University and Occupational Commitment of Russian Faculty

Lovakov A.

[Andrey Lovakov](#)
Junior Researcher, International Scientific and Academic Laboratory of Institutional Analysis of Economic Reforms, Institute of Institutional Studies, National Research University—Higher School of Economics. Address: 20 Myasnitskaya str., 101000, Moscow, Russian Federation. E-mail: lovakov@hse.ru

Abstract. This article reviews the results of an online poll held among 317 teachers of state universities in a number of regions of Russia. The commitment to university and profession is evaluated with a 3-component Meyer and Allen model that singles out: emotional commitment (emotional attachment to the university or profession), normative commitment (perceived liabilities towards the university or profession), commitment based on estimate of costs (subjective estimate of costs associated with potential change of the university or profession). It shows that there are no reasons for a conflict between commitment to the university and commitment to the profession, however different groups of teachers feature different correlation between those sets. What is the most important in differentiating between the commitments is the role of work experience in a different university. Publication activity of teachers is not related to their emotional commitment to the profession or the university, however it is related to cost estimate and the normative commitment to the university and the profession. Based on which the author concludes that Russian teachers are not encouraged with article publications, i. e. with the research activity in general as the attractive part of their job and most likely are forced to do it.

Keywords: universities, teaching staff, commitment to organization, commitment to profession, academic inbreeding, satisfaction with job.

DOI: 10.17323/1814-9545-2015-2-109-128

Received in January 2015

1. Occupational commitment in academic environment

The notion of occupational commitment is multifaceted: one can be committed to their occupation, team or work group, organization as a whole, or leader [Vandenberghe, 2009]. Occupation and organization are the most important and researched objects of commitment. An employee always performs a specific range of functions related to this or that occupation, working for a specific organization. Correlations between awareness of belonging to a specific occupation/organization and occupational/organizational commitment differ from one person to another. Some researchers describe the relationship between these two as a conflict or a zero-sum play between occu-

pation and organization. Gouldner [Gouldner, 1957; 1958] classified employees into cosmopolitans and locals. Cosmopolitans have great loyalty to their occupation but little to the organization they work for. Locals are more committed to their organization and less to occupation. However, subsequent studies established that an expert may be equally committed to both organization and occupation [Aranya, Ferris, 1983; 1984; Gunz, 1994], so there is no reason to talk about any conflict between these two attitudes. A meta-analysis of 15 studies showed that correlation between occupational and organizational commitment is 0.45 [Wallace, 1993]. Another meta-analysis, which was conducted later and included 76 independent samples, revealed the same value for employees of professional organizations (0.48), while correlation for employees of non-professional ones was lower (0.23) [Lee, Carswell, Allen, 2000]. At the same time, occupational commitment and organizational commitment correlate differently with a number of working attitudes and forms of organizational behavior. For instance, organizational commitment predicts better the intention to leave the organization, while occupational commitment predicts better the intention to change occupation. Employees committed to their occupation are more often involved in related activities (reading professional literature, being members of professional associations, etc.) and demonstrate high productivity and willingness to do more than they are expected to more often [Meyer, Allen, Smith, 1993]. Therefore, "organizational commitment" and "occupational commitment" reflect associated though different phenomena.

Specific features of academic environment provide for high importance of organizational and occupational commitment, as well as for singularity of correlations between them. On the one hand, there are factors stimulating occupational commitment of faculty. Universities are professional organizations, and working for them suggests having specific education and professionalization. University career is most often associated with professional success. Most frequently, though not always, it's people with high academic achievements who become chair holders, deans, provosts, and rectors. That is why occupational commitment and success play such a significant role for a university professor.

On the other hand, there are factors stimulating university commitment of faculty. The specific feature of universities is that they can hire their own graduates. Researchers dubbed this phenomenon "academic inbreeding" [Eells, Cleveland, 1935a; Sivak, Yudkevich, 2009]. Faculty is divided into insiders (those who work in the university they graduate from) and outsiders (those who are not graduates of the university they work for). When a university employs its own graduates, the crucial role is played by social ties and personal relationships between the graduate, on the one part, and the professor and people taking employment decisions, on the other part [Navarro, Rivero,

The article was prepared as part of the 2014 project "Academic Occupation in Russia in the Cross-Country Context: Academic Contracts, Management Norms and Structures" (fundamental study program, NRU HSE). The work was sponsored by the Government of the Russian Federation as part of the Road Map of the NRU HSE 5/100 Program.

We hereby thank Irina Davydova for her assistance in data collection and all employees of the International Research Laboratory for Institutional Analysis of Economic Reforms for their assistance in questionnaire developing and their helpful comments on the original version of the article.

2001; Sivak, Yudkevich, 2015; Sivak, Yudkevich, 2009]. This means that a vacancy is obtained through research advisors and the special attitude of university administration to them, which makes the newly-employed graduate feel certain responsibilities toward the advisor, the administration, and the university as a whole, i. e. makes them feel committed to their university.

Russian universities follow the tradition of schools of thought, the essential mechanism of professionalization for researchers and teachers [Sivak, Yudkevich, 2015]. A group of researchers is formed around one or more faculty instructors to work in the same area or on the same theoretical approach. Such groups may last for a long time, attracting and professionalizing young researchers and teachers from among students and graduates. Joining a school of thought is often the only way to engage and progress in the academic community for a young specialist. As schools of thought mostly have an institutional relation with a specific university or research institute, they also contribute to the liability to these institutions. Thus, inbreeding is one of the crucial determinants of organizational commitment in academic environment. However, there is still no sufficient reason to say that insiders are more committed to university and outsiders to occupation. This study aims to investigate the specifics of correlations between university and occupational commitment across different groups of faculty.

2. Research hypotheses

The abovementioned features of academic environment suggest that insiders and outsiders differ in the balance between their university and occupational commitment. Different researchers use different criteria to discriminate between insiders and outsiders. Thus, either graduating from the employing university or no experience of working for any other university may be used as a ground for referring an employee to insiders. The same professor may be classified as an insider or an outsider based on these two different criteria. There is no sufficient research data to determine which of the two is more important, so we will consider both in this study.

Eells and Cleveland [Eells, Cleveland, 1935a; 1935b] defined insiders as faculty working at a university where they obtained at least one degree (Bachelor, Specialist, Master, or research degree). Such instructors have a longer history of relationships with their university and more positive emotions about it (their student years passed in this university), which should provide a strong emotional connection with the university, i. e. insiders should be committed more to organization than to occupation. Meanwhile, outsiders have dealt with at least two universities: the one they studied at and the one they are working for. Therefore, little imbalance between their university and occupational commitment should be expected.

Hypothesis 1 Faculty working for the university where they obtained at least one degree are more committed to university than to occupation.

Navarro and Rivero [Navarro, Rivero, 2001] defined insiders as faculty working at the university where they obtained their highest degree, which is most often PhD in Russian universities. It is expected that contribution learning at a university makes in developing the commitment to this university depends on which degrees an individual obtains there. Research advisors often engage postgraduate students in teaching their own courses, thus contributing to their further employment at the university. Therefore, inbreeding will probably stimulate university commitment, not occupational one.

Hypothesis 2 Faculty working for the university where they obtained their PhD are committed more to university than to occupation.

Eisenberg and Wells [Eisenberg, Wells, 2000] classify insiders as faculty instructors who had never worked for any other university than the one they are working for now. In this case, experience becomes the key insider characteristic. Irrespective of the university of studies, the first academic workplace affects greatly the process of professionalization. The first years of work inculcate values, norms, and rules of the academic community, and the university as a conductor of these values, norms, and rules determines to a large extent the process of professor professional development. A professor may have an experience of working at two or more universities, whether simultaneously or consecutively. The practice of teaching at several universities is rather common in Russia [Yudkevich, 2014], the main reason for this being financial interest: an international comparative study reports salaries of Russian faculty to be among the lowest [Altbach et al., 2012]. We can suggest that experience of working for more than one university provides for occupational commitment, while working for one university only provides for university commitment.

Hypothesis 3 Faculty instructors who have never worked for any other university are committed more to their university than to occupation.

It has been empirically proved that insiders are mostly oriented towards their in-house community (they are more likely to appreciate their belonging to the university, to publish articles in university journals, and to hold executive offices, and less likely to participate in joint research projects with their counterparts from other universities), while outsiders are more oriented to the outside professional environment (feeling more liability towards their professional community and the field of study they teach) [Yudkevich, Sivak, 2012; Sivak, Yudkevich, 2015]. If hypotheses 1–3 are true and insiders and outsiders

truly differ in their levels of university and occupational commitment, it may be suggested that university or occupational commitment of faculty is mostly related to their publication activity.

Faculty with high university commitment have more articles published in journals of their university. Hypothesis 3

3. Method

3.1. Sample

The empirical basis of research embraced data of a survey among 317 faculty instructors of Russian state universities (109 men and 208 women). The average age of respondents was 41.57 years (SD = 11.235), one respondent didn't specify the age. The average total length of service was 20.51 years (SD = 11.34), the average total length of service in a specific university was 11.716 years (SD = 8.03). 17% of respondents were professors, 56% were associate professors, 15% were senior teachers, 5% were teachers, and 7% were assistants. The sample included faculty in various fields: 34% in economics, 44% in other social studies, 5% in natural sciences, 9% in engineering science, 16% in humanities, 13% in mathematics and cybernetics, and 4% in other fields (the total exceeds 100% as some respondents teach disciplines that belong to more than one category). 27% of respondents work in national research universities, and 10% in federal universities.

3.2. Accumulation of data

The survey was conducted using an online questionnaire published on the research project website from April to June 2014. Invitation to participate was distributed among subscribers of several Russian education magazines, within academic-field-specific groups in social networks, and through personal contacts of the author and his colleagues. Data was accumulated until new efforts to distribute the questionnaire and to attract respondents didn't increase the number of participants. Participation in the survey was anonymous. Instructions on the questionnaire specified the main goal of the survey, and respondents could refuse from participation at any time.

3.3. Variables and measures

3.3.1. University commitment

University commitment was assessed using an abridged version of the organizational commitment questionnaire (Organizational Commitment Scale, OCS) [Allen, Meyer, 1990] embracing three mindsets: affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment. The mindsets reflect the commitment components identified by Meyer and Allen [Meyer, Allen, 1991; Allen, Meyer, 1990] in their organizational commitment model, one of the most well-known and widespread in psychology of employee-organization linkages. Affective commitment is emotional attachment the employee develops with the organization; normative commitment is perceived obligations towards the organization; continuance commitment is perceived costs of leaving the organization. In other words, an af-

fectively committed employee *wants*, a normatively committed one *should*, and a continuance committed one *has to* stay in the organization. Each scale used tree items, for example: *"I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization" (*affective commitment), *"I feel that I have very few options to consider leaving this organization" (*continuance commitment), *"If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my organization" (*normative commitment). Every item had to be responded to on a seven-point scale ranging from *"absolutely disagree"* to *"absolutely agree"*. The items were translated from English into Russian by the author of this study. The translation was discussed with a bilingual who didn't know about the aim of research. Confirmatory factor analysis (MLR method) was conducted to verify reproducibility of factor structure of the abridged Russian version of the organizational commitment questionnaire. The results revealed that the model with three latent variables (three items per variable) was in good fit with empirical data: $\chi^2 = 25.42$ ($p = 0.329$), df = 23, CFI = 0.996, TLI = 0.994, RMSEA = 0.018, 95% CI [0.000–0.051], SRMR = 0.030. Internal consistency of scales varied between 0.66 and 0.80. The results allowed for a conclusion that the Russian version of the organizational commitment questionnaire was similar in its structure to the original one, and items associated with the three commitment mindsets might be regarded as independent scales.

3.3.2. Occupational commitment

Occupational commitment was assessed using an abridged version of the OCS modified by Meyer and Allen specifically for this purpose [Meyer, Allen, Smith, 1993] and embracing three mindsets: affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment. Each scale used tree items, for example: *"I am proud of being a teacher" (*affective commitment), *"Changing teaching for another job would be very costly for me right now" (*continuance commitment), *"I feel responsible for the teaching profession, which makes me keep to it"*. Every item had to be responded to on a seven-point scale ranging from *"absolutely disagree"* to *"absolutely agree"*. The items were translated from English into Russian by the author of this study. The translation was discussed with a bilingual who didn't know about the aim of research. Confirmatory factor analysis (MLR method) was conducted to verify reproducibility of factor structure of the abridged Russian version of the occupational commitment questionnaire. The results revealed that the model with three latent variables (three items per variable) was in satisfactory fit with empirical data: $\chi^2 = 70.281$ ($p = 0.001$), df = 23, CFI = 0.921, TLI = 0.877, RMSEA = 0.081, 95% CI [0.059–0.102], SRMR = 0.066. Internal consistency of scales varied between 0.69 and 0.77. The results allowed for a conclusion that the Russian version of the occupational commitment questionnaire was similar in its structure to the original one, and items associated with the three commitment mindsets might be regarded as independent scales

3.4. Insiders/ outsiders

Four different criteria were used to identify insiders.

1. Insiders as faculty teaching at the university where they obtained at least one degree (Bachelor, Specialist, Master, or research degree). This criterion included 189 respondents into the group.
2. Insiders as faculty instructors whose main activity at the time of the survey was teaching at the university where they obtained their research degree. This criterion selected 108 respondents into the group.
3. Insiders as faculty instructors who had never worked for any other university than the one they were working for at the time of the survey. Experience of working for other universities was determined using two questions:

a. *How many universities have you worked for (full-time, part-time, under the contract) since you graduated?* The answer *One* was accepted as indicating no experience of working at other universities (this criterion included 113 respondents to insiders), and *Two or more* as indicating having such experience (203 respondents were assigned to this group).
b. *Have you worked for any other university additionally in this year?* The answer *Yes* categorized respondents as having a side job at another university (129 respondents), the answer *No* as having no side job at any other university (188 respondents).

4. The most rigorous criterion: insiders as faculty working for the university where they obtained all of their degrees. 184 respondents were identified as insiders based on this criterion.

Outsiders were defined as instructors who didn't obtain any degree at the university where they had their main job at the time of the survey (or where they were teaching most of the time). Such super outsiders included 128 respondents.

3.5. Publication activity

The level of publication activity was assessed through respondents' self-reports. They were asked to specify the number of articles they had in Russian and Anglophone peer-reviewed research journals, in peer-reviewed journals of the university they worked for, and the number of monographs published over the last three years. The total number of publications was calculated as the sum of articles in Russian journals, articles in English journals, and books.

4. Results

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics, indicators of scale consistency and correlation between the investigated variables. Table 2 shows mean values of the level of the three types of university and occupational commitment, as well as results of comparing equalities of means in different faculty groups.

Table 1. **Descriptive statistics, indicators of scale consistency and correlation between different types of commitment.**

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
Affective university commitment	5.01	1.29	(0.70)					
Continuance university commitment	3.39	1.42	–0.38*	(0.66)				
Normative university commitment	3.52	1.45	0.32*	–0.13*	(0.80)			
Affective occupational commitment	5.24	1.11	0.16*	–0.10	0.13*	(0.75)		
Continuance occupational commitment	3.58	1.36	–0.06	0.44*	0.07	0.17*	(0.77)	
Normative occupational commitment	3.56	1.22	0.22*	–0.04	0.64*	0.28*	0.28*	(0.69)
Any-degree insider	0.60	0.49	0.10	–0.02	0.11	–0.01	0.00	0.08
Research-degree insider	0.34	0.47	–0.04	0.01	0.04	–0.04	0.05	–0.02
Experience of working for another university	0.36	0.48	0.19*	0.00	0.24*	0.00	0.07	–0.09
A side job at another university	0.41	0.49	–0.11*	–0.05	–0.06	0.00	0.02	0.01
Super insider	0.40	0.49	0.04	0.04	0.11	–0.03	0.03	0.05
Publications in Russian journals	6.41	7.10	0.04	–0.03	0.06	0.06	0.03	0.04
Publications in university journals	1.73	2.24	0.12*	–0.07	0.16*	0.05	0.07	0.10
Publications in Anglophone journals	0.97	2.31	0.05	–0.06	0.06	–0.09	–0.02	0.05
Total publications	7.05	8.21	0.03	–0.05	0.04	0.06	0.04	0.04

Note: $*p < 0.05$: the diagonal presents values of Cronbach's α, Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was calculated.

A comparison of mean levels of university and occupational commitment revealed that the level of affective occupational commitment was slightly higher than that of affective organizational commitment in the overall sample. The same difference was observed for continuance commitment. No discrepancy between university and occupational commitment was found for the group of insiders identified by having obtained at least one degree at the university they worked for at the time of the survey. Thus, hypothesis 1 was not confirmed. Neither was there any difference between the levels of university and

Table 2. **Comparing mean levels of university and occupational commitment across different types of insiders and outsiders**

Type of commitment	M (SD)		V	P-value
	University	Occupational		
Total sample, N=317				
Affective commitment	5.01 (1.29)	5.24 (1.11)	17643.50*	0.040
Continuance commitment	3.39 (1.42)	3.58 (1.36)	17847.00*	0.036
Normative commitment	3.52 (1.45)	3.56 (1.22)	16792.00	0.443
Insiders (at least one degree), N=189				
Affective commitment	5.11 (1.27)	5.22 (1.12)	7182.50	0.695
Continuance commitment	3.38 (1.47)	3.57 (1.33)	6141.00	0.102
Normative commitment	3.65 (1.46)	3.64 (1.21)	6464.00	0.968
Insiders (research degree), N=108				
Affective commitment	4.96 (1.27)	5.21 (1.03)	2126.00	0.223
Continuance commitment	3.43 (1.50)	3.66 (1.30)	2008.50	0.186
Normative commitment	3.58 (1.36)	3.54 (1.16)	2089.00	0.869
Insiders (never worked for another university), N=113)				
Affective commitment	5.33 (1.19)	5.24 (1.08)	2769.50	0.223
Continuance commitment	3.38 (1.39)	3.47 (1.32)	2273.00	0.590
Normative commitment	3.95 (1.41)	3.71 (1.17)	2985.50*	0.016
Worked for more than one university, N=203				
Affective commitment	4.82 (1.31)	5.23 (1.13)	6284.00***	<0.001
Continuance commitment	3.40 (1.44)	3.64 (1.38)	7401.00*	0.036
Normative commitment	3.27 (1.40)	3.48 (1.25)	5412.50**	0.005
Insiders (no side job at another university), N=188				
Affective commitment	5.13 (1.25)	5.26 (1.04)	6455.50	0.444
Continuance commitment	3.46 (1.41)	3.56 (1.33)	6478.50	0.392
Normative commitment	3.59 (1.46)	3.53 (1.14)	6630.00	0.643
With a side job at another university, N=129				
Affective commitment	4.83 (1.34)	5.20 (1.21)	2777.50*	0.026
Continuance commitment	3.30 (1.42)	3.60 (1.40)	2853.50*	0.030
Normative commitment	3.43 (1.43)	3.59 (1.34)	2327.50	0.081
Super insiders (all degrees), N=84				
Affective commitment	4.95 (1.28)	5.23 (1.00)	1228.50	0.225
Continuance commitment	3.57 (1.57)	3.65 (1.24)	1416.00	0.666
Normative commitment	3.63 (1.35)	3.60 (1.18)	1351.50	0.835
Super outsiders (no degree), N=128				
Affective commitment	4.87 (1.31)	5.26 (1.10)	2325.00**	0.007
Continuance commitment	3.41 (1.35)	3.59 (1.39)	3095.50	0.208
Normative commitment	3.33 (1.42)	3.43 (1.24)	2469.00	0.248

Note: V stands for the value of Wilcoxon signed-rank test, *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$.

occupational commitment in the group of insiders identified by having obtained their research degree at the university they worked for at the time of the survey. Thus, hypothesis 2 was not confirmed. The group of complete outsiders working for the university they had never studied at demonstrated higher commitment to occupation than to university. Super insiders identified by the most rigorous criterion didn't show any difference between the levels of university and occupational commitment.

Different results were obtained when splitting the sample by having/lacking experience of working successively for more than one university. Insiders who had never worked for any other university showed much greater normative university commitment than normative occupational one. The difference was insignificant for affective and continuance commitment. However, statistically significant differences were observed for all the three types of commitment among faculty instructors who had worked for more than one university, occupational commitment being higher in all cases. Similar results were obtained when splitting the sample by having/lacking a side job at another university. The level of affective and continuance occupational commitment was considerably higher than affective and continuance university commitment among faculty having side jobs at other universities. Those who had never worked for another university didn't show any statistically significant difference between the levels of university and occupational commitment. Hypothesis 3 was confirmed in part.

Table 3 shows correlations between the levels of university and occupational commitment, on the one hand, and those of publication activity, on the other hand, for different types of insiders and outsiders. For insiders working at the university where they had obtained at least one degree, total number of publications and number of articles published in Russian journals correlated positively only with normative occupational commitment. The same indicator correlated positively with normative university and occupational commitment and with continuance occupational commitment for insiders working at the university where they had obtained at least their research degree. Normative university commitment also depended positively on the number of articles published in university journals. For super insiders, i. e. faculty working for the university where they had obtained all of their degrees, total publications and publications in Russian journals correlated positively with continuance and normative occupational commitment. Super outsiders, who had never studied at the university they were working for, didn't show any correlation between publication activity and university or occupational commitment. Total publications and publications in Russian journals correlated positively with normative university commitment and affective occupational commitment for insiders who had never worked for any other university. In the group of outsiders who had worked for more than

Table 3. **Correlations between university/occupational commitment and publication activity**

	Articles in Russian journals	Total publications	Articles in university journals
Any-degree insiders			
Normative occupational commitment	0.147	0.147	–
Research-degree insiders			
Normative university commitment	0.223	0.241	0.196
Continuance occupational commitment	0.217	0.226	–
Normative occupational commitment	0.239	0.265	–
Super insiders			
Continuance occupational commitment	0.239	0.251	–
Normative occupational commitment	–	0.220	–
Super outsiders	No correlations		
Never worked for any other university			
Normative university commitment	0.295	0.274	–
Affective occupational commitment	0.224	0.226	–
Worked for more than one university			
Affective university commitment	–	–	0.154
Normative university commitment	–	–	0.145
No side job at another university			
Affective university commitment	–	–	0.168
Continuance university commitment	–	–	– 0.157
Normative university commitment	0.184	0.162	–
With a side job at another university			
Normative university commitment	–	–	0.238
Continuance occupational commitment	–	–	0.186
Normative occupational commitment	–	–	0.226

Note: The table only gives statistically significant correlation coefficients ($p < 0.05$).

one university, affective and normative university commitment correlated positively with the number of articles published in university journals. Among insiders who had never worked for any other university, the number of articles in university journals correlated positively with affective university commitment and negatively with continuance university commitment. This group also demonstrated a positive

Table 4. **Summarized research results**

University commitment	Occupational commitment
Mutual correlations	
Total sample: Affective university commitment correlates positively with experience of having worked for another university and negatively with having a side job at another university Normative commitment correlates positively with having worked for another university	Total sample: No correlations
Total sample: Lower than occupational commitment (affective and continuance)	Total sample: Higher than university commitment (affective and continuance)
Higher among instructors who have never worked for any other university (normative) Lower among those who have worked for more than one university (affective, normative, and continuance) Lower among those who have a side job at another university (affective and continuance) Lower among those working at a university they have never studied at (affective)	Lower among instructors who have never worked for any other university (normative) Higher among those who have worked for more than one university (affective, normative, and continuance) Higher among those who have a side job at another university (affective and continuance) Higher among those working at a university they have never studied at (affective)
Correlations with publication activity	
Total sample: Affective commitment correlates positively with the number of publications in university journals Normative commitment correlates positively with the number of publications in university journals	Total sample: No correlations
Positive correlations with total publications and publications in university journals for faculty working for the university where they obtained their research degree (normative)	Positive correlations with total publications for faculty working for the university where they studied (normative and continuance)
Positive correlations with total publications for those who have never worked for any other university (normative). Negative correlations with the number of publications in university journals (continuance) Positive correlations with the number of articles published in university journals for instructors who have worked for more than one university (affective and normative)	Positive correlations with total publications for those who have never worked for any other university (affective)
Positive correlations with total publications and publications in university journals for those with no side job at another university (affective and normative) Positive correlations with publications in university journals for faculty with a side job at another university (normative)	Positive correlations with publications in university journals for faculty with a side job at another university (normative and continuance)

correlation between normative university commitment and total publications, as well as publications in Russian journals. The number of articles in journals published by the main-job university correlated positively with normative university and occupational commitment and with continuance occupational commitment for outsiders working for more than one university at the same time. Thus, hypothesis 4 was confirmed: university commitment does correlate positively with the number of articles published in university journals for some faculty groups. However, the number of articles in university journals also correlated with occupational commitment in some groups.

Table 4 summarizes all the data on correlations between university and occupational commitment of faculty.

5. Discussion

The study aimed to investigate how university and occupational commitment correlated among different categories of faculty, depending on their interaction with universities. It was established that experience of working for another university was the most important factor of differentiating between university and occupational commitment. Instructors with such experience were more likely to discriminate between occupation and the university they were working for. Meanwhile, even those who had worked for more than one university did not set university commitment in opposition to occupational one. Occupational commitment correlated with commitment to university, although the affective commitment correlation coefficient was lower here than in earlier studies [Lee, Carswell, Allen, 2000; Wallace, 1993] (0.16 vs. 0.45–0.48). The results obtained do not indicate there are explicit "cosmopolitans" or "locals", in Gouldner's terms [Gouldner, 1957; 1958], nor any conflict between university and occupational commitment [Aranya, Ferris, 1983; 1984; Gunz, 1994]. Rather, there are specific correlations between university and occupational commitment across different faculty groups. Thus, the most significant difference was observed among faculty instructors who had worked or were currently working for more than one university. They had more affective commitment and moral obligations to occupation, believing that changing occupation would be more troublesome than changing a university. Instructors who had never worked for any other university had more intense moral obligations to their organization.

As we can see, faculty instructors who have worked for more than one university are more loyal to their occupation, while those who had never worked for any other university are equally loyal to occupation and university but have stronger moral obligations to their organization. Obviously, insiders associate their university and occupation intimately, as they have no similar connection with any other university. For them, teaching means working at the university they graduated from/where their career started. This connection is based on emo-

tional affection, not on the absence of employment alternatives or the high cost of quitting. That is to say, insiders do not consider themselves less competitive as outsiders when changing jobs.

Having analyzed how university and occupational commitment correlate with publication activity, we can make a number of conclusions about faculty attitude towards research and teaching activities. First, there is a fable though significant correlation between university/occupational commitment and the level of publication activity. The correlation differs across different categories of faculty. The number of publications correlates with occupational commitment for insiders working at the university of their studies, with both university and occupational commitment for insiders who had never worked at any other university, and with university commitment for insiders with no side job at another university.

Second, the number of articles published by faculty instructors in journals of their own university correlates with their affective and normative university commitment. This correlation is observed for some groups of insiders and for outsiders with experience of working for more than one university. This may be regarded as faculty orientation to internal university environment or to external occupational environment [Yudkevich, Sivak, 2012; Sivak, Yudkevich, 2015]. However, not only insiders but also outsiders with experience of working for other universities can be oriented to internal university environment.

Third, the affective component of occupational commitment only correlates with total publications among instructors who have never worked for any other university. In other groups, total number of publications only correlates with normative and continuance occupational and university commitment. Otherwise speaking, attractiveness of the teaching profession or specific university is not correlated with the level of publication activity, and neither does affective commitment to them. At the same time, publication activity correlates with perceived cost of leaving the profession/organization and with moral obligations to them. We can thus suggest that Russian faculty instructors do not perceive publication of articles—and, consequently, research activity as such—as integral part of teaching at university. The 2007–2012 CAP (Changing Academic Profession) revealed that most Russian instructors preferred teaching over research [Kozmina, 2014]. Russian (former Soviet) universities didn't provide a strong research base for a long time, the best part of fundamental science being (and continuing to be) restricted to institutes of Academies of Sciences.

This study has several limitations. First, it was based on a small nonrandom sample. Invitation to participate in the survey was distributed among subscribers of several education magazines, within academic-field-specific groups in social networks, and through personal contacts of the author and his colleagues. As a result, the sample may be biased towards faculty with higher levels of occupational commitment, as they are more involved in occupation-related activi-

ties (reading professional journals, being members of interest groups in social networks). Second, labor markets are organized differently across different cities, some of them providing no possibility of working for more than one university. This limitation may affect university commitment, adding to dispersion. Third, the sample was inhomogeneous in terms of faculty disciplinary orientation. It included faculty instructors in various fields but the number of instructors in specific fields was insufficient to perform field-specific analysis and result comparison. Meanwhile, such analysis would be useful, as there is data suggesting that the level of university commitment may vary among faculty instructors in different fields of research (either applied or fundamental) [Neumann, Finaly-Neumann, 1990].

References

1. Allen N. J., Meyer J. P. (1990) The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, vol. 63, no 1, pp. 1–18.
2. Altbach P. G., Reisberg L., Yudkevich M., Androushchak G., Pacheco I. F. (eds) (2012) *Paying the Professoriate: A Global Comparison of Compensation and Contracts*, New York: Routledge.
3. Aranya N., Ferris K. R. (1984) A Reexamination of Accountants' Organizational-Professional Conflict. *The Accounting Review*, vol. 59, no 1, pp. 1–15.
4. Aranya N., Ferris K. R. (1983) Organizational-Professional Conflict among U.S. and Israeli Professional Accountants. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, vol. 119, no 2, pp. 153–161.
5. Eells W. C., Cleveland A. C. (1935a) Faculty Inbreeding. *The Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 6, no 5, pp. 261–269.
6. Eells W. C., Cleveland A. C. (1935b) The Effects of Inbreeding. *The Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 6, no 6, pp. 323–328.
7. Eisenberg T., Wells M. T. (2000) Inbreeding in Law School Hiring: Assessing the Performance of Faculty Hired from Within. *The Journal of Legal Studies*, vol. 29, no S1, pp. 369–388.
8. Gouldner A. W. (1957) Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles-I. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 2, no 3, pp. 281–306.
9. Gouldner A. W. (1958) Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles-II. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 2, no 4, pp. 444–480.
10. Gunz H. P. (1994) Professional/Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction for Employed Lawyers. *Human Relations*, vol. 47, no 7, pp. 801–828.
11. Lee K., Carswell J. J., Allen N. J. (2000) A Meta-Analytic Review of Occupational Commitment: Relations with Person- and Work-Related Variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 85, no 5, pp. 799–811.
12. Kozmina Ya. (2014) Preferences of Professors about Research and Teaching. *Voprosy obrazovaniya / Educational Studies. Moscow*, no 3, pp. 135–151.
13. Meyer J. P., Allen N. J. (1991) A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, vol. 1, no 1, pp. 61–89.
14. Meyer J. P., Allen N. J., Smith C. A. (1993) Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three-Component Conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 78, no 4, pp. 538–551.

15. Navarro A., Rivero A. (2001) High Rate of Inbreeding in Spanish Universities. *Nature*, vol. 410, no 6824, pp. 14.
16. Neumann Y., Finaly-Neumann E. (1990) The Reward-Support Framework and Faculty Commitment to Their University. *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 31, no 1, pp. 75–97.
17. Sivak E., Yudkevich M. (2015) Academic Immobility and Inbreeding in Russian University Sector. *Academic Inbreeding and Mobility in Higher Education* (eds M. Yudkevich, P. G. Altbach, L. E. Rumbley), Palgrave Macmilllan.
18. Sivak E., Yudkevich M. (2009) Academic Inbreeding: Pro and Contra. *Voprosy obrazovaniya / Educational Studies. Moscow*, no 1, pp. 170–188.
19. Vandenberghe C. (2009) Organizational Commitments. *Commitment in Organizations: Accumulated Wisdom and New Directions* (eds H. J. Klein, T. E. Becker, J. P. Meyer), SIOP Organizational Frontiers Series, New York, NY: Taylor & Francis. P. 99–136.
20. Wallace J. E. (1993) Professional and Organizational Commitment: Compatible or Incompatible? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 333–349.
21. Yudkevich M. (2014) The Russian University: Recovery and Rehabilitation. *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 39, no. 8, pp. 1463–1474.
22. Yudkevich M., Sivak E. (2012) *University Inbreeding: An Impact on Values, Strategies and Individual Productivity of Faculty Members*. Available at: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1996417 (accessed 10 April 2015).