

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9204427

The impact of race, gender and other selected variables on the participation of college and university faculty in professional associations

Daniels, Deborah Thies, Ed.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1991

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

**THE IMPACT OF RACE, GENDER AND OTHER SELECTED VARIABLES
ON THE PARTICIPATION OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY
FACULTY IN PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS**

BY

Deborah Thies Daniels

**A Dissertation Submitted To
The Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University Of North Carolina At Greensboro
In Partial Fulfillment
Of The Requirements For The Degree Of
Doctor Of Education**

**Greensboro
1991**

Approved by

David B. Sully
Dissertation Advisor

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation
Adviser

David W. Reilly

Committee
Members

Clark Bond
Joseph F. Brunson
Deborah J. ...

25 February 1991
Date of Acceptance by Committee

25 February 1991
Date of Final Oral Examination

DANIELS, DEBORAH THIES, Ed.D. The Impact of Race, Gender and Other Selected Variables on the Participation of College and University Faculty in Professional Associations. (1991) Directed by David H. Reilly. 244 pp.

The purpose of this research was to: (1) identify factors which affect the decisions of higher education social science faculty to affiliate or not to affiliate with professional organizations; (2) identify the efforts of selected professional organizations to recruit, retain, and reclaim minority and female higher education faculty; and (3) make recommendations to professional associations, university administrators, and other interested parties about the professional affiliations of minority and/or female higher education social science faculty.

Instruments to address the specific research questions of this study did not exist. Therefore, three separate instruments were devised to gather data from the following three sources: (1) selected professional associations; (2) twenty-two four-year North Carolina institutions; and (3) social science faculty members employed at the institutions in item (2).

A total of 245 faculty survey respondents indicated membership in a professional organization and 20 indicated nonmembership. These faculty selected as the most frequent employee benefit offered by their institutions time off for

participation in the activities of professional organizations and covering partial costs of conferences, regardless of the level. National meetings and professional development were chosen as reasons to affiliate. Costs was chosen for why faculty chose not to affiliate with a professional organization.

The underrepresentation of minorities and females throughout the educational system may continue to exist. Institutional and professional association officials as well as faculty members and government officials must place a higher priority on higher education if America expects to continue to be a leader in the field. If the expectations of higher education are high, then signs of a visible, stronger commitment must come forth.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTSiii
LIST OF TABLESv
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION1
Background and Overview1
Statement of the Problem	11
Purpose of the Study	14
Research Questions	15
Importance of the Study	18
Definitions	25
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	28
The Historically Development of HBCUS.	29
General History and Chronological Development	29
Philanthropic and Funding Efforts	36
Summary	40
The Historical Development of Professional Associations in Higher Education.	40
General History	41
The Participation of Women in Professional Associations	45

	Minority Participation in Professional	
	Associations	48
	Summary	53
III.	METHODOLOGY	55
	Instruments	57
	Pilot Study - Category One	58
	Pilot Study - Category Two	65
	Procedures for Category One	68
	Segment A	67
	Population	67
	Sample Selection	68
	Segment B	71
	Population	71
	Sample Selection	71
	Procedures for Category Two	72
IV.	RESULTS	74
	Category One	75
	Category Two	98
V.	CONCLUSIONS	103
	Background and Overview	103
	Purpose of Study	105
	Major Findings	107
	Implications of the Study.	112
	Potential Problems in Research Design.	113

Suggestions for Further Research116
BIBLIOGRAPHY.123

APPENDICES

A. Pilot Study Instruments133
B. Revised Instruments.134
C. List of Paired Institutions.135
D. List of Organizations Identified by Survey
 Respondents138
E. Study Tables165

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Frequencies by Institutions by Department (Pilot Study).	160
2. Frequencies by Department (Pilot Study) Analysis Technique.	161
3. Institutions Responding to the Institutional Survey.	162
4. Characteristics of Institutions Included in the Faculty Study by Support, Origin and Level.	163
5. Characteristics of Institutions by Which Faculty Survey Respondents as Members Were Employed.	164
6. Frequency Distribution of Responses by Faculty Who are Members of Professional Organizations by Rank/Position and Status.	165
7. Frequency Distribution of Responses by Faculty Who are Members of Professional Organizations by Current Discipline and Age Range.	166
8. Frequency Distribution of Responses by Faculty Who are Members of Professional Organizations by Sex, Race and Highest Degree.	167
9. Characteristics of Institutions by Which Faculty Survey Respondents as Non-Members Were Employed.	168

TABLE	Page
10. Frequency Distribution of Responses by Faculty Who Were NOT Members of Professional Organizations by Rank/Position and Status.	169
11. Frequency Distribution of Responses by Faculty Who Were NOT Members of Professional Organizations by Current Discipline and Age Range.	170
12. Frequency Distribution of Responses by Faculty Who Were NOT Members of Professional Organizations by Sex, Race, and Highest Degree Received.	171
13. Frequencies of Professional Organizations Listed by Social Science Faculty.	172
14. Summary Data of Number of Memberships in Professional Organizations By Institutional Type.	173
15. Summary Data of Number of Nonmemberships in Professional Organizations By Institutional Type.	174
16. Distribution of Faculty From Institutions Responding to the Institutional Survey.	175
17. Summary of Employee Benefits by Institutions to Faculty Who Choose to Affiliate with Professional Organizations.	176

TABLE	Page
18. Summary of Employee Benefits by Institutions to Faculty Who Choose to Affiliate with Professional Organizations (Continued).	177
19. Frequencies of Responses by Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations.	178
20. Frequencies of Responses by Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	179
21. Frequencies of Responses by Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations.	180
22. Frequencies of Responses by Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	181
23. Frequencies of Responses by Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	182

TABLE	Page
24. Frequencies of Responses by Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	183
25. Reasons Social Science Faculty Members are Non-Members of a Professional Organization.	184
26. Reasons Social Science Faculty Members are Non-Members of a Professional Organization (Continued).	185
27. Frequencies of Responses by Female Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations.	186
28. Frequencies of Responses by Female Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	187
29. Frequencies of Responses by Female Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	188
30. Frequencies of Responses by Female Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	189

TABLE	Page
31. Frequencies of Responses by Female Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	190
32. Frequencies of Responses by Female Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	191
33. Frequencies of Responses by Male Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations.	192
34. Frequencies of Responses by Male Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	193
35. Frequencies of Responses by Male Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations.	194
36. Frequencies of Responses by Male Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	195

TABLE	Page
37. Frequencies of Responses by Male Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	196
38. Frequencies of Responses by Male Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	197
39. Frequencies of Responses by Black Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations.	198
40. Frequencies of Responses by Black Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	199
41. Frequencies of Responses by Black Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	200
42. Frequencies of Responses by Black Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	201

TABLE	Page
43. Frequencies of Responses by Black Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	202
44. Frequencies of Responses by White Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations.	203
45. Frequencies of Responses by White Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	204
46. Frequencies of Responses by White Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (White).	205
47. Frequencies of Responses by White Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	206
48. Frequencies of Responses by White Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	207

TABLE	Page
49. Frequencies of Responses by White Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).	208
50. Summary Data For Number of Memberships in Professional Organizations By Race and Sex.	209
51. Summary Data For Number of Nonmemberships in Professional Organizations By Race and Sex.	210
52. Summary Data For Number of Memberships and Non-Memberships in Professional Organizations By Sex and Institutional Level.	211
53. Summary Data For Number of Memberships in Professional Organizations By Race and Institutional Level.	212
54. Summary Data For Number of Nonmemberships in Professional Organizations By Race and Institutional Level.	213
55. Summary Data For Number of Memberships in Professional Organizations By Race, Sex and Level.	214
56. Summary Data For Number of Nonmemberships in Professional Organizations By Race, Sex and Level.	215

TABLE	Page
57. Summary Data For Number of Memberships in Professional Organizations By Race, Sex, and Origin.	216
58. Summary Data For Number of Nonmemberships in Professional Organizations By Race, Sex, and Origin.	217
59. Characteristics of Professional Organizations as Indicated by Survey Responses.	218
60. Characteristics of Professional Organizations as Indicated by Survey Responses.	219
61. Comparison of Characteristics of Professional Organizations Between 1980 and 1988.	220
62. Responses of Professional Organizations to Questions About Special Efforts to Recruit Minorities and Women.	221
63. Survey Return Rate of Faculty Responses by Institution.	222
64. Number of Responses (#Res) and Faculty (#Fac) and Survey Return Rate (%Ret) by Institution.	223
65. Number of Faculty by Sex by Departments as Indicated in Institutional Survey.	224
66. Number of Faculty by Race by Departments as Indicated in Institutional Survey.	225

TABLE	Page
67. Number of Faculty by Sex by Departments from Publicly Supported Institutions as Indicated in Institutional Survey.	226
68. Number of Faculty by Sex by Departments from Privately Supported Institutions as Indicated in Institutional Survey.	227
69. Number of Faculty by Race by Departments from Publicly Supported Institutions as Indicated in Institutional Survey.	228
70. Number of Faculty by Race by Departments from Privately Supported Institutions as Indicated in Institutional Survey.	229
71. Number of Faculty by Sex by Departments from HBCU Institutions as Indicated in Institutional Survey.	230
72. Number of Faculty by Sex by Departments from Non-HBCU Institutions as Indicated in Institutional Survey.	231
73. Number of Faculty by Race by Departments from Non-HBCU Institutions as Indicated in Institutional Survey.	232
74. Number of Faculty by Race by Departments from HBCU Institutions as Indicated in Institutional Survey.	233

TABLE	Page
75. Number of Faculty by Sex by Departments from Undergraduate Institutions as Indicated in Institutional Survey.	234
76. Number of Faculty by Sex by Departments from Graduate Institutions as Indicated in Institutional Survey.	235
77. Number of Faculty by Race by Departments from Undergraduate Institutions as Indicated in Institutional Survey.	236
78. Number of Faculty by Race by Departments from Graduate Institutions as Indicated in Institutional Survey.	237
79. Institutions Responding to the Institutional Survey By Members and Nonmembers.	238
80. Institutions Responding to the Institutional Survey By Members and Nonmembers (Economics Faculty).	239
81. Institutions Responding to the Institutional Survey By Members and Nonmembers (History Faculty).	240
82. Institutions Responding to the Institutional Survey By Members and Nonmembers (Psychology Faculty).	241

TABLE		Page
83.	Institutions Responding to the Institutional Survey By Members and Nonmembers (Sociology Faculty).	242
84.	Institutions Responding to the Institutional Survey By Members and Nonmembers (Political Science Faculty).	243
85.	Institutions Responding to the Institutional Survey By Members and Nonmembers (Other Social Science Faculty).	244

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background And Overview

Since the founding of the United States, the early settlers worked hard to pattern their lives after values already set in the mother country, England. The settlers brought with them a continuing concern for a broad range of educational issues. However, they were forced to prioritize issues, concerns and problems, giving first priority to selecting those elements necessary for survival. Although formalized education at the primary and secondary levels may have concerned the settlers, this was not their highest priority. Therefore, the idea of higher education, beyond the primary and secondary levels was even less a priority.

The gradual growth and development of colonial society gave rise to an increasing need for citizenry to be equipped with proper academic credentials, hence a growing interest in higher education. The impetus for formulating institutions of higher education mandated strict attention to available financial resources. The need to provide proper academic credentials could only be entertained by those who could afford it, the wealthy. The interest in

higher education, born as a luxury option by the rich for the rich, became the historical foundation for the educational issues that are addressed in this study.

Long before the first American college was founded the issue of funding of higher education was a concern for the new settlers (Rudolph, 1962). The initial funding of American higher education was limited to donations by wealthy individuals. United States higher education began in 1636 when Englishman John Harvard provided funds to establish Harvard College. (The Right College 1989, 1989; 1989 HEP Higher Education Directory, 1989). Yale University opened in 1701 with a major gift provided by Englishman Elihu Yale. The philanthropic efforts of these wealthy gentlemen generated and encouraged new thrusts in support of higher education.

An exception to the traditional philanthropic sources of funding occurred when the Commonwealth of Virginia emerged as the first state government entity to grant financial support to an institution of higher education. William and Mary, the second American college, received the proceeds of this first state government grant (Curti and Nash, 1965). As the funding sources for educational

institutions were limited, so was the population selected for attending American institutions of higher education.

These institutions were opened to serve white males only. Initially, institutions did not include Negroes and women. However, during the 19th century, changes in the population of these institutions occurred as college officials for the first time invited women and Negroes to join the student body. Oberlin opened its doors to admit women in 1833 (The Right College 1989, 1989). Radcliffe College opened for women in 1879 as an annex to Harvard (for men) (The Right College 1989, 1989; 1989 HEP Higher Education Directory, 1989). Not until 1865 did a college emerge to address the higher educational needs and yearnings of women.

Vassar opened as the first college for women in 1865 (The Right College 1989, 1989). Several years later, Wellesley and Smith, in 1875, emerged as institutions for women (The Right College 1989, 1989; 1989 HEP Higher Education Directory, 1989). The opening of these institutions eventually established a basis for a more diverse student population at other institutions of higher education. The initial invitation for Negroes to receive

higher educational services came from a co-educational institution.

Oberlin College, noted as the first college to admit women, also altered its admission policies in 1835 to admit Negroes. Berea (KY) later joined institutions in the admission of Negroes. By 1860, the number of free black graduates from American colleges totaled 28 persons (Pifer, 1973). In spite of these changes in admissions practices, blacks continued to encounter obstacles in seeking educational services.

More than two hundred years after Harvard was founded, the idea to establish an institution to address the higher education needs of Negroes became a reality. Through the concerted efforts of interested individuals and several organized groups, the first institutions for Negroes were founded. The Quakers established the first institution for Negroes, now called Cheyney State University, in 1837 (The Right College 1989, 1989). Soon after in 1854, the Presbyterian Church founded Lincoln University (PA). Wilberforce University began in 1856, funded by the Methodist Episcopal Church (OH) (Pifer, 1973). Limited, but crucial and effective, the financial support of

individuals and organized groups proved instrumental to operating the first black colleges. Although these sources were limited, they were essential to the development of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).

Later as alternative sources of funding were established for HBCUs, U.S. Congressional legislation provided one funding alternative, which significantly impacted their developments.

The Land-Grant Act of 1862 (also called the Morrill Act) provided funding for land-grant institutions to be established in the South. The federal government charged the land-grant institutions with the responsibility for offering programs in agriculture, engineering, and national defense. Most land-grant institutions set up as a result of the first Morrill Act did not extend educational services to Negroes as intended in the legislation (Jones, 1969).

Congress passed a second Morrill act in 1887 (Thackrey, 1965) which established and provided funding to each of the 17 southern states with dual higher education systems. Other publications refer to 1890 as the year of

the second act (Jones, 1969; Holmes, 1934; Pifer, 1973; Orr, 1959; Hill, 1984). These allocations were designated to fund an institution for Negroes in each of the 17 states. The U.S. Government required each of the states to offer segregated but equal higher education to blacks and whites (Hill, 1984). Institutions for Negroes offered the same three programs as their white counterparts--agriculture, engineering and national defense (Thackrey, 1965).

By legislation of the Land-Grant Acts, the officials of land-grant institutions were ordered to form a professional organization. To satisfy the federal government's requirement to form a professional organization, college officials created the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. This organization gave college officials the opportunity to find solutions to the concerns of land-grant institutions (Thackrey, 1965). Out of the need to communicate with each other, college officials with similar problems began to form networks to find solutions to their common and unique problems.

Today officials at HBCUs, just like those at historically white institutions, face the common and unique problems of finance and enrollment- the two elements necessary for institutional survival. With the dwindling of resources, funds and enrollment, more HBCUs find themselves in danger of reducing or ceasing their operations. One hundred and twenty-one HBCUs existed in 1936, of which 96 awarded the baccalaureate degree (Hill, 1984). In 1984, 89 HBCUs existed which granted this degree (Whiting, 1988). Fewer than one third of all HBCUs founded between 1865 and 1950 are included within these 89 institutions (Albright, 1978). Some institutions formerly classified as HBCUs now have enrollments where whites are in the majority, such as Bluefield State College (WV) and Central State University (OK) (Minority Student Enrollments, 1987). It is beyond surface comprehension that most HBCUs have survived despite the obstacles encountered and overcome by their administrators.

HBCUs have traditionally operated with limited facilities and meager financial resources due to the effect of segregation. Despite these handicaps, some factors which helped HBCUs to survive are intense student determination, strong faculty commitment, and the tenacity

and wisdom of administrators (Hill, 1984). Provisions by federal legislation have also continued to affect the existence and the enhancement of HBCUs.

Although American society at first excluded minorities and women from participating in most educational activities, over the years they have been participating in these activities at more increasing rates. However, minorities and women have not overcome all barriers to participating in professional educational activities. There are some activities, where if minorities and women are represented at all, it is in small proportion to their white male counterparts. These activities range from enrolling in educational services to serving as professionals who deliver educational services. Moreover, minorities and women have not engaged in the activities of professional associations at the same level of participation as their male counterparts (Orr, 1959).

Integration of educational facilities became more of a reality during the 1960's and 1970's. Professional opportunities, including membership in professional organizations arose for HBCUs and their faculty, staff and students when various interest groups and individuals, i.e.

HBCU alumni and friends attempted to make Negro institutions more equitable with white ones.

Statement of The Problem

In the past, American society has limited and/or excluded minorities and women from participation in most professional and social events. The educational process was no exception to this significant pattern of non-participation. Recently, American society has made significant strides to allow and to include minority and female participants in most professional activities related to education.

An analysis of data in various phases of the educational process helped to determine the level of these strides. Astin (1982) attributed the severe underrepresentation of minorities in other disciplines to the heavy concentration of minorities in the field of education. According to Astin, since the mid-1970's, little change has occurred in minority student representation in higher education. Astin further claimed that the field of education accounted for 50 percent of doctorates earned by blacks in 1981. An increase in the number of minority students who complete higher education

programs may yield an increase in the number of minorities available in and qualified for employment in various occupations, especially where underrepresentation exists. Astin (1982) contended that this underrepresentation of minorities may be due to poor academic and pre-college preparation of minority students. The underrepresentation of minorities may continue to exist in the membership of professional associations because of the low representation in other phases of the educational system.

There continues to be underrepresentation of minorities in the educational process. The membership composition of professional associations is no exception to this underrepresentation. Professional organizations often serve as one arena where members form networks and develop professional relationships among themselves. Professional associations also serve as a source of continuing professional development. Many professional associations initially did not include minorities or women in their activities (Orr, 1959).

In recent years, several professional associations have conducted surveys to determine the needs of their minority and female constituencies. Based on survey

results, some committees and special interest groups have formed to provide special services to these constituents. Organizations have also offered fellowships and fee waivers to lure minorities and women into organizations. Despite these overt efforts to increase memberships, the unsolved questions remain: Why do many minority and female faculty members choose not to participate in the activities of professional associations? Why are many faculty members employed at HBCUs not present at or underrepresented at meetings and activities of professional organizations? Answers to these questions should provide a clearer perspective of the problem.

Purpose of Study

This study sought to:

- 1) Identify factors which affect the decisions of social science higher education faculty to affiliate or not to affiliate with professional organizations;

- 2) Identify the efforts of selected professional organizations to recruit, retain, and reclaim minority and female higher education faculty; and

3) Make recommendations to professional associations, university administrators, and other interested parties about professional affiliations of minority and/or female faculty members representing the social science disciplines in higher education.

To accomplish these ends, several research questions were proposed.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study were divided into two categories. The first category addressed social science faculty members of selected institutions which offer the baccalaureate or higher degrees. Four questions were addressed. These were:

(1) Which professional organizations do faculty members join, especially those organizations directly related to their disciplines? What differences occur in the number of memberships as a function of the following factors:

- o Institutional Support (Public, Private)?
- o Institutional Level (Undergraduate, Graduate)?
- o Institutional Origin (HBCU, non-HBCU)?
- o Sex of faculty member (Male, Female)?
- o Race of faculty member (black, white, other)?
- o Highest Degree Earned by Faculty Member (Bachelor's, Master's, Doctorate, Other)?
- o Discipline of Faculty Member?
- o Faculty Rank/Position?
- o Status of Faculty Member?
- o Age Range of Faculty Member?

2) What factors determine why faculty members select the professional organizations with which they affiliate?

(3) What factors influence faculty members not to affiliate with professional associations?

(4) What are the perceived positive and negative outcomes of minority and/or female faculty

members joining and/or not joining a particular professional organization?

The second category of this research addressed international, national, regional, state, and local professional associations in the social sciences. Three research questions were raised:

- (1) What memberships in professional organizations and associations are available to higher education social science faculty?
- (2) What is the membership composition of each higher education social science organization by race and by sex?
- (3) Which of the professional higher education organizations identified by the selected social science faculty make special efforts to recruit, retain, and reclaim minority and/or female professionals? What special efforts have these organizations made in the recruitment, retention and reclamation of minorities and/or females?

Importance of the Study

Many studies have been conducted to determine the status and needs of HBCUs. Holmes (1934) recommended that a "carefully organized survey" be conducted among Negroes in higher education to provide input about the interests of Negroes in long-range educational planning efforts. Holmes (1934) further suggested that a permanent commission be established to address the issues surrounding Negroes in higher education.

Thackrey (1965) proposed the following activity: a factual study to be conducted among higher education organizations to show "who does what in what fields, how many people are involved, and what it costs." The results of the study should be disseminated among university and foundation officials and higher education faculty to address the issue of duplication of efforts among professional associations. By providing faculty and administrators with this information, a new reflective attitude may be developed in choosing membership in an professional organization. To improve the choosing process, the development of criteria in a check list for college and university personnel to review and choose their professional association memberships would be helpful (Thackrey, 1965). According to the U.S.

Department of Education in 1988, very little research existed about higher education faculty (Elliott, 1988). The National Center for Education Statistics conducted the National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty to prepare a baseline for faculty profiles. This national survey of postsecondary faculty was implemented as an effort to contribute to and to alleviate the lack of knowledge concerning higher education faculty (Elliott, 1988).

Little published data exists on faculty membership in professional organizations, especially HBCU, minority, and female faculty. To address the needs of its constituencies, some professional associations have conducted surveys. However, most survey data are not publicly available in printed form. To learn more about professional organizations and its members, this study solicited data from professional organizations to determine which organizations have surveyed their constituencies.

Statistics from 1981 showed that black faculty comprised 4.2 percent of all postsecondary education faculty, while black administrators comprised 6.8 percent of all postsecondary administrators (Sudarkasa, 1987). HBCUs employed the majority of these black faculty and

administrators. Published research about white institutions and white faculty dominates the existing published data. The subject of black faculty and administrators at white institutions is more widely researched and published than that of faculty and administrators at HBCUs (Moore, 1988; Elmore and Blackburn, 1983; Exum, 1983; Moore and Wagstaff, 1985; Williams, 1985; Harvey, 1987). Although some publications even exist describing white faculty at HBCUs (Brown and Donovan, 1980), published research describing institutions and faculty, especially HBCU institutions and faculty, beyond mere statistics is rarely available (National Center for Education Statistics, 1990).

Astin (1982) listed five major leakage points in the educational system that account for the underrepresentation of minorities in higher levels of employment. These five leakage points, where minority group members drop out of the educational system, include:

- o Completion of high school
- o Entry to college
- o Completion of college
- o Entry to graduate or professional school
- o Completion of graduate or professional school.

At each higher leakage point, the number of minorities decreased even more than the prior level thus creating a greater underrepresentation of minorities. The minority dropout rate in graduate school exceeded the dropout rate of whites (Astin, 1982). Therefore, the availability of qualified professionals to participate in the higher education arena began to drastically diminish (Astin, 1982). The last two leakage points of Astin's research identified the sources of many higher education faculty. The intent of this study was to attempt to eliminate the void of available research concerning the characteristics of higher education faculty. This study provided an opportunity to gather and present some written documentation describing characteristics of selected institutions of higher education and their social science faculty. These characteristics include:

- o Institutional support (public and private)
- o Institutional level (undergraduate and graduate)
- o Institutional origin (HBCU and non-HBCU)
- o Gender of faculty member (Male and Female)
- o Race of faculty member (black, white, and other)

- o Highest degree earned by faculty member
(Bachelor's, Master's, Doctorate, and other)
- o Discipline of faculty member
- o Faculty rank/position
- o Status of faculty member
- o Age range of faculty member

The intent of this research is to describe the membership pattern of social science higher education faculty in professional organizations. The membership of professional organizations, including its leadership may wish to review the reasons why faculty choose to participate or not to participate in organizational activities.

Researchers projected a shortage of higher education faculty members by the end of the 20th Century (Mooney, 1989). The results of the present study may offer the higher education community some insight to attracting new higher education faculty, thus ameliorating this shortage.

This study focused on three groups:

- o Selected four-year colleges and universities

- o Selected faculty members of these
institutions and their professional
organization affiliation
- o Selected professional organizations.

This study reports a synthesis of survey data and conclusions regarding professional organizations and their relationships to minority and female faculty. In addition, the results offer comparison data between faculty members of HBCUs and non-HBCUs.

Definitions

Black is the term used to describe Americans of African descent. This term is used interchangeably over time to include such references as colored, Negro, Afro-American, African-American, etc. For this study, the term **black** will be used, unless a reference specifically uses another term.

HBCU is the acronym for Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

Graduate educational programs are defined as those educational programs offered at the master's and doctoral levels.

Higher education refers to postsecondary institutions which offer educational programs beyond the high school diploma.

Institutional support defines whether an institution is public or private.

Institutional level defines whether an institution is

undergraduate or graduate.

Institutional origin refers to whether an institution is an HBCU or a non-HBCU.

Minority refers to persons of color, such as blacks, Asians, American Indian, pacific islanders, Africans, Hispanics, etc.

NAFEO is the acronym for the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education.

Professional organization is an interest group whose membership is composed of individuals in a selected discipline or group of disciplines.

Social science includes the disciplines of Economics, History, Political Science/Public Administration (including Government and International Relations), Sociology/Social Work, and Psychology.

UNCF is the acronym for the United Negro College Fund.

Undergraduate educational programs are described as those educational programs offered at the baccalaureate level.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This study focused on three groups:

- o Selected colleges and universities which
offer the four-year baccalaureate degree
at minimum
- o Selected social science faculty members of these
institutions and their professional
organization affiliations
- o Selected professional organizations

This chapter presents a review of literature framing the major components of the study. The review focused on four areas:

- o The Development of Historically
Black Colleges and Universities
- o The Development of Professional
Associations in Higher Education
- o Faculty Participation in Professional
Associations
- o Summary and Analysis

The Development of HBCUS

This section of the review of literature is divided into three parts:

- o General History and Chronological Development
- o Philanthropic and Funding Efforts
- o Summary

General History and Chronological Development.

Three Negro institutions of higher learning existed before the Civil War. The Quakers opened the first American Negro institution in 1837, Cheyney State University (PA). The Presbyterians followed with the opening of Lincoln University (PA) in 1854 and the Methodist Episcopal Church with the opening of Wilberforce University (OH) in 1856 (Pifer, 1973).

Prior to 1917 no formal study of the American Negro colleges existed (Department of the Interior: Bureau of Education, 1917). Two projects initiated the first formal study of American Negro colleges. The Phelps-Stokes Fund conducted the first study (1917) and the U.S. Bureau of Education conducted the second one (1928).

In 1917 the Phelps-Stokes Fund with the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, published a report entitled Negro Education: A Study of the Private and Higher Schools For Colored People in the United States. The first part of this report dealt with Negro higher education in general. The second part addressed the geographical distribution of Negro higher education. As the first comprehensive compilation of HBCUs, this report listed the status of each Negro institution, by counties within each state (Department of the Interior: Bureau of Education, 1917).

In 1928 the U.S. Bureau of Education conducted a Survey of Negro Colleges and Universities. The Bureau differentiated Negro institutions into four classes:

- 1) State controlled and publicly supported, including land-grant institutions (Seventeen states and the District of Columbia maintained separate institutions for both races);
- 2) Independently controlled and privately supported;
- 3) Supported and controlled by northern white denominational church boards; and

- 4) Supported and controlled by Negro denominational church boards.

The 1928 Bureau study defined three periods of growth and development among Negro institutions. Period one, from 1854 to 1870, marked the establishment of the first Negro institutions. Northern churches founded 18 colleges during this period. The first schools trained preachers, farmers, and tradesmen.

During Period two, from 1870 to 1890, as a result of the Morrill Acts (1862 and 1890) and the Nelson Amendment (1907), nine Negro land-grant colleges and thirteen other state institutions opened their doors.

Period three (1890-1928) represented the emergence of teacher training institutions. The number of Negro institutions grew from 31 institutions in 1916 to 79 in 1926, most of which centered around teacher training (U.S. Department of the Interior: Bureau of Education, 1928). Other formal studies of the Negro colleges emerged.

Dwight Holmes (1934) published one study which listed four categories to indicate the four sources of support to institutions of higher learning. The categories were:

- o The federal government
- o The Christian church
- o Seventeen southern and border states
- o Organized philanthropy

Dwight Holmes' (1934) study defined four periods of development among Negro institutions. In period one, from 1860 to 1885, Northern private and denominational groups, the Negro churches, and the Freedman's Bureau provided leadership in establishing the first Negro institutions.

Period two, from 1886 to 1916 was the second wave of development. From the beginning, the faculty of schools supported by Negro church denominations were Negroes. During this period, institutions supported by sources other than Negro church denominations, expanded their faculties' racial composition beyond white faculty only. These institutions hired for the first time Negro faculty members.

During period three, from 1917 to 1928, the Phelps-Stokes Fund conducted the first formal survey of Negro institutions. The fourth period, from 1928 to 1946, considered the development of institutions identified in the survey conducted by the U.S. Bureau of Education in 1928.

Holmes (1934) expanded the historical development of Negro institutions by adding a fourth period from 1928 to 1946. However, the Phelps-Stokes and Holmes studies do not define the same periods of development among Negro institutions; therefore, it is difficult to analyze the two studies simultaneously.

Holmes (1934) felt that the subject of higher education for Negroes, an educationally disadvantaged group, had not received the needed attention of researchers. Holmes cited several deficiencies of Negro institutions. He began by pointing out that at the time of the Emancipation Proclamation (at the end of the Civil War, 1863) only 10 percent of the newly freed men could read.

Holmes' study of HBCUs cited several deficiencies and their impact on the development of HBCUs.

- o After World War I, all colleges regardless of their constituencies faced the same problems.
- o The Negro population faced a low socio-economic status.

- o White Americans did not create colleges for

blacks with the same vigor and zeal as they did in creating colleges for their own children.

- o Northern and southern whites held differing views and attitudes on educating the Negroes.

Hence, a conflict arose between the two groups which affected the growth rate of HBCUs. As the institutions developed, so did the philanthropic and funding efforts to finance them.

Philanthropic and Funding Efforts. Frederick Rudolph (1962) in his book, The American College and University, discussed the founding of Harvard and Yale. John Harvard and Elihu Yale served as the major benefactors to provide financial support to these two institutions (Rudolph, 1962). Not one Negro institution was fortunate enough to receive the high amount of proceeds from a single donor like those received by Harvard and Yale (Department of the Interior: Bureau of Education, 1917).

The Phelps-Stokes Fund (1917) with the Bureau of Education conducted a study to "supply through an impartial investigation of a body of facts that could be available to

all interested, showing the status of Negro education..." and to illustrate the financial needs of Negro institutions (Department of the Interior: Bureau of Education, 1917). The study results provided the bases for the chronological development of Negro institutions.

The federal government set up the Freedman's Bureau at the close of the Civil War to provide emergency relief for Negro refugees and to promote economic stability among the freedmen. The Bureau also aided in the formation of educational institutions for the freedmen. Following these activities, the number of HBCUs began to increase substantially.

Although mandated in the first Morrill Act of 1862, most states did not set aside funds to educate the Negro. The second Morrill Act of 1890 allocated funds to establish separate schools for both races in 17 states. Seventeen HBCUs were created as a result of this act.

The U.S. government continued to be instrumental in providing subsistence for HBCUs. With the Higher Education Amendments of 1965, the U.S. Congress addressed the question of equal access by minorities to the higher

education system. Astin (1982) defined four sources which identify the types of federal assistance to higher education. These sources included:

- o Institutional aid
- o Student financial assistance
- o Special programs (Access and persistence)
- o Support for professional training and human resource development.

Sources other than the United States government also provided funding for HBCUs.

Several Christian and denominational-related groups furnished support and funding in the initiation of HBCUs, including:

- o American Missionary Association
- o Freedmen's Aid Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church
- o American Baptist Home Mission Society
- o The Presbyterian Church
- o African Methodist Episcopal Church
- o African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church
- o Colored Methodist Episcopal Church

- o Negro Baptist Church Conventions

Organized philanthropy was another source designated as instrumental in the development of Negro institutions. Several wealthy individuals of prominence donated monies specifically devoted to Negro education. Some individuals earmarked monies and set up special accounts to control these allocations. Several foundations allocated funds to support general education, with specific line items directed to support Negro institutions. These foundations included the John F. Slater Fund, the Daniel Hand Fund, the Julius Rosenwald Fund, and the Anna T. Jeanes Fund. Holmes hailed the Phelps-Stokes Fund as the largest source of distributing information about the Negro colleges. Notably, Phelps-Stokes has supported research efforts of the American government. Phelps-Stokes provided funds for the U.S. Bureau of Education to conduct its survey of Negro colleges in 1928 (Holmes, 1934).

Summary. The Historically Black College arose in direct response to the needs and desires of the newly freed slaves following the declaration of the Emancipation Proclamation. The HBCU provided an opportunity for these freed men to expand their educational horizons. Various

sources provided funds to HBCUs. All HBCUs now depend on federal, state, affiliation-related, and/or individual funding for their continued existence and survival.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

This section of the review of literature is divided into four parts:

- o General history
- o The participation of women in professional associations
- o Minority participation in professional associations
- o Summary

General History. Thackrey (1965) discussed the diversity and multiplicity of professional associations in higher education. He credited the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, formed in 1887, as the nation's oldest higher education organization. This organization was formed as a result of the Morrill Act of 1887, the second land-grant act. This act required the institutions receiving land-grant funds to form a support

organization to address common problems.

Several other organizations were formed after institutional officials sensed the necessity for networking and interacting to solve mutual problems. The American Council on Education (ACE) was formed during World War I to address the impact of federal wartime programs on colleges and universities. ACE, which identified its role as the "major coordinating body" for higher education, continued to function, even after the war. Church-related college officials formed the Association of American Colleges to serve as their forum.

During the next few decades after World War I, numerous professional associations appeared. Thackrey (1965) contended that the number of organizations representing various viewpoints and interests created the "Tower of Babel" effect. A multiplicity of organizations in the same field emerged to recruit from the same membership pool. Because it was sometimes not economically and practically feasible to join all of the available professional organizations, many faculty members were forced to limit their membership to one or more

organizations, therefore excluding others. This competition caused organizations to strive harder for autonomy, and to create a unique experience for their members. Organizations discarded the idea of networking for the sake of professional unity and identity. At the time of Thackrey's study (1965), one U.S. Office of Education publication listed more than 2,000 educationally related organizations (Thackrey, 1965).

The publication, Career Guide to Professional Organizations, listed 2,500 professional organizations connected with occupational fields (Carroll Press, 1980). The HEP 1989 Higher Education Directory listed almost 300 professional associations available to higher education personnel (Higher Education Publications, 1989).

According to the U.S. Department of Education, prior to the study conducted in 1988 by the National Center for Education Statistics very little research existed about higher education faculty. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) conducted the National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty in 1988 to prepare a baseline for faculty profiles. This national survey of postsecondary faculty was an effort to contribute to and to alleviate the

lack of knowledge concerning higher education faculty (Elliott, 1988).

Faculty in Higher Education Institutions, 1988, a report released by NCES in 1990, provided descriptive data reported by faculty. Two other reports, A Descriptive Report of Academic Departments in Higher Education Institutions and Institutional Policies and Practices Regarding Faculty in Higher Education, were released simultaneously with the former report. Each of these three studies will be administered and published every four years to increase the amount of published research about institutions of higher education and their faculty (National Center for Education Statistics, 1990).

Only a small portion of these reports detailed the professional activity of faculty members. According to chief academic officers at four-year institutions, these institutions allocated discretionary funds to full-time faculty for professional travel (97%) more than for any other type of professional development. Funds for professional association memberships were provided by 31% of all four-year institutions included in the NCES survey. The responses of faculty members about the use of internal

funds for faculty professional development were not published in the NCES faculty report (National Center for Education Statistics, 1990). The development of women's participation in professional organizations provided another perspective of the total development of professional organizations.

Participation of Women in Professional Associations. This part of the review of literature addressed the participation of women in the activities of professional associations.

Several professional organizations emerged to meet the needs of female professionals. These groups include the American Association of University Women (AAUW); the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors; the Association of Black Women in Higher Education, Inc.; and the National Association of University Women. Several organizations have utilized surveys to evaluate the effectiveness of the organization (McEwen and Shertzer, 1979; Soldwedel, 1979; Krenkel, 1975).

McEwen and Shertzer (1979) surveyed the membership of three professional associations for which college student

personnel composed the membership. These researchers utilized a survey instrument to assess the differences in attitudes among males and females concerning professional issues. The research revealed that a significant difference did exist between male and female attitudes for selected professional issues. Women sensed more existence of sex discrimination than men. Women were stronger in their beliefs about the importance of the women's movement in higher education and the importance of role models for women and black students. McEwen and Shertzer (1979) recommended a closer examination of the differences in attitudes concerning professional issues among its members. The researchers further proposed the consideration of possible reasons and implications which may account for the difference. The authors suggested that further studies be administered at five-year intervals to determine attitude changes concerning professional issues and trends (McEwen and Shertzer, 1979)

Soldwedel (1979) reported on the membership survey of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors (N.A.W.D.A.C.) The purpose of this survey, including preparation of a membership profile, was to identify the value of the organization as perceived by its

members and to identify trends among members. N.A.W.D.A.C. officers incorporated the results into the program planning of the organization (Soldwedel, 1979). One researcher conducted a study among the leadership of several professional organizations.

Krenkel (1975) administered a questionnaire to leaders of a selected group of professional associations. The researcher designed the questionnaire to describe the activities of various women's committees in professional organizations. The chairperson of each women's committee and/or caucus provided a description of the organization's activities which directly affect women (Krenkel, 1975). The development of minority participation in professional organizations offered another dimension to the total development of professional organizations.

Minority Participation in Professional Associations. Several other professional associations initiated their formation in reaction to the needs and interests of black constituencies. For instance, persons interested in literature, art and science founded the American Negro Academy in 1897. The Association for the Study of Negro Life and History began as the brainchild of

Dr. Carter G. Woodson (Hughes, 1983).

The Phelps-Stokes study (1917) referred to three educational associations for Negroes that existed at the time of its research: the National Association of Teachers in Colored Schools; the Conference of Educational Boards; and the Conference of Presidents of Negro Land-Grant Colleges. These organizations were formed as support groups for the officials of Negro institutions.

The National Association of Teachers in Colored Schools held annual meetings beginning in 1904. State auxiliaries also emerged in most Southern states. At the 1916 meeting members of two other associations attended: the Presidents of the Land-Grant Colleges and the Council of College Presidents.

The Conference of Educational Boards Representatives was convened in 1913 by a representative of the Slater and Jeanes Funds. Representatives from church supported institutions who received funds from the Slater and Jeanes Funds attended. The conference continued to meet semi-annually. Interested parties also organized the Association of Colleges for Negro Youth in 1913. Only

those institutions providing programs at the college level were considered for membership (Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, 1917).

The Conference of Presidents of Negro Land-Grant Colleges served as an informal opportunity for the administrators of these institutions to meet and share problems and ideas. The official organization emerged in 1923 as the Association of Negro Land-Grant Colleges (Orr, 1959).

Dr. Frederick D. Patterson framed the idea to support private HBCUs. The United Negro College Fund is hailed as the first cooperative fund-raising effort in American higher education. Launched in 1944 for 21 institutions, UNCF currently represents 42 HBCUs (UNCF, 1988).

To serve as the voice for all HBCUs, the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO) emerged in 1969 (CASE, 1987; NAFEO, 1979).

Greene (1946) conducted a study to profile Negroes with earned doctorates. The three parts of the study

included: (1) the type and source of the earned degrees, (2) a composite list by field, and (3) social, economic and political characteristics of this group. Results revealed that 200 respondents reported membership in 24 professional organizations. Greene (1946) suggested that further research should focus on the extent of affiliation with each organization, including membership and participation.

Some organizations formed primarily to address the concerns of female and/or minority persons. Some organizations conducted periodic surveys among their membership to determine the needs of their members and how these needs could be met by the organization. One such organization, the American Educational Research Association (AERA), organized a committee to address the concerns of minority members. The Standing Committee on the Role and the Status of Minorities in Educational Research and Development conducted a survey among its minority membership following the 1984 Annual Meeting of AERA. The survey included questions about the level of participation and activity at the meeting and the financial constraints associated with the meeting. Results showed that minorities who attended the meeting had a high rate of participation and indicated an interest in increasing their

participation in AERA activities.

Astin (1982) recommended that institutions recruit, hire, promote, and tenure minorities to solve the problem of underrepresentation among minorities. The field of education accounted for 50 percent of doctorates earned by blacks. He attributed the severe underrepresentation of minorities in other fields to this heavy concentration of minorities in education. Since the mid 1970's, little change has occurred in minority representation in higher education. The lack of participation by minorities in professional activities may be attributed to the underrepresentation of minorities in the occupational fields attracted by sponsoring professional associations. An increase in minority participation in higher education may yield an increase in the number of available minorities to compete for vacancies in various occupational capacities (Astin, 1982).

Summary. The federal government mandate, via the second Morrill Act, provided the impetus for the development of the first professional association. The professional organization surfaced to serve as a network for professionals to share and exchange ideas. Some

professional organizations surfaced in direct response to the needs of females and minorities. Today, most professional organizations endeavor to serve the needs of all persons, regardless of race, sex, color, or creed. However, some professional interest groups have been formed to address the concerns of minorities and/or females. To serve the needs of women and/or minorities, existing organizations implemented committee or task force efforts.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The methodology for this study centered on two categories. Category one addressed social science faculty at selected institutions of higher education and their relationships with professional associations. This category consisted of two segments. Segment A focused on selected four-year institutions. Segment B focused on the individual assessments of social science faculty members employed by the selected four-year institutions. Professional associations served as the subjects for category two.

Due to the variety of curricula offered by institutions, the focused area of this study was limited to the social sciences. The social science disciplines were also chosen because the most popular majors selected by undergraduates were in the social sciences (Astin, 1982). In 1982 social science degrees awarded made up 21 percent of all baccalaureate degrees and 20 percent of all doctorate degrees awarded to minorities. The social science majors ranked second only to the field of education in the percentage of doctorates awarded to minorities.

(Austin, 1982) The U.S. Department of Education identified the majors in the social sciences as:

- o Anthropology
- o Economics
- o History
- o Political Science (Government, International Relations)
- o Psychology
- o Social Work
- o Sociology
- o Other Social Sciences

(Astin, 1982)

According to data in the Arco publication, The Right College, a major in Anthropology was offered in only two HBCUs (The Right College, 1989). For this reason, anthropology was eliminated from this study. Most HBCUs included the following social sciences in their academic offerings. Therefore, to allow equivalent comparisons, the current study included the core of social science disciplines:

- o Economics
- o Political Science/Public Administration
- o History

- o Sociology/Social Work
- o Psychology

These disciplines provided the strategies for developing the data collection and analysis procedures used in the study.

Instruments

Instruments to address the specific research questions of this study did not exist. Therefore, three separate instruments were devised to gather data from the following three sources:

1. Selected professional associations;
2. Selected four-year institutions; and
3. Social science faculty members who were employed at the selected four-year institutions.

The questionnaires were reviewed to determine that the instruments requested valid data. The two reviewers were Susan Hill, a leading expert in the study of HBCUs, formerly with the U.S. Department of Education and Richard Jaeger, a leader in survey research methods with previous experience in the professional attitudes of North Carolina HBCU faculty. (See Appendix A to review the pilot

study instruments and Appendix B to review the revised instruments.)

Pilot Study - Category One

The University of North Carolina (UNC) at Chapel Hill and Duke University served as the pilot study institutions. These two institutions were designated for the following reasons:

- o UNC at Chapel Hill, the flagship institution for the UNC system, was selected as the model for public institutions.

- o Duke University, with the largest student enrollment among private North Carolina institutions, was selected as the model for private institutions.

To obtain general information from the institutions, the following procedures were implemented:

1. A questionnaire to collect data from each institution was designed and constructed. (See Appendix B.) These data served as input to form generalizations about the types of financial and

administrative support offered by institutions to their faculty members for their professional activities.

The questionnaire requested the following documents:

- a. A copy of the institution's catalog
- b. Historical sketch or overview
- c. Faculty/staff roster, by department.

The first two items provided additional documentation to supplement the data provided in the questionnaire. The faculty roster identified the social science faculty members to contact in Segment B.

2. The questionnaire was mailed to the institutional research directors and/or the chief academic administrator of the two institutions.

Duke University responded immediately. The Institutional Research Director at UNC-Chapel Hill decided not to provide the requested information, even after a phone follow-up. The UNC-Chapel Hill faculty directory provided the roster of faculty for each department. Each department chairperson supplied the requested departmental data.

The following procedures were implemented to assess the activity level of social science faculty in the professional associations:

1. A questionnaire to assess the professional activity of social science faculty was designed and constructed.
2. Each social science faculty member from these institutions received the questionnaire via mail. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was provided to each faculty member. Follow up, where necessary, was made via phone, mail and/or visit.
3. Based on the 237 responses received from the pilot institutions' social science faculty, the questionnaire was revised to include the changes indicated below.

No changes were made in the survey to institutions. Based on the responses from the pilot study institutions and the recommendations of the reviewers, the following minor changes were made to

the faculty questionnaire.

1. The numbering of some questions was changed to facilitate the ease of data entry.

2. In Section C of the faculty survey:
 - a. "Received professional journals" was added as a reason to affiliate with an organization. Twenty-six persons (11%) provided this response in the pilot study.

 - b. A question was added to solicit the specific number of memberships held by the faculty member.

 - c. Some faculty members in the pilot study provided the acronyms of professional organizations. Others provided information in which the writing was not legible. For these reasons, the question was amended to read:

Print the full names of the organizations with which you have chosen to affiliate and indicate your level of membership via the chart

below.

3. In Section D, a question was added to indicate the number of nonmemberships of the faculty member.

(Refer to Appendix B. The changed items on the questionnaire are indicated with an asterisk.)

Table 1 contains the frequencies for those persons who responded to the survey by institution and discipline. Table 2 contains those persons who responded to the survey by discipline (institutions combined). (All tables may be referenced in Appendix E).

Insert Table 1 about here

Insert Table 2 about here

Pilot Study - Category Two

The following procedures were implemented to obtain and assess information from professional associations:

1. A questionnaire was designed and constructed to obtain data from professional associations identified by the selected social science faculty. (See Appendix B.) These data served as input to form some generalizations about the efforts of professional associations to recruit, retain, and reclaim minority and female members;

2. A pilot study was conducted with the questionnaire using professional associations not related to the social sciences. (See Appendix B);

3. Those professional associations identified by the social science faculty received the questionnaire via mail. Follow up was made via phone, mail and/or visit, as necessary.

Based on the recommendation of Ms. Susan Hill, the wording in the survey to professional organizations was changed from research to evaluation. Due to the lack of available data, the professional organizations were asked for a list of regional and state affiliated organizations.

The data collected in the pilot study served as a guide and benchmark for comparative uses in the actual study.

Procedures For Category One

Category one of this study dealt specifically with the participation of higher education faculty in professional associations.

Category one consisted of two segments. Segment A focused on four-year institutions. Segment B focused on the assessments of individual faculty members employed by four-year institutions.

Segment A.

Population. Currently, 89 institutions across the United States are designated as HBCUs. The state of Alabama holds the record as the state with the most HBCUs (12) and North Carolina has the second most. The eleven North Carolina HBCUs are classified as five public and six private.

Forty-eight institutions of higher education are located in North Carolina: 16 public and 32 private. (UNC, 1989)

For this study, North Carolina institutions served as the population for Segment A. North Carolina was selected due to the number of HBCUs in the state and the even balance between public and private HBCUs.

Institutions which offered at minimum the four-year bachelor's degree served as the selection criteria for inclusion in this study. Four distinct characteristics were identified in Segment A:

- o Public undergraduate institutions
- o Private undergraduate institutions
- o Public graduate institutions
- o Private graduate institutions

The faculty members of the institutions identified in Segment A served as the population of Segment B.

Sample Selection. The eleven North Carolina HBCUs characterized by level of instruction and source of support yielded the following array:

- o Public undergraduate (2);
- o Private undergraduate (6);
- o Public graduate (3) ; and
- o Private graduate (0) .

Because North Carolina did not have a private graduate HBCU, this characteristic was deleted from the sample.

A North Carolina non-HBCU institution was selected and paired with each North Carolina HBCU. The following factors provided the basis for the selection and pairing of institutions:

- 1) Institutional support (Private or public)
- 2) Faculty size
- 3) Student enrollment
- 4) Institutional level (Undergraduate or graduate)

The number of North Carolina institutions included in the sample totaled twenty-two: eleven HBCU and eleven non-HBCU. (Refer to Appendix C for a list of the paired institutions.)

The Statistical Abstract of Higher Education in North Carolina, 1988-90 provided the parameters for the characteristics assigned to each institution. (UNC, 1989)

To obtain general information from the institutions, the following procedures were implemented:

1. The questionnaire revised from the pilot study was employed to collect data from each institution. These data served as a base to form generalizations about the types of financial and administrative support offered by institutions to their faculty members for their professional activities. The questionnaire sought these documents as outlined in the pilot study.
2. The questionnaire was mailed to the institutional research directors and/or the academic dean of the selected institutions. A follow-up was made via phone and/or mail to the above named personnel or directly to the social science departments. Following this phase, it was possible to proceed to the next one.

Segment B.

Population. The population of Segment B consisted of the social science faculty members employed at the institutions identified in Segment A.

Sample Selection. The social science faculty at the selected institutions in Segment A comprised the sample. The documents collected in Segment A were used to identify these faculty members.

The following procedures were implemented to assess the activity level of social science faculty in the professional associations:

1. The questionnaire revised from the pilot study was employed to assess the professional activity of social science faculty.
2. The social science faculty from these institutions received the questionnaire via mail. Follow-up, where necessary, was made via phone, mail and/or visit.

Procedures For Category Two

The following procedures were implemented to obtain and assess information from professional associations:

1. The questionnaire was revised to obtain data from professional associations identified by the selected social science faculty. These data served as input to collect data about the efforts of professional associations to recruit, retain, and reclaim minority and female members;
2. The chief administrative officer or the president of those professional associations identified by the social science faculty received the questionnaire via mail. Follow-up was made via phone, mail and/or visit, as necessary.

The documents and data collected in the pilot study served as a guide and benchmark for comparative uses in the actual study.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The research questions for this study were divided into two categories. The first addressed selected institutions which offer the baccalaureate degree or higher and their social science faculty members. The second addressed selected international, national, state and local professional organizations.

Survey research provided the opportunity to generalize the results and findings. Measures of central tendency and frequency distributions allow such generalizations to be formed. Non-numeric data are presented in tabular and list formats. Numeric data are presented displaying measures of central tendency and frequency distributions. After consultation with the UNC-G Statistical Lab, the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) package was recommended and selected as the computer software package to manipulate numeric data. The results of the research are presented by category in the order of the research questions enumerated in Chapter 1.

Category One.

The first category of this study addressed four-year institutions and their social science faculty members. A survey instrument was administered to the institutional representatives of selected institutions in the state of North Carolina. A separate survey was sent to the social science faculty of the previous institutions.

Nine out of twenty-two (40.9%) institutions completed and returned the institutional survey. Refer to Table 3. The characteristics of the institutions included in the study are summarized in Table 4.

Insert Table 3 about here

Insert Table 4 about here

Representing the twenty-two institutions, a total of 245 faculty members responding to the survey indicated membership in a professional organization. Because the

faculty rosters could not be released, the department secretaries at North Carolina State University (NCSU) distributed the surveys. Therefore, the total population at NCSU was unknown. The survey return rate for the faculty survey instrument was 38.2%, not including the NCSU faculty respondents.

Table 5 summarizes the characteristics of the institutions of these survey respondents. The characteristics of the social science faculty members responding as members of a professional organization are summarized in Tables 6-8.

Insert Table 5 about here

Insert Table 6 about here

Insert Table 7 about here

Insert Table 8 about here

Ninety persons (38%) who indicated membership were employed at North Carolina State University, the most faculty members employed by a single institution who responded to the survey. It also represents the institution with the most employees included in the survey.

A total of 20 persons indicated nonmembership in professional organizations. Table 9 summarizes the characteristics of the institutions of these survey respondents. Tables 10-12 contain data which describe the characteristics of persons responding to the survey who indicated that they were not members of a professional organization.

Insert Table 9 about here

Insert Table 10 about here

Insert Table 11 about here

Insert Table 12 about here

Four research questions provided the direction for conducting the research in this category. The results are presented in the order of the research questions.

QUESTION 1. With which professional organizations do social science faculty members associate, especially those organizations directly related to their discipline?

Table 13 lists the frequencies of professional organizations by discipline as enumerated by participating social science faculty. In reviewing the compilation of professional organizations by discipline, one professional organization was not found in the compilation of every discipline. Social science faculty in the sociology/social work discipline revealed 151 different organizations with

which they affiliate, the highest number of any discipline. The social science faculty in the economics discipline indicated 71 different professional organizations with which they affiliate, the lowest frequency of any discipline. Appendix D lists those organizations identified by social science faculty members.

Insert Table 13 about here

Table 14 summarizes the number of memberships of social science faculty by the institutional type for persons responding who indicated membership in professional organizations. Table 15 summarizes the number of nonmemberships of the same.

Insert Table 14 about here

Insert Table 15 about here

Insert Table 16 about here

QUESTION 2. What factors determine how those faculty members who are members of professional organizations select the organization(s) with which they affiliate?

Tables 17-18 summarize the responses of social science faculty members to a prepared list of employee benefits offered to them by their respective institutions based on their membership in professional organizations. The items which faculty members indicated as an employee benefit offered by their institutions were:

- o Time off for national/international (66.5%), regional (65.7%), and state/local (63.0%) participation in the activities of professional organizations (See Table 18.);
- o Cover partial costs of national/international (68.6%), regional (65.3%), and state/local (58.8%) conferences (See Tables 17-18).

Insert Table 17 about here

Insert Table 18 about here

The social science faculties were asked to indicate their level of activity in professional organizations from a prepared list. Additionally, they were given the option to list other activities. Tables 19-24 contain the results of responses by faculty members to the prepared list of activities.

Insert Table 19 about here

Insert Table 20 about here

Insert Table 21 about here

Insert Table 22 about here

Insert Table 23 about here

Insert Table 24 about here

In most instances, in all items on the preselected list the faculties chose national/international activities over regional and state/local activities. The factor receiving the highest percentage of selection was national professional development (80.4%). (See Table 19.) Participation in national meetings (75.5%) was the factor receiving the next highest percentage of selection. (See Table 19.) Serving as a state/local officer (16.3%) was

the only item where the frequency of persons responding to a local item was higher than national (14.7%) and regional (13.9%). (See Tables 21 and 22.) The factor which was checked the least number of times was **other state/local reasons (for affiliation) (99.2%)**. (See Table 24.)

QUESTION 3. What factors influence faculty members not to affiliate with professional associations?

Tables 25-26 summarize the responses to a prepared selection list by social science faculty who indicated nonmembership in a professional organization. Whether at the national (42.9%), regional (42.9%) or state/local (42.9%) level, cost received the highest frequency for why nonmembers of professional organizations chose not to affiliate with a professional organization.

Insert Table 25 about here

Insert Table 26 about here

Most social science faculties who are members of professional organizations indicated that their decisions not to affiliate with some professional organizations were attributed to the following factors:

- o National/international (97.1%), regional (97.1%) and state/local (97.6%) dues are not borne by the institution. (Refer to Table 23.)
- o National/international (91.4%), regional (93.5%) and state/local (95.9%) other related costs are not paid by the institution. (Refer to Table 23.)
- o National/international (89.0%), regional (89.0%) and state/local (91.4%) affiliation is not because of the professional memberships of colleagues at the home institution of the faculty member. (Refer to Table 22.)
- o Any jobs received were not due to affiliation with a professional organization at a national/international (94.7%) level, regional level (97.1%) and/or state/local

level (98%). (Refer to Table 23-24.)

QUESTION 4. What are the perceived positive and negative outcomes of joining and/or not joining a particular professional organization to a minority and/or female faculty member?

Summararies of faculty member responses to a prepared list of activities were prepared by sex and by race, respectively. Tables 27-32 contain the responses of female faculty members. Tables 34-38 contain the results of male faculty members. The activity identified by faculty members, regardless of sex, was that a job was not due to state or local affiliation with a professional organization at the same percentage (98%).

The responses of black faculty members and white faculty members are summarized in Tables 39-43 and Tables 44-49, respectively. Regardless of race, faculty members selected attendance at national meetings as an important professional activity at the same percentage (76%). Additionally, at the same percentage, race was selected as not a factor for affiliation with a professional association with the following items:

- o Regional dues were not paid by the institution (97%);
- o Regional affiliation with a professional association was not because of colleagues at other institutions;
- o Did not serve as a national officer;
- o Affiliation at the regional level was not due to other factors.

Tables 50 and 51 summarize memberships and non-memberships by sex and race. The frequency of persons by sex responding to this survey as members of a professional organization were 61 females (24.9%) and 182 males (74.3%). (Refer to Table 8.) The frequency of persons by sex responding to this survey as nonmembers of a professional organization were 2 females (13.3%) and 13 males (86.7%). (Refer to Table 12.) Table 12 shows that the largest minority group represented in the sample were blacks, 38 who were members (15.5%) and 1 black who was not a member (6.7%). The minorities, not including blacks who responded to the survey as members, (Asians, Pacific islanders, American Indian and other races) totaled 9 persons (3.7%) The total of all minorities in the sample represented 47 persons who were members (19.2%) and 1 nonmember (6.6%).

The group with the highest number of average professional memberships by race and institutional level was black graduate faculty members at 5.38 as shown in Table 53. Female graduate faculty members indicated the highest number of average professional memberships by sex and institutional level at 4.53. (Refer to Table 54.)

Insert Table 27 about here

Insert Table 28 about here

Insert Table 29 about here

Insert Table 30 about here

Insert Table 31 about here

Insert Table 32 about here

Insert Table 33 about here

Insert Table 34 about here

Insert Table 35 about here

Insert Table 36 about here

Insert Table 37 about here

Insert Table 38 about here

Insert Table 39 about here

Insert Table 40 about here

Insert Table 41 about here

Insert Table 42 about here

Insert Table 43 about here

Insert Table 44 about here

Insert Table 45 about here

Insert Table 46 about here

Insert Table 47 about here

Insert Table 48 about here

Insert Table 49 about here

Insert Table 50 about here

Insert Table 51 about here

Insert Table 52 about here

Insert Table 53 about here

Insert Table 54 about here

Insert Table 55 about here

Insert Table 56 about here

Insert Table 57 about here

Insert Table 58 about here

Category Two.

The subject for this category of the study was international, national, state, regional, and local professional associations in the social sciences. Three research questions provided the focus for this category. The results are presented in the order of the research questions as presented in the methodology section of this report.

A survey instrument was administered to the subjects of this category to develop baseline data regarding characteristics of professional organizations and its memberships.

RESEARCH QUESTION 5. What professional organizations and/or associations are available to social science faculty at higher education institutions by institution and by selected social science disciplines?

The responses indicate that many of the social science faculties choose to affiliate with professional associations because of their disciplines. Yet there are some respondents who choose to affiliate with professional organizations which may not be discipline-related. Some faculty members choose to affiliate with some professional associations because the organization's aims, goals and activities appeal to the individual interest of the faculty member. Appendix D contains the list of professional organizations by discipline selected by social science faculty members.

RESEARCH QUESTION 6. What is the membership composition of each organization and/or association by race and by sex?

This information is based on the data collected from those professional associations which responded to the questionnaire. This comparison illustrated the level of success or failure of professional organizations to meet the professional needs of minorities and/or females. A comparison was made between the survey information collected from the professional organizations for 1980 and for 1988. Tables 59 and 60 summarize the profile data for 1980 and for 1988, respectively. The largest percent change in membership occurred in the Asian membership (77.8%). A decrease in membership occurred among male and female memberships, -7.1% and -9.1%, respectively. Table 61 summarizes the percent change between the two years 1980 and 1988.

RESEARCH QUESTION 7. What organizations and/or associations in selected disciplines make special efforts to recruit, retain, and reclaim minority and/or female professionals? What special efforts have organizations made?

Each professional organization was asked to respond to questions concerning its special efforts to recruit women and minorities. Table 62 provides a summary of the survey responses for professional organizations when asked about

their special efforts toward minority and/or female professionals. Only 10 professional organizations responding to the survey have a special committee to address the professional needs of minorities (27%). Eleven professional organizations responding to the survey have a special committee to address the professional needs of women (27%). The recruitment of minority members occurs in 6 organizations (16.2%). The recruitment of female members occurs in 5 organizations (13.5%). Of those with recruiting efforts, an evaluation of the recruiting effort rarely takes place nor does a written annual report exist.

Insert Table 62 about here

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS

Background and Overview.

This chapter begins with an overview of the study. Further discussion centers around the following points:

- o The findings of this study and its implications;
- o The conclusions of the study; and
- o The recommendations resulting from the study.

The first institutions of higher education in America were founded to serve the needs of white males only. Almost two hundred years after the first institution was founded, college administrators and sponsors saw the need to offer higher education to white women and minorities. Access to other educational services and activities for women and minorities followed a similar pattern of exclusion. Through the persistence of Americans who formed interest groups, however, these barriers and obstacles were turned to stepping stones.

The professional organization is one example of an interest group. Many members of professional organizations

often form networks and develop professional relationships among themselves. Professional associations also serve as a source of continuing professional development.

Many professional associations initially did not include minorities and women in their activities (Orr, 1959). In recent years, members of several professional organizations have made concerted efforts to respond to the needs of their female and minority members. Efforts to increase the membership composition by race and sex have been prevalent in several organizations. The intent of this study was to seek answers to the questions that follow. Why do minority and female faculty members choose not to participate in the activities of professional associations? Why are faculty members who are employed by HBCUs underrepresented in or not present at professional meetings and activities?

Purpose of Study

This study sought to provide the answer to the above questions by:

- 1) Identifying factors which affect the decisions of selected social science faculty to affiliate or not to affiliate with specific professional

organizations;

- 2) Identifying the efforts of selected professional organizations to recruit, retain, and reclaim minority and female higher education faculty; and
- 3) Making recommendations to professional associations, university administrators, and other interested parties about professional affiliations of minority and/or female faculty members.

This study focused on three subject groups:

- o Selected North Carolina four-year colleges and universities;
- o Social science faculty members of these selected institutions and their professional activities; and
- o Selected professional organizations as indicated by these faculty.

This study reported the survey results regarding professional organizations and their relationships to social science faculty members. Therefore, the results offer baseline data to compare the individual and institutional characteristics of faculty. These characteristics include origin and level of the institution and the sex, race, discipline, age, rank and status of the faculty member. A review of the literature indicates that no previous research exists to support or to refute the results of this survey.

In recent years, several professional associations have made attempts to respond to the needs of their minority and female constituencies. Many professional associations formed committees and special interest groups and provided special services to their constituents. For example, some professional associations have attempted to serve the needs of their members based on the results of surveys. These surveys conducted by professional associations requested information which sought to determine how to better serve the needs and the interests of their memberships. Other organizations extended fellowships to encourage minorities and/or females to join.

Major Findings.

Although a response rate of 38.2% appears low, the sample is representative of the population of those institutions responding to the institutional survey. Table 63 illustrates the representativeness of the faculty members responding to the faculty survey. Refer to Tables 64 - 86 for further statistical computations and variations.

Insert Table 63 about here

Insert Table 64 about here

Insert Table 65 about here

Insert Table 66 about here

Insert Table 67 about here

Insert Table 68 about here

Insert Table 69 about here

Insert Table 70 about here

Insert Table 71 about here

Insert Table 72 about here

Insert Table 73 about here

Insert Table 74 about here

Insert Table 75 about here

Insert Table 76 about here

Insert Table 77 about here

Insert Table 78 about here

Insert Table 79 about here

Insert Table 80 about here

Insert Table 81 about here

Insert Table 82 about here

Insert Table 83 about here

Insert Table 84 about here

Insert Table 85 about here

Insert Table 86 about here

Of those social science faculties participating in the survey, 236 persons (94%) indicated membership in a professional association. The typical social science faculty member participating in the survey who indicated professional organization membership was profiled as white male, tenured associate professor in sociology, between the ages of 40-49, and employed by a public, graduate, non-HBCU institution.

A total of 20 persons indicated nonmembership in professional organizations. The typical social science faculty member participating in the survey who indicated no professional organization membership was profiled as white male, tenured professor or associate professor in Economics, between the ages of 60-69, and employed by a private undergraduate non-HBCU.

In comparison, the size of the social science faculty at North Carolina State was far greater than any other institution. It is interesting to point out that 92 persons (39%) in the survey who indicated membership in professional organizations were employees of North Carolina State University. The survey results may be distorted due to the high number of faculty members employed at one institution who are included in the survey. Therefore, the survey results may not be typical of the total population. Eliminating this group from the population may reveal a different typical profile.

The group with the highest average number of memberships in professional organizations (4.6) was faculty employed by public graduate non-HBCU institutions. The group with the highest number of average professional memberships by race and institutional level (5.56) was black faculty employed by undergraduate institutions. The group with the highest number of average professional memberships by sex and institutional level (4.47) was female faculty members employed by graduate institutions.

The item receiving the highest percentage of selection by faculty was national professional development (80.5%).

The item receiving the next highest percentage was the participation at national meetings (75%). The item selected the least number of times was other state/local reasons for affiliation (99.1%).

Most social science faculty members indicated that their decisions not to affiliate with some professional organizations were attributed to the following factors:

- o International/national (97.5%), regional (97%) and state/local (97.9%) dues are not borne by the institution.
- o International/national (91.5%), regional (93.2%) and state/local (95.8%) other related costs are not paid by the institution.
- o Affiliation with a professional organization did not result in jobs received (secured) at the international/national (94.5%), regional (97%) and/or state/local (97.9%) levels.

The nonmember respondents identified several factors which influenced the decision of faculty members not to

affiliate with professional associations. These included cost (36%), meetings (25%), dues (14%) and none (no particular factor) (7.62%).

The following factors listed by a few faculty members may require further research attention:

- o Time/professional conflict
- o Unrelated/wrong emphasis (to professional interests)
- o Organizations sell mailing lists
- o Too many and/or useless publications
- o Travel distance (to conferences and meetings)
- o Little or no university support.

Although these factors were listed by a low number of respondents, they may provide some research potential for future related studies.

Only ten (27%) professional organizations responding to the survey have a special committee for minorities. Eleven (29.7%) professional organizations have a special committee for women. Recruitment for minority membership occurs in six (16.2%) organizations. Recruitment for

female membership occurs in five (13.5%) organizations. Of those with recruiting efforts, an evaluation of the recruiting effort rarely takes place.

Implications of the Study.

Several implications can be inferred as a result of the mean number of professional nonmemberships among social science faculty:

- o Faculty members felt they were affiliated with the professional organizations which they deemed important.
- o Faculty members could not financially afford the costs of any or a limited number of memberships.
- o Faculty members were not aware of all available professional organizations.

Further research should be conducted to determine the validity and reliability of these inferences.

Potential Problems in Research Design.

With each survey conducted a unique set of problems were identified. Unfortunately, the written word may take on different meanings to individual readers. Even after review by "experts", this was difficult to foresee. Therefore, the written instrument was prepared as clearly as possible to solicit the anticipated and expected responses. Potential problems will be discussed below in the order of the three subject groups: institutions, faculty members and professional organizations.

An attempt to locate an agency within the state of North Carolina with the responsibility to centralize data collection for higher education across the state came to no avail. The Director of Institutional Research for the University of North Carolina General Administration indicated that faculty characteristics of race, sex and other variables was not available.

One initial problem encountered in the institutional survey was how to develop a uniform set of procedures which could be implemented at each institution, since the hierarchial structure of each institution was not the same. For each institution within the University of North

Carolina system, an office of institutional research could readily be identified. However, the task of identifying the counterpart office at the private institutions was not so easy. Most of these institutions did not have such an office. The research component at the private institution was often subsumed under various positions such as provost, dean, etc., but a consistent position at each institution could not be identified. In some instances there was difficulty in obtaining a completed written instrument from an institutional official.

Problems were also encountered with administering the faculty survey. Some faculty members did not return the survey, even after follow-up efforts. Several threats to validity affected the study. The printed list of academic officials and social science faculty for this study in many instances was not current and accurate. Turnover or reassignment of higher education faculty was difficult to control. An extended education leave or illness caused another obstacle. Another factor for consideration was the timing of mailings with school breaks and peak periods in calendar which were crucial to the return rate of the instruments.

The instrument prepared for the professional organization was no exception to the consideration of general problems associated with devising effective instruments. No one source existed to identify the elected leadership or the mailing address of the professional organization to which the survey instrument should have been addressed. A request to the faculty members to provide an address for the organization which they listed may have increased the amount of time required to complete the faculty survey. This increase in time may have led to a further decrease in the return rate. A common problem with printed data is that the information listed sometimes is not accurate due to error or the changes which occur after the date of publication.

Suggestions for Further Research.

No other studies exist with which the results of this particular study can be compared. The U.S. Department of Education has made a commitment to conduct the higher education faculty survey every four years. What happens in the interim? In the wake of state of the art technology, where does the buck stop in the lack of available information on the subject of higher education? Who is to blame? Does higher education deserve more attention than

it is currently receiving? A data base of higher education characteristics should be established for the state of North Carolina and other states in an attempt to fill the gaps of information about faculty at each institution, each level, state-wide and nation-wide.

It is recommended that the study be replicated to further validate the findings. It is hoped that the results of this survey will fill some gaps in the void of research that exists to characterize higher education faculty. This study should be validated not only within the state of North Carolina for social science disciplines, but beyond the confines of the state and for all academic disciplines.

Further research may reveal more concrete patterns of how membership selections are made. Other patterns of association about professional membership activity may be revealed. Because no previous research exists on the professional membership activity of faculty, in addition to the replication of the current study, studies are suggested to include some combination of the following characteristics:

- o Institutional support- public only, private only
- o Institutional level- undergraduate only,
graduate only
- o Institutional origin- HBCU only, non-HBCU only
- o Faculty by individual social science discipline
- o Faculty by other individual and/or related
disciplines
- o Faculty by all disciplines
- o Sex of faculties- male only, female only
- o Race of faculties- black only, white only, other
minorities only, and combinations of blacks,
whites, and/or other minorities
- o Age range of faculties at 10-year intervals
- o Faculty rank/position at each rank and
combination of ranks
- o Faculty status by tenured only, non-tenured
only, full-time only, part-time only and
combinations of the above

The U.S. Department of Education should redirect its energies beyond primary and secondary education toward higher education. Future studies and analyses of the data collected by the National Center for Educational Statistics may be helpful in providing the impetus for developing

theories and determining patterns about the professional activities of social science faculty. What other concerns for higher education should be addressed at the time of the survey or in another survey?

The underrepresentation of minorities and females may continue to exist in the membership of professional associations because of the underrepresentation throughout the educational system. Some organizations' goals and membership composition do not address the needs of minorities and/or females. The underrepresentation of minorities in these organizations may lead to less attention to the needs of minorities and/or females. Members of professional organizations should demand that organizational programming reflect the interests of their memberships.

How can the "Tower of Babel" effect be eliminated? Leaders of professional organizations may need to convene a symposium similar to a job fair to explain and to market the services of each professional organization and/or association. This idea could be piloted on a small-scale with hopes of expansion to all professional associations. Some evaluation of the services offered by professional

associations should be conducted to include the level of satisfaction with the services provided to members. This may lead to merger due the duplicity of services, objectives and members. A checklist of do's and don'ts in selecting membership in a professional organization could be prepared. Members of professional organizations should ask for accountability of its officers to offer programming in response to the needs of the membership.

Coupled with the diminishing number of available faculty, institutions across the nation are experiencing cutbacks in budget allocations to higher education. Most institutions of higher education require faculty to participate in professional development. What measures will university administrators implement as an indication of the institutions' commitment to this thrust? Have institutions and their faculty members assumed a laissez-faire attitude toward the area of professional development?

Institutional and professional association officials as well as faculty members and federal and state government officials must place a higher priority on higher education if America expects to continue to be a leader in the field. If the expectations of higher education are high, then

signs of a visible, stronger commitment must come forth. These players must apply long-range and short-range planning techniques to the collection of data about institutions of higher education, higher education faculty and other components of higher education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AERA, Committee on the role and status of minorities.
(1986). Minority Participation in the 1984 AERA Annual Meeting. Educational Researcher, 12-16.
- Albright, R.L. (1978). A summary analysis of the history, contributions, and future of the historically negro colleges (MCAFA Special Research Report, #11-78-2). Moton Consortium on Admissions and Financial Aid.
- Astin, A.W. (1982). Minorities in american higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Brown, C.I. and Donovan, D.M. (1988). White faculty at historically black institutions: A pilot study. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Atlanta, GA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED224368.)
- Brown, S.V. (1988). Increasing minority faculty: An elusive goal. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Career guide to professional associations 2nd Ed. (1980). Cranston, RI: The Carroll Press Publishers.

- College Research Group of Concord Massachusetts. (1988).
The right college 1989. New York: Arco Publishing.
- Curti, M. and Nash, R. (1965). Philanthropy in the
shaping of american higher education. New Brunswick,
NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Department of the Interior: Bureau of Education. 1917).
Negro education: A study of the private and higher
schools for colored people in the united states.
Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Elliott, E.J. (1988). National survey of postsecondary
faculty: faculty questionnaire. Washington: Center for
Educational Statistics.
- Elliott, E.J. (1988). National survey of postsecondary
faculty: Institutional questionnaire. Washington:
Center for Educational Statistics.
- Elliott, E.J. (1988). National survey of postsecondary
faculty: Questionnaire for departments (or comparable
units). Washington: Center for Educational Statistics.

- Elmore, C.J. and Blackburn, R.T. (1983). Black and white faculty in white research universities. Journal of higher education, 54 (1), 1-15.
- Exum, W.H. (1983). Climbing the crystal stair: Values, affirmative action, and minority faculty. Social Problems, 30 (4).
- Greene, H.W. (1946, reprint 1974). Holders of doctorates among American Negroes. Newton, MA: Crofton Publishing Corporation.
- Harvey, W.B. (1987). An ebony view of the ivory tower: Memories of a black faculty member. Change, 19 (3), 46-49.
- Hill, S.T. (1984). The traditionally black institutions of higher education: 1860-1982. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics.
- Holmes, D.O.W. (1934, reprint 1969). The evolution of the Negro college. New York: Arno Press and the New York Times.

Jaeger, R.M. and Cole, C.M. (1987-88). An assessment of the utility types of educational research assistance: Perceptions of faculty at historically black institutions of the University of North Carolina. National forum of applied educational research journal, 1, (1), 14-22.

Jones, T.J. (Ed.) (1969). Negro education: A study of the private and higher schools for colored people in the United States. New York: Arno Press and the New York Times.

Krenkel, N. (1975). Activities of women's committees in a sample of professional associations. Educational Researcher, 25-28.

Mayhew, L.B. (1973). The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

McEwen, M. and Shertzer, B. (1979). An analysis of differences in professional attitudes and beliefs between male and female members of the college student personnel profession. In M.C. Berry, ed., Women in educational administration. Washington: The National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 79-86.

- McGrath , E.J. (1965). The predominantly Negro colleges and universities in transition. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Minority student enrollments in higher education. (1987).
Garrett Park, MD: Garrett Park Press.
- Mooney, C. J. In 2003, colleges may need to recruit a third more professors than in '89. The Chronicle of Higher Education, xxxv (45), A1, A10.
- Moore, W.M. (1988). Black faculty in white colleges: A dream deferred. Educational Researcher, 117-120.
- Moore, W.M. and Wagstaff, L.H. (1985). Black educators in white colleges: Progress and prospect. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Orr, C.L. (1959). An analytical study of the conference of presidents of negro land-grant colleges. Published doctoral dissertation, College of Extended Education, Lexington, KY.
- Pifer, A. (1974). The higher education of blacks. New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Rudolph, F. (1962). The American college and university.
New York: Vintage Books.

Soldwedel, B. J. (1979). The profile of N.A.W.D.A.C.
members, 1976. In M.C. Berry, ed., Women in
educational administration. Washington: The National
Association for Women Deans, Administrators and
Counselors, 158-164.

Sudarkasa, N. (1987). Affirmative action or affirmation
of the status quo? AAHE Bulletin, 39, (6), 3-6.

Thackrey, R.I. (1965). National organization in higher
education. In L. Wilson, ed., Emerging patterns in
American higher education. Washington: American
Council on Education, 236- 249.

The hep 1989 higher education directory. (1989). Falls
Church, VA: Higher Education Publications, Inc.

The University of North Carolina. (1989). Statistical
abstract of higher education in North Carolina, 1988-
89. Chapel Hill: Author.

Thompson, D.C. (1973). Private black colleges at the
crossroads. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, Inc.

U.S. Department of Education: National Center for Education Statistics. (1990). A descriptive report of academic departments in higher education. Washington: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education: National Center for Education Statistics. (1990). Faculty in higher education institutions. Washington: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education: National Center for Education Statistics. (1990). Institutional policies and practices regarding faculty in higher education. Washington: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of the Interior: Bureau of Education. (1928). Survey of Negro colleges and universities. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Whiting, A.N. (1988). Standing at the crossroads: traditionally black colleges today. In Minorities in public higher education: At a turning point (45-64). Washington: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Williams, L.E. (1988). Public policies and financial exigencies: Black colleges twenty years later, 1965-1985. Journal of black studies, 19 (2), 135-149.

Williams, S.S. (1985). Surviving double jeopardy in academe: Minority female administrators at predominantly white universities. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, Milwaukee, WI.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY OF INSTITUTIONS

Institution Name: _____
 Mailing Address: _____
 City/State/Zip: _____
 Telephone Number: _____
 Date of Founding: _____ (01)

Statistical Distribution by Status:

(Indicate the numbers. If not available, indicate N/A.)

_____ Full-time Grad Students (02) _____ Part-time Grad Students (03)
 _____ Full-time Undergrad Students (04) _____ Part-time Undergrad Students (05)
 _____ Full-time Faculty (06) _____ Part-time Faculty (07)
 _____ Tenured Faculty (08) _____ Non-Tenured Faculty (09)
 _____ Undergraduate (Only) Faculty (10) _____ Graduate (Only) Faculty (11)
 _____ Undergraduate and Graduate Faculty (12)

Faculty By Rank/Position

_____ Professor (13) _____ Associate Professor (14)
 _____ Assistant Professor (15) _____ Instructor (16)
 _____ Other (17): Please specify _____

Faculty by Discipline:

	PART-TIME FACULTY	FULL-TIME FACULTY
History	_____ (17)	_____ (18)
Philosophy	_____ (19)	_____ (20)
Psychology	_____ (21)	_____ (22)
Sociology	_____ (23)	_____ (24)
Political Science/ Public Administration	_____ (25)	_____ (26)

Faculty Distribution by Sex and Race:

	PART-TIME FACULTY	FULL-TIME FACULTY
Female	_____ (27)	_____ (28)
Male	_____ (29)	_____ (30)
Black	_____ (31)	_____ (32)
White, Not Hispanic	_____ (33)	_____ (34)
Hispanic	_____ (35)	_____ (36)
Asian, Pacific Islander	_____ (37)	_____ (38)
American Indian/Alaskan	_____ (39)	_____ (40)

Statistical Breakdown by Discipline
ECONOMICS

	PART-TIME FACULTY	FULL-TIME FACULTY
Professor	_____ (EC01)	_____ (EC02)
Associate Professor	_____ (EC03)	_____ (EC04)
Assistant Professor	_____ (EC05)	_____ (EC06)
Instructor	_____ (EC07)	_____ (EC08)
Other Faculty	_____ (EC09)	_____ (EC10)
Please specify _____		
Female	_____ (EC11)	_____ (EC12)
Male	_____ (EC13)	_____ (EC14)
Black	_____ (EC15)	_____ (EC16)
White, Not Hispanic	_____ (EC17)	_____ (EC18)
Hispanic	_____ (EC19)	_____ (EC20)
Asian, Pacific Islander	_____ (EC21)	_____ (EC22)
American Indian/Alaskan	_____ (EC23)	_____ (EC24)

HISTORY

	PART-TIME FACULTY	FULL-TIME FACULTY
Professor	_____ (HI01)	_____ (HI02)
Associate Professor	_____ (HI03)	_____ (HI04)
Assistant Professor	_____ (HI05)	_____ (HI06)
Instructor	_____ (HI07)	_____ (HI08)
Other Faculty	_____ (HI09)	_____ (HI10)
Please specify _____		
Female	_____ (HI11)	_____ (HI12)
Male	_____ (HI13)	_____ (HI14)
Black	_____ (HI15)	_____ (HI16)
White, Not Hispanic	_____ (HI17)	_____ (HI18)
Hispanic	_____ (HI19)	_____ (HI20)
Asian, Pacific Islander	_____ (HI21)	_____ (HI22)
American Indian/Alaskan	_____ (HI23)	_____ (HI24)

POLITICAL SCIENCE (GOVERNMENT, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS)

	PART-TIME FACULTY	FULL-TIME FACULTY
Professor	_____ (PO01)	_____ (PO02)
Associate Professor	_____ (PO03)	_____ (PO04)
Assistant Professor	_____ (PO05)	_____ (PO06)
Instructor	_____ (PO07)	_____ (PO08)
Other Faculty	_____ (PO09)	_____ (PO10)
Please specify _____		
Female	_____ (PO11)	_____ (PO12)
Male	_____ (PO13)	_____ (PO14)
Black	_____ (PO15)	_____ (PO16)
White, Not Hispanic	_____ (PO17)	_____ (PO18)
Hispanic	_____ (PO19)	_____ (PO20)
Asian, Pacific Islander	_____ (PO21)	_____ (PO22)
American Indian/Alaskan	_____ (PO23)	_____ (PO24)

PSYCHOLOGY

	PART-TIME FACULTY	FULL-TIME FACULTY
Professor	_____ (PS01)	_____ (PS02)
Associate Professor	_____ (PS03)	_____ (PS04)
Assistant Professor	_____ (PS05)	_____ (PS06)
Instructor	_____ (PS07)	_____ (PS08)
Other Faculty	_____ (PS09)	_____ (PS10)
Please specify	_____	

Female	_____ (PS11)	_____ (PS12)
Male	_____ (PS13)	_____ (PS14)

Black	_____ (PS15)	_____ (PS16)
White, Not Hispanic	_____ (PS17)	_____ (PS18)
Hispanic	_____ (PS19)	_____ (PS20)
Asian, Pacific Islander	_____ (PS21)	_____ (PS22)
American Indian/Alaskan	_____ (PS23)	_____ (PS24)

SOCIOLOGY/SOCIAL WORK

	PART-TIME FACULTY	FULL-TIME FACULTY
Professor	_____ (SO01)	_____ (SO02)
Associate Professor	_____ (SO03)	_____ (SO04)
Assistant Professor	_____ (SO05)	_____ (SO06)
Instructor	_____ (SO07)	_____ (SO08)
Other Faculty	_____ (SO09)	_____ (SO10)
Please specify	_____	

Female	_____ (SO11)	_____ (SO12)
Male	_____ (SO13)	_____ (SO14)

Black	_____ (SO15)	_____ (SO16)
White, Not Hispanic	_____ (SO17)	_____ (SO18)
Hispanic	_____ (SO19)	_____ (SO20)
Asian, Pacific Islander	_____ (SO21)	_____ (SO22)
American Indian/Alaskan	_____ (SO23)	_____ (SO24)

OTHER SOCIAL SCIENCES: Please specify

	PART-TIME FACULTY	FULL-TIME FACULTY
Professor	_____ (OS01)	_____ (OS02)
Associate Professor	_____ (OS03)	_____ (OS04)
Assistant Professor	_____ (OS05)	_____ (OS06)
Instructor	_____ (OS07)	_____ (OS08)
Other Faculty	_____ (OS09)	_____ (OS10)
Please specify	_____	

Female	_____ (OS11)	_____ (OS12)
Male	_____ (OS13)	_____ (OS14)

Black	_____ (OS15)	_____ (OS16)
White, Not Hispanic	_____ (OS17)	_____ (OS18)
Hispanic	_____ (OS19)	_____ (OS20)
Asian, Pacific Islander	_____ (OS21)	_____ (OS22)
American Indian/Alaskan	_____ (OS23)	_____ (OS24)

Number of Faculty Affiliations with Professional Organizations and/or Learned Societies (If available)

	National	Regional	State/Local
_____	(44)	_____	(45)
		_____	(46)

Does your institution promote the affiliation of faculty members with discipline-related organizations by providing:

Check all that apply

	National	Regional	State/Local
Time off for Participation?	_____ (47)	_____ (48)	_____ (49)
Total Cost of Dues?	_____ (50)	_____ (51)	_____ (52)
Partial Cost of Dues?	_____ (53)	_____ (54)	_____ (55)
Total Cost of Conferences?	_____ (56)	_____ (57)	_____ (58)
Partial Cost of Conferences?	_____ (59)	_____ (60)	_____ (61)
Other: Please specify	_____ (62)	_____ (63)	_____ (64)

List your institutional memberships (or attach a listing).

Does your institution promote the affiliation of faculty members with organizations related to your discipline by providing the following:

Check all that apply

	National	Regional	State/Local
Time off for Participation?	_____ 21	_____ 22	_____ 23
Total Cost of Dues?	_____ 24	_____ 25	_____ 26
Partial Cost of Dues?	_____ 27	_____ 28	_____ 29
Total Cost of Conferences?	_____ 30	_____ 31	_____ 32
Partial Cost of Conferences?	_____ 33	_____ 34	_____ 35

If you are a member of a professional association and/or learned society, proceed to Section C.

If you are not a member of a professional association and/or learned society at this time, proceed to Section B.

 * SECTION B *

TO BE COMPLETED BY PERSONS WHO CURRENTLY ARE NOT MEMBERS OF A PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION AND/OR LEARNED SOCIETY.

Please indicate why you have chosen not to affiliate.

Check all that apply

	National	Regional	State/Local
Cost	_____ 10	_____ 11	_____ 12
Lack of Personal Interest	_____ 13	_____ 14	_____ 15
Lack of Professional Interest	_____ 16	_____ 17	_____ 18
Lack of Institutional Support	_____ 19	_____ 20	_____ 21
Lack of Organizational Appeal	_____ 22	_____ 23	_____ 24
Other-Please specify	_____ 25	_____ 26	_____ 27

If you have ever been a member of a professional association and/or learned society, proceed to Section C.

Otherwise, PROCEED TO SECTION D.

 SECTION C *

TO BE COMPLETED BY PERSONS WHO ARE MEMBERS OR WHO HAVE BEEN MEMBERS OF A PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION AND/OR LEARNED SOCIETY.

Please indicate why you have chosen to affiliate.

Check all that apply

	National	Regional	State/Local
Networking	_____ 10	_____ 11	_____ 12
Professional Development	_____ 13	_____ 14	_____ 15
Dues Costs Borne by Institution	_____ 16	_____ 17	_____ 18
Other Related Costs Borne by Institution	_____ 19	_____ 20	_____ 21
Colleagues at My Institution	_____ 22	_____ 23	_____ 24
Colleagues at Other Institutions	_____ 25	_____ 26	_____ 27
Received Job Via Affiliation	_____ 28	_____ 29	_____ 30
Participation in Meetings	_____ 31	_____ 32	_____ 33
Participation in Workshops	_____ 34	_____ 35	_____ 36
Serve(d) as Officer	_____ 37	_____ 38	_____ 39
Serve(d) as Committee Chair	_____ 40	_____ 41	_____ 42
Serve(d) as Committee Member	_____ 43	_____ 44	_____ 45
Other-Please specify	_____ 46	_____ 47	_____ 48

List the organizations with which you have chosen to affiliate, and indicate your level of membership via the chart below.

	National	Regional	State/Local
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

What are the disadvantages of membership?

 * SECTION D *

TO BE COMPLETED BY PERSONS WHO HAVE COMPLETED SECTION B OR SECTION C.

List those organizations related to your discipline with which you are not affiliated.

Organization Name	National	Regional	State/Local
_____	_____ 40	_____ 41	_____ 42
_____	_____ 43	_____ 44	_____ 45
_____	_____ 46	_____ 47	_____ 48
_____	_____ 49	_____ 50	_____ 51

Indicate why you have chosen not to affiliate with these organizations.

Please feel free to share any comments or concerns that you may have about your professional activity.

Thank you for your cooperation in this effort.

OPTIONAL INFORMATION

NAME _____

Please return your completed survey form to:

Deborah T. Daniels
 WSSU Social Science Dept.
 601 ML King Drive
 Winston-Salem, NC 27110

SURVEY OF PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Please indicate N/A if requested information is not available.

Organization Name: _____

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Telephone Number: _____

Name and Title of Person Completing Questionnaire

Date of Founding

_____ Year (8-10)

	1988	1980
<u>Number of Members (12-16)</u>		
Total	_____	_____
<u>Membership Fees (18-22)</u>		
Amount	_____	_____
<u>Members Employed by Historically Black Colleges and Universities (24-28) Total</u>	_____	_____
<u>Membership by Sex (Numbers)</u>		
Females (30-34)	_____	_____
Males (36-40)	_____	_____
<u>Membership by Race (Numbers)</u>		
Black (42-46)	_____	_____
American Indian/Alaskan (48-52)	_____	_____
Asian/Pacific Islander (54-58)	_____	_____
Hispanic (60-64)	_____	_____
White, Not Hispanic (66-70)	_____	_____

Minority and Women's Concerns

Does your organization have a Special Committee for Minorities?
(10) _____ Yes (1) _____ No (2)

*If Yes, has an evaluation been conducted to determine the
committee's effectiveness? (11)
_____ Yes (1) _____ No (2)

*If yes, attach a copy of the results of this evaluation? (12)

Does your organization have Special Recruiting for Minorities?
(15) _____ Yes (1) _____ No (2)

* If Yes, has evaluation been conducted to determine the
effectiveness of the recruiting effort? (16)
_____ Yes (1) _____ No (2)

* If yes, attach a copy of the results of this evaluation? (17)

Does your organization have a Special Committee for Women? (20)
_____ Yes (1) _____ No (2)

* If Yes, has evaluation been conducted to determine the
committee's effectiveness? (21)
_____ Yes (1) _____ No (2)

* If yes, attach a copy of the results of this evaluation? (22)

Does your organization have Special Recruiting for Women? (25)
_____ Yes (1) _____ No (2)

* If Yes, has evaluation been conducted to determine the
committee's effectiveness? (26)
_____ Yes (1) _____ No (2)

* If yes, attach a copy of the results of this evaluation? (27)

Please list any additional concerns you may have. _____

If available, please return the following documents with this
questionnaire:

*List of regional and state affiliated organizations, including
addresses

A membership application package for prospective members (30)

A written historical summary of the organization and its
accomplishments (31)

A copy of the 1980 and 1988 Annual Report (32-33)

APPENDIX B

SURVEY OF PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Please indicate N/A if requested information is not available.

Organization Name: _____

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Telephone Number: _____

Name and Title of Person Completing Questionnaire

Date of Founding

Year (8-10)

	1988	1980
<u>Number of Members (12-16)</u>		
Total	_____	_____
<u>Membership Fees (18-22)</u>		
Amount	_____	_____
<u>Members Employed by Historically Black Colleges and Universities (24-28) Total</u>	_____	_____
<u>Membership by Sex (Numbers)</u>		
Females (30-34)	_____	_____
Males (36-40)	_____	_____
<u>Membership by Race (Numbers)</u>		
Black (42-46)	_____	_____
American Indian/Alaskan (48-52)	_____	_____
Asian/Pacific Islander (54-58)	_____	_____
Hispanic (60-64)	_____	_____
White, Not Hispanic (66-70)	_____	_____

Minority and Women's Concerns

Does your organization have a Special Committee for Minorities?
(10)

_____ Yes (1) _____ No (2)

If Yes, has research been conducted to determine the committee's effectiveness? (11)

_____ Yes (1) _____ No (2)

If yes, attach a copy of the results of this research? (12)

Does your organization have Special Recruiting for Minorities?
(15)

_____ Yes (1) _____ No (2)

If Yes, has research been conducted to determine the effectiveness of the recruiting effort? (16)

_____ Yes (1) _____ No (2)

If yes, attach a copy of the results of this research? (17)

Does your organization have a Special Committee for Women? (20)

_____ Yes (1) _____ No (2)

If Yes, has research been conducted to determine the committee's effectiveness? (21)

_____ Yes (1) _____ No (2)

If yes, attach a copy of the results of this research? (22)

Does your organization have Special Recruiting for Women? (25)

_____ Yes (1) _____ No (2)

If Yes, has research been conducted to determine the committee's effectiveness? (26)

_____ Yes (1) _____ No (2)

If yes, attach a copy of the results of this research? (27)

Please list any additional concerns you may have. _____

If available, please return the following documents with this questionnaire:

A membership application package for prospective members (30)

A written historical summary of the organization and its accomplishments (31)

A copy of the 1980 and 1988 Annual Report (32-33)

FACULTY SURVEY

 * SECTION A *

Institution Name _____

Department Name _____

Rank/Position: Check one 20

- (1) Professor (2) Associate Professor
- (3) Assistant Professor (4) Instructor
- (5) Other: Please specify _____

Status: Check all that apply

- (1) Full-time (2) Part-time 22
- (1) Tenured (2) Non-Tenured 24
- (2) Visiting 26

Current Discipline: 28

- (1) Economics (2) History
 - (3) Psychology (4) Sociology/Social Work
 - (5) Political Science (Government, International Relations)
 - (6) Other Social Science -
- Please specify: _____

Age Range: 30

- (1) 20-29 (4) 50-59
- (2) 30-39 (5) 60-69
- (3) 40-49 (6) 70+

Sex: 32

- (1) Female (2) Male

Race: 34

- (1) Black (2) White, Not Hispanic
- (3) Hispanic (4) Asian, Pacific
- (5) American Indian/Alaskan Islander
- (6) Other- Please specify: _____

Highest Degree Received: 36

- (1) Doctorate (2) Masters
- (3) Bachelors (4) Specialist
- (5) Other - Please specify: _____

Does your institution promote the affiliation of faculty members with organizations related to your discipline by providing the following:

Check all that apply

	International/ National	Regional	State/Local
Time off for Participation?	_____ 40	_____ 41	_____ 42
Total Cost of Dues?	_____ 43	_____ 44	_____ 45
Partial Cost of Dues?	_____ 46	_____ 47	_____ 48
Total Cost of Conferences?	_____ 49	_____ 50	_____ 51
Partial Cost of Conferences?	_____ 52	_____ 53	_____ 54

If you are a member of a professional association and/or learned society, proceed to Section C.

If you are not a member of a professional association and/or learned society at this time, proceed to Section B.

* SECTION B *

TO BE COMPLETED BY PERSONS WHO CURRENTLY ARE NOT MEMBERS OF A PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION AND/OR LEARNED SOCIETY.

Please indicate why you have chosen not to affiliate.

Check all that apply

	International/ National	Regional	State/Local
Cost	_____ 10	_____ 11	_____ 12
Lack of Personal Interest	_____ 13	_____ 14	_____ 15
Lack of Professional Interest	_____ 16	_____ 17	_____ 18
Lack of Institutional Support	_____ 19	_____ 20	_____ 21
Lack of Organizational Appeal	_____ 22	_____ 23	_____ 24
Other-Please specify	_____ 25	_____ 26	_____ 27

If you have ever been a member of a professional association and/or learned society, proceed to Section C.

Otherwise, PROCEED TO SECTION D.

 SECTION C *

TO BE COMPLETED BY PERSONS WHO ARE MEMBERS OR WHO HAVE BEEN MEMBERS OF
 A PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION AND/OR LEARNED SOCIETY.

Please indicate why you have chosen to affiliate.

Check all that apply

	International/ National	Regional	State/Local
Networking	_____ 10	_____ 11	_____ 12
Professional Development	_____ 13	_____ 14	_____ 15
Dues Costs Borne by Institution	_____ 16	_____ 17	_____ 18
Other Related Costs Borne by Institution	_____ 19	_____ 20	_____ 21
Colleagues at My Institution	_____ 22	_____ 23	_____ 24
Colleagues at Other Institutions	_____ 25	_____ 26	_____ 27
Received Job Via Affiliation	_____ 28	_____ 29	_____ 30
Participation in Meetings	_____ 31	_____ 32	_____ 33
Participation in Workshops	_____ 34	_____ 35	_____ 36
Serve(d) as Officer	_____ 37	_____ 38	_____ 39
Serve(d) as Committee Chair	_____ 40	_____ 41	_____ 42
Serve(d) as Committee Member	_____ 43	_____ 44	_____ 45
Receive Professional Journals	_____ 46	_____ 47	_____ 48
Other-Please specify	_____ 49	_____ 50	_____ 51

With how many professional organizations do you currently hold
 membership? _____ 54-55

Print the full names of the organizations with which you have chosen to
 affiliate and indicate your level of membership via the chart below.

Organization Name	International/ National	Regional	State/Local
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

What are the disadvantages of membership?

* SECTION D *

TO BE COMPLETED BY PERSONS WHO HAVE COMPLETED SECTION B OR SECTION C.

With how many professional organizations have you chosen not to affiliate? _____ 56-57

List those organizations related to your discipline with which you are not affiliated.

Organization Name	International/ National	Regional	State/Local
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

Indicate why you have chosen not to affiliate with these organizations.

Please feel free to share any comments or concerns that you may have about your professional activity.

Thank you for your cooperation in this effort.

OPTIONAL INFORMATION

NAME _____

Please return your completed survey form to:

Deborah T. Daniels
WSSU Social Science Dept.
601 ML King Drive
Winston-Salem, NC 27110

APPENDIX C

NORTH CAROLINA 4-YEAR INSTITUTIONS
SELECTED FOR SURVEY

PUBLIC UNDERGRADUATE

FICE	NAME	FACULTY	STUDENTS
2926	Elizabeth City State University>	99	1494
2907	University of North Carolina at Asheville<	131	1809
2986	Winston-Salem State University>	132	1958

PUBLIC GRADUATE

FICE	NAME	FACULTY	STUDENTS
2928	Fayetteville State University>	161	1908
2905	North Carolina A & T State University>	375	4654
2950	North Carolina Central University>	286	3037
2972	North Carolina State University<	1387	15569
2954	Pembroke State University<	123	1836
2981	Western Carolina University<	311	4346

PRIVATE UNDERGRADUATE

FICE NAME	FACULTY	STUDENTS
2909 Barber-Scotia College>	N/A	378
2910 Belmont Abbey College	61	850
2911 Bennett College>	54	695
2914 Catawba College<	59	900
2918 Davidson College<	107	1400
2933 High Point College<	59	1370
2936 Johnson C. Smith University>	66	1144
2942 Livingstone College>	57	713
2944 Mars Hill College<	80	1090
2955 Pfeiffer College<	52	851
2960 Salem College<	N/A	500
2962 Shaw University>	70	1505
2968 St. Augustine's College>	70	1657

Key for selected institutions

> Historically Black College or University (HBCU)

< Non-HBCU

APPENDIX D

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS OF ECONOMICS FACULTY

AICPA

Academy of International Business

Agricultural History Society

American Accounting Association

American Agricultural Economics Association

American Arbitration Association

American Bar Association

American Council on Consumer Interests

American Economics Association

American Finance Association

American Marketing Association

American Statistical Association

American Real Estate and Urban Economics Association

Association of Christian Economists

Association for Economic Democracy

Association for Energy Economics

Association of Environmental Resource Economists

ASSA

Atlantic Economics Society

Association for Asian Studies

Beta Gamma Sigma

Business History Conference

Carolinas Economics Association

Cliometrics

Communal Societies

Econometrics Society

Eastern Economics Association

Eastern Finance Association

Economic History Association

Financial Management Association

Gerontological Society of America

History of Economics Association

History of Science Society

Humanistic Economics Association

Industrial Relations Research Association

Institute of Mathematical Statistics

International Association of Energy Economy

International Association for Research on Economic

Psychology

International Institute of Forecasters

IUSSP

Midsouth Academy of Economy and Finance

National Association of Accounting

National Association of Forensic Economics

National Bureau of Economic Research

National Economic Association

National Tax Association

National Women's Studies

Nigerian Economics Society

North Carolina Sheriff's Association

North Carolina World Trade Association
Omicron Delta Epsilon
Phi Beta Kappa
Phi Delta Kappa
Population Association of America
Public Choice Society
Risk and Insurance Association
Royal Economics Society
SASA
Small Business Institute
Social Science History Association
Society for American Forecasters
Society for International Development
Southeastern Women's Studies
Southern Association of Agricultural Economy
Southern Economics Association
Southern Economics Research
Southern/Southwestern Finance Association
Southwestern Economics Association
Union for Radical Political Economy
Western Economics Association
World Academy of Development and Cooperation
World Watch Institute

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS OF HISTORY FACULTY

ASM

Abraham Lincoln Association

African Studies Association

Ag History Society

Air Force Historical Foundation

American and Episcopal Historical Society

American Association for the Advancement of Science

American Association for the Advancement of

Slavic Studies

American Association of State and Local History

American Association of University Professors

American Bar Association

American Committee on Irish Studies

American Culture Association

American Forum

American Historical Association

American Historians in North Carolina

American Military Institute

American Nomismatic Society

American Oriental Society

American Philological Association

American Schools of Oriental Research

American Society of Reformation Research

American Society of Church History

American Society for Legal History

American Studies Association
Appalachian Studies Association
Archaeological Institute of America
Association for Advancement of Slavic Studies
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Association for Teacher Educators
Association of Ancient Historians
Association of Black Social Scientists
Association of Carribean History
Association of Historians in North Carolina
Association of Third World Studies
Association for the Study of Afro-American
 Life and History
Association for Asian Studies
Association for Women in Science
Association of Ancient Historians
Association of World Historians
Aviation Historical Society
Berkshire Conference on Women Historians
British School of Rome
British Society for the History of Science
Calvin Studies Society
Cambridge Philological Society
Canadian Association of African Studies
Canadian Historical Association
Carolina Conference on British Studies

Carolinas British Symposium
Catholic Historical Society
Charles Homer Haskins Society
Classical Association of Canada
Classical Association of North Carolina
Classical Association of Midwest and South
College Arts Association
Col. Studies Conference
Conference Group on Central European History
Conference Group on Haitian Politics
Conference of British Studies
Conference of Latin American Historians
Conference on Peace Research in History
Congress of Americanists
Consortium on Revolutionary Europe
Coordinating Committee on Women in the
 Historical Profession
COPRED
Council on Latin American Studies
Ecclesiastical History Society
Ecological Society of America
French Historical Association
German Studies Association
Historians of the Civil War
Historians of Eastern North Carolina
Historical Society of North Carolina

History of European Ideas
History of Science Society
Indiana Historical Society
Institute of Early American History and Culture
International Congress of Orientalists
International Soc. for Comparative Study of Civ.
Interuniversity Seminar
Jackson County Historical Society
Latin American Studies Association
Medieval Academy of America
Mid-Atlantic Renaissance and Reformation Studies
Middle East Studies Association
Middle East Outreach Council
Modern Greek Studies Association
National Association for Economic Education
National Association for Ethnic Studies
National Association for Geography Education
National Association of Social Studies
National Council for Social Studies
North American Conference on British Studies
North Carolina Council of Social Studies
North Carolina Economics Education
North Carolina Literary and Historical Association
North Carolina Historical Society
North Carolina Council for the Social Studies
North Carolina Society for Professors of Social Studies

Educators

Northamptonshire Record Society

Ohio Academy of History

Organization of American Historians

Phi Alpha Theta

Pi Gamma Mu

Renaissance Society

Rocky Mountain Latin American Studies

Roman Society

Royal Historical Society

Sixteenth Century Studies Society

Social Science History Association

Society for Haitian Historical Studies

Society for Historians of the Early American Republic

Society for the History of Technology

Society for History Education

Society for History Teachers

Society for the History of Terminology

Society for French Historical Studies

Society for Italian Historical Studies

Society for Med Ren Phil

Society for Promotion of Roman Studies

Society for Reformation Research

Society for Spanish and Portuguese Studies

Society for Quing Studies

Soc, Internat. Pour L'edude Deaa Phil Med

Society of Ancient Medicine and Pharmacy
Society of American Historians
Society of Historians of American Foreign Relations
Society of Historians of the -- American Republic
Society of North Carolina Historians
South Carolina Historical Society
Southeast Japan Studies Association
Southeast Region- Association for Asian Studies
Southeastern Latin American Studies
Southeastern Seminar of African Studies
Southeastern Social Science Association
Southern Association of Asian and African Studies
Southern Conference on Slavic Studies
Southern Historical Association
Study Group for WWII
Sudan Studies Association
Texas State Historical Society
Triangle East Asia Colloquim
Triangle Universities Security Seminar
Urban History Association
Western American Heritage Symposium
Western Historical Society
Western History Association
Western Society for French History
William am Mary Cutly
World History Association

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE FACULTY

Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences

Academy of Management

African Studies Association

American Association of University Professors

American Culture Association

American Economics Association

American Political Science Association

American Real Estate Urban Economic Association

American Society for Criminology

American Society for Public Administration

APASA

APOR

APPME

ASLH

Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies

Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management

Association for Education in Journalism

Association of Management

Association of American Geographers

Association of Asian Studies

British International Studies Association

Budget and Finance

Caucus for a New Political Science

Center for Study of Presidency

Conference Group in German Politics

Council of European Studies

Decision Sciences

European Community Studies Association

H Society of American

IADLEST

International Association for Study of Common Property

International Association for Mass Communication Research

International Communication Association

International Political Science Association

International Public Management Association

International Society of Political Psychology

International Sociological Association

International Studies Association/South

International Studies Association

Latin American Studies Association

Law and Society Association

Legislative Studies Group

MELA

MESA

Middle East Institute

Midwest Political Science Association

National Association of College and University Attorneys

National Association of Attorney Generals

National Conference of Black Political Scientists

National Tax Association

National Womens Studies Association

North American Society of Soc. Phil.
North Carolina Social Studies Association
North Carolina Political Science Association
North Carolina Bar Association
Personnel and Labor Relations
Phillipine Studies Committee
Policy Studies Association
Public Choice Society
SERMELS
SHEAR
Society for International Development
Society of Historians of American Foreign Relations
Southeast Regional Middle East and Islamic Studies Seminar
Southeastern Conference on Public Administration
Southeastern Public Administration Society
Southeastern Regional Seminar in African Studies
Southern Association of Public Opinion Research
Southern Economics Association
Southern Political Science Association
Southern Political Science Association
Southwest SS Association
TIMS
Triangle East Asia Consortium
Triangle University Security Seminar
Urban Affairs Association
Urban Studies Association

Western Political Science Association
Women's Caucus (Political Science)

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS OF PSYCHOLOGY FACULTY

AASCB

Acoustical Society

Addiction Professionals of North Carolina

American Association for Advancement of Science

American Association of Animal Science

American Association of Counseling and Development

American Associaton of University Professors

American Board of Professional Psychologists

American College Personnel Association

American Diabetes Association

American Educational Research Association

American Physiological Society

American Psych-Law Society

American Psychological Association

American Psychological Society

American Psychopathological Association

American School Health Association

American Society of Pharmacol Exper Ther

American Society for Laser Medicine and Surgery

American Statistical Association

Animal Behavior Society

Appalachian Psychoanalytic Society

Association of Black Psychologists

Association of Heads of Departments of Psychology

Association for Advancement of Behavior Therapy

Association of Student Personnel Administrators
Association for Research in Vision and Ophthalmology
Association for Behavioral Analysis
Association for Transpersonal Psychology
Behavior Genetics Association
Behavioral and Brain Sciences Association
Canadian Psychoanalytic Association
Cognition Group of North Carolina
College Personnel Association
Council for Undergraduate Research
Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology
Dec Th & Am
Eastern Psychological Association
Florida Association of School Psychology
General Revolution Research Group
Human Factors Society
Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers
Interface Foundation
International Applied Psychology
International Conference on I Studies
International Neuropsychological Society
International Psychoanalytic Association
International Society of Developmental Psychiatry
International Society for Ecological Psychology
International Society for Social Development and
Psychobiology

International Society for Study of Behavior Development
Iowa/International Network of Personal Relationships
Jean Piaget Society
Judgement and Decision Making Society
Laser Institute of America
Mathematical Psychology Society
Midwestern Psychological Association
National Association of Academic Advisement
National Association of Black Psychologists
National Association of Developmental Education
National Association of School Psychology
Neuroscience Society
New York Academy of Sciences
North Carolina Archaeological Society
North Carolina Association of School Psychology
North Carolina College Personnel Association
North Carolina Cognition Conference
North Carolina Interuniversity Council on School Psychology
North Carolina Regional Chapter - Acoustical Society of
America
North Carolina Society of Neuroscience
North Carolina Psychological Association
North Carolina Society of Clinical Hypnosis
Oklahoma Psychological Association
Optical Society of America
Personality and Social Psychology

Phi Beta Kappa

Phi Kappa Phi

Population Association of America

Psi Chi

Psychometric Society

Psychonomics

Psychonomics Society

Royal Society of Medicine

SPSS

Sigma Xi

Social Personality Assessment

Society for Industrial/Organizational Psychology

Society for Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers

Society for Psychophysiological

Society for Study of Social Biology

Society for Risk Analysis

Society for Research on Adolescence

Society for Neuroscience

Society for Research in Child Development and

Psychopathology

Society for Computers in Psychology

Society for the Study of Psychological Study of Social

Issues

Society of Southeastern Social Psychology

Society of Experimental Social Psychology

Society of Personality Assessment

Southeastern Association of Behavior Analysis
Southeaster Industrial/Organizational Pschology Association
Southeastern Psychological Association
Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology
Southwestern Psychological Association
Southwestern Society for Research in Human Development
Textbook Authors Association
Tidewater Human Factors Society
Washington Evolutionary Systems Society
Western North Carolina Psychological Association

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS OF SOCIOLOGY FACULTY

Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences

AKA International Sociology Honor Society

Alpha Kappa Delta

American Antersological Association

American Anthopological Association

American Association of Suicidology

American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy

American Association of Criminology

American Association University Women

American Association University Professors

American Association of State Social Work Boards

American Association for the Advancement of Science

American Association for Public Opinion Research

American Correctional Association

American Criminal Justice Science

American Economics Association

American Jail Association

American Orthopsychiatric Association

American Political Science Association

American Psychological Association

American Public Welfare Association

American Public Health Association

American Quaternary Association

American Research of Marriage and Family Therapy

American Society for Study of Religion

American Society of Industrial Security
American Society of Criminology
American Sociological Association
American Socioloical Society
American Statistical Association
Appalachian Studies Association
APSA
Association for Humanist Society
Association for Evolutionary Economics
Association for Asian Studies
Association for Advancement of Social Work
Association for Children's Health Care
Association for Social Economics
Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development
Association of Voluntary Action Scholars
Association of Black Women Historians
Association of Social and Behavioral Scientists
Association of Applied Behavioral Analysis
Association of Cult Econ
Association of Experimental Social Psychologists
Association of Black Sociologists
Association of American Colleges
Association of Applied and Evaluation Research
Belizean Anthropology Association
Black Child Development Institute
BSA

Canadian Sociological and Anthropological Association
Child Welfare League of America
Community Development Society of America
Council on Social Work Education
Cultural Survival
Current Anthropology Association
Eastern Educational Research Association
Eastern Sociological Society
Epsilon Sigma Phi
Federation of Clinical Social Work
Geographical Society of Bangladesh
Geological Society of Bangladesh
Gerontological Society of America
Historical Association
International Academy of Law and Mental Health
International Congress on Women
International Criminal Justice Society
International Epidemiological Association
International Sociological Institute
International Sociological Association
International Union for Scientific Study of Population
(IUSSP)
IOM National o Sciences
Kentucky Head Start Association
Latin American Studies Association
Mid-South Sociological Association

Midwestern Sociological Society
National Association for Ethnic Studies
National Association of Black Social Workers
National Association of Social Workers
National Association of Deans and Program Directors
National Association of Black Social Workers
National Black Child Development
National Collegiate Honors Council
National Council on Family Relations
National Gerontological Association of America
National Historic Communal Societies Association
National Network for Social Work Managers
National Society for Internships and Experimental Education
National Society of Hospital Social Work Directors
National Women's Studies Association
NC American Research of Marriage and Family Therapy
NC Association of Social Workers for Mental Health
NC Coalition of Presidents of Social Work Organizations
NC School Social Workers Association
North Carolina Head Start Association
North Carolina Council on Social Work Education
North Carolina Association of Black Social Workers
North Carolina Sociological Association
North Carolina Division of Aging
North Carolina Criminal Justice Association
North Carolina Correctional Association

North Carolina Society for Clinical Social Work
North Carolina Archeological Council
North Carolina Sociological Association
North Carolina Social Services Association
North Carolina Social Science Association
North Carolina Network for Social Work Managers
Pacific Sociological Association
Phi Kappa Phi
Pi Gamma Mu
Population Association of America
Population Institute
Public Opinion Research Association
Rural Sociological Society
Sigma Xi
Small National- Specialized
Social Science Historical Association
Social With Groups
Social Work Managers
Society for Scientific Study of Relations
Society for Study of Symbolic Interaction
Society for Study of Social Problems
Society for the Study of Agrarian Systems
Society for Social Studies of Science
Society for Research in Child Development
Society for Phytolith Research
Society for Mexican Anthropology

Society for Ethnobiology
Society for Visual Anthropology
Society of Historic Archaeology
Society of Archaeological Sciences
Society of American Anthropology
Sociologists for Women in Society -Southern
Sociologists for Women in Society
South Atlantic Philosophy of Education Society
Southeastern Women's Studies Association
Southern Anthropological Society
Southern Association for Public Oriented Research
Southern Association for Public Opinion Research
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Southern Criminal Justice Society
Southern Criminal Justice Association
Southern Demographic Association
Southern Regional Demographic Group
Southern Rural Sociological Association
Southern Sociological Society
Southern Sociological Association
Southwestern Social Science Association
SPEAR
SWS
Tourette Syndrome Association
Triad Association of Human Service Worker
Triangle Association of Black Social Workers

Triangle Population Population

Union for Radical Political Economics

Women and Crime

APPENDIX E

Table 1. Frequencies by Institution by Department (Pilot Study)

	Number of Faculty	Responses Number (%)
DUKE UNIVERSITY		
Economics	29	12 (41)
History	36	18 (50)
Political Science	26	15 (58)
Psychology	24	10 (42)
Sociology/Social Work	16	14 (88)

TOTAL	131	69 (53)
	Number of Faculty	Responses Number (%)
UNC-CHAPEL HILL		
Economics	40	19 (48)
History	54	34 (63)
Political Science	49	36 (75)
Psychology	54	33 (62)
Sociology/Social Work	60	40 (67)

TOTAL	257	162 (63)

Table 2. Frequencies by Department (Pilot Study)

	Number of Faculty	Responses Number (%)
DUKE UNIVERSITY AND UNC-CHAPEL HILL (COMBINED)		
Economics	69	31 (45)
History	90	52 (58)
Political Science	75	51 (68)
Psychology	78	43 (55)
Sociology/Social Work	76	54 (71)

TOTAL	388	231 (59.33)

Table 3. Institutions Responding to the Institutional Survey.

Non-HBCU

Mars Hill

Salem College

UNC Asheville

Western Carolina University

HBCU

Bennett College

Livingstone College

North Carolina Central University

Shaw University

Winston-Salem State University

Table 4. Characteristics of Institutions Included in the Faculty Study by Support, Origin and Level.

	Number	(%)
<u>Support</u>		
Public	11	(50.0)
Private	11	(50.0)
<u>Origin</u>		
HBCU	11	(50.0)
Non-HBCU	11	(50.0)
<u>Level</u>		
Undergraduate	16	(72.7)
Graduate	6	(27.3)

Table 5. Characteristics of Institutions by Which Faculty Survey Respondents as Members Were Employed.

	Number	(%)
<u>Support</u>		
Public	187	(76.3)
Private	58	(23.7)
<u>Origin</u>		
HBCU	62	(25.3)
Non-HBCU	183	(74.7)
<u>Level</u>		
Undergraduate	88	(35.9)
Graduate	157	(64.1)

Table 6. Frequency Distribution of Responses by Faculty Who are Members of Professional Organizations by Rank/Position and Status.

Faculty By Rank/Position

Number (%)

69 (28.2) Professor
91 (37.1) Associate Professor
60 (24.5) Assistant Professor
19 (7.8) Instructor
6 (2.4) Other

Faculty By Status

Number (%)

<u>212</u>	(86.5)	Full-time	13 Missing
<u>20</u>	(8.2)	Part-time	
<u>105</u>	(42.9)	Tenured	83 Missing
<u>57</u>	(23.3)	Non-Tenured	
<u>217</u>	(88.6)	Resident	14 Missing
<u>14</u>	(5.7)	Visiting	

Table 7. Frequency Distribution of Responses by Faculty Who are Members of Professional Organizations by Current Discipline and Age Range.

Faculty By Current Discipline

Number (%)

<u>37</u>	(15.1)	Economics
<u>48</u>	(19.6)	History
<u>51</u>	(20.8)	Psychology
<u>54</u>	(22.0)	Sociology/Social Work
<u>42</u>	(17.1)	Political Science (Government, International Relations)
<u>13</u>	(5.3)	Other Social Science

Faculty By Age Range

Number (%)

<u>6</u>	(2.4)	20-29
<u>71</u>	(29.0)	30-39
<u>108</u>	(44.1)	40-49
<u>42</u>	(17.1)	50-59
<u>17</u>	(6.9)	60-69
<u>1</u>	(0.4)	70+

Table 8. Frequency Distribution of Responses by Faculty Who are Members of Professional Organizations by Rank/Position and Status.

Faculty By Sex

Number (%)		Number (%)
<u>61</u> (24.9)	Female	<u>182</u> (74.3) Male
	2 Missing	

Faculty By Race

Number (%)	
<u>38</u> (15.5)	Black
<u>196</u> (80.0)	White, Not Hispanic
<u>0</u> (0.0)	Hispanic
<u>4</u> (1.6)	Asian, Pacific
<u>1</u> (0.4)	American Indian/Alaskan Islander
<u>4</u> (1.7)	Other
	2 Missing

Faculty By Highest Degree Received

Number (%)	
<u>204</u> (83.3)	Doctorate
<u>37</u> (15.1)	Masters
<u>4</u> (1.7)	Other

Table 9. Characteristics of Institutions by Which Faculty Survey Respondents as Non-Members Were Employed.

	Number	(%)
<u>Support</u>		
Public	8	(40.0)
Private	12	(60.0)
<u>Origin</u>		
HBCU	8	(40.0)
Non-HBCU	12	(60.0)
<u>Level</u>		
Undergraduate	12	(60.0)
Graduate	8	(40.0)

Table 10. Frequency Distribution of Responses by Faculty Who Were NOT Members of Professional Organizations by Rank/Position and Status.

Faculty By Rank/Position

Number (%)

<u>4</u>	(26.7)	Professor	5 Missing
<u>4</u>	(26.7)	Associate Professor	
<u>3</u>	(20.0)	Assistant Professor	
<u>2</u>	(13.3)	Instructor	
<u>2</u>	(13.3)	Other	

Faculty By Status

Number (%)

<u>13</u>	(65.0)	Full-time	1 Missing
<u>6</u>	(30.0)	Part-time	
<u>7</u>	(43.7)	Tenured	4 Missing
<u>9</u>	(56.3)	Non-Tenured	
<u>15</u>	(100.0)	Resident	5 Missing
<u>0</u>	(0.0)	Visiting	

Table 11. Frequency Distribution of Responses by Faculty Who Were NOT Members of Professional Organizations by Current Discipline and Age Range.

Faculty By Current Discipline

Number (%)

<u>5</u>	(25.0)	Economics
<u>3</u>	(15.0)	History
<u>4</u>	(20.0)	Psychology
<u>5</u>	(25.0)	Sociology/Social Work
<u>3</u>	(15.0)	Political Science (Government, International Relations)

Faculty By Age Range

Number (%)

<u>1</u>	(5.0)	20-29
<u>3</u>	(15.0)	30-39
<u>5</u>	(25.0)	40-49
<u>8</u>	(40.0)	50-59
<u>3</u>	(15.0)	60-69

Table 12. Frequency Distribution of Responses by Faculty Who Were NOT Members of Professional Organizations by Sex, Race, and Highest Degree Received.

Faculty By Sex

Number (%)	Number (%)
<u>3</u> (15.0) Female	<u>17</u> (85.0) Male

Faculty By Race

Number (%)	
<u>4</u> (21.1) Black	1 Missing
<u>15</u> (78.9) White, Not Hispanic	
<u>0</u> (0.0) Hispanic	
<u>0</u> (0.0) Asian, Pacific	
<u>0</u> (0.0) American Indian/Alaskan Islander	
<u>0</u> (0.0) Other	

Faculty By Highest Degree Received

Number (%)	
<u>12</u> (60.0) Doctorate	
<u>7</u> (35.0) Masters	
<u>1</u> (5.0) Other	

**Table 13. Frequencies of Professional Organizations Listed
By Social Science Faculty.**

	Sample	Pilot	Both	Total
Economics	50	11	10	71
(%)	(70.4)	(15.5)	(14.1)	
History	79	30	22	151
(%)	(52.3)	(19.9)	(14.6)	
Political Science/ Public Administration	25	36	17	78
(%)	(32.1)	(46.2)	(21.8)	
Psychology	51	35	23	109
(%)	(46.8)	(32.1)	(21.1)	
Sociology/Social Work	98	45	14	157
(%)	(62.4)	(28.7)	(08.9)	

Table 14. Summary Data of Number of Memberships in Professional Organizations By Institutional Type.

	Mean (Standard	Response	
	Deviation)	Number	
<u>Number of Memberships</u>			
All Institutions	4.2	(2.88)	243
Public Undergraduate HBCU	4.18	(2.52)	11
Public Undergraduate			
Non-HBCU	4.11	(2.13)	19
Public Graduate HBCU	3.77	(2.33)	31
Public Graduate Non-HBCU	4.54	(3.22)	124
Private Undergraduate HBCU	3.21	(3.08)	19
Private Undergraduate			
Non-HBCU	4.15	(2.17)	39

Table 15. Summary Data of Number of Nonmemberships in Professional Organizations By Institutional Type.

	Mean (Standard Deviation)	Response Number
<u>Number of Nonmemberships</u>		
All Institutions	38.6 (46.59)	191
Public Undergraduate HBCU	16.43 (36.49)	7
Public Undergraduate		
Non-HBCU	36.57 (48.31)	14
Public Graduate HBCU	24.58 (41.08)	24
Public Graduate Non-HBCU	41.78 (47.58)	106
Private Undergraduate HBCU	36.2 (45.78)	10
Private Undergraduate		
Non-HBCU	45.47 (48.42)	30

Table 16. Distribution of Faculty from Institutions Responding to the Institutional Survey.

	Nonmembers	Members
Non-HBCU	2 (4.1)	47 (95.9)
HBCU	4 (13.3)	26 (86.7)
<hr/>		
TOTAL	6 (7.6)	73 (92.4)

Table 17. Summary of Employee Benefits by Institutions to Faculty Who Choose to Affiliate with Professional Organizations.

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
Total Cost of State/Local Dues	231	(94.3)	11	(4.5)
Total Cost of National Dues	230	(93.8)	12	(4.9)
Total Cost of Regional Dues	230	(93.8)	12	(4.9)
Partial Cost of Regional Dues	229	(93.5)	13	(5.3)
Partial Cost of State/Local Dues	229	(93.5)	13	(5.3)
Partial Cost of National Dues	226	(92.2)	16	(6.5)
Total Cost of National Conferences	202	(82.4)	40	(16.3)
Total Cost of State/Local Conferences	201	(82.0)	41	(16.7)
Total Cost of Regional Conferences	200	(81.6)	42	(17.1)
Partial Cost of State/Local Conferences	98	(40.0)	144	(58.8)

Table 18. Summary of Employee Benefits by Institutions to Faculty Who Choose to Affiliate with Professional Organizations (Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
Time off for State/Local Participation	88	(35.9)	154	(63.0)
Partial Cost of Regional Conferences	82	(33.5)	160	(65.3)
Time off-Regional Participation	81	(33.1)	161	(65.7)
Time off-National Participation	79	(32.2)	163	(66.5)
Partial Cost of National Conferences	74	(30.2)	168	(68.6)

Table 19. Frequencies of Responses by Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations.

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
National Professional				
Development	48	(19.6)	197	(80.4)
Participation in National				
Meetings	60	(24.5)	185	(75.5)
Participation in National				
Workshops	60	(24.5)	185	(75.5)
Participation in Regional				
Workshops	88	(35.9)	157	(64.1)
Participation in Regional				
Meetings	88	(35.9)	157	(64.1)
National Networking	100	(40.8)	145	(59.2)
Regional Professional				
Development	104	(42.4)	141	(57.6)
Regional Networking	124	(50.6)	121	(49.4)

Table 20. Frequencies of Responses by Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations
(Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
(National Because of)				
Colleagues at Other				
Institutions	138	(56.3)	107	(44.7)
Participation in State/				
Local Meetings	144	(58.8)	101	(41.2)
Participation in State/				
Local Workshops	144	(58.8)	101	(41.2)
State/Local Networking	155	(63.3)	90	(36.7)
State/Local Professional				
Development	157	(64.1)	88	(35.9)
(Regional Because of)				
Colleagues at Other				
Institutions	158	(64.5)	87	(35.5)
Serve(d) as National				
Committee Member	187	(76.3)	58	(23.7)

Table 21. Frequencies of Responses by Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations
(Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
(State/Local Because of)				
Colleagues at Other				
Institutions	193	(78.8)	52	(21.2)
Serve(d) as National				
Committee Chair	195	(79.6)	50	(20.4)
Serve(d) as Regional				
Committee Member	197	(80.4)	48	(19.6)
Serve(d) as State/Local				
Committee Member	201	(82.0)	44	(18.0)
Serve(d) as Regional				
Committee Chair	201	(82.0)	44	(18.0)
Serve(d) as State/Local				
Officer	205	(83.7)	40	(16.3)
Serve(d) as National				
Officer	209	(85.3)	36	(14.7)

Table 22. Frequencies of Responses by Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations
(Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
Serve(d) as Regional				
Officer	211	(86.1)	34	(13.9)
Serve(d) as State/Local				
Committee Chair	211	(86.1)	34	(13.9)
(National Because of)				
Colleagues at My School	218	(89.0)	27	(11.0)
(Regional Because of)				
Colleagues at My School	218	(89.0)	27	(11.0)
(National) Other Related				
Costs Borne by Institution	224	(91.4)	21	(8.6)
(State/Local Because of)				
Colleagues at My School	224	(91.4)	21	(8.6)
(Regional) Other Related				
Costs Borne by Institution	229	(93.5)	16	(6.5)

Table 23. Frequencies of Responses by Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations
Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
Other Reasons (National)	229	(93.5)	16	(6.5)
Received Job Via National				
Affiliation	232	(94.7)	13	(5.3)
(State/Local) Other Related				
Costs Borne by Institution	235	(95.9)	10	(4.1)
National Dues Costs Borne				
by Institution	238	(97.1)	7	(2.9)
Regional Dues Costs Borne				
by Institution	238	(97.1)	7	(2.9)
Received Job Via Regional				
Affiliation	238	(97.1)	7	(2.9)
State/Local Dues Costs Borne				
by Institution	239	(97.6)	6	(2.4)
Other Reasons (Regional)	239	(97.6)	6	(2.4)

Table 24. Frequencies of Responses by Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations
(Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
Received Job Via State/Local				
Affiliation	240	(98.0)	5	(2.0)
Other Reasons (State/				
Local)	243	(99.2)	2	(0.8)

Table 25. Reasons Social Science Faculty Members are Non-Members of a Professional Organization.

	Responses (%)	
National Cost	6	(42.9)
Regional Cost	6	(42.9)
State/Local Cost	6	(42.9)
Lack of Personal Interest (National)	3	(21.4)
Lack of Personal Interest (Regional)	3	(21.4)
Lack of Personal Interest (State/Local)	3	(21.4)
Lack of Institutional Support (National)	3	(21.4)
Lack of Institutional Support (Regional)	3	(21.4)
Lack of Institutional Support (State/Local)	3	(21.4)
Lack of Professional Interest (National)	2	(14.3)
Lack of Professional Interest (Regional)	2	(14.3)
Lack of Professional Interest (State/Local)	2	(14.3)

Table 26. Reasons Social Science Faculty Members are Non-Members of a Professional Organization (Continued).

Lack of Organizational Appeal (National)	2	(14.3)
Lack of Organizational Appeal (Regional)	2	(14.3)
Lack of Organizational Appeal		
(State/Local)	2	(14.3)
Other-Please specify (National)	2	(14.3)
Other-Please specify (Regional)	2	(14.3)
Other-Please specify (State/Local)	2	(14.3)

Table 27. Frequencies of Responses by Female Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations. _____

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
Receive National Journal	8	(13.1)	53	(86.9)
National Professional				
Development	10	(16.4)	51	(83.6)
Participation in National				
Meetings	10	(16.4)	51	(83.6)
Participation in Regional				
Meetings	17	(27.9)	44	(72.1)
National Networking	20	(32.8)	41	(67.2)
Regional Networking	22	(36.1)	39	(63.9)
Regional Professional				
Development	22	(36.1)	39	(63.9)
(National Because of)				
Colleagues at Other				
Institutions	28	(45.9)	33	(54.1)
State/Local Networking	33	(54.1)	28	(45.9)
State/Local Professional				
Development	34	(55.7)	27	(44.3)

Table 28. Frequencies of Responses by Female Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
(Regional Because of)				
Colleagues at Other				
Institutions	34	(55.7)	27	(44.3)
Participation in State/				
Local Meetings	34	(55.7)	27	(44.3)
Participation in National				
Workshops	35	(57.4)	26	(42.6)
Receive Regional Journal	35	(57.4)	26	(42.6)
Participation in Regional				
Workshops	41	(67.2)	20	(32.8)
Participation in State/				
Local Workshops	42	(68.9)	19	(31.1)
(State/Local Because of)				
Colleagues at Other				
Institutions	43	(70.5)	18	(29.5)

Table 29. Frequencies of Responses by Female Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
Serve(d) as Regional				
Committee Member	44	(72.1)	17	(27.9)
Serve(d) as Regional				
Committee Chair	47	(77.0)	14	(23.0)
Serve(d) as National				
Committee Member	47	(77.0)	14	(23.0)
Receive State/Local Journal	47	(77.0)	14	(23.0)
Serve(d) as State/Local				
Committee Member	48	(78.7)	13	(21.3)
Serve(d) as Regional				
Officer	50	(82.0)	11	(18.0)
Serve(d) as State/Local				
Officer	50	(82.0)	11	(18.0)
Serve(d) as National				
Committee Chair	50	(82.0)	11	(18.0)

Table 30. Frequencies of Responses by Female Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations
(Continued).

	NO (%)	YES (%)
Serve(d) as State/Local		
Committee Chair	51 (83.6)	10 (16.4)
(Regional Because of)		
Colleagues at My School	53 (86.9)	8 (13.1)
(State/Local Because of)		
Colleagues at My School	54 (88.5)	7 (11.5)
Serve(d) as National		
Officer	54 (88.5)	7 (11.5)
Other Reasons (National)	55 (90.2)	6 (9.8)
(State/Local) Other Related		
Costs Borne by Institution	59 (96.7)	2 (8.2)
(National Because of)		
Colleagues at My School	56 (91.8)	5 (8.2)
(National) Other Related		
Costs Borne by Institution	57 (93.4)	4 (6.6)

Table 31. Frequencies of Responses by Female Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
(Regional) Other Related				
Costs Borne by Institution	58	(95.1)	3	(4.9)
Received Job Via National				
Affiliation	59	(96.7)	2	(3.3)
Received Job Via Regional				
Affiliation	60	(98.4)	1	(1.6)
Received Job Via State/Local				
Affiliation	60	(98.4)	1	(1.6)
Other Reasons(Regional)	60	(98.4)	1	(1.6)
National Dues Costs Borne				
by Institution	61	(100.)	0	(0.0)
Regional Dues Costs Borne				
by Institution	61	(100.0)	0	(0.0)
State/Local Dues Costs Borne				
by Institution	61	(100.0)	0	(0.0)

Table 32. Frequencies of Responses by Female Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations
(Continued).

	NO (%)	YES (%)
Other Reasons (State/ Local)	61 (100.0)	0 (0.0)

Table 33. Frequencies of Responses by Male Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations. _____

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
National Professional				
Development	37	(20.3)	145	(79.7)
Receive National Journal	40	(22.0)	142	(78.0)
Participation in National				
Meetings	48	(26.4)	134	(73.6)
(National Because of)				
Colleagues at Other				
Institutions	109	(59.9)	123	(67.6)
State/Local Professional				
Development	121	(66.5)	61	(66.5)
Participation in Regional				
Meetings	70	(38.5)	112	(65.5)
National Networking	79	(43.4)	103	(56.6)
Regional Professional				
Development	82	(45.1)	100	(54.9)
Regional Networking	101	(55.5)	81	(44.5)

Table 34. Frequencies of Responses by Male Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
Receive Regional Journal	106	(58.2)	76	(41.8)
Participation in State/ Local Meetings	110	(60.4)	72	(39.6)
State/Local Networking (Regional Because of Colleagues at Other Institutions	121	(66.5)	61	(33.5)
Participation in National Workshops	137	(75.3)	45	(24.7)
Serve(d) as National Committee Member	138	(75.8)	44	(24.2)
Receive State/Local Journal	139	(76.4)	43	(23.6)
Serve(d) as National Committee Chair	143	(78.6)	39	(21.4)

Table 35. Frequencies of Responses by Male Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
Participation in Regional				
Workshops	145	(79.7)	37	(20.3)
Participation in State/				
Local Workshops	146	(80.2)	36	(19.8)
State/Local Because of)				
Colleagues at Other				
Institutions	149	(81.9)	33	(18.1)
Serve(d) as Regional				
Committee Member	151	(83.0)	31	(17.0)
Serve(d) as Regional				
Committee Chair	152	(83.5)	30	(16.5)
Serve(d) as State/Local				
Committee Member	152	(83.5)	30	(16.5)
Serve(d) as National				
Officer	153	(84.1)	29	(15.9)

Table 36. Frequencies of Responses by Male Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations
(Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
Serve(d) as State/Local				
Officer	154	(84.6)	28	(15.4)
Serve(d) as State/Local				
Committee Chair	159	(87.4)	23	(12.6)
Serve(d) as Regional				
Officer	159	(87.4)	23	(12.6)
(National Because of)				
Colleagues at My School	160	(87.9)	22	(12.1)
(Regional Because of)				
Colleagues at My School	163	(89.6)	19	(10.4)
Other Reasons (National)	55	(90.2)	6	(9.8)
(National) Other Related				
Costs Borne by Institution	165	(90.7)	17	(9.3)
(State/Local Because of)				
Colleagues at My School	168	(92.3)	14	(7.7)

Table 37. Frequencies of Responses by Male Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
(Regional) Other Related				
Costs Borne by Institution	169	(92.9)	13	(7.1)
Received Job Via National				
Affiliation	171	(94.0)	11	(6.0)
Other Reasons(Regional)	172	(94.5)	10	(5.5)
Costs Borne by Institution	174	(95.6)	8	(4.4)
National Dues Costs Borne				
by Institution	175	(96.2)	7	(3.8)
Regional Dues Costs Borne				
by Institution	175	(96.2)	7	(3.8)
State/Local Dues Costs Borne				
by Institution	176	(96.7)	6	(3.3)
(State/Local) Other Related				
Received Job Via Regional				
Affiliation	176	(96.7)	6	(3.3)

Table 38. Frequencies of Responses by Male Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations
(Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
Received Job Via State/Local				
Affiliation	179	(98.4)	3	(1.6)
Other Reasons (State/				
Local)	180	(98.9)	2	(1.1)

Table 39. Frequencies of Responses by Black Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations. _____

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
National Professional				
Development	4	(10.5)	25	(89.5)
Receive National Journal	7	(18.4)	31	(81.6)
Participation in National				
Meetings	9	(23.7)	29	(76.3)
State/Local Networking	12	(31.6)	26	(68.4)
Regional Professional				
Development	13	(34.2)	25	(65.8)
Participation in State/				
Local Meetings	13	(34.2)	25	(65.8)
Participation in Regional				
Meetings	4	(36.8)	24	(63.2)
National Networking	18	(47.4)	20	(52.6)
State/Local Professional				
Development	18	(47.4)	20	(52.6)
Regional Networking	20	(52.6)	18	(47.4)

Table 40. Frequencies of Responses by Black Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
Participation in National				
Workshops	20	(52.6)	18	(47.4)
Participation in State/				
Local Workshops	20	(52.6)	18	(47.4)
(National Because of)				
Colleagues at Other				
Institutions	21	(55.3)	17	(44.7)
Receive State/Local Journal	23	(60.5)	15	(39.5)
Receive Regional Journal	24	(63.2)	14	(36.8)
(Regional Because of)				
Colleagues at Other				
Institutions	24	(63.2)	14	(36.8)
Participation in Regional				
Workshops	24	(63.2)	14	(36.8)
Serve(d) as State/Local				
Committee Member	24	(63.2)	14	(36.8)

Table 41. Frequencies of Responses by Black Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
(State/Local Because of)				
Colleagues at Other				
Institutions	26	(68.4)	12	(31.6)
Serve(d) as State/Local				
Officer	27	(71.1)	11	(28.9)
Serve(d) as National				
Committee Member	27	(71.1)	11	(28.9)
Serve(d) as Regional				
Committee Member	27	(71.1)	11	(28.9)
Serve(d) as Regional				
Committee Chair	28	(73.7)	10	(26.3)
Serve(d) as State/Local				
Committee Chair	29	(76.3)	9	(23.7)
Serve(d) as Regional				
Officer	29	(76.3)	9	(23.7)

Table 42. Frequencies of Responses by Black Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations
(Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
Serve(d) as National				
Committee Chair	31	(81.6)	7	(18.4)
Serve(d) as National				
Officer	32	(84.2)	6	(15.8)
(National Because of)				
Colleagues at My School	33	(86.8)	5	(13.2)
(Regional Because of)				
Colleagues at My School	33	(86.8)	5	(13.2)
(State/Local Because of)				
Colleagues at My School	33	(86.8)	5	(13.2)
Received Job Via National				
Affiliation	33	(86.8)	5	(13.2)
(National) Other Related				
Costs Borne by Institution	35	(92.1)	3	(7.9)
(Regional) Other Related				
Costs Borne by Institution	36	(94.7)	2	(5.3)

Table 43. Frequencies of Responses by Black Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
(State/Local) Other Related				
Costs Borne by Institution	36	(94.7)	2	(5.3)
National Dues Costs Borne				
by Institution	36	(94.7)	2	(5.3)
State/Local Dues Costs Borne				
by Institution	36	(94.7)	2	(5.3)
Other Reasons (National)	36	(94.7)	2	(5.3)
Received Job Via Regional				
Affiliation	36	(94.7)	2	(5.3)
Received Job Via State/Local				
Affiliation	37	(97.4)	1	(2.6)
Regional Dues Costs Borne				
by Institution	37	(97.4)	1	(2.6)
Other Reasons (Regional)	37	(97.4)	1	(2.6)
Other Reasons (State/				
Local)	37	(97.4)	1	(2.6)

Table 44. Frequencies of Responses by White Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations. _____

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
Receive National Journal	37	(18.9)	159	(81.1)
National Professional Development	41	(20.9)	155	(79.1)
Participation in National Meetings	46	(23.5)	150	(76.5)
Participation in Regional Meetings	70	(35.7)	126	(64.3)
National Networking	82	(41.8)	114	(58.2)
Regional Professional Development	86	(43.9)	110	(56.1)
Regional Networking	100	(51.0)	96	(49.0)
(National Because of) Colleagues at Other Institutions	107	(54.6)	89	(45.4)
Receive Regional Journal	112	(57.1)	84	(42.9)

Table 45. Frequencies of Responses by White Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
(Regional Because of)				
Colleagues at Other				
Institutions	124	(63.3)	72	(36.7)
Participation in State/				
Local Meetings	125	(63.8)	71	(36.2)
State/Local Networking	128	(65.3)	68	(34.7)
State/Local Professional				
Development	134	(68.4)	62	(31.6)
Participation in National				
Workshops	145	(74.0)	51	(26.0)
Serve(d) as National				
Committee Member	149	(76.0)	47	(24.0)
Serve(d) as National				
Committee Chair	154	(78.6)	42	(21.4)

Table 46. Frequencies of Responses by White Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations
(Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
Participation in Regional				
Workshops	156	(79.6)	40	(20.4)
(State/Local Because of)				
Colleagues at Other				
Institutions	157	(80.1)	39	(19.9)
Receive State/Local				
Journal	157	(80.1)	39	(19.9)
Serve(d) as Regional				
Committee Member	159	(81.1)	37	(18.9)
Participation in State/				
Local Workshops	161	(82.1)	35	(17.9)
Serve(d) as Regional				
Committee Chair	163	(83.2)	33	(16.8)
Serve(d) as State/Local				
Committee Member	166	(84.7)	30	(15.3)

Table 47. Frequencies of Responses by White Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations (Continued).

	NO (%)	YES (%)
Serve(d) as National		
Officer	166 (84.7)	30 (15.3)
Serve(d) as State/Local		
Officer	167 (85.2)	29 (14.8)
Serve(d) as State/Local		
Committee Chair	171 (87.2)	25 (12.8)
Serve(d) as Regional		
Officer	172 (87.8)	24 (12.2)
(National Because of)		
Colleagues at My School	175 (89.3)	21 (10.7)
(Regional Because of)		
Colleagues at My School	175 (89.3)	21 (10.7)
(National) Other Related		
Costs Borne by Institution	179 (91.3)	17 (8.7)

Table 48. Frequencies of Responses by White Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations
(Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
(State/Local Because of)				
Colleagues at My School	181	(92.3)	15	(7.7)
(Regional) Other Related				
Costs Borne by Institution	182	(92.9)	14	(7.1)
Other Reasons (National)	182	(92.9)	14	(7.1)
(State/Local) Other Related				
Costs Borne by Institution	188	(95.9)	8	(4.1)
Received Job Via National				
Affiliation	188	(95.9)	8	(4.1)
National Dues Costs Borne				
by Institution	191	(97.4)	5	(2.6)
Regional Dues Costs Borne				
by Institution	191	(97.4)	5	(2.6)
Received Job Via Regional				
Affiliation	191	(97.4)	5	(2.6)

Table 49. Frequencies of Responses by White Faculty To A Prepared List Indicating Level of Activity and Reasons to Affiliate With Professional Organizations
(Continued).

	NO	(%)	YES	(%)
Other Reasons (Regional)	191	(97.4)	5	(2.6)
Received Job Via State/Local				
Affiliation	192	(98.0)	4	(2.0)
State/Local Dues Costs Borne				
by Institution	193	(98.5)	3	(1.5)
Other Reasons (State/				
Local)	195	(99.5)	1	(0.5)

Table 50. Summary Data For Number of Memberships in Professional Organizations By Race and Sex.

	Mean (Standard Deviation)	Response Number
<u>Number of Memberships</u>		
Black Female	4.54 (3.91)	13
Black Male	4.75 (4.12)	24
White Female	4.27 (1.94)	48
White Male	4.21 (2.86)	146
Asian Male	2.25 (0.5)	4
American Indian Male	2.0 (.)	1
Other Race Male	3.25 (1.26)	4

Table 51. Summary Data For Number of Nonmemberships in Professional Organizations By Race and Sex.

	Mean (Standard Deviation)	Response Number
<u>Number of Nonmemberships</u>		
Black Female	28.33 (43.14)	9
Black Male	29.07 (45.91)	14
White Female	37.57 (47.07)	44
White Male	41.78 (47.19)	116
Asian Male	2.0 (0)	3
American Indian Male	0 (.)	1
Other Race Male	50.0 (69.30)	2

*Subjects who did not indicate race and sex were not included in this frequency table.

Table 52. Summary Data For Number of Memberships and Non-Memberships in Professional Organizations By Sex and Institutional Level.

	Mean (Standard Deviation)	Response Number
<u>Number of Memberships</u>		
Undergraduate Female	4.00 (3.02)	23
Graduate Female	4.53 (2.06)	38
Undergraduate Male	3.92 (2.12)	65
Graduate Male	4.35 (3.35)	116
<u>Number of Nonmemberships</u>		
Undergraduate Female	41.38 (47.59)	16
Graduate Female	33.68 (46.0)	37
Undergraduate Male	37.58 (46.71)	45
Graduate Male	40.96 (47.3)	92

Table 53. Summary Data For Number of Memberships in Professional Organizations By Race and Institutional Level.

	Mean (Standard Deviation)	Response Number
<u>Number of Memberships</u>		
Black Undergraduate	3.71 (3.6)	17
Black Graduate	5.38 (4.14)	21
White Undergraduate	4.1 (2.11)	66
White Graduate	4.29 (2.91)	128
Asian Undergraduate	2.00 (0.00)	2
Asian Graduate	2.50 (0.71)	2
American Indian Graduate	2.00 --	1
Other Race Undergraduate	3.00 (0.00)	2
Other Race Graduate	3.50 (2.12)	2

Table 54. Summary Data For Number of Nonmemberships in Professional Organizations By Race and Institutional Level.

	Mean (Standard Deviation)	Response Number
<u>Number of Memberships</u>		
Black Undergraduate	28.67 (42.91)	9
Black Graduate	28.86 (46.05)	14
White Undergraduate	41.84 (47.65)	50
White Graduate	39.76 (46.88)	111
Asian Undergraduate	2.00 --	1
Asian Graduate	2.00 (0.00)	2
American Indian	1.00 --	1
Other Race Undergraduate	1.00 --	1
Other Race Graduate	1.00 --	1

Table 55. Summary Data For Number of Memberships in Professional Organizations By Race, Sex and Level.

	Mean (Standard Deviation)	Response Number
<u>Number of Memberships</u>		
Black Female Undergraduate	4.14 (4.91)	7
Black Female Graduate	5.0 (2.68)	6
Black Male Undergraduate	3.4 (2.59)	10
Black Male Graduate	5.71 (4.79)	14
White Female Undergraduate	3.94 (1.91)	16
White Female Graduate	4.44 (1.97)	32
White Male Undergraduate	4.16 (2.18)	50
White Male Graduate	4.24 (3.16)	96
Asian Male Undergraduate	2.0 (0)	2
Asian Male Graduate	2.5 (0.71)	2
Amer. Indian Male Graduate	2.0 (.)	1
Other Race Male		
Undergraduate	3.0 (0)	2
Other Race Male Graduate	3.5 (2.12)	2

Table 56. Summary Data For Number of Nonmemberships in Professional Organizations By Race, Sex and Level.

	Mean (Standard Deviation)	Response Number
<u>Number of Nonmemberships</u>		
Black Female Undergraduate	18.00 (27.71)	3
Black Female Graduate	33.50 (50.74)	6
Black Male Undergraduate	34.0 (50.36)	6
Black Male Graduate	25.38 (45.46)	8
White Female Undergraduate	46.77 (50.35)	13
White Female Graduate	33.71 (45.9)	31
White Male Undergraduate	40.11 (47.26)	37
White Male Graduate	42.57 (47.44)	79
Asian Male Undergraduate	2.0 (.)	1
Asian Male Graduate	2.0 (0)	2
Amer. Indian Male Graduate	0.0 (.)	1
Other Race Male		
Undergraduate	1.0 (.)	1
Other Race Male Graduate	99.0 (.)	1

*Subject who did not indicate race, sex or level were not included in this frequency table

Table 57. Summary Data For Number of Memberships in Professional Organizations By Race, Sex, and Origin.

	Mean (Standard Deviation)	Response Number
<u>Number of Memberships</u>		
Black Female HBCU	5.50 (4.63)	8
Black Female Non-HBCU	3.0 (1.87)	5
Black Male HBCU	4.22 (2.90)	18
Black Male Non-HBCU	6.33 (6.74)	6
White Female HBCU	3.00 (1.41)	9
White Female Non-HBCU	4.56 (1.94)	39
White Male HBCU	3.10 (1.52)	20
White Male Non-HBCU	4.39 (2.98)	126

*Subjects who did not indicate race, sex or origin were not included in this frequency table.

Table 58. Summary Data For Number of Nonmemberships in Professional Organizations By Race, Sex, and Origin.

	Mean (Standard Deviation)	Response Number
<u>Number of Nonmemberships</u>		
Black Female HBCU	37.25 (47.44)	4
Black Female Non-HBCU	21.20 (43.49)	5
Black Male HBCU	40.40 (50.45)	10
Black Male Non-HBCU	0.75 (0.96)	4
White Female HBCU	38.88 (49.80)	8
White Female Non-HBCU	37.22 (47.18)	36
White Male HBCU	12.87 (28.86)	15
White Male Non-HBCU	46.08 (47.96)	101

Table 59. Characteristics of Professional Organizations as Indicated by Survey Responses.

	1980	
	Mean	(Standard Deviation)
Members	9051	(19842)
Fees	\$ 35	(16)
HBCU Members	1	(.)
Females	2896	(2558)
Males	6669	(6020)
Black	353	(411)
White	5654	(6839)
Hispanic	136	(174)
Indian	69	(114)
Asian	257	(306)

Table 60. Characteristics of Professional Organizations as Indicated by Survey Responses.

	1988	
	Mean	(Standard Deviation)
Members	11423	(23494)
Fees	\$ 48	(20)
HBCU Members	31	(42)
Females	2533	(3281)
Males	6193	(9028)
Black	550	(745)
White	6132	(5379)
Hispanic	206	(281)
Indian	32	(41)
Asian	457	(574)

Table 61. Comparison of Characteristics of Professional Organizations Between 1980 and 1988.

	Percent Change
Members	26.2%
Fees	37.1%
HBCU Members	100.0%
Females	-9.1%
Males	-7.1%
Black	55.8%
White	8.5%
Hispanic	51.5%
Indian	53.6%
Asian	77.8%

Table 62. Responses of Professional Organizations to Questions About Special Efforts to Recruit Minorities and Women.

	Responses		
	Yes	No	NA
Special Committee for Minorities	10	24	0
Evaluation of Special Committee for Minorities	2	9	23
Copy of Evaluation Results	0	4	30
Special Recruiting for Minorities	6	28	0
Evaluation of Special Committee for Minorities	1	7	26
Copy of Evaluation Results	0	2	32
Special Committee for Women	11	23	0
Evaluation of Special Committee for Women	2	10	22
Copy of Evaluation Results	0	2	32
Special Recruiting for Women	5	29	0
Evaluation of Special Recruiting for Women	1	8	25
Copy of Evaluation Results	0	2	32

Table 63. Survey Return Rate of Faculty Responses by Institution.

<u>INSTITUTION</u>	<u>%Population</u>	<u>%Sample</u>
Barber-Scotia	1.3 (5)	0.1 (1)
Belmont Abbey	2.6 (10)	3.4 (5)
Bennett College	3.6 (14)	2.7 (4)
Catawba College	3.4 (13)	2.0 (3)
Davidson College	10.9 (42)	12.9 (19)
Elizabeth City State University	4.9 (19)	2.0 (3)
Fayetteville State University	6.7 (26)	1.4 (2)
High Point College	3.1 (12)	4.1 (6)
Livingstone College	3.4 (13)	3.4 (5)
Mars Hill College	4.9 (19)	5.4 (8)
North Carolina Central Univ.	4.9 (19)	4.1 (6)
North Carolina State University	NA	NA
North Carolina A&T State Univ.	8.1 (31)	8.8 (13)
Pembroke State University	5.2 (20)	6.1 (9)
Pfieffer College	3.9 (15)	3.4 (20)
Saint Augustine's College	3.9 (15)	1.4 (2)
Shaw University	1.3 (5)	3.4 (5)
UNC Asheville	10.9 (42)	12.9 (19)
Western Carolina State Univ.	12.2 (47)	15.0 (22)
Winston-Salem State University	4.6 (18)	6.8 (10)

Table 64. Number of Responses (#Res) and Faculty (#Fac) and Survey Return Rate (%Ret) by Institution.

<u>INSTITUTION</u>	<u>#RES</u>	<u>#FAC</u>	<u>%RET</u>
Barber-Scotia	1	5	20.0%
Belmont Abbey	5	10	50.0%
Bennett College	4	14	28.6%
Catawba College	3	13	23.1%
Davidson College	19	42	45.2%
Elizabeth City State University	3	19	15.8%
Fayetteville State University	2	26	7.7%
High Point College	6	12	50.0%
Livingstone College	5	13	38.5%
Mars Hill College	8	19	42.1%
North Carolina Central Univ.	6	19	31.6%
North Carolina State University	93	NA	NA
North Carolina A&T State Univ.	13	31	41.9%
Pembroke State University	9	20	45.0%
Pfieffer College	5	15	33.3%
Saint Augustine's College	2	15	13.3%
Shaw University	5	5	100.0%
UNC Asheville	19	42	45.2%
Western Carolina State University	22	47	46.8%
Winston-Salem State University	10	18	55.5%

Table 65. Number of Faculty by Sex by Departments
as Indicated in Institutional Survey.

	Female	Male
Economics	11	13
History	13	31
Political Science	10	34
Psychology	25	59
Sociology/ Social Work	26	29
Other Social Science	2	3

Table 66. Number of Faculty by Race by Departments
as Indicated in Institutional Survey.

	Black	White
Economics	2	22
History	19	24
Political Science	19	21
Psychology	17	66
Sociology/ Social Work	13	41
Other Social Science	2	1

Table 67 . Number of Faculty by Sex by Departments
from Publicly Supported Institutions as Indicated
in Institutional Survey.

	Female	Male	Total
Economics	7	8	15
History	9	21	30
Political Science	10	28	38
Psychology	19	53	72
Sociology/ Social Work	14	19	33
Other Social Science	0	1	1

Table 68. Number of Faculty by Sex by Departments
from Privately Supported Institutions as Indicated
in Institutional Survey.

	Female	Male	Total
Economics	4	5	9
History	4	10	14
Political Science	0	6	6
Psychology	6	6	12
Sociology/ Social Work	12	10	22
Other Social Science	2	2	4

Table 69. Number of Faculty by Race by Departments from Publicly Supported Institutions as Indicated in Institutional Survey.

	Black	White	Total
Economics	1	14	15
History	16	14	30
Political Science	18	17	35
Psychology	16	55	71
Sociology/ Social Work	9	24	33
Other Social Science	0	1	1

Table 70. Number of Faculty by Race by Departments from Privately Supported Institutions as Indicated in Institutional Survey.

	Black	White	Total
Economics	1	8	9
History	3	10	13
Political Science	1	4	5
Psychology	1	11	12
Sociology/ Social Work	5	17	22
Other Social Science	1	1	2

Table 71. Number of Faculty by Sex by Departments
from HBCU Institutions as Indicated in
Institutional Survey.

	Female	Male	Total
Economics	4	3	7
History	9	19	28
Political Science	8	25	33
Psychology	10	19	29
Sociology/ Social Work	12	16	28
Other Social Science	2	3	5

Table 72. Number of Faculty by Sex by Departments
from Non-HBCU Institutions as Indicated in
Institutional Survey.

	Female	Male	Total
Economics	7	10	17
History	0	16	16
Political Science	2	9	11
Psychology	1	53	54
Sociology/ Social Work	0	26	26
Other Social Science	0	0	0

Table 73. Number of Faculty by Race by Departments
from Non-HBCU Institutions as Indicated in
Institutional Survey.

	Black	White	Total
Economics	1	16	17
History	0	16	16
Political Science	2	9	11
Psychology	1	53	54
Sociology/ Social Work	0	26	36
Other Social Science	0	0	0

Table 74. Number of Faculty by Race by Departments
from HBCU Institutions as Indicated in
Institutional Survey.

	Black	White	Total
Economics	1	6	7
History	19	8	27
Political Science	17	12	29
Psychology	16	13	29
Sociology/ Social Work	14	15	29
Other Social Science	2	1	3

Table 75. Number of Faculty by Sex by Departments from Undergraduate Institutions as Indicated in Institutional Survey.

	Female	Male	Total
Economics	3	2	5
History	3	14	27
Political Science	2	12	14
Psychology	8	16	24
Sociology/ Social Work	8	11	19
Other Social Science	2	3	5

Table 76. Number of Faculty by Sex by Departments
from Graduate Institutions as Indicated in
Institutional Survey.

	Female	Male	Total
Economics	4	4	8
History	8	14	22
Political Science	8	22	30
Psychology	15	41	56
Sociology/ Social Work	16	15	31
Other Social Science	2	3	5

Table 77. Number of Faculty by Race by Departments from Undergraduate Institutions as Indicated in Institutional Survey.

	Black	White	Total
Economics	7	3	10
History	7	9	16
Political Science	4	8	12
Psychology	4	20	24
Sociology/ Social Work	8	12	20
Other Social Science	2	1	3

**Table 78. Number of Faculty by Race by Departments
from Graduate Institutions as Indicated in
Institutional Survey.**

	Black	White	Total
Economics	0	8	8
History	12	10	22
Political Science	15	13	28
Psychology	13	42	55
Sociology/ Social Work	6	24	30
Other Social Science	2	1	3

Table 79. Institutions Responding to the Institutional Survey.

<u>Non-HBCU</u>	Nonmembers	Members
Mars Hill	1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)
Salem College	0	0
UNC Asheville	0	19 (100.)
Western Carolina University	1 (4.5)	21 (95.5)
 <u>HBCU</u>		
Bennett College	0	4 (100)
Livingstone College	0	5 (100)
North Carolina Central University	0	6 (100)
Shaw University	4 (80)	1 (20)
Winston-Salem State University	0	10 (100)

Table 80. Institutions Responding to the
Institutional Survey By Members and Nonmembers.

<u>Non-HBCU</u>	Nonmembers	Members
Mars Hill	1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)
Salem College	0	0
UNC Asheville	0	19 (100.)
Western Carolina University	1 (4.5)	21 (95.5)
 <u>HBCU</u>		
Bennett College	0	4 (100)
Livingstone College	0	5 (100)
North Carolina Central University	0	6 (100)
Shaw University	4 (80)	1 (20)
Winston-Salem State University	0	10 (100)

Table 81. Institutions Responding to the
 Institutional Survey By Members and Nonmembers
 (Economics Faculty).

<u>Non-HBCU</u>	Nonmembers	Members
Mars Hill	0	0
Salem College	0	0
UNC Asheville	0	4 (100.)
Western Carolina University	0	5 (100.)
 <u>HBCU</u>		
Bennett College	0	0 (100)
Livingstone College	0	0 (100)
North Carolina Central University	0	0 (100)
Shaw University	0	0 (100)
Winston-Salem State University	0	10 (100)

Table 82. Institutions Responding to the
 Institutional Survey By Members and Nonmembers
 (History Faculty).

<u>Non-HBCU</u>	Nonmembers	Members
Mars Hill	0	2
Salem College	0	0
UNC Asheville	0	3 (100.)
Western Carolina University	0	4 (100.)
<u>HBCU</u>		
Bennett College	0	0 (100)
Livingstone College	0	0 (100)
North Carolina Central University	0	2 (100)
Shaw University	0	0 (100)
Winston-Salem State University	0	2 (100)

Table 83. Institutions Responding to the
Institutional Survey By Members and Nonmembers
(Psychology Faculty).

<u>Non-HBCU</u>	Nonmembers	Members
Mars Hill	1	2
Salem College	0	0
UNC Asheville	0	7 (100.)
Western Carolina University	0	8 (100.)
 <u>HBCU</u>		
Bennett College	0	1 (100)
Livingstone College	0	1 (100)
North Carolina Central University	0	1 (100)
Shaw University	0	0 (100)
Winston-Salem State University	0	2 (100)

Table 84. Institutions Responding to the
Institutional Survey By Members and Nonmembers
(Sociology Faculty).

<u>Non-HBCU</u>	Nonmembers	Members
Mars Hill	0	2
Salem College	0	0
UNC Asheville	0	1 (100.)
Western Carolina University	1	3 (100.)
 <u>HBCU</u>		
Bennett College	0	0 (100)
Livingstone College	0	2 (100)
North Carolina Central University	0	2 (100)
Shaw University	0	0 (100)
Winston-Salem State University	0	1 (100)

Table 85. Institutions Responding to the
Institutional Survey By Members and Nonmembers
(Political Science Faculty).

<u>Non-HBCU</u>	Nonmembers	Members
Mars Hill	0	1
Salem College	0	0
UNC Asheville	0	4 (100.)
Western Carolina University	0	1 (100.)
 <u>HBCU</u>		
Bennett College	0	1 (100)
Livingstone College	0	2 (100)
North Carolina Central University	0	1 (100)
Shaw University	0	0 (100)
Winston-Salem State University	0	2 (100)

Table 86. Institutions Responding to the
 Institutional Survey By Members and Nonmembers
 (Other Social Science Faculty).

<u>Non-HBCU</u>	Nonmembers	Members
Mars Hill	0	0
Salem College	0	0
UNC Asheville	0	0 (100.)
Western Carolina University	0	0 (100.)
 <u>HBCU</u>		
Bennett College	0	0 (100)
Livingstone College	0	0 (100)
North Carolina Central University	0	0 (100)
Shaw University	4	1 (100)
Winston-Salem State University	0	0 (100)