INFORMATION TO USERS

While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted. For example:

- Manuscript pages may have indistinct print. In such cases, the best available copy has been filmed.

- Manuscripts may not always be complete. In such cases, a note will indicate that it is not possible to obtain missing pages.

- Copyrighted material may have been removed from the manuscript. In such cases, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is also filmed as one exposure and is available, for an additional charge, as a standard 35mm slide or as a 17"x 23" black and white photographic print.

Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack the clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For an additional charge, 35mm slides of 6"x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography.

Order Number 8719181

Perceived and reported importance of teaching in public, comprehensive colleges and universities

Starr, Nina Kennedy, Ed.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1987

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48 106

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark __✓__.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy __✓__
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages __✓__
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received _____
16. Other _____

_____

_____

University
Microfilms
International

PERCEIVED AND REPORTED IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING IN PUBLIC, COMPREHENSIVE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

by

Nina K. Starr

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 Doctorate in Education

Greensboro
1987

Approved by

Jack D. Bardon
Dissertation Adviser

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 Jack L. Bardon

Committee Members David H. Reilly

Joseph E Bryson

Joseph E Johnson

March 20, 1987
Date of Acceptance by Committee

March 20, 1987
Date of Final Oral Examination

STARR, NINA K., Ed.D. Perceived and Reported Importance of Teaching in Public, Comprehensive Colleges and Universities. (1987). Directed by Dr. Jack I. Bardon. 150 pp.

Recent studies have emphasized faculty perceptions of the rise in importance of scholarly activities as the basis for institutional rewards. What has not been reported is the institutional commitment to the importance of teaching. This study sought to determine the importance of teaching within public, comprehensive institutions as perceived by professors, associate professors, and assistant professors, and as supported by institutions. Collection of data relied on self report survey instruments. The response rate for institutional data was 82% with 65.5% of faculty returning surveys. When comparing Mission and Goal categories to the existence of budget support for instructional development activities, institutions with strongly inferred or explicitly stated Mission Statements also tended to have budget lines for instructional development (analysis was not statistically significant). Comparing institutions and written policies which encouraged instructional development, 41.5% of institutions which strongly/explicitly stated teaching as important in the Mission Statement had more than four written policies to support that commitment. Institutional ranking of teaching in promotion and tenure decisions was not related to the public statement.

Results indicate that faculty perceptions about teaching on their campus do not vary significantly according to the institution's public statement. However, data indicated

that perceptions of the importance of teaching are positively related to faculty rank, with statistically significant differences in perception between professor and associate professor. Rank was statistically significant when faculty members were asked about the importance of teaching for rewards (defined as promotion and/or tenure). More full professors ranked teaching as a first or second choice in importance for promotion and tenure than did either associate or assistant professors. For all faculty, 52.8% ranked teaching as the most important activity for promotion; 65.1% ranked teaching as most important for tenure.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge and express her appreciation to Dr. Jack I. Bardon, chairperson of the Dissertation Committee, for his invaluable professional assistance, continued support, and encouragement throughout this research.

To the other members of the Dissertation Committee, Dr. David H. Reilly, Dr. Joseph E. Bryson, and Dr. Joseph E. Johnson, I offer my sincere appreciation for their sustaining commitment to the completion of this study.

The author wishes to acknowledge the Statistical Consulting Center of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro for assistance with design and analysis of statistical data.

For the love and support of my family, friends, and in particular my daughter, and for the loving memory of my son, I express my gratitude.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES CONTINUED

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Overview of Importance of Teaching

Since the beginnings of the modern college and university system, three primary roles of faculty members have been prominent; teaching, research and service. In general, rhetoric has been given to the role of teaching as the raison d'etre for faculty. In reality, the role of teaching may not be as formally recognized or rewarded as is scholarship and research (Kasten, 1984). The imbalance between the recognition of these two functions is purported to have grown even greater during the past decade. This viewpoint is reinforced by a recent study conducted by Bowen and Schuster (1986) who report that the escalation of conflict between research and teaching activities reflects a trend of junior faculty to view publication as the only means of professional survival. Senior faculty then feel pressed by this shift in institutional priorities which now tends to reward activities differentially. What has not been reported is whether this conflict is universal across all institutional types, or if the emphasis towards research is more endemic to a particular setting.

Many obvious reasons for the complexities involved in the recognition of teaching as a priority activity can be

cited. Most university professors traditionally have not been socialized into the teaching profession. Competence and expertise within the discipline and in research methodology have been adequate to provide the credentials necessary for admittance into the chosen profession. There have been few formal training requirements, such as workshops, courses, or seminars, to assist the emerging professional in an understanding of learning styles, teaching methodologies, or instructional media (Bess, 1982; Cross, 1985; Dressel and Marcus, 1982). It also has been widely recognized that the immediate outcomes of teaching have been difficult to measure. The proliferation of many of the faculty development programs that appeared on college campuses during the 1970's was an attempt to correct this omission in the training of faculty.

Although most faculty development programs have greatly expanded their initial conceptualizations, the basis for their establishment had its genesis in the desire to improve university teaching. Most faculty development programs now emphasize not only instructional development, but also personal/professional development and organizational planning, change and development. The establishment of formal faculty development and teaching centers on various college campuses did, however, signal to the faculty a willingness on the part of many institutions to recognize the need for assistance in the instructional development of an individual mem-

ber who in all probability would retain long term membership in that institution. The case study of "Professor Abbot" aptly chronicles this instructional and teaching development throughout a career (Axelrod, 1973). However, in practice the appropriate link between improved instructional practice and institutional rewards was never clearly stated or reported, since participation in instructional development was largely a voluntary activity. It also is unclear from the literature whether or not instructional improvement was a priority activity across all institutional types; i.e., liberal arts colleges, comprehensive colleges and universities, doctoral degree granting universities, and research universities.

The need for faculty development programs was prompted not only by concern for instruction but also by factors external to the university but which, nevertheless, contributed to budget, personnel and program considerations: student enrollment declines, tuition increases and decreases in student aid, the advent of management information systems and cost benefit analyses, and the realization by most institutions that fiscal and personnel resources were finite. Thus, both external and internal factors stimulated the institution to provide some assistance in the improvement of the instructional process.

Importance of the Environmental Context

Instructional centers and formal instructional development programs were primarily aimed at the methodology and

technology of teaching. Few programs seemed to consider the environmental context and value system in which they were embedded. Most researchers within the behavioral and social sciences feel that an understanding of the environment is critical to an understanding of both individual and group behavior. It is generally agreed that individual behavior can be given direction by the needs of the organization in which the individual holds membership. The environment is important as both a determinant and as a predictor of behaviors. Behaviors exist as that delicate and interrelated balance between personal characteristics and environmental presses and/or characteristics. Thus the priority of instructional development and teaching should not only be studied as a response to an individual's concern but also should be examined within the context of its occurrence. This becomes even more critical for a higher education system that currently can delineate many institutional types, each with traditionally unique missions and goals.

The individual also is affected by attributes of the environment which may be changed by the behaviors of the system in which that individual functions (Hall and Fagen, 1968). From a systems perspective, behaviors may be more influenced by those system attributes which are in closest proximity to the unit of analysis. For faculty members in higher education, these system attributes in close proximity may be the department or school in which the member is affiliated.

While individual behavior can be assessed according to motives and needs, the consensual behavior of the composite membership of the organization can be obtained through an assessment of the institutional "press". To discern institutional environments and its consensual press, one must be able to examine not only the formal reward structure which exists, but also the institutional values and mores as perceived by the majority of members of that institution.

Summary and Questions Raised

It thus seems appropriate to examine and ascertain if university teaching is indeed an institutional press within an institutional type; i.e., a valued activity for both the system and the individual within a given context. In a time when public education is looking critically at the quality of the teaching process and preparation, higher education appears to be moving even further away from this internal scrutiny. Does the college environment and, in particular the comprehensive institution, not only value but reward a concern for the quality of teaching that occurs within its boundaries? Does there exist an institutional press for teaching excellence and the teaching role, or in most institutions has this function been shifted in the reordering of priorities which stress publications, university service, research grants and computer expertise?

If teaching is to remain a highly ranked institutional priority, not only should this activity be formally recog-

nized, supported and rewarded, but it should be perceived by members as an activity which is congruent with institutional goals and thus a legitimate determinant of behavior. Ellner and Barnes (1983) have asked if university teaching will become a desired but nonessential priority of a successful career. The question pertains to the priority of teaching activities in higher education both from the perspective of the individual and the institution in which s/he holds membership. If these authors also are correct that "most current programs to improve teaching are low-profile programs set in environments that range from mildly supportive to the openly hostile" (p. 8), then an understanding of the environmental press can assist members either to re-direct behaviors or to change that press to provide for more congruence between valued and rewarded activity. What is especially important is whether these statements are true for all of higher education or applicable only to selected institutional types. Given the recent generalized statements which emphasize research over teaching as the priority activity for career advancement and entrance into the profession, it seems necessary and important to examine four key questions.

First, are generalized statements about the rise in importance of research over teaching applicable to all institutional types that currently exist within higher education? This generalization, if correct, would reflect a significant change in the mission of institutions which are not charac-

terized or categorized as major research universities. For the purpose of this study, the selection of public comprehensive institutions is an attempt to narrow or confine this generalization within a setting which has traditionally emphasized the importance of the teaching role. Comprehensive colleges and universities are so designated because of a liberal arts curriculum and at least one professional or specialized program (The Carnegie Foundation, 1979).

Second, does instructional improvement or instructional development remain a priority activity both for the individual and for the system in which that individual holds membership, specifically in this study for faculty within the public comprehensive institution? While role functions of faculty do not necessarily remain stagnant for the individual, a major systems level change in role expectations would create a need for examination and study of that system. Related to this concern is whether the link between emphasized activities is now clearly defined by the system within the reward structure. An examination of the mission statement, applicable policies and the formal reward structure would be necessary to discern the linkage between behaviors and compensation.

Third, there also is some question as to whether teaching is both an institutionally valued and an individually desired activity within a given context. In general, studies on the intrinsic rewards of teaching for a faculty member

have not been specific to one institutional setting. For this study, the institution will be defined as the unit of analysis so that individually valued activities can be examined within a contextual framework. If the environmental setting claims to value teaching, then do faculty perceptions in general corroborate this activity as an individually valued priority?

Lastly, if either the setting or the individual consensus are not in agreement about teaching as the priority activity, then is dissonance created for some or all faculty between what is perceived or valued, what is stated as an institutional priority, and what in practice actually occurs? Where dissonance between faculty activities and institutional expectations does not exist, is it possible to identify those factors which alleviate this incongruence?

Importance and Purpose of the Study

For this study, the selection of public comprehensive institutions is viewed as important because of the traditional value orientation that has stressed teaching and student advisement. The study is proposed in order to clarify and expand the knowledge base concerning the current importance of the teaching role in these institutions. If this mission still remains of primary importance, then generalized statements about the role of research cannot be applicable to all institutional types. If public comprehensive institutions are shifting their emphasis to incorporate

research and scholarly productivity as the priority activity for faculty, then the study becomes significantly important in terms of its implications for faculty and organizational development. The environment, with each institution as the unit of analysis, must be assessed in order to establish parameters for generalized statements which cite the rise in importance of scholarly productivity for faculty within higher education. As very few studies have examined this proposition within comprehensive institutions, and as this institutional type has traditionally maintained teaching as its primary focus, the chosen unit of analysis for this study is the public, comprehensive institution.

The importance of teaching as a primary role for faculty is then viewed within a specified context. At Indiana University, a sample of 112 faculty found these faculty concerned about the conflicting demands of research, teaching, and service (Administrator, 1985). There was general agreement that the University rewards research but that teaching is not as highly rewarded as it could be. A recent survey of deans within public liberal arts colleges cited research and publication as increasing in importance in faculty evaluation (Seldin, 1985). Although this survey focused on the evaluation of faculty in liberal arts colleges, a tentative extrapolation of similar results could be made to the comprehensive college or university since these institutions have primarily been characterized at the undergraduate level

by their liberal arts curriculum. If institutional priorities for faculty are changing, it could be hypothesized that some degree of dissonance would exist between perceptually valued activities for faculty and those activities which are valued in practice but perhaps not stated by the institution. This concern should be examined within the context of person and environment interaction.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Major Areas within the Literature

The research base relevant to the questions posed has been divided into four major sections:

A. Research related to the faculty member's perception of teaching as a personally valued activity.

B. Research related to the individual member's perception of the institution's commitment to teaching.

C. Research related to the institution's commitment to the importance of the teaching role.

D. The theoretical basis of cognitive consistency and dissonance.

Faculty Perception of Teaching as a Personally Valued Activity

A brief synopsis of the research related to the individual's perception of teaching as a personally valued activity must first begin with an understanding of the person/environment interaction. The basis for most of the research in person/environment interaction rests on the work of psychologist Kurt Lewin (1936): behavior is a function of person/environment interaction. In practice, this translates to a more objective analysis of the environment in order to understand individual and collective behaviors of persons indigenous to that institution.

The basic theoretical groundwork for examination of person/environment interaction has been formulated by several researchers in a variety of discipline areas. Key theories of interaction have been related to (1) interpersonal attraction, (2) perceptions, (3) general systems theory, (4) behavioral interactions, and (5) personality theory. One aspect of person/environment interaction is the implication and/or observation of reprocity. Newcomb (1963) relied on this conceptualization to examine interpersonal attraction within personal and social relationships. In the view of this researcher, interpersonal attraction involved reciprocal rewards and similarities of attitudes. For Cantril (1963), interaction was evident in personality development because individual perceptions were of necessity formed as a transaction within that individual's environment. Much can be related concerning the theory of interaction and the examination of behaviors. Sommerhof (1968) hypothesized that the individual could only be viewed in conjunction with dynamic relationships that existed for that individual. Interactions of behaviors were described through the use of adaptation, regulation, coordination, and integration, with adaptation being of critical importance since this concept takes into account "causal connections".

Perhaps the most recent of theories which stress interaction is general systems theory (Miller, 1978). All living systems are composed of subsystems that are interrelated and

integrated. The degree of interaction is expressed as relationships which exist between the environment and a set of objects (Hall and Fagen, 1968), and the flexibility of the system to adapt to changes in the environment (Cadwallader, 1968). A general systems theory views the individual as a component of a structure (Boulding, 1968) so that elements of the system are directly or indirectly related in a causal network. Interaction in general systems theory is the change of the system in response to its "relevant environment" (Buckley, 1968).

When considering individual/environment interaction, Murray (1951) took into account the purpose or need of both aspects within a given time frame. Overt behaviors were explained only in the context of a given situation. This unit of analysis was the interaction between the internal state of the subject and the external situation. This theme was further refined by Galbraith (1977) who looked at the stimulus elements of the environment and the evoked set of behaviors as the unit of interactional analysis. In his most recent work, Sarason (1985) calls for the study of context in clinical practice so that the clinician may move closer to a prevention model (i.e., the individual is treated in context in order to prevent problems). In summary, the theoretical basis for the use of person/environment interaction is sufficiently strong to warrant its use in the examination of an institution's influence on the perception of the importance of a particular faculty member's role.

Moos and Brownstein (1977) placed much emphasis on the totality of relationships between persons and their environmental context. Moos (1979) then developed a "social-ecological" framework for evaluating educational institutions. Moos' measure of the social environment was applied to the student population within a university setting and was designed to differentiate behaviors, performance and attitudes. Pace and Stern (1974) used Henry Murray's "need-press" model (1938) to describe the college environment as an interaction between individual needs and institutional press as expressed through the curricula, policies, rewards, practices and services offered. These authors concluded that the implicit institutional press should be congruent with individual needs so that personal achievement and change are more effectively promoted.

Both Stern (1970) and Pervin (1974) also define individual behaviors in relationship to their environments. For Stern the press of the institution is the counterpart to individual needs, although he emphasized the "consensual press" as representative of aggregate behavior. Pervin recommends an environmental classification model to help explain person/institution interactions. The needs-press model also has been used to look at student needs in relation to the press of the university as a determinant of student behaviors (Glenn, 1970).

A brief review of the literature on teaching as a valued activity finds the research grouped into three broad categories:

1. Attempts to define teaching effectiveness.
2. Research focused on the improvement of the teaching process.
3. Research on teaching as a valued activity.

Hammond, Meyer and Miller (1969) surveyed faculty at a major university (Stanford) to ascertain the influence of teaching and research in the determination of rewards. While research was extremely influential in determining university rewards, teaching was only slightly influential. This finding seems highly compatible with the research base on person/environment interaction. The value structure of a major research university would be expected to focus on scholarly productivity as a primary faculty activity and thus as a chief determinant of rewards. Hammond et al. (1969) suggest that part of the discrepancy between research and teaching revolves around the problem of specifying quality teaching. These authors also confirmed that knowledge of the quality of research does not assist in knowing the quality of teaching of a particular faculty member. Eble (1972) also took the position that the reward system needed changing if teaching was to be improved. He maintained that the reward system should be evaluated in light of the values and goals of the institution.

Fuhrmann and Grasha (1983) looked at the difficulty in defining teaching effectiveness, and reasoned that any definition which delineates traits of the effective teacher should take into account the teaching situation. "The concern should be with what traits are appropriate for various teaching situations" (p. 286); i.e., an idiosyncratic definition of teaching effectiveness. Cammann (1982) supports this notion especially during the evaluative process of teaching; i.e., evaluation is done within the organizational context. However, in trying to specify characteristics or traits of good teachers, most researchers agree that being (1) highly organized, (2) student oriented, (3) encouraging of student participation, and (4) providing regular feedback are traits most common to effective teachers (Easton, Barshis and Ginsberg, 1983).

Initial attempts at faculty development centered mainly on the improvement of teaching. Miller and Wilson (1963) cited current practices which included (a) departmental conferences dealing with the improvement of teaching, (b) faculty discussions on college teaching, (c) active faculty committees on improving instruction, and (d) a teacher exchange network. Menges (1979) added that discussion and reflection about teaching were needed on a regular basis, although a recent survey by Cross (1976) at the University of Nebraska found that most faculty rated themselves above average teachers and therefore did not feel the need for activities designed

to improve teaching. In contrast, a 1976 survey of university faculty by Lipset and Ladd (Centering on Teaching Improvement, 1976) revealed that 75% of those surveyed felt that excessive amounts of money spent for research had caused undergraduate education to suffer. In essence, when the environment has overtly valued and supported one major activity, faculty have subsequently matched their primary role with that major environmental press. Eraut (1975) also cited several obstacles to change and innovation in teaching, with two obstacles of particular importance: (1) few resources are directed specifically toward innovations in teaching; and (2) no priority is given to teaching and learning. In agreement is Weaver (1982) who reviewed published articles of faculty and found few related to the actual practice of teaching.

When deciding the value and/or importance of an activity for faculty, one measure frequently used is time allocation. In an interesting study conducted by Ladd (1979) within different types of institutions, 70% of all faculty surveyed stated a personal preference for teaching over research. Ladd's data indicate that 7% of faculty in research universities reported no publications, while 25% of faculty in comprehensive colleges and universities fall into the "no publications" category. In research universities, 18% of faculty reported no publications during the last two years, while the percentage was 46% in comprehensive colleges and

universities. Self perceptions also indicated that faculty in general thought of themselves as teachers rather than scientists or intellectuals. Ladd indicated that the norms of academe that emphasize research may be unrealistic in terms of what faculty actually do and/or desire to do. In another study at Auburn University at Montgomery (Blackwell, 1985), full-time faculty (N=90) also rank ordered teaching as most important to oneself in terms of professional contributions (i.e., faculty perceptions indicated teaching was of greater importance to self in contributions made as a professional).

In Scriven's study (1982), the multiple roles of faculty are looked at in terms of personal decisions regarding time allocation and loyalties to each role. Difficulties involved in the precise evaluation of teaching may then distort decisions regarding time allocation to this function. Scriven suggests that within faculty evaluation, one of the biggest problems is the use of "unspecified weights for teaching, research and service" (p. 315). Likewise, Ericksen (1982) looked at faculty instructional evaluation from two perspectives: the public and the private aspects of teaching. His 1978 survey of 69 liberal arts faculty disclosed that faculty felt research was given more weight than teaching in the formal evaluation process. In this author's opinion, more evaluative judgments about the teaching process are probably made within smaller institutions where the

individual can more readily sense the institutional culture.

The intrinsic value of teaching has been another area of interest to researchers. Kozma (1979) found the use of extrinsic rewards a better predictor in the use of technical innovations by faculty in their teaching practice, while intrinsic rewards (i.e., teaching as a source of satisfaction) were better predictors for the use of discussion and role playing (i.e., the nontechnical teaching innovations). He concludes with the caveat that professional risk is involved when a faculty member displays an active concern for teaching at a major research university.

Other researchers have used intrinsic and extrinsic rewards in teaching (Bess, 1982; Czikszentmihalyi, 1982) and a personal need theory (Schneider and Zalesny, 1982) to explain individual motivations linked to teaching activities. To further differentiate intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, Deci and Ryan (1982) hypothesized intrinsic rewards as having an internal locus of causality, while extrinsic rewards were linked to formal rewards and compliance with constraints. Deci and Ryan's research showed that external rewards, administered in a controlling way, tended to decrease intrinsic motivation. Although this sample consisted of public school teachers, the authors stated that in higher education, controls and pressures used by administrators also would probably reduce the intrinsic motivation for teaching since teaching itself is not as highly valued by the administration

as is scholarly activity. Such a generalized statement may or may not be true within comprehensive institutions.

Faia (1980) also studied the restructuring of faculty roles in order to promote the role of teaching. He maintains that the teaching/research roles should be merged into a "teaching-and-research subculture" (p. 39); i.e., a merger of two separate roles into a single, unifying role. Faia also concedes that teaching has not been viewed in relation to the work setting, characterized by organizational constraints and formal rewards. In conclusion, Martin (1982) proposes the concept of a college which develops an "educated heart"; i.e., persons with social and personal tolerance, mastery of skills, and fairness (p. 113). Martin then calls for the restoration of the dignity and authority of the teaching profession within higher education.

Summary of Faculty Perception of Teaching as Personally Valued

In summary, while the role of teaching may be of personal value and importance to faculty, most current studies indicate that faculty believe the importance of teaching, research, and scholarly productivity is related to institutional priorities. This is substantiated by the literature review which emphasizes the interaction of person and environment. Individual work behaviors and values are described within an organizational context so that priorities of the organization are recognized. Organizational priorities are then translated into a formal reward system. The literature

which was reviewed also indicates that teaching has been capriciously rewarded in large measure because of difficulties encountered in the definition and measurement of what is effective teaching, regardless of personal interest in teaching as a valued activity.

Faculty Perception of the Institution's Commitment to Teaching

A brief synopsis of the research related to the individual's perception of an institution's commitment to teaching begins with the assumption that aggregate perceptions offered by individuals in a particular institution are justified as a measure of the institution's functioning. The culture of any system represents a collection of "accepted meanings operating for a given group at a given time" (Pettigrew, 1979, p. 574). This collection of operating values thus assists in the interpretation of a given environment. Downey and Ireland (1979) further define measures of the environment as objective and subjective, with the former being the assessment of environmental attributes and the latter as the interpretation or perception of the environment by its participants. If the role of teaching is of perceptual importance to the individual faculty member and to his/her institution, then that perception can be recorded and placed in juxtaposition to the context of that perception.

As early as 1969, Martin and Berry examined the teaching/research roles of university faculty and the inherent

conflict between them, although the role of researcher is an integral part of the university structure. According to these authors, conflict becomes apparent because the university hires a professor to teach but evaluates his/her scholarship. While this conflict has been cited for the university, it has not been documented with any other institutional type currently recognized within higher education. Part of the difficulty inherent in the evaluation of teaching within higher education has been the establishment of objective measures of classroom performance. Since teaching outcomes are not as easily quantified as scholarly productivity, perceptions of an institution's commitment to teaching have in many ways been biased because of unequal measurements of faculty role outcomes. Within liberal arts colleges and comprehensive institutions, this has not traditionally been an issue, as teaching and student advisement have been primary activities for faculty and the basis for faculty evaluation.

When looking at perceptions of the importance of the teaching role, not only is the formal reward system critical but the value system as espoused by administrators and faculty becomes an additional dimension for consideration. Again, the culture/environment which supports teaching is important. O'Connell and Meeth (1978) state that "any program to improve teaching has to be designed to suit the setting in which it is to function" (p. 13). This thesis is reinforced by researchers who have looked at instructional centers designed

to promote growth and development of teachers (Crow, Milton, Moomaw and O'Connell, 1976). For effective center functioning, Crow et al. maintain that an examination of the culture and academic milieu in which faculty function is necessary. Bergquist and Phillips (1977) also distinguish between the trait of the person and state of the person in relation to the environment which encorporates the informal academic culture. Within state theory, work behaviors and the means for rewarding these behaviors are influenced by organizational and systemic factors. However, the informal culture may support and encourage activities which may or may not coincide with organizational priorities. Within comprehensive institutions, any assumed change from the traditional mission would necessitate an assessment of both the organization and the informal culture to determine the existence of overall congruence.

Davis and his colleagues (1982) studied instructional improvement and its perceived value in a generic sense using a model of personal awareness of teaching innovations. They then distinguished between innovation product and process. When an innovation was considered conceptually as a process, organizational support was listed as one of four key factors in the eventual adoption of the innovation. These researchers also found that administrative support was especially critical during the innovation's implementation and continuation stages if the innovation was to be successful. Fran-

cis (1975) also suggests that the institutional climate increases the potential impact and relevance of attempts to implement faculty development programs, including instructional development. For this author, faculty development is defined as an institutional process that seeks to change attitudes, skills, and behaviors. A commitment to behaviors for instructional development may necessitate the establishment or re-emphasis of institutional policies and practices in order to reinforce the value of this activity. Institutional commitment may be particularly crucial for faculty who are operating under the assumption that the priority of the comprehensive institution is its teaching function.

If perceptions are accepted as one dimension in the examination of an environment, then one method of clarifying those perceptions is through the process of faculty development. Within the literature, many researchers view faculty development as a process. Freedman (1979) defined faculty development as the "heightening of self awareness, an increase of autonomy, and a broadening of perspective on the world" (p. v.). This view is reinforced by Crow (1978) who defines faculty development as an attitude or commitment and not as a set of activities.

Freedman used faculty interviews to assist in the development of awareness and understanding of both self and the environment. For Freedman, the usual approach to instructional development is to review teaching methods with-

out regard for the attitudes and values of the system in which a faculty member serves as a teacher. In Freedman's study of faculty at Stanford, only 12% described themselves as superior teachers, while the majority indicated that the culture and reward system at this institution reinforce the importance of research and publication. Webb and Smith (1976/77) go beyond traditional models and the personal awareness concept to address the idea of a modification in faculty roles. While each faculty member would be responsible for instructional content, student assessment would be externally handled. Webb and Smith acknowledge that this method is generally theoretical at this point, but they do see the implementation of administratively supported instructional development teams as one example of this approach in practice. Both the study at Stanford and the Webb and Smith study reinforce the importance of culture and administrative support as determinants of faculty behavior. Neither used the comprehensive institution as the unit of analysis.

When relating teaching to the context in which it occurs, Pfnister, Solder and Verroca (1979) advocated use of the personal growth contract (i.e., a personal plan for professional development) so that individual development plans are coordinated with the institutional planning process. Growth contracts can be used as a means of identifying individual strengths and weaknesses in relation to institutional needs and priorities. Bergquist and Phillips (1981) state that

the nature of the organization determines in large measure what faculty want to accomplish and do accomplish as professionals. Therefore, they call for a change in the culture of the institution in order for professional growth to become effective.

Summary of Faculty Perception of Institutional Commitment to Teaching

In summary, one way in which the value system of an institution is expressed is through its commitment of finite resources and its formal system of rewards. Perceptions of activities which assume importance to the institution are reinforced by this tangible reward system. In many ways, the informal culture; i.e., the assumptions, perceptions, and belief sets, is influenced by or influences the formal practices and policies which exist within the institution. Even when faculty development and instructional improvement are regarded as a process, both the informal culture and the formal system rewards are interrelated to influence how this process is valued. Faculty perceptions are necessary to clarify both the culture and the setting in which faculty members work.

The importance of environmental assessment is stressed throughout the literature, with particular attention given to the informal culture that influences faculty activities. But no clear differentiation of environmental assessment of faculty perceptions by distinct institutional types was

located. There is a dearth of studies of faculty perceptions specific to comprehensive institutions. It is not possible, based on the literature reviewed, to determine if perceptions of faculty in comprehensive institutions are congruent with current institutionally valued activities. An assessment of perceptions in comprehensive institutions is needed to clarify this omission.

Institutional Commitment to the Importance of the Teaching Role

A review of the literature related to the commitment of an institution to the support of teaching begins with the work of Rudolf Moos and Paul Insel (1974) who maintained that individual behavioral differences are in part attributed to situational differences or variables. Thus the environment can be limiting, constraining, or supportive of potential behaviors of persons within that given environment. These authors advocated several approaches to classifying organizations. Among these approaches are classifications designed according to data received through (1) an examination of the psychosocial characteristics to determine organizational climate, and (2) the conducting of a functional analysis to identify reinforcing contingencies that maintain certain behaviors. Moos and Insel concluded that the actual support given to any system of beliefs must be assessed in order to fully understand sustaining behaviors.

This need for assessment is reinforced by many researchers (Knox, 1956; Astin, 1968; Trent and Rose, 1973; Hunt and Sullivan, 1974; Bergquist and Phillips, 1977). Astin (1968) maintained the need for identification of environmental differences which would account for observed effects, while Cronbach and Snow (1977) were more concerned with the similarity of situations and how this similarity produced different effects with different individuals. Trent and Rose (1973) observed that the teaching/learning interaction cannot be separated from the environment in which it occurs. Thus an analysis of the environment is an initial step in the process of defining its primary goals and commitments.

Bergquist and Phillips (1977) emphasized that faculty will be motivated to teach when the environment supports this activity through its organizational design. They also maintained that the informal academic culture may reinforce behaviors other than those of teaching. Within this organizational structure, Foote and Mayer (1968) referred to the informal culture as those implicit assumptions that are made about behaviors which are deemed important. Foote and Mayer also noted that the governance structure of the university will influence its culture and academic values through support or lack of support for designated activities. For Meyer and Scott (1983), the organizational structure evolves to facilitate the acquisition of resources that will affect

individual behaviors. Several studies have demonstrated that the reward structure reinforces behaviors (Bornheimer, Burns and Dumke, 1973; Whitfield and Brammer, 1973). One study (Lewis, 1984) looked at teaching versus service in merit recommendations and another study (Gaff, 1978) examined participation in instructional development activities as one factor in the consideration of promotion.

The literature reviewed clearly suggests that the environment contributes to individual behavioral differences, and an assessment of the environment is a necessary step towards an understanding of these behavioral differences. General statements about the importance of teaching probably are not grounded in fact unless the environmental context is considered. The literature also is clear that within the environmental assessment, one key factor to be considered is the formal reward system that is utilized to reinforce and support designated environmental goals. The assignment of critical resources has been translated as a tangible commitment to behavioral practices.

For Dressel (1976), the theory of person/environment interaction was expanded to include aggregate behaviors because of the expected relationship between the environment and groups of individuals. Dressel's work in assessing behaviors included time utilization as one measure in determining level of value of a given activity. A second method

in environmental assessment was to solicit views about the environment from its participants. For Eble (1971), the specific practices of the institution became concrete examples of its institutional values, and the study by Crow, Mitton, Moomaw, and O'Connell (1976) uses this theory to explain how instructional centers are specific support mechanisms for the teaching role. Eble also recognized that the concern for teaching by an institution may be lessened because teaching effects are "personal, slow to work and slow to be discovered" (p. 3).

In defining specific practices of the university, Blau (1974) used academic salaries and promotion policies as measures of reinforcement to faculty members. Blau drew his sample of faculty members from 114 academic institutions that granted four year degrees in the liberal arts in 1964. In Blau's study, the greater the emphasis expressed for teaching by the institution, the less loyalty expressed by the faculty to that institution; i.e., teaching was not as highly regarded as the research role. Blau's data also indicated that institutional practices will influence a research orientation by its members to a higher degree than either individual interest or training would predict. The individual's obligation to publish was highly correlated with the weight research was given within that institution. In comparison, a 1976 study of 135 schools, colleges, and departments of Education (Contextual Factors Affecting In-

dividual and Institutional Behavior, 1976) found that institutions which emphasized research over teaching tended to have an idiographic culture; i.e., concerns were for the individual rather than for institutional priorities. The importance of research as a major activity of faculty has been well documented, but faculty perceptions of the priority of this role within institutions that have traditionally valued teaching have not been clearly documented. Ernest L. Boyer, President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, stated that a major area of confusion for four-year colleges is generated by faculty/institutional research needs versus students' classroom needs (Chronicle of Higher Education, October 9, 1985). Mr. Boyer's comments were based on survey data from a two year study of four-year colleges.

For Hall and Bazerman (1982), the design of the university would affect faculty motivation to teach since the key to goal implementation is the commitment of critical resources. For these researchers, the determination of university goals is important because the reward structure may reveal "biased" behaviors although verbalization is given to the importance of multiple role activities. Expectancy theory (i.e., the belief that outcomes are likely from behaviors) was used to document low motivation for instructional effectiveness and relates to the valence attached to behavioral outcomes (Mowday, 1982). Thus the reward system influences faculty behaviors through expectations of rewards

contingent on pre-determined behaviors. Fenker's (1975) study at Texas Christian University was designed to make goals and rewards more explicit in order to clarify faculty evaluation procedures. Fenker discovered that many faculty are cautious about evaluating the various and complex aspects of faculty behaviors. Thus the environment can influence behaviors via its formal reward system, but the literature does not address whether or not institutions are accurately and overtly stating priorities particular to that institution. It also is necessary to determine whether faculty perceptions are accurate about these institutional priorities.

Lastly, Fenker (1977) surveyed faculty at one private university to examine the relative importance of possible incentives. In this study, faculty perceived that research and publication had a greater influence on the reception of incentives offered at the institution. Fenker observed that faculty were expected to improve teaching without (1) the support of formal policies or guidelines; (2) properly constructed and/or validated evaluation instruments; and (3) clearly defined incentives for the improvement of teaching. In another recent survey of faculty at liberal-arts colleges (Chronicle of Higher Education, June 19, 1985), morale of faculty was reportedly a problem because institutional criteria for promotion and tenure did not fit current realities of faculty time commitments (i.e., faculty spend their time teaching). Faculty at these 270 colleges are

helping these institutions to develop a new definition of faculty success with appropriate evaluation criteria. Neither study has been replicated in comprehensive colleges and universities.

Summary of Institutional Commitment to the Importance of Teaching

In summary, an institution's commitment to the importance of the teaching role can be understood through an analysis of the institution. The formal reward system, the organizational structure, and the informal culture, all of which can be reinforcing to designated activities, are critical dimensions within this analysis. Clearly inferred from the literature is the notion that research is a highly valued activity for faculty members. What is not clearly stated is what influence a particular institutional type has on this value orientation. The literature also gives credence to the use of perceptions of the organization by its individual members as one means of environmental assessment. However, studies have not assessed the accuracy of perceptions in relation to stated or implied values within a given context. It is important to examine perceptual accuracy of institutional values in comprehensive universities as there is a generalized indication that research is assuming greater importance among all institutions, including comprehensive colleges and universities.

Cognitive Consistency and Dissonance

The main theoretical basis of cognitive consistency stems from the work of Roger Brown and Leon Festinger. Brown (1965) hypothesized that the human mind is strongly motivated for cognitive consistency. This motivation will assist the individual with attitude changes in order to reduce inconsistencies. Three ways are suggested to assist in the reduction of these inconsistencies: (1) through the cognitive model; (2) through the balance model; and (3) through the utilization of Festinger's dissonance theory.

The cognitive model is based on the acquisition of information to reformulate attitudes. When additional information is added to an individual's cognitive processing, attitude adjustment can occur. The balance theory of cognitive consistency predicts that attitude change will occur from a small number of changes which are interrelated and directed toward greater attitude change. In essence, cognitive balance is achieved by incorporating interrelated small changes.

The work by Festinger (1957) began with the assumption that disequilibrium or dissonance is a state of psychological discomfort which then motivates an individual to reduce this tension. In essence, action taken by an individual that is inconsistent with previously formed attitudes will create a degree of cognitive dissonance so that the individual may seek to change attitudes to support the action taken.

Even though dissonance can occur between any two cognitive elements, the greater the magnitude or importance of the ideas and attitudes, the more likely is consonance sought. Thus if only a few elements are dissonant but they carry a high valence, then the individual will work to change these elements.

Festinger's approach expanded on previous work in cognitive inconsistency by including a behavioral aspect to his theory. Cognitive elements could incorporate attitudes, beliefs or observations about one's own behavior. What was significant about Festinger's theory was that he placed attitude change as occurring after the target behavior. Through this process, a person should become more favorable toward an action that has been completed in order to justify the behavior and reduce dissonance. Strategies to reduce dissonant elements include reducing the importance of dissonant elements, adding more consonant elements, and actually changing the dissonant elements.

Theories of cognitive inconsistency and dissonance are important for this study because of the potential psychological discomfort which can be created when job requirements are inconsistent with expectations. If faculty hold certain perceptions about the traditional mission of an institution, and these perceptions are inaccurate because of subtle or overt changes in the environment, then an examination of the environment could assist in the exposure of these discrepan-

cies. Comprehensive institutions have not been examined with this theory as the foundation.

Summary and Conclusions from the Literature

This review of the literature demonstrates that individual behaviors are shaped by their significant environments and that person/environment interaction is a viable conceptualization for the framework of this study. The literature also suggests that aggregate behaviors and/or perceptions given by members can be solicited as an important source of information in the assessment of an environment. A second source of useful knowledge is the reward system or the placement of critical resources, since an institution may operationalize its value system through rewards and support mechanisms. The reward system becomes a tangible reinforcement of institutionally valued activities.

In general, the literature seems to indicate that connections between instructional improvement and rewards have been ambiguously inferred, or at the very least, poorly defined by the institution. There also seems to be little documentation concerning faculty perceptions of current role priorities, especially within comprehensive institutions. The utilization of the theory of cognitive dissonance offers assistance as a useful description of inconsistencies which exist between behaviors and cognition.

The literature reviewed does not seem to indicate, however, whether institutions are accurately reflecting current

priorities, especially in those institutions which have historically valued teaching. Also unclear is whether faculty perceptions of institutional priorities are accurate about the institutional value placed on teaching and scholarly productivity.

Given the research base as reviewed, it is hypothesized that faculty perceptions of role priorities should substantiate institutional priorities in cases where the institutional mission is clearly stated, critical resources are used as a viable support system, and clear outcomes are linked to specified behaviors. This should be true regardless of institutional type or individual idiosyncracies. If the mission, reward structure, and behavioral outcomes reinforce the value of teaching within comprehensive institutions, then faculty perceptions should corroborate this priority and cognitive dissonance due to this particular discrepancy would not be a significant characteristic of faculty members. There should be very little conflict about role expectations.

Are faculty activities, especially in comprehensive institutions, influenced by the traditional mission of the institution so that a generalized statement about the rise in importance of the research role is not applicable to the comprehensive institution? Has there been a subtle shift in the ordering of priorities so that faculty are experiencing discomfort between their role expectations and changing institutional requirements?

Very few studies have sampled faculty perceptions in comprehensive institutions, probably because role expectations have been fairly prescriptive. However, recent statements indicate that these role expectations may be changing in response to institutionally imposed priorities. In addition, very few studies have considered an interactional basis for behaviors within a specified institutional type. This study proposes to examine these omissions.

Statement of the Problem

The review of the literature clearly directs this research as a study of potential change within higher education. Traditionally, very clear goals have been stated for specific institutional types; e.g., the community college, the four year liberal arts college, the comprehensive and doctoral granting institutions. The possibility exists that major changes may be taking place both in *de facto* and *de jure* characteristics of these institutions as they assume new degree levels, leaving wide discrepancies between faculty and institutional expectations of faculty role requirements. A recent survey of 5,000 faculty at a representative sample of two-year and four-year institutions by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1985) found almost 40% so dissatisfied with their choice of an academic career that leaving academe within five years was a serious consideration. Part of this discontent may be due to tensions generated by differences

in expectations for career success.

Within the research base, it is difficult to isolate and reference comprehensive institutions. The bulk of data has been compiled within research institutions and, to a lesser extent, four year institutions. Traditional expectations for faculty activities within public, comprehensive institutions are particularly questioned because of the substantial lack of information which defines current institutional values and practices. Thus, the framework for this study includes the reaffirmation of that which has been viewed traditionally as the primary faculty role in these institutions and the identification of change which may have occurred to negate and/or demote this primary function to one of lesser importance. Based on the review of the literature, it becomes even more important to apply this framework to a specified institutional type, since the literature does not separate recent studies according to contextual situations.

The context chosen for this study, therefore, is the public comprehensive institution. According to recent data (Fact Book, 1984-85), the comprehensive institution has grown in absolute numbers from 360 in 1950-51 to 709 institutions in 1982, representing a growth exceeded only by two year institutions during the same time period. In many ways, the comprehensive institution has reflected societal changes. Many comprehensive institutions originally were chartered as

four year or teacher education colleges. Tensions felt in institutions stressing research or teaching thus may be exacerbated in a comprehensive institution which has not been so clearly defined. The comprehensive institution becomes in essence, the best laboratory for the examination of current tensions and conflicts between mission statement and de facto faculty activities and the development of new or ancillary values for professional advancement.

The review of the literature suggests that the importance of teaching as a primary faculty role should be examined within an institutional context and related to the institution's commitment to the importance of instruction, the individual faculty member's perception of the institution's emphasis, and the individual's perceived importance and value of teaching as a primary role within the current institutional environment. Questions central to this study are the following:

I. Within public, comprehensive institutions, to what extent is teaching important to an institution as the primary role for faculty?

   Operationally, this research question will be answered by the examination of the following information:

   A. The existence of a written public statement which specifies the importance of teaching within an institution;

B. Evidence of support for instructional development activities within an institutional budget;

C. The presence of written policies which support teaching on that campus; and

D. The relative importance of teaching in promotion and tenure decisions as specified by a chief administrative officer.

II. Do relationships exist among an institution's statement of support for teaching, an institution's financial support for teaching, and faculty perceptions of the importance of teaching within an institution?

Operationally, this research question will be answered using the following information:

A. An assessment of the institution's Mission and Goal Statement to determine the degree of publicly stated support for teaching on a given campus;

B. Evidence of support for instructional development activities within an institution's budget; and

C. Perceptions by liberal arts faculty at a given institution of teaching as a primary mission of their institution.

III. Within public, comprehensive institutions, do faculty differ in the way they perceive the importance

of teaching in their institution as a function of the professorial rank of these faculty?

Operationally, this research question will be answered using the following information:

A. A statistical analysis of differences in the average perceptions of liberal arts faculty within a specified institution which can be attributed to their rank as full professor, associate professor or assistant professor.

IV. Do faculty perceive institutional rewards as clearly linked to instructional priorities within a given institutional context?

Operationally, this research question will be answered using the following information:

A. Perceptions of liberal arts faculty at different faculty ranks as to the importance of teaching in faculty promotion decisions made at their institution.

B. Perceptions of liberal arts faculty at different faculty ranks as to the importance of teaching in faculty tenure decisions made at their institution.

V. To what extent is there a general opinion or attitude among faculty at public, comprehensive institutions as to the current importance of teaching across a selected sample of institutions?

Operationally, this research question will be answered as follows:

A. Perceptions of liberal arts faculty will be combined across all public, comprehensive institutions in the Southeast to indicate a general opinion of the importance of teaching within those institutions surveyed.

Answers to these questions will assist in an understanding of current concerns and tensions within a particular educational setting. It also is anticipated that answers to these questions will reflect the current status of the role of teaching as a primary faculty responsibility.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

For this study, the institution becomes the major unit of analysis. The work of Peter Blau (1973) has established the conceptual framework for the use of the organization rather than the individual as the unit of analysis in a "macrosociological" view of social structures. Stern (1970) used normative measures in the comparison of institutions and has demonstrated that environmental press can be inferred from self-estimates. The study of faculty perceptions within an institutional context was examined in juxtaposition to stated policies and what in practice actually is supported relative to the importance of teaching.

Sample

The target population was identified as all comprehensive institutions in the United States defined as Level III institutions by the Carnegie Foundation (1979). Level III institutions offer Bachelor's and Master's degrees, and may include the Specialist in Education degree (Proceedings, 1984). From this target population, institutions were selected according to the following criteria: publicly supported, located in the Southeast, and accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Universities according to a 1984 list of accredited member institutions. There was

a total of 77 comprehensive institutions identified by these criteria (see Appendix A).

Comprehensive institutions were selected because of the traditional emphasis which has been given to the role of teaching for faculty employed at these institutions. The sample was restricted to liberal arts faculty in each institution in order to reduce the possibility of intervening variables related to inter-school/college discrepancies in role activities; e.g., faculty within a professional school might place additional importance on the service role. It seemed likely that liberal arts faculty would be the group experiencing conflict over the importance of teaching within their institutional context because of the traditional orientation to teaching/learning in a liberal arts curriculum. In addition, the delimiting of institutions to publicly supported institutions was designed to reduce confounding variables related to funding differences between public and private institutions.

Institutions were drawn from those eleven states incorporated under the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. These states include Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia. Selection was made with the expectation that institutional response rates might increase if the study focused specifically on one regional area.

Within each institution, all liberal arts faculty members were identified and listed by name from the 1985 college catalog and according to three faculty ranks: professor, associate professor and assistant professor. The faculty sample included three faculty ranks because of potential differences in perception which might occur relative to the rank of the faculty member. The range of total faculty per institution was from six to 262. At the rank of professor, the range was three to 138; for associate professors, the range was two to 96, and for assistant professors, the range was from one to 76 faculty (see Appendix B). Faculty were not listed if the catalog specified a position as adjunct or administrative since the study was to focus on perceptions of teaching faculty.

Within each institution, one chief administrative officer of the institution was selected to respond to information needed about institutional policies and instructional budget, and was identified through the college catalog as the Vice President/Chancellor of Academic Affairs or the person in the most comparable position. Data from each administrative officer were critical since the institution is the unit of analysis.

For statistical computation, it was necessary to have a total of 10 faculty members per institution per rank. Therefore, 10 institutions were deleted from the original sample of 77 institutions because they did not meet this criterion.

One institution was deleted because of failure to submit a current college catalog. Thus, the sample was reduced to 66 institutions to be included in the study (see Appendix C).

After faculty were listed alphabetically for each rank at each institution, a table of ten thousand random numbers (Gay, 1976) was used to select the faculty to be included in the study. Oversampling per rank was done in an attempt to receive 10 responses per rank, or a total of 30 responses per institution.

Instruments

Two questionnaires were developed to produce information needed for this study in order to answer the questions posed. The institutional survey contained a section requesting demographic information, a section requesting the respondent to rank order seven activities considered important in tenure and promotion decisions at that institution, a section requesting information about the existence of a budget line for instructional development and the percent of this budget line to the total institutional budget, and a final section requesting information about the current status of written policies which existed relative to instructional support.

From the literature, the most universal means of institutional support for instructional development were identified. This list included the following activities: (1) released time for new course development; (2) student course evaluations; (3) financial support for visiting lecturers;

(4) institutional resources for teaching assistants; (5) sabbaticals or "leaves" for instructional improvement; (6) course analysis by colleague observation; (7) documentation of teaching for promotion and/or tenure; (8) campus committees on instructional development; (9) summer grants for projects to improve instruction on campus; (10) salary/merit increase based solely on teaching excellence; (11) an institution-wide instructional development program; (12) seminars or courses on pedagogy for faculty and/or teaching assistants; (13) travel funds for instructional improvement; i.e., to improve mastery of content, instructional delivery; (14) a teaching excellence award regularly given to faculty recipients. (See Appendix D for a copy of the Institutional Survey).

The faculty survey was designed to assess a faculty member's perception of the importance of teaching within his/her institution. The first section of this survey requested demographic information, one section requested the respondent to rank order seven activities considered important in tenure and promotion decisions at that institution, and a final section requested the respondent to use a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 4 to indicate extent of agreement or disagreement with 11 statements related to support of teaching activities at his/her institution. The 11 statements identified through the literature are as follows:

1. Within my own institution, people have been promoted solely on the basis of their teaching excellence.

2. Within my institution, teaching excellence by itself is sufficient for a positive tenure decision.

3. My institution does little to encourage a faculty member to develop as a teacher.

4. My institution supports the development of a long range plan which includes financial support for instructional improvement or faculty development.

5. My colleagues, in general, support efforts I make to improve my teaching at my institution.

6. Excellent teaching appears to be the primary mission of my University or College.

7. At my institution, my department/academic unit is encouraged to have a Teaching Effectiveness or Teaching Evaluation Committee.

8. My institution encourages an annual review of faculty by the department chair and/or dean for the purpose of instructional feedback and improvement.

9. My performance as a teacher seems to be more important to my institution now than it was three years ago.

10. If my teaching were consistently rated superior for several years, I would then expect my institution to offer me released time for new course development.

11. If my teaching were consistently rated superior for several years, I could then expect my institution to award me a citation for outstanding teaching. (See Appendix E for a copy of the Faculty Survey).

Both instruments represented operational measures of the importance of teaching, albeit one was designed to access the reality of institutional support and one was designed to access perceptions of institutional commitment to teaching. Both questionnaires included adequate instructions about completion of each section. Both the faculty and institutional survey asked the respondent to rank order the following seven activities considered important in tenure and pro-

motion decisions: (1) departmental administrative service; (2) grant writing and support; (3) professional association service; (4) published works; i.e., books, refereed and non-refereed articles; (5) service to the local community; (6) evidence of good classroom teaching; and (7) university service; i.e., elected or appointed committees.

Questionnaire items were derived from information gleaned from literature in the area of teaching as a primary faculty role, and both instruments were field tested and revised before utilization in this study. First, two colleagues were asked to read each survey to suggest appropriate content and editing changes. Second, field testing involved asking two administrative officers and 11 liberal arts faculty members at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro to respond to the questionnaires and to offer suggestions concerning availability of information requested, time required to answer the questionnaire, clarity of questions asked, and general format of the questionnaire. Both administrative officers returned the institutional questionnaire, and 10 of the 11 faculty members returned the faculty survey.

Both surveys again were edited and revised in order to clarify concerns raised during the field testing. Technical assistance was requested from the Statistical Consulting Center at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro for coding of questionnaires since data were to be computer analyzed.

Procedures

Permission to conduct the survey was sought and obtained from the UNCG Committee on Human Subjects Protection as the first procedural activity. Ethical standards as outlined by the American Psychological Association were followed to protect confidentiality of faculty responses. Each survey was numerically coded. Analysis was made only of aggregate faculty data for each institution.

In order to survey the designated institutions, a 1985-86 catalog from each institution was ordered to identify and list names and rank of faculty members within the liberal arts component. Catalogs also were used to determine the institution's stated commitment to teaching as a valued activity. To insure the accuracy of this statement, the survey to the institution asked if the current catalog contained the most recent mission statement, if this statement was in the process of revision, or if a new statement had been adopted since the publication of the institution's catalog. If a new mission statement had been adopted, the institution was requested to furnish this information and a comparison of change in statements was assessed.

The classification of an institution's mission and goal statement involved a modified critical incident technique (see Appendix F). A Likert scale ranging from 0 to 4 was developed for the classification of statements related to the institution's commitment to teaching. Each scale inter-

val was characterized by explicit examples taken from catalogs of the institutional sample. Inter-rater reliability for the classification of statements for each of the 66 institutions was established by two raters (this researcher and an UNCG colleague) for all institutional catalogs. If a score of zero was received by an institution; i.e., no judgment could be made from the statements presented, or if there was disagreement between the raters after the first reading, then the two raters reassessed the catalog and reached agreement on the classification through discussion. Statistically, a zero could not be used here for computation.

Both the institutional survey and the faculty survey were accompanied by cover letters explaining the purpose of the study and requesting participation (see Appendices D and E). The cover letter to the chief academic officer also contained information about the survey of faculty at that institution. In addition, a separate cover letter was included from the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs of the University of North Carolina General Administration. A stamped, self-addressed return envelope was included with each survey. Surveys with appropriate cover letters then were mailed simultaneously to the selected faculty and chief administrative officer of each institution. After two months, a follow up letter was sent with another survey and return envelope to those who had not responded to the first mailing.

Statistical Design and Data Analysis

This study is based on social survey research methodology which attempts to explain certain characteristics of a group of institutions, describe what conditions currently exist, and what is perceived by faculty within public, accredited comprehensive institutions. The collection of research data relies on the use of a self reporting survey instrument. Both institutional and faculty surveys were formatted so that responses could be given a numerical value and entered on the University of North Carolina Vax computer system. Each returned survey was first hand coded and then data were entered on the computer. After all raw data were entered, the printout was checked against the original survey form to guard against human error in computer entry. In addition, written comments included on the surveys were hand recorded and sorted by major theme areas.

In order to answer the proposed questions, institutions were compared by their categories relative to their Mission and Goal Statement and several other variables: a separate budget line for instructional development, the number of written policies each institution had to encourage instructional development, and the importance to the institution and faculty of teaching in tenure and promotion decisions.

Data were analyzed by the appropriate use of percentages, the range, the mean and standard deviation, the ANOVA, and the chi square test of statistical significance.

Limitations of the Study

Anticipated limitations of this study which could have influenced results included: (1) an overall lack of faculty or institutional response; (2) recognition that those who chose to respond may have been different in some way from those who did not participate; and (3) use of only one section of the country from which to draw inferences. It also was recognized that in order for an institution to be considered in the data analysis, three separate pieces of information were needed: a school catalog, a response from the identified chief administrative officer (or his/her designee), and a statistically adequate response rate from the selected faculty sample.

Another limitation which should be recognized is that this study did not control for sex of the respondents. The literature reviewed indicates that sex may be a factor in professional decisions which place more personal energies either in teaching or research. In general, males tend to be more oriented to research while females stress teaching activities. However, for this study, to statistically control for sex at each of the three faculty ranks would greatly reduce the population of institutions under study. Equal proportions of males and females would need to be found at all three ranks. Unfortunately, females are not proportionately represented at the full professor rank. According to a 1986 report from the U.S. Department of Education's Center

for Statistics, females make up 27.5 percent of full-time faculty and only 11.4 percent of the full professors (Chronicle of Higher Education, Sept. 10, 1986). In the judgment of this researcher, rank becomes the more significant stratification since perception of institutional commitment by faculty is the primary focus. Another concern may be that differences in perception might be influenced by whether an institution originally was established as a black or white institution. For both potential concerns, a post hoc analysis after the completion of this study will be attempted to see what influence race and sex may have on perception by faculty in order to provide the basis for future study.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY OF DATA RESULTS

Demographic Information

Of 77 institutions initially identified, 11 were deleted because absolute faculty numbers were too small for sampling, leaving a total of 66 institutions to be included in the study. After the return of the institutional surveys, one institution had been incorrectly identified and thus was ineligible for inclusion. Three institutions responded to the questionnaire by requesting that neither their institutional data nor faculty data be included. For the 65 eligible institutions, 39 institutional representatives responded to the first mailing, 14 responded to the second mailing, and three responded by asking that their data not be included, yielding a response rate for institutions of 86% (N=56), and a usable response rate of 82% (N=53). For this study, total institutional data were available for 53 institutions (with nine institutions not responding).

Information recorded about institutions also includes the fact that 49.0% of these institutions have headcount student enrollments of less than 5,000 students. Of responding institutions, 41.5% have headcount enrollments ranging from 5,000 to 9,999 students, while only 9.5% of responding

institutions record a headcount of over 10,000 students. Institutional responses were returned primarily by the Vice President/Chancellor of Academic Affairs (64.1%), by the Provost (3.8%), Dean of the Faculty (1.9%), or by others (30.2%), which generally meant an officer in institutional research.

The founding date of these institutions ranged from 1770 to 1972, with almost two thirds (62.0%) established since 1900, approximately one third (34.2%) established in the 1800's, and only 3.8% established in the 1700's. Of institutions responding, 81.1% (N=43) were founded as traditionally white institutions, 17.0% (N=9) were founded as traditionally black institutions, and 1.9% (N=1) as other.

For budget considerations, total academic budgets ranged from $4 million to $49 million, although external sources of funds for academic support ranged from zero to $14 million. Of all institutions responding, over two thirds (67.9%) reported no separate institutional budget line for instructional development, and 87.5% report no separate budget line for instructional development within departments. Of those institutions reporting a separate budget line for instructional development, 82% record 2% or less of the total academic budget for this activity. When asked about a separate institutional budget line for faculty development, 38.5% of institutions responded having no separate line for faculty development, while 43.6% responded having a separate line,

but 17.9% responded that instructional development was not included under the broad category of faculty development. Of those institutions which reported percentages of the faculty development budget designated for instructional development, the range was from 1% to 100% of the budget.

For the 66 institutions identified to be included in this study, a total of 30 faculty (10 per rank) was desired as an adequate faculty sample per institution. Because of oversampling, approximately 45 faculty per institution were sampled, creating an absolute possible data set of 2,744 faculty members. The number of faculty responding to the first mailing was 1,393 and to the second mailing 405, yielding a total response of 1,798 or a 65.5% response rate.

Faculty surveys were screened after their return and 207 surveys were deleted from data analysis because of the following reasons:

1. The institution requested faculty data not be used
2. The respondent was not at the rank of assistant, associate, or full professor
3. The respondent was a full time administrator
4. The respondent was not on a tenure track
5. The respondent was deceased, retired, or no longer employed at the sampled institution
6. The questionnaire was not completed with usable data
7. The questionnaire identification number had been destroyed

Thus, the total number of usable faculty surveys was 1,591, with the following percentages noted: 21.2% of faculty who responded were females and 78.8% were males. At the three faculty ranks, 25.8% were assistant professors, 36.3%

were associate professors, and 38.0% were professors. Since the central interest was in responses from faculty whose primary responsibility was teaching, those surveys which indicated primary responsibilities as other than teaching were deleted. Thus, 82.7% of respondents indicated that for the 1985-86 year, they were full time with tenure status, while less than 1% (.63%) indicated they were part time with tenure; 16.5% indicated they were full time, without tenure (but on the tenure track), and less than 1% (.1%) indicated they were part time and without tenure at the time of the survey.

Of all respondents, 77.2% indicated appointments were for full time teaching; 22.4% indicated appointments for part time teaching, part time administration, and only .4% indicated an appointment for part time teaching, part time research. Table 1 shows the division of sex by rank, and Table 2 depicts the division of sex by type of appointment.

Survey Results

The following section contains results of institutional and faculty surveys which were returned for data analysis. Following the review of literature, five questions were central to this study. Each question is presented and followed by an appropriate data analysis.

Question I:

Within public, comprehensive institutions, to what extent is teaching important to an institution as the primary role for faculty?

Table 1

Sex of Respondents by Rank

	RANK			
SEX	ASSISTANT	ASSOCIATE	PROF	TOTAL
Female (n =337)	9.06%	7.11%	5.03%	21.19%
Male (n =1253)	16.73%	29.12%	32.96%	78.81%

Note. N = 1,590

Table 2

Sex of Respondents by Type of Appointment

	APPOINTMENT				
SEX	FULL TIME WITH TENURE	PART TIME WITH TENURE	FULL TIME NO TENURE	PART TIME NO TENURE	TOTAL
Female (n= 336)	16.26%	.19%	4.73%	.00%	21.17%
Male (n= 1251)	66.48%	.44%	11.78%	.13%	78.83%

Note. N = 1,587

A. The existence of a written, public statement which specifies the importance of teaching within an institution.

The Mission and Goal Statement as it appeared in the 1985-86 institutional catalog was reviewed for each institution to determine the institution's stated commitment to teaching as a valued activity. Among institutions responding, 18.9% had no reference to the importance of teaching within the published Mission and Goal Statement, 34.0% had a weak inference to the importance of teaching, 11.3% had a strongly inferred statement, and 35.8% had Mission and Goal Statements which explicitly stated the importance of teaching to the institution.

B. The presence or absence within the academic budget of funds appropriated for instructional development activities.

Each institutional survey requested information about the existence of a budget line for instructional development, and the amount of that budget. Of responding institutions, 60.4% reported having some instructional development funds either through an institutional or departmental budget, or as funds embedded in a faculty development line item. Almost 40% (39.6%) reported no instructional development funds in any budget source.

C. The presence of written policies which support teaching on a particular campus.

Institutions were asked about the presence or absence of policies which either encourage or discourage instructional

development activities. The presence of many written policies which encourage faculty to participate in instructional development activities would then indicate a high degree of institutional commitment to instructional development as a formally recognized faculty activity. From a total of 14 possibilities, the following percentages were recorded:

> 20.8% of institutions indicated having zero to three policies; 71.7% of institutions reported four to nine policies, and 7.5% of institutions reported having 10 to 14 policies.

No institution had written policies which encouraged all 14 activities, but the range was from one policy to 12 policies (the mode being seven). Of all 53 institutions responding, 22.6% had seven policies, 17.0% had four policies, and 13.2% had either three or six policies.

D. The relative importance of teaching in promotion and tenure decisions as specified by a chief institutional officer.

Each chief institutional officer was asked in the survey to rank order seven activities considered important in tenure and promotion decisions at that institution (1=most important; 7=least important). Of institutions responding, 96.2% reported teaching as the most important activity for acquisition of tenure, and 3.8% ranked teaching as the second most important for tenure. Institutions also ranked teaching as most important for promotion (92.5%) and second in importance for 7.5% of all institutions.

For the purpose of statistical analysis, those institutions with strongly inferred or explicit published statements about the importance of teaching were grouped together, yielding three groupings: no reference to the importance of teaching, importance as weakly inferred from the written Mission and Goal Statement, and strongly inferred/explicitly stated as to the importance of teaching to the institution. When institutions were compared according to the existence of budget support for instructional development activities, those institutions with strongly inferred or explicitly stated statements also had budget lines for instructional development (see Table 3). Statistical analysis, using the chi square, was not statistically significant, however. When institutions were compared according to the number of written policies that existed to encourage instructional development, 41.5% of institutions which strongly/explicitly stated teaching as important in the published Mission and Goal Statement also had more than four written institutional policies to convey that commitment (see Table 4). The chi square analysis showed no statistically significant difference.

When institutions were asked to rank teaching among other activities relative to its importance in tenure decisions, there was no statistical difference in the rating of teaching as the most important activity when compared to what is actually stated in the published Mission and Goal Statement (see Table 5). Likewise, there was no statistically

Table 3

Comparison of Institutional Budget Support with Mission and Goal Statements

MISSION/GOAL	BUDGET		
	NO BUDGET LINE (n=21)	BUDGET LINE (n=32)	ROW PERCENTAGE
No Reference (n= 10)	4	6	60%
Weakly Inferred (n= 18)	10	8	44%
Strongly/Explicitly Inferred/Stated (n= 25)	7	18	72%

Note. Chi square = 3.322
df = 2
p = .190

Table 4

Comparison of Institutional Budget Support with Number of Written Policies

MISSION/GOAL	POLICIES 0-3	4-9	10-14
No Reference (n= 10)	4	6	0
Weakly Inferred (n= 18)	4	14	0
Strongly/Explicitly Inferred/Stated (n= 25)	3	18	4

MISSION/Goal	POLICIES 0-3	4-9	10-14
No Reference			
Expected Observation	2.08	7.17	.75
Residual	+1.92	-1.17	-.75
Weakly Inferred			
Expected Observation	3.74	12.91	1.26
Residual	+.26	+1.09	-1.26
Strongly/Explicit			
Expected Observation	5.19	17.92	1.89
Residual	-2.19	+ .08	+2.11

Note. Chi square = 7.49
df = 4
p = .112

Table 5

Comparison of Importance of Teaching in Tenure Decisions with Mission and Goal Statements

MISSION/GOAL	RANKING: MOST IMPORTANT	RANKING: 2nd IN IMPORTANCE	ROW PERCENTAGE
No Reference (n= 10)	9	1	90%
Weakly Inferred (n= 18)	18	0	100%
Strongly/Explicitly Inferred/Stated (n= 25)	24	1	96%

Note. Chi square = 1.77
df = 2
p = .411

significant difference among institutions when asked to rank the importance of teaching in promotion decisions (see Table 6).

Question II:

Do relationships exist among an institution's statement of support for teaching, an institution's financial support for teaching, and faculty perceptions of the importance of teaching within an institution?

A. An assessment of the institution's Mission and Goal Statement to determine the degree of publicly stated support for teaching on a given campus.

An institution's statement of support for teaching as assessed in the Mission and Goal Statement was reported in Question I (A).

B. Evidence of support for instructional development activities within an institution's budget.

Evidence of support for instructional development activities within the institutional budget was reported in Question I (B).

C. Perceptions by liberal arts faculty at a given institution for teaching as a primary mission of their institution.

Liberal arts faculty at the selected institutions were asked their perception of the importance of teaching at their institution. After surveys were returned, one statement from the original list of 11 was deleted because of lack of response to this statement. Thus, for 10 statements a maxi-

Table 6

Comparison of Importance of Teaching in Promotion Decisions with Mission and Goal Statements

MISSION/GOAL	RANKING: MOST IMPORTANT	RANKING: 2nd IN IMPORTANCE	ROW PERCENTAGE
No Reference (n= 10)	9	1	90%
Weakly Inferred (n= 18)	17	1	94%
Strongly/Explicitly Inferred/Stated (n= 25)	23	2	92%

Note. Chi square = .196
df = 2
p = .907

mum score of 40 would indicate that the faculty member perceives teaching as very important at his/her institution. A minimum score of 10 would indicate a perception that teaching is not encouraged or supported at that institution. The mean response of all faculty (N = 1479) was 24.67 with a standard deviation of 5.29.

An analysis of variance showed that when Mission and Goal Statements are compared to mean faculty perceptions of the importance of teaching, there are no statistically significant differences (see Table 7).

Question III:

Within public, comprehensive institutions, do faculty differ in the way they perceive the importance of teaching in their institution as a function of the rank of these faculty?

A. A statistical analysis of difference in the average perceptions of liberal arts faculty within specified institutions which can be attributed to their rank as professor, associate, or assistant professor.

Each faculty survey asked the respondent to indicate his/her faculty rank and the extent of agreement or disagreement with statements related to support of teaching activities at his/her institution. A maximum score of 40 would indicate a perception of teaching as very important at that institution. Data analysis began with a matrix indicating at each responding institution the number of faculty respon-

Table 7

Comparison of Faculty Perceptions of the Importance of Teaching with Mission and Goal Statements Using Analysis of Variance

MISSION/GOAL	MEAN FACULTY PERCEPTION
No Reference (n= 10)	$\bar{x}$ = 24.92
Weakly Inferred (n= 18)	$\bar{x}$ = 23.98
Strongly/Explicitly Inferred/Stated (n= 25)	$\bar{x}$ = 25.13

SOURCE	df	ss	ms	F	p
Mission Goal Grouping	2	14.47	7.23	1.57	.2185
Error	50	230.62	4.61		
Total Corrected	52	245.09			

R^2 = .059

ses at each rank of assistant, associate, and professor. Where an institution had less than five responses in a cell, that cell was deleted in further analysis. Only 12 institutions had one cell which fell into this category. Total faculty responses (N=1591) were 410 assistant professors, 577 associate professors, and 604 professors.

A mean score of perceived institutional importance of teaching was obtained on the ten items for each faculty rank (see Table 8). The ANOVA was then performed to compute the within subjects analysis of variance. A statistically significant difference ($p = .05$) was found between the ranks of associate and professor. No significance was found between the mean scores of assistant and associate professors or between assistant and professor. As a revalidation of this finding, the ANOVA was computed only for faculty responses where institutional data had been received in order to determine if there were any possible differences among faculty ranks whose institutions did or did not respond to the survey. There were no differences in statistical outcomes. A statistically significant difference ($p = .05$) was found between the mean scores of associate and professor, but not between assistant and associate professors or between assistant and professor (using a two-tailed test of significance which allowed for the possibility that a difference could have occurred in either direction). These results indicated that there are statistically significant differences in the per-

Table 8

Comparison of Rank with Faculty Perceptions of the Importance of Teaching

RANK	FACULTY RESPONSES
Assistant	$\bar{x}$ = 24.60
Associate	$\bar{x}$ = 24.21
Professor	$\bar{x}$ = 25.16 *

Note. *Comparison significant at .05 level

RANK	LOWER CONFIDENCE LEVEL	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS	UPPER CONFIDENCE LEVEL
Prof-Assist	-0.2193	0.5606	1.3405
Prof-Assoc	0.2268	0.9578	1.6888 *
Assist-Assoc	-0.3827	0.3972	1.1771

ceived importance of teaching between full professors and associate professors.

The mean response of perceived institutional importance of teaching was then sorted according to the published importance of teaching at each institution. For statistical analysis, institutions again were grouped to yield three groups: (1) no reference to the importance of teaching, (2) importance as weakly inferred from the written Mission and Goal Statement, and (3) strongly inferred/explicitly stated as to the importance of teaching to the institution. For institutions having no reference to the importance of teaching in the Mission and Goal Statement, the combined mean perception of all faculty responding to the importance of teaching was 24.92. For institutions which had weak inferences to the importance of teaching, a faculty mean of 23.98 was recorded. For institutions having a strongly inferred or explicit statement about teaching, a faculty mean of 25.13 was recorded. An analysis of variance showed no statistical significance in differences among these average faculty perceptions when compared to the written importance of teaching in institutional Mission and Goal Statements (see Table 9).

Faculty perception of the importance of teaching also was compared according to rank and Mission and Goal category (see Table 10). A two-way analysis of variance was computed to determine whether any differences in mean faculty percep-

Table 9

Comparison of Faculty Perceptions of the Importance of Teaching with Mission and Goal Statements

MISSION/GOAL	MEAN FACULTY PERCEPTION
No Reference (n= 10)	$\bar{x}$ = 24.92
Weakly Inferred (n= 18)	$\bar{x}$ = 23.98
Strongly/Explicitly Inferred/Stated (n= 25)	$\bar{x}$ = 25.13

Table 10

Comparison of Faculty Perception of Importance of Teaching by Faculty Rank with Mission and Goal Statement

	RANK (in mean scores)		
MISSION/GOAL	ASSISTANT	ASSOCIATE	PROFESSOR
No Reference (n= 10)	24.04	24.42	25.60
Weakly Inferred (n= 18)	24.08	23.78	24.31
Strongly/Explicitly Inferred/Stated (n= 25)	25.04	24.39	25.60

ceptions existed between institutions (based on their assigned Mission and Goal category) and faculty ranks. Again, rank was statistically significant ($p = .02$) based on three categories of rank and three categories of Mission and Goal Statements (see Table II), indicating that there are statistically significant differences in perceived importance of teaching between associate and professor, regardless of the institution's stated importance of teaching.

Question IV:

Do faculty perceive institutional rewards as clearly linked to instructional priorities within a given institutional context?

A. Perceptions of liberal arts faculty at different faculty ranks as to the importance of teaching in faculty promotion decisions made at their institution.

On the faculty survey, each respondent was asked to rank order seven faculty activities considered important in promotion and tenure decisions at his/her institution. When faculty are divided by rank on this question, there are statistically significant differences. The chi square ($p = .0001$) reveals a statistically significant difference when rank of faculty is accounted for; i.e., when faculty activities are grouped, more professors ranked teaching as a first or second choice in importance for promotion than did either associate or assistant professors (see Table 12). More assistant and associate professors ranked teaching as a

Table 11

Within Subjects and Between Subjects Analysis of Importance of Teaching Mean Scores by Faculty Rank and Institutional Mission and Goal

SOURCE	df	ss	ms	F	p
Mission/Goal	2	21.74	10.87	.83	.44
Error A	50	650.90	13.02		
Rank	2	22.46	11.23	4.12	.02*
Rank* (Mission/Goal)	4	6.21	1.55	.57	.69
Error B	83	226.05	2.72		
Total	141	936.62			

Note. * Significant at .02 level

Table 12

Comparison of Faculty Rating of Importance of Teaching in Promotion Decisions by Rank

CATEGORIES OF RATINGS	RANK			
	ASSISTANT	ASSOCIATE	PROF	TOTAL
1-2	213	309	377	899
3-5	82	103	73	258
6-7	32	40	23	95
Total	327	452	473	1252

Note. N = 1252
Chi square = 24.897
df = 4
p = .0001

CATEGORIES OF RATINGS	RANK		
	ASSISTANT	ASSOCIATE	PROFESSOR
1-2			
Expected Observation	234.8	324.6	339.6
Residual	- 21.8	- 15.6	37.4
3-5			
Expected Observation	67.4	93.1	97.5
Residual	14.6	9.9	- 24.5
6-7			
Expected Observation	24.8	34.3	35.9
Residual	7.2	5.7	- 12.9

3 or lower than would be statistically expected.

B. Perceptions of liberal arts faculty at different faculty ranks as to the importance of teaching in faculty tenure decisions made at their institution.

When faculty were surveyed as to their perception of the importance of teaching in tenure decisions, of those faculty responding (N=1252), more professors report teaching as first or second in importance for tenure than would be statistically expected (see Table 13). More assistant and associate professors ranked teaching as a 3 or lower than would have been expected. This was a statistically significant difference ($p = .007$).

Question V:

To what extent is there a general opinion or attitude among faculty at public, comprehensive institutions as to the current importance of teaching across a selected sample of institutions?

A. Perceptions of faculty will be combined across all institutions to indicate a general opinion of the importance of teaching within those institutions surveyed.

Faculty were asked their perception of the importance of teaching at their institution by ranking teaching among seven other faculty activities normally associated with the faculty role. For all faculty (N = 1,591), 52.8% ranked teaching as the most important activity for promotion, while 18.3% ranked teaching as the second most important activity for

Table 13

Comparison of Faculty Rating of Importance of Teaching in Tenure Decisions by Rank

CATEGORIES OF RATINGS	RANK			
	ASSISTANT	ASSOCIATE	PROF	TOTAL
1-2	248	346	400	994
3-5	59	78	50	187
6-7	23	26	22	71
Total	330	450	472	1252

Note. N = 1252
Chi square = 14.251
df = 4
p = .007

CATEGORIES OF RATINGS	RANK		
	ASSISTANT	ASSOCIATE	PROFESSOR
1-2			
Expected Observation	262.0	357.3	374.7
Residual	- 14.0	- 11.3	25.3
3-5			
Expected Observation	49.3	67.2	70.5
Residual	9.7	10.8	- 20.5
6-7			
Expected Observation	18.7	25.5	26.8
Residual	4.3	0.5	- 4.8

promotion. Approximately one third (34.7%) of all faculty responding ranked research/publication as first in importance, and 27.9% ranked this activity as second in importance (see Table 14).

In tenure decisions, 65.1% ranked teaching as first in importance, and 13.4% ranked teaching as second in importance when tenure is the issue. Almost one fourth (24.5%) of all faculty ranked research/publication as first in importance in tenure decisions, and 32.0% ranked this activity as second in perceived institutional importance (see Table 15).

Table 14

Faculty Ranking of Activities in Promotion

ACTIVITY	RANKING (in percentage) MOST IMPT	2nd in IMPT
Dept. Admin. Service	3.6	10.4
Grant Writing	3.3	12.7
Prof. Assoc.	1.0	5.3
Publication	34.7	27.9
Community Service	1.4	4.4
Good Teaching	52.8	18.3
University Service	6.2	25.1

Note. N = 1,591

Table 15

Faculty Ranking of Activities in Tenure

ACTIVITY	RANKING (in percentage) MOST IMPT	2nd in IMPT
Dept. Admin. Service	3.0	9.9
Grant Writing	2.9	10.3
Prof. Assoc.	1.0	4.1
Publication	24.5	32.0
Community Service	1.4	4.6
Good Teaching	65.1	13.4
University Service	5.4	28.1

Note. N = 1,591

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

This study was intended as an investigation of potential change within higher education. Comprehensive universities, chosen as the institutional unit of analysis, traditionally have emphasized the teaching role of the faculty member because many of these institutions began as four-year liberal arts colleges or as teacher education institutions. Faculty members at these institutions have been hired primarily for their expertise in content areas.

Recent reports and studies have indicated that teaching currently may not be the most important or rewarded faculty activity for higher education faculty members. However, the literature did not clearly differentiate this finding as applicable for faculty at all institutional types. The need, therefore, was to reaffirm traditional expectations for faculty activities at public, comprehensive institutions, or to identify areas of change which substantiate the findings that teaching may not be the most important or rewarded activity at selected institutions.

Summary of Review of Literature

The review of the literature cited four areas relevant to the study:

1. Research related to the faculty member's perception of teaching as a personally valued activity.
2. Research related to the individual member's perception of the institution's commitment to teaching.
3. Research related to the institution's commitment to the importance of the teaching role.
4. The theoretical basis of cognitive consistency and dissonance.

The review of literature indicated that most faculty value teaching as a personally rewarding activity. However, the ordering of teaching, service, and scholarly productivity is related to institutional priorities which then are supported by institutional rewards. The literature also indicates that teaching has been difficult to reward because of confusion and lack of precision in the definition and measurement of what is effective teaching. This confusion may have added to the perception that teaching is not as important as other faculty activities which can be precisely measured and defined.

The theory of cognitive dissonance then offers assistance as a useful description of inconsistencies which may exist between behaviors and cognition. Theories of cognitive inconsistency are important for this study because of the potential psychological discomfort which can be created when job requirements are inconsistent with perceived expectations.

Thus, the importance of environmental assessment is stressed throughout the literature, with particular attention given to person/environment interaction. The literature is sufficiently supportive to warrant the use of person/environment interaction in the examination of an institution's influence on the perception of the importance of a particular faculty member's role.

Within the review of literature, however, there was no clear differentiation of institutional priorities for the comprehensive institution. The literature clearly specifies that institutional values are embodied through a statement of mission and through the activities and institutional rewards that occur within that institution. The need was to discern whether comprehensive institutions are accurately and overtly stating priorities particular to an institution, and whether faculty perceptions reflect these priorities.

Five questions were central to this study in the attempt to examine current tensions and potential change:

1. Within public, comprehensive institutions, to what extent is teaching important to an institution as the primary role for faculty?
2. Do relationships exist among an institution's statement of support for teaching, an institution's financial support for teaching, and faculty perceptions of the importance of teaching within an institution?

3. Within public, comprehensive institutions, do faculty differ in the way they perceive the importance of teaching in their institution as a function of the professorial rank of these faculty?

4. Do faculty perceive institutional rewards as clearly linked to instructional priorities within a given institutional context?

5. To what extent is there a general opinion or attitude among faculty at public, comprehensive institutions as to the current importance of teaching across a selected sample of institutions?

Summary of Results

Of 66 institutions identified to be included in this study, the usable response rate was 82% (N = 53). Institutional responses were returned primarily by the Vice President/Chancellor of Academic Affairs (64.1%), by the Provost (3.8%), Dean of the Faculty (1.9%), or by others (30.2%), which generally meant an officer in institutional research. Of all institutions responding, 67.9% reported no separate institutional budget line for instructional development, and 87.5% reported no separate budget line for instructional development within departments. Of those institutions reporting a separate budget line for instructional development, 82% recorded 2% or less of the total academic budget for this activity. When asked about a separate institutional budget

line for faculty development, 38.5% of institutions responded having no separate line for faculty development, while 43.6% responded having a separate line, but 17.9% responded that instructional development was not included under the broad category of faculty development.

The number of faculty responding to the faculty survey yielded a total response of 65.5% (N = 1,798). Total number of usable faculty surveys was 1,591, with the following percentages noted: 21.2% of faculty who responded were females and 78.8% were males. At the three faculty ranks, 25.8% were assistant professors, 36.3% were associate professors, and 38.0% were professors. Of all respondents, 77.2% indicated appointments were for full time teaching.

For the purpose of statistical analysis, institutions were categorized according to the importance of teaching as expressed in the institutional Mission and Goal Statement, yielding three categories of institutions: those with no reference to the importance of teaching, those with importance of teaching as weakly inferred, and those with a strongly inferred/explicitly stated reference to the importance of teaching in the Mission and Goal Statement.

Question I was concerned with the extent to which teaching was important to an institution as the primary role for faculty. When institutions were compared according to their Mission and Goal category and according to the existence of budget support for instructional development activities,

those institutions with strongly inferred or explicitly stated Mission and Goal statements also tended to have budget lines for instructional development. Statistical analysis, using the chi square, was not statistically significant, however. When institutions were compared according to the number of written policies that existed to encourage instructional development, 41.5% of institutions which strongly/explicitly stated teaching as important in the published Mission and Goal Statement also had more than four written institutional policies to support that commitment (chi square not being statistically significant). When institutions were asked to rank teaching among other activities relative to its importance in tenure and promotion decisions, there was no statistically significant difference in the rating of teaching as the most important activity when compared to what is actually stated in the published Mission and Goal Statement for either tenure or promotion.

Question II asked if relationships exist among an institution's statement of support for teaching, an institution's financial support for teaching, and faculty perceptions of the importance of teaching within an institution. An analysis of variance showed that when Mission and Goal Statements are compared to faculty perceptions of the importance of teaching, there are no statistically significant differences; i.e., faculty perceptions about the importance of teaching on their campus do not vary significantly accord-

ing to the institution's public statement of the importance of teaching. Likewise, as reported in Question I, there is no statistically significant relationship when institutions are compared according to their public statement and financial support for teaching.

Question III asked if there are differences among faculty in the way they perceive the importance of teaching in their institution which may be a function of the rank of these faculty. A mean score of perceived institutional importance of teaching was obtained for each faculty rank. The ANOVA was then performed to compute the within-subjects analysis of variance. A statistically significant difference was found between the perceptions of associate and professor, indicating that differences in perceived importance of teaching do exist between the ranks of associate professors and professors. No statistical significance was found between the mean scores of assistant and associate professors, or between assistant and professor. This same pattern was true when perceptions were analyzed for faculty whose institutions had returned institutional surveys. Faculty perception of the importance of teaching also was compared according to faculty rank and institutional Mission and Goal category using a two-way analysis of variance. Again, rank was statistically significant based on three categories of rank and three categories of Mission and Goal Statements, indicating

that regardless of the public statement of the importance of teaching, differences in perception do exist based on the rank of the faculty member. In all cases, the mean score of professors was highest, indicating stronger agreement that teaching was considered highly important on a particular campus.

Question IV asked if faculty perceived institutional rewards as clearly linked to instructional priorities within a given institutional context. Institutional rewards were defined here as the awarding of promotion or tenure. When faculty were divided by rank on this question, there are statistically significant differences using the chi square. More professors ranked teaching as a first or second choice in importance for promotion than did either associate or assistant professors. More assistant and associate professors ranked teaching as a 3 or lower than would have been statistically expected. This same pattern held true when the reward was defined as tenure; i.e., more professors reported teaching as first or second in importance for tenure than would have been statistically expected.

Question V explored to what extent a general opinion or attitude existed among faculty at all institutions as to the current importance of teaching. For all faculty, 52.8% ranked teaching as the most important activity for promotion, while 65.1% ranked teaching as most important for tenure.

Approximately one third (34.7%) of all faculty responding ranked research/publication as first in importance for promotion, while only 24.5% ranked research/publication as first in importance in tenure decisions.

Conclusions and Discussion

Several conclusions can be drawn from the results of this study. Institutions with strongly inferred or explicit statements about the importance of teaching in the institutional Mission and Goal also tended to financially support teaching on a particular campus. Although not statistically significant, analysis of data showed 18 institutions which strongly/explicitly stated teaching as important in the Mission Statement as having a budget line to support instructional or faculty development. This was in comparison to seven institutions which also strongly/explicitly stated teaching as important but had no budget line to support that mission. This finding seems important given the fact that over one third of the responding institutions reported no instructional development funds in any budget line, and one third reported no separate institutional budget line for faculty development. It also was surprising that over one half (52.9%) of responding institutions had no reference or a weakly inferred reference to the importance of teaching within the written Mission and Goal Statement. In addition, commitment to teaching also was evident in the trend for institutions that publicly state teaching as important to have

written policies which encouraged teaching activities. In the analysis of data, the number of institutions having 10 to 14 policies and strong/explicit statements about the importance of teaching exceeded what would have been expected (i.e., this residual was the highest positive value when institutions were compared according to budget support and existence of written policies). In comparison, the lowest negative residual value (i.e., a value indicating less than what would be expected) occurred for institutions having a strong/explicit statement about the importance of teaching and 0-3 written policies to support that mission. The survey listed 14 statements which were derived from the literature as areas of most frequent support for teaching. Institutions which strongly favor a particular faculty activity should then strengthen that commitment through policy statements supporting that commitment. Twenty percent of responding institutions in this study report having less than three written policies to support teaching. What seems evident is that institutions need to express institutional commitment through overt and tangible means in order to lessen confusion about institutional expectations.

This conclusion that institutions should be more definitive about institutional priorities is made even more apparent by written comments from faculty which were included on the faculty survey. One theme which emerged from these written comments by faculty was that the administration may say

one thing but do another; i.e., that lip service is given to the support of teaching, but that in reality, teaching is not adequately encouraged. As one assistant professor stated, "There is a curious lack of resources for the development of better teaching and little formal recognition for excellence in teaching (even though teaching is valued on paper and to some extent in practice)". Another common theme that emerged from faculty comments was that teaching was once the basis for institutional recognition, but that now the institution requires and/or expects more in the area of research and publication. As one professor stated, "Instructional development receives a lot of emphasis in terms of the public front, but in practice more and more weight is attached to publication".

Institutions were almost unanimous in their declaration that teaching is the most important activity for promotion and tenure decisions on their campus. This declaration was not statistically related to the extent of publicly stated importance of teaching. However, many faculty commented on the fact that the institution supposedly stresses teaching, but other activities are important for obtaining rank and tenure. As one associate professor stated, "I don't think a really poor teacher could be tenured or promoted, but really good teaching might not be enough".

Faculty perceptions about the importance of teaching were not related to the institution's public statement of

support for teaching; i.e., perceptions did not vary significantly according to the institutional Mission and Goal category. This finding substantiates the idea that person/environment interaction is important to assess, and that a written mission statement is not, by itself, descriptive of an institution's environment. It is strongly suggested that institutions find the means to contribute to perceptions of institutional priorities not only through a public statement of mission, but also through other means such as clearly defined reward structures, written policies in support of institutional values, and financial support for those activities it deems of primary importance.

When faculty responses were analyzed by rank and according to their perceptions of the importance of teaching on their campus, differences in perceived importance of teaching were noted between average scores of professors and associate professors. The average score of perception of the importance of teaching was highest for professors, indicating greater agreement with statements that the institution supports teaching on a particular campus. Faculty perception of the importance of teaching was analyzed in context (i.e., rank also was taken into account when institutions were grouped according to the importance of teaching as stated in the Mission and Goal Statement). Again, rank was statistically significant, indicating that faculty rank does have an influence on perceptions of teaching importance regardless

of the institution's statement of support for that activity.

Since more professors consistently maintained higher agreement with institutional commitment/support for teaching,

several conclusions may be suggested. First, perceptions of professors may have been influenced by realities or the lack of reality based on longevity in higher education. Second, professors may be too far removed from tenure and promotion decisions to accurately reflect institutional priorities in these decisions. Third, more professors may serve on institutional committees which influence institutional support for faculty activities, and thus this group may be in a better position to judge relative importance of faculty activities within the institutional context. Last, professors may be exercising their status to participate more directly in activities other than teaching for their own professional growth and development. In this supposition, professors would not be as concerned with actual support for teaching as would be junior faculty and thus perceptions could be skewed.

Rank also was significant when faculty were asked to rank order activities important for promotion and tenure decisions on their campus. Consistent with the previous finding, more professors ranked teaching as a first or second choice in importance for promotion and tenure than did either associate or assistant professors. As one associate professor stated, "Excellence in teaching is an articulated value which is not adequately rewarded/encouraged/supported by the

institution". One assistant professor stated that new faculty coming into the institution are "clearly informed" of the research expectations, while another states that "supposedly, teaching (good) is a sine qua non for all promotion and tenure. Since it is an underlying requirement and expectation, it is often ignored in reality".

To further define whether rank was significant in perceptions of the importance of teaching, faculty were analyzed according to gender. When divided by gender, females (N=219) did not differ statistically in their ranking of teaching as first, second, third, fourth or lower for the importance of teaching in tenure decisions. That is, the percent of females who ranked teaching as first in importance was approximately what would be expected. Sixty percent of females ranked teaching as first in importance for tenure, regardless of rank.

The result was the same when females ranked teaching in promotion decisions. Forty eight percent of females ranked teaching as first in importance for promotion. A chi square analysis indicated that percentages of ranking were not statistically significant. This confirmed faculty rank as the basis for differences when faculty are asked about the importance of teaching in tenure and promotion decisions.

When asked about the importance of teaching, approximately one half of all faculty who responded (52.8%) ranked teaching as the most important activity for promotion, and

in tenure decisions, approximately two thirds (65.1%) ranked teaching as most important. This finding was substantiated by many faculty comments which stated that good teaching is essential for tenure, but that the criteria for promotion are somewhat different. Approximately one third of faculty ranked research/publication as most important for promotion. Somewhat indicative of the frustrations of junior faculty were two comments from assistant professors: "tenure committees expect the untenured to walk on water", and ".. . feel that we (faculty) are expected to produce in every area plus teach larger classes more effectively. The result is frustration". Several faculty expressed the concern that promotion and tenure criteria were different among colleges or departments, making generalized statements about institutional policies difficult to answer. Many faculty also commented that tenure and promotion are based on "who you know", rather than on standardized criteria.

Many faculty commented on the need to accurately define good or excellent teaching. The general consensus was that it is hard to reward what you cannot define or measure. As one professor stated, "I believe that if the administration knew of a good system to evaluate superior teaching, we would be told, and likewise, if the faculty found such a system, we would install it". In addition, many faculty reported the use of student surveys as the sole method of teaching evaluation. This was an area of concern for many faculty who expressed the need to develop good instrumentation in the evaluation of teaching.

In terms of the actual classroom experience, faculty mentioned the difficulty involved in the development of superior teaching when released time for this purpose is absent. Many faculty teach large classes, have large teaching loads, or teach those who are not academically prepared for college/university work.

Finally, several faculty expressed the concern that teaching and research are interrelated activities and that they are not mutually exclusive. One associate professor wrote, "I strongly believe that enthusiastic involvement in research can contribute to good teaching. Let's not forget that synergistic process".

Contributions of Study

At the most general level, this study was proposed to determine areas of change within higher education institutions. Pertinent areas included the possible change in emphasis of institutional mission, the possibility that institutional expectations of faculty activities have been altered, or that faculty themselves perceive rewarded activities as different from those which have been traditionally of value.

The analysis of data indicated that from the institutional perspective, comprehensive institutions included in this study still maintain that teaching is the most important activity for faculty. These institutions almost unanimously ranked teaching of primary importance for the institution, although this emphasis was not always reflected

in the institutional budget, the Mission and Goal Statement, or in written policies which support this emphasis. In terms of what institutions say they value, there has been no substantive change in the professed mission of this institutional type. Neither has the institution waivered in what it says faculty should be doing. However, within the review of literature, there is a clear indication that activities of high priority or value to the institution should be formally recognized and rewarded. One major contribution of this study is the recognition that these comprehensive institutions are not definitive in their public statement of what is important to the institution. If teaching is ranked of primary importance to the institution, then that institutional priority should be confirmed by a clear mission statement, budget support, and written policies to convey that commitment.

A major theoretical frame of reference for this study was the stated importance of teaching not only from an institutional perspective, but from an individual viewpoint as well. Perceptions offered by members of the system are one valid measure of the informal culture or institutional "press" that exists within a given institution. For this study, perceptions of the importance of teaching by professor, associate, and assistant professors were assessed to help understand the current status of the public, comprehensive institution. Analysis of data indicated that only 52.8% of all faculty in these institutions ranked teaching as the most

important activity for promotion, and 65.1% ranked teaching as most important for tenure. Approximately one third of all faculty ranked research/publication as first in importance for promotion, and almost one fourth ranked research/publication as first in importance in tenure decisions. This finding confirms the necessity for assessment of individual perceptions and provides the basis for discussion of lack of congruence between stated institutional priorities and individual perceptions of those priorities.

It can be proposed that some measure of dissonance exists for those faculty who did not rank teaching as the most important activity for promotion or tenure, even though this is of stated importance to the institution. From the literature, dissonance was proposed as psychological discomfort created by cognitive inconsistencies. If faculty perceptions are inconsistent with institutional priorities, then dissonance is a logical outcome for many members of these institutions. This conclusion is supported by the large number of unsolicited statements and comments by faculty who described the "mixed messages" of the institution; i.e., the institution may say one thing but do another. Festinger's work, in particular, offers assistance with this problem area. Dissonance can be reduced with the addition of pertinent information (i.e., information added to cognitive processing tends to produce attitude adjustments). This study provides a beginning for institutional/faculty dialogue

to clarify these inconsistencies.

The study was proposed and conducted as an analysis of the individual in context. This major theoretical framework states that individual behaviors and perceptions are a function of the pertinent environment of that individual. The comprehensive institution as the environmental context was chosen for this study primarily because of its traditional emphasis on teaching as an institutional mission. Results of this study confirm the importance of this framework as a viable methodology which contributes to the knowledge of the comprehensive institution as one institutional type within the higher education system. Comprehensive institutions included in this study continue to profess teaching as the primary faculty activity, although faculty perceptions do not consistently support this institutionally stated priority. Faculty perceive institutional rewards (i.e., promotion and tenure) as not consistently related to institutional priorities. The need is to strengthen positive consequences for behaviors which are important to the institution so that consistencies exist between individual and environment.

Implications for Further Study

Two areas offer the basis for further study: the theoretical frame of reference and the applied aspect of findings from this study. From the theoretical perspective, a continuation of studies of person/environment interaction is suggested. An assessment of individual concerns, perceptions,

and behaviors consistently should be viewed in the context in which they occur. Institutions should routinely review their current policies, budget support, and mission statement in order to positively contribute to the goals which are of importance to the institution. Activities considered of major importance to the institution should be conveyed and supported by the institution which has the responsibility for providing the setting in which teaching and learning take place. Rewards should be perceived as a natural consequence of institutionally valued behaviors. The implication of this congruence between institutional priorities and public support of these activities should be to increase faculty morale through increased clarification of stated objectives.

A follow-up study of these institutions within five years would be informative to determine if more consistency occurs between stated activities of value and public recognition of these activities. This follow-up study would provide additional baseline data for the establishment of a long-term profile of the comprehensive institution. However, the replication would include a more definitive measurement of budget support for stated activities.

The area of cognitive dissonance offers a second theoretical perspective which should be studied in greater detail. In particular, a study of promotion and tenure policies across institutions, or within specified departments,

would be helpful. The major problem area for this suggestion is the lack of definition and measurement of what actually constitutes "good" or "effective" teaching. This study should concentrate on assistance in the clarification of this issue within a stated institutional context (i.e., "good" teaching may be specific to the context in which it occurs).

A second area for further study is why faculty perceptions were influenced by the rank of the professor. Some tentative suggestions were offered in this study, but these are only suppositions at this point. In-depth structured interviews would contribute greatly to this question to assist in an understanding of faculty perceptual differences.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Council on Education. (1985). 1984-85 Fact book on higher education. New York: Macmillan.

Ashby, W.R. (1968). Regulation and control. In W. Buckley (Ed.), Modern systems research for the behavioral scientist (pp. 296-303). Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Assessing faculty performance. (1976, November). Teaching Research Division, Oregon State System of Higher Education.

Astin, A.W. (1968). The college environment. Washington: American Council on Education.

Axelrod, J. (1973). The university teacher as artist. Washington: Jossey-Bass.

Baldwin, R. (1979). Adult and career development: What are the implications for faculty? Current issues in Higher Education, 13-20.

Bergquist, W.H., and Shoemaker, W.A. (Eds.). (1976). A comprehensive approach to institutional development. Washington: Jossey-Bass.

Bergquist, W.H., and Phillips, S.R. (1977). A handbook for faculty development (Vol. 2). Washington: The Council for the Advancement of Small College.

Bergquist, W.H., and Phillips, S.R. (1981). A handbook for faculty development (Volume 3). Washington: Council of Independent College.

Bess, J.L. (1982). The motivation to teach: Meanings, messages, and morals. In J. L. Bess (Ed.), Motivating professors to teach effectively (pp. 99-107). Washington: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Bess, J.L. (1982). University organization: A matrix analysis of the academic professions. New York: Human Sciences Press, Inc.

Blackburn, R.T. (1979). Academic careers: Patterns and possibilities. Current Issues in Higher Education, 25-28.

Blackwell, M.W. (1985, November). Perceptions of professional contributions. Paper presented at the Mid-South Educational Research Association, 14th Annual Conference. Biloxi, Miss.

Blau, P.M. (1974). On the nature of organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Blau, P.M. (1973). The organization of academic work. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Bolman, W.M. (1967). Theoretical and empirical bases of community mental health. American Journal of Psychiatry, October, 124(4), 8-13.

Bornheimer, D.G., Burns, G.P., and Dumke, G.S. (1973). The faculty in higher education. Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc.

Boulding, K.E. (1968). General systems theory: The skeleton of science. In W. Buckley (Ed.), Modern systems research for the behavioral scientist (pp. 3-10). Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Bowen, H. and Schuster, J. (1986). American professors: A national resource imperiled. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Boyer sees 'mismatch' between students' quality and faculty expectations. (1985, October 9). Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 23.

Brown, R. (1965(. Social psychology. New York: The Free Press, 549-609.

Buckley, W. (1968). Society as a complex adaptive system. In W. Buckley (Ed.), Modern systems research for the behavioral scientist (pp. 490-513). Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Cadwallader, M.L. (1968). The cybernetic analysis of change in complex social organizations. In W. Buckley (ed.), Modern systems research for the behavioral scientist (pp. 437-440). Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Cammann, C. (1982). Feedback systems for teachers. In J. L. Bess (Ed.), Motivating professors to teach effectively (pp. 85-94). Washington: Jossey-Bass.

Cantril, H. (1968). Perception and interpersonal relations. In E.P. Hollander and R.G. Hunt (Eds.), Current perspectives in social psychology (pp. 290-298). New York: Oxford University Press.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1979). Missions of the college curriculum. Washington: Jossey-Bass.

Centering on teaching improvement. (1976, June). Regional Spotlight Newsletter, Southern Regional Educational Board, X,(4).

Centra, J.A. (1979). Determining faculty effectiveness. Washington: Jossey-Bass.

Chronicle of Higher Education, (1985, October). XXXI(8).

Ciampa, B.J. (1980, December). Fostering instructional improvement through faculty development. Planning for Higher Education, 9(2), 22-27.

Chait, R.P., and Ford, A.T.(1982). Beyond traditional tenure. Washington: Jossey-Bass.

Competence of new teachers improving, faculty quality up, survey finds. (1983, July 20). Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 1.

Contextual factors affecting individual and institutional behavior in schools, colleges and departments of education. (1976, November). Washington: Research on Institution of Teacher Education.

Cronbach, L.J., and Snow, R.E. (1977). Aptitudes and instructional methods. New York: Halstead Press.

Cross, P. (1976). Not when, but will teaching be improved? In J. A. Centra (Ed.), Reviewing and evaluating teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Crow, M.L., Milton, O., Moomaw, W.E., and O'Connell, W.R., Jr. (Eds.). (1976). Faculty development centers in southern universities. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board.

Crow, M.L. (1978, May-June). The future. Journal of Teacher Education, XXIX(3), 34-36.

Czikszentmihalyi, M. (1982). Intrinsic motivation and effective teaching. In J. L. Bess (Ed.), Motivating professors to teach effectively (pp. 15-26). Washington: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Davis, R.H., Strand, R., Alexander, L.T., and Hussain, M.N. (1982). The impact of organizational and innovator variables on instructional innovation in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 53(5), 568-586.

Deci, E., and Ryan, R.M. (1982). Instrinsic motivation to teach: Possibilities and obstacles in our colleges and universities. In J. L. Bess (Ed.), Motivating professors to teach effectively (pp. 27-35). Washington: Jossey-Bass.

Downey, H.K. and Ireland, R.D. (1979, December). Quantitative verses qualitative: Environmental assessment in organizational studies. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 630-637.

Dressel, P.L. (1976). Handbook of academic evaluation: Assessing institutional effectiveness, student progress, and professional performance for decision making in higher education. Higher Education Series, Jossey-Bass.

Dressel, P.L., and Marcus, G.D. (1982). On teaching and learning in college. Washington: Jossey-Bass.

Easton, J.Q., Barshis, D. and Ginsberg, R. (1983-84, December/January). Chicago colleges identify effective teachers, students. Community and Junior College Journal, 27-31.

Eble, K.E. (1971). The recognition and evaluation of teaching. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors.

Eble, K.E. (1972). Professors as teachers. Washington: Jossey-Bass.

Ellner, C.L., and Barnes, C.P. (1983). Studies of college teaching. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company.

Eraut, M. (1975, February). Promoting innovation in teaching and learning: Problems, processes, and institutional mechanisms. Higher Education, 4(1), 18-26.

Ericksen, S.C. (1982). A measure of good teaching. Invited Address, Division 2, American Psychological Association, University of Michigan: Center for Research on Learning and Teaching.

Faculty members at liberal-arts colleges searching for a new definition of success. (1985, June 19). Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 23.

Faia, M.A. (1980, March). Teaching, research and role theory. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 448, 36-45.

Fenker, R.M. (1975, November/December). The evaluation of university faculty and administrators. Journal of Higher Education, XLVI(6), 665-685.

Fenker, R.M. (1977, July/August). The incentive structure of a university. Journal of Higher Education, XLVIII(4), 453-471.

Festinger, L. (1957). A theory of cognitive dissonance. New York: Rowland Peterson.

Foote, C., and Mayer, H. and Associates. (1968). The culture of the university: Governance and education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Francis, J.B. (1975, November/December). How do we get there from here? Program design for faculty development. Journal of Higher Education, XLVI(6), 719-732.

Fredericksen, N. (1974). Toward a taxonomy of situations. In R. Moos and P. M. Insel (Eds.), Issues in social ecology (pp. 29-44). Palo Alto: National Press Books.

Freedman, M. (1979). Academic culture and faculty development. California: Montaigne Press, Inc.

Fuhrmann, B.S., and Grasha, A.F. (1983). A practical handbook for college teachers. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.

Gaff, J.G. (Ed.). (1978). Institutional renewal through the improvement of teaching. Washington: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Galbraith, J.R. (1977). Organization design. Massachusetts: Addison Wesley.

Gay, L.R. (1976). Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Co.

Glenn, J.M. Chemistry scholars in school and university contexts. A study of transition from school to university. (1970). In W.J. Campbell (Ed.), Scholars in context: The effects of environment on learning (pp. 217-240). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Grasha, A.F. (1978, May-June). The role of organizational development. Journal of Teacher Education, XXIX(3), 27-30.

Hall, A.D. and Fagen, R.E. (1968). Definition of a system. In W. Buckley (Ed.), Modern systems research for the behavioral scientist (pp. 81-92). Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Hall, D.T., and Bazerman, M.H. (1982). Organization design and faculty motivation to teach. In J. L. Bess (Ed.), Motivating professors to teach effectively (pp. 71-83). Washington: Jossey-Bass.

Hammond, P.E., Meyer, J.W. and Miller, D. (1969, December). Teaching versus research: Sources of misperceptions. Journal of Higher Education, XL(9), 682-690.

Houle, C.O. (1984). Patterns of learning: New perspectives on life-span education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 205-233.

Hunt, D.E., and Sullivan, E.V. (1974). Between psychology and education. Hinsdale, Illinois: Dryden Press.

Involvement in learning: Realizing the potential of american higher education. (1984, October). Final Report of the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education, National Institute of Education.

Job competition, unrealistic expectations said to generate an anxious professoriate. (1986, March 26). Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 27.

Kasten, K.L. (1984, July/August). Tenure and merit pay as rewards for research, teaching, and service at a research university. Journal of Higher Education, 55(4), 500-514.

Knox, W.B. (1956, December). A study of the relationships of certain environmental factors to teaching success. Journal of Experimental Education, 25(2), 95-151.

Kozma, R.B. (1979). Communication, rewards, and the use of classroom innovations. Journal of Higher Education, 50 (6), 761-771.

Ladd, E.C., Jr. (1979). The work experience of American college professors: Some data and an argument. Current Issues in Higher Education, 3-12.

Lambert, R.D. (Ed.). (1980). The annals of the American academy of political and social science. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science.

Lazarus, B., and Tolpin, M. (1979). Engaging junior faculty in career planning: Alternatives to the exit interview. Current Issues in Higher Education, 29-32.

Lewin, K. (1936). Principles of topological psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lewis, L.S. (1984, July). Trying to define 'merit' in academe. The Chronicle of Higher Education.

Lindquist, J. (1978). Strategies for change. Berkeley, California: Pacific Sounding Press.

March, J.G., and Simon, H.A. (1958). Organizations. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Martin, T.W., and Berry, K.J. (1969, December). The teaching-research dilemma: Its sources in the university setting. Journal of Higher Education, XL(9), 691-703.

Martin, W.B. (1982). A college of character. Washington: Jossey-Bass.

Mathis, B.C. (1979). Academic careers and adult development: A nexus for research. Current Issues in Higher Education, 21-24.

McKeachie, W.J. (1982, June). The rewards of teaching. In J. L. Bess (Ed.), Motivating professors to teach effectively (pp. 7-13). Washington: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Menges, R.J. (1979, May). Raising consciousness about college teaching: Rationale and effects of college classroom vignettes. Educational Technology, XIX(5), 14-18.

Meyer, J.W. and Scott, W.R. (1983). Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Miller, J.G. (1978). Living systems. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Miller, W.S., and Wilson, K.M. (1963). Faculty development procedures. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board.

Moos, R.H. and Brownstein, R. (1977). Environment and utopia: A synthesis. New York: Plenum Press.

Moos, R.H. (1979). Evaluating educactional environments. Washington: Jossey-Bass.

Moos, R.H., and Insel, P.M. (Eds.). (1974). Issues in social ecology. Palo Alto: National Press Books.

Morrill, P.H., and Spees, E.R. (1982). The academic profession: Teaching in higher education. New York: Human Sciences Press, Inc.

Morris, W.H. (Ed.). (1970). Effective college teaching. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Mowday, R.T. (1982). Expectancy theory approaches to faculty motivation. In J. L. Bess (Ed.), Motivating professors to teach effectively (pp. 59-70). Washington: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Murray, H.A. (1928). Explorations in personality. New York: Oxford University Press.

Murray, H.A. (1951). Toward a classification of interactions. In T. Parsons and E. A. Shils (Eds.), Toward a general theory of action (pp. 434-464). Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Nadel, S.F. (1968). Social control and self-regulation. In W. Buckley (Ed.), Modern systems research for the behavioral scientist (pp. 401-408). Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Newcomb, T.M. (1963). The prediction of interpersonal attraction. In E. P. Hollander and R. G. Hunt (Eds.), Current perspectives in social psychology (pp. 298-311). New York: Oxford University Press.

O'Connell, W.R., Jr., and Meeth, L.R. (1978). Evaluating teaching improvement programs. New York: Change Magazine, National Teaching Program.

Pace, C.R., and Stern, G.C. (1974). An approach to the measurement of psychological characteristics of college environments. In R. H. Moos and P. M. Insel (Eds.), Issues in social ecology (pp. 417-428). Palo Alto: National Press Books.

Pervin, L.A. (1974). Performance and satisfaction as a function of individual - environment fit. In R. H. Moos and P. M. Insel (Eds.), Issues in social ecology (pp. 569-587). Palo Alto: National Press Books.

Pettigrew, A.M. (1979, December). On studying organizational cultures. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 570-581.

Pfnister, A.O., Solder, J., and Verroca, N. (1979). Growth contracts: Viable strategy for institutional planning under changing conditions? Current Issues in Higher Education, 33-39.

Picot, M.R. (1984). The role of the four-year college in addressing the development needs of faculty during middle-age and old-age transition periods. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, NC.

Proceedings, (1984, March-April). Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 30(4).

Profile: The Indiana U faculty. (1985, November 11). Administrator Newsletter, 4(22).

A radical proposal. (1985, October 14). Administrator Newsletter, 4(20).

Russell, J.D. (1962, December). Faculty satisfactions and dissatisfactions. Journal of Experimental Education, 31(2), 135-139.

Salomone, R.E., and Vorhies, A.L. (1985, Summer). Just rewards: Ensuring equitable salary reviews. Educational Record, 44-47.

Samuels, A.R., and McClure, C.R. (1983, Fall). Utilization of information for decision making under varying organizational climate conditions in public libraries. Journal of Library Administration, 4(3), 1-20.

Sarason, S.B. (1985). Caring and compassion in clinical practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schneider, B., and Zalesny, M.D. (1982). Human needs and faculty motivation. In J. L. Bess (Ed.), Motivating professors to teach effectively (pp. 37-46). Washington: Jossey-Bass.

Scriven, M. (1982). Professional ethics. Journal of Higher Education, 53 (3), 307-317.

Seldin, P. (1985). Changing practices in faculty evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sommerhof, G. (1968). Purpose, adaptation and directive correlation. In W. Buckley (Ed.), Modern systems research for the behavioral scientist (pp. 281-295). Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Stern, G.C. (1970). People in context: Measuring person-environment congruence in education and industry. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

The unnecessary conflict between teaching and research. (1984, July 25). Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 64.

Trent, J.W., and Rose, C. (1973). Teaching environments. In R. M. W. Travers (Ed.), Second handbook of research on teaching (pp. 999-1005). Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.

Weaver, F.S. (1982). Teaching, writing and developing. Journal of Higher Education, 53 (5), 587-592.

Webb, J., and Smith, A.B. (1976/1977), Winter). Improving instruction in higher education. Educational Horizons, 55 (2), 86-91.

Whitfield, R.P., and Brammer, L.M. (1973, January). The ills of college teaching: Diagnosis and prescription. Journal of Higher Education, XLIV(1), 1-14.

Wurster, S.H., and McCartney, J.F. (1980, December). Faculty development: Planning for individual and institutional renewal. Planning for Higher Education, 9(2), 14-21.

Zabel, R.H., Smith, M.L., and White, W.J. (1984, Summer). Relations between selected personal characteristics of special education, teacher educators and their job satisfaction. Teacher Education and Special Education, 7 (3), 132-141.

APPENDIX A

Total Institutional Sample

Appendix A
Total Institutional Sample

I. Alabama

1. Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University
   P. O. Box 285
   Normal, Alabama 35762

2. Alabama State University
   Montgomery, Alabama 36195

3. Auburn University at Montgomery
   Montgomery, Alabama 36193

4. Jacksonville State University
   Jacksonville, Alabama 36265

5. Livingston University
   Livingston, Alabama 35470

6. University of Motevallo
   Montevallo, Alabama 35115

7. University of North Alabama
   Florence, Alabama 35632-0001

8. Troy State University
   Troy, Alabama 36082

9. Troy State University in Montgomery
   P. O. Drawer 4419
   Montgomery, Alabama 36195-5701

II. Florida

1. Florida International University
   Tamiami Trail
   Miami, Florida 33199

2. University of North Florida
   4567 St. Johns Bluff Road
   Jacksonville, Florida

3. University of West Florida
   Pensacola, Florida 32504

III. Georgia

1. Albany State College
   Albany, Georgia 31705

2. Armstrong State College
   11935 Abercorn Street
   Savannah, Georgia 32419

3. Augusta College
   2500 Walton Way
   Augusta, Georgia 30910

4. Columbus College
   Columbus, Georgia 31993

5. Fort Valley State College
   State College Drive
   Fort Valley, Georgia 31030

6. Georgia College
   Milledgeville, Georgia 31061

7. Georgia Southern College
   Statesboro, Georgia 30460

8. Georgia Southwestern College
   Americus, Georgia 31709

9. North Georgia College
   Dahlonega, Georgia 30597

10. Savannah State College
    Savannah, Georgia 31404

11. Valdosta State College
    Valdosta, Georgia 31698

12. West Georgia College
    Carrollton, Georgia 30118

IV. Kentucky

1. Eastern Kentucky University
   Richmond, Kentucky 40475

2. Kentucky State University
   Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

3. Morehead State University
   Morehead, Kentucky 40351

4. Murray State University
   Murray, Kentucky 42071

5. Northern Kentucky University
   Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

6. Western Kentucky University
   Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101

V. Louisiana

1. Grambling State University
   Grambling, Louisiana 71245

2. Louisiana State University at Shreveport
   Shreveport, Louisiana 71115

3. McNeese State University
   Lake Charles, Louisiana 70609

4. Nicholls State University
   Thibodaux, Louisiana 70301

5. Southeastern Louisiana University
   Hammond, Louisiana 70402

6. Southern University A. and M. College
   Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70813

VI. Mississippi

1. Alcorn State University
   Lorman, Mississippi 39096

2. Mississippi University for Women
   Columbus, Mississippi 39701

3. Mississippi Valley State University
   Itta Bena, Mississippi 38941

VII. North Carolina

1. Appalachian State University
   Boone, North Carolina 28608

2. Fayetteville State University
   Fayetteville, North Carolina 28301

3. North Carolina A&T State University
   Greensboro, North Carolina 27411

4. University of North Carolina at Charlotte
   UNCC Station
   Charlotte, North Carolina 28223

5. University of North Carolina at Wilmington
   Wilmington, North Carolina 28403

6. North Carolina Central University
   Durham, North Carolina 27707

7. Pembroke State University
   Pembroke, North Carolina 28372

8. Western Carolina University
   Cullowhee, North Carolina 28723

VIII. South Carolina

1. The Citadel
   Charleston, South Carolina 29409

2. The College of Charleston
   Charleston, South Carolina 29424

3. Francis Marion College
   P. O. Box F-7500
   Florence, South Carolina 29501

4. South Carolina State College
   Orangeburg, South Carolina 29117

5. Winthrop College
   Rock Hill, South Carolina 29733

IX. Tennessee

1. Austin Peay State University
   Clearksville, Tennessee 37040

2. University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
   Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402

3. University of Tennessee at Martin
   Martin, Tennessee 38238

X. Texas

1. Angelo State University
   2601 West Avenue North
   San Angelo, Texas 76909

2. Corpus Christi State University
   6300 Ocean Drive
   Corpus Christi, Texas 78412

3. East Texas State University at Texarkana
   P. O. Box 5518
   Texarkana, Texas 75501

4. University of Houston at Clear Lake City
   2700 Bay Area Boulevard
   Houston, Texas 77058

5. University of Houston Victoria
   2302 C Red River
   Victoria, Texas 77901

6. Laredo State University
   West End Washington Street
   Laredo, Texas 78040

7. Midwestern State University
   3400 Taft Boulevard
   Wichita Falls, Texas 76308

8. Pan American University
   Edinburg, Texas 78539

9. Prarie View A&M University
   Prarie View, Texas 77445

10. Southwest Texas State University
    SWTSU Station
    Box 1002
    San Marcos, Texas 78666

11. Sul Ross State University
    Alpine, Texas 79832

12. Tarleton State University
    Stephenville, Texas 76402

13. University of Texas at San Antonio
    San Antonio, Texas 78285

14. University of Texas at Tyler
    3900 University Boulevard
    Tyler, Texas 75701

15. University of Texas at the Permian Basin
    Odessa, Texas 79762

16. West Texas State University
    P. O. Box 998
    Canyon, Texas 79016

XI. Virginia

1. James Madison University
   Harrisonburg, Virginia 22807

2. Longwood College
   Farmville, Virginia 23901

3. Mary Washington College
   Fredericksburg, Virginia 22401

4. Norfolk State University
   2401 Corprew Avenue
   Norfolk, Virginia 23504

5. Radford University
   Radford, Virginia 24142

6. Virginia State University
   Petersburg, Virginia 23803

APPENDIX B

Absolute Numbers of Faculty

Appendix B
Absolute Numbers of Faculty

	Institution	Full	Assoc.	Assist.
I.	Alabama			
1.	Alabama A&M Univ.	21	24	30
2.	Auburn Univ. at Montgomery	13	24	34
3.	Jacksonville State Univ.	55	23	16
4.	Livingston University	12	8	13
5.	Troy State Univ. in Troy	17	13	29
6.	Troy State Univ. in Montgomery	0	4	6
7.	Univ. of Montevallo	22	22	11
8.	Univ. North Alabama	32	24	32
9.	Alabama State Univ.			
II.	Florida			
1.	Florida International Univ.	30	75	55
2.	Univ. North Florida	15	32	17
3.	Univ. West Florida	40	46	14
III.	Georgia			
1.	Armstrong State	30	10	29
2.	Augusta College	26	35	25
3.	Georgia College	23	15	16
4.	Georgia Southern College	44	40	62
5.	Georgia Southwestern College	20	18	18
6.	Savannah State College	24	24	7
7.	West Georgia College	42	45	41
8.	Columbus College	31	37	11
9.	North Georgia College	23	11	14
10.	Valdosta State College	34	19	32
11.	Albany State College			
12.	Fort Valley State			

	Institution	Full	Assoc.	Assist.
IV.	Kentucky			
1.	Eastern Kentucky Univ.	105	79	48
2.	Kentucky State Univ.	11	15	20
3.	Morehead State Univ.	55	25	27
4.	Murray State Univ.	48	44	31
5.	Northern Kentucky Univ.	23	71	40
6.	Western Kentucky Univ.	138	80	44
V.	Louisiana			
1.	Grambling State Univ.	30	17	31
2.	Louisiana State at Shreveport	26	24	33
3.	McNeese State Univ.	21	27	43
4.	Nicholls State Univ.	30	25	15
5.	Southeastern Louisiana Univ.	43	40	24
6.	Southern Univ. A&M College			
VI.	Mississippi			
1.	Alcorn State Univ.	6	13	27
2.	Mississippi Univ. for Women	26	8	9
3.	Mississippi Valley State Univ.	13	10	23
VII.	North Carolina			
1.	Appalachian State Univ.	126	64	27
2.	N.C. A&T State	29	33	31
3.	UNC-Charlotte	67	96	54
4.	UNC-Wilmington	52	56	65
5.	N.C. Central Univ.	30	46	33
6.	Pembroke State	14	19	15
7.	Western Carolina Univ.	42	56	29
VIII.	South Carolina			
1.	The Citadel	34	34	21
2.	College of Charleston	32	69	66

	Institution	Full	Assoc.	Assist.
3.	Francis Marion College	18	25	17
4.	South Carolina State	18	28	22
5.	Winthrop College	38	28	28
IX.	Tennessee			
1.	Austin Peay State Univ.	46	30	19
2.	Univ. Tennessee at Chattanooga	44	47	24
3.	Univ. Tennessee at Martin	52	39	9
X.	Texas			
1.	Angelo State Univ.	33	27	16
2.	Corpus Christi State	13	16	7
3.	East Texas State at Texarkana	3	2	1
4.	Univ. Houston at Clear Lake City	20	34	8
5.	Univ. Houston at Victoria	2	4	3
6.	Laredo State Univ.	2	5	2
7.	Midwestern State Univ.	23	24	21
8.	Pan American Univ.	31	41	43
9.	Southwest Texas State Univ.	87	75	63
10.	Sul Ross State Univ.	11	14	9
11.	Tarleton State Univ.	12	15	25
12.	Prairie View A&M Univ.			
13.	Univ. Texas at San Antonio	36	42	76
14.	Univ. Texas at Tyler	10	13	5
15.	Univ. Texas at Permian Basin	9	19	3
16.	West Texas State Univ.	36	23	15
XI.	Virginia			
1.	James Madison			
2.	Longwood College	17	29	24
3.	Mary Washington College	46	33	29
4.	Norfolk State Univ.	44	35	33
5.	Radford Univ.	59	51	50
6.	Virginia State Univ.	33	22	46

APPENDIX C

Institutions Surveyed

Appendix C

Institutions Surveyed

Alabama A & M University	Normal, Alabama
Auburn University at Montgomery	Montgomery, Alabama
Jacksonville State University	Jacksonville, Alabama
Troy State University in Troy	Troy, Alabama
University of Montevallo	Montevallo, Alabama
University of North Alabama	Florence, Alabama
Alabama State University	Montgomery, Alabama
Florida International University	Miami, Florida
University of North Florida	Jacksonville, Florida
University of West Florida	Pensacola, Florida
Armstrong State College	Savannah, Georgia
Augusta College	Augusta, Georgia
Georgia College	Milledgeville, Georgia
Georgia Southern College	Statesboro, Georgia
Georgia Southwestern College	Americus, Georgia
West Georgia College	Carrollton, Georgia
Columbus College	Columbus, Georgia
North Georgia College	Dahlonega, Georgia
Valdosta State College	Valdosta, Georgia
Albany State College	Albany, Georgia
Fort Valley State College	Fort Valley, Georgia
Eastern Kentucky University	Richmond, Kentucky

Kentucky State University	Frankfort, Kentucky
Morehead State University	Morehead, Kentucky
Murray State University	Murray, Kentucky
Northern Kentucky University	Highland Heights, Kty.
Western Kentucky University	Bowling Green, Kentucky
Grambling State University	Grambling, Louisiana
Louisiana State University at Shreveport	Shreveport, Louisiana
McNeese State University	Lake Charles, Louisiana
Nicholls State University	Thibodaux, Louisiana
Southeastern Louisiana University	Hammond, Louisiana
Southern University A & M College	Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Mississippi Valley State University	Itta Bena, Mississippi
Appalachian State University	Boone, North Carolina
North Carolina A & T State University	Greensboro, N.C.
UNC Charlotte	Charlotte, N.C.
UNC Wilmington	Wilmington, N.C.
North Carolina Central University	Durham, N. C.
Pembroke State University	Pembroke, N.C.
Western Carolina University	Cullowhee, N.C.
Fayetteville State University	Fayetteville, N.C.
The Citadel	Charleston, S.C.
College of Charleston	Charleston, S.C.
Francis Marion College	Florence, S.C.
South Carolina State University	Orangeburg, S.C.

Winthrop College	Rock Hill, S.C.
Austin Peay State University	Clarksville, Tennessee
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	Chattanooga, Tennessee
University of Tennessee at Martin	Martin, Tennessee
Angelo State University	San Angelo, Texas
Midwestern State University	Wichita Falls, Texas
Pan American University	Edinburg, Texas
Southwest Texas State University	San Marcos, Texas
Sul Ross State University	Alpine, Texas
Tarleton State University	Stephenville, Texas
University of Texas at San Antonio	San Antonio, Texas
West Texas State University	Canyon, Texas
Corpus Christi State College	Corpus Christi, Texas
University of Houston-Clear Lake	Houston, Texas
James Madison University	Harrisonburg, Virginia
Longwood College	Farmville, Virginia
Mary Washington College	Fredericksburg, Virginia
Norfolk State University	Norfolk, Virginia
Radford University	Radford, Virginia
Virginia State University	Petersburg, Virginia

APPENDIX D

Institutional Survey

Appendix D
Institutional Survey

Name of Institution_____

Name of Person Completing this Survey_____

Your Title or Position_____

1. According to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Level III institutions are defined as those institutions offering Bachelor's and Master's degrees, and may include the Specialist in Education degree. If your College or University is not a public, comprehensive Level III institution, which category below is the best descriptor:

_____Major Research University

_____Doctoral Granting

_____Four Year Liberal Arts College

_____Community/Junior College

_____Other (please specify)_____

2. Headcount Student Enrollment 1985-86:

_____500 or less

_____501-749

_____750-999

_____1,000-2,999

_____3,000-4,999

_____5,000-9,999

_____10,000-15,000

_____15,001-20,000

_____20,001-25,000

_____Over 25,000

3. Status of Current Mission Statement of your institution:

_____Accurate as appears in 1984-85 catalogue

_____Currently under revision but not yet approved

_____Has been revised and approved for future use (please attach new statement to this survey)

_____Other (please specify)_____

4a. When tenure decisions are made on any campus, many activities are considered important to the granting of tenure to faculty. Please rank order the following activities for their relative importance in tenure decisions at your own institution:

(1 = most important, 7 = least important)

_____Departmental administrative service

_____Grant writing and support

_____Professional association service

_____Published works (books, refereed and non-refeered articles)

_____Service to your local community

_____Evidence of good classroom teaching

_____University service, i.e., elected or appointed committee service

4b. Using the same scale, please rank order the following activities for their relative importance when decisions for promotion of faculty are made at your institution.

(1 = most important, 7 = least important)

_____Departmental administrative service

_____Grant writing and support

_____Professional association service

_____Published works (books, referred and non-refereed articles)

_____Service to your local community

_____Evidence of good classroom teaching

_____University service, i.e., elected or appointed committee service

5. Total 1984-85 institutional budget (all sources). If exact figures are not available, please provide a close estimate.

$_____

6. Total 1984-85 institutional budget derived from external (non-state) funds only (grant support, contracts, etc.). If exact figures are not available, please provide a close estimate.

$_____

7. Total 1984-85 academic budget (all sources) designated for instructional activities, including faculty salaries. If exact figures are not available, please provide a close estimate.

$_____

8. Total 1984-85 academic budget (external funds only) designated for instructional activities, including faculty salaries. If exact figures are not available, please provide a close estimate.

$_____

9. Does your institution have a separate budget line for instructional development, i.e., resources to improve and/or assist teaching activities within the classroom (excluding faculty salaries)?

Yes_____ No_____

If yes, amount budgeted for 1984-85 from internal sources only (excluding grants, contracts, etc.) If exact figures are not available, please provide a close estimate.

$_____

If yes, amount budgeted for 1984-85 from external sources only (non-state funds). If exact figures are not available, please provide a close estimate.

$_____

Do you consider these external funds as "soft money"?

Yes_____ No_____

10. If your institution does not have a separate budget line for instructional development, is there a budget line for instructional development within separate departments or schools?

Yes_____ No_____

11. If your institution does not have a separate budget line for instructional development, are these activities included in a separate budget line for faculty development, i.e., resources for professional travel, research leaves, course redesign, etc.

_____Yes, included under faculty development

_____Not included under faculty development

_____No budget line for faculty development exists

If yes, percent of faculty development budget designated specifically for instructional development 1984-85:

_____%

12. Written policies are often used as one means of conveying information to faculty. Using the following scale, please indicate the current policy status of each activity at your institution.

Have written policies which encourage	No written policies exist but we encourage	Have written policies which discourage	No written policies exist but we discourage
4	3	2	1

a. Released time for new course development_____

b. Student course evaluations_____

c. Financial support for visiting lecturers_____

d. Institutional resources for teaching assistants_____

e. Sabbaticals or "leaves" for instructional improvement_____

f. Course analysis by colleague observation_____

g. Documentation of teaching for promotion and/or tenure_____

h. Campus committees on instructional development_____

i. Summer grants for projects to improve instruction of courses_____

j. Salary/merit increase based solely on teaching excellence _____

k. An institution-wide instructional development program _____

l. Seminars or courses on pedagogy for faculty and/or teaching assistants_____

m. Travel funds for instructional improvement, i.e., to improve mastery of content, instructional delivery_____

n. A teaching excellence award regularly given to faculty recipients_____

Any additional comments concerning instructional development on your campus.

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for your assistance in completing this survey. Please check if you would like to receive results of this study.

Yes_____ No_____

THE CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL STUDIES AND DEVELOPMENT

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
AT GREENSBORO

April 28, 1986

Offering
Educational
Services to
Individuals and
Organizations
through

Consultation

Counseling

Evaluation

Instruction

Intervention Services

Psychoeducational
Assessment

Research

Vocational
Development

Dear Academic Officer,

As a member of the higher education community, I have been increasingly concerned about how faculty activities and responsibilities are presented in institutional publications and policies and their relationship to what activities, in practice, actually are rewarded. I am especially interested in the relative importance of teaching as a primary institutional emphasis within public, comprehensive institutions in the Southeast.

While the mission of a major research institution traditionally has been clearly defined, there has been very little scholarly work to delineate the current mission and goals of the comprehensive institution. In many ways, the comprehensive institution becomes the best laboratory for the examination of relationships among mission statements and de facto faculty activities. Your institution has been selected to be included in this study, and I would hope you view the problem as important enough to offer your assistance.

At each institution, faculty from the College or School of Liberal Arts have been asked to complete a separate instrument designed to assess their perceptions about what, in practice, actually occurs on your campus. Your completed survey is vital to this research in order to balance these perceptions with policies and resources which currently exist at the institutional level.

Although the end of this semester is very near and I know academic responsibilities are foremost at this time, I hope you can find the time to complete the survey form. It will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. (Perhaps members of your staff can assist with the collection of information requested). Your participation will assist in the development of a clearer understanding of the role of teaching as a major faculty responsibility within our academic institutions today. A self addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Nina K. Starr

Nina K. Starr
Associate Director

Corner of Highland Avenue & Spring Garden Street
Greensboro, North Carolina 27412-5001
Telephone: 379-5100

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
General Administration
P.O. BOX 2688
CHAPEL HILL 27515-2688

DONALD J. STEDMAN
Associate Vice President
for Academic Affairs

TELEPHONE: (919) 962-6981

April 10, 1986

Dear Chief Academic Officer:

The enclosed survey instrument requests information needed to help complete a study being conducted by Ms. Nina Starr, Director of the Center for Educational Studies and Development at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. This study will examine the importance of teaching as a primary institutional goal in public, comprehensive institutions in the Southeast. Administrators and liberal arts faculty at these institutions are being asked to provide perceptions of and actual institutional support for teaching.

There is little in the literature that helps us understand the public comprehensive institution as an important entity in higher education in the United States. Ms. Starr's study could add substantially to our understanding of comprehensive colleges and universities and the changes currently underway in their missions and activities. I hope you can assist her with her study.

A return envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Ms. Starr will inform you of the results of the study when they are available.

Sincerely yours,

Donald J. Stedman

DJS/cw

Enclosures

THE CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL STUDIES AND DEVELOPMENT

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
AT GREENSBORO

July 2, 1986

Offering
Educational
Services to
Individuals and
Organizations
through

Consultation

Counseling

Evaluation

Instruction

Intervention Services

Psychoeducational
Assessment

Research

Vocational
Development

Dear Academic Officer,

Recently you received from me a survey form designed to assess policies and resources which currently exist at your institution. In addition, a separate instrument to assess faculty perceptions of current activities has been sent to a selected sample of faculty in the College or School of Liberal Arts. Although I have received an overwhelmingly positive response to the initial request, I realize that the survey form was mailed during the most hectic time of your academic year. Your completed survey is still of critical importance to insure your institution's inclusion in this study.

For my own time table, it would be most beneficial to have your completed survey form returned to me by mid-August. For your convenience, I have enclosed another survey form, return envelope, and the original cover letter.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. I can assure you that your participation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Nina Starr

Nina Starr
Associate Director

NS:kb

enclosures

Corner of Highland Avenue & Spring Garden Street
Greensboro, North Carolina 27412-5001
Telephone: 379-5100

APPENDIX E

Faculty Survey

Faculty Survey

1. Sex

_____Female

_____Male

2. Present Rank

_____Lecturer

_____Instructor

_____Assistant Professor

_____Associate Professor

_____Full Professor

_____Adjunct

_____Other (please specify)_____

3. Current Academic Appointment

_____Not on a tenure track

_____Full time with tenure

_____Part time with tenure

_____Full time without tenure

_____Part time without tenure

_____Other (please specify)_____

4. For the 1985-86 academic year, was your faculty appointment defined primarily as:

_____Full time teaching

_____Full time administrative

_____Part time teaching, part time administrative (Percent time for teaching _____%)

5a. When tenure decisions are made on any campus, many activities are considered important to the granting of tenure to faculty. Please rank order the following activities for their relative importance in tenure decisions at your institution and according to how decisions are actually made in practice.

(1 = most important, 7 = least important)

_____Departmental administrative service

_____Grant writing and support

_____Professional association service

_____Published works (books, refereed and non-refereed articles)

_____Service to your local community

_____Evidence of good classroom teaching

_____University service, i.e., elected or appointed committee service

5b. Using the same scale, please rank order the following activities for their relative importance when decisions for promotion of faculty are made at your institution. This rank order also is based on what actually occurs in practice.

(1 = most important, 7 = least important)

_____Departmental administrative service

_____Grant writing and support

_____Professional association service

_____Published works (books, refereed and non-referred articles)

_____Service to your local community

_____Evidence of good classroom teaching

_____University service, i.e., elected or appointed committee service

6. Perceptions about the importance of teaching for any University or College campus may vary widely depending upon circumstances of the campus and faculty interests. Using the following scale, please rate your extent of agreement or disagreement with the following statements as indicative of the importance of teaching at your own institution.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
4	3	2	1

_____Within my own institution, people have been promoted solely on the basis of their teaching excellence.

_____Within my institution, teaching excellence by itself is sufficient for a positive tenure decision.

_____My institution does little to encourage a faculty member to develop as a teacher.

_____My institution supports the development of a long range plan which includes financial support for instructional improvement or faculty development.

_____My colleagues, in general, support efforts I make to improve my teaching at my institution.

_____Excellent teaching appears to be the primary mission of my University or College.

_____At my institution, my department/academic unit is encouraged to have a Teaching Effectiveness or Teaching Evaluation Committee.

_____My institution encourages an annual review of faculty by the department chair and/or dean for the purpose of instructional feedback and improvement.

_____My performance as a teacher seems to be more important to my institution now than it was three years ago.

_____If my teaching were consistently rated superior for several years, I would then expect my institution to offer me released time for new course development.

_____If my teaching were consistently rated superior for several years, I could then expect my institution to award me a citation for outstanding teaching.

Any additional comments concerning instructional development on your campus:

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for your assistance in completing this survey. Please check if you would like to receive results of this study.

Yes_____ No_____

THE CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL STUDIES AND DEVELOPMENT

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
AT GREENSBORO

April 28, 1986

Offering Educational Services to Individuals and Organizations through

Consultation

Counseling

Evaluation

Instruction

Intervention Services

Psychoeducational Assessment

Research

Vocational Development

Dear Colleague,

As a member of the higher education community, I have become increasingly concerned about how faculty activities and responsibilities are presented in institutional publications and policies and their relationship to what activities, in practice, actually are rewarded. I am especially interested in the relative importance of teaching as a primary institutional emphasis within public, comprehensive institutions in the Southeast.

While the mission of a major research institution traditionally has been clearly defined, there has been very little scholarly work to delineate the current mission and goals of the comprehensive institution. In many ways, the comprehensive institution becomes the best laboratory for the examination of relationships among mission statements and de facto faculty activities. Your institution has been selected to be included in this study, and I would hope you view the problem as important enough to offer your assistance.

At each institution, the institutional Vice Chancellor or Vice President of Academic Affairs will be completing a separate instrument designed to record policies and resources which exist to support teaching and instructional development. Your completed survey is vital to this research in order to balance these existing policies and budget with perceptions about what, in practice, actually occurs on your campus. Please be assured that only aggregate faculty data will be used in the reporting of results. Survey forms have been coded in order to record institutional responses.

Although the end of this semester is very near and I know your academic responsibilities are foremost at this time, the survey form is very short and will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Your participation would assist in the development of a clearer understanding of the role of teaching as a major faculty responsibility within our academic institutions today. A self addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Nina Starr

Nina Starr
Associate Director

Corner of Highland Avenue & Spring Garden Street
Greensboro, North Carolina 27412-5001
Telephone: 379-5100

THE CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL STUDIES AND DEVELOPMENT

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
AT GREENSBORO

June 30, 1986

Offering
Educational
Services to
Individuals and
Organizations
through

Consultation

Counseling

Evaluation

Instruction

Intervention Services

Psychoeducational
Assessment

Research

Vocational
Development

Dear Colleague,

Recently you received from me a survey form designed to assess your perception of current faculty activities within your institutional context. Although I have received an overwhelmingly positive response to the initial request, I realize that the survey was mailed during the most hectic time of your academic year. Your completed survey is still important to insure an adequate representation from faculty at the ranks of assistant, associate, and full professor.

For my own time table, it would be most beneficial to have your completed survey returned to me by mid-August. For your convenience, I have enclosed another survey form, return envelope, and the original cover letter.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. I can assure you that your participation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Nina Starr

Nina Starr
Associate Director

Corner of Highland Avenue & Spring Garden Street
Greensboro, North Carolina 27412-5001
Telephone: 379-5100

APPENDIX F

Classification of Institutional Mission and Goal Statement

Appendix F

Classification of Institutional Mission and Goal Statement

Explicit Statement	Strong Inference	Weak Inference	No Reference	No Judgment
4	3	2	1	0

0 = Cannot make a judgment based on statements presented in the catalog

1 = No reference that teaching is important

Example ..."recognizes its pressing responsibility to provide programs, both credit and non-credit, that are current, comprehensive, and subject to ongoing review and revision" (Columbus College)

Example ..."to encourage among the faculty the maintenance of a high level of scholarship, an interest in research and a continuing concern for the role of higher education in the betterment of society." (North Georgia College)

2 = Teaching weakly inferred as important

Example ..."attempts to provide for the development of students' mental, moral and spiritual faculties through motivating educational, social, and religious programs." (Mississippi Valley State)

Example ..."Objectives are...to promote and maintain professional competency in all instruction and research programs." (Nicholls State University)

3 = Teaching strongly inferred as important

Example ..."to conduct that research which is appropriate to support the College's teaching mission, and ..." (Francis Marion College)

Example ..."seeks to provide support to individual and institutional research as integral to effective teach-

ing and learning..." (University of North Alabama)

4 = Teaching explicitly stated as important and central to the mission of the institution

Example: "The primary commitment of the University is to informed and effective teaching." (UNC-Charlotte)

Example: ..."seeks to create an environment which promotes and encourages intellectual freedom, excellence in teaching..." (Augusta College)