DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 481 703 HE 036 258

AUTHOR Schauer, Rhonda

TITLE Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) 2001-02 Faculty

Survey.

INSTITUTION North Dakota Univ. System, Bismarck.

PUB DATE 2003-07-00

NOTE 46p.; Originally written in 1998 by Justin J. Wageman.

Updated and revised by Rhonda Schauer.

AVAILABLE FROM North Dakota University System, 600 East Boulevard Avenue,

Department 215, Bismarck, ND 58505-0230. Tel: 701-328-2960;

Fax: 701-328-2961; Web site: http://www.ndus.nodak.edu.

PUB TYPE Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Diversity (Faculty); Higher Education; *Job

Satisfaction; School Age Day Care; Teacher Attitudes;

*Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Salaries

IDENTIFIERS *North Dakota University System

ABSTRACT

Researchers surveyed faculty from North Dakota's 11 public higher education institutions to investigate the general characteristics of faculty members, whether they differed by institution, and how they compared to faculty at similar institutions nationwide. A total of 788 faculty members completed the University of California Los Angeles Higher Education Research Institute's national survey in the spring of 2002. Results indicated that North Dakota faculty at doctoral, four-year, and two-year institutions expressed greater satisfaction about teaching and spent more time in the classroom than did their national peers. However, they were less satisfied than peers nationally with some aspects of their jobs, such as salary and fringe benefits, which was considerably below national norms. While faculty satisfaction with the availability of child care was considerably lower at North Dakota four-year and two-year institutions, it was noticeably higher at North Dakota doctoral institutions. Despite faculty commitment toward multiculturalism, all three types of institutions reported lower percentages for all non-white backgrounds, indicating there is little progress being made toward diversifying faculty. Overall, the number one personal goal expressed by all North Dakota University System faculty was to be a good teacher and for students to develop the ability to think clearly. Nine appendixes contain numerous supplemental tables of data. (Contains 16 tables.) (SM)



Creating a University System for the 21st Century

Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) 2001-02 Faculty Survey

July 2003

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION Office of Educational Research and Improvement EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as

CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

 Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy. PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Isaak

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)



The Vital Link to a Brighter Future

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all those who contributed to the production of this report. Special mention goes to Dr. Justin J. Wageman who was the original author of the 1998 report and Rhonda Schauer who updated and revised the report using the 2001-02 survey data.

We also thank the faculty who took time to complete the survey, the Council of College Faculties for their support and encouragement and campus coordinators who provided the campus information for the survey.

Special thanks go to Bill Korn and Kit Mahoney at the HERI Institute for managing the data processing tasks.

Prepared by:

600 E Boulevard Ave. Dept 215 • Bismarck, N.D. 58505-0230

Phone: 701.328.2960 • Fax: 701.328.2961 • Website: www.ndus.nodak.edu



Executive Summary

An overview, the major findings and conclusions of the 2001-02 HERI Faculty Survey are summarized as follows:

<u>Purpose</u>: This is the second comprehensive effort to collect information on faculty members from the doctorate-granting, four-year, and two-year institutions within the North Dakota University System.

<u>Broad Research Questions</u>: What are the general characteristics of faculty in North Dakota's 11 public institutions of higher education? Do faculty differ by type of institution? How do North Dakota faculty compare to faculty at similar institutions across the United States?

Methodology: Faculty from North Dakota's 11 public institutions participated in the national survey of college and university faculty conducted by the University of California Los Angeles Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) in the spring of 2002. Of 1,601 questionnaires mailed to North Dakota University System (NDUS) faculty, 788 returns were processed for a total response rate of 49.2 percent.

Findings:

- North Dakota's doctorate-granting institutions had higher percentages of male faculty and lower percentages of female faculty than four-year, two-year or national doctoral institutions.
- The majority of North Dakota faculty held the rank of assistant professor.
- Doctorate institutions reported higher percentages of tenured status than twoyear or four-year institutions. NDUS two-year institutions recorded the lowest percentages of tenured status.
- The aging of North Dakota faculty is demonstrated by the results: the majority of all faculty are 45 or older (compared to 35 in 1998).
- North Dakota faculty at all institutions reflected their peers at four-year, doctorate institutions and nationally in regard to age, with average age ranges from 45 to 54.
- NDUS faculty members spent eight hours less on research and creative activities than their colleagues nationwide.
- Generally, NDUS institutions recorded lower percentages of diverse racial backgrounds than their national peers.
- North Dakota faculty overwhelmingly rated teaching as their principal activity.
- North Dakota faculty spent the majority of their time on teaching, including preparation and advising.
- Autonomy and independence were most noted as a very satisfactory or satisfactory aspect of the job by NDUS doctorate and four-year faculty. For twoyear faculty, professional relationships with other faculty was the most satisfactory aspect.



i

- Overall job satisfaction by North Dakota faculty was lower than the national norms.
- The number one source of stress for faculty members in North Dakota was time pressure.
- Developing students' ability to think clearly was distinctly the primary goal of all faculty.
- Six goals for which all NDUS faculty indicated higher percentages than the
 national averages were to raise a family, help others who are in need, integrate
 spirituality in one's life, be a good colleague, be a good teacher and achieve
 values similar to their institutional values.

Conclusions:

North Dakota faculty at doctoral, four-year and two-year institutions expressed greater satisfaction about teaching and spent more of their time in the classroom than their national peers. On the other hand, they were less satisfied than peers nationally with some aspects of their jobs such as salary and fringe benefits, which was considerably below the national norms including visibility for jobs at other institutions and organizations. While faculty satisfaction with the availability of childcare was considerably low at North Dakota four-year and two-year institutions, it was noticeably higher at North Dakota doctorial institutions. Interestingly, despite faculty commitment toward multiculturalism, all three types of institutions reported lower percentages for all non-white backgrounds indicating there is little progress being made toward diversifying faculty. Overall, the number one personal goal expressed by all North Dakota University System faculty was to be a good teacher and for students to develop the ability to think clearly.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Sample	1
Demographics	2
Faculty Perspectives on Multi-Cultural Issues	4
Faculty Interests	6
How Faculty Spend Their Time	6
Professional Activities of Faculty	8
Personal Goals of Faculty	9
Faculty Job Satisfaction	11
Faculty Stress and its Sources	14
Faculty Goals for Undergraduate Students	15
Conclusion	16
Appendix A	19
Appendix B	23
Appendix C	25
Appendix D	31
Appendix E	35
Appendix F	39
Appendix G	41
Appendix H	43
Annendix I	45



Introduction

During the 2001-02 academic year, North Dakota's 11 public campuses participated in the Higher Education Research Institute's (HERI) Faculty Survey. This survey was the fifth in a national series of faculty surveys conducted on a triennial basis by the HERI. In addition to demographic and biographic information, the questionnaire for the 2001-02 HERI Faculty Survey focused on faculty member demographics, how they spent their time, publications and creative productions, goals, preferred methods of teaching and examining students, perceptions of the institutional climate and primary sources of stress and satisfaction.

The North Dakota University System (NDUS) was particularly interested in separately identifying characteristics of NDUS faculty for three categories: faculty at doctorate-granting institutions, faculty at other four-year institutions, and faculty at two-year institutions. Questions included:

- 1. What are the general characteristics of faculty in North Dakota's 11 public higher education institutions?
- 2. Do faculty differ by institutional type?
- 3. How do North Dakota faculty compare to faculty in similar institutions across the United States?¹

Sample

The overall survey response rate for the 11 institutions was 49.2 percent (see Table 1). Of 1,601 questionnaires mailed to NDUS faculty, usable returns were eventually received from 788. This response rate was high, especially when considering that the response rate for all institutions nationally was 41.2 percent.

Only full-time faculty who were engaged in teaching undergraduates were included in the normative data for the faculty survey and in this report. Thus, full-time administrators, full-time researchers or faculty members who teach only at the postgraduate level have been excluded.²

² Responses were included in the normative data if the respondent indicated full-time employment and if one of the following conditions was met: (1) if he or she noted teaching as the principal activity and either (a) taught at least one undergraduate-level course or (b) taught no classes at all in the most recent term (for faculty on sabbatical or currently engaged in research full-time; (2) if he or she taught at least two courses in the last term, at least one of which was at the undergraduate level; (3) if he or she indicated spending at least nine hours per week in scheduled teaching, but did not indicate any specific types of course taught.



¹ In this report, the doctorate-granting institutions (University of North Dakota and North Dakota State University) will be compared to the national norms for public universities. The institutions, which are primarily four-year institutions (Dickinson State University, Mayville State University, Minot State University and Valley City State University), will be compared to the national norms for public four-year colleges. The two-year institutions (Bismarck State College, Minot State University-Bottineau Campus, North Dakota State College of Science, Williston State College and Lake Region State College) will be compared to the national norms for public two-year colleges.

Table 1
Responses to Survey by Institution

Institution	Number	Faculty*
	Returned	
Doctorate-granting		
University of North Dakota (UND)	243	178
North Dakota State University	228	136
(NDSU)	_	
Total	471	314
Four-year		
Dickinson State University (DSU)	37	33
Mayville State University (MaSU)	17	14
Minot State University (MiSU)	91	75
Valley City State University (VCSU)	30	27
Total	175	149
All 11 institutions	788	587
* Dean and set are all facilities as and		<u> </u>

^{*} Respondents used for this report

Demographics

Appendix A compares NDUS respondents by gender, academic rank, tenure status, age, racial background and principal activity. Table 2 below compares the percentage of NDUS respondents by gender to the national norms. In comparing the three types of North Dakota institutions, the two doctoral institutions reported a higher percentage of male faculty and a lower percentage of female faculty than the four-year schools. In comparison to national norms, North Dakota doctoral institutions reported a higher percentage of male faculty (cf. 65.9 percent to 63.9 percent, respectively) and the four-year institutions cited a higher percentage of female faculty than the national percentage (cf. 41.6 percent to 37.5 percent, respectively).

Table 2
Comparison of the Percentage of Respondents by Gender

	Doc	toral	Fou	r-year	<u>Two-year</u>	
Gender	NDUS 7	National %	NDUS %	National %	NDUS %	National %
Males	65.9	63.09	58.4	62.5	64.5	52.1
Females	34.1	36.1	41.6	37.5	35.5	4 <u>7.9</u>

Table 3 shows that, in the distribution of academic rank by category of institution, the majority of respondents from the doctorate-granting institutions and the four-year institutions were at the assistant-professor level. At the two-year institutions, the majority of respondents indicated holding the associate-professor rank.

Table 3
Comparison of the Percentage of Respondents by Academic Rank

	Doctoral		Four	-year	Two-year		
Rank	NDUS %	National %	NDUS %	National %	NDUS %	National %	
Professor	23.6	34.2	18.4	33.8	6.5	29.4	
Associate Professor	31.6	27.2	25.8	26.9	37.4	21.0	
Assistant Professor	36.4	24.6	39.4	27.9	26.8	22.2	
Lecturer	3.2	5.3	6.8	4.2	0.0	1.1	
Instructor	4.8	6.2	9.5	6.4	28.5	24.6	
Other	0.3	2.0	.10	0.9	80	1.6	

NDUS doctoral institutions reported higher percentages of associate and assistant professors and a lower percentage of full professors than other public universities nationwide. A lower percentage of instructors also were indicated. At the NDUS four-year institutions, percentages of full professors and associate professors were lower, while the percentage of assistant professors was much higher than other public four-year institutions. A greater percentage of instructors also was cited. For NDUS two-year schools, lower percentages were indicated for the ranks of full professor and lecturer. Much higher percentages were noted for the ranks of associate professor, assistant professor and instructor. North Dakota faculty, according to the findings, did not consistently follow the national norms in terms of rank. It is noted, however, that what a particular rank signified at one institution may not have meant the same at another, even within the same type of institution.

As shown in Table 4, the highest percentages of tenured faculty in the NDUS were employed by the doctoral institutions. Two-year and four-year faculty at NDUS institutions reported lower percentages of tenured status than their peers nationally. More men and women at doctorate, four-year and two-year institutions in North Dakota indicated non-tenured status than the national norms.

Table 4
Comparison of the Percentage of Respondents by Tenure Status

	Dog	toral	Fou	r-year	Two	-year
Status	NDUS %	National %	NDUS %	National %	NDUS %	National %
Non-tenured	47.0	42.0	50.0	41.1	51.3	39.1
Men	37.2	33.4	48.5	33.8	41.7	35.4
Women	66.0	56.7	52.5	52.9	68.0	43.1
Tenured	53.0	58.0	50.0	58.9	48.7	60.9
Men	62.8	66.6	51.5	66.2	58.3	64.6
Women	34.0	43.3	47.5	4 <u>7.1</u>	32.0	56. <u>9</u>

Generally, North Dakota faculty reflected their peers nationwide in regard to age. Table 5 shows that, given the age ranges in each category, the largest percentage of NDUS



doctorate and four-year faculty are 45 to 54 years of age. Two-year colleges also reported the highest percentage in the 45 to 54 age range.

Table 5
Comparison of the Percentage of Respondents by Age

	Doc	toral	Fou	r-year	<u>Two-year</u>		
Age	NDUS %	National %	NDUS %	National %	NDUS %	National %	
Under 35	9.4	8.5	4.0	3.0	13.0	15.2	
33-44	26.8	23.4	31.7	39.4	30.1	26.1	
45-54	37.6	33.9	37.1	36.3	33.3	43.5	
55-64	24.4	28.1	23.6	15.1	22.8	15.2	
65 and over	1.9	7.0	3.4	6.1	.08	0.0	

Table 6 shows that a significant majority of the respondents from all 11 campuses were White/Caucasian. Except for the racial background of American Indian at North Dakota's doctoral and four-year institutions, faculty members from all three types of institutions generally reported lower percentages for all non-white backgrounds when compared to the national norms.

Faculty Perspectives on Multi-Cultural Issues

A series of questions in the survey contained several multi-cultural statements to get the faculty perspective on educational needs of minority students and fellow faculty.

When faculty were asked whether any of their research or writing focused on racial or ethnic minorities, they were consistent with the national 32.1 affirmative percentage response rate compared to 32.4 percent at public four-year institutions and 28.6 percent at public two year institutions.

In regard to enhancing student knowledge of and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups, 60 percent of NDUS faculty rated this "very important," consistent with national percentages. At 54.1 percent, public four-year universities rated this "very important" and 60.6 percent of public two-year colleges said it was a very important or essential goal.

National percentages were slightly higher for promoting racial understanding as a personal goal. Of the public four-year universities, 56.1 percent said promoting racial understanding is a personal goal, and 56.8 percent of public two-year institutions also stated this was an important goal. 54.8 percent of North Dakota faculty said promoting racial understanding was an important personal goal.

At 59.5 percent, North Dakota faculty agreed on the need for racial and ethnic diversity to be strongly reflected in the curriculum, whereas, 50.6 percent at four-year pubic universities and 54.7 percent at two-year public colleges said it should be reflected. When asked if more faculty of color should be hired, 59.9 percent of North Dakota



faculty replied "yes" compared to 69.5 percent at public four-year universities and 59.3 percent at public two-year colleges.

NDUS faculty were consistent with national peers when asked if subtle discrimination (e.g. prejudice, racism, sexism) was a factor of stress during the last two years. Reporting at 27.8 percent, North Dakota faculty said it was a factor compared nationally to 26.0 percent at public four-year universities and 21.0 percent at public two-year colleges.

Table 6
Comparison of the Percentage of Respondents by Racial Background

	<u>Doctoral</u>		Fou	<u>r-year</u>	<u>Two-year</u>		
Race	NDUS %	National %	NDUS %	National %	NDUS %	National %	
White/Caucasian	92.6	90.8	93.2	88.3	97.6	91.8	
African Amer./Black	0.3	2.2	0.0	2.7	21.8	1.8	
American Indian	2.3	1.4	3.4	1.7	1.6	1.8	
Asian Amer./Asian	4.2	4.0	2.0	5.0	0.0	2.8	
Mexican Amer./Chicano	0.6	0.8	0.0	1.1	0.0	1.2	
Puerto Rican American	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.5	
Other Latino	0.0	1.7	.68	1.5	0.0	1.2	
Other	1.9	2.2	.68	2.9	0.0	2.1	

Inasmuch as the 2001-02 HERI Faculty Survey was designed to profile the full-time teaching faculty at American colleges and universities, it was to be expected that the majority of respondents from the 11 NDUS public campuses would indicate that their principal activity was teaching. Table 7 shows that, from a high of 96.3 percent reported at the two-year institutions to a low of 84.8 percent at doctorate-granting institutions, a significant majority of faculty were engaged in teaching as their primary responsibility. Faculty at the doctoral and two-year institutions who were not active in teaching reported administration as their principal activity. Only at the two doctorate-granting institutions did some faculty report research as principal activities. It is further shown that faculty at doctoral institutions nationwide cited a somewhat greater percentage of research as their principal activity.

Table 7
Comparison of the Percentage of Respondents by Principal Activity

	Doct	Doctoral		r-year	Two-year	
Activity	NDUS %	National %_	NDUS %	National %	NDUS %	National %
Administration	5.8	4.0	.05	3.5	2.1	2.6
Teaching	84.8	84.0	99.3	94.4	96.3	96.4
Research	9.1	10.8	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0
Services to clients/patients	0.3	0.8	0.0	0.3	.80	0.6
Other	0.0	0.5	.06_	0 <u>.3</u>	.80	0.4



Faculty Interests

Appendix B reflects the primary interests of faculty across North Dakota. Table 8 displays the collective results of faculty responses when asked to indicate whether their primary job interest was in teaching or research. A strong majority of North Dakota faculty members in all three categories of institutions reported that their primary interest was teaching.

Table 8
Percent Distribution for the Primary Interest of Faculty

	Doctoral		Fou	r-year	Two-year		
Activity	NDUS %	National %	NDUS %	National %	NDUS %	National %	
Very heavily in teaching	22.4	20.7	54.1	30.7	78.2	72.7	
Leaning toward teaching	42.3	36.8	30.4	44.6	20.2	23.5	
Leaning toward research	29.8	36.1	14.2	22.1	1.6	3.5	
Very heavily in research	5.4	6.4	1.3	2.6	0.0	0.3	

In comparison to peers at four-year and doctorate institutions, faculty from two-year institutions were more likely to state that their primary interest was teaching. Percentages for primary interest in teaching ranged from a high of 98.4 percent for two-year colleges to 84.5 percent for four-year institutions and 64.7 percent for doctorate institutions.

Overall, NDUS faculty in each category of institution stated greater interest in teaching than the national average. The two doctorate institutions expressed considerably more interest in teaching than their peers at public universities nationally (64.7 percent to 57.5 percent). In the four-year college category, the four North Dakota institutions also were notably more interested in teaching than the national average (84.5 percent to 75.3 percent). Meanwhile, North Dakota faculty at two-year colleges were comparable to the national average (98.4 percent to 96.2 percent respectively). Since faculty were forced to choose either teaching or research, expressions of interest in one area should not be interpreted to mean a lack of interest in the other. It should also be noted that administration, while not an option on this question, may have been a primary interest for some faculty.

How Faculty Spend Their Time

Appendix C and Table 9 represent the findings of faculty who were next asked to indicate the amount of time spent on a variety of activities ranging from the number of hours spent each week on teaching to hours spent on outside consultation work. Faculty were asked to indicate the actual number of hours spent on each activity. Means were calculated for each type of activity using the midpoint for each hourly range. These midpoint means were used to compare North Dakota institutions by type to each other and to their peers nationally.



Table 9
Faculty Activities: Average Hours * Per Week Spent in Each Activity

	Doc	toral	Four	-year	Two-year	
Faculty Activity	NDUS	National	NDUS	National	NDUS	National
Scheduled teaching	9.2	8.8	13.1	8.4	20.3	16.2
Preparing for teaching	12.9	11.6	14.8	11.3	12.7	13.2
Advising/Counseling students	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	3.3	4.6
Committee work and meetings	4.2	4.1	3.8	4.1	3.1	3.8
Other administration	5.8	5.3	5.9	5.1	4.7	5.5
Research and scholarly writing	8.9	10.0	5.1	11.0	2.8	4.2
Creative products/						
Performances	5.1	5.5	4.5	5.8	3.3	4.5
Consultation with clients and						
patients	4.3	5.1	5.0	5.0	3.5	4.9
Community or public service	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.3	3.8
Outside consulting or freelance						
work	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.1	3.5	5.7
Total	62.6	62.9	64.3	62.7	60.5	66.4

^{*} Hours indicated are the midpoints of the hourly ranges on the survey. The NDUS column represents the average of the midpoints for each category, excluding those respondents who did not participate in a given activity.

In considering the total number of hours faculty devoted to job-related activities, a profile can be drawn of the "typical" faculty member in North Dakota and nationally. North Dakota faculty at four-year institutions spent the most time on job-related activities: an average of 64.3 hours per week, while their peers nationally reported 62.7 hours per week. North Dakota two-year institution faculty indicated 60.5 total hours compared to the national average of 66.4 hours. Doctoral institution faculty in North Dakota were consistent with national data on doctoral institutions: 62.6 to 62.9 hours, respectively.

The three activities that deal primarily with teaching include scheduled teaching (actual, not credit hours), preparing for teaching (including reading student papers and grading), and advising and counseling students. Faculty at all three types of NDUS institutions reported, on average, more hours spent per week in both classroom teaching and preparation than the national averages. Time spent on advising and counseling students was consistent with the national data across all three types of institutions.

North Dakota faculty spent more time teaching than their peers nationwide, irrespective of the type of institution. Overall, North Dakota two-year college faculty said they spent an average of 36.3 hours per week on teaching-related activities compared to 34.0 hours per week by their national peers. North Dakota four-year institution faculty said they spent 32.2 hours per week on teaching-related activities while their national peers spent only 24.1 hours on this activity. North Dakota doctoral institution faculty reported spending 26.5 hours each week on teaching-related activities compared to a nationwide average of 24.8 hours.



When considering differences among the three types of institutions in North Dakota in regard to how NDUS faculty spent their time each week, there was a balance between teaching and research. NDUS faculty who taught fewer hours per week reported more hours in research, scholarly writing, and creative products/performances. Faculty who reported fewer hours of research devoted more time to teaching. For example, faculty members at NDUS doctoral institutions reported fewer hours of teaching (26.5 hours per week) than faculty members at NDUS two-year institutions (36.3 hours per week). However, those faculty at NDUS doctoral institutions also reported more hours in research and creative activities (14.0 hours per week) than NDUS two-year faculty (6.1 hours per week). Faculty at NDUS four-year institutions reported an average of 10.6 hours per week on research and creative activities.

Overall, North Dakota faculty spent less time on research and creative activities than did their peers at comparable institutions nationwide. Faculty at North Dakota's doctoral institutions spent one hour less per week on research than did their peers nationally. At the four-year and two-year institutions, NDUS faculty members spent eight hours less on research and creative activities than their colleagues nationwide. Further investigation would need to be conducted to account for the additional time spent in teaching rather than in research and creative activity. Factors such as the mission of the institution, what activities are emphasized, job descriptions of faculty, teaching loads and types of classes (lecture versus lab) must be considered.

Other faculty responsibilities of committee work, meetings, administration, consultation, service and outside consulting also made up the total number of hours given to job-related activities. NDUS faculty at all three types of institutions reported an average of about four hours per week dedicated to committee work and meetings. Administrative tasks occupied about five hours per week for NDUS faculty members. In addition to teaching and research, service was the third major job-related activity of college faculty. Nearly 82 percent of NDUS faculty spent about three hours per week in providing community or public service. About 36 percent of NDUS faculty spent time on outside consulting or freelance work; about four hours per week was spent on these activities.

It should be noted that how faculty reported spending their time on job-related activities may not be completely accurate. This limitation is related to the HERI survey categories. There may have been other activities not included in the survey on which NDUS faculty spent their time each week. Other activities may include workshops, seminars, conferences, reading and other assigned duties.

Professional Activities of Faculty

Appendix D and Table 10 provide more information about how faculty spend their time. The average numbers and types of scholarly writings and professional performances are shown. Clearly, differences existed by institutional type. North Dakota faculty in doctoral institutions were consistent in producing more articles for academic and professional journals, writing book chapters, books, manuals and monographs than their peers at the four-year and two-year institutions. This difference was consistent with the national sample; although North Dakota faculty did publish less overall than the national average.



Of those who reported publication activity, faculty at North Dakota doctoral institutions published 9.9 articles in academic or professional journals compared to 10.6 articles by their national peers. Faculty at NDUS four-year institutions published an average of 3.9 articles compared to the national average of 5.5. North Dakota faculty at two-year institutions reported an average of .6 articles compared to 4.8 articles by faculty at all public two-year institutions. Except for those at two-year institutions, North Dakota faculty were close to the national average for performance activities in the fine and applied arts. Notable was the under average exhibitions or performances by North Dakota faculty from the four-year and two-year institutions. Faculty at North Dakota four-year institutions reported an average of 2.2 exhibitions or performances compared to the national average of 12.8, and North Dakota two-year institutions reported an average of 1.2 exhibitions or performances compared to the national average of 10.0.

While the level of professional activity among North Dakota faculty as it relates to publications was less than their peers nationally, there was greater emphasis on teaching. Nevertheless, the need for an increased emphasis on research and scholarly production may be becoming evident. A final category asked faculty to indicate the number of professional writings published or accepted for publication in the last two years. The NDUS averages were closer to the national average and may suggest an increasing focus on this area by North Dakota faculty while still maintaining a strong dedication to teaching.

Table 10
Publication Activities: Average Number* of Publications and Performances

	Do	ctoral	Fou	ır-year	Two-year	
Publication Activity	NDUS	National	NDUS	National	NDUS	National
Articles published in academic or						
professional journals	9.9	10.6	3.9	15.5	.6	4.8
Chapters published in edited volumes	1.0	3.4	.8	6.3	.1	2.9
Books, manuals, or monographs						
published	1.5	1.9	1.0	3.9	.4	2.9
Exhibitions or performances presented						
in the fine/applied arts	1.1	1.5	2.2	12.8	1.2	10.0
Professional writings published or						
accepted for publication in the last						
two years	2.8	3.4	1.3	5.0	.5_	2.5

^{*} Numbers indicated are the midpoints of the numerical ranges on the survey. The NDUS column represents the average of the midpoints for each category, excluding those respondents who did not participate in a given activity.

Personal Goals of Faculty

As Table 12 and Appendix F depict, without exception the number one personal goal for all NDUS faculty was to be a good teacher. Of the three categories of North Dakota institutions, faculty from two-year schools unanimously concurred (100 percent) that to be a good teacher was essential or very important. North Dakota faculty at doctorate



institutions agreed at a rate of 95.2 percent, while 97.9 percent of faculty at four-year institutions agreed.

Second in order of importance for North Dakota faculty was to be a good colleague. Also, higher percentages were noted, regardless of type of institution, for the three personal goals of developing a meaningful philosophy of life, raising a family and helping others who are in need. Less important to North Dakota faculty were obtaining recognition from one's colleagues for contributions to one's special field, becoming involved in programs to clean up the environment, being very well-off financially, influencing social values and influencing the political structure. Of all the goals and corresponding percentages noted by North Dakota faculty, the goal of influencing the political structure was the least important. These percentages also mirrored the national norms.

Six goals for which all NDUS faculty indicated higher percentages than the national averages were to raise a family, help others who are in need, integrate spirituality in one's life, be a good colleague, be a good teacher and achieve values similar to their institutional values.

Table 11
Percent of Faculty Noting Personal Goals as Essential or Very Important

	Doc	toral	Fou	r-year	Two	o-year
Goals	NDUS %	National %	NDUS %	National %	NDUS %	National %
Becoming authority in own	-					
field	51.9	60.1	43.2	64.0	54.8	45.4
Influence political structure	15.2	15.1	10.1	15.1	10.4	14.1
Influence social values	30.8	37.0	41.2	32.6	41.9	38.6
Raise a family	77.5	72.5	74.3	71.5	83.9	74.3
Be very well off financially	38.2	37.0	41.2	37.8	41.1	41.5
Help others in need	68.0	63.4	72.9	58.2	73.4	67.4
Be involved in environ.						
clean up	35.0	30.7	32.4	29.3	32.3	34.2
Develop philosophy of life	77.0	76.2	70.9	73.3	69.5	75.6
Promote racial						
understanding	58.3	58.0	29.0	56.1	41.1	56.8
Obtain recognition from						
colleagues	47.9	51.4	3.5	55.5	30.6	33.5
Integrate spiritually into life	55.5	50.4	59.0	41.1	63.7	56.1
Be a good colleague	92.9	89.3	95.2	87.6	95.6	89.4
Be a good teacher	95.2	96.8	97.9	95.9	100.0	99.2
Achieving congruence						
between own values and						
institutional values	56.6	51.3	57.4	46.7	64.5	58.0



Faculty Job Satisfaction

Faculty members' job satisfaction was a result of many factors. The 2001-02 HERI Faculty Survey asked NDUS faculty to indicate the reasons pursuing an academic career was very important; then, to indicate what aspects of their jobs were very satisfactory or satisfactory; and finally, to report if they still wanted to be a college professor. The findings are shown in the three tables that follow.

Appendix G and Table 13 present the reasons faculty members noted as being very important in their decision to choose a career in higher education. While NDUS faculty at doctorate and four-year institutions reported intellectual challenge as being the most important reason, faculty at two-year institutions indicated opportunities for teaching. In considering the highest percentages, faculty at doctorate institutions reported intellectual change (86.4 percent), intellectual freedom (74.4 percent), and freedom to pursue interests (75.1 percent), 63.0 percent said opportunities for teaching was an important reason. For four-year faculty, intellectual challenge (74.8 percent), opportunities for teaching (75.5 percent) and intellectual freedom (69.4 percent) were the top reasons. Two-year faculty indicated opportunities for teaching (80.5 percent), intellectual challenge (71.5 percent) and intellectual freedom (64.2 percent) were top reasons for deciding to pursuer an academic career. Clearly, the attractive aspects of a position in higher education were the academic challenges, freedoms and teaching prospects. Ranking at the bottom for faculty at doctorate and four-year institutions was occupational prestige and status. For two-year faculty, opportunities for research were the lowest in importance. These findings reflected the national norms.

Table 12
Reasons Noted as Very Important for Pursuing an Academic Career:
Percent Responding to Each Category

	Doc	toral	Foui	r-year	Two	-year
Reasons	NDUS	National National	NDUS	National	NDUS	National
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Autonomy	72.8	74.3	57.8	76.1	50.4	66.4
Flexible schedule	68.0	68.4	53.7	67.6	58.5	67.7
Intellectual challenge	86.4	87.2	74.8	88.5	71.5	75.0
Intellectual freedom	74.4	78.5	69.4	81.4	64.2	71.2
Freedom to pursue						
interests	75.1	80.5	62.6	83.0	53.6	62.7
Opportunities for teaching	63.0	64.1	75.5	60.0	80.5	77.9
Opportunities for research	50.6	54.8	21.8	61.1	3.4	9.4
Occupational						
prestige/status	18.5	19.1	14.9	19.5	5.7	17.1
Opportunity to influence						
social change	24.4	23.8	21.0	22.3	19.5	25.0

Faculty next responded to what aspects of a position in higher education were very satisfactory or satisfactory. The percentages are displayed in Table 14. For North Dakota faculty members in doctorate and four-year institutions, autonomy and independence in



their jobs were rated most satisfactory. However, for North Dakota faculty in two-year institutions, professional relationships with other faculty were rated satisfactory. A fairly high proportion of North Dakota faculty at doctoral institutions also reported being satisfied with their working conditions, professional relationships with other faculty, competency of colleagues and the opportunity to develop new ideas. Four-year faculty noted professional relationships with other faculty and the competency of colleagues as satisfactory. Two-year faculty reported professional relations with other faculty, social relations with other faculty, competency of colleagues and the opportunity to develop new ideas as satisfactory.

When comparisons were made between types of institutions within North Dakota, faculty at the doctoral institutions indicated they were more satisfied with the quality of students and working conditions than their peers at four-year and two-year institutions. Four-year and two-year faculty, however, expressed greater satisfaction in professional and social relationships with other faculty.

North Dakota faculty were generally less satisfied with some aspects of their jobs than were their peers nationwide. Faculty across the state were less satisfied with salary and fringe benefits, autonomy and independence, job security and opportunity to develop new ideas. Differences were more pronounced for faculty within North Dakota's four-year and two-year institutions. Four-year faculty rated every aspect of their job satisfaction lower than their national peers, except for working conditions and professional and social relationships with other faculty. Two-year faculty also rated all aspects of job satisfaction lower than the national norms, with the exception of opportunity for scholarly pursuits, quality of students, working conditions, professional and social relationships with other faculty, competency of colleagues and visibility for jobs at other institutions/organizations.

Faculty at doctoral institutions were particularly less satisfied than peers at other public universities with some aspects of their jobs, such as salary and fringe benefits, opportunity for scholarly pursuits, teaching load, autonomy and independence, competency of colleagues, visibility for jobs at other institutions and organizations, relationships with administration, overall job satisfaction and opportunity to develop new ideas. Still, they were much more satisfied than their national peers with the quality of students and professional relationships with other faculty.



Table 13
Percent Noting that Aspects of Job were Very Satisfactory or Satisfactory

	Doc	toral	Fou	r-year	Two	-year
Aspect of job*	NDUS %	National %	NDUS %	National %	NDUS %	National %
Salary and fringe benefits	31.1	46.1	20.09	46.6	28.4	54.8
Opportunity for scholarly						
pursuits	58.8	67.9	40.5	70.5	57.7	56.3
Teaching load	52.1	61.0	47.9	62.5	47.9	55.3
Quality students	50.8	50.6	43.2	44.0	52.8	33.7
Working conditions (hours						
and location)	62.7	62.6	66.2	61.4	60.9	58.8
Autonomy and						
independence	84.0	87.7	76.3	88.4	53.6	85.9
Professional relations with						
other faculty	74.8	73.8	75.0	72.4	86.1	82.7
Social relations with other						
faculty	62.8	61.2	65.5	57.1	73.1	68.3
Competency of colleagues	72.1	73.1	70.9	72.1	75.6	74.7
Visibility for jobs at other						
institutions/organizations	35.7	48.1	35.8	49.5	39.8	41.3
Job security	76.6	76.3	61.5	80.0	70.7	79.9
Relationships with						
administration	58.0	57.9	50.0	57.1	55.3	61.4
Overall job satisfaction	68.9	74.0	62.1	73.6	69.1	80.7
Opportunity to develop new						
ideas	73.7	78.6	61.5	79.6	71.5	76.3
Availability of childcare	33.8	28.7	12.8	31.7	18.6	<u>52.4</u>

^{*}Respondents marking "Not applicable" are not included in these results.

Of particular significance was the fact that while faculty satisfaction with salary and fringe benefits was not very high nationwide, the satisfaction of faculty at North Dakota institutions was considerably below the national comparison. Only 31.1 percent of the faculty at North Dakota doctorate institutions, 20.9 percent of faculty at North Dakota four-year institutions, and 28.4 percent of faculty at North Dakota two-year institutions were satisfied with their salaries, compared to national figures of 46.1 percent, 46.6 percent and 54.8 percent, respectively.

Overall job satisfaction was found to be relatively high, but still below the national averages. 68.9 percent of NDUS faculty at doctoral institutions reported a high job satisfaction rate compared to 74.0 percent nationwide; four-year faculty indicated 62.1 percent compared to 73.6 percent nationwide; and two-year faculty reported a 69.1 percent overall job satisfaction rate compared to 80.7 percent by their national peers. Table 15 shows that, for the most part, faculty reported continued satisfaction with the decision to become a college professor. Sixty-seven to 88 percent of respondents at all three institutions said that they "definitely" or "probably" want to continue to be a professor. A higher proportion of North Dakota faculty members at two-year institutions said they "probably" or "definitely" did not want to be a professor. When compared to national norms, faculty from doctoral and four-year institutions were found to be less



satisfied with their decision to become a college professor than were their peers at other public institutions.

Table 14
Career Choice: Percent Responding to Each Category

	Doc	toral	Fou	r-year	Two	-year
Still want to be a professor?	NDUS %	National %	NDUS %	National %	NDUS %	National %
Definitely yes	42.5	46.3	33.5	45.1	40.4	51.0
Probably yes	31.9	33.3	33.5	33.7	47.8	31.8
Not sure	14.4	12.9	18.8	13.2	23.4	11.1
Probably no	9.3	6.0	10.0	6.4	25.5	4.5
Definitely no	1.9	1.5	4.7	1.5	2.1	1.6

Faculty Stress and Its Sources

Table 16 and Appendix H show that, while responses among the three types of NDUS institutions varied, respondents at four-year institutions reported higher levels of stress (excluding research or publishing demands and marital function) than colleagues at doctorate institutions in North Dakota. Generally speaking, time pressure and lack of personal time were the most common causes of stress for faculty members from all three types of institutions during the last two years. The next major source of stress for North Dakota doctorate and four-year respondents was institutional procedures and red tape. For North Dakota two-year faculty, committee work was a greater source of stress. NDUS faculty at doctoral institutions rated all sources of stress higher than the national norms, except one's physical health, personal finances, students, children's problems and marital friction. NDUS two-year faculty rated all sources of stress lower than their national peers, with the exception of nine sources: childcare, committee work, faculty meetings, colleagues, students, institutional procedures and red tape, teaching load, marital friction and keeping up with information technology.

As might be expected, NDUS doctoral faculty reported higher percentages of stress related to the review/promotion process and research and publishing demands than four-year, two year and national peers. Of further note is that North Dakota doctoral faculty, in contrast to their statewide peers, indicated a higher stress level than the national norm in regard to keeping up with information technology.



Table 15
Sources of stress during the last two years: Percent of Respondents to Each
Source

	Doc	toral	Four	-yea <u>r</u>	Two	o-year
Sources*		National %		National %		
Managing household		70				
responsibilities	70.6	69.8	75.0	68.3	77.4	71.7
Childcare	30.8	30.6	31.7	30.3	38.7	28.2
Care of elderly parent	34.5	31.4	37.0	30.5	33.8	35.0
My physical health	43.3	46.6	55.4	45.7	52.4	50.0
Review/Promotion process	53.7	49.1	56.0	48.3	48.3	44.5
Subtle discrimination (e.g.,	•					
prejudice, racism,						
sexism)	28.9	26.1	30.4	26.0	21.7	21.0
Personal finances	57.3	57.6	71.6	55.5	72.5	59.4
Committee work	66.9	58.8	73.6	60.5	78.9	63.5
Faculty meetings	62.0	50.8	70.3	52.1	83.3	57.5
Colleagues	58.8	55.3	63.5	58.1	56.4	50.3
Students	51.3	53.9	66.9	55.4	76.6	63.2
Research or publishing						
demands	66.7	64.0	33.8	66.9	3.2	11.2
Institutional procedures and						
"red tape	75.6	68.8	77.0	73.5	78.2	74.7
Teaching load	68.0	60.6	78.3	60.3	79.8	67.5
Children's problems	26.5	28.2	28.3	27.5	37.0	29.3
Marital friction	21.5	22.0	16.8	22.2	28.2	20.6
Time pressures	87.1	83.8	90.5	83.3	87.9	79.9
Lack of personal time	81.9	77.5	88.5	77.6	83.8	75.4
Keeping up with						
information technology	68.8	66.4	72.9	67.6	85.4	76.3

^{*}Percentage of respondents marking "Somewhat" or "Extensive"

Faculty Goals for Undergraduate Students

The survey asked faculty the importance of a number of educational goals for undergraduate students. Table 17 and Appendix I show that almost all faculty believed it was "very important" or "essential" for students to develop the ability to think clearly. Faculty members from all three types of institutions placed a great importance on undergraduate students being prepared for employment. These findings were consistent with nation responses. Other educational goals which the majority of NDUS faculty found important were enhancing students' self-understanding, preparing students for responsible citizenship, enhancing students' knowledge of and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups, helping students develop personal values and moral character. NDUS doctoral institution faculty rated almost all goals for undergraduates higher than national peers at other public universities. Faculty at the four-year institutions also rated almost all goals higher than peers at other public four-year institutions. Two-year NDUS institution faculty responses were comparable to the national percentages: some goals were rated higher; others were rated lower. North Dakota two-year faculty reported a



lower percentage of importance on studying a foreign language than their peers at doctoral and four-year institutions.

Table 16
Faculty Goals for Undergraduates Noted as Very Important or Essential:
Percent Responding to Each Goal

	Doc	toral	Fou	r-year	Two	-year
Educational Goals		National %		National %		National %
Develop ability to think					_	,
clearly	99.4	99.5	99.3	99.4	99.2	99.3
Prepare for employment	72.8	65.9	83.6	64.0	89.5	80.9
Prepare for graduate						
education	53.4	58.2	56.2	57.4	37.0	49.5
Develop moral character	58.1	56.1	63.0	49.7	75.0	65.3
Provide for emotional						
development	34.2	34.4	39.0	29.1	53.2	41.9
Prepare for family living	12.8	15.0	17.1	9.5	24.2	21.1
Teach classes of western						
civilization	28.1	29.1	36.9	25.6	8.9	22.1
Help develop personal						_
values	55.3	56.8	58.9	51.2	79.0	63.3
Enhance out-of-class	_					
experience	45.8	38.4	47.3	34.8	51.6	45.3
Enhance self-understanding	64.2	60.1	70.4	56.5	71.7	66.9
Instill commitment to						
community service	36.5	35.1	45.2	29.5	50.8	38.7
Prepare for responsible						
citizenship	64.9	59.5	60.3	54.3	77.4	62.7
Enhance knowledge of and						
appreciation of race/ethnic	60.4	57.5	62.3	54.1	56.4	60.6
Study of foreign language	32.1	35.1	18.5_	33.2	10.5	21.6

Conclusion

The 2001-02 HERI Faculty Survey provides tremendous insight into the demographics, faculty time, publications and creative productions, goals, perceptions, and job-related stressors and satisfaction of North Dakota faculty. North Dakota doctorate institutions had the highest percentages of male faculty and the lowest percentages of female faculty compared to the four-year and two-year institutions.

Most NDUS two-year faculty hold the rank of associate professor, while most doctoral and four-year faculty hold the rank of assistant professor. Percentages of North Dakota faculty, in terms of rank, did not follow a consistent pattern when compared to national percentages. This may indicate that there were differences among the 11 institutions in regard to the definition of each rank; what the level of a particular rank means at a doctoral institution may not be the same for a four-year or two-year institution.



Faculty members at NDUS doctoral institutions reported the highest percentages of tenured status. These percentages, along with those from North Dakota's four-year institutions, were lower than national percentages. Faculty members at NDUS doctorate institutions, however, indicated higher percentages of non-tenured status than the national norms.

The age of North Dakota faculty was consistent with national norms. A significant majority of respondents from all 11 campuses were White/Caucasian. Generally, NDUS institutions recorded lower percentages of diverse racial backgrounds than their national peers. Overall, NDUS faculty strongly agree for a need to diversify their campus and incorporate diversity into their curriculums.

With a high of 99.3 percent to a low of 84.0 percent, North Dakota faculty overwhelmingly rated teaching as their principal activity. These percentages were higher than the national percentages for similar institutions. As a result, doctorate institutions in North Dakota also reported lower percentages of research than their national peers.

Not only was teaching the principal activity for the majority of all North Dakota faculty, but it also was their primary job interest. Percentages ranged from a high of 98.4 percent to a low of 64.7 percent. NDUS two-year institutions recorded the highest percentage of interest and activity in teaching while doctorate-granting institutions reported the lowest. Still, the North Dakota percentages were higher than the national averages.

A typical NDUS doctoral institution faculty member spent 62.6 hours per week on job-related activities. At four-year institutions, the average number of hours per week was 64.3, and the average at two-year institutions was 60.5 hours. North Dakota faculty dedicated more hours per week to their positions than their national peers, and they spent the majority of their time on teaching, including preparation and advising. Again, these figures were greater than the national numbers. For those NDUS faculty who spent less time teaching, more time was devoted to research and creative activities. It should be noted that how faculty reported spending their time on job-related activities may not be completely accurate. Other activities not included in the survey may include workshops, seminars, conferences, reading and other assigned duties.

The professional activities of North Dakota faculty patterned national trends, and most publications were authored at the doctorate-granting institutions. However, exhibitions and performances were most often presented by faculty from four-year institutions. Overall, as stated earlier, North Dakota faculty generally published and performed less than their national peers because the time required for those activities was dedicated to teaching.

Consistent with the amount of time North Dakota faculty spent on teaching, the personal goal noted by all respondents as most important or essential was to be a good teacher. Second in importance for all faculty was to be a good colleague. Of least importance to all respondents was the goal of influencing the political structure. These percentages reflected the national norms.



While most North Dakota faculty chose careers in higher education for the intellectual challenge, opportunities to teach also was one of the top three reasons. This shows that NDUS faculty view themselves foremost as teachers. Choosing to be a college professor for reasons of prestige and status was least indicated.

Still, despite whatever reasons for choosing a postsecondary career, autonomy and independence were most noted as a "very satisfactory" or "satisfactory" aspect of the job by NDUS doctorate and four-year faculty. For two-year faculty, professional relationships with other faculty was the most satisfactory aspect. Least satisfactory for all North Dakota faculty was salary and fringe benefits, significantly less so than their national peers.

Overall job satisfaction by North Dakota faculty was lower than the national norms. NDUS doctorial institutions reported that 74.4 percent still wanted to be college professors compared to 67.0 percent at four-year institutions and 88.2 percent at two-year institutions. The national number for four-year public institutions was 88.8 percent who said they still wanted to be a college professor and 82.8 percent national two-year colleges wanted to remain a college professor.

The number one source of stress for faculty members in North Dakota was time pressure. Lack of personal time was second. NDUS doctorate institutions reported higher percentages of stress related to research and publishing demands than four-year institutions in the state and nation. With less time devoted to research, which was typically one of the requirements for being granted tenure, faculty were experiencing more stress in these two related areas.

Finally, North Dakota faculty were asked to indicate their goals for undergraduate students. Developing students' ability to think clearly was distinctly the primary goal of all faculty, which echoed national respondents' sentiments.

North Dakota faculty were interested in and spent the majority of their time on teaching. They are teachers. Yet, while two-year faculty enjoyed being tenured and spending more time than anyone on teaching, faculty at doctorate institutions had to balance the additional pressure to publish. Moreover, they continued to devote the majority of their time to teaching. This, unfortunately, took away time for their research activities which, in turn, affected their ability to attain tenure. The high stress of this situation, coupled with low salary and fringe benefits, produced an overall lower job satisfaction rate than their peers at the state or national levels.

G:\ANNA\700\799\HERI report 2003.doc



Appendix A

Table 1 Comparison of the Percentage of Respondents by Gender (\underline{N} = 587)

	Doct	oral									
	Institu	utions	Ŗ	Four-Year Institutions	nstitution	SL		Two-ye	Two-year Institutions	suo	
Gender	OND NDS	NDSO	nsa	MaSU	MiSU	MISU VCSU	BSC	MISU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	WSC LRSC
	67.0	76 6 76 9	75.9	,	ă	503	909	87 5	0 0	£3.8	7 Y
Maies	6. /C	0.07	0.07	-	5	0.90	0.60	5.70	6.00	0.00	?
Females	42.1	23.5	24.2	28.6	52	40.7	40.7 30.4	12.5	39.1	46.2	45.5
Total Number of Respondents	178	136	33	4	75	26	46	ω	46	13	=

Note: Percentages will sum to more than 100.0 if any respondents marked more than one category.

Comparison of the Percentage of Respondents by Academic Rank (N = 583) Table 2

	Doc	Doctoral									
	Institu	Institutions	ŭ.	Four-Year Institutions	nstitutior	SI		Two-ye	Two-year Institutions	suc	i
Rank	QND	NDSN	DSO	MaSU	Misu	VCSU	BSC	Misu-BC	NDSCS	MSC	LRSC
Professor	18.6	30.1	21.2	35.7	13.7	18.5	4.3	37.5	6.7	0.0	0.0
Assoc. Prof	31.1	32.4	18.2	35.7	30.1	18.5	41.3	12.5	51.1	0.0	27.3
Asst. Prof	37.3	35.3	9.09	14.3	37.0	33.3	32.6	25.0	26.7	23.1	9.1
Lecturer	5.1	0.7	0.0	7.1	9.6	7.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Instructor	7.3	1.5	0.0	7.1	8.2	22.2	21.7	25.0	15.6	6.97	54.5
Other	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1
Total Number of Respondents	177	136	33	14	73	27	46	8	45	13	=

Comparison of the Percentage of Respondents by Tenure Status (\underline{N} = 553) Table 3

	Doctoral	toral									
	Institu	ıtions	Æ	Four-Year Institutions	nstitutio	ns		Two-y	Two-year Institutions	ons	
Rank	OND	NDSO	DSO	MaSU	MiSU	vcsu	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
Non-tenured	52.4	40.2	46.7	33.3	55.9	46.2	20	62.5	47.6	58.3	54.5
Men	56.1	30.7	45.5	25.0	54.8	46.7	43.3	57.1	41.7	33.3	33.3
Women	36.1	71.0	50.0	20.0	56.8	45.5	2.99	100.0	9:29	83.3	80.0
Tenured	47.6	59.8	53.3	66.7	44.1	53.8	50.0	37.5	52.4	41.7	45.5
Men	56.1	69.3	54.5	75.0	45.2	53.3	56.7	42.9	58.3	66.7	66.7
Women	36.1	29.0	20.0	50.0	43.2	54.5	33.3	0.0	44.4	16.7	20.0
Total Number of Respondents	170	132	32	12	89	26	45	8	42	12	11

Table 4 Comparison of the Percentage of Respondents by Age (\underline{N} = 579)

	Doct	toral									
	Instituti	ıtions	F.	Four-Year Institutions	nstitutio	ns		Two-y	Iwo-year Institutions	ons	
Age	OND	NDSU	DSO	MaSU	MiSU	vcsu	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	MSC	LRSC
Under 35	7.5	11.9	3.0	14.3	4.0	0.0	15.2	12.5	1.1	15.4	9.1
35-44	28.9	23.8	39.4	7.1	33.3	30.8	26.1	12.5	28.9	53.9	36.4
45-54	35.9	40.3	36.3	42.9	37.3	34.6	43.5	25.0	31.1	15.4	27.3
55-64	26.0	22.3	15.1	35.7	24.0	26.9	15.2	20.0	26.7	15.4	27.3
65 and over	1.7	2.2	6.1	0.0	1.3	7.7	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	173	135	33	14	75	26	46	8	45	13	11



Comparison of the Percentage of Respondents by Racial Background (N = 582) Table 5

	Doctoral	oral									
	Institu	ıtions	F	Four-Year Inst	nstitution	SL		Two-ye	Iwo-year Institution	lions	
Race	OND	NDSN	DSO	MaSU	MiSU	VCSU	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
White/Caucasian	94.3	90.4	93.9	100 0	100 0	663	100 0	100 0	100 0	1000	100 0
African Amor /Block	0										
Allical Alliel Diack		÷	5))	5))	7.7	9.00	5	5	5.
American Indian	3.4	0.7	9.1	0.0	4.	3.7	2.2	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0
Asian Amer./Asian	2.3	9.9	0.0	0.0	2.7	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mexican Amer./Chicano	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Puerto Rican American	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other Latino	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	2.3	1.5	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	174	136	33	14	74	27	46	∞	46	13	11

Comparison of the Percentage of Respondents by Principal Activity (\underline{N} = 582) Table 6

	Docto	oral									
	Institu	ıtions	ß	Four-Year Institutions	nstitution	S		Two-ye	Two-year Institutions	suc	
Activity	UND	NDSN	DSO	MaSU	MiSU	VCSU	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
Administration	5.7	0.9	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0
Teaching	90.9	76.7		100.0	92.0	96.3	8.76	100.0	95.7	92.3	100.0
Research	3.4	16.5		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Services to clients/patients	0.0	0.8		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	3.7	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents 176	176	133	33	14	75	27	46	8	46	13	11

Appendix B

Table 1 Primary Interest of Faculty: Percent Responding to Each Category (\underline{N} = 584)

	Docto	oral									
	Instituti	ıtions	S.	Four-Year Institutions	nstitution	SL		Two-ye	Two-year Institutions	ons	
Primary Interest	OND	NDSN	DSO	MaSU	MiSU	VCSU	BSC	MISU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
Very heavily in teaching	28.7	14.2	63.6	64.3	41.9	70.4	9.69	87.5	87.0	69.2	81.8
Leaning toward teaching	41.6	43.3	21.2	21.4	39.2	22.2	28.3	12.5	13.0	23.1	18.2
Leaning toward research	27.0	33.6	15.2	14.3	16.2	7.4	2.5	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
Very heavily in research	2.8	9.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	178	134	33	14	74	27	46	8	46	13	11



Appendix C

Table 1 Hours Per Week Spent in Scheduled Teaching: Percent Responding to Each Category (N = 560)

	Doct	toral									
	Institu	tions	Ŗ	Four-Year I	Institutions	SL		Two-ye	Iwo-year Institutions	Suc	
Hours	OND	NDSO	DSO	MaSU	Misu	VCSU	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
900Z	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0 0	0.0
1 to 4	4.7	15.5	0.0	0.0	4.	4.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
5 to 8	33.1	41.9	9.4	7.1	13.7	8.3	9.1	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
9 to 12	45.6	31.0	46.9	28.6	39.7	41.7	9.1	12.5	4.7	0.0	27.3
13 to 16	10.1	7.0	18.8	35.7	28.8	33.3	13.6	50.0	30.2	38.5	0.0
17 to 20	5.3	0.8	15.6	28.6	13.7	8.3	25.0	25.0	14.0	30.8	27.3
21 to 34	1.2	2.3	9.4	0.0	1.4	4.2	36.4	12.5	48.8	15.4	18.2
35 to 44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	4.5	0.0	2.3	0.0	9.1
45 or more	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2
Total Number of Respondents	169	129	32	14	73	24	44	8	43	13	11

Hours Per Week Spent in Preparing for Teaching: Percent Responding to Each Category (N = 559) Table 2

	Doct	ctoral									
	Institu	tutions	Ē	Four-Year Institutions	nstitutior	SI		Two-ye	Two-year Institutions	ons	
Hours	OND	NDSO	DSO	MaSU	MiSU	VCSU	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
N Cool N	c	o C	c	c	Ċ	Ċ	Ċ	c	c	c	
	5	0.0	9	5))	5	5))	5.0	5	5
1 to 4	9.7	8.6	1	7.1	2.7	4.2	4.7	0.0	4.7	7.7	63.6
5 to 8	21.2	29.7	21.9	7.1	26.0	12.5	20.9	37.5	34.9	30.8	27.3
9 to 12	21.2	25.8	15.6	21.4	27.4	33.3	23.3	25.0	23.3	30.8	0.0
13 to 16	22.4	15.6	21.9	28.6	20.5	4.2	9.3	12.5	14.0	7.7	9.1
17 to 20	13.5	6.3	15.6	7.1	12.3	20.8	16.3	12.5	14.0	15.4	0.0
21 to 34	11.2	11.7	15.6	14.3	8.2	20.8	23.3	12.5	4.7	7.7	0.0
35 to 44	1.8	1.6	6.3	14.3	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0
45 or more	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	170	128	32	14	73	24	43	8	43	13	11



	Doct	toral									
	Institu	utions	Ϋ́	Four-Year Institutions	nstitution	JS		Two-ye	Two-year Institutions	Suc	
Hours	QND	NDSO	DSO	MaSU	Misu	VCSU	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
None	2.9	3.1	0.0	0.0	4.	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1 to 4	59.4	64.3	61.3	45.9	63.0	62.5	79.5	100.0	81.4	69.2	63.6
5 to 8	28.8	25.6	32.3	57.1	30.1	33.3	18.2	0.0	18.6	30.8	27.3
9 to 12	7.1	5.4	6.5	0.0	5.5	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13 to 16	1.2	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
17 to 20	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21 to 34	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
35 to 44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
45 or more	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	170	129	31	14	73	24	4	8	43	13	1-

Hours Per Week Spent in Committee Work and Meetings: Percent Responding to Each Category (N = 559) Table 4

	Doct	toral									
	╼	tions	Ľ.	Four-Year Institutions	nstitution	SL		Two-y	Iwo-year Institutions	ions	
Hours	OND	NDSN	DSO	MaSU	MiSU	VCSU	BSC	MISU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
	•	Ċ	Ó	Ċ	ć	Ó	Ċ	Ċ	1	d	č
None	4.1	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	4./	0.0	٦. ص
1 to 4	9.79	62.0	78.1	71.4	68.1	2.99	7.97	87.5	86.0	100.0	63.6
5 to 8	21.2	27.1	21.9	21.4	27.8	29.5	18.6	12.5	9.3	0.0	27.3
9 to 12	5.3	7.8	0.0	7.1	4.2	4.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13 to 16	1 .	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
17 to 20	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21 to 34	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
35 to 44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
45 or more	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	170	129	32	14	72	24	43	80	43	13	1

Hours Per Week Spent in Other Administration: Percent Responding to Each Category ($\underline{N} = 535$) Table 5

	Doct	ctoral					E.				
	Institu	tutions	ቯ	Four-Year Institutions	nstitutio	us		Two-ye	Two-year Institutions	ions	
Hours	QND	NDSON	DSO	MaSU	Misu	NCSU	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
None	31.7	37.9	38.7	33.3	29.9	37.5	26.8	42.9	29.3		27.3
1 to 4	36.6	41.1	35.5	58.3	43.3	33.3	53.7	42.9	48.8	53.8	45.5
5 to 8	14.6	9.1	9.7	0.0	9.0	20.8	9.8	14.3	4.9		18.2
9 to 12	10.4	4.8	9.7	0.0	9.0	8.3	7.3	0.0	9.8		9.1
13 to 16	3.0	0.8	3.2	8.3	1.5	0.0	2.4	0.0	2.4		0.0
17 to 20	3.0	3.2	3.2	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4		0.0
21 to 34	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4		0.0
35 to 44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0
45 or more	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0
Total Number of Respondents	164	124	31	12	29	24	41	7	41	13	11

Hours Per Week Spent in Research and Scholarly Writing: Percent Responding to Each Category (N = 540)Table 6

	Doct	toral									
	Institu	ıtions	ĭ	Four-Year Institutions	nstitution	SI		Two-ye	wo-year Institutions	ons	
Hours	QND	NDSO	DSO	MaSU	MiSU	VCSU	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
None	11.9	5.6	38.7	50.0	26.5	31.8	70.5	71.4	89.7	69.2	50.0
1 to 4	36.9	19.4	32.3	42.9	36.8	50.0	25.0	28.6	10.3	30.8	50.0
5 to 8	25.0	29.8	19.4	0.0	27.9	4.5	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9 to 12	15.5	12.1	3.2	7.1	5.9	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13 to 16	3.6	12.9	3.2	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
17 to 20	1.8	10.5	3.2	0.0	1.5	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21 to 34	4.8	7.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
35 to 44	9.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
45 or more	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	168	124	31	14	99	22	44	7	39	13	10

Hours Per Week Spent in Creativ	Creative	e Produ	cts/Pe	formance	<u>ces</u> : Pe	rcent R	espone	ve Products/Performances: Percent Responding to Each Category (<u>N</u> = 524)	th Catego	ory (N =	: 524)
	Doct	ctoral									
	Institu	utions	Ŗ	Four-Year Institutions	nstitutio	SL		Two-yea	Two-year Institutions	ns	
Hours	OND	NDSN	DSO	MaSU	Misu	vcsu	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
None	53.1	50.8	48.3	58.3	48.5	33.3	39.5	71.4	52.5	33.3	66.7
1 to 4	31.9	32.5	31.0	16.7	35.3	50.0	46.5	28.6	40.0	58.3	22.2
5 to 8	7.5	9.5	10.3	25.0	11.8	4.2	11.6	0.0	7.5	8.3	0.0
9 to 12	3.7	5.8	3.4	0.0	1.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1
13 to 16	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
17 to 20	2.5	1.7	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21 to 34	1.2	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
35 to 44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
45 or more	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	160	120	29	12	89	24	43	7	40	12	6

Table 8 Hours Per Week Spent in Consultation with Clients or Patients: Percent Responding to Each Category (N = 522)

	Doctoral	oral									
	Institut	ıtions	Ŗ	Four-Year Institutions	nstitution	SI		Two-ye	Two-year Institutions	ons	
Hours	OND	NDSN	DSO	MaSU	MiSU	vcsu	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
adoN	77.8	67.8	828	100.0	70.0	87.0	90.5	100 0	69 2	69.2	100 0
1 to 4	17.7	24.6	10.3	0.0	15.7	13.0	7.1	0.0	28.2	7.7	0.0
5 to 8	3.2	4.2	6.9	0.0	10.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	2.6	23.1	0.0
9 to 12	9.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13 to 16	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
17 to 20	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	4.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21 to 34	9.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
35 to 44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
45 or more	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	158	118	29	13	70	23	42	7	39	13	10

	Doct	toral									
	Institu	utions	Ä	Four-Year Institutions	nstitution	SL		Two-y	Two-year Institutions	ions	
Hours	OND	NDSN	DSO	MaSU	Misu	VCSU	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
None	20.7	24.2	13.3	7.1	13.9	9.0	16.3	12.5	18.6	0.0	9.1
1 to 4	66.5	55.6	63.3	78.6	72.2	70.8	8.69	75.0	65.1	84.6	45.5
5 to 8	10.4	15.3	20.0	14.3	9.7	25.0	9.3	12.5	11.6	15.4	0.0
9 to 12	1.8	2.4	3.3	0.0	4.2	0.0	4.7	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0
13 to 16	9.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
17 to 20	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21 to 34	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
35 to 44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
45 or more	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	164	124	30	4	72	24	43	8	43	13	7

Table 10

Hours Per Week Spent in Outside Consulting or Freelance Work: Percent Responding to Each Category (N = 526)

	Docto	oral			!						
	Institu	tions	Ŗ	Four-Year I	nstitution	SI		Two-year	Institut	ions	
Hours	OND	NDSO	DSO	MaSU	MiSU	vcsu	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
	9	ט	7.07	£7.4	9 09	909	70 7	1 7 4	71.0	603	0 02
	0.00	0.00	1 .7	- - -	0.00	0.60	- 0	1.70	0	7.60	0.0
1 to 4	25.3	28.6	20.7	35.7	28.2	21.7	30.2	28.6	25.6	30.8	30.0
5 to 8	7.0	6.7	0.0	7.1	6.6	4.3	9.3	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0
9 to 12	1.3	2.5	3.4	0.0	1.4	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13 to 16	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
17 to 20	0.0	0.8	3.4	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21 to 34	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
35 to 44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
45 or more	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	158	119	29	14	71	23	43	7	39	13	10

Table 11 Hours Per Week Spent in $\frac{\text{Household/Childcare Duties}}{\text{Category (N}} = 541)$

	Doct	Doctoral									
	Instituti	ıtions	ቯ	Four-Year Institutions	nstitution	SL		Two-ye	Two-year Institutions	ons	
Hours	QND	NDSN	DSO	MaSU	MisU	VCSU	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
None	7.2	10.0	3.3	0.0	6.9	12.5	9.1	28.6	4.9	0.0	10.0
1 to 4	13.9	16.7	23.3	28.6	16.7	20.8	11.4	14.3	14.6	7.7	0.0
5 to 8	22.9	21.7	33.3	50.0	26.4	20.8	27.3	28.6	19.5	46.2	10.0
9 to 12	24.1	20.8	16.7	0.0	15.3	16.7	27.3	14.3	24.4	15.4	20.0
13 to 16	10.2	8.3	10.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	9.1	0.0	14.6	0.0	30.0
17 to 20	9.0	10.8	0.0	7.1	4.2	4.2	0.0	14.3	9.8	7.7	0.0
21 to 34	7.2	5.8	6.7	0.0	9.7	8.3	2.3	0.0	7.3	7.7	0.0
35 to 44	1.8 8.	4.2	3.3	7.1	4.2	4.2	11.4	0.0	4.9	0.0	10.0
45 or more	3.6	1.7	3.3	7.1	8.3	12.5	2.3	0.0	0.0	15.4	20.0
Total Number of Respondents	166	120	30	4	72	24	44		4	13	1



Appendix D

Table 1 Number of Articles in Academic or Professional Journals: Percent Responding to Each Category (\underline{N} = 577)

	Doct	oral									
	Institu	ıtions	Ω	Four-Year Institutions	nstitutio	SL		Two-ye	Iwo-year Institutic	tions	
Number	UND NDS	NDSO	DSO	MaSU	Misu	VCSU	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	MSC	LRSC
OCON	23.1	α	36.4	35.7	36.5	53.8	66.7	75.0	008	69.2	70.0
400	- 7 - 4	, c	7.0	50.5	2000	7.0.7	1 7 7 8	, C	λ 2 7 . α	15.4	30.0
701	-	C.2	7.4.7	0.00	20.5	<u>.</u>	2	6.2) -	†. 2	5.0
3 to 4	17.3	16.3	21.2	7.1	20.3	7.7	11.1	0.0	0.0	15.4	0.0
5 to 10	26.6	27.2	9.1	7.1	12.2	3.8	4.4	12.5	2.2	0.0	0.0
11 to 20	10.4	13.2	3.0	0.0	8.1	11.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21 to 50	9.8	22.1	6.1	0.0	1.4	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
51 or more	1.2	5.9	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	173	136	33	14	74	26	45	8	45	13	10

Table 2 Number of Chapters in Edited Volumes: Percent Responding to Each Category (\overline{N} = 552)

	Doct	toral									
	Institu	itions	굔	Four-Year Institutions	nstitutio	SL		Two-ye	Iwo-year Institutions	Suc	
Number	OND	NDSN	DSO	MaSU	MiSU	NCSU	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	MSC	LRSC
acoN.	62.7	43.8	7 27	92.3	74.3	88.5	84 4	100 0	95.3	846	0 06
	1 70	2		1 1	- 7	5.7	· •) /	, t	2 6
1 to 2	7.1.7	24.0	7.01).	0.0).)	-:	0.0	4.	4.0	0.0
3 to 4	9.6	15.4	6.1	0.0	4.3	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5 to 10	2.0	8.5	6.1	0.0	1.4	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9.0	9.0	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21 to 50	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
51 or more	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	161	130	33	13	20	26	45	ω	43	13	10

Number of Books, Manuals, or Monographs: Percent Responding to Each Category (N = 562) Table 3

	Doctoral	toral									
	Instituti	utions	FC	Four-Year Institutions	nstitutio	ns		Two-ye	Iwo-year Institutions	ons	
Number	OND	NDSO	DSO	MaSU	Misu	VCSU	BSC	Misu-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
None	62.1		69.7		72.2	69.2	83.7	100.0	190.7	76.9	81.8
1 to 2	21.9		18.2	0.0	16.7	7.7	16.3	0.0	2.3	7.7	9.1
3 to 4	8.3		3.0	7.7	4.2	23.1	0.0	0.0	4.7	15.4	9.1
5 to 10	5.3		6.1	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11 to 20	9.0		0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0
21 to 50	1 .	0.0	3.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
51 or more	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	169	131	33	13	72	26	43	8	43	13	1

Number of Exhibitions or Performances in the Fine/Applied Arts Presented: Percent Responding to Each Category (N = 572) Table 4

	Doct	toral									
	Institut	tutions	Fc	Four-Year Institutions	nstitution	JS		Two-ye	Iwo-year Institutions	Suc	
Number	OND	NDSN	DSO	MaSU	MiSU	VCSU	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
None	84.7	84.2	58.1	78.6	74.3	51.9	76.1	100.0	88.9	69.2	81.8
1 to 2	4.1	3.8	16.1	7.1	8.1	25.9	8.7	0.0	6.7	7.7	9.1
3 to 4	1.2	0.8	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.5	0.0	2.2	15.4	0.0
5 to 10	3.5	1.5	3.2	0.0	1.4	7.7	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0
11 to 20	1.2	1.5	6.5	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21 to 50	1.2	3.0	3.2	14.3	2.7	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
51 or more	4.1	5.3	6.5	0.0	10.8	1.1	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1
Total Number of Respondents	170	133	31	14	74	27	46	8	45	13	7

Number of Professional Writings Published/Accepted for Publication in Last Two Years: Percent Responding to Each Category (N = 578) Table 5

	Docto	toral									
	Instituti	ıtions	Ē.	Four-Year Institutions	nstitutio	JS		Two-ye	Iwo-year Institutions	suc	
Number	OND	NDSO	DSO	MaSU	MiSU	VCSU	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
							,	. 1			
None	38.2	16.3	63.6	78.6	64.0	81.5	82.2	87.5	97.8	91.7	6.06
1 to 2	27.7	29.6	21.2	7.1	26.7	7.7	1.7	0.0	2.2	8.3	9.1
3 to 4	23.7	31.1	6.1	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.4	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
5 to 10	8.7	20.0	6.1	0.0	5.3	7.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11 to 20	1.7	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21 to 50	0.0	0.7	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
51 or more	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	173	135	33	14	75	27	45	8	45	12	11



Appendix E

Actual Hours Spent on Scheduled Teaching: Percent Responding to Each Category (N = 560) Table 1

	Doctoral	oral									
	Institu	tions	굓	Four-Year Institutions	nstitutio	us		Two-ye	Iwo-year Institutions	ions	
Frequency	OND	NDSN	DSO	MaSU	MisU	VCSU	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	MSC	LRSC
None	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1 to 4	4.7	15.5	0.0	0.0	1.4	4.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
5 to 8	33.1	41.9	9.4	7.1	13.7	8.3	9.1	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
9 to 12	45.6	31.0	46.9	28.6	39.7	41.7	9.1	12.5	4.7	0.0	27.3
13 to 16	10.1	7.0	18.8	35.7	28.8	33.3	13.6	50.0	30.2	38.5	0.0
17 to 20	5.3	80.	15.6	28.6	13.7	8.3	25.0	25.0	14.0	30.8	27.3
21 to 34	1.2	2.3	9.4	0.0	1.4	4.2	36.4	12.5	48.8	15.4	18.2
35 to 44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	4.5	0.0	2.3	0.0	9.1
45 or more	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2
Total Number of Respondents	169	129	32	14	73	24	44	8	43	13	11

Table 2

Actual Hours Spent on Preparing for Teaching (Including Reading and Grading Student Papers: Percent Responding to Each Category (N = 559)

	Doctora	oral									
	Institut	tions	Ϋ́	Four-Year I	nstitutions	SL		Two-ye	Fwo-year Instituti	ons	:
Frequency	OND	NDSO	DSO	MaSU	Misu	vcsu	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
None	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1 to 4	9.7	8.6	3.1	7.1	2.7	4.2	4.7	0.0	4.7	7.7	0.0
5 to 8	21.2	29.7	21.9	7.1	26.0	12.5	20.9	37.5	34.9	30.8	36.4
9 to 12	21.2	25.8	15.6	21.4	27.4	33.3	23.3	25.0	23.3	30.8	27.3
13 to 16	22.4	15.6	21.9	28.6	20.5	4.2	9.3	12.5	14.0	7.7	18.2
17 to 20	13.5	6.3	15.6	7.1	12.3	20.8	16.3	12.5	14.0	15.4	9.1
21 to 34	11.2	11.7	15.6	14.3	8.2	20.8	23.3	12.5	4.7	7.7	0.0
35 to 44	1.8	1.6	6.3	14.3	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.7	0.0	9.1
45 or more	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	170	128	32	14	73	24	43	8	43	13	1



Actual Hours Per Week Spent on Advising and Counseling of Students: Table 3

Percent Responding to Each Category (N = 560)

	Doct	oral									
	Institu	tions	Ϋ́	Four-Year Institutions	nstitution	SL		Two-ye	Two-year Instituti	tions	
Frequency	QND	NDSO	DSO	MaSU	Misu	VCSU	BSC	MISU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
None	2.9	3.1	0.0	0.0	4.	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1 to 4	59.4	64.3	61.3	42.9	63.0	62.5	79.5	100.0	81.4	69.2	63.6
5 to 8	28.8	25.6	32.3	57.1	30.1	33.3	18.2	0.0	18.6	30.8	27.3
9 to 12	7.1	5.4	6.5	0.0	5.5	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13 to 16	1.2	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1
17 to 20	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21 to 34	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
35 to 44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
45 or more	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	170	129	31	14	73	24	44	8	43	13	1

Actual Hours Per Week Spent on Administration: Percent Responding to Each Category (\underline{N} = 559) Table 4

	Doctora	oral									
	Institu	tions	F	Four-Year I	nstitutions	SI		Two-ye	wo-year Institutions	ions	
Frequency	OND	NDSO	DSO	MaSU	Misu	VCSU	BSC	MISU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
None	4.1	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	4.7	0.0	9.1
1 to 4	9.79	62.0	78.1	71.4	68.1	2.99	7.97	87.5	86.0	100.0	63.6
5 to 8	21.2	27.1	21.9	21.4	27.8	29.2	18.6	12.5	9.3	0.0	27.3
9 to 12	5.3	7.8	0.0	7.1	4.2	4.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13 to 16	1. 8.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
17 to 20	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21 to 34	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
35 to 44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
45 or more	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	170	129	32	14	72	24	43	8	43	13	11



Actual Hours Per Week Spent on Administration: Percent Responding to Each Category (N = 535) Table 5

	Doct	ctoral									
	Institu	tions	ጟ	Four-Year Institutions	nstitution	ns		Two-ye	Two-year Institutions	ions	
Frequency	QND	NDSO	DSO	MaSU	Misu	VCSU	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
None	31.7	37.9	38.7	33.3	29.9	37.5	26.8	42.9	293.3	30.8	27.3
1 to 4	36.6	41.1	35.5	58.3	43.3	33.3	53.7	42.9	48.8	53.8	45.5
5 to 8	14.6	9.7	9.7	0.0	9.0	20.8	9.8	14.3	4.9	15.4	18.2
9 to 12	10.4	4.8	9.7	0.0	9.0	8.3	7.3	0.0	9.8	0.0	9.1
13 to 16	3.0	0.8	3.2	8.3	1.5	0.0	2.4	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0
17 to 20	3.0	3.2	3.2	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0
21 to 34	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0
35 to 44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
45 or more	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	164	124	31	12	67	24	41	7	41	13	11

Average Hours Per Week Spent on Research and Scholarly Writing: Percent Responding to Each Category (N = 540) Table 6

	Doct	oral									
	Institu	tions	Ϋ́	Four-Year Institutions	nstitution	SL		Two-ye	Iwo-year Institutions	ons	
Frequency	QND	NDSO	DSO	MaSU	Misu	VCSU	BSC	Misu-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
None	11.9	5.6	38.7	50.0	26.5	31.8	70.5	71.4		69.2	50.0
1 to 4	36.9	19.4	32.3	42.9	36.8	20.0	25.0	28.6		30.8	50.0
5 to 8	25.0	29.8	19.4	0.0	27.9	4.5	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9 to 12	15.5	12.1	3.2	7.1	5.9	9.1	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
13 to 16	3.6	12.9	3.2	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
17 to 20	1 .	10.5	3.2	0.0	1.5	4.5	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
21 to 34	4.8	7.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
35 to 44	9.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
45 or more	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	168	124	31	14	89	22	44	7	39	13	10



Average Hours Per Week Spent on Other Creative Products/Performances: Percent Responding to Each Category (N = 524) Table 7

	Doct	oral									
	Institu	ıtions	Ŗ	Four-Year Institutions	nstitutio	us		Two-ye	Iwo-year Institut	lions	
Frequency	QND	NDSN	DSO	MaSU	Misu	NCSU	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
None	53.1	٠,	48.3	58.3	48.5	33.3	39.5	71.4	52.5	33.3	66.7
1 to 4	31.9	32.5	31.0	16.7	35.3	50.0	46.5	28.6	40.0	58.3	22.2
5 to 8	7.5		10.3	25.0	11.8	4.2	11.6	0.0	7.5	8.3	0.0
9 to 12	3.7		3.4	0.0	1.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1
13 to 16	0.0		3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
17 to 20	2.5		0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21 to 34	1.2		3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
35 to 44	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
45 or more	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	160	120	29	12	89	24	43	7	40	12	6

Average Hours Per Week Spent on Consultation with Clients/Patients: Percent Responding to Each Category (N = 522) Table 8

	Doct Doct	ctoral									
	Institu	ıtions	Ŗ	Four-Year Institutions	nstitutior	SI		Two-ye	Two-year Institutions	ions	
Frequency	OND	NDSN	nsa	MaSU	MiSU	NCSN	BSC	MISU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
9002	77.8	678	% %	100	70.0	87.0	90 5	100	69.2	69 2	100
1 to 4	17.7	24.6	10.3	0.00	15.7	13.0	7.1	0.00	28.2	7.7	0.00
5 to 8	3.2	4.2	6.9	0.0	10.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	2.6	23.1	0.0
9 to 12	9.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13 to 16	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
17 to 20	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21 to 34	9.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
35 to 44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
45 or more	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	158	118	53	13	20	23	42	7	39	13	10



Appendix F

Table 1
Personal Goals Noted as Very Important or Essential: Percent Responding to Each Category

	Doct	ctoral									
	Institu	utions	Ŗ	Four-Year Institutions	stitution	S		Two-yea	Iwo-year Institutions	ons	
Goals	QND	NDSO	DSO	MaSU	Misu	VCSU	BSC	Misu-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
Become authority in own field	48.0	57.0	66.7	14.3	43.2	29.6	55.6	37.5	54.3	38.5	81.8
Influence political structure	14.4	16.3	12.1	21.4	6.8	11.1	13.0	12.5	4.3	7.7	27.3
Influence social values	34.1	26.7	39.4	50.0	39.2	44.4	34.8	37.5	41.3	38.5	81.8
Raise a family	73.0	83.5	69.7	84.6	74.0	74.1	80.4	75.0	87.0	91.7	81.8
Be very well-off financially	35.6	41.5	54.5	35.7	36.5	40.7	39.1	50.0	37.0	30.8	72.7
Help others in difficulty	69.0	2.99	72.7	92.9	66.2	77.8	9.69	87.5	76.1	61.5	81.8
Be involved in environ clean-up	34.5	35.6	27.3	35.7	32.4	37.0	39.1	12.5	34.8	23.1	18.2
Develop philosophy of life	79.2	74.3	75.8	57.1	68.9	77.8	7.1.7	75.0	63.0	53.8	100.0
Promote racial understanding	6.09	54.8	97.2	50.0	60.3	63.0	52.2	37.5	30.4	38.5	45.5
Obtain recognition from colleagues	44.8	51.9	48.5	14.3	37.8	22.2	28.3	20.0	26.1	23.1	63.6
Integrate spirituality into life	58.4	51.9	57.6	71.4	56.8	63.0	58.7	37.5	65.2	75.0	81.8
Be a good colleague	95.4	89.6	6.96	100.0	93.2	96.3	93.5	100.0	97.8	92.3	100.0
Be a good teacher	96.0	94.1	100.0	100.0	95.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Achieving congruence between my											
own values and institutional values	61.0	50.7	51.5	50.0	8.09	59.3	52.2	50.0	2.99	83.3	6.06

¹ This item was included for the first time in 2001-02



Appendix G

Table 1 Reasons Noted as Very Important for Pursuing an Academic Career: Percent Responding to Each Category

	Doct	toral									
	Institu	tions	Ľ	Four-Year Institutions	nstitution	SL		Two-year Inst	=	tutions	
Reasons	QND	NDSN	DSO	MaSU	Misu	vcsu	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
Autonomy	71.1	75.8	62.5		56.2	63.0	55.2	50.0	35.6	46.2	54.5
Flexible schedule	67.1	69.1	39.4	57.1	55.4	63.0	9.69	37.5	54.3	53.8	54.5
Intellectual challenge	86.7	86.0	63.6	71.4	79.7	77.8	77.8	62.5	64.4	76.9	72.7
Intellectual freedom	75.0	73.5	2.99	71.4	63.5	88.9	77.8	50.0	50.0	69.2	0.09
Freedom to pursue interests	73.4	77.2	57.6	57.1	66.2	63.0	65.2	37.5	42.2	69.2	45.5
Opportunities for teaching	65.7	59.6	2.99	78.6	75.0	85.2	82.6	87.5	78.3	84.6	72.7
Opportunities for research	45.9	9.99	18.2	14.3	30.1	7.4	2.2	0.0	4.3	7.7	0.0
Occupational prestige/status	20.3	16.2	18.2	35.7	9.6	14.8	8.7	12.5	21.7	15.4	0.0
Opportunity to influence social change	26.2	22.1	24.2	21.4	21.9	14.8	19.6	12.5	19.6	23.1	18.2

Faculty Noting If They Still Wanted to Be a College Professor: Percent Responding to Each Category Table 2

	Doct	ctoral									
	Institu	tions	Ē	Four-Year Insti	stitution	s		Two-ye	Two-year Instituti	ons	
Still want to be a professor?	OND	NDSO	DSO	MaSU	MiSU	vcsu	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC
Definitely yes	43.5	41.2	21.2	21.4		33.3	39.1	37.5	17.4	46.2	27.3
Probably yes	34.5	28.7	42.4	35.7	26.7	40.7	34.8	25.0	43.5	23.1	36.4
Not sure	10.7	19.1	12.1	14.3	22.7	18.5	10.9	37.5	26.1	7.7	9.1
Probably no	9.6	8.8	21.2	14.3	6.7	3.7	13.0	0.0	13.0	23.1	18.2
Definitely no	1.7	2.2	3.0	14.3	2.7	3.7	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1



Aspects of Job Noted as Very Satisfactory or Satisfactory: Percent Responding to Each Category Table 3

	Doctor	Doctoral Institutions	utions		Four-Y	Four-Year Institutions	utions			Ž	Two-Year Institutions	itutions		:
Aspect of job*	QNO	NDSO	Nat'I	DSO	MaSU	Misu	vcsu	Nat'i	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC	Nat'i
Salary and fringe														
benefits	32.9	28.7	46.1	18.2	21.4	21.6	22.2	46.6	33.3	25.0	19.6	53.8	18.2	54.8
Opportunity for scholarly														
pursuits	60.5	9.99	67.9	32.3	35.7	40.3	20.0	70.5	52.3	75.0	53.5	58.3	70.0	56.3
Teaching load	54.9	48.5	61.0	9.79	42.9	44.6	48.1	62.5	54.3	62.5	43.5	46.2	36.4	55.3
Quality of students	53.8	47.1	9.09	36.4	42.9	37.8	51.9	44.0	43.5	100.0	43.5	6.97	63.6	33.7
Working conditions	73.8	48.5	62.6	81.8	57.1	61.6	63.0	61.4	58.7	87.5	65.2	38.5	63.6	58.8
Autonomy and														
independence	87.7	79.4	87.7	78.8	64.3	78.4	74.1	88.4	87.0	100.0	73.9	84.6	72.7	85.9
Prof relations w/other														
faculty	78.0	9.07	73.8	81.8	78.6	73.0	70.4	72.4	89.1	100.0	78.3	92.3	6.06	82.7
Social relations w/other														
faculty	6.99	27.7	61.2	78.1	61.5	62.7	59.3	57.1	76.1	100.0	56.5	83.3	88.9	68.3
Competency of														
colleagues	76.3	2.99	73.1	69.7	78.6		2.99	72.1	76.1	100.0	67.4	84.6	81.8	74.7
Visibility for jobs	32.1	39.4	48.1	37.9	18.2	34.0	43.8	49.5	32.3	16.7	42.1	55.6	62.5	41.3
Job security	74.0	80.0	76.3	2.99	28.6	64.4	64.0	80.0	73.3	87.5	65.2	69.2	81.8	79.9
Relationships with														
admin	60.5	54.8	67.9	39.4	35.7	52.7	63.0	57.1	41.3	87.5	54.3	69.2	70.0	61.4
Overall job satisfaction	72.8	64.0	74.0	48.5	64.3	64.9	70.4	73.6	71.7	75.0	63.0	84.6	63.6	80.7
Opportunity to develop														
new ideas	75.1	71.9	78.6	54.5	64.3	62.2	66.7	9.6	73.9	75.0	67.4	6.9	81.8	76.3
Availability of child care	39.4	28.9	28.7	12.5	87.5	4.2	0.0	31.7	7.1	0.0	25.0	0.0	75.0	52.4

*Respondents marking "Not applicable" are not included in these results.



Appendix H

Table 1 Job-Related Stress: Percent Responding to Each Category

			;		ָ נ									
	Doctor	Doctoral Institutions	Itions		Four-Y	Four-Year Institutions	utions			_	I WO-Year Institutions	Itutions		:
Sources of stress*	OND	NDSO	Nat'l	DSO	MaSU	MiSU	VCSU	Nat'I	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	WSC	LRSC	Nat'l
-														
Honsehold		_						•						
responsibilities	74.6	65.4	69.8	75.8	78.6	74.3	74.1	68.3	71.1	62.5	82.6	76.9	6.06	71.7
Child care	28.3	34.1	30.6	33.3	21.4	33.8	30.8	30.3	34.8	0.0	34.8	69.2	63.6	28.2
Care of elderly														
parent	37.2	31.1	31.4	21.2	57.1	41.9	37.0	30.5	30.4	12.5	32.6	46.2	54.5	35.0
My physical health	48.3	37.0	46.6	54.5	64.3	51.4	63.0	45.7	47.8	37.5	28.7	46.2	63.6	50.0
Review/promotion														
process	51.7	56.3	49.1	48.5	50.0	59.5	59.3	48.3	41.3	37.5	56.5	46.2	54.5	44.5
Subtle														
discrimination	29.7	27.9	26.1	39.4	21.4	31.1	22.2	26.0	19.6	12.5	26.1	30.8	9.1	21.0
Personal finances	2.09	52.9	9.75	87.9	64.3	65.8	70.4	55.5	63.0	75.0	78.3	76.9	81.8	59.4
Committee work	66.3	9.79	58.8	66.7	78.6	71.6	85.2	60.5	89.1	62.5	73.9	69.2	72.7	63.5
Faculty meetings	62.8	61.0	50.8	75.8	78.6	59.5	88.9	52.1	82.6	62.5	91.3	76.9	81.8	57.5
Colleagues	9.79	60.3	55.3	63.6	71.4	59.5	2.99	58.1	45.7	37.5	65.2	76.9	54.5	50.3
Students	56.4	44.9	53.9	72.7	78.6	63.5	63.0	55.4	78.3	20.0	80.4	84.6	63.6	63.2
Research or														
publishing demands	64.2	6.69	64.0	28.1	71.0	45.9	22.2	6.99	2.2	0.0	2.2	15.4	0.0	11.2
Inst procedures &														
'red tape'	77.3	73.5	68.8	84.4	85.7	73.0	74.1	73.5	84.8	75.0	80.4	69.2	54.5	74.7
Teaching load	68.8	6.99	9.09	84.8	92.9	71.6	81.5	60.3	9.69	75.0	84.8	92.3	6.06	67.5
Children's problems	25.7	27.4	28.2	21.2	50.0	25.7	34.6	27.5	34.8	25.0	23.9	69.2	72.7	29.3
Marital friction	17.4	26.7	22.0	30.3	7.1	12.2	19.2	22.2	21.7	25.0	30.4	30.8	45.5	20.6
Time pressures	87.9	86.0	83.8	87.9	92.9	93.2	85.2	83.3	84.8	75.0	91.3	92.3	90.9	79.9
Lack of personal														
time	83.8	79.4	77.5	81.8	100.0	90.5	85.2	9.77	82.6	87.5	84.8	76.9	90.9	75.4
Keeping up with info	i		(! !	!			ļ	í		1	(I	i I
tech	71.5	65.4	66.4	75.8	85.7	63.5	88.9	9.79	73.9	100.0	95.7	92.3	72.7	76.3

*Percentage of respondents marking "Somewhat" or "Extensive.



Appendix I

Table 1 Goals for Undergraduates Noted as Very Important or Essential: Percent Responding to Each Category

und NDSU DSU Masu VCSU BSC early 100.0 98.5 100.0 100.0 98.6 100.0 100.0 action 71.2 75.0 75.0 92.9 83.6 88.9 78.3 action 54.8 51.5 59.4 57.1 57.5 48.1 39.1 elop 37.3 30.1 28.1 71.4 32.9 51.9 34.8 elop 37.3 30.1 28.1 71.4 32.9 51.9 34.8 civilization 28.8 27.2 46.9 35.7 25.7 37.0 13.0 lues 59.9 49.3 43.8 71.4 58.1 69.6 45.7 erience 68.9 58.1 58.1 85.7 47.3 55.6 45.7 munity service 38.6 33.8 40.6 42.9 41.1 63.0 77.8 71.7 ace/ethnic 67.8 50.7		Doctora Institution	oral tions	For	Four-Year Institutions	stitution	s		Two-ye	Two-year Institutions	ons	
100.0 98.5 100.0 100.0 98.6 100.0 71.2 75.0 75.0 92.9 83.6 88.9 54.8 51.5 59.4 57.1 57.5 48.1 59.9 55.9 55.9 59.4 85.7 60.3 61.5 37.3 30.1 28.1 71.4 32.9 51.9 14.1 11.0 12.5 28.65 8.1 40.7 28.8 27.2 46.9 35.7 25.7 37.0 59.9 49.3 43.8 71.4 58.1 74.1 63.0 p 70.1 58.1 62.5 69.2 50.7 77.8 thnic 67.8 50.7 75.0 78.6 50.0 70.4 18.5	Educational goals	OND	NDSO	DSO	MaSU	Misu	VCSU	BSC	MiSU-BC	NDSCS	MSC	LRSC
71.2 75.0 75.0 92.9 83.6 88.9 54.8 51.5 59.4 57.1 57.5 48.1 59.9 55.9 55.9 59.4 57.1 57.5 48.1 59.9 55.9 55.9 59.4 85.7 60.3 61.5 37.3 30.1 28.1 71.4 32.9 51.9 14.1 11.0 12.5 28.65 8.1 40.7 28.8 27.2 46.9 35.7 25.7 37.0 59.9 49.3 43.8 71.4 58.1 74.1 63.0 p 70.1 58.1 62.5 69.2 50.7 77.8 thnic 67.8 50.7 75.0 78.6 50.0 70.4 48.5	Develop ability to think clearly	100.0	98.5	100.0	100.0	98.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.8	100.0	100.0
54.8 51.5 59.4 57.1 57.5 48.1 59.9 55.9 59.4 85.7 60.3 61.5 37.3 30.1 28.1 71.4 32.9 51.9 14.1 11.0 12.5 28.65 8.1 40.7 14.1 11.0 12.5 28.65 8.1 40.7 59.9 49.3 43.8 71.4 58.1 74.1 63.0 68.9 58.1 58.1 85.7 68.5 81.5 (service 38.6 33.8 40.6 42.9 41.1 63.0 p 70.1 58.1 62.5 69.2 50.7 77.8 thnic 67.8 50.7 75.0 78.6 50.0 70.4 18.5	Prepare for employment	71.2	75.0	75.0	92.9	83.6	88.9	78.3	87.5	97.8	92.3	100.0
59.9 55.9 59.4 85.7 60.3 61.5 37.3 30.1 28.1 71.4 32.9 51.9 14.1 11.0 12.5 28.65 8.1 40.7 14.1 11.0 12.5 28.65 8.1 40.7 28.8 27.2 46.9 35.7 25.7 37.0 59.9 49.3 43.8 77.4 58.1 74.1 68.5 68.9 58.1 58.1 85.7 68.5 81.5 68.9 58.1 58.1 85.7 68.5 81.5 pt. 70.1 58.1 62.5 69.2 50.7 77.8 thnic 67.8 50.7 75.0 78.6 50.0 70.4 18.5	Prepare for graduate education	54.8	51.5	59.4	57.1	57.5	48.1	39.1	50.0	30.4	38.5	45.5
37.3 30.1 28.1 71.4 32.9 51.9 14.1 11.0 12.5 28.65 8.1 40.7 14.1 11.0 12.5 28.65 8.1 40.7 159.9 49.3 43.8 71.4 58.1 74.1 45.5 46.3 43.8 35.7 47.3 55.6 68.9 58.1 58.1 85.7 68.5 81.5 service 38.6 33.8 40.6 42.9 41.1 63.0 70.1 58.1 62.5 69.2 50.7 77.8 nic 67.8 50.7 75.0 78.6 50.0 70.4 37.5 25.0 31.3 71 14.9 18.5	Develop moral character	59.9	55.9	59.4	85.7	60.3	61.5	71.7	62.5	91.3	84.6	81.8
tion 28.8 27.2 46.9 35.7 25.7 37.0 59.9 49.3 43.8 71.4 58.1 74.1 74.1 45.5 46.3 43.8 71.4 58.1 74.1 74.1 68.9 58.1 58.1 85.7 68.5 81.5 service 38.6 33.8 40.6 42.9 41.1 63.0 70.1 58.1 62.5 69.2 50.7 77.8 nic 67.8 50.7 75.0 78.6 50.0 70.4 37.5 25.0 31.3 7.1 14.9 18.5	Provide for emotional develop	37.3	30.1	28.1	71.4	32.9	51.9	34.8	62.5	65.2	61.5	63.6
tion 28.8 27.2 46.9 35.7 25.7 37.0 59.9 49.3 43.8 71.4 58.1 74.1 45.5 46.3 43.8 35.7 47.3 55.6 68.9 58.1 58.1 85.7 47.3 55.6 68.9 58.1 58.1 85.7 68.5 81.5 service 38.6 33.8 40.6 42.9 41.1 63.0 70.1 58.1 62.5 69.2 50.7 77.8 nic 67.8 50.7 75.0 78.6 50.0 70.4 37.5 25.0 31.3 71 14.9 18.5	Prepare for family living	14.1	11.0	12.5	28.65	8.1	40.7	17.4	12.5	32.6	46.2	18.2
59.9 49.3 43.8 71.4 58.1 74.1 45.5 46.3 43.8 35.7 47.3 55.6 68.9 58.1 58.1 85.7 68.5 81.5 service 38.6 33.8 40.6 42.9 41.1 63.0 70.1 58.1 62.5 69.2 50.7 77.8 nic 67.8 50.7 75.0 78.6 50.0 70.4	Teach classics of western civilization	28.8	27.2	46.9	35.7	25.7	37.0	13.0	25.0	15.2	23.1	27.3
45.5 46.3 43.8 35.7 47.3 55.6 68.9 58.1 58.1 85.7 68.5 81.5 service 38.6 33.8 40.6 42.9 41.1 63.0 70.1 58.1 62.5 69.2 50.7 77.8 nic 67.8 50.7 75.0 78.6 50.0 70.4 37.5 25.0 31.3 7.1 14.9 18.5	Help develop personal values	59.9	49.3	43.8	71.4	58.1	74.1	9.69	75.0	84.4	84.6	100.0
68.9 58.1 58.1 85.7 68.5 81.5 service 38.6 33.8 40.6 42.9 41.1 63.0 70.1 58.1 62.5 69.2 50.7 77.8 nic 67.8 50.7 75.0 78.6 50.0 70.4 37.5 25.0 31.3 7.1 14.9 18.5	Enhance out-of-class experience	45.5	46.3	43.8	35.7	47.3	55.6	45.7	62.5	56.5	38.5	63.6
38.6 33.8 40.6 42.9 41.1 63.0 70.1 58.1 62.5 69.2 50.7 77.8 67.8 50.7 75.0 78.6 50.0 70.4 37.5 25.0 31.3 7.1 14.9 18.5	Enhance self-understanding	68.9	58.1	58.1	85.7	68.5	81.5	63.0	71.4	75.6	66.7	90.9
70.1 58.1 62.5 69.2 50.7 77.8 67.8 50.7 75.0 78.6 50.0 70.4 37.5 25.0 31.3 7.1 14.9 18.5	Instill commitment to community service	38.6	33.8	40.6	42.9	41.1	63.0	37.0	20.0	54.5	6.9/	63.6
67.8 50.7 75.0 78.6 50.0 70.4 37.5 25.0 31.3 7.1 14.9 18.5	Prepare for response citizenship	70.1	58.1	62.5	69.2	20.7	77.8	71.7	85.7	73.3	100.0	81.8
67.8 50.7 75.0 78.6 50.0 70.4 37.5 25.0 31.3 7.1 14.9 18.5	Enhance appreciation of race/ethnic											
37 5 250 313 71 149 185	droups	8.79	20.7	75.0	78.6	50.0	70.4	56.5	75.0	40.0	84.6	81.8
0::0	Study a foreign language ¹	37.5	25.0	31.3	7.1	14.9	18.5	15.2	12.5	4.5	23.1	9.1

¹ This item was included for the first time in 2001-02.



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.



