DISCOMFORT IN ACADEMIA AND ITS EFFECT ON READINESS FOR CHANGE

Laurie A. Branch, Tony Lingham, and Kalle Lyytinen

The BRC Academy Journal of Business 8, no. 1 (2019): 29–59.

<https://dx.doi.org/10.15239/j.brcacadj.2020.08.01.ja02>

WEB APPENDIX

<https://dx.doi.org/10.15239/j.brcacadj.2020.08.01.wa02>

TABLE 1

Example of Items, EFA, Correlations, and Reliabilities for Discomfort as a Factor¹

CONSTRUCT: DISCOMFORT (Reflective) Example of Items By Factor					
Workload Impact (WL): My institution typically expects me to work harder when we are in the midst of a change.					
Job Security Impact (JS): Changes at work are likely to impact my job security.					
Relationship Impact (R): I have found that changes at my institution typically lead to changes in my relationships at work.					
Emotional Impact (EMO): I am frustrated when my institution asks me to do extra work because we are making a change.					
Work Focus Impact (WF): It is hard to stick to my plans at work when my institution is making changes.					
FACTOR	Work Load Impact	Job Security Impact	Relationship Impact	Emotional Impact	Work Focus Impact
Abbreviation	WL	JS	R	EMO	WF
Avg. Loading	.762	.843	.856	.700	.737
R1			.862		
R2			.897		
R3			.810		
JSEC1		.949			
JSEC2		.676			
JSEC3		.905			
EMO1				.862	
EMO2				.811	
EMO3				.565	.226
EMO4				.561	
WL1	.680				
WL2	.775				
WL3	.832				
WF1					.709
WF2					.729
WF3					.773
CORRELATIONS					
WL	0.822^a				
JS	0.133	0.874			
R	0.348	0.271	0.890		
EMO	0.292	0.229	0.108	0.806	
WF	0.486	0.319	0.352	0.616	0.807

^aReliabilities are shown in the diagonal

¹ For our EFA analysis we used Maximum Likelihood extraction and Promax rotation with a maximum of 25 iterations for convergence. We forced an 8 factor solution comprised of the 5 factors shown here plus self-efficacy (SE1-8), perceived collective efficacy (PCE1-8), and intentional readiness for change (RC1-3). We suppressed values below .20. The sample size was 435.

TABLE 2

Demographical Information of Sample

Demographic	Grouping Variable	# of Respondents (out of 489)	% of Respondents (out of 100%)	Accredited Business School Population* (out of 100%)
Gender	Male/ Female	335; 154	69%; 31%	70%; 30% (a)
Tenure	Tenured/Tenure Track/Non-Tenure Track	329;92;68	67%; 19%; 14%	56%; 23%; 20% (b)
Professorial Rank	Full/Asst/Assoc Lecturer/Instructor/Other	219/101/140 12/3/14	45%; 21%; 29% 2%; 1%; 3%	33%; 25%; 27% (c) na; 15% (c); na
Organization Type	Public NFP/Private NFP/FP	258; 227; 4	53%; 46%; 1%	57%; 43% (a)
U.S. Business Schools Ranking	Top 20/1 st and 60 th /ranked Not ranked/I don't know	37; 140; 147 86; 79	8%; 29%; 30% 18%; 16%	

*Source: a) Business School Data Trends (2012) AACSB; <http://www.aacsb.edu/publications/businesseducation/2012-Data-Trends.pdf>

b) Business School Data Trends (2011) AACSB; <http://www.aacsb.edu/publications/businesseducation/2011-data-trends.pdf>

c) Faculty Profile (2011-12) AACSB; graciously provided by AACSB Knowledge Services in private correspondence

TABLE 3

Validity and Reliability of our CFA, Model Fit for CFA, Correlations and Reliabilities after Removing SE1 and SE7

Validity and Reliability of CFA									
	CR		AVE		MSV		ASV		Cronbach α
PCE	0.965		0.778		0.057		0.037		.965
WL	0.823		0.609		0.236		0.069		.822
JS	0.885		0.722		0.102		0.042		.874
R	0.892		0.734		0.124		0.051		.890
EMO	0.813		0.527		0.379		0.142		.806
WF	0.807		0.583		0.379		0.155		.807
SE	0.858		0.502		0.111		0.052		.855
IR	0.863		0.679		0.324		0.086		.849
Metric	Observed value		Recommended Value for N>250 and m>30						
Chi ² /df	656.065/466		NA						
Cmin/df	1.408		Between 1 and 3						
CFI	.979		>.900*						
TLI	.977		>.900*						
RMSEA	.031		<.07 with CFI>.900*						
PCLOSE	1.000		>.500**						
SRMR	.0368		<.0800 w/CFI>.920*						
Factor Correlation Matrix ^a									
FACTORS	PCE	WL	JS	R	EMO	WF	SE	IR	
PCE	0.882								
WL	-0.151	0.780							
JS	-0.115	0.133	0.850						
R	-0.136	0.348	0.271	0.857					
EMO	-0.228	0.292	0.229	0.108	0.726				
WF	-0.229	0.486	0.319	0.352	0.616	0.764			
SE	0.208	0.006	-0.187	-0.017	-0.299	-0.292	0.709		
IR	0.239	0.000	0.002	0.073	-0.569	-0.324	0.333	0.824	

*(Hair, et al., 2010: 654) ** (Byrne, 2010: 81)

^aSquare root of the AVE is reported on the diagonal

TABLE 4

Comparison of R² Statistic, Model Fit and Path Weights

R ² Statistics and Model Fit			
Metric	Proposed Model	Alternative Model	Recommended Value for N>250 and m>30
R ² of Intentional Readiness	.233	.428	Not applicable
Chi ² /df	1114.688/658	1069.002/650	NA
Cmin/df	1.694	1.645	Between 1 and 3
CFI	.952	.956	>.900*
TLI	.946	.950	>.900
RMSEA	.040	.039	<.07 with CFI≥.900*
PCLOSE	1.000	1.000	>.500**
SRMR	.0747	.0778	<.0800 w/CFI>.920*

Path Weights								
Path*	Proposed Model				Alternative Model			
	Std. Est.	Unstd. Est	Std. Error	P-Value	Std. Est.	Unstd. Est	Std. Error	P-Value
SE to IR	0.205	0.277	0.080	<.001	0.164	0.228	0.082	0.005
SE to PCE	0.198	0.367	0.098	<.001	0.201	0.371	0.098	<.001
SE to D	-0.339	-0.212	0.045	<.001				
SE to DS					-0.225	-0.041	0.022	0.059
SE to DOS					-0.342	-0.350	0.071	<.001
PCE to IR	0.137	0.099	0.036	0.006	0.127	0.095	0.034	0.005
D to IR	-0.320	-0.691	0.156	<.001				
DS to IR					0.177	1.358	0.660	0.039
DOS to IR					-0.555	-0.751	0.101	<.001

* SE = self-efficacy; IR = intentional readiness for change; PCE = perceived collective efficacy; D = discomfort, a

second order factor comprised of five dimensions; DS = discomfort from stretching, a second order factor comprised

of three dimensions; DOS = discomfort from over-stretching, a second order factor comprised of two dimensions.

FIGURE 1
SEM Results of Proposed Model

FIGURE 2
Alternative Model with Two Types of Discomfort

Note: $*** p < .001$; $** p < .05$; $* p < .10$