DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 454 930 JC 010 523

AUTHOR Cohen, Arthur M.; Outcalt, Charles L.
TITLE A Profile of the Community College Professoriate: A Report Submitted to the Small Research Grants Program of the Spencer Foundation.
INSTITUTION Center for the Study of Community Colleges, Los Angeles, CA. Technology.
PUB DATE 2001-06-29
NOTE 82p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Community Colleges; Faculty Development; *Professional Recognition; Teacher Alienation; *Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Empowerment; *Teacher Morale; *Teacher Motivation; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

This study focused on the nature and formation of a professional identity for the community college professoriate. In late 2000, a random national sample of more than 1,500 community college faculty were surveyed on their professional practices and attitudes. This survey, which contained over 200 items, revealed that the community college professoriate grew not only more diverse but also more disparate since 1975, when a similar survey was undertaken. Survey data showed that faculty differed significantly on a wide variety of measures according to their personal and professional characteristics, including their instructional practices, levels of professional involvement, and use of professional reference groups. Some groups, most notably full-timers and doctoral seekers, demonstrated higher degrees of commitment to teaching, to their profession, and to their institution. However, these same groups also reported closer ties with four-year colleges and universities, a finding that contradicts the notion that community college instruction has developed as a professional practice sui generis. In conclusion, the community college professoriate has become increasingly differentiated at the same time the community college mission has grown ever more complex; however, it is not clear that the institutional mission and instructor practice have developed with close regard for one another. (Author/NB)

A Profile of the Community College Professoriate

A Report Submitted to the Small Research Grants Program of the Spencer Foundation

Arthur M. Cohen
Charles L. Outcalt

June 29, 2001

Abstract

In late 2000, a random national sample of over 1500 community college faculty were surveyed on their professional practices and attitudes. This survey, which contained over 200 items, revealed that the community college professoriate grew not only diverse but also more disparate since 1975, when a similar survey was undertaken. Survey data showed that faculty differed significantly according to their personal and professional characteristics on a wide array of measures, including their instructional practices, levels of professional involvement, and use of professional reference groups. Some groups, most notably full-timers and doctoral seekers, demonstrated higher degrees of commitment to teaching, to their profession, and to their institution. However, these same groups also reported closer ties with four-year colleges and universities, a finding that contradicts the notion that community college instruction has developed as a professional practice *sui generis*. In conclusion, the community college professoriate has become increasingly differentiated at the same time the community college mission has grown ever more complex; however, it is not clear that institutional mission and instructor practice have been developed with close regard for one another.

Research Question

As detailed in our proposal, the central research question for this study concerned the nature and formation of a professional identity for the community college professoriate, particularly since the maturation of the community college system in the 1970s. To answer this broad research question more precisely, we posed a series of sub-questions concerning faculty professional practices and attitudes, especially in the areas of professional involvement, curriculum and instruction and the use of reference groups.

Relevant Literature

Several studies, dating from the late 1960s (most notably Garrison, 1967; Cohen and Brawer, 1972, 1977 and 1984), demonstrate a slow and unsteady progression toward the development of community college teaching as a profession within the context of rapid demographic changes for both community college faculty and their students. Garrison found that community college faculty had not yet formed a professional identity, because they did not have oversight of several factors that were (and are) central to their ability to practice their profession as they saw fit: They could not choose the students they taught, and they could not control the number of students entering their institutions. In addition, Garrison found that community college faculty were pressed for time to the extent that they did not believe they could continue to fulfill their myriad professional duties well, were isolated from other instructors both within and without their institutions, and did not feel that professional development activities, when available at all, met their needs.

Studies subsequent to Garrison's work show that little progress has been made toward the development of the community college professoriate as a distinct professional group. In the early 1970s, Cohen and Brawer (1972) analyzed available literature on the community college professoriate. Their focus was the development of the faculty, particularly given the stabilization of growth in the then-burgeoning community college system. The most important step in community colleges' progression toward a mature system, for Cohen and Brawer, was the development of "a professional, mature, self-aware faculty" (Cohen and Brawer, 1972, p. 4). To be truly professionalized, this faculty would need to be independent, self-managing, and assess itself according to its ability to effect student learning.

For Cohen and Brawer, the primary mission of the community college, and therefore of the faculty, was to be instruction. As they stated, "First and last, the junior college purports to be a teaching institution—student personnel and community service programs notwithstanding. For the junior college instructor, then, the process of instruction is crucial to identity formation" (Cohen and Brawer, 1972, p. 13). For them, community college faculty are "practitioners in the art of instruction" (Cohen and Brawer, 1972, p. 3)—that is to say, specialists in teaching, above all else.

The teaching mission defined not only the faculty, but the institutions themselves. As the extremely rapid construction of new campuses drew to a close, Cohen and Brawer asserted that it was essential that the hundreds of new campuses base their mission statements on instruction. Unfortunately, through their 1972 analysis of an extensive set of criteria, including measures of self-management, the acquisition of a specialized body of knowledge, and overt and specific organizational structures, among others, Cohen and

Brawer concluded that the community college professoriate had not yet achieved a distinct professional identity based on teaching. As will be explored in more detail below, the role of teaching as the defining characteristic and central preoccupation of community college faculty has continued to draw attention from scholars of the community college.

With their 1977 work, Cohen and Brawer elaborated their 1972 enumeration of categories into which the professional activities of community college faculty can be divided. According to this work, the formation of a distinct profession depends on a) the ability to control membership in one's professional group; b) lengthy preparation before entry; c) self-management; d) service to a discrete population; e) the acquisition of a specialized body of knowledge; f) overt and specific organizational structures; and g) a code of ethics.

Basing their analysis on the above-listed set of criteria, Cohen and Brawer concluded that the community college professoriate had not developed a distinct identity at the time of the 1975 survey. They were not self-policing; did not perform a distinct and unique service on behalf of their students; did not value and consider teaching as an act of instruction, rather than as possession of specialized knowledge; did not consider themselves members of a unique field, as evidenced by their tendency to eschew joining professional associations, reading academic journals, and participating in conferences; were not recognized as a distinct professional group by outsiders; and had not formulated a unique code of conduct and ethics. On another characteristic of professionalism, the requirement of a long period of preparation, community college faculty seemed to be

ambivalent: the tendency was for longer periods of preparation, but this increase was not related directly to the goals of teaching.

Cohen and Brawer's 1984 analysis of the community college faculty used the same set of criteria to define professionalization as their earlier work. For this work, they followed a procedure similar to that employed for 1972's *Confronting Identity*. By undertaking an exhaustive analysis of available literature on the community college professoriate, they found that the faculty had changed little since 1972 with respect to most of the above-mentioned indicators of professionalization.

More recent literature has continued to explore the role of instruction within the professional practice of the community college professoriate, and within the overall mission of the community college. This literature attests not only to the desire of community college faculty to gain familiarity with new pedagogical practices, but also to the increasing emphasis placed on instruction within the professional activities of the community college professoriate. For example, Angelo and Cross's 1993 work on within-classroom assessment and teaching argued that the focus of community college practice must be the classroom. In his 1994 compilation *Teaching & Learning in the Community College*, O'Banion invoked a 1988 report from the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, "The community college should be the nation's premier teaching institution," then argued that community colleges have sometimes lost that focus during their three decades of rapid expansion following World War II (O'Banion, 1994, p. 301). Within this anthology, O'Banion included a wide range of community colleges scholars and practitioners, each arguing from his or her perspective that community colleges must return to their primary mission of teaching.

Although she did not highlight instruction, the question of the professionalization of community college faculty was explored by Rifkin (1998), who investigated the "professionalism" of community college faculty. Rifkin used sociological theory to define professionalism as scholarship, service, autonomy, commitment, and integrity. She discovered differences between part-time and full-time faculty in many elements of her definition of professionalism.

In summary, the research literature, especially that concerned with instruction, shows that community college faculty might be in the process of creating a distinct professional identity. In particular, this identity might be related to the primacy of teaching within the community college mission. Accordingly, as mentioned above, the current study was designed to explore the extent to which the community college professoriate has developed as a distinct and coherent profession, especially since the maturation of the community college system in the 1970s. While the results reported below cover a great many aspects of the community college professoriate's professional practices and attitudes, particular attention will be given to instruction.

Method

Obtaining the Institutional Sample

This method for this study paralleled that used in the 1975 survey. To generate the institutional sample, we obtained the directory of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), the national association of which almost all community colleges are members. We sought a sample of 150 colleges in total for the study. Since previous experience (particularly the 1975 survey) indicated that at least some colleges would choose not to respond, we planned to solicit participation from at least 240 institutions initially. The colleges were chosen by selecting every 5th institution listed in the AACC directory. Because colleges are arranged alphabetically within states, selecting every nth college generated a random sample of institutions, since our n was small enough to allow several "passes" through the entire directory.

On May 1, community college presidents from the initial sample of 240 institutions were invited to participate in the survey (see Appendix for the text of this letter). For each institution that chose not to participate in the study or did not respond the survey invitation, another college of similar size was chosen to maintain the overall representativeness of institutions in the sample. By summer's end, we had invited 478 colleges to participate; of these, 70 said "no," 156 said "yes," and the remainder did not respond. No inferences can be drawn from the ways in which institutions responded to our invitation.

Appointing a Local Facilitator

As part of the invitation letter, community college presidents were asked to appoint a local facilitator to serve as the contact person on campus. This person was to be responsible for administering the survey on the campus. In most cases, this person was a Vice President, usually for academic instruction. The president's invitation letter contained a form to be used to designate this person (as well as a response envelope addressed to the Center for the Study of Community Colleges). Our goal in using local facilitators was two-fold: First, we wanted to obligate respondents to a local figure, rather than us, to complete their surveys. We believed respondents would take a survey more seriously if it came from their Vice President than from researchers they had never met. Second, we hoped to distribute the burden of distributing and retrieving surveys as widely as possible, and thought it would be much easier to follow up with 150 or so facilitators much more easily than with 2,000 or so respondents. As soon as college presidents agreed to participate and designated their local facilitator, these facilitators were sent a letter to welcome them to the study, and asked for a Fall 2000, course schedule. This schedule was used to select the faculty sample. By September 2000, we had received course schedules from 114 of the 156 colleges that had agreed to participate. A small number (under 20) of colleges sent course schedules after late September; however, it was not possible to include these colleges in the study.

Obtaining the Faculty Sample

Our goal was to obtain at least 1500 completed surveys. While we did not expect to equal the 1975 response rate of 84%, we hoped for a rate of at least 65%, and so 2300 was the minimum number of surveys we needed to distribute to receive 1500 completed instruments. To generate a list of approximately 2300 respondents, we chose every 10th instructor in colleges with fewer than 2,500 students (the number of students was obtained from the AACC directory); every 20th instructor from colleges with 2,501 to 6,500 students, and every 30th instructor from colleges more than 6,500 students. Instructors were chosen by selecting every 10th name in the course schedule. If a professor was listed as teaching more than one course, we counted him or her only once. In other words, we counted instructor names, rather than courses. If no instructor was named (usually because the instructor for that course was a part-timer), we counted by course. Some colleges have a majority of part-time instructors, and so their set of instructors includes many unnamed individuals. If a name was given for a course, we simply listed that name and the department; if no instructor was named, we gave as much information as possible for the facilitator to identify that instructor. To achieve the desired list of 2,300 faculty, we chose no more than 25 faculty for each school, producing a sample of 2,292 individuals.

The Survey Packet

The survey instrument consisted of a questionnaire of approximately 200 hundred questions in eight pages (please see Appendix for a draft of this instrument). Approximately 75% of survey questions were exact or near-exact repetitions of questions asked on the 1975 survey. As will be detailed below, most of the questions on the survey were designed to illuminate one or more of seven analytical categories.

On October 2, survey packets were sent to facilitators. Each packet contained instructions for the facilitator, a checklist of respondents, a stamped return envelope for all surveys, a postcard to be mailed to the Center for the Study of Community Colleges to indicate that the packet had been received, and a smaller packet for each respondent, addressed to that respondent. These smaller respondent packets each contained the survey, an envelope addressed to the Center for the Study of Community Colleges, and an envelope addressed to the facilitator.

Respondents were asked to complete the survey, then seal it in the envelope addressed to the Center for the Study of the Community Colleges, then seal this envelope in the envelope addressed to the on-campus facilitator. Once the facilitator received completed surveys, he or she removed the envelope addressed to him or her, crossed that respondent off the checklist, and returned the inner, sealed envelope to us.

By January 2001, 1531 of the 2292 surveys sent in October had been returned. Five colleges, with 95 surveys among them, chose to withdraw from the study between their presidents' decisions to participate and the survey deadline, two because of staffing changes, one because of a campus relocation, and two for unknown reasons. An

additional 204 surveys were never delivered by the local facilitators, almost always because courses were changed between the time the schedules were printed in the spring and the beginning of the Fall semester. In total, then, 1531 of 1993 valid surveys were returned, for a response rate of 76.8%.

Timeline

To summarize, the above-mentioned steps were taken in the following order, at the following times:

April 2000	Survey items finalized
May 2000	Participation by college presidents solicited
June-July 2000	Participation agreements finalized
September 2000	Faculty respondents selected
October 2000 - January 2001	Surveys distributed and returned
January 2001 - May 2001	Data analysis, compilation of findings

Constructs

As mentioned above, survey items were assigned to analytical categories, or constructs. These constructs were meant to allow a more probing interpretation of survey responses than would be possible with single item analysis. Individual survey items were assigned point values. These point values were combined to create overall construct values. Because of this procedure, differences in relative construct values, rather than the

absolute values themselves, have significance. A brief description of each construct and its constituent questions follows.

Curriculum and Instruction

This construct is meant to indicate respondents' degree of attachment to and involvement with the instructional aspects of their professional lives. Typical questions used to build the construct include hours spent teaching, the desire to spend more time teaching, the revision of the teaching syllabus, and receipt of awards for teaching.

Institutional Orientation

The Institutional Orientation construct was designed to measure respondents' degree of involvement with their colleges. Typical questions for this construct included measures of time spent performing professional duties on the campus, statements of desire to spend more time on those duties, and positive ratings of respondent's experience his/her institution.

Professional Involvement

This construct indicates the extent of respondents' participation in their professions. Questions used to create this construct covered attendance at professional meetings, reading professional journals, and publishing works related to the respondents' discipline.

The Use of the University as Reference Group

The Use of the University as Reference Group construct (or URG) was designed to reveal the extent to which respondents emulated the four-year college or university, either explicitly or implicitly, in their professional practices and attitudes. Typical items used to create this construct included questions on the respondents' desire to teach in a four-year school, suggestions to students that they make use of a university's resources, and the belief in the university as a source of important ideas for the respondents' disciplines.

Limitations

While every effort was made to obtain a national random sample of community college faculty, several types of sampling bias might have crept into the current study. As will be reported below, women and full-timers seem to be over-reported in the sample. However, the over-representation of full-timers is most likely attributable to the sampling procedure followed in this study. Recall that faculty were sampled according to courses taught (i.e., by selecting faculty from course schedules). Logically, this method would produce a greater proportion of full-timers, since full-timers teach a greater number of courses than do part-timers.

Other types of limitations apply as well. Because all survey data are self-reported, it is possible that respondents intentionally or inadvertently misrepresented some aspects of their attitudes and practices. As Grubb (1999) noted, it is possible, for example, that instructors believe their classrooms to be lively, discussion-oriented

environments, when in fact they are dominated by lecture. Similarly, respondents might have caused their responses to sensitive issues to conform their expectations of social norms.

Results

Demographic Characteristics

Before presenting study findings related to practices and attitudes, it would be useful to provide a general description of the faculty sample. For simplicity of presentation, longitudinal comparisons between Humanities faculty in 1975 and 2000 will be presented in this section as well. (Recall that *only* Humanities faculty were surveyed in 1975.)

Table 1: Faculty Gender

	All Faculty 2000		Humanities 2000		Humanities 1975
Sex	N	%	N	%	%
Male	743	48.5	83	45.9	66.7
Female	740	48.3	95	52.5	33.3
Missing	48	3.1	3	1.7	
Total	1531	100.0	181	100.0	100.0

Sources: 1975 data from Cohen and Brawer, 1977; 2000 data from 2000 Faculty Survey
Notes: Totals may not equal 100.00 because of rounding.

As Table 1 shows, women have achieved greater representation among Humanities faculty than they enjoyed in 1975. Indeed, results from the current study show that men and women comprise the faculty in nearly equal measure for all faculty,

and that women are slightly over-represented among Humanities faculty. This result is significantly different from those obtained in 1975, when men outnumbered women by a two-to-one ratio. In addition, this result is slightly different from figures reported by the National Center for Education statistics, which reported that just over half (54.7%) of community college faculty are male (Digest, 1997, Table 227). This result contrasts with results obtained by Palmer & Zimbler (2000) whose analysis of 1992 data revealed that 56.5% of all community college faculty were male (Palmer & Zimbler, 2000, table 2). Overall, then, it seems that the current study has slightly over-represented female faculty.

Table 2: Faculty Race/Ethnicity

	All Faculty 2000		Humanities 2000		1975
Race/Ethnicity	N	%	N	%	%
African American	74	4.8	10	5.5	2.6
American Indian	22	1.4	2	1.1	0.2
Asian American	28	1.8	1	0.6	0.9
Hispanic/Latino	30	2.0	11	6.1	2.2
White/Caucasian	1327	86.6	153	84.5	90.6
Other	32	2.1	2	1.1	1.9
Missing	20	1.3	2	1.1	1.5
Total	1533	100.0	181	100.0	99.9

Sources: 1975 data from Cohen and Brawer, 1977; 2000 data from 2000 Faculty Survey.
Notes: For 1975 data, all Hispanic/Latino categories (Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, Chicano) were collapsed into "Hispanic/Latino" category. Totals may not equal 100.00 because of rounding.

Table 2 demonstrates that, just as faculty have moved closer to gender parity since 1975, they have also progressed in their representation of people of color. These findings are consistent with those of Palmer & Zimbler (2000), whose analysis of 1992 data showed that 86.1% of the community college professoriate is White/Caucasian. According to Table 2, the percentage of White/Caucasian faculty has declined by just 6.1% (in absolute terms) for Humanities faculty since 1975. However, this slight reduction has made possible increases in the percentage of racial/ethnic minority faculty. Most strikingly, the proportion of African American instructors has nearly doubled.

However, it must be noted that the small number of faculty of color in the Humanities makes longitudinal comparisons intriguing, but unreliable. Nevertheless, these findings are consistent with the literature (for example, with Carter's 1994 finding that people of color are steadily, if slowly, achieving more proportionate representation within the community college professoriate).

Table 3: Faculty Age

	All Faculty 2000		Humanities 2000		Humanities 1975	
Age		N	%	N	%	%
Under 25	2	0.1			Under 25	1.3
25-34	150	9.8	16	8.8	26-30	12.1
35-44	340	22.2	35	19.3	31-35	20.3
45-54	586	38.2	66	36.5	36-40	16.2
55-64	352	23.0	51	28.2	41-45	13.1
65 and Over	70	4.6	10	5.5	46-50	13.8
Missing	33	2.2	3	1.7	51-55	9.5
					56-60	7.6
					61 and Older	6.2

Sources: 1975 data from Cohen and Brawer, 1977; 2000 data from 2000 Faculty Survey.

Because survey items regarding faculty ages differed slightly in the 1975 and 2000 surveys, exact comparisons between these time points are difficult to achieve.

However, the data do show clearly that, on the whole, the faculty are growing older. For example, just 27.3% of Humanities faculty were under 45 years of age in 2000, while nearly half (46.8%) were under age 46 in 1975. Similarly, 33.7% of the Humanities faculty reported being over 55 years of age in 2000, compared with 23.3% in this range in 1975. This finding is consistent with patterns of faculty employment, in which a large number of faculty were hired as the system grew through the 1960s, then stabilized (and began to hire fewer professors). As the faculty hired through the period of growth remained in their positions, their mean age increased.

Table 4: Demographic Characteristics by Full-Time/Part-Time Status

	All Faculty 2000		Humanities Faculty 2000	
Category	N Full-Time	% Full-Time	N Full-Time	% Full-Time
Men	522	70.3	57	68.7
Women	506	68.4	65	68.2
African American	58	78.4	8	80.0
American Indian	17	77.3	2	100.0
Asian American	21	75.0	1	100.0
Hispanic/Latino	23	76.7	9	81.8
White/Caucasian	916	69	103	67.3
Other	26	81.3%	0	N/A
Age: Under 25	2	100.0**	0	N/A
Age: 25-34	86	57.3**	8	50.0**
Age: 35-44	235	69.1**	21	60.0**
Age: 45-54	441	75.3**	55	83.3**
Age: 55-64	257	73.0**	36	70.6**
Age: 65 and Older	23	32.9**	3	30.0**
School: Small	340	72.7	35	74.5
School: Medium	322	67.7	42	67.7
School: Large	356	68.7	48	66.7
Liberal Arts	386	68.2	N/A	N/A
Total	1064	69.5	125	69.1

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.
**Denotes differences significant at $p \leq .01$ level.

As Table 4 shows, full-timers constituted 69.5% of the total sample for the current study, and 69.1% of Humanities instructors in the sample. These figures demonstrate a clear over-representation of full-timers (recall that Palmer & Zimbler, 2000, found that full-timers formed only 38% of the community college professoriate in 1992). Table 4 provides further information on respondents' characteristics as categorized by full-time or part-time employment status. In this sample, slightly more men than women are part-timers; however, this difference is not statistically significant. Similarly, the counts for

racial/ethnic minorities (*i.e.*, the number of respondents within cells) are not large enough to permit meaningful analysis, although it might be noted that Whites show the lowest proportion of part-timers of any racial/ethnic group. Younger faculty are more likely to be part-timers than are their older counterparts (with the exception of the practically insignificant number of faculty under the age of 25, and the similarly practically insignificant number of Humanities faculty over the age of 55). No statistically significant differences in employment status were observed between Liberal Arts/Non-Liberal Arts instructors. With the exceptions noted, these trends were consistent for Humanities instructors, as well as instructors in general. Unfortunately, comparisons at this level of detail are not available with 1975 data.

Table 5: Length of Service as Community College Faculty

	All Instructors 2000		Humanities 2000		Humanities 1975
Years	N	%	N	%	%
None	33	2.2	3	1.7	3.6
<1 Year	104	6.8	13	7.2	7.3
1-4 Years	289	18.9	31	17.1	29.7
5-10 Years	362	23.6	46	25.4	37.7
11-20 Years	402	26.3	49	27.1	16.7
> 20 Years	326	21.3	39	21.5	3.8

Sources: 1975 data from Cohen and Brawer, 1977; 2000 data from 2000 Faculty Survey.

As Table 5 demonstrates, the average period for which instructors have served their profession has lengthened since 1975. In 1975, 58.2% of Humanities faculty had served over five years; by 2000, this figure had climbed to 74.0%. This trend persists for all instructors, with 72.2% of them having served longer than five years. This dramatic lengthening is almost certainly related to the pattern by which the community college system was developed. The dramatic growth in the number of and size of colleges through the 1960s resulted in a great deal of hiring, followed by a period of relative stability since the 1960s (Cohen and Brawer, 1996).

Table 6: Length of Service as Administrator

	All Instructors 2000		Humanities 2000		Humanities 1975
Years	N	%	N	%	%
None	1408	92.0	161	88.9	83.7
<1 Year	14	0.9	1	0.6	0.3
1-4 Years	59	3.9	10	5.5	2.3
5-10 Years	27	1.8	3	1.7	1.0
11-20 Years	18	1.2	4	2.2	0.3
> 20 Years	5	0.3	2	1.1	0.1

Sources: 1975 data from Cohen and Brawer, 1977; 2000 data from 2000 Faculty Survey.
Note: "Missing" responses have been interpreted as "No" for 2000 data.

While the absolute numbers presented in Table 6 are comparatively small, since relatively few community college instructors have served as administrators, the same

trend toward a longer period of service is evident here. In 1975, 1.4% of Humanities instructors had served as administrators for at least five years; by 2000, the figure was 5.0% for Humanities instructors, with 3.3% of all instructors having served as administrators for at least five years.

Table 7: Length of Service as Secondary Instructor

	All Instructors 2000		Humanities 2000	Humanities 1975
Years		N	%	%
None	951	62.1	99	54.6	41.1
<1 Year	87	5.7	11	6.1	3.5
1-4 Years	180	11.8	27	14.9	20.8
5-10 Years	151	9.9	17	9.4	17.7
11-20 Years	100	6.5	16	8.8	8.8
> 20 Years	62	4.0	11	6.1	2.3

Sources: 1975 data from Cohen and Brawer, 1977; 2000 data from 2000 Faculty Survey.
Note: "Missing" responses have been interpreted as "No" for 2000 data.

Table 7 shows the decreasing importance of the secondary schools as sources of community college instructors. While nearly 60% of community college instructors in the Humanities had taught in the secondary schools in 1975, only 45.4% had done so by 2000, with an even smaller percentage of community college instructors in general (37.9%) having taught in the high schools.

Table 8: Length of Service as Four-Year Instructor

	All Instructors 2000		Humanities 2000		Humanities 1975
Years	N	%	N	%	%
None	1046	68.3	104	57.5	54.7
<1 Year	79	5.2	76	3.9	3.1
1-4 Years	223	14.6	34	18.8	18.2
5-10 Years	93	6.1	21	11.6	9.4
11-20 Years	61	4.0	11	6.1	4.0
> 20 Years	29	1.9	4	2.2	1.1

Sources: 1975 data from Cohen and Brawer, 1977; 2000 data from 2000 Faculty Survey.
Note: "Missing" responses have been interpreted as "No" for 2000 data.

Table 8 reveals information not only on the proportion of community college instructors who have had experience teaching in four-year colleges and universities, but also on demographic shifts within this group. As this table shows, a higher proportion of Humanities instructors than non-Humanities instructors has had experience teaching at the four-year level. This difference is consistent with the presence of non-Liberal Faculty within the "non-Humanities" subgroup: Non-Liberal Arts instructors are less likely to have taught at a four-year college or university. In a finding consistent with those noted above, Table 4.10 shows that the 19.9% of Humanities instructors in the 2000 study had taught at the four-year level for five or more years, while only 14.5% of those in the 1975 study had done so. However, it should be noted that a missing response on this item was

construed as being equivalent to responding "None;" it cannot be assumed that missing responses were so construed in the 1975 study.

Summary of Demographic Results

Overall, community college faculty are a more diverse group than they were in 1975, and, indeed, are closer to being representative of the United States population in general. Women in particular have made gains since the 1975 survey, and, at least according to the results of the current survey, have achieved parity with men. As mentioned above, the faculty are in general older than they were in 1975, most probably because of hiring patterns within the community college system. In addition, they are a more experienced group, with longer periods of service to their profession. The high schools are much less important sources of community college faculty than they were in 1975, and the colleges and universities are more important. While there are no statistically significant differences between full-timers and part-timers in regard to sex or race/ethnicity, it is clear that part-timers are more likely to be younger than full-timers. However, it must be noted that women and full-timers seem to be over-represented in this sample.

Results by Construct

To simplify the reporting of results, we will first offer the research question which guided our analysis of a particular subset of the data, then we will present our response to that question.

Curriculum and Instruction

Research Question:

How do faculty differ from one another in their commitment to teaching, and in their expressed teaching practice?

As discussed above, teaching, above all other forms of professional practice, is critical within the scope of responsibilities of the community college professoriate. Accordingly, we have been particularly attentive to study results related to instructional practice.

While the literature reports a popular perception that part-timers are less committed to teaching than their full-time colleagues, and teach less well than full-timers, repeated studies (Cohen and Brawer, 1977; Gappa and Leslie, 1993; Grubb, 1999) have found no differences in teaching quality between full-timers and part-timers. While the construct Curriculum and Instruction cannot be equated with teaching quality (indeed, an analysis of the difficult concept of "good teaching" would constitute a separate study), it is possible to assume that there is a very strong relationship between Curriculum and Instruction as a construct and good teaching.

Table 9: Summary of Curriculum and Instruction Scores

	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Statistical Significance
Full-Time N=1064	29.3402	7.3222	0.000
Part-Time N=467	27.1413	7.2967	
Doctoral Holder N=239	28.1799	7.6508	0.265
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	28.7601	7.3305	
Doctoral Seeker N=135	31.5926	6.9886	0.000
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	28.3868	7.3598	
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	26.9441	6.6917	0.050
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	29.3684	7.3225	
Liberal Arts N=844	28.3626	7.4186	.074
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	29.0455	7.2812	
Entire Sample N=1531	28.6695	7.3819	NA

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Table 9 contrasts results for the Curriculum and Instruction construct by respondent category. As this table shows, full-timers posted much higher scores on this construct than did part-timers, with scores of 29.3402 and 27.1413, respectively, a difference of 2.1989. This difference is statistically significant at $p \leq .000$. Those with the doctorate posted slightly higher scores on this construct than those with without the doctorate (with scores of 28.7601 vs. 28.1799, respectively, a difference of 0.5801).

However, this difference was not statistically significant. Those who reported seeking the doctorate achieved much higher scores on the Curriculum and Instruction construct than those who were not, with scores of 31.5926 and 28.3868, respectively, a difference of 3.2058. This difference was significant at $p \leq .000$ level. Part-timers who were not seeking the doctorate scored 26.9441, versus 29.3684 (a difference of 2.4243). However, this difference was significant only at the $p \leq .05$ level. Non-Liberal Arts instructors posted slightly higher scores for the Curriculum and Instruction construct than their Liberal Arts counterparts, with scores of 29.0455 and 28.3626, respectively, a difference of 0.6830. However, this difference was not statistically significant at the $p \leq .01$ level.

In summary, differences on this construct tended to be statistically significant, indicating real contrasts between the respondent categories noted above. Particularly striking were the differences between full- and part-timers, and doctoral seekers and non-doctoral seekers. Overall, the strongest contrast was between doctoral seekers, who scored the highest, as a group, and part-time non-doctoral seekers, who scored the lowest. At 31.5926, the mean score for doctoral seekers was a full 4.6485 points above the mean of part-time non-doctoral seekers.

Tables 10 through 14 provide more insight into the individual measures used to build the Curriculum and Instruction construct, and therefore shed more light on differences in instructional practice between respondent categories.

Table 10: Use of Instructional Time, by Employment Status

Activity	Full-Time N=1060	Part-Time N=464	Nation N=1524
Instructor Lectures	36.15	37.72	36.63
Guest Lectures	1.37	1.44	1.39
Student Presentations	5.00	5.69	5.21
Class Discussion	14.18	14.87	14.39
Viewing Media	4.04	3.82	3.97
Simulation/Gaming	2.23	2.41	2.28
Quizzes/Exams	8.63	8.97	8.74
Field Trips	0.97	0.92	0.96
Lectures/Exps	4.81	3.89	4.53
Lab Experiments	7.00	4.43	6.21
Lab Quizzes/Exams	2.46	2.32	2.42
Student Computer	6.89	6.91	6.90
Other	3.59	3.97	3.71

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.
Note: Anomalous responses (i.e., respondents reporting more than a total percentage allocation greater than 150) have been excluded from results.

Table 11: Use of Instructional Time, by Doctoral Attainment

Activity	Doctoral Holder N=238	Non-Doctoral Holder N=1286	Nation N=1524
Instructor Lectures	43.30	35.39	36.63
Guest Lectures	1.44	1.38	1.39
Student Presentations	5.52	5.15	5.21
Class Discussion	15.27	14.23	14.39
Viewing Media	4.24	3.92	3.97
Simulation/Gaming	1.62	2.41	2.28
Quizzes/Exams	8.33	8.81	8.74
Field Trips	0.88	0.97	0.96
Lectures/Exps	2.42	4.92	4.53
Lab Experiments	5.43	6.36	6.21
Lab Quizzes/Exams	1.35	2.61	2.42
Student Computer	5.02	7.24	6.90
Other	2.23	3.98	3.71

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.
Note: Anomalous responses (i.e., respondents reporting more than a total percentage allocation greater than 150) have been excluded from results.

Table 12: Use of Instructional Time, by Doctoral Aspiration

Activity	Doctoral Seeker N=133	Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1391	Nation N=1524
Instructor Lectures	36.09	36.68	36.63
Guest Lectures	1.68	1.36	1.39
Student Presentations	6.88	5.05	5.21
Class Discussion	15.75	14.26	14.39
Viewing Media	4.95	3.88	3.97
Simulation/Gaming	2.92	2.22	2.28
Quizzes/Exams	9.03	8.71	8.74
Field Trips	0.86	0.96	0.96
Lectures/Exps	4.41	4.54	4.53
Lab Experiments	5.22	6.31	6.21
Lab Quizzes/Exams	1.59	2.50	2.42
Student Computer	7.55	6.83	6.90
Other	2.65	3.81	3.71

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.
Note: Anomalous responses (i.e., respondents reporting more than a total percentage allocation greater than 150) have been excluded from results.

Table 13: Use of Instructional Time, by Employment Status and Doctoral Aspiration

Activity	Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=427	Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=37	Nation N=1524
Instructor Lectures	37.66	38.35	36.63
Guest Lectures	1.45	1.30	1.39
Student Presentations	5.69	5.70	5.21
Class Discussion	14.94	14.03	14.39
Viewing Media	3.54	7.08	3.97
Simulation/Gaming	2.34	3.16	2.28
Quizzes/Exams	8.92	9.54	8.74
Field Trips	0.96	0.49	0.96
Lectures/Exps	4.00	2.57	4.53
Lab Experiments	4.35	5.27	6.21
Lab Quizzes/Exams	2.39	1.43	2.42
Student Computer	7.04	5.38	6.90
Other	4.00	3.65	3.71

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.
Note: Anomalous responses (i.e., respondents reporting more than a total percentage allocation greater than 150) have been excluded from results.

Table 14: Use of Instructional Time, by Instructional Area

Activity	Liberal Arts N=840	Non-Liberal Arts N=657	Nation
Instructor Lectures	39.43	33.37	36.63
Guest Lectures	0.86	2.08	1.39
Student Presentations	5.86	4.41	5.21
Class Discussion	16.18	12.25	14.39
Viewing Media	3.86	4.10	3.97
Simulation/Gaming	1.84	2.80	2.28
Quizzes/Exams	9.50	7.83	8.74
Field Trips	0.81	1.13	0.96
Lectures/Exps	3.40	5.95	4.53
Lab Experiments	5.27	7.42	6.21
Lab Quizzes/Exams	1.27	3.66	2.42
Student Computer	5.14	9.23	6.90
Other	4.05	3.19	3.71

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.
Note: Anomalous responses (i.e., respondents reporting more than a total percentage allocation greater than 150) have been excluded from results.

As Tables 10 through 14 show, lecture and discussion continue to be the most prevalent forms of instructional methods for all instructors. While part-timers did not differ greatly from full-timers in their use of class time, Table 11 shows several significant differences in the ways those who do and do not have the doctorate use their time in the classroom. Those with doctorates are much more likely to spend class time in lectures (with 43.30% for doctoral holders, versus 35.39% for those who do have the doctorate). Non-doctoral holders use nearly twice as much class time for Laboratory Quizzes and Examinations (2.61% versus 1.35%), and twice as much time for Lectures and Demonstration Experiments (4.92% versus 2.42%). These differences are no doubt related to the concentration of non-doctoral holders in the non-Liberal Arts (that is to say, Occupational) disciplines, in which laboratories and practical demonstrations are more

important instructional tools. The pursuit of the doctorate did not seem to have a significant relationship to use of instructional time, as illustrated in Tables 12 and 13.

However, many differences were observed between Liberal Arts and non-Liberal Arts faculty, as noted in Table 14. In fact, Liberal Arts differed from their non-Liberal Arts colleagues on nearly ever measure of use of class time. Liberal Arts faculty made greater use of lectures (39.43% versus 33.37%), greater use of discussion (16.18% versus 12.25%), greater use of student presentations (5.86%, relative to 4.41%) and greater use of exams and quizzes (9.50% compared with 7.8%). For their part, non-Liberal Arts faculty tended to devote more classroom time to laboratory activities and the use of technology. They made greater use of Lectures and Demonstration Experiments (5.95% versus 3.40%), Laboratory Experiments (7.42% versus 5.27%), Laboratory Quizzes and Examinations (3.66%, versus 1.27%) and student computer use (9.23% versus 5.14%).

Table 15: Percent Stating Revised Syllabus in Past Three Years

	Percent
Full-Time N=1064	95.2
Part-Time N=467	86.1
Doctoral Holder N=239	93.7
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	92.2
Doctoral Seeker N=135	96.3
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	92.0
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	85.5
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	92.1
Liberal Arts N=844	92.7
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	92.3
Entire Sample N=1531	94.3

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Table 15 demonstrates that nearly all faculty, in all categories, reported they had revised their syllabi within the three years before completing the survey. Full-timers were most likely to have revised their syllabi, at 95.2%. The only group to report a syllabus revision rate of under 90% was part-time non-doctoral seekers, at 85.5%.

Table 16: Percent Stating Received Award for Teaching

	Percent
Full-Time N=1064	38.9
Part-Time N=467	23.1
Doctoral Holder N=239	40.6
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	32.9
Doctoral Seeker N=135	44.4
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	33.1
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	22.6
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	28.9
Liberal Arts N=844	35.8
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	32.4
Entire Sample N=1531	34.1

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

As shown in Table 16,doctoral seekers were the most likely to report having received a teaching award, at 44.4%. Interestingly, doctoral aspirations were more closely linked to the receipt of such an award than was any other respondent characteristic noted in Table 16, although employment status was closely related as well. Not only were part-timers much less likely than full-timers to report having received an award, but part-time non-doctoral seekers, at 22.6%, were the least likely of all groups to state they had received this type of award.

Table 17: Percent Stating Taught Honors

	Percent
Full-Time N=1064	10.0
Part-Time N=467	5.4
Doctoral Holder N=239	17.2
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	7.0
Doctoral Seeker N=135	14.8
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	8.0
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	7.9
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	5.1
Liberal Arts N=844	13.6
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	1.8
Entire Sample N=1531	8.6

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Table 18: Percent Stating Taught Remedial

	Percent
Full-Time N=1064	27.0
Part-Time N=467	25.1
Doctoral Holder N=239	22.6
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	27.1
Doctoral Seeker N=135	34.1
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	25.6
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	25.4
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	21.1
Liberal Arts N=844	38.7
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	10.5
Entire Sample N=1531	27.1

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Tables 17 and 18 show that doctoral holders, doctoral seekers and Liberal Arts instructors are the most likely to report having taught honors courses. Members of each of these response categories were much more likely to report having taught honors than their counterparts. This difference was particularly striking in the case of instructional area: While 13.6% of Liberal Arts instructors reported having taught honors, only 1.8% of Non-Liberal Arts instructors reported having done so. These patterns did not hold for Table 18, which shows that doctoral holders were slightly less likely to have taught remedial courses than their non-doctoral holding counterparts. Interestingly, doctoral

seekers were substantially more likely to have taught honors than their non-doctoral seeking counterparts (at 34.1% versus 25.6%).

Table 19: Percent Stating Taught Jointly with Colleagues Outside their Department

	Percent
Full-Time N=1064	24.0
Part-Time N=467	15.0
Doctoral Holder N=239	28.9
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	19.8
Doctoral Seeker N=135	24.4
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	20.9
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	13.2
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	15.2
Liberal Arts N=844	22.6
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	18.8
Entire Sample N=1531	21.2

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Doctoral holders were more likely than any other group to report having taught jointly with a colleague outside their department, with over one-fourth stating they had done so. Part-timers were less likely than full-timers to have taught jointly, with those part-timers who were not seeking the doctorate least likely of all to report having done so.

Table 20: Percent Stating Traveled Off Campus for Conference or Symposium

	Percent
Full-Time N=1064	86.6
Part-Time N=467	65.1
Doctoral Holder N=239	85.8
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	78.9
Doctoral Seeker N=135	91.1
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	78.9
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	62.9
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	89.5
Liberal Arts N=844	77.8
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	82.9
Entire Sample N=1531	80.0

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Table 21: Percent Stating Organized Extracurricular Activities for Students

	Percent
Full-Time N=1064	71.9
Part-Time N=467	59.3
Doctoral Holder N=239	70.3
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	67.6
Doctoral Seeker N=135	80.0
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	66.9
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	57.6
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	78.9
Liberal Arts N=844	66.0
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	70.6
Entire Sample N=1531	68.1

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Tables 20 and 21 present two final measures of practice related to curriculum and instruction. While these measures do not concern in-class practice per se, they do provide information on additional steps instructors could take to enhance their teaching practice. As Table 20 shows, full-timers and doctoral seekers are much more likely than their counterparts to report having traveled off campus for a conference or symposium. Over 90% of doctoral seekers reported having attended an off-campus symposium or conference, versus just 62.9% of part-time non-doctoral seekers. Similarly, full-timers and doctoral seekers were more likely than their counterparts to have organized extra-curricular activities for their students. Once again, part-time non-doctoral seekers, at 57.6%, were the least likely to report they had organized such activities.

Institutional Orientation

Research Question:

How does involvement with the institution vary by instructor characteristics?

As numerous studies (Cohen and Brawer, 1977; Seidman, 1985, Gappa and Leslie, 1993; Grubb, 1999) have shown, part-timers are less likely to take part in institutional life for two reasons: They face many competing demands on their time, especially if they are employed elsewhere, and they are often discouraged, by custom, policy or both, from taking part in institutional affairs, such as committee work and governance, at the colleges at which they teach. Our data confirm this finding at the same time they reveal other interesting differences in scores for this construct.

Table 22: Summary of Institutional Orientation Construct Scores

	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Statistical Significance
Full-Time N=1064	14.1758	4.433	0.031
Part-Time N=467	13.6445	4.3940	
Doctoral Holder N=239	14.0983	4.6095	0.082
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	13.5565	4.3886	
Doctoral Seeker N=135	15.5481	4.3189	0.000
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	13.8653	4.4102	
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	13.4569	4.3375	0.002
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	15.7632	4.5288	
Liberal Arts N=844	13.8175	4.4442	0.043
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	14.2822	4.3790	
Entire Sample N=1531	14.0137	4.4267	NA

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

As Table 22 shows, full-timers posted higher scores on the Institutional Orientation construct than did part-timers, with values of 14.1758 and 13.6445, respectively, a difference of 0.5312. This difference was statistically significant at the $p \leq .05$ level. Those with doctorates posted lower mean scores on the Institutional Orientation construct than those without (with mean values of 13.5565 and 14.0983, respectively, a difference of 0.5418). However, this difference was not statistically significant. In contrast to the less-than-striking difference between doctoral holders and non-doctoral holders, those who are seeking the doctorate posted much higher scores on the Institutional Orientation construct than their non-doctoral seeking counterparts.

Doctoral seekers had a mean score of 15.5481, versus 13.8653, a difference of 1.6828. This difference was significant at the $p \leq .000$ level. Non-Liberal Arts instructors posted slightly higher scores on the Institutional Orientation construct than those teaching in the Liberal Arts, with scores of 14.2822 and 13.8175, respectively, a difference of 0.4647. This difference is statistically significant at the $p \leq .05$ level.

In summary, doctoral seekers have the highest score on the Institutional Orientation construct of any group. Those 429 respondents who were employed part-time and were *not* seeking the doctorate posted a still lower mean score, of 13.4569, versus 15.7632 for part-timers who were seeking the doctorate. Tables 23 through 26 provide more details on the individual survey items on which this construct is based.

Table 23: Percent Rating Relations with Colleagues Excellent or Good

	Percent
Full-Time N=1064	92.2
Part-Time N=467	88.0
Doctoral Holder N=239	93.3
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	90.5
Doctoral Seeker N=135	93.3
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	90.7
Part-Time Doctoral Seekers N=39	94.7
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seekers N=429	87.5
Liberal Arts N=844	91.0
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	91.0
Total N=1531	90.9

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Table 23 shows that nearly all respondents reported their relations with colleagues to be excellent or good. While part-timers were the least likely to state this, and doctoral holders the most likely, neither these differences nor any other were substantial.

Table 24: Time Spent in Informal Interaction with Colleagues

	Average Hours per Day in Informal Interaction with Colleagues	Percent Preferring More Time in Informal Interaction with Colleagues
Full-Time	0.99	41.4
	N=1032	N=1064
Part-Time	0.73	32.3
	N=446	N=467
Doctoral Holder	0.91	43.1
	N=232	N=239
Non-Doctoral Holder	0.91	37.8
	N=1246	N=1292
Doctoral Seeker	0.93	53.3
	N=126	N=135
Non-Doctoral Seeker	0.91	37.2
	N=1352	N=1396
Part-Time Doctoral Seekers	0.91	44.7
	N=34	N=38
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seekers	0.72	31.2
	N=412	N=429
Liberal Arts	0.89	38.9
	N=805	N=844
Non-Liberal Arts	0.92	38.8
	N=645	N=659
Total	0.91	38.7
	N=1478	N=1531

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.
Note: Anomalous responses (those respondents indicating more than 30 hours in their work days) were excluded from the above table. However, all respondents were included for column three of this table, as noted in the individual Ns reported.

As Table 24 demonstrates, all respondent groups reported they spent between 0.73 and 0.99 hours per day in informal interaction with colleagues. Although full-timers reported the greatest amount of time with colleagues, and part-timers the least, respondents did not vary greatly by group on this measure. However, respondent groups

did differ substantially when asked whether they would prefer to spend *more* time with their colleagues. Over half (53.3%) of doctoral seekers desired more time with colleagues, but only 37.2% of those not pursuing the doctorate expressed this desire. With the exception of the nearly identical responses for Liberal Arts and Non-Liberal Arts instructors, other contrasts, while not as dramatic, were striking.

Table 25: Percent Stating More Interaction with Colleagues or Administrators Would Improve Courses

	Percent
Full-Time N=1064	38.1
Part-Time N=467	42.4
Doctoral Holder N=239	32.6
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	40.6
Doctoral Seeker N=135	43.0
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	39.0
Part-Time Doctoral Seekers N=38	52.6
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seekers N=429	41.5
Liberal Arts N=844	40.5
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	38.5
Total N=1531	39.1

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Table 25, which presents the percent of respondents who stated that more interaction with colleagues or administrators would improve their courses, shows relatively similar responses across respondent categories, with one exception: Those part-timers who were seeking the doctorate were much more likely than members of other groups to agree that their teaching would be improved if they had more interaction with colleagues or administrators.

Table 26: Rating Sources of Teaching Advice

	Percent Rating Chairs Useful or Quite Useful	Percent Rating Colleagues Useful or Quite Useful
Full-Time N=1064	74.4	94.0
Part-Time N=467	81.6	86.1
Doctoral Holder N=239	70.3	92.4
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	78.0	91.4
Doctoral Seeker N=135	83.0	97.0
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	76.3	91.0
Part-Time Doctoral Seekers N=38	89.5	89.5
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seekers N=429	80.9	85.7
Liberal Arts N=844	77.0	91.5
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	76.6	92.1
Total N=1531	76.8	91.6

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

As shown in Table 26, colleagues were much more likely than departmental chairs to be rated as "quite useful" or "useful" sources of teaching advice. In fact, no group rated chairs more highly on this measure, although part-time doctoral seekers did give chairs and colleagues identical scores. Little variation was noted between respondent categories on either measure, although it is worth noting that full-timers were more likely than part-timers to rate chairs highly, while part-timers were more likely to

rate colleagues highly. Also noteworthy is the extremely high score given by doctoral seekers to colleagues—a full 97.0% of them considered their colleagues to be useful or quite useful sources of teaching advice.

Professional Involvement

Research Question

How does professional involvement vary by instructor characteristics?

Many studies have demonstrated that part-timers are less involved in their professions than their full-time colleagues. In addition, results from the current study suggest that those who are seeking the doctorate have greater levels of involvement than those who are not.

Table 27: Summary of Professional Involvement Scores

	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Statistical Significance
Full-Time	23.3017	9.2789	0.000
Part-Time	18.9336	8.7012	
Doctoral Holder	25.3515	9.4630	0.000
Non-Doctoral Holder	21.3437	9.1651	
Doctoral Seeker	28.5704	9.9240	0.000
Non-Doctoral Seeker	21.3309	9.0140	
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seekers	18.1608	8.3063	0.000
Part-Time Doctoral Seekers	27.6579	8.3869	
Liberal Arts	21.9609	9.3785	0.931
Non-Liberal Arts	22.0030	9.2317	
Entire Sample	21.9693	9.3234	NA

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

As table 27 shows, full-timers scored significantly higher in regard to Professional Involvement than did part-timers, with scores of 23.3017 and 18.9336, respectively, a difference of 4.3681. This difference was statistically significant at the $p \leq .000$ level. Doctoral holders scored higher on this construct than did instructors without doctorates, as reported in table 27, with scores of 25.3515 and 21.3437, respectively, a difference of 4.0078. This difference is statistically significant at the $p \leq .000$ level. Further, doctoral seekers differed dramatically from their non-doctoral seeking counterparts on the Professional Involvement construct. Doctoral seekers posted a value of 28.5704, 7.2394 points above their non-doctoral seeking counterparts. This difference was significant at the $p \leq .000$ level. Part-timers who were pursuing the doctorate posted substantially, and statistically significantly, higher scores on the Professional Involvement construct than

did part-timers who were not seeking the doctorate, with scores of 27.6579 and 18.1608 respectively, a difference (significant at the $p \leq .000$ level) of 9.4971. Finally, Liberal Arts instructors did not differ substantially or significantly from those not teaching in the Liberal Arts in regard to this construct.

In summary, doctoral seekers posted the highest relative scores on the Professional Involvement construct of any sample group and part-time non-doctoral seekers the lowest. Sample groups differed widely on this construct, with the exception of Liberal Arts vs. Non-Liberal Arts instructors, who scored similarly. The tables below will allow a more detailed examination of responses to individual items used to build this construct.

Table 28: Percent Belonging to General Education Association

	Percent Belonging to General Education Association
Full-Time N=1064	44.5
Part-Time N=467	28.3
Doctoral Holder N=239	47.7
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	38.1
Doctoral Seeker N=135	48.9
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	38.7
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	27.0
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	42.1
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	35.7
Liberal Arts N=844	40.3
Total N=1531	39.6

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Table 29: Percent Belonging to Community College Specific Association

	Percent
Full-Time N=1064	29.0
Part-Time N=467	10.5
Doctoral Holder N=239	22.2
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	23.6
Doctoral Seeker N=135	33.3
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	22.4
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	10.0
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	15.8
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	20.0
Liberal Arts N=844	25.9
Total N=1531	23.4

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Table 30: Percent Belonging to Disciplinary Association

	Percent
Full-Time N=1064	52.3
Part-Time N=467	33.0
Doctoral Holder N=239	61.9
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	43.6
Doctoral Seeker N=135	60.0
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	45.1
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	31.2
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	52.6
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	49.8
Liberal Arts N=844	42.5
Total N=1531	46.4

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Table 29: Percent Belonging to Community College Specific Association

	Percent
Full-Time N=1064	29.0
Part-Time N=467	10.5
Doctoral Holder N=239	22.2
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	23.6
Doctoral Seeker N=135	33.3
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	22.4
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	10.0
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	15.8
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	20.0
Liberal Arts N=844	25.9
Total N=1531	23.4

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Table 31: Percent Belonging to *Any* Type of Education Association

	Percent
Full-Time N=1064	73.7
Part-Time N=467	48.4
Doctoral Holder N=239	75.7
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	64.2
Doctoral Seeker N=135	76.3
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	65.0
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	46.9
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	53.1
Non-Liberal Arts	61.9
Liberal Arts	69.3
Total	66.0

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Tables 28 through 31 provide details on membership in professional associations of various types. For each type of association, full-timers were more likely to report being members than were part-timers; doctoral more likely than non-doctoral holders, doctoral seekers more likely than non-doctoral seekers, and Liberal Arts more likely than Non-Liberal Arts. In general, community college specific associations (for example, the Community College Humanities Association) were less popular than either general education associations (for example, the American Association of University Professors) or disciplinary associations (for example, the American Historical Association). Only

23.4% of respondents belonged to a community college specific association, versus 39.6% for general education associations, and 46.4% for disciplinary associations.

Table 32: Mean Number of General Education Journals Read Regularly

	Mean
Full-Time N=1064	0.4821
Part-Time	0.4099
Doctoral Holder N=239	0.5021
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1291	0.4524
Doctoral Seeker N=135	0.8074
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1395	0.4265
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	0.5082
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	0.8684
Non-Liberal Arts N=844	0.4597
Liberal Arts N=659	0.5539
Total N=1530	0.4601

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Table 33: Mean Number of Community College Specific Journals Read Regularly

	Mean
Full-Time N=1061	0.2752
Part-Time N=467	0.1820
Doctoral Holder N=237	0.2954
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1291	0.2378
Doctoral Seeker N=135	0.4074
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1393	0.2312
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	0.1655
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	0.3684
Non-Liberal Arts N=657	0.2405
Liberal Arts N=843	0.2444
Total N=1528	0.2467

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Table 34: Mean Number of Disciplinary Journals Read Regularly

	Mean
Full-Time N=1064	1.5536
Part-Time N=467	1.4090
Doctoral Holder N=239	1.7741
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	1.4605
Doctoral Seeker N=135	1.9926
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	1.4628
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	1.3100
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	2.5263
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	1.7542
Liberal Arts N=844	1.3571
Total N=1531	1.5095

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Tables 32 through 34 demonstrate that, on the whole, patterns regarding journal reading match patterns of association membership. As with association memberships, full-timers demonstrate a greater level of involvement than do part-timers, doctoral holders a higher level than non-doctoral holders, doctoral seekers a higher level than non-doctoral seekers, and Liberal Arts a higher level than Non-Liberal Arts. The overall pattern of journal subscription matches that of association membership as well: Community college specific journals were far less popular than either disciplinary journals (which were the most popular) or general education journals.

Table 35: Professional Association Attitudes and Hours

	Average Hours Spent in Professional Association Work	Desires More Time in Professional Association Work
Full-Time	0.30	19.5
	N=1032	(N=1064)
Part-Time	0.46	19.3
	N=446	(N=467)
Doctoral Holder	0.25	16.4
	N=232	(N=239)
Non-Doctoral	0.36	20.0
Holder	N=1246	(N=1292)
Doctoral Seeker	0.42	44.4
	N=126	(N=135)
Non-Doctoral	0.34	17.1
Seeker	N=1352	(N=1396)
Part-Time Doctoral	0.50	52.6
Seekers	N=38	(N=38)
Part-Time Non-	0.46	17.5
Doctoral Seekers	N=412	(N=429)
Liberal Arts	0.30	17.3
	N=805	(N=844)
Non-Liberal Arts	0.41	22.2
	N=645	(N=659)
Total	0.35	19.4
	N=1478	(N=1531)

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.
Note: Anomalous responses (those respondents indicating more than 30 hours in their work days) were excluded from the above table. However, all respondents were included for column three of this table, as noted in the individual Ns reported.

Table 35 reveals perhaps surprising findings. Part-timers reported more hours in professional association work, as did non-doctoral holders. Indeed, doctoral holders reported the lowest amount of time spent in this activity of any group—just 15 minutes per day, on average. In a reverse of earlier findings, part-timers who were not seeking the doctorate reported more time spent in this activity than their non-doctoral seeking

counterparts. With the exception of doctoral seekers, few respondents reported a desire to spend more with professional associations. The contrast between part-time doctoral seekers with other respondents is especially striking: Over half (52.6%) of these respondents expressed a desire for more time in professional association work, versus just 19.2% of the entire sample.

University as Reference Group

Research Question:

For whom does the university function most strongly as a reference group?

Both the literature and common sense suggest that those enrolled in doctoral programs will tend to depend more strongly on the university as a reference group than those who do not. However, just as Cohen and Brawer (1977) found that an orientation toward research was not opposed to commitment to teaching, so we speculated that making reference to the university and expressing a commitment to teaching are not antithetical.

Table 36: Summary of University as Reference Group Scores

	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Statistical Significance
Full-Time N=1064	18.0658	7.0947	0.626
Part-Time N=467	18.2612	7.5117	
Doctoral Holder N=239	18.7908	6.7902	0.121
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	18.0023	7.2955	
Doctoral Seeker N=135	26.9407	6.3136	0.000
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	17.2729	6.7183	
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	17.5035	7.1462	0.000
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	26.8158	6.1725	
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	16.0956	6.5938	0.000
Liberal Arts N=844	19.6445	7.2800	
Total N=1531	18.1254	7.2225	NA

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Table 36 shows, not surprisingly, that those who were seeking the doctorate achieved a higher value on the University as Reference group construct than those who were not enrolled in a doctoral program, with scores of 26.9407 and 17.2729, respectively. As might be expected, those in the Liberal Arts showed a higher score on this Construct than those in occupational disciplines, with values of 19.6445 and 16.0956 (3.549), respectively. However, the greatest contrast to be found in Table 36 is that

between doctoral seekers and their non-doctoral seeking counterparts, who posted scores of 16.9407 and 17.2729, respectively. Indeed, doctoral seekers demonstrated a far higher mean score than did members of any other group on this construct.

Table 37: Correlations with the University as Reference Group

Characteristic	Correlation with University as Reference Group	Sig of Correlation
Age	-0.242	0.000
Ctty College Faculty Service	-0.195	0.000
Ctty College Admin Service	-0.007	0.833
Four-Year Service	0.181	0.000
Resp. Instit. Service	-0.243	0.000

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

As table 37 shows, a strong and statistically significant negative correlation exists between respondent age and his/her use of the university as reference. Simply put, older faculty tend to rely on the university as a reference less. Similarly, those with longer periods of service to the community college as faculty use the university as a reference less, as do those with more community college service as administrators. Interestingly, however, while the correlation between years of administrative service and the University as Reference Group construct is negative, it is much weaker than that between years of faculty service and this construct, indicating that instructors who hold administrative appointments tend to rely on the university more for reference groups than do instructors who do not. It should be noted that the correlation between this construct and community college administrative service was not statistically significant. Overall length of service

at the institution from which the respondent completed the survey is highly negatively correlated with the University as Reference Group construct. The only positive correlation with this construct came, logically, with length of service as an instructor or administrator in a four-year college or university.

Table 38: Percent Stating They "Strongly" or "Somewhat" Agree that Most Important Ideas Originate in University

	Percent
Full-Time N=1064	25.0
Part-Time N=467	25.0
Doctoral Holder N=239	39.4
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	22.3
Doctoral Seeker N=135	36.3
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	23.9
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	24.2
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	34.3
Liberal Arts N=844	32.9
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	14.4
Entire Sample N=1531	25.1

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Table 38 demonstrates that doctoral holders and doctoral seekers are much more likely than members of other respondent categories to believe that the most important ideas in their discipline originate at the university. Non-Liberal Arts instructors were the least likely to agree with this statement, with just 14.4% doing so.

Table 39: Percent Finding Faculty Position at Four-Year College or University Attractive

	Percent
Full-Time N=1064	29.9
Part-Time N=467	47.1
Doctoral Holder N=239	30.5
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	36.0
Doctoral Seeker N=135	48.1
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	33.9
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	45.2
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	68.4
Liberal Arts N=844	36.6
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	33.1
Entire Sample N=1531	35.1

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Respondent projections of the attractiveness of various professional positions in the year 2005 (that is, five years after taking the survey) provide some insight into their professional goals and aspirations. As Table 39 indicates, the majority of part-time doctoral seekers (68.4%) reported that they expected to find a teaching position at a four-year college or university attractive in five years' time. In no other respondent category did a majority of statements express this sentiment, although part-timers, at 47.1%, were

much more likely to agree with it than full-timers, at 29.9%. In addition, doctoral seekers, at 48.1%, were much more likely to express this opinion than were non-doctoral seekers, at 33.9%.

Table 40: Percent Finding University Professors Useful or Quite Useful Sources of Teaching Advice

	Percent
Full-Time N=1064	60.5
Part-Time N=467	58.0
Doctoral Holder N=239	63.2
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	59.0
Doctoral Seeker N=135	74.8
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	58.3
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	55.7
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	84.2
Liberal Arts N=844	62.0
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	56.4
Entire Sample N=1531	69.7

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Most respondents, in all categories, stated that they found university professors to be "quite useful" or "useful" sources of teaching advice. However, clear differences between respondent categories were evident. While full-timers and part-timers did not differ significantly from one another, those part-timers who were seeking the doctorate were much more likely than their non-doctoral seeking counterparts to find university professor's teaching advice to be valuable. Doctoral seekers were much more likely to turn to university professors for teaching advice than were non-doctoral seekers.

Table 41: Mean Rank of "Preparation for Further Formal Education" in Qualities Students Should Gain from Two-Year College Education

	Mean Rank
Full-Time N=1064	2.56
Part-Time N=467	2.32
Doctoral Holder N=239	2.24
Non-Doctoral Holder N=1292	2.53
Doctoral Seeker N=135	2.33
Non-Doctoral Seeker N=1396	2.50
Part-Time Non-Doctoral Seeker N=429	2.34
Part-Time Doctoral Seeker N=38	2.08
Liberal Arts N=844	2.23
Non-Liberal Arts N=659	2.81
Entire Sample N=1531	2.49

Source: 2000 Faculty Survey.

Tables 41 presents responses to questions on the function of the community college. These items were designed to yield insight into respondents' views of the relative importance of the multiple missions of the community college. A higher score on the items reported in these tables indicates a higher rank of importance for that particular function. For example, a score of "1" would indicate that every member of a response category ranked the listed function of the community college as the single most important.

As Table 41 shows, when respondents were asked to rank various qualities students could gain from a community college education, part-time doctoral seekers ranked "preparation for further formal education" more highly than did members of any other group. In contrast, Non-Liberal Arts instructors ranked this purpose of the community college lower than did members of other response categories. The highest-ranked purpose of the community college, for all groups, was "Knowledge and skills directly relevant to their careers" at 1.93; the lowest was "Knowledge of an[d] interest in community problems" at 3.76.

Longitudinal Comparisons, 1975-2000

As noted above, approximately 75% of the items used for the 2000 survey repeated questions used in the 1975 study, making possible interesting longitudinal comparisons on a wide variety of measures. As above, we will first present our guiding research question, then our response to that inquiry. It is important to note that only Humanities faculty participated in the 1975 study; therefore, all comparisons below involve only those teaching in the Humanities.

Table 42: Curriculum and Instruction, 1975 and 2000

	Humanities Instructors 2000				Humanities 1975
	N	Mean	SD	Sig of Difference	
Total	181	29.602	7.381		
Full-Time	125	30.704	7.391	0.002**	
Part-Time	56	27.143	6.797		
Doctoral Holder	47	30.142	7.139		No diff.
Non-Doctoral Holder	134	28.064	7.908		
Doctoral Seeker	23	30.044	7.737		
Non-Doctoral Seeker	158	29.538	7.351		

Sources: 1975 data from Cohen and Brawer, 1977; 2000 data from 2000 Faculty Survey.
Notes: **Denotes differences significant at $p \leq .01$ level; *Denotes differences significant at $p \leq .05$ level.

As Table 17 shows, Humanities instructors showed increasing differentiation by subgroup in regard to the Curriculum and Instruction construct. Full-timers demonstrated significantly higher scores than part-timers. This difference was not noted in 1975. As will become evident below, this pattern of internal differentiation will recur often in results for other constructs. However, the data do reveal interesting patterns of continuity with 1975 results as well. Recall that the 1975 study found that those full-time instructors who were seeking the doctorate and had at least three years of experience at the community college scored higher on this construct than others. An analysis of the 69 instructors in the current sample who met this description shows that this trend still holds. Full-timers with at least five years of experience (the relevant question in the 2000 survey did not allow respondents to describe their experience as three years, rather the closest

ranges were 1-4 years and 5 to 10 years) who sought the doctorate showed a value of 33.1739 for this construct, versus 28.6498 for other instructors. This difference was statistically significant at the p ≤.01 level.

Table 43: Percent Stating Use of Selected Instructional Practices, 1975 and 2000

	Revised Syllabus	Taught Jointly	Taught Honors	Taught Remedial	Submit Evidence	Received Award	Prepared Multimedia
Humanities 2000	95	28*	13*	26**	23	38	50
Humanities 1975	92.7	27.1	N/A	N/A	16.9	20.8	41.5

Sources: 1975 data from Cohen and Brawer, 1977; 2000 data from 2000 Faculty Survey.
Notes: **Denotes differences significant at p ≤ .01 level; *Denotes differences significant at p ≤ .05 level.

Comparisons between Humanities faculty in 1975 and 2000 showed a few differences in the use of practices related to instruction. While roughly the same proportion of faculty reported having revised their syllabus (95% in 2000, versus 92.7% in 1975) and having taught jointly (28% in 2000; 27.1% in 1975), significantly more Humanities faculty in 2000 reported having submitted written evidence of student progress other than grades, having received awards for teaching, and having prepared multimedia presentations for use in the classroom. While it is logical that more faculty would have received teaching awards in 2000, since, in general, the faculty are more experienced now than in 1975 and so would have had more time to accumulate such

awards, the other differences offer potential insights into changes in instructional practice. It seems that more faculty make use of classroom technology (at least the sort used to make multimedia presentations), and it seems that more faculty are making use of alternative evaluation systems beyond conventional grades to assess their students' progress.

Table 44: Selected Measures of Institutional Orientation, 1975 and 2000

	Humanities 2000	Humanities 1975
Relations with Colleagues: Good or Excellent	94.4	91.7
Average Hours Spent Teaching: Two or Fewer	11.0	9.3
Average Hours Spent Teaching: More than Five	34.3	20.3
Doing What I'm Doing Now in Five Years: Attractive	77.3	78.1

Sources: 1975 data from Cohen and Brawer, 1977; 2000 data from 2000 Faculty Survey.
Notes: responses to item "Doing What I'm Doing Now" were divided into "Very Attractive" and "Somewhat Attractive" in 1975; these responses both reported in column 3 as "Attractive".

Table 44 shows responses to specific measures of Institutional Orientation in the 2000 and 1975 surveys. This table shows remarkable consistency among instructors (in 1975 and 2000 in ratings of relations with colleagues and the desirability of holding one's current position in five years. However, this table does show that a significant larger portion of faculty report spending at least five hours a day in classroom instruction than did so in 1975. This finding further confirms the popular conception that faculty are increasingly pressed by their workloads.

Table 45: Specific Measures of Professional Involvement, 1975 and 2000

	Humanities 2000	Humanities 1975
Percent Reading More than 1 General Education Journal	11.7	13.5
Percent Desiring More Time in Research or Writing	32.0	61.0
Percent Belonging to General Professional Association	43.8	77.5
Percent Belonging to Disciplinary Professional Association	56.4	N/A
Percent Belonging to Community College specific Professional Association	31.5	N/A

Sources: 1975 data from Cohen and Brawer, 1977; 2000 data from 2000 Faculty Survey.

As Table 45 shows, Humanities instructors report consistent responses on one measure of Professional Involvement between 1975 and 2000: In 2000, as in 1975, a small fraction report reading more than one general education journal. However, other measures of Professional Involvement show remarkable differences between 1975 and 2000. The proportion who desire more time in research and/or professional writing has declined precipitously, from 61.0% to 32.0%. Non-Humanities instructors in 2000 showed an even lower level of desire for more time spent on these activities, at 26.6%. Similarly, it seems that a smaller proportion of the faculty report belonging to a professional association in 2000 than did so in 1975: Over three-fourths of Humanities instructors (77.5%) reported belonging to a professional association in 1975. In 2000, this figure had fallen to 70.7%. In the latter survey, respondents were asked to detail the type of professional association(s) to which they belonged, as indicated above. Fewer

than half (43.6%) of the faculty reported belonging to a professional association in 2000, but over half (56.4%) belonged to a disciplinary association, and just under one-third (31.5%) belonged to a community college specific association.

Table 46: Selected Measures of the University as Reference Group, 1975 and 2000

	Humanities 2000	Humanities 1975
Most Important Ideas in My Discipline Come from University: Percent Agree	33.7	28.3
Faculty Position at 4-Year School: Percent Find Attractive	44.8	75.2
University Professors as Sources of Teaching Advice: Percent Find Useful	64.6	66.5

Sources: 1975 data from Cohen and Brawer, 1977; 2000 data from 2000 Faculty Survey.
Note: Both "Very Attractive" and "Somewhat Attractive" responses to Item on Desirability of 4-Year Faculty position on 1975 instrument reported as "Attractive" in column 3.

As Table 46 shows, attitudes toward the University as the source of "Important Ideas" in the respondents' disciplines were fairly consistent from 1975 to 2000 for Humanities instructors, although there was a slight increase in the percentage of faculty agreeing with this statement. (However, it must be noted that the item was worded slightly differently: In 1975, respondents were asked to report on the University as the source of "Important Ideas" in the Humanities, whereas 2000 respondents were asked to report on "my discipline." Similarly, roughly the same proportion of Humanities respondents in 1975

and 2000 believed that university professors were useful sources of advice on teaching, with slightly fewer non-Humanities instructors believing this. The most striking finding presented in Table 21 concerns the desirability of a faculty position in a four-year college or university. While just over three-fourths of Humanities instructors (75.2%) rated such a position as attractive in 1975, under half the Humanities instructors (44.8%) stated thus in 2000. Even fewer (43.6%) of non-Humanities instructors reported finding a four-year faculty position attractive in 2000.

Conclusions

Have community college faculty developed a unified and distinct professional identity? If so, is this identity strongly related to teaching?

Recall that the literature (Cohen and Brawer, 1972, O'Banion, 1994) noted that community colleges, to fulfill their multiple and complex missions, would do well to foreground instruction among all the professional responsibilities assumed by their instructors. Accordingly, a major goal of this study has been an analysis of the means by which respondents discharge their professional responsibilities, especially those related to teaching.

Most significantly, given the centrality of instruction to the community college mission, our analysis has shown a great deal of difference in the fulfillment of the faculty's primary function—teaching—according to their professional characteristics. On nearly every measure of instructional practice, we found that full-timers demonstrated a higher level of professional practice than did part-timers, and that those seeking the doctorate demonstrated a higher level than did those who did not. In particular, full-timers and doctoral seekers achieved higher mean scores on the Curriculum and Instruction construct. On many individual components of this construct, they demonstrated their strong commitment to teaching. For example, they were more likely to have revised their syllabi, received teaching awards, taught jointly and organized extra-curricular activities for students.

Full-timers and doctoral seekers were more likely to score highly on measures of professional involvement and institutional orientation as well. As detailed above, they

were more likely to belong to associations, read education journals and desire more time with colleagues. From these results, it would seem that one could conclude that full-timers and doctoral seekers demonstrate an overall greater commitment to teaching, to their institutions, and to their professions.

A facile conclusion would be that part-timers and doctoral seekers are indeed contributing to the overall development of the community college professoriate, and that institutions should make a particular point of hiring members of these groups. However, results for the final construct analyzed above—the University as Reference Group—make such simple conclusions difficult to sustain. On many measures of orientation toward four-year colleges and universities, full-timers and doctoral seekers scored much more highly than their part-time and non-doctoral seeking counterparts (although part-timers were more likely to express a desire for a teaching position at a four-year institution). It is clear, then, that the university acts as a much stronger role model for members of these groups than for other community college instructors. Therefore, it seems most likely that community college instruction has *not* yet developed as a professional practice in and of itself—rather, those who demonstrate the strongest commitments to teaching, to their institutions and to their professions are also those with the closest ties to four-year colleges and universities.

In conclusion, it is clear that community college faculty are both increasing diverse, and increasingly disparate. While diversity in itself is certainly not an impediment to the formation of a cohesive group with a common set of professional practices, the many significant differentiations in professional attitudes and practices noted above do present a challenge to the formation of a unified community college

professoriate. At the same time that the influence of the secondary schools has waned, and the influence of four-year colleges and universities has increased, the strong divisions within the community college professoriate have prevented it from achieving status as separate professional group.

While internal differences within the community college professoriate have been noted in the literature, their foregrounding by the current study causes one to reflect on one of what Cohen and Brawer (1977) termed the hallmarks of the formation of a distinct profession: the provision of discrete services to a distinct clientele. On that measure, as on so many others, the community college professoriate has not yet established its identity as a distinct group. It is readily apparent that the distinctiveness of the clientele served by community college faculty exists in nominal form only: The population served by community college faculty can all be described as "community college students," but this common label might be all these students, the most diverse such group in higher education, have in common. However, it is less remarked that, apart from the title "community college professor," little, not even a commonly expressed commitment to instructional practice, unites the disparate body of the community college professoriate. In the future, researchers would do well to investigate the increasing heterogeneity of the community college professoriate. In particular, it would be well to attempt to develop a taxonomy of types of community college faculty. This taxonomy would be most useful if it addressed the multiple (and multiplying) missions of the community college itself, and if it held practical significance for those who employ and are taught by community college faculty.

Work Cited

(1997). *Digest of Education Statistics* (NCES 98-015). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1972). *Confronting Identity: The Community College Instructor*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1977). *The Two-Year College Instructor Today*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1984). *The Collegiate Function of Community Colleges: Fostering Higher Learning through Curriculum and Student Transfer*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Garrison, R. H. (1967). *Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems. A Preliminary National Appraisal*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Grubb, N. W. (1999). *Honored but Invisible: An Inside Look at Teaching in Community Colleges*. New York: Routledge.

O'Banion, T. (Ed.). (1994). *Teaching and Learning in the Community College*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Palmer, J.C. & Zimbler, L. J. (2000). *Instructional Faculty and Staff in Public 2-year Colleges*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Rifkin, T. (1998). Differences between the Professional Attitudes of Full- and Part-Time Community College Faculty. *Paper presented at the American Association of Community Colleges Convention, Miami, FL, April 1998* (JC980181).

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").