization are less likely to leave the organization, in turn decreasing the organization's turnover.

Given the value-driven nature of the field of community psychology (Fryer, 2008), scholars found a need to expand traditional conceptualization to examine how Community Psychology values influence individuals who belong to the professional organization of the field and who work in academia. While the roots of Community Psychology may vary, most community psychologists agree that the field can be best defined by its values (Kloos, Hill, Thomas, Wandersman, Elias, & Dalton, 2012; Rappaport, 1977).

Furthermore, it would be interesting to examine whether the ASA framework will be translated to academia in relation to specific values. Thus, if the values of the organization (i.e., university/college department) match those of the individual (e.g., community psychologists), the person might be more likely to report being more satisfied with and more committed to his or her job.

Specifically, community psychologists within an academic setting might be more satisfied with their jobs as well as be more committed to their workplace if they believe there is a better match between their own values and the values of the department of which these individuals are a part. In turn, high value congruence with the workplace might also be positively related to positive organizational outcomes, such as better performance. In addition, because the field of Community Psychology has such strong value roots, it may be that even a small number of faculty with high Community Psychology values will have an effect on the overall value makeup of the department. Finally, because many community psychologists spend at least part of their life within an academic setting, it is important to study the construct of Community Psychology value congruence that explores the relationship between faculty and their departments in academic settings.

The focus of the present study was primarily on the values component of P-O fit, specifically the level of congruence between the values of employees and their employing organization and the relation of value congruence to satisfaction, commitment, and willingness to recommend one's department. That is, this study examined the relationship of value congruence

between the individuals who belong to the professional organization of the field of Community Psychology and their workplace (i.e., department) in relation to the aforementioned work-related outcomes in academic settings.

Values

Individual *values* are intrinsic, stable perspectives or attitudes that reflect a principle, standard, or quality which the individual perceives to be right or wrong (Rokeach, 1973), or most desirable and appropriate (Shiraev & Levy, 2009). Schwartz (1994) defined values as "desirable transsituational goals, varying in importance, that serve as guiding principles in the life of a person or other social entity" (p. 21). That is, values (1) serve the interests of some social entity, (2) can motivate action by providing direction and emotional intensity, (3) create standards by which actions are judged and justified, and (4) are acquired through both socialization to the values of the dominant group as well as individual's unique learning experiences (Schwartz, 1994). One's value system is relatively stable over time, and shapes and influences one's behavior (England, 1967; Rokeach, 1973). Thus, values are views of specific behaviors (sometimes called *instrumental values* and related to social and personal concerns) or goals (sometimes called *terminal values* and related to morality and competency) that an individual would consistently choose over other behaviors and goals (Shiraev & Levy, 2009).

Schwartz (1999) also suggested that values are drivers of workplace behavior. According to Lusk and Oliver (1974), when it comes to work

settings, throughout employees' lifetime, individuals establish relatively permanent values systems, which are unlikely to be altered by organizational socialization. Similarly, in their meta-analysis of longitudinal studies, Jin and Rounds (2012) found that the rank-order of work values was relatively stable over time. That is, over their lifetime, individuals tend to remain consistent on what work values are more important to them than others. In addition, the authors also found that across all age categories, work values were more stable than personality traits (Jin & Rounds, 2012). Thus, values may offer an insight into human beliefs and behavior, including in relation to work.

Researchers have studied "organizational culture," which consists of the central norms or values that most organizational members agree on (Enz, 1988; O'Reilly et al., 1991; Rousseau, 1990). Based on a meta-analyses of 192 articles on organizational culture published between June 1975 and December 1984, academics and practitioners alike recognized the importance of organizational culture (Barley, Meyer, & Gash, 1988). According to Meglino et al. (1989), values are relatively stable and often are a central part of corporate culture.

Judge and Bretz (1992) found that when organizational work values were known, these values significantly affected employees' job choice decisions. In addition, when persons were choosing a job, work values were more important than other factors such as pay and potential for advancement. Furthermore, Barney (1986) suggested that strong workplace culture (i.e., the use of socialization and emphasis of specific core values) shared by

employees may lead to superior corporate performances (e.g., financial) of the firm. These shared core values, which in turn shape the firm's culture, may be divided into two functions: *external adaptation* and *internal integration* (Schein, 1985). According to Schein (1985), external adaptation is related to the organization's external environment and refers to employees' tendency to act in ways that are necessary for the organizational survival. Internal integration is related to how shared values affect interpersonal interactions, and includes aspects such as common language and group boundaries for inclusion and exclusion. Schein (1985) also stated that those individuals within a work setting, whose values match, tend to share aspects of cognitive processing. In turn, such similarities may lead to better interpretation of environmental events as well as a common communication system thus, improving the effectiveness within organizations.

Person-Environment Fit

According to *Person-Environment (P-E) Fit theory*, individuals prefer settings that reflect their personalities (e.g., values and beliefs) (Kroeger, 1995). For example, Diener, et al. (1984) found that those individuals with a higher need for order and cognitive structure chose settings which matched those characteristics over novel situations. In addition, those individuals who scored higher on a measure of extraversion preferred social rather than alone type recreation. Also, when there is compatibility between one's personality and the situation they are in, a person tends to experience more positive affect such as happiness, joy, enjoyment, and pleasure and less negative affect such

as depression, unhappiness, frustration, anger, and worry (Diener et al., 1984)

Thus, individuals in more congruent settings experience more positive

feelings than those who find themselves in less congruent settings.

Person-Organization Fit

The importance of compatibility between one's personality and the

setting they are in may also be translated into the workplace. In the context of

a workplace, *P-E theory* is referred to as *Person-Organization (P-O) fit*

(Amos & Weathingtin, 2008). According to Westerman and Cyr (2004), P-O

fit is "multidimensional," and includes "personality, skills, needs, and values"

(p. 258). Numerous studies have focused on the concept of P-O Fit or the

match between the individual and his or her work setting (i.e., supplementary

fit) (Ostroff & Judge, 2007). According to Chatman (1989), P-O fit involves

how well patterns of organizational values and patterns of individual values

match. These values are what an individual finds important within an

organization such as innovation and striving to succeed. Cable and Judge

(1996) suggested that potential employees' perception of P-O fit depends on

the match between their perceptions of organizations' and their own values.

Thus, when there is a match between employees' and organizations' values,

the values between the employees and organizations are said to be congruent.

Attraction-Selection-Attrition Framework

When people are seeking employment, they recognize an

organizational culture (i.e., characteristics such as organizational rewards,

support, and expectations) (Schneider, 1987). According to the Attraction

Selection Attrition (ASA) framework (Schneider, 1987), individuals are an active part of the organizational structure. That is, the organizational behavior can be attributed to the collective characteristics of the members of the organization (Schneider, Goldstein, & Smith, 1995). In addition, Schneider et al. (1995) suggested that personalities, attitudes, and values of those within an organization determine organizational nature, culture, climate, and processes. Based on the ASA framework, individuals' career paths may be split into three distinct categories: *Attraction*, *Selection*, and A*ttrition* (i.e., the kinds of people who are attracted to, are selected by, and remain with the organization) (Schneider et al., 1995).

Specifically, when it comes to *attraction*, individuals' personalities and interests drive them toward specific careers (Holland, 1985). Furthermore, people search for working environments based on the fit between personal and organizational characteristics (Schneider et al., 1995). As such, an individual is more inclined to choose an organization whose goals, culture, structure, and processes match the individual's personality. The *selection* process involves the organization's tendency to recruit and hire applicants with characteristics desirable to the organization. Finally, *attrition* refers to the tendency of people, who do not fit an environment, to leave it. Thus, when people who do not fit in their work setting leave it, the organizational layout changes and becomes more homogenous. As a result of these processes, the unique characteristics of the individuals who apply for, get hired by, and stay with the

organization, shape the processes, structures, and cultures of the organization of which they are a part of (Schneider et al., 1995).

Value Congruence and Job Search

According to Schneider (1987), organizations have recognizable characteristics such as what they reward, support, and expect. Research suggests that when it comes to value congruence, it is generally true that when looking for a job, people try to find a match between their personal values and the values of the institutions in which they choose to work (Cable & Judge, 1994; Chatman, 1989, 1991; Judge & Bretz, 1992; Tom, 1971). For example, the results of Judge and Cable's (1997) study supported the relationships among the 5-factor model of personality (i.e., the Big Five personality traits) and organizational culture preferences. In another study, Tom (1971) found significantly greater similarity between potential employees' self-descriptions (i.e., personality patterns) and descriptions of their most preferred organizations compared to descriptions of their least preferred organizations. Therefore, when individuals are choosing a potential workplace, they tend to prefer organizations that match the individuals' personality characteristics.

Value Congruence and Employee Turnover

Value congruence has also been related to turnover (Amos & Weathington, 2008; Cable & Judge, 1996; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). In their study, Amos and Weathington (2008) found a negative relation between value congruence and employee turnover intentions. Additionally, Cable and Judge (1996) found that one's P-O fit predicted participants' turnover intentions and

their willingness to recommend the department to others. O'Reilly et al. (1991) found that high P-O fit positively predicted the probability of a person staying with the organization. Finally, according to Saks and Ashforth's (1997) longitudinal study, perceptions of P-O fit were negatively related to intentions to quit and turnover. Thus, when an individual perceives a high value congruence between him or herself and their organization, he or she will be at a lower risk of turnover compared to those individuals who perceive a low value congruence.

<div align="center">*Work Related Measures*</div>

Job Satisfaction

According to Weiss (2002), job satisfaction consists of three separate constructs - overall evaluative judgments about jobs, affective experiences at work, as well as beliefs about jobs. Howard and Frink (1996) stated that job satisfaction includes employee feelings about both intrinsic and extrinsic elements of his or her job, citing the importance of both satisfaction with coworkers and supervisors. The coworkers appeared to play a major role in motivating each other while supervisors played a major role on general satisfaction. Additionally, Arvey, Carter, and Buerkley (1991) found different facets of work situations to have an effect on job satisfaction. Porter and Steers (1973) believe that job satisfaction was related to employee expectations such as pay or promotion, which were in turn related to his or her values. Job satisfaction has also been studied in relation to its impact on

commitment, absenteeism, intentions to quit, as well as actual turnover (Agho, Mueller, & Price, 1993).

In a qualitative study, Bussing, Bissels, Fuchs, and Perrar (1999) found that job satisfaction was related to the congruence between employee's work expectations and needs, as well as their motives, and the work situation. Finally, Moorman (1993) suggested that affect-based job satisfaction (e.g., evoking positive feelings) was more closely related to the organizational citizenship behavior (i.e., job performance) than cognition based job satisfaction (e.g., conditions or opportunities). Thus, when studying job satisfaction, it is important to focus on intrinsic and extrinsic elements of the job as well as the match between employee's expectations and especially values (i.e., affective aspects), while also keeping in mind the consequences of job satisfaction on the future employment.

To provide an indicator of the employees' affective responses to their job (i.e., the extent to which individuals like or are satisfied with versus dislike or are dissatisfied with their jobs), researchers have created a number of overall job satisfaction scales. The job satisfaction measures may assess global satisfaction with a job or a number of specific facets of the job (e.g., pay, supervision, promotion, co-worker, and the job itself) (Fields, 2002, p. 3). For example, the *Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire* (OAQ) includes the *Job Satisfaction subscale* which measures satisfaction with the social dimensions of one's job and organization. In past studies, using this measure, job satisfaction has correlated positively with "leader's positive

affectivity, leader's job involvement, distribution of risk exposure in the workplace, the economic value placed on health and safety, organizational commitment, job involvement, job focus, and work complexity" (George, 1995; McLain, 1995; Siegall & McDonald, 1995) (as cited in Fields, 2002, p.5)

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment has been defined as: "a psychological link between the employee and his or her organization that makes it less likely that the employee will voluntarily leave the organization" (Allen & Meyer, 1996, p. 252). Thus, organizational commitment includes identifying with, believing in, and accepting the goals and values of the organization one is a part of, a willingness to exert significant effort on behalf of the organization, as well as a strong desire to stay a member of an organization. According to Meyer and Herscovitch (2001), there are two components of work commitment: an attitudinal component toward a relevant target and a behavioral component which can take a form of desire, perceived cost, or obligation to continue a particular course of action related to the earlier stated target. In other words, work commitment includes a course of action directed at a relevant target(s). Thus, when defining work commitment, it is important to pay attention to both commitment directed at "relevant entities" (i.e., attitudinal commitment; organizations, occupations, and unions), and "courses of action" (i.e., behavior commitment; commitment to working toward achievement of certain goals and implementations of certain policies). According to Meyer and

Herscovitch (2001), a change in organizational policy such as an increase in

diversity within the organization or an increase in customer satisfaction would

be an example of "commitment to entity" (p. 309). In addition, an actual

behavior directed to achieving a goal, such as actual change in organizational

policy such as broadening recruitment to reach a more diverse population or

increasing the quality of customer service would be "commitment to courses

of action" (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001, p. 309). The authors further noted

that even when the focus seems to be on the commitment to entity, although

the behavior consequences of such commitment are not explicitly stated, they

are still implied. The same is true vice versa, as when an entity to which the

behavior is related is being inferred without being specifically stated. In

addition, for better understanding and prediction of the outcomes related to

work commitment, the authors suggest clearly defining both the relevant

entity and the behavior attached to it (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001).

Typically, measures of organizational commitment require employees

to respond to statements or questions that represent their beliefs and attitudes

about their relationship with the organization they work for. The measure

looks at the match between goals of the organization and those of individuals

it employs (Fields, 2002). Based on their research, Meyer and Allen (1991,

1997) divide commitment into three characterized employee mindsets –

desire, obligation, and cost. Employees who score high on the Affective

Commitment Subscale (ACS), exhibit strong affective commitment and stay

because they *want to;* employees who score high on the Normative

Commitment Scale (NCS), exhibit strong normative commitment and stay because they feel they *ought to;* and employees who score high on Continuance Commitment Scale (CCS) and stay because they *have to* do so. Not all commitments are alike (Allen & Meyer, 1996, 2000; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). For example, research has demonstrated that employees who want to stay (i.e., score high on ACS) tend to perform better than those employees who do not want to stay (i.e., score low on ACS). Employees who remain out of obligation (i.e., score high on NCS) perform better that those who do not feel obligated (i.e., score low on NCS). In addition, the effect on performance found by the researchers was not as strong as that observed for desire (i.e., ACS). Furthermore, employees who reported staying to avoid losing something of value (e.g., benefits, seniority) also reported little incentive to do anything more than is required to retain their positions (Allen & Meyer, 1996, 2000; Meyer et al., 2002). Thus, high Affective Commitment, defined as "emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization" (Allen & Meyer, 1990, p. 1) may be the most relevant factor influencing the positive effects of organizational commitment.

Value Congruence and Job Related Outcomes

The effects of workplace value congruence go beyond job seeking and potential for turnover. In their review of the literature on the fit between an individual and his or her work environment in relation to job outcomes, Ostroff and Judge (2007) organized their review into three categories:

attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction, organizational commitment), mental and physical health (e.g., approach to stress), and task and contextual performance (e.g., employee's contribution to his or her employer). In fact, occupational choice, job satisfaction, job performance, organizational commitment, turnover, and psychological and physical well-being were all influenced by the P-O fit (Boxx et al., 1991; Caldwell, & O'Reilly, 1990; Edwards, 1991; Kristof, 1996; Verquer et al., 2003).

Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

Multiple studies suggest that there is a relationship between, on the one hand, individual and organization value match, and on the other hand, work outcomes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Amos & Weathingtin, 2008; Boxx et al., 1991; Bretz & Judge, 1993; Cable & Judge, 1996; Chatman, 1989, 1991; Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1990; Edwards, 1991; Kristof, 1996; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meglino et al., 1989; Saks & Ashforth, 1997; Verquer et al., 2003). Specifically, researchers suggest that high person-organization fit is related to high satisfaction and high commitment scores. Additionally, while Westerman and Cyr (2004) found that P-O fit measures were related to employees' intent to remain with their employer, the authors also found that this effect was generally mediated by job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

When it comes to job satisfaction, Arciniega and Gonzalez (2005) found that when conditions at work fulfilled the individuals' needs that matched their values, those individuals were more satisfied with their jobs.

That is, if individuals feel like they fit within a work setting, they tend to be more satisfied. Adkins et al. (1996) found that value congruence was significantly related to job satisfaction. According to O'Reilly et al. (1991), in order for one to be satisfied and attached to an organization, beyond having task and job competency, the individual needs a value system similar to the central values of the organization. Westerman and Cyr (2004) suggested that value congruence between personality and work environment was the best predictor of job satisfaction. Saks and Ashforth (1997) found that perceptions of P-O fit were positively related to job satisfaction. Finally, the results of the meta-analysis of 21 studies supported a positive relation between value congruence and job satisfaction (Verquer et al., 2003).

In addition to satisfaction, how committed a person is to an organization is also related to P-O fit. Ravlin and Meglino (1987) found that both job satisfaction and organizational commitment were higher when there was value congruence between employees and their supervisors. Similarly, Meglino et al. (1989) found that when production workers' and their supervisors' values were closely matched, their job satisfaction and organizational commitment was higher. The findings also suggested that such worker-supervisor value match remained fairly stable over time (Meglino et al., 1989). Ugboro (1993) found that value congruence and affective commitment were significantly and positively related. Additionally, Cable and Judge (1996) found that P-O fit predicted participants' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Amos and Weathington (2008) found that

employees' perceived congruence of employee-organizational values was positively associated with satisfaction with their job and organization as a whole. The researchers also found that such congruence was positively associated with employee commitment to the organization (Amos & Weathington, 2008).

In addition, a number of researchers have been studying organizational commitment and job satisfaction in their relationships with various situational characteristics, attitudes, and behaviors of employees (Howard & Frink, 1996; Mowday et al., 1982; Rehman & Waheed, 2011). For example, affective commitment has been shown to be related to such attitudes and behaviors as job satisfaction, absenteeism, and turnover intentions (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Riketta & Van Dick, 2005). According to Mowday et al. (1982), workplace commitment has a potential to influence organizational effectiveness, employee well-being, as well as potential for turnover. Furthermore, research consistently shows that commitment contributes to a decrease in turnover (Tett & Meyer, 1993; Meyer et al., 2002). Rehman and Waheed (2011) found a correlation between job performance and job satisfaction. Finally, Howard and Frink (1996) found that job satisfaction increased life satisfaction.

Community Psychology

The field of Community Psychology is defined by its values such as social justice, respect for diversity, and empowerment (Fryer, 2008; Kloos et al., 2012; Rappaport, 1977). It is a subfield of psychology and is called

Division 27 of the American Psychological Association. The professional

organization of the field is the *Society for Community Research and Action*

(SCRA). As of August 2011, there were 1,361 listed members of SCRA.

There are currently 2 undergraduate, 15 Masters, and 38 Doctoral programs

offered in the US (See Appendix A). Having been established in the US in the

1960s, Community Psychology is a relatively new field.

History and Definition

The field of Community Psychology, according to Rappaport (1977),

is best defined as a perspective or paradigm. Different roots have been cited in

the development of what is currently known as this field. Some of the roots of

Community Psychology are in Europe, while the field's rapid growth spurt

occurred in the US during the 20th century. The context of the 1960's played

a major role on the way the field has been shaped. In addition, Fryer (2008)

has written about intellectual, cultural, and ideological dominance of the U.S.

which has and still plays a role in shaping the field across the world.

According to Fryer (2008), the U.S. produces most of the textbooks and

journals, and it leads in the number of teaching programs and trained faculty,

which in turn may lead to a US-centric version of community psychological in

terms of conceptualization, methodology and intervention.

Traditionally, psychology focused on the individual rather than the

individual within the community (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2005). Community

Psychology, on the other hand, studies people in context and uses ecological

(i.e., multilevel) analyses. In addition, traditional psychologists often use a

medical model, focusing on the problems and deficiencies within individuals and intervene after a problem has already occurred. In contrast, Community Psychologists focus on strengths or resilience factors and emphasize the importance of prevention and early intervention. Community Psychology emphasizes participatory, action-oriented research. This emphasis results in efforts to change social conditions. Finally, Community Psychology also focuses on promoting social change (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2005; Rappaport, 1977).

Values of the Field

While the roots of the field may vary, most community psychologists agree that the origins of the field are better defined not as a professional organization, but rather as a set of values about research and practice. Rappaport (1977) highlighted the themes of the ecological viewpoint (the fit between people and their social and physical environments), the importance of cultural relativity and diversity, and a focus on social change. Kloos et al. (2012) called Community Psychology a "shift in perspective" (p. 7). They further suggest that "Community psychology concerns the relationships of individuals with communities and societies. By integrating research with action, it seeks to understand and enhance quality of life for individuals, communities, and societies" (Kloos et al., 2012, p. 12). According to Kloos et al. (2012), US-centric values that guide the field include "individual and family wellness, sense of community, respect for human diversity, social

justice, empowerment and citizen participation, collaboration and community strength, and empirical grounding" (p. 26).

Community Psychology values were examined through a survey completed by the attendees of the *Society for Community Research and Action* (SCRA) Biennial Conference in 2009 (See Appendix B). Specifically, the conference attendees were provided with a survey asking them to identify top three values of Community Psychology that drive their research and teaching. This examination yielded fourteen highly rated Community Psychology values including: (1) social justice, (2) respect for diversity, (3) empowerment, (4) collaboration, (5) ecological perspective, (6) empirical grounding, (7) sense of community, (8) strength-based approach, (9) citizen participation, (10) prevention, (11) working with marginalized populations, (12) action research, (13) second order change, and (14) program efficacy. Specifically, these particular values were the most often reported and were selected on the basis of responses to an open-ended survey asking the participants to identify the top three values of Community Psychology that influence their research and teaching.

Organizational Studies in Community Psychology

There has been a lack of organizational research in the field of Community Psychology. Boyd and Angelique's (2002) content analysis of all organizational studies published in the *American Journal of Community Psychology* and *Journal of Community Psychology* from 1977 through the end of 2000 found that community psychologists rarely use organizational

constructs and theories. Rather, much work on organizations focus on performance and profitability ideals within an organizational context. The community psychology tenet, through its focus on well-being and psychological needs of people, can bring a humanistic perspective into the study of organizations, including academic institutions (Boyd & Angelique, 2002).

An academic setting is an excellent place for studying community psychologists' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Many community psychologists find themselves in an academic setting for at least a part of their career (i.e., professional training) and many remain in such settings. Thus, it is important for research to examine the relationship between Community Psychology values and how they impact individuals who are employed in academic settings.

Attraction-Selection-Attrition and Academia

Research on the ASA framework suggests that individuals are drawn to and remain in the settings where values match their own (Schneider et al., 1995). Such settings may include both one's career as well as one's workplace. Although this framework has been tested on many samples, it has never been tested within an academic setting focusing on a specific value set. This study sets out to test whether the ASA framework can translate to an academic setting with a focus on a specific set of value of the field of Community Psychology.

Just as with many other professions, in line with the ASA framework, people with certain personal values choose Community Psychology as their professional field. Because the field is defined by its values (e.g., respect for diversity, social justice, etc.), it is plausible that those entering the field of Community Psychology should feel like the values of the field at least partially match their own values. Additionally, based on the ASA framework, those individuals drawn to the field might look for job settings whose values are congruent with their own values.

Because the field of Community Psychology has such strong value roots, it may be that even a small number of faculty with high Community Psychology values will have an effect on the overall value makeup of the department. Because the field is not considered to be one of the main subfields of psychology, staffing for Community Psychology curriculum may be limited or spread among faculty, thus a loss of a Community Psychology faculty member, may result in a complete loss of the curriculum for a department.

Rationale

Value congruence between employees and their workplace is an important dimension of an individual's fit with his or her work environment. Although researchers explored aspects of this congruency, there is dearth of research on value congruence between professors and departments within academic settings. This lack of research is unfortunate because employees in such settings have a direct effect on the type and quality of their institution's

student's body education. For the field, it is important to identify the benefits of congruence among faculty members.

Additionally, it is important to study environments in which individuals might lack a match between their personal values and the values of their academic workplace. Therefore, it is expected that the findings of the present study will suggest the need to provide support to the faculty who report value incongruence within their departments. Improvements in value congruency may assist faculty to remain at a setting and report better job outcomes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

<u>Statement of Hypotheses</u>

Hypothesis I: Departments that will be rated higher on the Community

Psychology Values survey will have a higher number of faculty

who report stronger Community Psychology values.

Hypothesis II: Participants who report better scores on the *Community*

*Psychology Person-Organization Fit (*CPV P-O Fit) survey

will report higher scores on the Job Satisfaction scale.

Hypothesis III: Participants who report better scores on the *Community*

Psychology Person-Organization Fit (CPV P-O Fit) survey

will report higher scores on the Organizational Commitment

scale.

Hypothesis IV: Participants who report better scores on the *Community*

Psychology Person-Organization Fit (CPV P-O Fit) survey

will report a stronger willingness to recommend their

department as a good place to work.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Participants

This study focused on those who hold a professional role (i.e., faculty and staff) in academia. The criteria for inclusion in the study required participants of this study to be a member of the professional organization called the *Society for Community Research and Action* (SCRA), and currently work and/or teach at a higher education institution. After initial contact, forty nine emails were returned indicating non-existent account, eight individuals identified themselves as non-academic, and one person asked not to be contacted again. Forty three participants have contacted the researchers either via email or in person indicating that they have completed the survey. At least two week following the initial contact, the remaining six hundred thirty four individuals were sent a reminder email.

The total number of the Society for Community Research and Action members who responded to the survey was two hundred and seventeen. The total number of the *Society for Community Research and Action* members who responded to the survey was two hundred and seventeen, which is a return rate of 32%. Twenty two surveys (10% of the total surveys returned) were excluded because the participants did not meet the criteria of being an academic. Thirty-one surveys (14%) were incomplete and thus, were not used in all analyses. The final sample consisted of 107 females and 88 males, which brought the return rate down to 27%. The mean age of our sample was

44.09 years (standard deviation, $SD = 3$). The majority of participants (70.2%) were White, 9.6% were Black or African Americans, 9.6% were Hispanic/Latino/Latina, 5.1% were Asian, and 5.1% were reported to be other. The majority of participants were married (65.7%), 22.2% were single/never married, 8.6% were divorced and 1% was separated.

Measures

The first portion of the survey collected individual's demographic information. Participants were asked to identify their sex, age, ethnicity, marital status, and highest degree he or she earned. In addition, they were asked to what extend they identified with being a Community Psychologist, whether or not they hold a Community Psychology degree, to what extend they are involved with the *Society for Community Research and Action,* whether they have taught at least one Community Psychology course in the past three academic years, their employment status (i.e., full vs. part-time), how many jobs in an academic setting they held since receiving their graduate degree, their tenure at the current position, their type of institution they are a part of (i.e., private faith-based, private, public, community/junior college, four-year undergraduate institution, college/university with graduate programs, professional school, and other), their type of college their department is a part of, the time of department they are a member of, and their types of degrees in Community Psychology offered by the department (i.e., none, BA, MA, PhD, other) (See Appendix C).

Participants also completed the *Community Psychology Values Person-Organization Fit* (CPV P-O Fit) survey, specifically designed for this study. The *CPV P-O Fit* survey measured how individuals rated themselves and their department on a number of Community Psychology values (See Appendix D). Specifically, the participants were provided a list of fourteen Community Psychology values and were asked to indicate how high they would rate themselves and their department on such values. Fourteen Community Psychology values included: (1) social justice, (2) respect for diversity, (3) empowerment, (4) collaboration, (5) ecological perspective, (6) empirical grounding, (7) sense of community, (8) strength-based approach, (9) citizen participation, (10) prevention, (11) working with marginalized populations, (12) action research, (13) second order change, and (14) program efficacy. As stated previously, these particular values were selected on the basis of responses to an open-ended survey asking the participants to identify the top three values of Community Psychology that influence their research and teaching. The survey was given to the attendees of the *Society for Community Research and Action* (SCRA) Biennial 2009.

Scores were calculated by computing the sum of absolute value of the difference between the two ratings on each of the values. The value congruence between a participant and department was assessed. Higher scores on *CPV P-O Fit* survey indicated further distance from zero and thus, less fit.

A portion of the *CPV P-O Fit* survey that describes value makeup of the participant's department was used to test the relationship between ratings

of the department on the Community Psychology values and the number of faculty who hold similar values. Participants were asked to answer this question: "In your opinion, what percentage of the members of your department will score high on the values you have used earlier to rate your department?" (See Appendix E). Responses could range from "0%" to "100%." In this case, higher scores on the scale indicated a higher rating on Community Psychology values.

The *Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire* (MOAQ) measures the perceptions of organizational members (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1983). The three-item subscale of the MOAQ selected for this study measures satisfaction with the social dimensions of one's job and organization (See Appendix F). Satisfaction was rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 7 = *strongly agree*). Sample items included: All in all, I am satisfied with my job, In general, I don't like my job (R), and In general, I like working here. For scoring purposes, participants' responses to all of the items within a satisfaction scale were averaged to yield an overall score. Items denoted with (R) were reversed and re-coded (e.g., 1 = 7; 7 = 1) before averaging the overall score. This measure has been reported to be adaptable to fit the needs of this study. In the instructions, the word "organization" was replaced with "department" and instead of leaving a space for inserting an organization's name by the participant, a phrase "your college/university" was used. Internal consistency (alpha) for the three-item subscale of the MOAQ was .77 (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1983)

and ranged from 0.67 to 0.95 (Hochwarter, Perrewe, Ferris, Brymer, 1999;

McFarlin & Rice, 1992; McLain, 1995; Sanchez & Brock, 1996; Siegall &

McDonald, 1995).

The *TCM Employee Commitment Survey* measures three forms of

employee commitment to an organization: (1) affective commitment (based

on desire), (2) normative commitment (based on obligation), and (3)

continuance commitment (based on cost) (Meyer & Allen, 1997). According

to the authors, the three scales of the survey, *Affective Commitment* scale

(ACS), the *Normative Commitment* scale (NCS) and the *Continuance*

Commitment scale (CCS) are well-validated. Specifically, according to Allen

and Meyer (1990), ACS "correlated positively with six different types of

organizational socialization programs and negatively with having an

innovative role orientation within the first 6 months of entering an

organization" (as cited in Fields, 2002, p.5). Because each scale is scored

separately and can be used to identify, what the authors call, "commitment

profile" of employees within an organization, only a portion of the survey,

(i.e., ACS) will be used in this study (p. 2) (See Appendix G). The *Affective*

Commitment scale "measures an employee's emotional attachment to,

identification with, and involvement in the organization" (p. 2). According to

the authors, employees with a strong affective commitment (i.e., high ACS

scores) stay because they *want to* and not because they *ought to* or *have to,*

measured by the other two scales (i.e., NCS & CCS). As stated earlier, out of

the three *Commitment* scales, high *Affective Commitment* scale is the most

relevant measure of organizational commitment effects. The revised version of the affective commitment scale includes 6 items. Commitment was rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 7 = *strongly agree*). Sample items included: I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization, I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own, I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my organization (R), I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization (R), This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me, and I do not feel strong sense of belonging to my organization (R). For scoring purposes, participants' responses to all of the items within a commitment scale were averaged to yield an overall score. Items denoted with (R) were reversed and re-coded (e.g., 1 = 7; 7 = 1) before averaging the overall score. The final score could range in value from 1 to 7 with higher scores indicating stronger commitment. Coefficient alpha value of the *Affective Commitment* scale (ACS) was 0.87 (Allen & Meyer, 1990) and ranged from 0.77 to 0.88 (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Cohen, 1996, 1999; Cohen & Kirchmeyer, 1995; Hackett et al., 1994; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer, Irving, & Allen, 1998; Somers, 1995; Somers & Birnbaum, 1998).

The *Perceived Person-Organization Fit* scale measures an employee's perception of his or her fit with an organization (Cable & Judge, 1996) (See Appendix H). The three-item scale will be rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = not at all and 5 = completely). Sample items include: "To what degree do you feel your values "match" or fit this department and the current employees in this department?" "My values match those of the current employees of this

department," and "Do you think the values and "personality" of this department reflect your own values and personality?" Coefficient alpha of the scale was 0.87 (Cable & Judge, 1996). Participants' responses to all of the items within the *Perceived Person-Organization Fit* scale were averaged to yield an overall score.

In addition, the participants were asked to indicate their willingness to recommend their department assessed with the questions, "How likely would you be to recommend your department to your friends as a good place work?" (See Appendix I). Willingness to recommend was rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *not recommend*; 5 = *recommend strongly*). Using the same question, Cable and Judge (1996) found that P-O fit perceptions significantly predicted participants' willingness to recommend their department to others. In addition, Wanous and Colella (1989) found a large percentage of new job applicants were referred to the organization by current employees and those individuals who were then hired showed better performance and lower turnover (as cited in Cable & Judge, 1996).

Procedures

To help identify a pool of faculty from which to sample, in the Fall of 2011, we obtained a list of all members of SCRA. Specifically, the list of potential participants was obtained from the SCRA's website. To qualify, the initial participants had to be listed as members of SCRA and currently working/teaching at an academic institution in the United States. Names of one thousand three hundred fifty seven members of the Society for

Community Psychology Research and Action were identified. Those individuals whose affiliation was clearly identified as non-academic or international were excluded from search (N = 64). The researchers were able to obtain seven hundred thirty five emails. Each participant was contacted via email. The email included an introduction from the researchers, a brief description of the study, and a link to the questionnaires. In addition, in the email, the researchers informed all potential participants that their participation was completely voluntary and that individual responses were going to be held in strict anonymity. Clicking on the survey link took the participant to the survey sharing website (i.e., limeservice.com). The last item on the survey asked the participants to provide the researchers with contact information of any individuals who might be interested in participating in this study (See Appendix J).

Chapter III

RESULTS

Correlational Analyses

To examine relationships among the variables of interest, Pearson product-moment correlations were computed. Overall, there were eleven significant correlations. Three correlations were weak, six correlations were moderate, and one correlation was strong. It needs to be noted that level of Community Psychology value fit *(CPV P-O Fit)* was a measure of distance, with higher scores representing greater distance between one's own values and the values of the department (i.e., worse fit) and lower scores representing smaller distance between one's own values and the values of the department (i.e., better fit).

Specifically, there was a weak positive correlation between the level of one's own Community Psychology values and the level of *CPV P-O Fit* ($r = .22$, $n = 179$, $p < .05$). In addition, there was a weak positive correlation between the level of department's Community Psychology values and the level of job satisfaction ($r = .25$, $n = 172$, $p < .05$). Additionally, there was a weak negative correlation between the level of *CPV P-O Fit* and the level of job satisfaction ($r = -.25$, $n = 169$, $p < .05$).

There was a moderate positive correlation between the level of department's Community Psychology values and the willingness to recommend one's department as a good place to work ($r = .39$, $n = 168$,

$p < .001$). There was a moderate negative correlation between the level of

CPV P-O Fit and the willingness to recommend one's department ($r = -.44$,

$n = 166$, $p < .001$). In addition, there were moderate positive correlations

between the willingness to recommend one's department and the level of job

satisfaction ($r = .62$, $n = 171$, $p < .001$) and the level of organizational

commitment ($r = .68$, $n = 171$, $p < .001$).

In addition, there was a moderate negative correlation between the

level of organizational commitment and the level of *CPV P-O Fit* ($r = -.52$,

$n = 169$, $p < .001$). Additionally, there were moderate positive correlations

between the level of organizational commitment and the level of department's

Community Psychology values ($r = .49$, $n = 172$, $p < .001$) and the level of job

satisfaction ($r = .52$, $n = 175$, $p < .001$).

Furthermore, there was a strong, negative correlation between the level

of the department's Community Psychology values and the level of *CPV P-O

Fit* ($r = -0.85$, $n = 179$, $p < .001$). Increases in the level of the department's

Community Psychology values were correlated with increases in the level of

Community Psychology values fit (i.e., a smaller difference between one's

own values and the values of the department).

Table 1

Correlation Matrix between the Measures of Values and Work Related

Outcomes

Measures	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Personal Values	-	.10	.22*	.01	-.01	-.08
2 Departmental Values		-	-.85**	.25*	.49**	.39**
3 CPV PO Fit			-	-.25*	-.52**	-.44**
4 Satisfaction				-	.52**	.62**
5 Commitment					-	.68**
6 Willingness to recommend department						-

*Note: *p* < .05. **p* < .001 (2-tailed)

Because of the strong correlation between the scores on the *CPV P-O*

Fit survey and the department values, department values were not included in

any regression examining value fit, as was originally proposed. Furthermore,

from the theoretical perspective *CPV P-O Fit* was a better measure of one's

value fit than the departmental scores.

Regression Analyses

Hypothesis I: *Departments that will be rated higher on the Community*

Psychology Values survey will have a higher number of faculty

who report stronger Community Psychology values.

To examine the first hypothesis, a linear regression was conducted.

The department's values score (measured by a portion of the *CPV P-O Fit*

survey) was the independent variable and the number of academic faculty

with Community Psychology values ("In your opinion, what percentage of the

members of your department will score high on the values you have used

earlier to rate your department?") as the outcome variable.

Table 2

Regression of the Department's CP Value Scores onto Department Members'

Values (N = 169)

	B	SE B	β
Constant	58.07	1.63	
CPV PO Fit	15.79	2.13	.50**

*Note: **p < .001.*

Higher departmental scores on the *CPV-PO-Fit* survey [$M = 3.54$,

$SD = .76$] predicted greater number of faculty possessing similar values

[$M = 58.23$, $SD = 24.29$], $β = .50$, $t(168) = 7.40$, $p < .001$. The overall model

fit was $R^2 = .25$, $F(1, 168) = 54.77$, $p < .001$, indicating that about one quarter

(25%) of the variance in the number of faculty in one's department that

possess similar values was explained by the department's Community

Psychology Values scores.

Hypothesis II: *Participants who report better scores on the CPV P-O Fit*

survey will report higher scores on the Job Satisfaction scale.

The second hypothesis explored how much of the observable

variability in job satisfaction scores can be attributed to the level of *CPV P-O*

Fit. However, based on the results of the correlation, the departmental

Community Psychology values scores were not included as a control variable

in the linear regression. Therefore, a hierarchical linear regression model was

examined whether better fit, as measured by the *CPV P-O Fit survey* (i.e., smaller averaged difference between the department and the individual values)*,* predicted higher job satisfaction scores beyond personal Community Psychology values. Specifically, personal Community Psychology values scores and the scores for the value fit (i.e., the averaged difference between the personal values and the departmental values) were entered into the regression to examine how well this variable predicts satisfaction scores, while controlling for the level of personal values. Results are displayed in the table below.

Table 3

Regression of CPV P-O Fit onto Job Satisfaction (N = 168)

Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Constant	6.25	.20	
Your CP Values	.23	.25	.07
CPV PO Fit	-.53	.16	-.26*

*Note: *p* < .05.*

Better value fit, as measured by the *Community Psychology Values Person-Organization Fit (CPV P-O Fit)* survey [$M = 1.08$, $SD = .71$], predicted higher job satisfaction scores [$M = 5.69$, $SD = 1.43$]. About seven percent of the variability in job satisfaction was explained by the *CPV P-O Fit*, $\beta = -.26$, $t(166) = -3.41$, $p < .05$. The overall model fit was $R^2 = .07$, $F(2, 166) = 5.84$, $p < .05$. The subscale of the *Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire* that measures satisfaction with the social

dimensions of one's job and organization consisted of 3 items and appeared to have good internal consistency, $\alpha = .91$. Cronbach's alphas for the 14 personal and 14 departmental values items of the *CPV P-O Fit* survey were .76 and .91 respectively.

Hypothesis III: *Participants who report better scores on the CPV P-O*

Fit survey will report higher scores on the Organizational

Commitment scale.

A hierarchical linear regression model was created to examine whether better fit, as measured by the *CPV PO Fit* survey (i.e., smaller averaged difference between the department and the individual), predicts higher organizational commitment scores beyond personal Community Psychology values. Results are shown in the table below.

Table 4

Regression of CPV P-O Fit onto Organizational Commitment (N = 168)

Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Constant	5.57	.17	
Your CP Values	.35	.21	.11
CPV PO Fit	-1.05	.13	-.54**

*Note: **p < .001.*

Better value fit, as measured by the *Community Psychology Values Person-Organization Fit (CPV P-O Fit)* survey [$M = 1.08$, $SD = .71$], predicted higher organizational commitment scores [$M = 4.38$, $SD = 1.40$]. About 28% percent of the variability in organizational commitment was

explained by the *CPV P-O Fit*, $\beta = -1.05$, $t(166) = -7.98$, $p < .01$. The overall

model fit was $R^2 = .28$, $F(2, 166) = 31.84$, $p < .001$. The affective commitment

subscale of the *TCM Employee Commitment Survey consisted of 6 items and*

appeared to have good internal consistency, $\alpha = .89$.

Hypothesis IV: *Participants who report better scores on the CPV P-O Fit*

     survey will report a stronger willingness to recommend their

     department as a good place to work.

  The fourth hypothesis predicted that better fit, as measured by the *CPV*

P-O Fit survey (i.e., smaller averaged difference between the department and

the individual) will predict higher recommendation scores. Results are shown

in the table below.

Table 5

*Regression of CPV P-O Fit onto Willingness to Recommend Department
(N = 165)*

_____

Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Constant	4.55	.15	
CPV PO Fit	-.70	.11	-.44**

*Note: **p < .001*

  Better fit, as measured by the *CPV P-O Fit* survey [$M = 1.08$,

$SD = .71$] was a significant predictor of the likelihood of recommending one's

department as a good place to work, $M = 3.78$, $SD = 1.14$, $\beta = -.44$, $t(163) =$

-6.35, $p < .001$. The overall model fit was $R^2 = .29$, $F(1, 163) = 40.38$,

p < .001. About twenty-nine percent of variance in the willingness to

recommend one's department was explained by the scores on the *CPV P-O Fit*

survey.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Major Findings & Implications

Departments rated higher on Community Psychology Values, as measured by the *Community Psychology Values Person-Organization Fit (CPV P-O Fit)* survey, predicted greater number of faculty possessing similar values employed in one's department. The results suggest that the *Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA)* theory works with values of the field of Community Psychology. These findings also suggest that the *ASA* theory, usually used in discussion of non-academic settings, translates to academic settings. This has important implications for the field of Community Psychology. Given that faculty members with similar values are attracted to departments with a higher number of individuals sharing their values, academic settings with little or no faculty members with Community Psychology values are less likely to attract Community Psychology faculty. These settings will thus have fewer individuals capable of teaching Community Psychology curriculum or disseminating Community Psychology values to such departments.

Better value fit, as measured by the *Community Psychology Values Person-Organization Fit (CPV P-O Fit)* survey, predicted higher job satisfaction scores and higher organizational commitment scores, as well as a stronger willingness to recommend their department as a good place to work. Based on these findings, those members of the *Society for Community Research and Action (SCRA)* who find themselves in academic settings with a

low level of Community Psychology values might need additional support from other sources such as professional organizations (e.g., *SCRA*), in order to ensure that these individuals remain in such settings and raise awareness about the field. In particular, such organizations can provide support that emphasizes the value fit for those individuals beyond their workplace (e.g., listserv, conferences, committees, etc.). Those members of *SCRA* who find themselves in academic settings which do not match their values will be less likely to recommend their workplace to colleagues, thus not attracting potential *SCRA* members to their departments, which in turn will hamper the department from increasing its level of Community Psychology values and potentially, attracting more members of *SCRA*.

Findings also supported the positive relationship between "value congruence" and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and willingness to recommend one's workplace. At the same time, they provided a better understanding of the concepts of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the academic settings. Furthermore, these findings highlight the importance of values in relation to "organizational culture" beyond those strictly related to work/job. Finally, there may be a need for additional support for community psychologists in specific academic settings.

Limitations of Research

This study has several limitations that should be highlighted. For instance, it was not possible to obtain the contact information of every member of the *Society for Community Research and Action*. In addition, it

was not possible to identify those individuals who are currently employed in an academic setting, which also limited our conclusion about the study's return rate. That is, there is a chance that some of the individuals who had neither responded to the survey nor contacted the researchers had been in non-academic settings. Furthermore, those who were less satisfied with their workplace may have been more overwhelmed and less likely to notice or respond to emails. However, they may have been more likely to pay attention to emails regarding the values they share. Therefore, generalizability could have been compromised.

Future Directions

Previous research also suggests a relationship between length of time in an organization and *Person-Organization Fit* (Holland, 1985). For example, individuals with low tenure who had high value congruence had higher social satisfaction compared to those with low value congruence. There was little difference in satisfaction compared to those with high tenure (Adkins et al., 1996). This suggests that those individuals who are new to a workplace that does not share their values may be at a higher risk of social dissatisfaction compared to those who have been in the department longer. Future studies should examine the relationship between work adjustment and community psychologists in academia. Furthermore, given that the duration of time one is in a setting may also impact job satisfaction; future research in this area should utilize a longitudinal design to provide further insight into satisfaction of community psychologists within an academic setting.

Additionally, future studies might explore a more comprehensive perspective on value congruence. For example, value fit between members of a department could have important implications for job satisfaction and organizational commitment and should be explored. Previous research has indicated that value congruence in the workplace may be split into (1) values between co-workers and (2) supervisors. Though both types of value congruencies have been found to have an effect on the individuals' job outcomes, there is no research that explores the interaction of the different types of value congruencies within academia.

Furthermore, future research should focus on exploring the difference between perceived versus actual values. Specifically, there may be a difference between the values that are put out by the organization (e.g., mission statement) and those that are being implemented (e.g., faculty and stuff often participate in volunteer work in accordance with the value of giving back to the community).

Finally, the current study only focused on the values of the field of Community Psychology. In the future research, there should be some competing values such as meritocracy, competition, self-reliance, etc. Inclusion of such values (i.e., beyond Community Psychology values) may be a better predictor of job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

Value congruence between employees and their workplace is an important dimension of an individual's fit with a work environment. High congruence potentially may affect various facets of job outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and willingness to recommend one's workplace. Although previous research finds Person-Organization (P-O) fit to be multidimensional, the present study focused primarily on the unidimension of values component within P-O fit. Specifically, the level of congruence between the values of employees and their employing organization and the relation of value congruence to satisfaction, commitment, and willingness to recommend one's department was examined. This study focused on the relationship of value congruence between the individuals who belong to the field of community psychology and their workplace in relation to the aforementioned work-related outcomes in an academic setting. Results show that departments rated higher on community psychology values had a greater number of faculty possessing similar values employed in one's department. In addition, better value fit predicted higher job satisfaction scores and higher organizational commitment scores, as well as a stronger willingness to recommend their organization as a good place to work. Findings further supported the positive relationship between "value congruence" and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and willingness to recommend one's workplace. At the same time, they provided a better understanding of the

concepts of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the academic

settings. Furthermore, the findings highlighted the importance of values in

relation to "organizational culture" beyond those strictly related to work/job.

Finally, there may be a need for additional support for community

psychologists in specific academic settings.

REFERENCES

Adkins, C. L., Ravlin, E. C., & Meglino, B. M. (1996). Value congruence between co-workers and its relationship to work outcomes, *Value congruence between co-workers and its relationship to work outcomes, 21,* 439-460.

Agho, A. O., Mueller, C. W., & Price, J. L. (1993). Determinant validity of measures of job satisfaction, positive affectivity and negative affectivity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 65,* 185-196.

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (2000). Construct validation in organizational behavior research: The case of organizational commitment. In R. D. Goffin & E. Helmes (Eds.), Problems and solutions in human assessment: Honouring Douglas N. Jackson at seventy (pp. 285–314). Norwell, MA: Kluwer.

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,49,* 252–276.

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 63,* 1-18.

Amos, E. A., & Weathington, B. L. (2008). An analysis of the relation between employee-organization value congruence and employee attitudes. *The Journal of Psychology, 142,* 615-631.

Arciniega, L. M., & Gonzalez, L. (2005). Other-oriented values and job satisfaction. *Problems and Perspectives in Management, 4,* 128-132.

Arvey, R. D., Carter, G. W., & Buerkley, D. K. (1991). Job Satisfaction: Dispositional and situational influences. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 6, pp. 359-383). New York: John Wiley.

Barley, S. R., Meyer, G. W., & Gash, D. C. (1988). Cultures of Culture: Academics, Practitioners and the   Pragmatics of Normative Control, *Administrative Science Quarterly, 33,* 24-60

Barney, J. B. (1986). Organizational culture: Can it be a source of sustained competitive advantage? *The Academy of Management Review, 11,* 656-665.

Bond, M. A. (1999). Gender, race, and class in organizational contexts. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 27,* 327-355.

Boxx, W. R., Odom. R. Y., & Dunn, M. G. (1991). Organizational values and value congruency and their impact on satisfaction, commitment, and cohesion: An empirical examination within the public sector. *Public Personnel Management, 20,* 195-206.

Boyd, N. M., & Angelique, H. (2002). Rekindling the discourse: Organization studies in community psychology. *Journal of Community Psychology, 30*, 325-348.

Bretz, R. D., & Judge, T. A. (1993). Report on an alternative measure of affective disposition, *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53,* 1095-1104.

Bussing, A., Bissels, T., Fuchs, V., & Perrar, K. M. (1999). A dynamic model of work satisfaction: Qualitative approaches, *Human Relations, 52,* 999-1028.

Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person-organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 67,* 294-311.

Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1994). Pay preference and job search decisions: A person-organization fit perspective, *Personnel Psychology, 47,* 317-.

Caldwell, D. F., & O'Reilly, C. A. III. (1990). Measuring person-job fit with a profile-comparison process, *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75,* 648-657.

Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, G. D., & Klesh, J. R. (1983). Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. In S. E. Seashore, E. E. Lawler, P. H. Mirvis, & C. Cammann (Eds.), *Assessing Organizational Change: A Guide to Methods, Measure, and Practices* (Vol. 1, pp. 71-119). John Wiley & Sons: New York.

Cauce, A. M. (2007). Bringing community psychology home: The leadership, community and values initiative, *American Journal of Community Psychology, 39.* 1-11.

Chatman, J. A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms, *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36,* 459-484.

Chatman, J. A. (1989). Improving international organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Review, 14,* 333-349.

Cohen, A. (1996). On the discriminant validity of the Meyer and Allen measure of organizational commitment: how does it fit with the work commitment construct? *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* 56, 494-503.

Cohen, A. (1999). Relationships among five forms of commitment: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 285-308.

Cohen, & Kirchmeyer (1995), A multidimensional approach to the relation between organizational commitment and nonwork participation, Journal of Vocational Behavior, Volume 46, Issue 2, Pages 189-202.

Diener, E., Larsen, R. J., & Emmons, R. A. (1984). Person x situation interactions: Choice of situations and congruence response models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47,* 580-592.

Dalton, J.H., Elias, M.J., & Wandersman, A. (2007). Community psychology: Linking individuals and communities. Stamford, CT: Wadsworth.

England, G. W. (1967). Personal value systems of American managers. *Academy of Management Journal, 51*, 53-68.

Enz, C. A. (1988). The role of value congruity in intraorganizational power. Academic Science Quarterly, 33, 284-304.

Fields, D. L. (Ed.), (2002). Taking the Measure of Work: A Guide to Validated Scales for Organizational Research and Diagnosis. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Fryer, D. (2008). Some questions about "the history of community psychology," *Journal of Community Psychology, 36,* 572-586.

Hackett, R. D., Bycio, P., & Hausdorf, P. A. (1994). Further assessments of Meyer and Allen's three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 15-23.

Hochwarter, W. A., Perrewé, P. L., Ferris, G. R., & Brymer, R. A. (1999). Job satisfaction and performance: The moderating effects of value attainment and affective disposition. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54,* 296-313.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software in the mind.* London: McGraw-Hill.

Hogan, R. T. (1991). Personality and personality measurement. In D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough & (Eds.), *Handbook on industrial and organizational psychology*, (2nd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 873-919). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Holland, J.L. (1985). *Making vocational choices: A theory of careers.* Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Howard, J. I., & Frink, D. D. (1996). The effects of organizational restructure on employee satisfaction, *Group & Organization Management, 21,* 278-303.

Jegadeesan, G. (2007). Job satisfaction: A conceptual framework, *The ICFAI Journal of Organizational Behavior, 4*, 53-60.

Jin, J. & Rounds, J. (2011). Stability and change in work values: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. DOI: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S000187911100 1448

Johnson, D. W. (Jan. 2011). Professional culture fit and work-related quality of life in academic departments: A phenomenographic approach**.** (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Minnesota, Twin Cities.

Judge, T. A., & Bretz, R. D. Jr. (1993). Report an alternative measure of affective disposition, *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53,* 1095 -1104.

Judge, T. A., & Bretz, R. D. (1992). Effects of work values on job choice decision, *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77,* 261-271.

Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurements, and implications. *Personnel Psychology, 49,* 1-49.

Lusk, E. J., & Oliver, B. L. (1974). American managers' personal value systems – revisited. *Academy of Management Journal, 17,* 549-554.

Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. (1990). A review of meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin, 108,* 171-194.

McFarlin, D. B., & Rice, R. W. (1992). The role of facet importance as a moderator in job satisfaction processes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13,* 41-54.

McLain, D. L. (1995). Responses to health and safety risk in the work environment. *Academy of Management Journal, 38,* 1726-1746.

Meglino, B. M., Ravlin, E. C., & Adkins, C. L. (1989). A work values approach to corporate culture: A field test of the value congruence process and its relationship to individual outcomes, *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74,* 424-432.

Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (2004). TCM Employee Commitment Survey Academic Users Guide 2004. University of Western Ontario.

Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1997) *Commitment in the workplace.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace toward a general model, *Human Resource Management Review, 11,* 299-326.

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective,continuance and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *61*, 20-52.

Meyer, J. P., Irving, P. G., & Allen, N. J. (1998). Examination of the combined effects of work values and early work experiences on organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19,* 29-52.

Moorman, R. H. (1993). The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior, *Human Relations, 46,* 759-776.

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (Eds.), 1982. *Employee-Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover.* New York, NY: Academic Press, INC.

Mowday, R. T., Steers, R., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14,* 224-247.

Nelson, G., & Prilleltensky, I. (2005). *Community Psychology: In Pursuit of Liberation and Well-Being.* New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71,* 492-499.

O'Reilly, C. A. III, Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit, *The Academy of Management Journal, 34,* 487-516.

Ostroff, C. & Judge, T. A. (Eds.), (2007). *Perspectives on organizational fit.* New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1973). Organizational, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism, *Psychological Bulletin, 80,* 151-176.

Rappaport, J. (1977). Community psychology: Values, research, and action. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Ravlin, E. C., & Meglino, B. M. (1987). Effects of values on perception and decision making: A study of alternative work values measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72,* 666-673.

Rehman, M. S., & Waheed, A. (2011). An empirical study of impact of job satisfaction on job performance in the public sector organizations. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 2,* 167-181.

Riketta, M., & Van Dick, R. (2005). Foci of attachment in organizations: A meta-analytic comparison of the strength and correlates of workgroup versus organizational identification and commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67,* 490-510.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values.* New York: Free Press.

Rousseau, D. M. (1990). Normative beliefs in fund-raising organizations: Linking culture to organizational performance and individual response, *Group & Organization Management 15*(448), 448-460.

Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (1997). A longitudinal investigation of the relationships between job information sources, applicant perceptions of fit, and work outcomes. *Personnel Psychology, 2,* 395-423.

Sanchez, J. I., & Brock, P. (1996). Outcomes of perceived discrimination among Hispanic employees: Is diversity management a luxury or a necessity? *Academy of Management Journal, 39,* 704-720.

Schein, E.H. (1985-2005) *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, 3rd Ed., Jossey-Bass

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, *40*, 437-453.

Schneider, B., Goldstein, H.W. & Smith, D.B. (1995). The ASA Framework: An Update. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 747-779.

Schwartz, S. H. (1999). A theory of cultural values and some implications for work. Applied Psychology: *An International Review, 48,* 23–47.

Schwartz, S. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and content of human values? *Journal of Social Issues, 50,* 19-45.

Shiraev, E. B., & Levy, D. A. (2009). *Cross-Cultural Psychology: Critical Thinking and Contemporary Applications* (4th Ed). Allyn & Bacon.

Siegall, M., & McDonald, T. (1995). Focus of attention and employee reactions to job change. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 25*(13)*, 1121-1141.

Society for Community Research and Action (n.d.). Graduate programs in

Community Psychology. Retrieved from

http://www.scra27.org/resources/educationc/academicpr/2010academi

cprogramsincommunitypsychologypdf

Society for Community Research and Action (2010). Undergraduate programs

in Community Psychology. Retrieved from

http://www.scra27.org/wiki/undergraduateprogramsincommunitypsych

ology

Somers, M. J. (1995). Organizational commitment, turnover and absenteeism:

An examination of direct and interaction effects. *Journal of

Organizational Behavior, 16,* 49-58.

Somers, M. J., & Birnbaum, D. (1998). Work related commitment and job

performance: It's the nature of the performance that counts. *Journal of

Organizational Behavior, 19,* 621-634.

Tett, R.P., & Meyer, J.P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment,

turnover intention, and turnover: Path analysis based on meta-analytic

findings. *Personnel Psychology, 46,* 259-293.

Tom, V.R. (1971). The role of personality and organizational images in the

recruiting process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*,

6, 573-592.

Ugboro, I. O. (1993). Loyalty, value congruency, and affective organizational

commitment. *Mid-American Journal of Business, 8,* 29–36

Verquer, M. T., Beehr, T. A., & Wagner, S. H. (2003). A meta-analysis of the

relationship between person-organization fit and work-related

attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63,* 473-489

Vroom, V. R. (1966). Organizational choice: A study of pre- and post-

decision processes. *Organizational Behavior and Human*

Performance, 1, 212-226.

Wanous, J. P., & Colella, A. (1989). Organizational entry research: Current

status and future directions. In G. R. Ferris & K. M. Rowland (Eds.),

Research in personnel and human resources management (Vol. 7, pp.

59-120). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Weiss, H. M. (2002). Deconstructing job satisfaction: separating evaluations,

beliefs and affective experiences, *Resource Management Review, 12,*

173-194.

Westerman, J. W., & Cyr, L.A. (2004). An integrative analysis of person-

organization fit theories. *International Journal of Selection and*

Assessment, 12, 252-261.

Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view.

Academy of Management Review, 7, 418-428.

Appendix A

Programs in Community Psychology

Graduate Programs in Community Psychology

Masters in Community Psychology

• The Adler School of Professional Psychology - Vancouver, Canada

• The American University in Cairo Psychology Unit - Cairo, Egypt

• Antioch University Department of Psychology - Los Angeles, CA

• University of Brighton School of Applied Social Science - Brighton, UK

• Central Connecticut State University Department of Psychology - New Britain, CA

• Edith Cowan University School of Psychology and Social Science - Joondalup, Australia

• Manchester Metropolitan University Faculty of Health, Psychology, and Social Care -

  Manchester, England

• University of Massachusetts Lowell Psychology Department - Lowell, MA

• Metropolitan State University College of Professional Studies - St. Paul, MN

• University of New Haven Department of Psychology and Sociology - West Haven, CT

• Pacifica Graduate Institute Department of Psychology - Carpinteria, CA

• Penn State Harrisburg School of Behavioral Sciences and Education - Harrisburg, PA

• Portland State University Psychology Department - Portland, OR

• The Sage Colleges Department of Psychology - Albany, NY

• Instituto Superior de Psicologia Aplicada Department of Psychology - Lisbon, Portugal

• The University of the Incarnate Word Psychology Department San - Antonio, Texas

• Victoria University of Technology School of Psychology - Melbourne, Australia

• University of Waikato School of Arts and Social Sciences - Hamilton, New Zealand

• Wilfrid Laurier University Department of Psychology - Waterloo, Canada

Masters in Community-Clinical Psychology

• Antioch University Department of Psychology - Los Angeles, CA

• University of North Carolina, Charlotte Department of Psychology - Charlotte, NC

• Sage Graduate Schools Department of Psychology - Albany, NY

Interdisciplinary Masters in Community Research/Action and Prevention

• Harvard University *Ed. M. in Prevention Science and Practice* - Cambridge, MA

• University of Miami *M.S. Ed. in Community and Social Change* - Miami, FL

• University of Michigan *M.P.H. in Health Behavior and Health Education* - Ann Arbor, MI

• University of Wisconsin-Madison *M.S. in Human Development and Family Studies* - Madison, WI

• Vanderbilt University *M.Ed. in Community Development & Action* - Nashville, TN

Doctoral Programs in Community Psychology

• DePaul University Department of Psychology - Chicago, IL

• Edith Cowan University School of Psychology and Social Science - Joondalup, Australia

• Georgia State University Department of Psychology - Atlanta, GA

• Instituto Superior de Psicologia Aplicada Department of Psychology - Lisbon, Portugal

• Michigan State University Department of Psychology - East Lansing, MI

• National-Louis University Department of Psychology - Chicago, IL

• Pacifica Graduate Institute Department of Psychology - Carpinteria, CA

• Portland State University Department of Psychology - Portland, OR

• University of Hawaii Department of Psychology - Honolulu, HI

- University of Illinois at Chicago Department of Psychology - Chicago, IL

- Université Laval Department of Psychology - Québec City, Canada

- University of Maryland, Baltimore County Department of Psychology - Baltimore, MD

- University of Quebec Department of Psychology - Montreal, Canada

- University of Virginia Department of Psychology - Charlottesville, VA

- University of Waikato School of Arts and Social Sciences - Hamilton, New Zealand

- Wichita State University Department of Psychology - Wichita, KS

- Wilfrid Laurier University Department of Psychology - Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

Doctoral Programs in Community-Clinical Psychology

- Arizona State University Department of Psychology - Tempe, AZ

- Bowling Green State University Department of Psychology - Bowling Green, OH

- California School of Professional Psychology School of Professional Psychology - Los

  Angeles, CA

- DePaul University Department of Psychology - Chicago, IL

- George Washington University Department of Psychology - Washington, DC

- Georgia State University Department of Psychology - Atlanta, GA

- Michigan State University Department of Psychology - East Lansing, MI

- University of Alaska Department of Psychology - Anchorage or Fairbanks, AK

- University of Illinois Department of Psychology - Urbana-Champaign, IL

- University of La Verne Department of Psychology - La Verne, CA

- University of Maryland Department of Psychology - Baltimore, MD

- University of South Carolina Department of Psychology - Columbia, SC

• Rutgers University Graduate School of Applied & Professional Psychology - Piscataway, NJ

• Wayne State University Department of Psychology - Detroit, MI

• Wichita State University Department of Psychology - Wichita, KS

Interdisciplinary Doctoral Programs in Community Research/Action and Prevention

• Clemson University *International Family and Community Studies* - Clemson, SC

• Georgetown University *Psychology & Public Policy* - Washington, DC

• North Carolina State University *Psychology in the Public Interest* - Raleigh, NC

• Penn State University *Human Developmental and Family Studies* - University Park, PA

• University of California - Santa Cruz *Social Psychology with a Social Justice Focus* - Santa

  Cruz, CA

• University of Guelph, Ontario *Applied Social Psychology* - Ontario, Canada

• University of Kansas *Applied Behavioral Science* - Lawrence, KS

• University of Michigan *Health Behavior and Health Education* - Ann Arbor, MI

• University of North Carolina, Charlotte *Community Health Psychology* - Charlotte, NC

• University of North Carolina *Community Health* - Greensboro, NC

• University of Wisconsin-Madison *Human Development and Family Studies* - Madison, WI

• Vanderbilt University *Community Research and Action* - Nashville, TN

Undergraduate Programs in Community Psychology

• DePaul University *Department of Psychology* – Chicago, IL

• Makerere University *Department of Psychology* – Uganda

- The University of Notre Dame Australia *Department of Behavioral Sciences* – Fremantle, Australia

- University of Washington-Bothell *Interdisciplinary Studies* – Bothell, WA

Appendix B

Top Community Psychology Values Survey

Dear Valued Community Psychology Colleague,

We are asking you to be in a research study to help us gain a better understanding of the influence of specific Community Psychology values on the field and its members. In order to help us with our study we are asking you to reply to this brief research survey. Your participation in this research is voluntary and you may choose to not participate. If you choose to participate in the research, complete the brief survey.

Please write the three (3) top Community Psychology values that you believe influence your research and teaching.

1)

2)

3)

Please know that I greatly appreciate your time and that your responses will make a positive difference in the field.

Thank you for your time and assistance in this brief opinion survey.

If you have questions about this study, please contact Olya Belyaev-Glantsman at orabinbe@depaul.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact Susan Loess-Perez, DePaul University's Director of Research Protections at 312-362-7593 or by email at sloesspe@depaul.edu.

Appendix C

Demographic Information

Demographics

The following information is needed to help with the statistical analyses of the data. This information will allow comparisons among different groups of participants and comparisons with similar participants in other organizations.

All of your responses are strictly anonymous. We really appreciate your help in providing this important information.

1. Sex

Please choose **only one** of the following:

□ Female

□ Male

2. Age (in years)

Please write your answer here:

3. Ethnic Group

Please choose **only one** of the following:

□ Black or African American

□ White

□ Hispanic/Latina/Latino

□ Native American

□ Asian

□ Other

4. Marital Status

Please choose **only one** of the following:

□ Single, Never Married

□ Married

□ Separated

□ Divorced

□ Widowed

5. What is your highest degree earned?

Please write your answer here:

6. Do you hold a Community Psychology Degree?

Please choose **only one** of the following:

□ Yes

□ No

7. Have you taught at least one Community Psychology course in the past three academic years?

□ Yes

□ No

8. What is your employment status?

Please choose **only one** of the following:

□ Full Time

□ Part Time

9. How long (in years and months) have you been working at your current position?

 Please write your answer here:

10. What type of institution are you currently working at?

Please choose **only one** of the following:

□ Private

□ Public

□ Other

11. What type of institution are you currently working at?

Please choose **only one** of the following:

□ Community College

□ 4 year College

□ Other

12. What type of college within your university is your department a part of?

Please write your answer here:

13. What types of Community Psychology degrees are offered by your department?

□ BA (i.e., Undergraduate Concentration/Major)

□ MA

□ PhD

□ None

□ Other

Appendix D

Community Psychology Values Person-Organization Fit Survey

1 = very high	2 = somewhat high	3 = neutral	4 = somewhat low	5 = very low

Using the scale above, by sliding the marker, please indicate how high you would rate yourself and your department on the following values:

	You	*Your Department*
1. Social justice	1----------I----------5	1----------I----------5
2. Respect for diversity	1----------I----------5	1----------I----------5
3. Empowerment	1----------I----------5	1----------I----------5
4. Collaboration	1----------I----------5	1----------I----------5
5. Ecological perspective	1----------I----------5	1----------I----------5
6. Empirical grounding	1----------I----------5	1----------I----------5
7. Sense of community	1----------I----------5	1----------I----------5
8. Strength-based approach	1----------I----------5	1----------I----------5
9. Citizen participation	1----------I----------5	1----------I----------5
10. Prevention	1----------I----------5	1----------I----------5
11. Working with marginalized populations	1----------I----------5	1----------I----------5
12. Action Research	1----------I----------5	1----------I----------5
13. Second order change	1----------I----------5	1----------I----------5
14. Program efficacy	1----------I----------5	1----------I----------5

Appendix E

Department Value Makeup Question

In your opinion, what percentage of the members of your department will score high on the values you have used earlier to rate your department?

Appendix F

Satisfaction Subscale of the Michigan Organizational Assessment

Questionnaire

Listed below are a series of statements that represent possible feelings that individuals might have about the department for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the particular department for which you are now working at your college/university, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking one of the seven alternatives below each statement.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1. All in all, I am satisfied with my job

   1----------------2----------------3----------------4----------------5----------------6----------------7

2. In general, I don't like my job

   1----------------2----------------3----------------4----------------5----------------6----------------7

3. In general, I like working here

   1----------------2----------------3----------------4----------------5----------------6----------------7

Appendix G

The Affective Commitment Subscale of the Three Component Model

Employee Commitment Survey

Listed below is a series of statements that represent feelings that individuals might have about the department for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the particular department for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling a number from 1 to 7 using the scale below.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Undecided	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.

   1----------------2----------------3----------------4----------------5----------------6----------------7

2. I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside of it.

   1----------------2----------------3----------------4----------------5----------------6----------------7

3. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.

   1----------------2----------------3----------------4----------------5----------------6----------------7

4. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.

   1----------------2----------------3----------------4----------------5----------------6----------------7

5. I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization.

   1----------------2----------------3----------------4----------------5----------------6----------------7

6. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization.

   1----------------2----------------3----------------4----------------5----------------6----------------7

7. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.

   1----------------2----------------3----------------4----------------5----------------6----------------7

8. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.

   1----------------2----------------3----------------4----------------5----------------6----------------7

Appendix H

The Perceived Person-Organization Fit Scale

With respect to your own feelings about the particular department for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement with each question by checking a number from 1 to 5 using the scale below.

Not at all   *Completely*

1-----------------------2-----------------------3-----------------------4-----------------------5

1. To what degree do you feel your values "match" or fit this department and the current employees in this organization?

1-----------------------2-----------------------3-----------------------4-----------------------5

2. My values match those of the current employees in this department.

1-----------------------2-----------------------3-----------------------4-----------------------5

3. Do you think the values and "personality" of this department reflect your own values and personality?

1-----------------------2-----------------------3-----------------------4-----------------------5

Appendix I

Willingness to Recommend Department Question

With respect to your own feelings about the particular department for which you are now

working, please answer the following question by checking a number from 1 to 5 using the scale

below:

How likely would you be to recommend your department to your friend as a good place to work?

not recommend   *recommend*
at all   *strongly*

1------------------------2------------------------3------------------------4------------------------5

Appendix J

Request for Potential Participants' Information

If you know anyone who would be interested in taking this survey, please fill out his or her contact information here: