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FULL-TIME COMMUNITY COLLEGE
FACULTY WITH DOCTORATES

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to portray full-time community college faculty with doctorates and to identify differences and/or similarities between two-and four-year full-time faculty with doctoral degrees. The author also hoped to explore why community college faculty with doctorates decided either to enter or remain in the community college sector of higher education.

This study used a mixed design to answer the research questions. The National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93) database was used to answer the first two questions. Chi-square analysis identified statistical differences between the two- and four-year faculty. Interviews with 21 faculty in three community colleges in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States were used to answer the third question.

Findings indicate that the two- and four-year full-time faculty with doctorates are similar. The pattern of differences between the two groups revolves around the community college faculty commitment to and engagement in teaching and the four-year faculty commitment to and engagement in research.

Thematic analyses revealed personal and professional motivators for selecting and staying in the community college. Personal motivators included feelings of self-
satisfaction and intrinsic reward in addition to “fit” with personal and family needs.

Professional motivators included enjoyment of teaching along with the existing challenges of teaching in the community college.
FULL-TIME COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY WITH DOCTORATES
Chapter One

Full-time Community College Faculty with Doctorates

Introduction

The approximately 370,000 full-time faculty members serving in the 3,535 higher education institutions in the United States do not constitute a unified whole (Altbach, 1997). Fragmentation of the professoriate has occurred throughout the history of American higher education, with one element of that fragmentation being the differential rankings in prestige according to various types of institutions ranging from distinguished research institutions at the top to community colleges at the lower end of the scale. Clark (1987) and Altbach and Finkelstein (1997) have given attention to this hierarchical structuring of institutions of higher education. Ruscio (1987) also wrote about the diverse institutional settings that make up American higher education and borrowed from the science of genetics in characterizing these diversities as higher education's "phenotype" or observable, measurable characteristics (p. 331).

In parallel fashion, Ruscio (1987) called the organization of scholarly disciplines or fields within academe its "genotype" or basic composition (p. 331). Some scholars have suggested that this multiplicity of academic disciplines produces a second element of fragmentation within the professoriate (Altbach & Finkelstein, 1997; Becher, 1987; Clark, 1987). In describing this segmented universe of academe, Clark (1987) has written about
two categories of "worlds." The diverse institutional settings constitute the "small worlds" within the universe. The disciplinary diversity comprises the "different worlds" of education.

This study examines both elements of fragmentation—institutional and disciplinary—with respect to full-time faculty members with doctoral degrees who teach in community colleges. The questions addressed are (a) who are the people who comprise the full-time faculty with doctoral degrees teaching in community colleges; (b) how is this group different from or similar to the faculty in four-year institutions; and (c) why have these people decided to either enter or remain in the community college sector of higher education? The research used both quantitative and qualitative methods.

Institutional Differences

Diverse institutions of higher education evolved throughout the history of American higher education. An institutional hierarchy of postsecondary education emerged as higher education became an integral part of American society. Viewing postsecondary educational growth from a sociological and a historical perspective, Jencks and Riesman (1968) suggested that the early concepts of elitism in American higher education (education for the privileged few) gradually transformed into concepts of education for the masses (education for all people). These authors viewed this opening of educational opportunities to the general public as a major facet in the "academic revolution." The establishment of the land grant universities following the Civil War, the establishment of urban universities after World War I, the GI Bill after World War II, the
development of the state university, and the emergence of the comprehensive community college in the 1970s all give evidence of this transformation (Altbach & Finkelstein, 1997; Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Jencks & Riesman, 1968).

The concept of mass education was not the only new educational idea to spring up after the Civil War; the concept of the research university also emerged. This development added yet another rung to the hierarchical ladder of higher education. The research university, with its emphasis on graduate education, became the dominant and most prestigious sector of American higher education (Altbach & Finkelstein, 1997). Thus, the stage was set for the promotion of two distinctive characteristics of postsecondary education in the United States—decentralization and competitiveness.

With each institution now competing for its niche to perform a particular role, the diversity and complexity of the American higher education arena has become apparent (Bok, 1986). The classification of higher education institutions was established in 1970 by Clark Kerr for the Carnegie Foundation “to improve the precision of the Carnegie Commission’s research” (Carnegie Classification: Forward, 1994, ¶2). The aim of the classification was to “cluster institutions with similar programs and purposes and we oppose the use of the classification as a way of making qualitative distinctions among the separate sectors” (Carnegie Classification: Forward, 1994, ¶2). Even though the classification is “not intended to confer status or to rank institutions, it is widely interpreted in those ways” (Carnegie Classification: Future Plans for the Carnegie Classification, 1999, November, ¶4), and it has been interpreted to indicate status. The 1994 Carnegie Classification reveals the heterogeneity of missions within American higher
education from Research Universities I followed by Research Universities II and Doctoral Universities I and II. The institutions in the middle of the classification are the Master's (Comprehensive) Universities and Colleges I and II. These groups are distinguished from the research and doctoral universities by their commitment to graduate education through the master's degree in addition to a full range of baccalaureate programs (Carnegie Classification: Definitions of Categories, 1994).

Institutions considered to be primarily undergraduate institutions are Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I and II. The final two groups of the classification are composed of the Associate of Arts Colleges and a category called specialized institutions (Carnegie Classification: Definitions of Categories, 1994).

The Associate of Arts Colleges include the community, junior, and technical colleges that offer associate of arts certificates or degrees and do not offer baccalaureate degrees (Carnegie Classification: Definitions of Categories, 1994). Because of the variation existing in the community college sector, the institutions in this category are considered to be the most organizationally confusing (Ruscio, 1987).

The specialized institutions are those offering degrees ranging from baccalaureate to doctorate. Over 50% of these institutions that specialize in professional preparation offer degrees in a single discipline such as theology, medicine, engineering, business, management, pharmacy, art, music, and teacher education (Carnegie Classification: Definitions of Categories, 1994).

The Foundation plans a complete overhaul of the Carnegie Classification to coincide with its centennial in 2005. A new system of classification will attempt to
provide institutional comparisons in many ways. "Differentiation of 2-year colleges, long a weakness of the present system, is also a high priority for the 2005 revision" (Carnegie Classification: Future Plans for the Carnegie Classification, 1999, November, ¶2).

Disciplinary Differences

In addition to differences based on types of institutions, disciplinary differences also contribute to the fragmentation of the professoriate in American higher education. This form of fragmentation among the professoriate evolved gradually. In the early history of American higher education, no disciplinary differences existed among the professoriate. The tutors taught the classical curriculum to the students, assuming that all subjects could be taught by a bright graduate. A sense of permanence among higher education faculty marked the next phase of the movement toward fragmentation. Individuals began making a long-term commitment to education rather than moving in and out of teaching, as the tutors had done (Altbach & Finkelstein, 1997).

Faculty immersion in their academic careers expanded from the pre-Civil War period onward. Altbach and Finkelstein (1997) have noted that the disciplinary career of the faculty was evidenced by increased specialized training, involvement with discipline associations, and more publication activity.

Specialization was enhanced in the 1850s and 1860s, when professors in the colleges and universities in the United States began to earn PhD degrees in selected disciplines in Europe. They returned to U.S. universities with a strong desire to increase research in their respective disciplines. During the same period, colleges in the eastern
states were shifting away from hiring faculty trained in theology and classic literature and establishing a new trend of hiring faculty with graduate education in a specialty (Altbach & Finkelstein, 1997).

In the mid-19th century, faculty mobility increased. Traditionally, graduates had remained in their alma maters to teach, but the growing commitments to academic disciplines created job opportunities in other academic institutions. Faculty were drawn to the institutions where their disciplinary careers could be enhanced. Altbach and Finkelstein (1997) considered this an "unmistakable sign of the ascendance of the disciplinary career" (p. 33).

Another phenomenon that emerged during the pre-Civil War period was that of "the external career," an opportunity for academics to apply their expertise in service outside the university. Academic institutions and their faculties were becoming more involved in society, and the community involvement was directly discipline related. The first example of external career was a Brown chemistry faculty member's appointment as head of the board of weights and measures in Rhode Island (Altbach, 1997).

New graduates with specialty degrees were entering junior faculty ranks in large numbers in the decade following the Civil War. More junior faculty with doctoral degrees were entering academe and, as Altbach and Finkelstein (1997) observed, "the modern academic career had come of age" by 1880 (p. 23).

The academic career continued to become more consolidated in the early 20th century. The first organization of professors, The American Association of University Professors (AAUP), was founded in 1915, partially as a response to the transition between
faculty in the old guard and faculty in the new guard. The old guard faculty continued
with the tradition of preserving the curriculum that taught students piety and discipline.
The new guard faculty was oriented toward disciplinary research and the preparation of
students who were interested in the specialties (Altbach & Finkelstein, 1997). Although
the academic career became more consolidated, Metzger (1987) concluded that unity
among the professoriate was fractured by the commitments of specialization.

Graduate study had an unprecedented growth between World War I and World
War II. Specialization was promoted to the point of subspecialization. This
subspecialization was evidenced by the birth of specialized societies branching from the
larger societies. For example, the Society for Applied Anthropology (1941) and the
Economic History Association (1941) were formed from the social science arena. Biology
is an example of a discipline that has become highly subspecialized. There are over 100
subdisciplines in biology. These subdisciplines are further divided into the institutional
sectors of education. For example, there is a group for faculty who teach physiology in
the community colleges (Altbach & Finkelstein, 1997).

By the late 1940s, the differentiated model of the professoriate had taken a firm
shape. The academic role of professors consisted of teaching, research, administrative
responsibility, student advising, and public and institutional service. This model for the
academic professions continues in place today (Altbach & Finkelstein, 1997).

With the model of the American professoriate firmly in place, sociologists and
psychologists began examining the disciplines and the faculty in the disciplines (Biglan,
1973 a,b; Gouldner, 1957,1958; Kolb, 1981). Biglan (1973 a,b) developed a classification
of disciplines that is frequently used in the literature: "hard-pure-nonlife" (e.g., physics), "hard-pure-life" (e.g., botany and zoology), "soft-pure-nonlife" (e.g., English and history), "soft-pure-life (e.g., anthropology and sociology), "hard-applied-nonlife" (e.g., civil and mechanical engineering), "hard-applied-life" (e.g., agronomy, agricultural economics), "soft-applied-nonlife" (e.g., accounting and finance), "soft-applied-life" (e.g., education). The disciplines in this classification have distinct characteristics and culture. Each discipline group has an identified nature of knowledge and nature of disciplinary culture. These components of the disciplines have shaped the academic profession within educational institutions (Becher, 1987).

Becher (1987) submitted, in his discussion of the disciplinary shaping of the academic profession, that there is a pecking order of academic disciplines, although status and prestige of disciplines is not necessarily constant across all institutions. For example, Becher suggested that the discipline of physics enjoys a strong position in academic institutions as well as on national and international levels. In comparison to the hard-pure discipline of physics, he suggested that education has a "significantly less prestigious" position among disciplines because of its unstable intellectual base (p. 288). Although history is a soft-pure discipline, it holds a relatively strong position inside and outside of academe because of the "established scholarly traditions" (p. 288).

Both the institution and the discipline exert powerful influences on the individual in academe. These two elements, namely, the distinct types of institutions and the categorization of disciplines, have potentially created a fragmented professoriate. The hierarchies associated with these two components of the postsecondary educational
system make the American professoriate complicated, misunderstood, and deserving of observation (Becher, 1987; Clark, 1987; Ruscio, 1987).

Context of the Study

This study focuses on the full-time faculty who hold doctoral degrees and teach in American community colleges. This focus cannot be fully understood without an awareness of the history of the community college and the evolution of the faculty within that system. Since the hierarchical elements of institution and discipline are embedded within the American professoriate, it is important to place the community college faculty with doctoral degrees into the context of these two elements.

Development of Community Colleges

The genesis of the community college in the United States may be traced to the early 1900s and the establishment of the first two-year institution of education by William Rainey Harper, president of the University of Chicago. Since that time, the community college system in the United States has grown in numbers and has changed its roles and missions. By 1991 there were approximately 1,472 public community colleges, two-year branch colleges, and independent junior colleges in the United States (Vaughan, 1995). The community colleges have been dynamic in their response to the educational needs of the country and communities (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Diener, 1994; Koos, 1970).

As the missions and functions of community colleges were restructured, so were the roles, selection, and preparation of the community college faculty. Just as institutions were searching for an identity, so was the faculty (Cohen & Brawer, 1972; Hawthorne,
Early in the 20th century, community colleges were seen mainly as extensions of secondary education. The faculty were recruited from high schools to teach at community/junior colleges. Later in the century, community colleges began teaching the established liberal arts curriculum of the first two years of higher education.

As technology advanced and the country became involved in wars, technical education became more prevalent. More people were graduating from high schools, and there was a gradual change in the American policy on higher education. The egalitarian philosophy in education modified the elitist idea, and the community college provided a way to offer higher education to the masses of ordinary people. With its open access to students with high school diplomas, the community college became "democracy's college" (Roueche & Baker, 1987, p. 4).

In contrast to the research universities that emerged throughout the development of American higher education, community colleges are relatively new institutions of higher learning and have a reputation of occupying the lowest rung of the hierarchy ladder (Jencks & Riesman, 1968). During a period of rapid expansion of community colleges in the 1960s, along with a questioning of their value to society, Jencks and Riesman (1968) pointed out that the community college is the lower part of the downward ebbing in U.S. higher education from the prestigious graduate schools and four-year institutions. Jencks and Riesman characterized the community college as "an essential pillar" in the academic revolution, acting as a "safety valve releasing pressures that might otherwise disrupt the dominant system" (p. 492).

As the community college developed, the composition of the student body
gradually changed to one of “nontraditional” student, with diverse academic and personal backgrounds and needs. Thus, faculty members who taught in community colleges found it necessary to develop specific skills to teach students who had not been preselected to attend a college. The faculty member was expected to be flexible enough to meet the academic and psychological needs of a student body that was heterogeneous in terms of age as well as academic ability and experience (Cohen & Brawer, 1972; Hawthorne, 1994).

With the expansion of the community college movement, the size of the community college professoriate increased from 23,762 in 1953 to 289,190 in 1993. Community colleges began requiring more specialized credentials among the faculty to meet the changing missions of the institutions and the changing student population. Historically, the desired credential for the community college faculty member was the master’s degree. Work experience with some pedagogical training was considered to be the most important asset for one who aspired to teach in a community college. The percentages of all faculty members holding a doctoral degree gradually increased from 9% in 1930 to 22% in 1984, and 18% in 1989 (Cohen & Brawer, 1989, p. 79). The 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93) performed by the National Center for Education Statistics revealed that 16% of all full-time community college teaching faculty had doctoral degrees.

Stratification within Higher Education

Even though the doctoral degree became the standard for teaching in four-year institutions beginning in the mid-1800s when faculty members started earning doctoral degrees.
degrees in Europe, the doctoral degree was not considered a necessary credential to teach in a community college. In fact, it was often considered a hindrance because of a belief that faculty with doctoral degrees would de-emphasize teaching and would want to perform research, thereby disrupting the system (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).

Additionally, community college faculty were considered generalists rather than specialists, since they were teaching students in basic courses of the first two years of higher education. When an individual graduated from a university with a degree in a discipline, that individual was considered a specialist, but when that individual entered the community college system to teach, the role emphasis had to shift from specialist to generalist. Faculty had to remember that the community college was considered to be a teaching institution rather than a research institution. Data from some studies have shown that those teaching in community colleges tended to feel inferior to those teaching at more prestigious institutions (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Seidman, 1985). In a 1987 project evaluation done by Buttenwieser, community college faculty considered themselves to be "one rung under college or university" (cited in McGrath and Spear, 1994, p. 357).

Community college faculty committed to scholarly work, or who revealed a traditional professional style, like that of faculty teaching in four-year institutions, were likely to receive chastisement from their peers for being elite and not caring for student learning (Seidman, 1985). Faculty in traditional academic disciplines felt more out of place in the community college system than did faculty in other disciplines (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).

Not only do the community college faculty perceive themselves as inferior, but the professoriate in four-year institutions also tend to perceive community college faculty as
inferior. A tenured physics professor at a four-year institution related to me his opinion that community college faculty teach there because they cannot get jobs anywhere else. "Why else would they teach in a community college?" he commented. McGrath and Spear (1994) stated that the community college professoriate have "no real analogue among either university professors or high school teachers" (p. 366).

The culture of community college faculty is also thought to be different from the four-year institution's professional culture. McGrath and Spear (1994) identified features in the community college professoriate's culture they considered "startling," specifically, the "insistence of avoiding even the appearance of disagreement, the continuing search for areas of commonality, and the dread of irresolvable conflict with a society of equals" (p. 366).

Purpose of the Study and the Research Questions Guiding It

The numbers of faculty with doctoral degrees teaching in community colleges are increasing (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Vaughan, 1995). To date the literature does not provide a portrait of this enlarging cohort. Community college faculty have been included in the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93) database available from the National Center for Education Statistics. Specific information about full-time community college faculty with doctoral degrees was gathered from this database. This information has not yet been extracted and analyzed from the NSOPF-93.

To facilitate an increased understanding and appreciation for community college faculty with doctoral degrees, a profile of this group is needed. Data from the national
survey can be used to answer some of the research questions guiding this study. The data can be analyzed to answer the following research questions:

1. Who are the full-time faculty with doctoral degrees teaching in community colleges?
2. How is this group different from or similar to faculty in four-year institutions?

The database is limited to information that can be gathered by questionnaires. A more complete picture of this cohort can be achieved by supplementing the data from the database with interviews of full-time, community college faculty who have doctoral degrees. Data to answer the following research question were gathered from interviews:

3. Why have faculty with PhDs decided either to enter or remain in the community college sector of higher education?

Definitions

1. Faculty: For purposes of this study, the definition of faculty will be the one used in the NSOPF-93 survey. The eligible universe of postsecondary faculty was defined to include the following:

- full-time and part-time personnel whose regular assignment include instruction;
- full-and part-time individuals with faculty status whose regular assignments did not include instruction;
- permanent and temporary personnel with any instructional duties, including
adjunct, acting, or visiting status, and

- faculty and instructional personnel on sabbatical leave.

Excluded from the faculty universe were the following:

- faculty and other personnel with instructional duties outside the United States (but not on sabbatical leave);
- temporary replacements for faculty and other instructional personnel;
- faculty and other instructional and noninstructional personnel on leave without pay;
- graduate teaching assistants;
- military personnel who taught only ROTC courses; and
- instructional personnel supplied by independent contractors.

(Source: National Center for Education Statistics Methodology Report, October 1997, p. 26)

2. **Full-time:** This study is limited to full-time faculty defined and coded as they are by the NSOPF-93 study. Full-time status may be

- defined by compensation or benefits (and teaching load);
- defined by length or terms of contract (and teaching load);
- defined by teaching load and/or other duties and responsibilities only (number of courses per term or year/number of hours or week/student contact hours/days worked per term or year);
- defined by rank/title/faculty status/voting privileges or senate membership (and teaching load);
- defined by integrated postsecondary education data system (IPEDS) definition;
- defined by funding source or type of funding/legislative body/other governing body (private or public) and teaching load;
defined by tenure status—tenured or tenure track—and teaching load; or
- defined by using other governmental or organizational definition.

(Source: National Center for Education Statistics, Methodology Report, October 1997, p. 88)

3. **Doctoral Degree or doctorate:** The highest attained degree is either the PhD or EdD. Professional degrees (e.g., MD and JD degrees) were separated from this group in the database. I selected only the doctoral degree (EdD and PhD) for this study.

4. **Two-Year Colleges:** Using the same definition as the NSOPF-93, the universe of institutions was stratified, using a modified Carnegie classification system. Nonprofit, two-year colleges were defined as those offering certificate or degree programs through the Associate of Arts level and which, with few exceptions, offer no baccalaureate degrees (National Center for Education Statistics, Methodology Report, October 1997, p. 28).

The term “community college” is used in this study since the terms community college, junior college, and two-year college have essentially become synonymous. Both public and private two-year institutions were used in this data analysis.

5. **Discipline or Field:** These terms are used interchangeably in this study to refer to a branch of knowledge or learning.

**Delimitations and Limitations**

This study is delimited to instructional faculty members in the community college system who are full-time and have attained a doctoral degree. However, in addition to this delimitation, this study is subject to several limitations. First, the initial stage of this study...
is limited to questions that can be answered by the data presented in the national database (NSOPF-93). Even though the variables used in the national database were extensive (37 institution-level and 107 faculty-level), I was limited to those variables while performing this study.

Second, as a user of the public access database, I was not permitted access to data that might infringe upon confidentiality. Since it is a public access file, selected derived variables that were found to pose disclosure risks were deleted from the file.

Third, even though the term “faculty” was clearly defined in the NSOPF-93 survey, institutions have a variety of methods of classifying faculty. These methods may not have coincided with those outlined in the survey.

Fourth, although the NSOPF-93 is a national database, the qualitative methodology used in the second phase of the study was limited to those faculty with doctorates in three community colleges in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States. The sizes of the colleges ranged from large (19,000 students) to small (1,500 students). Thus, the results of this data will not be generalizable to all regions and/or sizes of community colleges.

**Significance of the Study**

A body of literature specifically related to full-time community college faculty with doctoral degrees has not been identified, even though the numbers of this cohort have gradually increased. Thus, this study will add specific information about this academic cohort. Using the guiding framework of “small worlds, different worlds” for the study, the focus is on faculty in the community college sector of higher education who hold
specific disciplinary degrees. Negative perceptions of community college faculty persist among members of academe in other sectors of higher education. This study furnished information that can increase the understanding for this group. This information also challenges stereotypes and conventional wisdom about motives and satisfactions for this group.

This study can be used by graduate schools to inform their students about the community college faculty and their characteristics. The community college may be offered as a viable teaching career alternative to doctoral degree graduates who are interested in academic careers.

One practical implication for this study is in policy-making at the state and local levels of community college education. This study increases awareness of the fact that faculty members are attracted to the community college sector of higher education for a variety of reasons. Policy changes may make teaching in community colleges more appealing. For example, funding for all forms of scholarship, as described by Boyer (1990), should be explored to encourage faculty to engage in a variety of scholarly endeavors. Policies can be structured so that those faculty who are as interested in research as they are in teaching may be given opportunities to perform research. Active recruitment at graduate schools by community colleges may increase interest in teaching in this sector.

A second practical implication for this study is to encourage institutions to provide a defined plan for orientation and socialization to the community college sector of higher education. New doctoral graduates may not have been introduced to the community
college as a part of higher education. There can be misunderstandings as to how faculty roles relate to the missions and goals of the institutions. It is important for institutions to clarify their roles in order to maintain the desired standards within the institution and to decrease faculty frustration.

Chapter Summary

The community college as a relative newcomer to higher education has specific missions that are not consistently understood by the public as well as educators. In view of this confusing position in higher education, there arises the overarching question of why persons with doctoral degrees would either enter or remain on the teaching faculty at community colleges. An effort to uncover answers to that question is a major focus of this study.

In addition to the faculty fragmentation associated with the categorization of types of institutions within American higher education, there is a plethora of literature about the powerful influence of the disciplines in the professoriate. In some instances, the discipline influence is considered more powerful than the institutional differences. Ruscio (1987) pointed out that the first mark of identity for an individual is the discipline in which the degree is attained. The identification with the institution occurs only after a socialization process.

Using Ruscio’s (1987) concept of “phenotypes” (or institutions) and “genotypes” (or academic discipline) and Clark’s (1987) “small worlds, different worlds” as a backdrop to this research, I have conducted this mixed-design study to provide a portrait of the full-time faculty with doctorates who teach in community colleges. How are such faculty
similar to or different from full-time faculty with doctorates in other institutions of higher learning? With a portrait of these community college faculty in mind, institutional orientation and professional development can be enhanced. Also, graduate schools may gain a better understanding of this group and include the community college sector of higher education in their suggestions for those interested in an academic career.

Chapter Two synthesizes findings from the literature and provide a theoretical basis for the underpinnings of this study—institutional and disciplinary heterogeneity in higher education. Chapter Three describes the methodology used to collect and analyze the data for the study. Chapter Four presents the findings of the study. Chapter Five interprets the findings presented in Chapter Four, explores the implications of the results, and offers recommendations.
Chapter Two

A Review of Literature

The concept of "small worlds, different worlds" in academic life (Clark, 1987) provides the theoretical framework for this study. Before focusing on the full-time faculty in the community college sector of higher education, it is necessary to look at American higher education as a whole and develop an understanding of the concept of fragmentation in the academic world.

The "small worlds" component of Clark's (1987) presentation referred to the institutional differences that exist in American higher education. The "different worlds" component referred to the disciplinary differences that exist in American higher education. This chapter is therefore divided into three parts: Institutional Differences, Disciplinary Differences, and Development of the Community College Sector. The first part is a descriptive overview of the institutional differences within American higher education that have resulted in a unique, stratified structure. Literature describing the evolution of a diverse professoriate within the diverse institutional types is reviewed. The second part of this chapter deals with the differences in academic disciplines and how the development of a hierarchy of disciplines contributed to fragmentation within the professoriate. The third part provides an overview of the evolution of the community
college and the community college professoriate within the context of higher education.

Small Worlds – Institutional Differences

Historical Evolution of Institutional Differences

Diversity in American higher education institutions has developed as a major characteristic over the years since Harvard was founded in 1643 (Clark, 1987; Jencks & Riesman, 1968; Rudolph, 1962/1990). Colleges and universities were small/large, state affiliated/private, urban/rural, comprehensive/specialized, selective/nonselective, and undergraduate learning focused/research focused. This diversity emerged as higher education became an integral part of American society, with its economic and social differentiation.

The initial concept of higher education in the United States was not to educate the diverse members of society, but rather to educate the sons of the elite to become leaders of society. Throughout the following 357 years of higher education history, a more egalitarian concept of education was emerged (Jencks & Riesman, 1968). Today, each type of higher education institution fulfills a different purpose. The research university provides a competitive atmosphere for learning and enhancing the body of knowledge. The liberal arts college provides a student with a well-rounded background to apply to advanced education or to the workplace. The comprehensive community college offers students of varying abilities an opportunity to enter the higher education track through transfer programs. In addition, the community college furnishes opportunities for technical training and/or retraining, as well as developmental and general education. It
also provides a conveniently located, less expensive form of continuing education.

The Diverse Professoriate in Higher Education

The structure of American higher education has created a professoriate that is as diverse as the institutions where faculty members work. The classification of an institution largely determines the qualifications of the faculty. Because of an increased commitment to research, American institutions of higher education in the late 19th and early 20th centuries expected professors to advance knowledge as well as to disseminate it. Thus, in institutions specifically committed to research, the professoriate was required to have earned doctoral degrees. The PhD degree did not simply designate a scholar, it was the required credential to teach at the college or university level. William James called this emphasis the "PhD octopus," which he viewed as reaching out its tentacles from the research universities and squeezing all of American higher education (cited in Kennedy 1995, p. 10). The concept of "professor" was transformed from "tutor" to "scholar" (Clark, 1987).

At the same time, community colleges have traditionally avoided hiring faculty with doctoral degrees because the teaching role has been considered dominant and the research role minor. A master's degree, with expertise in a field or discipline, was viewed as more desirable than a doctorate if one could also bring real-world experience into the classroom (Clark, 1987).

Gouldner (1957) described "manifest roles" in organizations, and the concept has been applied to higher education institutions. The "manifest role" of the professoriate is related to the type of higher education institution. Four-year institution faculty have
responsibilities in teaching, research, and service. Depending on the mission and size of the four-year educational institution, faculty may spend a higher proportion of their time in research rather than teaching. In the case of community colleges, the missions are comprehensive, yet they are student-learning oriented and the focus of faculty is on teaching. Little emphasis has historically been placed on research in these institutions (Clark, 1987; Cohen & Brawer, 1991; Kerr, 1982; Ruscio, 1987).

Ruscio (1987) suggested that “institutional differences operate more covertly than disciplinary differences” (p. 332). The relative amount of emphasis on the creation of knowledge (research) and the transmission of knowledge (teaching) varies among the different sectors of higher education. Although some research is performed in all sectors of higher education, the amount of time the professoriate spends in this activity parallels the sector. The average amount of time all faculty spend in research activities is highest in private research institutions—43% (NSOPF-93). In contrast, the average amount of time all faculty spend in research is lowest in community colleges—10% (NSOPF-93). This parallel between the education sector and the amount of research time spent was evidenced 30 years earlier in a 1969 analysis by Fulton & Trow in a Carnegie Commission Survey (cited in Ruscio, 1987).

Similarly, although teaching is performed in all sectors of higher education, the amount of time the professoriate spends in this activity also varies by sector. The average amount of time all faculty spend in teaching activities in the community colleges is 70%, compared to 35% in private research universities. The workload for community college faculty has remained fairly consistent through time, with from 13 to 15 lecture hours per
week the norm. Differences between faculty teaching in states where there is collective bargaining and those teaching in states where there is no collective bargaining is minimal (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). In recent years, many state-level community college systems have established teaching loads of 13 to 15 hours a semester for full-time faculty, limiting time for research. It has not been the practice to use graduate students to teach in the community college; therefore, faculty members who are interested in some form of research must apply for release time (Cohen & Brawer, 1991). The heavy teaching load precludes research and scholarship.

Cohen and Brawer (1996) described professionalism among community college faculty, suggesting that "a professionalized community college faculty organized around the discipline of instruction might well suit the community college" (p. 97). Faculty allegiance to academic disciplines "leads to a form of cosmopolitanism that ill suits a community-centered institution. . . ." (p. 96).

Although teaching is considered to be the major role of the professoriate in all academic sectors, rewards such as promotion, tenure, and merit pay, especially in four-year institutions, are provided for research and publication. Community colleges, however, with their emphasis on teaching rather than research and publication, have made the rewards congruent with this emphasis (Clark, 1987; Ruscio, 1987). There is a disparity between the task as a professor and the behavior that determines success or failure in the institution and discipline (Caplow & McGee, 1958; Ruscio, 1987). Caplow and McGee (1958) suggested in their discussion of problems of individual scholars that "the best teachers in educational institutions, those at whose feet students come to learn, often
restrict themselves to a minimum of participation in the educational process. It means, further, that a great deal of foolish and unnecessary research is undertaken by men who bring to their investigations neither talent nor interest” (p. 221). Ruscio (1987) attributed the reward system in academe to “Gresham’s Law of academic evaluation: the hard, tangible results of research productivity drive out the soft, intangible contributions of teaching or service to the institution” (p. 344).

The academic role of the professoriate changed throughout the history of American higher education. Early in the history, educational institutions primarily determined the course of the academic role and career. As the classic curriculum declined and scientific knowledge grew, academic disciplines, along with specialization also began to determine the course of the academic role and career (Altbach, 1997; Finkelstein, 1997; Rudolph, 1962/1990).

Different Worlds—Disciplinary Differences

The Historical Evolution of Disciplinary Differences

The fragmentation of the American professoriate has been attributed not only to the diverse types of institutions, but also to the associated disciplines or fields. From a historical perspective, the “disciplinary career” with its increased specialization began before the Civil War. Students were graduating with discipline-related academic credentials in increasing numbers. As faculty equipped with their discipline credentials were entering academe, the disciplinary career became more important than the institutional career. Clark (1987) used the term “scatteration” to define the 20th century
American professoriate (p. 44). Faculty mobility among institutions of higher education increased, as faculty members moved to other institutions if they could enhance their disciplinary careers (Altbach, 1997).

Both disciplinary and institutional careers were consolidated in the years between the world wars. The numbers of graduates from doctoral programs increased fivefold. The disciplinary expertise they brought to the institutions improved faculty bargaining power in terms of salaries, job security, and autonomy, thus enhancing institutional careers (Altbach, 1997; Finkelstein, 1997).

The Professoriate Operating as Distinct Entities Within the University

Becher (1987) summarized research by social psychologists, psychologists, and sociologists that attempted to quantify differences among academic disciplines. These studies, completed in the 1970s and early 1980s, confirmed F.G. Bailey's portrayal of the professoriate as a composite of distinct groups functioning within the university. Bailey's portrayal was interpreted by Becher as a 'community culture' in which different tribes cohabit” (p. 272).

The studies of Biglan (1973a,b), Lodahl and Gordon (1972), Ladd and Lipset (1975), and Kolb (1981) revealed that disciplines are indeed distinct in their learning styles (Kolb), paradigm development (Lodahl & Gordon), and the political attitudes of academics within the disciplines (Ladd & Lipset). “The Biglan Model” suggested that three pairs of discipline groupings could be identified from the clustered characteristics of the subject matter in the academic disciplines. These groups were (a) hard versus soft, (b) pure versus applied, and (c) life system versus nonlife system.
Becher (1987) suggested that throughout the historical evolution of higher education, the professoriate has shown a progression of division of labor based on increasing specialization within disciplines. Becher used two of Biglan's contrasts of disciplines—hard versus soft and pure versus applied—for his 1980 study. In that study, his goal was to identify characteristics of different disciplines. The disciplines he selected for his study were pure sciences (physics and biology), humanities and social sciences (history and sociology), and professional domain (mechanical engineering and academic law). This selection of disciplines "fell" into the categories of "hard-pure" (e.g., physics), "soft-pure" (e.g., history), "hard-applied" (e.g., mechanical engineering), and "soft-applied" (e.g., education). Becher (1987) summarized his findings by describing the characteristics of the nature of knowledge existing in each of the four discipline groups. Knowledge in the "hard-pure" disciplinary group was cumulative; atomistic; concerned with universals, quantities, and simplification; and resulting in discovery and explanation. Knowledge in the "soft-pure" disciplines was more holistic and reiterative. These disciplines were focused on particulars, qualities, and complications, resulting in understanding and interpretation. The "hard-applied" disciplines revealed characteristics of being purposive, pragmatic, concerned with mastery of physical environment, and resulting in products or techniques. The "soft-applied" disciplines were more functional, utilitarian, concerned with enhancement of practice, and resulting in protocols and procedures (p. 278). Although evidence in that study indicated an epistemological clustering of disciplines, Becher (1987) cautioned against considering all individuals within a discipline to be homogeneous.
After clustering the knowledge base within the four discipline categories, Becher (1987) continued with an examination of how the disciplines shaped their practitioners' lives in terms of initiation into the practice, social interaction patterns, specialization, and mobility and change.

Initiation to the Discipline. Initiation into the discipline commonly begins in undergraduate school. However, differences were found among the four discipline categories as to when formal initiation began. In the hard-pure category, formal initiation begins after a postgraduate student's acceptance into the disciplinary department, where he or she work closely with a faculty member on research projects. In the soft-pure category, graduate students function as independent researchers within the department.

The hard-applied and soft-applied faculty were initiated into their disciplines differently from the way "pure" discipline faculty were initiated. Those applied disciplines usually worked in their identified area before entering graduate school. Salaries outside of academe were higher than in academe for the hard-applied disciplines. In the soft-applied disciplines, such as education, practical knowledge was more valued than theoretical knowledge; therefore, working in the field before attending graduate school was encouraged (Becher, 1987).

Social Interaction of Disciplines. Becher (1987) continued his analysis of the disciplinary shaping by discussing social interaction characteristics. He found that in the hard-pure disciplines, there was a need to work as a group on problems since the theoretical base was rather clearly defined. The pace for progress and the exchange of current information was rapid, and communication among individuals within the disciplines was maintained by correspondence.
In the soft-pure disciplines, the problems tended to be more of a personal interest and concern. The need for group interaction and idea sharing was less. As a result, conferences were infrequent.

Socially, Becher (1987) observed a "pecking order of academic disciplines" related to the political status and prestige in the institutions (p. 288). The pecking order was not "constant across institutions or countries" (p. 288). The disciplines with distinct paradigms or lenses through which they viewed the world tended to have greater prestige than disciplines with a less distinct paradigm. For example, the physics discipline garnered a higher political position than engineering. The soft-applied disciplines, such as education, were considered to have an "unstable intellectual base" (p. 288) and were thus viewed as less prestigious than hard-applied disciplines such as engineering.

In the area of specialization within disciplines, Becher (1987) noted further fragmentation of the professoriate when the subspecialty areas were considered. This specialization offered opportunities for various personality types to pursue careers within a discipline. Individuals who were more social preferred to work in areas with more teamwork. Once an affiliation with a discipline and a specialty was made, individuals became committed to the small group.

Publications in Disciplines. Publications differed between the hard-pure and the soft-pure disciplines. The hard-pure tended to work in groups, with several authors to an article. The articles were short, with the result that numbers of publications were high early in the disciplinary experience. Those persons in the soft-pure disciplines tended to work individually, and there was no great need to publish rapidly. Articles tended to be longer and publications fewer in this group.
In the hard-applied and soft-applied disciplines, problems written about tended to be complex. Thus, papers would be longer than those in the hard-pure disciplines, but fewer in number. Shorter reports were written as part of consultant projects.

**Change and Mobility in Disciplines.** The concept of change and mobility in the disciplines was addressed by Becher (1987) in relation to the permeability of the discipline’s boundaries to external values. The boundaries of disciplines thus may shift. As an example, Becher (1987) cited the separation of statistics and computer science from the mathematics discipline.

Becher (1987) also pointed out shifts within the careers of the professoriate. Such shifts may occur during the “cooling out process” at the beginning of one’s career, or at the end where there may be a “burning out” among faculty (p. 295). Different disciplines show these signs at different times. Those in the hard-pure discipline tended to show a greater productivity early in their career. Individuals in the soft-pure disciplines tended to peak as experience increased.

Ease of mobility among disciplines tended to be related to the discipline. Barriers to mobility were higher in disciplines such as mathematics, whereas Becher found fewer barriers in areas such as literature.

**Loyalties—Cosmopolitans vs. Locals**

Loyalty to the job rather than the organization was described in terms of “latent social identities” by Gouldner (1957). In higher education terms, the latent social identity is related to the discipline in which the faculty is associated or credentialed. Gouldner hypothesized that there were two latent social identities in organizations—the cosmopolitans and the locals. The “cosmopolitans” were committed more to the
specialized skill (discipline) and less loyal to the organization (institution). The “locals” were more loyal to the organization (institution) and less committed to the specialized skill (discipline).

Ruscio (1987), using Gouldner’s (1957) terminology and characteristics of latent social identities, analyzed faculty in different types of higher education institutions. He identified faculty in research universities as “cosmopolitans” and faculty in the community colleges as “locals.” The liberal arts faculty fell somewhere inbetween, with loyalties to both the institution and to the discipline.

Ruscio (1987) suggested that there were findings in the literature to support the idea that faculty tend to seek the type of institution where they can fulfill their desired roles of teacher, researcher, or a combination of the two. Because the research university emphasizes research in its mission, faculty who are more interested in research in their disciplines have tended to desire affiliation with research universities. Faculty in community colleges, on the other hand, have tended to identify themselves more with the institution and with the fulfilling of its egalitarian educational mission of providing an opportunity for all to experience higher education. The faculty member’s discipline has thus been viewed as a “tool” to teach in the community college (p. 347). In the liberal arts college sector, therefore, there is a greater mix of emphasis on research and teaching. Faculty who are interested in pursuing both research and teaching tend to select this sector for their academic careers.
Development of the Community College Sector

The Community College Institution

The community college sector evolved in American higher education in response to philosophical changes in the purposes of higher education and in response to societal changes. The early purpose of institutions of higher education was to educate the sons of the elite to become leaders in the new America, patterned after the British schools with a classic curriculum (Rudolph, 1962/1990).

In the 19th century, the philosophy of higher education began to change to one of egalitarianism. More populist overtones began to develop. Evidence of this philosophical change is the passage of the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1861. The purpose of that act was to provide land to institutions of higher education if they were established to educate the sons of farmers, mechanics, and the average citizen. This was considered to be the beginning of the open-door philosophy of education (Clark, 1987; Rudolph, 1962/1990).

At the turn of the 20th century, institutions of American higher education were blossoming in all regions of the United States. This regional development occurred in response to the needs of the country for teachers and persons with mechanical training and expertise in agricultural studies. There was a commitment by higher education institutions to "relevance" and "public service" (Altbach 1997, p.6). That commitment led to a concern for training in the "emerging professions and for skilled occupations involving technology" (Altbach 1997, p. 6).

As publicly supported universities grew, there were innovative ideas to extend university-based services to the communities through extension services. A wider range of the population had access to higher education through such additions. Areas of study
such as forestry, business, social work, and journalism rapidly increased to meet the learning needs of society (Cohen & Brawer, 1991).

As a result of the rapid expansion of institutions of higher education throughout the country, increasing demands were placed on educational institutions at all levels. New institutions and new curricula sprouted throughout the country. Because of the rapid expansion of higher education institutions, concerns about inconsistent education quality developed. University presidents, including William Rainey Harper, President of the University of Chicago, collaborated with President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia and David Starr Jordan of Stanford to discuss possible solutions to their concerns about education quality. They concurred that one out of four existing colleges would become a university, and that three would become academies, a term given to extensions of high schools comparable to the German gymnasia (Cohen & Brawer, 1991; Fields, 1962; Rudolph, 1962/1990).

One solution to the problem of increased quantity and inconsistent quality of higher education in the United States was suggested by five German-educated American university presidents—Tappan of the University of Michigan, Lange of the University of California, Jordan of Stanford, Folwell of the University of Minnesota, and Harper of the University of Chicago. These presidents brought the German style of education—laboratory, seminars, and research—to American higher education. The German form of graduate education was another evolution in the American higher education system (Kennedy, 1995; Rudolph, 1962/1990). This group of university presidents proposed a differentiation between junior and senior education. Junior education was to provide the general postsecondary courses, and senior education was to provide specialized education.
Based on this delineation of junior and senior education, Joliet Junior College in Chicago was founded in 1901 under the influence of William Rainey Harper. It is the oldest public junior college in the nation (Cohen & Brawer, 1991; Fields, 1962; Ratcliff, 1994).

**Placement of the Community College in the Higher Education Continuum**

Early in the 20th century, the education continuum in the United States had been relatively well established. Elementary and four-year colleges were established in the 18th century. Establishment of middle and secondary education completed the continuum in the 19th century. When the idea of the junior college was proposed to provide grades 13 and 14, the four-year institutions were reluctant to relinquish the freshman and sophomore years. Thus, the position of the community college sector remained unclear. It did not fit into the continuum as part of the secondary school, nor did it fit into the continuum as part of higher education (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Diener, 1994).

In the early stages of its development, the community college was considered to be an extension of the high school. Colleges and universities thought of junior college as a buffer institution providing the "isthmian function" for students (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Diener, 1994; Fields, 1962; Koos, 1970). The junior college was considered the place where ill-prepared or under-prepared students would gain access to the higher education system, and only the best would be sent to the four-year institutions (Cohen & Brawer, 1991). It was suggested by Eells in 1931 (cited in Cohen & Brawer, 1996) that junior colleges provided a conduit for students to attain education beyond high school, while at the same time providing an honorable end for those who were not fit for a four-year institution.

Cohen & Brawer (1991, 1996) reported that the first doctoral dissertation
describing the community college movement was written by McDowell in 1919. His dissertation traced the expansion of junior colleges from secondary schools, church-sponsored colleges, and normal schools. He asserted that four-year institutions supported the junior college movement because they provided a diversion for the lower division students the higher institutions could not accommodate.

In the 1920s and 1930s, the place of junior colleges in the education continuum was still not well established. Their numbers, however, increased from eight (all private) in 1901 to 436 (41% public, 59% private) found in 43 states in 1930 (reported in Cohen & Brawer, 1991, 1996). During this period, discussion revolved around whether high schools and junior colleges (grades 11-14) were to be combined at a secondary level of education, or whether junior colleges should be elevated to a higher education status. Combining high school and junior college would allow students to complete compulsory education by age 16 or grade 10, and either leave school or continue their education. Elevating the junior college to higher education status would provide a transition institution of higher education close to home for adolescents to mature emotionally and physically, and be better prepared for the last two years in a senior institution of learning (Cohen & Brawer, 1991).

The community college gained a more stable place in the educational system after World War II. Cohen (1998) called the period between 1945 and 1975, “the mass higher education era . . . marked by student access and activism” (p. 196). The passage of the GI Bill of Rights in 1944 and The President’s Commission on Higher Education Report of 1947 (Truman Commission) brought federal funding into the education system. The Truman Commission Report proposed that all barriers to educational opportunity be
abolished. American colleges and universities should no longer consider themselves to be associated with the elite, but should consider themselves part of individual life-long learning in order to improve national life (Cohen & Brawer, 1991; Diener, 1994; Gleazer, 1994).

The GI Bill of Rights energized the community college movement. That bill provided funds for thousands of veterans to attend institutions of higher education. A flood of individuals entered the American educational system. Community colleges were in a position to expand. In 1948, there were 650 two-year colleges (50% public; 50% private), stabilizing at around 600 by 1955 (56% public and 44% private) (Cohen & Brawer, 1991; Diener, 1994).

Access to higher education was related to proximity of the institution to the populace. Community colleges opened in areas where there were no publicly supported colleges. Opening community colleges in such areas gave more students access to higher education than even the open door policy did. The numbers of high school graduates who attended college increased by 50% in some areas where community colleges were built (Cohen & Brawer, 1991, 1996). During this period of the 1950s, the term "community college" began to replace the terms "junior college," "technical college," "two-year college," "city college," and "county college." By 1970, the term "community college" was used by all two-year institutions awarding an Associate of Arts or Associate in Science degree. "Community college" emerged as the preferred term because the institutions were located in specific locales to serve the needs of those communities (Cohen & Brawer, 1991).

The community college "boom" period was during the 1960s and 1970s. In that
ten-year period, the numbers of community colleges increased from 678 to 1,091. External forces influencing this growth were the civil rights movement, the entry of large numbers of women to higher education, and federal legislation facilitating expansion of higher education to include poor, disadvantaged, and minority students. Jencks and Riesman (1968) labeled the community college movement as "some deviation from this highroad" of a standard high quality education in American higher education. They called them "anti-university colleges" (p. 480).

Cohen & Brawer (1996), however, were more positive in their characterization of the community college movement. They wrote:

Perhaps community colleges should merely be characterized as untraditional. They do not follow the tradition of higher education as it developed from the colonial colleges through the universities. They do not typically provide the students with new value structures, as residential liberal arts colleges aspire to do. Nor do they further the frontiers of knowledge through scholarship and research training, as in the finest traditions of the universities. . . . Community colleges are indeed untraditional, but they are truly American because, at their best, they represent the United States at its best. (p. 36-37)

The breadth of programs offered by community colleges increased from their early function of transition between high school and college. Their functions became more comprehensive to include developmental/compensatory, technical/occupational, general education, college transfer, and community education. Democratic egalitarian principles were embedded in the community college missions—"to bring within the scope of education all available talent, wherever it may be found" (Bowles, 1963, cited in Gleazer, 1994).

As a result of its historical development, the community college has evolved into a
comprehensive institution—the model at the end of the 20th century. It did not fit into the traditional growth pattern of American higher education. The community college sector provided access to education for those in the lower income bracket, for those who were immobile or have work/family responsibilities, and for those who were under-prepared for the traditional undergraduate experience (Cohen & Brawer, 1991/1996, Diener, 1994; Jencks & Riesman, 1968). Diener (1994) described the community college as “of the people, by the people, and for the people. It arises from the aspirations and faith of the people of a locale or state; it holds itself open to rapid change; it adopts and reshapes its organization and offerings in response to changing societal needs” (p. 11).

The Community College Student

The profile of students attending the community college has changed as the goals and missions of the institutions have changed. In the early years of community college development, little was written about the community college student. Koos (1970) provided a synthesis of the findings of more than 300 researchers, summarizing the holistic development of students, sexual and dating behavior, vocational interests, aptitudes, socioeconomic backgrounds, personal characteristics, attitudes, interests, and personal problems. What was striking about this synthesis was the finding that the community college student in the early history was not very different from the student attending a four-year institution. The age range (18-24 years), attitudes, concerns, and problems were similar to those of the typical American adolescents attending four-year institutions.

Community colleges continued to attract students who did not “fit” into the traditional student mold. They attracted students who were economically, academically,
and attitudinally different from the four-year college student (Cohen, 1998). The turning point for a major change in student population in the community colleges was in the 1960s. During that time, the numbers of 18-24 year old students increased, resulting from the baby boom of World War II. By 1960, one half of high school graduates went to college (Adelman, 1994; Cohen & Brawer, 1989). In 1960, students enrolled in community colleges numbered 500,000 (Cohen & Brawer, 1989). Additionally, in the 1960s, academic abilities among recent high school graduates were declining. Those students who demonstrated academic ability tended to seek higher education at more prestigious four-year institutions. Students with lesser abilities were more likely to attend community colleges (Cohen, 1998).

In 1970, the community college student population increased to 2 million. By 1990, there were 5 million students (Cohen & Brawer, 1989). In the fall of 1992, 6.5 million students were enrolled in community colleges (Vaughan, 1995). The exponential increase in numbers of students enrolled in the community college is attributed not only to the general population increase, but also to participation in the community college by older students, increased part-time attendance, and increased numbers of low ability, minority, disabled, and female students. Such colleges were geographically accessible to more students than the four-year colleges. By opening in areas where there was a need for higher education institutions, community colleges were convenient for students who wanted to live at home, have jobs, and attend college (Cohen, 1998).

In 1970, studies by Harris (cited in Cohen, 1998, p. 200) reported correlations between socioeconomic status (SES) and access to higher education. He also found a
relationship between the types of institutions students attended and the students’ socioeconomic status. The higher SES group more often attended private four-year colleges, and the lower SES group more often attended public two- and four-year colleges. Financial aid became more available, and there was aggressive recruitment of students in community colleges offering “something for everyone in the community: everyone is potentially a student” (Cohen & Brawer, 1991; Jencks & Riesman, 1968)

“Diversity” and “numbers” were two words used to describe the community college student population (Cohen & Brawer, 1991). Vaughan (1995) summarized the community college student in the brochure, The Community College Story: A Tale of American Innovation, prepared for the American Association of Community Colleges. In his summary, he found that of approximately 6.5 million students enrolled in community colleges in the fall of 1992, 4.1 million attended part-time and 2.2 million attended full-time. Fifty percent of all first-time freshmen enrolled in institutions of higher education in the United States were enrolled in community colleges. The average age of the community college student was 28 years, and 58% of community college students were women.

Vaughan (1995) continued his summary with a presentation of data on minority enrollment. Forty-seven percent of all minorities enrolled in higher education in the United States were enrolled in community colleges. Of this group, 40% were African Americans, 36% were Hispanic, 19% were Asian and Pacific Islanders, and 4.3% were American Indians.

Furthermore, as Harris had observed in 1970, Vaughan (1995) found that "many
community college students come from lower socioeconomic groups and from the mid-ranks of their high school graduating class" (p. 17). For the majority of community college students, the student role was secondary, with work and family being the primary role. Attending college depended on having available time and money (Vaughan, 1995).

The fact that the majority of students were part-time and were "citizens-as-students" rather than "students-as-citizens" had implications for student development as well as curriculum planning. Courses had to be offered at times that were convenient for the working student. Extracurricular activities, important to the traditional college student, were not considered as important to the part-time, working, nontraditional age-student. However, since there were also traditional-age students who attended community colleges, the student activities that were considered a part of the "college experience" were expected to be available as well (Vaughan, 1995). This heterogeneous student body created a challenge for student services as well as for faculty.

With such a large and diverse student body in the community college, the faculty found itself in a unique position to open the doors for students to a different way of thinking, a different occupation, or a different world from the one in which they lived. It was necessary to provide flexible opportunities for students with highly individual needs while at the same time maintaining standards of learning at a higher education level.

Community College Faculty: Institutional Affiliation

As the system of higher education in the United States was undergoing transformation throughout the 20th century, the community college emerged as an American innovation to meet the democratic ideals of universal access to higher
education. Throughout the transformation, missions and functions were restructured to meet the needs of the nation and the communities. The roles of the faculty were as responsive as the institutions to the changing needs. Faculty, as well as institutions, continued to search for an identity (Brint & Karabel, 1989; Clark, 1994; Clowes & Levin, 1994; Cohen & Brawer, 1972, Cooper & Kempner, 1993, Eaton, 1994; Fields, 1962; Finkelstein, Seal, & Schuster, 1998).

Since two-year colleges began as extensions of secondary schools, faculty in this expanding area of education were recruited from high schools. The two-year colleges had curricula and work rules originating from state-level education organizations, so the flow of faculty from secondary schools to two-year institutions was a natural one. In a 1920 study performed by Eells (cited in Cohen & Brawer, 1991), results indicated that 80% of two-year instructors had prior high school teaching experience.

As the years progressed and the market for community college faculty stabilized, the faculty coming from high school teaching declined. A study performed by Medsker in 1960 (cited in Cohen & Brawer, 1991) found that 4% of the community college faculty had previous elementary or high school teaching experience. Keim (1989) reported that 55% of full-time community college faculty teaching transfer courses had some public secondary school teaching experience, but the numbers with college-level teaching experience were increasing. DeBard’s 1995 study of community college English faculty found that faculty coming from secondary school backgrounds had decreased to 26% (cited in Miller, 1997).

Compared to four-year institutions, “the community college has become a
qualitatively different world of work” (Clark, 1987, p. 85). State and institutional mandates have shaped the work of the community college faculty rather than the discipline. Because of the open-door student admission policies, diverse personal and academic backgrounds of students, and multifaceted curricula, faculty were expected to teach introductory courses rather than graduate-level, discipline-specific courses. Therefore, disciplinary specialists were thought to be unnecessary.

Community colleges have traditionally avoided hiring faculty with PhD degrees. The rationale has been that a faculty member with a doctorate degree would confuse his or her role with that of a four-year institution faculty member. Because the teaching role is dominant in the community college and the research role is de-emphasized, the traditional and common perception of a faculty member with a doctoral degree teaching in a community college has been of an individual out of place. Such a faculty member might not understand the function of a community college and his or her role in it, thus creating havoc within the system (Clark, 1987).

The master's degree was considered the desired credential to teach in the community college. In 1969, the National Center for Education Statistics reported that 75% of faculty in the community college had a master's degree; 7% of faculty had a doctorate. The ratio between faculty with master's degrees and those with doctoral degrees continued to shift. In 1984, the Carnegie Faculty Study recorded that 63% of faculty had a master's degree, and 22% had a doctorate (Clark, 1987; Cohen & Brawer, 1991). In the NSOPF-93 study, the master's degree was still dominant among the community college faculty, but the percentage of full-time faculty (nonadministrative
positions) who have doctorates and first professional degrees is 16%. While considering the 16% of full-time teaching faculty number, keep in mind that 64% of community college faculty are part-time employees.

The increase in the number of full- and part-time faculty with doctoral degrees in the 1980s was attributed to the stable market in higher education, and the fact that faculty members had obtained their doctorates to move to a higher salary scale while remaining within the community college system (Cohen & Brawer, 1991).

Additional reasons for a doctorate-prepared individual's decision to teach at a community college were illuminated by Bywater (1990). The reasons he identified were based on his experience as a faculty member who had obtained a doctorate from a research university and taught in a community college. The reasons were (a) there is more collegial interaction across disciplines; (b) the teaching atmosphere creates an increased sensitivity to student needs and allows faculty an opportunity to teach a diverse student body that is representative of the total population; (c) faculty development opportunities, including scholarly activities, are encouraged even though pressures for research, publication, and grant writing are not stressed for promotion; and (d) community college faculty and administrators have an immediate impact on students who are often lost in larger universities.

Thoughts about hiring faculty with doctoral degrees in community colleges are changing. In the late 1990s, some community colleges were actively seeking PhD candidates as full-time faculty. That trend was related to two conditions: (a) the academic market was sluggish for full-time academic positions, and (b) some community college
boards and presidents were interested in increasing their regional academic reputations. More recent graduates from doctoral programs are considering the community college as a place of employment and do not necessarily consider it a failure not to teach in a four-year institution (Haworth, 1999).

Haworth, in a recent Chronicle of Higher Education article (1999, January 8), suggested that more new PhD graduates are interested in teaching in community colleges. Also, there is a shifting desire by community colleges to hire new PhD graduates. In one interview, a community college faculty member with a 1992 PhD from Columbia suggested that the process of attaining a doctoral degree adds "a philosophical underpinning" that the faculty member brings into the classroom (p. A13). Another proponent of community college faculty having doctoral degrees was a mathematics professor who remembered a Chinese saying, "If you want to teach one drop of knowledge to your students, you have to have a gallon" (p. A13). In the same Chronicle article, a faculty member said that community colleges would be more willing to hire PhD graduates if graduate programs included pedagogy courses in their curricula.

Not all new graduates from doctoral programs are equally attracted to teaching in a community college. They consider it a "step down on the [academic] career ladder" (Haworth 1999, A13). Since they are not prepared to teach in the demanding schedule of the community college, they tend to burn out of academe within five years (Haworth, January 8, 1999).

Community College Faculty: Academic Discipline Affiliations

As the power of the discipline increased throughout the history of American higher
education, prestige for faculty was enhanced. Faculty sought positions in higher education where they could increase their expertise through research and publication (Altbach & Finkelstein, Eds., 1997). Investigations about disciplinary differences in community college faculty, however, have been limited. The 1980s produced the most studies related to disciplines and community college faculty.

The humanities disciplines were studied by Brawer (1984) to determine if there was a decrease in professionalism over time among community college faculty. She found that their participation in professional organizations had increased and that they were more demanding of their students.

In the community college setting, faculty from the various sectors of the college were studied—general education versus career education or vocational education. In 1985, Seidman found that career education faculty and general education faculty differed in their expectations of students. The career education faculty were interested in creating a solid foundation, not only in reading and writing, but in the skills necessary to be competent in a vocation. The general education faculty were interested in setting standards but were also interested in the general success of students in the community college atmosphere.

Keim (1989) investigated the differences between faculty teaching occupational/technical courses and those teaching courses with credits that could be transferred to four-year institutions. She found that faculty teaching transfer courses were more involved in publication activity than faculty teaching in occupational/technical courses.
During the evolution of the community college as part of higher education, the culture of the community college was such that faculty spent less time in discipline-related activity and more time in student-centered teaching activity (Kempner, 1990). McGrath and Spear (1994) proposed that since community college faculty are denied respect as academics in their disciplines, they can become self-defined as teachers rather than sociologists, biologists, or historians. In addition, McGrath and Spear (1994) illustrated the point that community college faculty share a commitment to teaching and have strong affective ties to one another without the guidance and constraint of disciplinary cultures. They participate in a practitioners' culture and share anecdotes among colleagues rather than theory and rigorous research.

Clark (1987), in his qualitative study of faculty in various disciplines at different levels of institutions of higher education, found that faculty in research universities considered the power of discipline identification greater than that of the institution. This discipline power was found to be weakened in nonresearch academic institutions. As the faculty member moved into other classifications of academic institutions, disciplinary involvement lessened. Faculty in liberal arts and comprehensive institutions were found to be ambivalent in their commitments. Despite the fact that community college faculty were firmly committed to the student-oriented ideals of the community college, they did not deny the fact that it was necessary to keep up with their respective disciplines. The anchor that the community college faculty has is a strong identification with the values of community college education—egalitarian, open access, and student-centered. These ideals tend to prevail over devotion to the disciplines (Clark, 1987). This makes the
community college faculty's latent role identification fall into the "locals" group rather than the "cosmopolitans" group (Gouldner, 1957).

Because of their unique roles, which are distinct from those of the faculty in four-year institutions, community college faculty have been the focus of research and discussion. Teaching in nonselective institutions with a highly diverse student body and multifaceted curriculum requires skills different from those learned in colleges and universities (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Gleazer, 1994; McGrath & Spear, 1994; Palmer, 1998). Cohen and Brawer (1996) suggested that community college faculty are faced with the dilemma of maintaining standards while teaching academically inferior students. They also become frustrated with institutional policies that encourage retention of students despite low performance. Therefore, despite external pressures, faculty should maintain the established standards for their classes. Close student interaction is an important skill in reaching some of the students at the community college level. Intrinsic motivation is often lacking among community college students, meaning they may have a need for personal encouragement and tutoring. According to Gleazer (1994), basic capabilities for community college faculty are disciplinary knowledge, teaching skills, interpersonal sensitivity, and communication skills. McGrath and Spear (1994) emphasize the focus on individualized learning for this group of students (McGrath & Spear, 1994).

Palmer (1998) in his discussion about "good teaching," pointed out elements that were important to all teachers, but particularly pertinent to community college teachers. He stated that a teacher should open the learning space rather than fill the space with teacher's knowledge. There must also be a meaningful connection between facts and
practice. This is particularly necessary for community college students.

The abundant research about community college faculty has been targeted at the group as a whole and at part-time faculty in particular. The topics for discussion about the faculty in general have revolved around (a) the identity of the community college professoriate (Clowes & Levin, 1994; Cohen & Brawer, 1972; Diener, 1994; Dougherty, 1994), (b) the culture of the community college affecting the professoriate (Kempner, 1990; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Palmer, 1994a,b), and (c) scholarship for the community college faculty (Boyer, 1990; Palmer, 1994; Parilla, 1991; Vaughan, 1988/1991).

Part-time faculty in the community college have been the focus of recent attention in the literature because of the increased use of part-time faculty in the community college systems. The percentage of part-time faculty in the community college systems nationwide was 64% (NSOPF-93). Some of the literature referred to part-time faculty as “strangers in their own land” (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1996) and “gypsy scholars” (Reed, 1985). Gappa and Leslie (1993) found that some part-time faculty in the community college preferred this status because it fit their life styles. A review of literature written since the late 1980s about the use of part-time faculty in community colleges was completed by Banachowski (1996). She concluded that there are both disadvantages and advantages in the extensive use of part-time faculty. An important advantage is that such faculty members provide a practical education to the students in the community college. A strong disadvantage to their use is that the part-time faculty “leave the classroom without being recognized as valuable participants in the American system of higher learning” (p. 58). She also suggested that “little effort has been made to examine
the positive attributes of part-time faculty” (p. 57).

What seems to be absent from the literature is research related specifically to the community college professoriate who have attained doctoral degrees, more specifically those who are full-time faculty members. With the increasing numbers of faculty members in the community college with doctoral degrees, it is appropriate that this cohort be considered as a focus for research. A portrait of this cohort does not exist. It is also not known why those with doctoral degrees have chosen to teach in the community college sector nor why faculty members who began teaching without doctoral degrees have elected to remain on community college faculties after receiving their doctorate.

The research questions guiding this study have emerged from the literature, although little is written specifically about full-time community college faculty members with doctoral degrees. These questions are: (a) who are the full-time faculty with doctoral degrees teaching in community colleges; (b) how is this group different from or similar to faculty in four-year institutions; and (c) why have faculty with PhDs decided either to enter or remain in the community college sector of higher education?

Chapter Summary

Faculty roles in the community colleges have changed throughout the 100 years that community colleges have been part of the higher education continuum. Earlier in the century, faculty were hired from the high school sector of education. When the numbers of community colleges increased at mid-century, the numbers of faculty from the high schools declined and a greater number came into the system with master’s degrees.
The master's degree was the preferred degree, since teaching was the major role of faculty. The doctorate-prepared faculty members were considered neither appropriate nor necessary in institutions of higher education where research was not a priority. In the decade of the 1990s, the numbers of full-time community college faculty with doctoral degrees is increasing. Evidence suggests that community colleges are seeking faculty members with doctoral degrees and that new graduates from doctoral programs are seeking to teach in community colleges (Haworth, 1999).

Faculty in the community college sector of higher education have disciplinary associations that are different from faculty in other sectors (Clark, 1987). It is suggested that this different association is related to the discipline content as it pertains to the missions and goals of the community college. Additionally, the community college institutional sector has a unique student body and curricula. Taken together, these factors set the community college faculty apart from the other sectors in the academic classification.

Community college faculty have been studied in terms of identity, socialization, culture, scholarship, and part-time roles. However, there is no body of literature concerned specifically with full-time doctorate-prepared faculty, a cohort that is increasing in numbers. Thus, the focus of this study is to draw a portrait of this cohort, examine the differences from and similarities to the four-year professoriate, and identify reasons why this they remain in or elect to teach in the community college sector.
Chapter Three

Research Methodology

Overview and Research Questions

Because the sectors of American higher education have different missions and purposes in the education continuum, faculty roles vary in each. The doctoral degree is the accepted degree necessary for an academic position in most four-year institutions. The master's degree is the accepted degree necessary to teach in most community colleges.

Graduates from doctoral programs have been socialized into academic roles that include teaching, research, and service. These roles are ambiguous in four-year institutions, which hire faculty to teach, but reward them with promotion, retention, and tenure on the basis of their research (Caplow & McGee, 1958/1964). These roles also shift for faculty who teach in community colleges. They are hired and rewarded for teaching, not research. Faculty work loads of 15.2 lecture hours/week are considered to be the norm; therefore, there is limited time to engage in research or scholarly activities without release time (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).

An intersection exists between a doctorally-prepared faculty member's career and the type of higher education institution where he or she is employed. Also, a faculty member's teaching career in an institution intersects with his or her disciplinary
This study explores the increasing numbers of teaching faculty in community colleges who have doctorates in specific disciplines. Using a mixed design, it addresses the following research questions: (a) who are the full-time faculty with doctoral degrees teaching in community colleges; (b) how is this group different from or similar to faculty in four-year institutions; and (c) why have faculty with PhDs decided either to enter or remain in the community college sector of higher education?

The first question, who the full-time teaching faculty are with doctorates teaching in the community college, was answered with the national database, National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93). Demographic information, certain attitudinal information, and faculty plans were extracted from the parameters available in the NSOPF-93 sponsored by the National Council on Educational Statistics (NCES).

The second question, how this cohort is different from or similar to full-time faculty with doctorates teaching in four-year higher education institutions, was answered by extracting the data for this cohort, using the same parameters used with the community college faculty, from the NSOPF-93.

The last question, why this cohort has either selected or remained in the community college sector of higher education, cannot be answered by using the database, therefore it was answered by interviews with full-time faculty who have doctoral degrees in a variety of disciplines. This chapter outlines the process of data collection, analysis, and presentation to be used in this study to answer the guiding research questions.
Research Design

Data Collection

The sources used for data collection are The National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93) in the first part of the study, and open-ended, semistructured faculty interviews in the second part. The NSOPF-93 was sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and cosponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and the National Science Foundation. The national survey was conducted by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC).

The faculty interviews were conducted with 21 full-time faculty with doctorates teaching in three community colleges of varying sizes from moderately large (19,000 students) to small (1,500 students). The institutions were located in rural and urban areas in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States. Participants volunteered from each of the groups described initially by Biglan (1973 a,b) and later modified by Becher (1987): hard-pure, soft-pure, hard-applied, and soft-applied.

The NSOPF-93 Source. The faculty sample for the NSOPF-93 study was selected from 817 eligible institutions that agreed to participate in the study and provide lists of faculty employed during the 1992 fall term. Initially, institutional recruitment for the full-scale study began in October, 1992, when 789 institutions were sent recruitment packets. The institution universe was selected from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) universe if they met certain criteria (e.g., accreditation recognized by the U.S. Department of Education). A supplemental sample of 185 institutions was added to the sample to ensure adequate representation of all strata,
making a total of 974 institutions in the study. The sample was thus augmented to provide
data about faculty in the humanities, as well as Black, non-Hispanic, Hispanic,
Asian/Pacific Islander, and full-time female faculty.

The target sample for the faculty survey consisted of 31,354 faculty. Of the
31,354 faculty members in the target sample, 1,590 were found to be ineligible. The new
sample of faculty was 29,764 of whom 25,780 responded, achieving an 86.6% response
rate providing useable responses.

Six hundred fifteen public and private four-year institutions were eligible for the
study. Five hundred forty-six of these institutions completed the questionnaires, achieving
an 88% response rate. Faculty lists were provided from the four-year institutions, and
19,512 faculty were eligible. Sixteen thousand eight hundred twenty-eight faculty
completed the questionnaires, achieving a 71% response rate.

Three hundred forty-seven public and private two-year institutions were eligible
for the study. Three hundred twenty-eight of these institutions completed the
questionnaires, achieving a 97% institution response rate. Faculty lists were provided by
the participating institutions. Of the 10,252 eligible faculty in public and private two-year
institutions, 8,952 faculty completed the questionnaires, providing a response rate of 87%.

In the NSOPF-93 study, two survey instruments were developed and used: the
faculty questionnaire (Appendix A) and the institution questionnaire. Both instruments
were designed as self-administered questionnaires (SAQs). A computer-assisted
telephone interview (CATI) version of the faculty questionnaire was also used during the
follow-up data collection effort.
The questionnaire development was guided by research and policy concerns. Questionnaire items were constructed on the basis of input from the 1988 questionnaire, other postsecondary education surveys (e.g., Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, National Survey of Faculty; 1984 and 1989), the National Technical Review Panel for the NSOPF-93, and project staff and consultants.

Because I extracted data related to the faculty questionnaire rather than the institution questionnaire, my focus is on the faculty questionnaire contents. The faculty questionnaire was designed to address (a) the background characteristics and current activities of instructional and noninstructional faculty; (b) the supply of, and demand for, faculty in postsecondary institutions; (c) faculty as both a resource and a consumer of resources; and (d) faculty attitudes and behaviors about key aspects of the higher education environment.

A field test of the NSOPF-93 data collection instruments and survey procedures with a national probability sample of 136 institutions and 636 faculty was conducted between February and September 1992. I field tested the questionnaire for validity and reliability. The purposes of the field test were to evaluate the adequacy of the faculty and institution questionnaires and to test key procedures to be used in the full-scale study. Questions resulting in low reliability in the field test I changed for the full-scale study. Validity in the full-scale study was assessed, and the indices that I reviewed exhibited lower levels of inconsistency in the institution responses than were observed in the field test report.

The NSOPF created 36 institution-level and 107 faculty-level variables to simplify...
access to standard queries useful to those analyzing the data. NSOPF-93 data were collected and provided the data for public use in the form of magnetic tape and CD-ROM. Variables posing significant risk of disclosure were suppressed or modified to reduce any risk of a breach of confidentiality.

To answer the first question (who the full-time teaching faculty cohort are who have doctorates), I extracted information from the NSOPF-93 data by consistently placing filters on each generated file. These filters were (a) faculty status or instructional duties for credit, (b) attainment of PhD or EdD degrees, and (c) full-time employment. Each of the demographic, employment, faculty plans, and opinion variables selected were generated for the two-year institutions.

The effort to answer the second question (how community college faculty with doctoral degrees are different from or similar to faculty who teach in four-year institutions) also used data from the NSOPF-93. I consistently placed the same filters when running each of the variables. I ran the same variables used for the two-year institutions for the four-year institutions. I then compared the results of the four-year faculty and two-year faculty response patterns. The four-year faculty group sample size using these parameters was 290,610, and the two-year faculty group sample size was 19,960.

Faculty Interviews Source. To achieve a more complete picture and to answer the third question in the study, open-ended, face-to-face interviews with community college full-time faculty complemented the data from the NSOPF-93 survey used with the first two research questions. The research question posed in interviews was this: why are
the members of the PhD cohort selecting or remaining to teach in two-year institutions?

I designed the qualitative component of this study guided by Lincoln and Guba (1993) in their contrast of the post-positivistic inquiry with positivistic inquiry. The first implication is that the last question in this study is answered best in the context of the setting of this study—the community college. Second, there are multiple, intangible facets of this cohort of faculty with doctorates teaching in the community college sector. Third, these facets or variables are interdependent and cannot be separated from each other. For example, it is unknown whether there is an existing pattern of motives among this cohort to teach in a community college. The pattern may include personal, professional, market-related, or previously unidentified reasons. It is difficult to distinguish cause and effect with the multiple variables. Fourth, because of the multiplicity of involved factors, it is not possible to devise a data-gathering instrument adaptable to the unanswered questions about this cohort. In this case, I as the researcher became the instrument for the interviews. Fifth, the inquiry is value bound, influenced by my values, my choice of conceptual framework, and my selections of method of inquiry (Lancy, 1993; Lincoln & Guba, 1993).

Instead of using a random sample, I used purposive sampling—several faculty members in each of the four discipline groups initially described by Biglan (1973 a,b) and modified by Becker (1987). These groups are discussed in chapters one and two of this study. My ability to investigate the theory of disciplinary differences, specifically in the community college professoriate, was maximized by using Becher’s (1987) groupings.

Although the sample is bounded by the full-time faculty in community colleges
who have doctorates, there were otherwise no limits to the size of the community college institutions or the regions where these institutions are located. The three institutions selected are located in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States, but they are varied in size and one is a multicampus institution. The institutions are located in both rural and urban areas. Faculty who have attained doctorates in hard-pure disciplines (e.g., physics, biology, chemistry), soft-pure disciplines (e.g., history, foreign language, psychology, sociology), hard-applied disciplines (e.g., mechanical or electrical engineering), and soft-applied disciplines (e.g., education, social work, nursing) volunteered to participate.

I obtained public access college catalogues containing faculty names, credentials, and disciplines from each of the three institutions. I then sent a letter of invitation to participate in the study to all full-time teaching faculty with doctoral degrees (Appendix B), asking them to respond to me by mail, telephone, or e-mail if they agreed to participate. A mutually agreed upon date, time, and place were established for the interview. Most interviews took place in faculty offices and lasted approximately one hour.

The interview questions, with probes designed to answer the research question, I formulated with a relationship to the conceptual framework literature or as a supplement to the results of the extracted data from the NSOPF-93. I pilot tested these questions on faculty who have doctorates, making changes as needed in the questions after the pilot test and after extracting the NSOPF-93 data. After participants’ approval, I set up an hour interview with each of the selected faculty to be held at the convenience of the interviewee. I obtained prior permission for audiotaping the interview. All interviews
were completed in one to one-and-one-half hours.

Glesne and Peshkin (1992), describe interviewing “as the process of getting words to fly” (p.63). In “getting the words to fly,” the topic must be clearly defined. The questions must be designed to fit the topic and provide responses that answer the research questions. The questions must be asked in a way that encourages forthcoming responses. In other words, the interviewer should use complex techniques simultaneously. These techniques include (a) being a good listener; (b) controlling verbal and nonverbal negative emotions to the interviewee; (c) anticipating the next questions, in-depth probes, or day’s activities; (d) establishing rapport with the interviewee; (e) setting aside assumptions and asking for clarifications and explanations from the interviewee; (f) considering relationships, meanings, and explanations that may lead to new questions; (g) controlling the shape of the interview while being less dominant; and (h) expressing concern without opinion.

Past criticisms of qualitative research have been related to internal and external validity. The internal validity of qualitative research is threatened by subjectivity of the researcher relationship with the data. The mere fact that the researcher is the instrument of data collection creates biases. External validity is related to the inability to generalize the results of research that is based on a nonrepresentative population (Borg & Gall, 1989).

Wolcott (1994) argued that validity may not be a well-suited “criterion, guideline, or objective for qualitative approaches to research” (p. 347). Instead, qualitative researchers seek “rigor” in their data collection, analysis, and interpretation. Wolcott
discussed nine points he considers to be important in satisfying "the implicit challenge of validity" (p. 347). I took care at the three levels of data collection, analysis, and interpretation to follow these nine points: (a) talk little and listen a lot; (b) record precise words of the informant and record accurate, detailed observations of field work; (c) write early to identify the obvious and possible gaps; (d) include the primary data in the final account; (e) include comments that are not fully understood—report fully; (f) be subjective (seen as a strength of qualitative approaches); (g) share developing materials with informed readers for feedback; (h) attempt to achieve balance in the report and what was observed by reviewing field notes or interviews; and (i) check for coherence and consistency in the final writing.

Faculty Interview Questions

The interview questions I developed for this study are as follows:

1. Demographic information gathered from interviewee before the interview
   a. Date of birth
   b. Academic degree
   c. Degree attainment date
   d. Discipline/field
   e. Institution of degree
   f. Number of years of teaching experience before doctorate. In what sector of education was the experience?
   g. Number of years teaching in the community college?
   h. Family members
   i. Spouse occupation (if applicable)

Reason for this information:
The demographic information was used in the analysis of age cohorts. Also, as discussed in the literature, mobility can be horizontal or vertical; therefore, whether the doctoral degree was attained before or after joining the community college professoriate may provide useful information. The institution of degree may provide some information
related to prestige and/or desire to teach in a community college. The discipline will provide a guide to discussion of relationships with disciplines and institutions as discussed in the literature.

2. **Tell me about your career path in academe.**

*Reason for this question:*

This question allowed interviewees to tell their stories about how and when they entered academe, how and when they attained their terminal degree, and how they selected or ended up in the community college sector. Reasons for selecting the community college sector may range from market demands for their discipline to personal considerations such as family. It would be difficult to anticipate all of the responses to this question to set it up in a questionnaire format.

Since there may be differences in the disciplines, it is important to select interviewees from each of the four discipline groups described by Biglan (1973 a,b) and modified by Becher (1987).

3. **Tell me about some of your personal and professional reasons for selecting the community college.**

*Reason for this question:*

This question allowed interviewees to tell their stories about the decision making process in their career selection. This information may reinforce, enhance, or dispel the information extracted from the database. The literature points to specific reasons for selecting or not selecting the community college sector as the choice for entering or remaining in academe.

4. **What critical or key events helped you decide to teach at the community college?**

*Reason for this question:*

This question triggered thoughts to narrow down the main reason for selecting the community college sector of academe. The reasons can be varied—market, geography, personal desires to teach rather than do research. All of the various reasons cannot be considered in order to prepare a proper questionnaire-type question. This question arises from the literature that discusses graduate school socialization as well as personal choice.
5. How did your discipline/field play a role in your decision-making about your work?
   
a. What job alternatives did you have?

Reason for This Question:

This question enhanced the information extracted from the database. This is an important question relating to the literature about “different worlds” and the intersections between institution and discipline.

6. What had you known about the community college sector of higher education before entering the academic job market?
   
a. How did you hear about the community college sector?

Reason for This Question:

The major purpose for this question was to see if graduate schools included information about the community college sector of academe. The question also related to the socialization during graduate school that was mentioned in the literature.

7. Describe any discord you may have had between your graduate education and your role in a community college

Reason for This Question:

This question relates to the socialization in graduate school and what has been described in the literature as discipline loyalty (cosmopolitans) over institution loyalty (locals). This is another way to acquire information about how the community college is portrayed in graduate school. Since information on the institution of degree attainment was gathered in the demographic data at the beginning of the interviews, a difference among the classification of institutions may result.

8. Since teaching in a community college, what changes, if any, have you been forced to make about being a scholar or college professor?

Reason for This Question:

This question directly sought information about the power of the discipline as well as the socialization during graduate school. Additionally, information about the orient-
ation process or socialization process to the community college sector may come out in the responses.

9. **What do you like most about teaching in a community college?**

*Reason for this Question:*

This question reinforces the positive reasons for selecting the community college. This question incorporates the general mission of the community colleges and the role of the professoriate in this sector. The literature suggested positive reasons for teaching in the community college, such as diminished “publish or perish” demands to attain tenure, the challenges of teaching under-prepared students, being rewarded for teaching, spending time with students.

10. **What do you like least about teaching in a community college?**

*Reasons for this Question:*

This question allowed the interviewees to vent their personal and professional conflicts in teaching at the community college level. The literature pointed to several frustrations about teaching in the community college—among them state-wide policies with a mandatory workload, not allowing time for scholarly activity, administrator policies to keep the enrollment high to keep the state funds coming, lack of socialization to the community college sector of education during the orientation, and lack of prestige to teach in the community college.

**Analysis of Data**

**NSOPF-93.** After I had extracted the data from the NSOPF-93, I compiled the results of the demographic, planning, and opinion variables. A descriptive portrait within the limits of the NSOPF-93 data for the full-time teaching faculty in community colleges with doctorates cohort emerged. Some of the data I presented as percentages, other data as means or averages. This answered the question: who is this group of faculty?

I presented the comparative data for two-year and four-year full-time faculty with doctorates in tables. The sample in the NSOPF-93 is an estimate of the population. The
data obtained from the NSOPF-93 appeared in terms of frequencies of occurrence in the various categories, so I used the nonparametric chi-square test to determine the statistical significance of differences between the two-year and four-year faculty (Kiess, 1996). The null hypothesis for the chi-square test is that there is no difference between the two-and four-year faculty. This type of analysis will help to answer the question: what are the differences and similarities between the two-year and four-year faculty?

NCES's methodology report states that "The sample was weighted to produce national estimates of institutions and faculty by using weights designed to adjust for differential probabilities of selection and non-response at the institution and faculty levels" (National Center for Education Statistics, Methodology Report, October, 1997, p. 34). The NSOPF-93 computed weighted samples in three stages: (a) the first stage institution-level weight (institutions that submitted a faculty sampling list), (b) final institution, and (c) faculty weights. The total weighted sample size of the two-year and four-year faculty who have faculty status or teach for credit, are full-time, and have doctoral degrees is 310,560 with the four-year faculty weighted sample size 290,610 and the two-year faculty weighted sample size 19,960.

Interview Data. Qualitative methodology allows for inductive data analysis. Because of the multiple realities in this study, data analysis may identify a facet that has not been considered either in the literature or by me. The "mutually shaping influences that interact" are more likely to be identified by inductive data analysis (Lincoln & Guba 1993, p. 42).

This study did not begin with an a priori theory. Guiding theory exists, but I was
not setting out to confirm any theory. I examined the data to see if the findings fit or did not fit into the established theory of "small worlds, different worlds." Further questions did arise from the data as they were collected.

Wolcott (1994) described three ways of "doing something" with the data that have been collected (p. 10). The first strategy is to treat the descriptive data as fact and allow these data to speak for themselves. The second level of organizing the data is to extend the descriptive account by identifying relationships and key factors in them. The third level of data organization goes beyond the relationship identification and attempt to find an explanation beyond the descriptive data. I used the three levels described by Wolcott (1994).

Once the interviews were completed, I transcribed them. After reading the transcripts, I highlighted key words, factors, relationships, and themes occurring in the raw, descriptive data. Once the themes were identified, I searched for outliers, because the outlying factors may become important in the analysis. The third level of analysis included the search for an explanation or an understanding of the data. As cautioned by Wolcott (1994), I tried not to be tempted to reach interpretations that go beyond the collected data.

Wolcott (1994) suggested "that description, analysis, and interpretation are the three primary ingredients of qualitative research" (p. 49). Additionally, he suggested that a balance among these three elements is important. He also pointed out that these three levels of analysis are not mutually exclusive. The lines are not distinct between description, analysis, and interpretation. It is not a linear process, but a "dialectic" (p. 11).
He used ethnographer Michael Agar's synonymous use of the terms "analysis and interpretation". The collection of data is where one tries to learn something. Analysis of data is where one tries to make sense out of the findings. Interpretation of the data to see if they make sense may require more data, so one returns to collect more data and continue analysis.

**Presentation of Description, Analysis, and Interpretation of Data.** The framework for this study—"small worlds, different worlds"—provides a guide for the presentation of the data. The descriptive data were used to illustrate the themes that emerged from the analysis—what Wolcott (1994) called "transformation of data."

I took precautions not to over- or underextend interpretation of the data, as cautioned by Wolcott (1994). I discussed my interpretations with objective observers to see if they felt that I made extended interpretations of the data. As a community college faculty member, I did use the "connect with personal experience" as one approach to data interpretation (Wolcott 1994, p. 44).

**Assumptions**

While embarking on this study, I made several assumptions. The first was that faculty teaching in various sectors of higher education fulfill the established academic roles of teaching, research, and service differently. This difference is based on the missions and goals of the institutions as well as the student bodies served by them. The missions of the research university usually include some statement about the education of students at the graduate as well as the undergraduate level. Community college mission statements, on the other hand, usually include statements reflecting the comprehensiveness of the
institutions (career education, community education, collegiate function, developmental function, and general education) (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).

A second assumption was that prestige is a factor in selecting the sector of higher education where one would accept an academic position. Prestige has been emphasized in many early studies of the professoriate and higher education. Caplow and McGee (1958/1964) mentioned the pioneering work of Logan Wilson in 1942 in which he studied the academic man [sic] and the emphasis of prestige evaluation in higher education. The term “prestige” was used by Wilson as the estimated standing of an individual in a large social group. Jencks and Riesman (1964) and Clark (1987) discussed higher education in terms of a hierarchy with the research university at the top and the comprehensive universities, liberal arts colleges, and community colleges rank-ordered below them. Even though there is respect for all levels of postsecondary education, the “pecking order” still exists (Clark, 1987).

A third assumption was that graduates from doctoral programs have personal preferences in their academic roles. Some prefer to spend much of their time performing research and others prefer to spend most of their time teaching.

Preservation of Confidentiality

The national database used was the public-use faculty data file. This file contains a reduced number of variables to avoid disclosure. There is no indication as to what institutions or faculty members participated in this study. Participation in the interviews was voluntary. Precautions were given to preserve both institution and individual identities.
Chapter Summary

A mixed design study endeavored to answer the research questions about the full-time community college faculty with doctorates. Answers to the questions regarding the demographics and the comparison between the two-year and four-year full-time faculty came from study of the national database. Interviews answered the questions that were multifaceted and for which the "variables are complex, interwoven, and difficult to measure." The use of both quantitative and qualitative methods of data gathering, analysis, and interpretation provided a more complete picture of this faculty cohort. The results of this study provided information about a population that heretofore has not been studied.
CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

In this study, community college teaching faculty with doctorates were examined and compared with their counterparts in four-year institutions. An analysis of selected data from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93) provided an overview of the characteristics of both groups. A second part of the study consisted of interviews. Twenty-one full-time, doctorate-holding teaching faculty in three community colleges in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States were asked about their decisions to enter or remain in community college teaching. In analyzing the interview data, I used a conceptual framework built around four academic discipline categories ("hard-pure," "soft-pure," "applied-hard," and "applied-soft").

Two-Year and Four-Year Faculty Described and Compared

I extracted data from the public access information file of the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93) by consistently using three controls: (a) the possession of the highest degree—PhD or EdD, (b) having faculty status or instructional duties for credit, and (c) holding a full-time position. The descriptive and comparative data are presented in three categories: (a) demographics and background, (b) work-related
issues, and (c) future career plans. The weighted sample sizes stand at the end of each table. Most of the results are based on a total weighted sample size of 310,560, with 290,610 as the weighted sample size of the four-year faculty and 19,960 as the weighted sample size of the two-year faculty. However, there are some variations depending on the selected parameters.

Demographics and Background

Table 1 shows comparative demographic information for full-time faculty with doctorates who were teaching in either a two-year or four-year institution. In the two institutional types, the average age for faculty was found to be similar (51 in two-year institutions, 49 in four-year), as was marital status. Nor were great differences found in comparing citizen status and racial and ethnic makeup. The gender makeup was slightly different, however. Two-year institutions had a ratio of two-thirds male to one-third female, whereas in four-year institutions, three-fourths of the faculty were male and only one-quarter were female.
Table 1  
**Faculty Demographics by Type of Institution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Two-year</th>
<th>Four-year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male 67%</td>
<td>Male 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 33%</td>
<td>Female 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Married 75%</td>
<td>Married 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced 11%</td>
<td>Divorced 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single. Never Married 10%</td>
<td>Single. Never Married 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widowed 2%</td>
<td>Widowed 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living in a marriage-like relationship 2%</td>
<td>Living in a marriage-like relationship 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separated &lt;1%</td>
<td>Separated 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>1-3 dependents 70%</td>
<td>1-3 dependents 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents</td>
<td>Average = 2.16</td>
<td>Average = 2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>American Citizens 96%</td>
<td>American Citizens 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noncitizens 4%</td>
<td>Noncitizens 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>White, not Hispanic 85%</td>
<td>White, not Hispanic 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander 6%</td>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black, not Hispanic 5%</td>
<td>Black, not Hispanic 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native 1%</td>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native &lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Source: NCES, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty 3/16/98. Based on a weighted “n” of 290,610 faculty in four-year institutions and a weighted “n” of 19,960 faculty in two-year institutions.

The background of faculty was ascertained through data on the highest educational attainments of their parents. The percentage of parents with a high school or less than high school education was higher among two-year faculty than among four-year faculty.

Among two-year faculty, 59% of fathers and 63% of mothers were found to have a high school education or less, as compared to 48% of fathers and 57% of mothers of four-year faculty. The percentage of the four-year faculty fathers with bachelor’s degrees and higher was 37, as compared to 28% for fathers of two-year faculty. Among mothers of four-year faculty, 25% had achieved a bachelor’s degree or higher, as compared to 19% of mothers.
of two-year faculty. Although there is a percentage difference between the faculty cohorts in the two institutional types, the difference in educational attainment distribution for the fathers is statistically significant, while differences in the mother’s educational attainment distribution are not significant. Table 2 presents a breakdown of the percentages of parental educational attainments.

**Table 2**

*Highest Educational Attainment of Parents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fathers of faculty</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>&lt; High School Diploma</th>
<th>High School Diploma</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>Associate’s Degree</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree</th>
<th>Master’s Degree</th>
<th>PhD/Other Professional</th>
<th>Misc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-Year</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mothers of faculty</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>&lt; High School Diploma</th>
<th>High School Diploma</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>Associate’s Degree</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree</th>
<th>Master’s Degree</th>
<th>PhD/Other Professional</th>
<th>Misc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-Year</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Fathers’ educational attainments differ, $x^2 = 33.02$, $p < 0.001$ (df=7). Mothers’ educational attainments do not differ, $x^2 = 2.34$, $p < .20$ (df=7). Source: Based on data from NCES, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty 3/16/98. Weighted “n” of 289,360 faculty in four-year institutions and a weighted “n” of 19,770 faculty in two-year institutions.

**Work-Related Issues**

The work-related issues explored were (a) faculty teaching/research fields; (b) average basic institution salary; (c) number of teaching credit hours per semester; (d)
average time spent in the areas of teaching, administration, and research;
and (e) areas of satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction.

**Teaching/research fields.** As shown in Table 3, the fields of teaching/research
that have a relatively higher representation in two-year institutions are English/literature/
communication, mathematics/statistics/computer science, physical science, and
psychology. The other fields of teaching/research are more equally distributed, with some
having slightly higher percentage in the four-year institutions. There is no significant
difference between the two-and four-year faculty.
Table 3
Principal Teaching Research Fields for Two-and Four-Year Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Two-Year</th>
<th>Four-Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English/Lit/Communications</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Statistics/Computer sciences</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological sciences</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical sciences</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher &amp; other education</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology and other social sciences</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine arts</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health sciences</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law/Economics/Political science</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign languages</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy and Religion</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational programs</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/Home economics</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square is not significant, $x^2 = 16.04, p < .20$ (df=17).
Source based on data from NCES, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty 1/16/98.
Weighted “n” of 288,710 full-time faculty with doctorates in the four-year institutions and 19,750 in two-year institutions.
Salaries. The null hypothesis (no difference) regarding basic institution salary was retained, although inspection shows a noticeable percentage difference between the two groups, especially at the higher end of the salary scale. Table 4 displays the basic institutional salary ranges.

Table 4  
Basic Institution Salary for Two-and Four Year Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Percent of Two-Year Faculty</th>
<th>Percent of Four-Year Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $40,000</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $50,000</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $60,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 to $70,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $70,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square is not significant, $x^2 = 8.75, p < .10$ (df=4).
Source: Based on data from NCES, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty 3/16/98
Weighted "n" of 265,110 full-time faculty with doctorates in the four-year institutions with doctorates for 17,200 in the two-year institutions.

To add another perspective to the basic institution annual salaries, using the NSOPF-93, the mean salary for four-year faculty is $51,982 contrasted with $45,031 for two-year faculty.

Data about salaries for 1999-2000 reveal that faculty salaries decrease with movement down the classification of institutions (Magner, 2000). Full-time faculty holding the rank of professor in doctoral institutions average $87,000, in comprehensive institutions, $67,000, in baccalaureate institutions $62,000, and in two-year institutions, $57,000. The salaries for full-time faculty in four-year institutions have increased by from 3.6% to 4.4% in one year, while those in two-year institutions have increased only 2.6%. As might be expected, the eight-year-old NSOPF-93 data showed lower salary bases in
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both two-and four-year institutions, with no significant difference between the two groups. The 2000 data reveal that the salaries are increasing across the board for full-time faculty, but the two-year faculty salaries are increasing at a slower rate.

Classroom credit hours. Traditionally, four-year faculty have taught fewer hours than two-year faculty because of the research demands. Two-year faculty have been expected to fulfill a distinct mission that demands a different time allocation. Since two-year colleges are considered "teaching institutions," there is a "powerful community college imperative of student centeredness" (McGrath & Spear, 1994, 358). Thus community college faculty spend the majority of their time teaching, advising, and guiding students, as well as giving considerable time to administrative duties (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).

The NSOPF-93 data validate the statements of the above authors. The number of classroom credit hours taught is higher for the two-year faculty. Fifty-four percent of two-year faculty teach from 9 to 17 or more credit hours per semester. In contrast, more than half of the four-year faculty teach from 3 to 9 credit hours per semester; only 21% of the two-year faculty teach this few credit hours. This difference is significant. Table 5 presents the comparative percentages.
Table 5
Classroom Credit Hours Per Semester for Two- and Four-Year Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>3-5 credits</th>
<th>5-7</th>
<th>7-9</th>
<th>9-11</th>
<th>13-15</th>
<th>15-17</th>
<th>&gt;17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-year</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square is significant, \( \chi^2 = 45.90, p < 0.001 \) (df=6).
Source: Based on data from NCES, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty 1/16/98.
Weighted "n" of 235,770 full-time faculty with doctorates in the four-year institutions and 18,390 in two-year institutions.

Time spent in academic duties. The average percentage of time spent in each of the three major academic duties (teaching, research, and administration) also reflects the type of institution. Table 6 illustrates this point. Not surprisingly, in view of the traditional emphases characteristic of the two types of institution, the greatest differences show up in the respective amount of time given to teaching and research. Four-year faculty spend more time in research and less time in teaching than two-year faculty. The difference is statistically significant.

Table 6
Average Time Spent in Academic Duties for Two- and Four-Year Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-year</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square is significant, \( \chi^2 = 10.95, p < 0.01 \) (df=2).
Source: Based on data from NCES, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty 1/16/98.
Teaching data based on weighted "n" of 266,120 full-time faculty with doctorates in the four-year institutions and 19,120 in two-year institutions.
Research data based on weighted "n" of 258,550 full-time faculty with doctorates in the four-year institutions and 10,950 in two-year institutions.
Administration data based on weighted "n" of 181,970 full-time faculty with doctorates in the four-year institutions and 10,390 in two-year institutions.
Because these are averages, the percentages may total more than 100%.
Evaluation criteria. As part of the work-related issues, I looked at opinions about evaluation criteria (teaching versus research). These results also reflect the classification of institution. Ninety-five percent of the two-year faculty agreed that teaching should be a determinant of promotion, with the majority reporting they agree strongly. Sixty-seven percent of four-year faculty also agreed that teaching should be a criterion for promotion, with slightly fewer than half stating they agreed strongly. The chi square distribution for the opinion about teaching used as promotion criteria is significant, $x^2 = 41.00$, $p < 0.001$ (df = 3).

Sixty-three percent of four-year faculty agree strongly or agree somewhat that research should be rewarded more than teaching. In contrast, 75% of two-year faculty disagree strongly that research should be rewarded more than teaching, and another 17% reported that they disagree somewhat. The chi square distribution for opinions about whether research should be rewarded more than teaching is significant, $x^2 = 77.74$, $p < 0.001$ (df = 3).

Areas of satisfaction/dissatisfaction. Job satisfaction has been included as a variable in many studies and surveys. In the 1995-1996 Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac (1997), for example, job satisfaction was reported for two- and four-year faculty. Autonomy and independence were aspects of the job that were rated "very satisfactory" or "satisfactory" for the highest percentage of both faculties. Visibility for jobs at other institutions and organizations was an aspect of the job that rated the lowest in terms of satisfaction. The four-year faculty surveyed in the Chronicle study were more satisfied than two-year faculty with quality of students. The two-year faculty were more satisfied
than four-year faculty with the following: salary with fringe benefits, professional and
social relationships with other faculty, and overall job satisfaction. Both groups fairly
evenly selected the following aspects of the job as “very satisfactory” or “satisfactory”:
opportunity for scholarly pursuits, teaching load, working conditions, competency of
colleagues, job security, relationship with administration, and opportunity to develop new
ideas.

A recent report (Leatherman, 2000) on The American Faculty Poll, a survey of
full-time two-and four-year faculty conducted by the National Opinion Research Center at
the University of Chicago, revealed that 40% of this group had considered changing
careers “in part because of low salaries, a lousy academic job market, and the petty politics
of academe” (p. A19). Seventeen reasons were given by this faculty group for why they
stayed on the job. The top reasons “were the opportunity to educate students, the chance
to work in an intellectually challenging environment, the freedom to teach what interests
them, and the ability to have time for their families” (p. A19). Department and institution
reputations, physical working conditions, and professional recognition ranked at the
bottom of this list.

In my own study, I examined opinions about various aspects of job satisfaction
from the NSOPF-93 data, and there were similarities between the two- and four-year
faculties. Over 80% of both groups indicated overall job satisfaction. The two-year
faculty reported a slightly higher job satisfaction than did four-year faculty (85% and 82%,
respectively). This difference was not significant, $x^2 = 1.47, p < .20$ (df=3).

Thirty-five percent of the two-year faculty thought the quality of facilities and
resources was poor or very poor, but 65% indicated it was good or very good. Among four-year faculty, 24% reported it was poor or very poor, and 76% reported it was good or very good. This difference is not significant. (See Table 7.)

Table 7
Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Facilities and Resources for Two- and Four-year Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-year</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square is not significant, $\chi^2 = 3.08, p < .20$ (df=3).
Source: Based on data from NCES, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty 1/16/98.
Weighted "n" of 284,150 full-time faculty with doctorates in the four-year institutions and 19,020 in two-year institutions.

With regard to advancement opportunities, the majority of both groups reported being either satisfied or very satisfied as demonstrated in Table 8. This difference is not significant.

Table 8
Satisfaction with Advancement Opportunity for Two- and Four-year Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-year</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square is not significant, $\chi^2 = 3.86, p < .20$ (df=3).
Source: Based on data from NCES, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty 1/16/98.
Weighted "n" of 290,610 full-time faculty with doctorates in the four-year institutions and 19,960 in two-year institutions.

Over 50% of both faculty groups were satisfied with salaries, as shown in Table 9. This difference, too, was not significant.
Table 9
Satisfaction with Salary for Two- and Four-Year Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-year</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square is not significant, $\chi^2 = 1.18, p < .20$ (df=3).
Source: Based on data from NCES, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty 1/16/98.
Weighted “n” of 290,610 full-time faculty with doctorates in the four-year institutions and 19,960 in two-year institutions.

Despite the differences in the teaching and research workload between the two faculty groups, the two were equally satisfied with their workloads. Sixty-seven percent of both two-year and four-year faculty indicated they were either somewhat satisfied or very satisfied. This difference is not significant, $\chi^2 = 0.34, p < .20$ (df=3).

Nearly 80% of both two- and four-year faculty indicated that they felt the professional development funds for faculty were either adequate or somewhat adequate as shown in Table 10. This difference is not significant.

Table 10
Overall Adequacy of Professional Development Funds for Two- and Four-Year Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Somewhat Adequate</th>
<th>Somewhat Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-year</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square is not significant, $\chi^2 = 0.80, p < .20$ (df=2).
Source: Based on data from NCES, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty 1/16/98.
Weighted “n” of 290,610 full-time faculty with doctorates in the four-year institutions and 19,960 in two-year institutions.

Faculty satisfaction was found by Schecket (1995) to vary according to the age and
previous teaching experience of the individual. In his qualitative investigation of career plateauing, Shecket found that faculty who had the most complaints were those who had been faculty a relatively shorter period of time, 12 to 16 years. The faculty closer to retirement had more positive career self-assessments. The basically positive career assessments for both faculty cohorts in my study may be related to the fact that 41% were planning to retire in the next five years, indicating that they may have been in the veteran faculty group.

Publications. The analysis of the NSOPF-93 data showed that although two-year faculty have a bimodal distribution for number of career total publications at the 3-7 level and >26 level, four-year faculty have a higher percentage of total career publications (>26). There is a significant difference between the two institutional levels. Table 11 illustrates the distribution.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>3-7</th>
<th>7-10</th>
<th>10-13</th>
<th>13-16</th>
<th>16-19</th>
<th>19-22</th>
<th>22-26</th>
<th>&gt;26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-Year</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square is significant, $x^2 = 23.15$, $p < 0.01$ (df=7).
Source: Based on data from NCES, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty 1/16/98.
Weighted “n” of 240,280 full-time faculty with doctorates in the four-year institutions and 10,240 in two-year institutions.

Seventy-five percent of two-year faculty reported from 5 to 11 recent publications (defined in NSOPF-93 as during the past two years), however. Two-year faculty are publishing, even though their total career publications are fewer than those of four-year
faculty. The difference in recent publications is not significant. Table 12 illustrates the total recent (within the past two years) publications for both two-year and four-year faculty.

Table 12
*Total Recent (Past Two Years) Publications for Two-and Four-Year Faculty*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>5-8</th>
<th>8-11</th>
<th>11-14</th>
<th>14-17</th>
<th>17-20</th>
<th>20-23</th>
<th>23-26</th>
<th>&gt;26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-Year</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Chi square is not significant, \( \chi^2 = 6.38, p < .20 \) (df=7).

*Source.* Based on data from NCES, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty 1/16/98. Weighted "n" of 133,070 full-time faculty with doctorates in the four-year institutions and 2,580 in two-year institutions.

Palmer (1994a) reported that in a survey conducted about community college faculty in 1991 by George Mason University's Center for Community College Education assisted by the National Council for Instructional Administrators, 86% of all faculty completed at least one scholarly product. He found that doctoral degree faculty were more likely to have produced more research or technical papers than master's degree faculty. In the same monograph, Palmer indicated that males are more likely than females to produce publications. The speculated reasons for this finding were that there were more men than women who held doctorates, and women cited family responsibilities as a factor limiting their scholarly activity.

**Future Career Plans**

The NSOPF-93 descriptive and comparative data concerning future career plans were examined by looking at 12 values considered to be important for faculty if they were...
to leave their current academic positions to accept another position inside or outside of academe. Additionally, retirement plans for both faculty groups were examined.

Only 13\% of both groups felt that opportunities for advancement were not important if they were to leave their current positions. More than half stated that advancement opportunities were very important. In contrast, 72\% of four-year faculty and 68\% of two-year faculty stated that administrative opportunities were not important. The chi square distribution for the importance of advancement opportunity for two- and four-year faculty is *not significant*, $\chi^2 = 0.22, p < .20$ (df=2). The chi square distribution for the importance of administration opportunity for two- and four-year faculty is also *not significant*, $\chi^2 = 0.58, p < .20$ (df=2).

Both groups felt that instructional facilities were very important. Only 6\% of the four-year faculty and 5\% of the two-year faculty felt they were not important. The chi square distribution for the importance of instructional facilities is *not significant*, $\chi^2 = 2.23, p < .20$ (df=2).

Both groups felt that job security, tenure, and salary were very important. There was no significant difference when each of these three characteristics was individually analyzed. This is represented in table 13.
Table 13
Importance of Job Security, Tenure, and Salary Level in Two- and Four-Year Faculty if Faculty were to Leave Current Academic Position to Accept Another Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>Two-year 8%</td>
<td>Two-year 21%</td>
<td>Two-year 71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four-year 7%</td>
<td>Four-year 21%</td>
<td>Four-year 72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Two-year 19%</td>
<td>Two-year 26%</td>
<td>Two-year 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four-year 15%</td>
<td>Four-year 20%</td>
<td>Four-year 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Level</td>
<td>Two-year 4%</td>
<td>Two-year 33%</td>
<td>Two-year 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four-year 4%</td>
<td>Four-year 36%</td>
<td>Four-year 60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square for job security is not significant, \( \chi^2 = 0.07, p < .20 (df=2) \).
Chi square for tenure is not significant, \( \chi^2 = 2.08, p < .20 (df=2) \).
Chi square for salary is not significant, \( \chi^2 = 0.20, p < .20 (df=2) \).

Source: Based on data from NCES, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty 3/16/98.
Weighted "n" of 290,610 faculty in four-year institutions and a weighted "n" of 19,960 faculty in two-year institutions.

The life-style qualities of geographic location, job for spouse, and schools for children showed similar response patterns for both groups. Geographic location was considered to be very important for two-thirds of both groups. Only 5% in each group thought geographic location was not important. The responses were also similar for both groups for the quality of job for spouse. Nearly three-fourths of both groups considered this quality either somewhat important or very important.

The responses for the importance of schools for children were bipolar for both groups. Nearly half of both groups thought that schools were very important. However, 40% in each group thought that they were not important. The chi square distributions for each of these characteristics are as follows:
The distribution for the importance of geographic location for two- and four-year faculty is not significant, $x^2 = 0.23, p < .20$ (df=2). The distribution for the importance of schools for children for two- and four-year faculty is not significant, $x^2 = 0.28, p < .20$ (df=2). The distribution for the importance of job for spouse for two- and four-year faculty is not significant, $x^2 = 0.94, p < .20$ (df=2).

The opinions about the importance of greater opportunities to teach and to do research and no pressure to publish had, as expected, opposite results based on the sector of higher education. Table 14 shows these opinions. Forty-two percent of the four-year faculty thought teaching opportunity was not important. In contrast, 42% of the two-year faculty considered it very important.

A reverse picture emerges when attention is paid to opinion about the importance of research. Thirty-nine percent of four-year faculty thought research opportunity was very important, whereas 41% of two-year faculty felt it was not important.

The two groups expressed contrasting opinions about freedom from publishing pressure. Forty-three percent of two-year faculty thought it was very important to be free of publishing pressure, whereas 44% of four-year faculty reported that freedom from publishing pressure was not important. In all three cases—teaching opportunity, research opportunity, and no pressure to publish—slightly more than one-third of both groups answered "somewhat important." The differences between the two institutional groups for these three opinions are significant.
Table 14
Importance of Teaching and Research Opportunities and No Pressure to Publish in Two- and Four-Year Faculty if Faculty were to leave Current Academic Position to Accept Another Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion About</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Two-year 24%</td>
<td>Two-year 34%</td>
<td>Two-year 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four-year 42%</td>
<td>Four-year 37%</td>
<td>Four-year 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Two-year 41%</td>
<td>Two-year 38%</td>
<td>Two-year 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four-year 23%</td>
<td>Four-year 38%</td>
<td>Four-year 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Pressure to</td>
<td>Two-year 23%</td>
<td>Two-year 34%</td>
<td>Two-year 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish</td>
<td>Four-year 44%</td>
<td>Four-year 35%</td>
<td>Four-year 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Chi square for importance of teaching opportunity is significant, $\chi^2 = 12.03, p < .001$ (df=2).
Chi square for importance of research opportunity is significant, $\chi^2 = 10.46, p < .001$ (df=2).
Chi square for importance of no pressure to publish is significant, $\chi^2 = 14.98, p < .001$ (df=2).
Source: Based on data from NCES, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty 3/16/98.
Weighted “n” of 290,610 faculty in four-year institutions and a weighted “n” of 19,960 faculty in two-year institutions.*

Both faculty cohorts responded similarly when responding to questions on retirement age and plans for non-postsecondary jobs in three years after the study. On the average, the four-year faculty plan to retire at age 66 and the two-year faculty at age 64. Considering the average ages of both faculty groups in the NSOPF-93 study, the majority would be projected to retire between 2005 and 2010. This information may indicate that many institutions can anticipate a spate of faculty retirements. In a recent article, Magner (2000) reinforced this information in the discussion about the large numbers of faculty hired in the 1960s and 1970s during the rapid growth for community colleges and state universities. This group will be looking forward to retirement in the early 2000s. In addition to the age factor, Magner suggested that faculty may also retire because of the booming stock market and retirement incentives offered by some colleges and universities.

Apart from retirement, few faculty in either group had plans to leave academe. In
response to the question of whether they would accept a full-time non-postsecondary job within three years of the NCES survey, nearly one out of eight said that it was not at all likely he/she would accept a full-time non-postsecondary job. The difference is not significant. This is illustrated in table 15.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Not at all likely</th>
<th>Somewhat likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four-year</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square is not significant, $\chi^2 = 0.50, p < 0.20$ (df=2).

Source. Based on data from NCES, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty 3/16/98.

Weighted "n" of 290,610 faculty in four-year institutions and a weighted "n" of 19,960 faculty in two-year institutions.

The essential similarities in the two- and four-year faculty were in the areas of demographics, general satisfaction with academe, and life-style values associated with their academic positions. The one persistent pattern of difference revolves around the community college faculty commitment to (and engagement in) teaching, in contrast to the four-year faculty commitment to (and engagement in) research. The interview data of this study help to frame questions that arise, such as, why community college faculty either seek or remain in the two-year academic institutions. Do comparative graduate education experiences play a role in the socialization process of these individuals? What are the individual psychological propensities that might help faculty make their decisions to teach in the community colleges? Are there intrinsic rewards in two-year institutions that are particularly fulfilling to faculty? Such questions serve to introduce the second part of this research.
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Interviews with Doctoral-level Faculty in Community Colleges

Having investigated the available national database for postsecondary faculty (NSOPF-93), it was important to add another dimension to this study. Thus, I conducted interviews with full-time faculty with doctorates who were teaching in community colleges. The intent was to seek answers to questions not covered in the national study.

The broad purpose of the interviews was to explore why full-time faculty with doctoral degrees either select or remain in community colleges. The following quote from one of the participants relates to this broad purpose:

I spent 27 years in community college education, and I love it. And I would choose it. I like it because it is the essence of democracy in higher education—the open access to absolutely everybody. I believe in it very strongly, and I think that Thomas Jefferson’s statement that education should be available within one day’s horseback ride for everyone in the Commonwealth is a very good description—not for the University of Virginia, which he founded, but rather the community college. . . . But just the availability of it is wonderful.

I sent letters asking for participation in the study to all full-time faculty with either a PhD or EdD who were teaching in three community colleges in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States. Those interested in participating notified me by mail or e-mail. I then set up appointments for the hour-long interview. Twenty-one qualified faculty members responded and participated in the study. Identifying information such as individual and institutional names was eliminated to ensure anonymity. To explore why this cohort of
full-time faculty had either selected or remained in community colleges, open-ended questions were asked in varied ways (See Chapter Three, pp.62-65).

Characteristics of the Participants

I collected demographic information before the interview. The results are compiled in the following table:
Table 16
*Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N=21)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>N=21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>41-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>11 male, 10 female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree before Community College Experience</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree after Community College Experience</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree in Discipline</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree Outside of Discipline</td>
<td>5 (Education 2, School Administration 1, Urban Services 1, Higher Education 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>English 2, History 4, Art History 1, Psychology 1, Foreign Language 1, Linguistics 1, Reading 1, Math 1, Microbiology/ecology 1, Chemistry 1, Biology 1, Librarian 1, Counselor 1, Business Administration 1, Early Childhood Education 1, Nutrition 1, Health Education 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Teaching Experience Sector</td>
<td>Elementary School 2, High School 8, Community College 3, Four-year institutions 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years Teaching in Community College</td>
<td>&lt;5 yrs. = 3; 5-10 yrs. =2; 10-15 yrs. =3; 15-20 yrs. =0; 20-25 yrs. =7; 25-30 yrs. =6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Married 15, Single 3, Divorced 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number with Children</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 21 individuals who agreed to participate in this study, 11 fell into the "pure soft" discipline category (English, History, Art History, Linguistics, Foreign Language, and Reading). Four were in the "pure hard" discipline category (Biology, Chemistry,
Mathematics, and Microbiology). Four individuals fitted in the “Soft-Applied” discipline category (Library Science, Counseling, Business Administration, and Early Childhood Education). Two were within the “Hard-Applied” discipline category (Nutrition and Health Education).

The counselor and librarian from the “applied soft” category qualified as participants since they are teaching full-time in the community college and documented classes they had taught. Each one teaches a certain number of classes each semester.

McGrath and Spear (1994) mentioned that community college faculty who return to graduate school do so in order to enhance their pedagogical skills or pursue degrees in education rather than their discipline. In this study, 5 of 21 participants have doctoral degrees in education, higher education, school administration, or urban services.

The participants received their graduate education from large public research universities, including state universities (Alabama, Indiana, Michigan, Tennessee, and Virginia), Ivy League institutions, (such as Princeton), private research institutions (such as Duke University, Emory University, and Boston University), and smaller liberal arts institutions (such as The College of William and Mary). One participant was a Fulbright Scholar.

Thirteen of the 21 participants had been teaching in the community college for 20 to 30 years. Eight had been teaching in the community college from two to 15 years.

Common Themes

Analysis of the interview data produced some common themes related, first, to their initial selection of the community college as a place to teach and, second, to their
decision to remain at the community college.

Responses given by participants when asked about their selection of the community college could be separated into two categories of motivations: personal and professional. The personal motivations that were mentioned related to the attraction of the community college atmosphere, a "fit" with the participant's philosophy of life and education, a way of meeting family needs, a sense of positive happenstance or serendipity, and the desired geographic location. Professional motivations appeared in responses relating to the job market, noncompletion of a dissertation or a lack of desire to attain a doctoral degree, a dislike of research and publishing pressures, comfort with teaching introductory-level courses, and dissatisfaction with other sectors of education.

**Personal Motivators for Selecting the Community College**

While the faculty members were "telling their stories" about how they entered teaching and specifically community college teaching, expressions of their personal motivation emerged.

**Community College Atmosphere.** Many of the participants in this study came to the community college during its rapid growth period—in the 1970s. Little direct knowledge was available to them about this sector of higher education. One or two of the interviewees knew relatives who were teaching part-time in a community college. Most of the faculty members reported that they had been looking for jobs and applied for positions in the community college.

One respondent, who had worked as a staff member in a community college before earning her doctoral degree, said:
I just liked the atmosphere and especially learning about community colleges since we don’t have them in Britain . . . and seeing what a difference it made in the lives of people, especially in a small community, like we were in, where there was nothing else. . . . So it really appealed to me and I kept thinking, “This is much less elitist than what I’m used to.” It was great.

Another respondent stated, “There is no discrimination, nothing of that sort. So they honored me; they respected me; they liked me a lot more than their own people. I got a lot of encouragement in this place; they respect me here.”

After having taught in several four-year institutions, a respondent commented: “[I liked] the non-pretentiousness [of the community college].” And another participant related the story about his initial hiring interview:

The head of the department at the time really wanted me here—I don’t know why. In my letter, I had a bachelor’s degree from [a prestigious school in the northeast]—absolutely nothing about education or dealing with slow learners or the least bit of interest in community college . . . so there was nothing in that letter that would have made him think that I would fit in here. I was seen as a wonderful teacher at the four-year college because they gave me that extra year, in fact. So I think that is what made him think that I could teach in a community college.

Another respondent, who applied to community colleges only after receiving a master’s degree, commented on the multiplicity of choices available at the time.
The market was wide open. There were all kinds of jobs. The community colleges were new...I call it "the wild, wild west." The selection process was very primitive. I interviewed with the division chair; he walked me over to the provost, then they signed me up. It was truly amazing!

A respondent who had taught for four years in a university without a doctoral degree was not given a contract, so was forced to look for other work. A new community college was opening in the area and it was suggested that he go "out there" (the way it was characterized in the four-year institution). He did apply and recalled his initial impression.

I loved the people; I loved the crew. It was just the most exciting thing I had ever experienced up until that point. The faculty was new so they did not harbor things for years and years and years, that I had sometimes witnessed [in the four-year institution]. And I thought this is a place where I can really be a part of what this place is going to be.

"Fit" with personal and educational philosophies. During the interviews, without prompting or a directly related question, the participants revealed some of their personal philosophies based on their backgrounds and experiences. Even though there was no specific question on philosophies, the importance emerged while they were telling their stories. Several grew up in blue-collar families and were among the first college graduates in the family. One had started her education in a one-room schoolhouse. Several admittedly had prestigious backgrounds, such as an Ivy League education, or being an only child, or were privileged not to have to work for their education. Several
had parents who were college professors, while others had come from different countries for their doctoral education in the United States. Their philosophies of life and education were molded by their experiences, and they found a “fit” between these philosophies and the community college.

One respondent who had taken a course in the community college during his master’s degree program, said:

[I] had a chance to observe and to talk to some people [in the community college]. Got real excited about the community college. Just said that would be a great thing to do for 30 years. Yes, I sought this out at least three or four years before I got this. I was thinking that this was what I really wanted to do.

Another respondent, who had worked two and one-half years as a community college faculty member under a grant, said, “I loved it. It was one of the most meaningful jobs I ever had.”

Still another commented, “I have been inspired by people who felt that every human being was born worthy and capable, and that is how I operated.”

One who came from a blue-collar working family said, “I know how important it is for people in those types of circumstances to have people who understand them and can help them meet their educational goals. And a lot of them have pretty complicated lives.”

Another faculty member said that his reasons for selecting the community college were “kind of hokey,” but “I was real fortunate to have parents who emphasized education and religion. The sense of education and living your moral beliefs was
important—more important than money.”

Serendipity. In addition to the community college atmosphere and the “fit” that was felt between personal and professional philosophies, serendipity was a repeated theme that occurred in the interviews.

A respondent who had just finished work on a doctorate said, “I probably knocked on the door. I asked, and it coincided with their search. They needed [someone in my discipline], so I came at the right time. The ad came out about the same time I needed the job.”

Another individual stated, “[Coming to the community college] was at first an accident. I had moved through my professional practitioner experience at a very good time, so this was nice developmental leap.”

An individual who had a varied background in several different disciplines said, “There are just peculiar circumstances and whatever the needs, it is being in the right place, at the right time, with the right combination, and thank God it did. It worked out beautifully.”

Meeting family needs. Family needs also played an important role in why some of the participants had selected a community college. One interviewee stated, “Well, I guess divorce and desire to relocate near the rest of my family if I wasn’t going to have a whole complete family myself—brothers, sisters, and parents—that was pretty important. It was just this opportunity.”

Another respondent who interviewed at two- and four-year institutions when she came to the area with her husband said:
The community college selected me. The best offer came from the community college. At that time, I had a very young child, and I didn't want to work on weekends or at night. The community college's offer was one where I didn't have to work weekends and the salary was much higher [than in the four-year institutions].

Another commented, "We didn't have any children yet. My wife and I decided we didn't want to grow up kids in New York City. So it seemed like a nice place to grow up a family."

Another respondent had been teaching in an area high school and four-year institutions and did not want to uproot his wife and children, so "I kind of stumbled into [the community college], directed by my wife."

Desired geographic location. One respondent came to the community college before completing a doctoral dissertation and "... never expected to stay here; I was just passing through. Then, of course, we found a school where we wanted our kids at. We liked the geographical location; we liked the weather; my wife had a job that she enjoyed. We liked the ocean; we liked being able to go to the mountains. We liked the fact that we could get to Disney World overnight."

A faculty member selected this area of the country because an uncle had lived there and she had always wanted to come, so she applied for jobs in all educational sectors in the region.

Professional Motivators for Selecting the Community College

Some responses to the reasons for selecting the community college did overlap
between personal and professional motivators. However, when I asked what critical points helped them decide to teach in a community college, the most prevalent response was related to getting a job.

**Job market.** One participant said, “I guess I selected it because that is where the jobs were. It was just happenstance that I arrived in the community college system. I would have preferred a four-year school, but it didn’t work there.”

Another respondent stated:

The only reason I am in a community college is because that is what was available. There were two of us and we agreed to go anyplace where we could find two jobs. He got a job in a small, liberal arts, private college; and I got a job in a community college. I didn’t select the community college. That is the job that I got. There are not that many jobs available. Every place I have been there have always been five people ready to take my job if I were ready to give it up. We hired somebody in history this past year and we got over 150 applications. And they were mostly qualified.

A respondent in an applied discipline stated, “[My husband and I agreed] that when I finished my degree, we would look elsewhere. And I began to look other places and nothing really looked that great. The job market was very tough in my area when I was looking for jobs.”

Another respondent said, “I needed a job real quick. . . . It was right after Viet Nam and there were major cutbacks [in the army] and they were letting people go. So I needed a job quick. So I would have gone anywhere.”
The same respondent told stories of classmates who had gone to four-year schools, but they were like gypsies. You could only stay, with a master’s degree, like two or three years. And then you would have to go to another one. A lot of them ended up in a community college anyway. I didn’t want to go that cycle. Like I wanted something that was permanent that I could develop a career with.

After relocating because the spouse wanted to be close to family, one interviewee spent three years as an adjunct in two- and four-year colleges until a job opened up in the field. Recalling this period of time, he said:

This was in 1975-78 when there was real scarcity of full-time positions and there were cutbacks. And you also had affirmative action taking hold where being a white male was not so advantageous. Theoretically, all things being equal, preference was given to women and to minorities.

The same respondent said, “Wanting to have a job was the bottom line. I think the issue was really in where can you have a full-time job with health care provided and a decent standard of living.”

A faculty member who came to the community college with a doctoral degree said, “I can’t say that I selected the community college to be perfectly honest. I was looking for a job and this is the job that developed. I was looking at all levels.”

A faculty member who came to the community college with a doctorate from a research university stated:

Jobs had just disappeared, particularly for a white man. This was in 1970.
I had all kind of job offers in 1966 with a master’s degree. By 1970, everything was gone. I actually had a fair amount of contempt for going to a community college. I really thought that I wanted to be in a good Ivy League school, really spend my life writing books, researching, working with advanced students. But there were no jobs.

A participant who had spent all of her career teaching in four-year institutions came to the community college in an administrative position since there were no teaching jobs available in her field. She related:

I found it much easier finding administrative positions because fewer people are looking for them. I love teaching, but I did that [administration] for about six years and then decided it was time for me to go back to full-time teaching and, as their one and only English as a Second Language teacher had resigned about three years before and they had never replaced her, it was easy for me to get—kind of slide into—this previous position and become a full-time teacher again.

One faculty member pointed out the difficulty in finding a job in a four-year institution because of the specialization within the discipline:

[There were] no openings—not in my field. Unfortunately, there is no opening like someone might say, “we need a person in history.” The actual ads are very specific. You have to have what they are asking for—French, Russian, African American, Native American, Early American History, etc. Noncompleted dissertation or no desire to get a doctorate. Several of
the participants had taken positions in four-year institutions, anticipating that they would complete their dissertations while teaching, but were unable to do so. Other interviewees, however, reported having had no desire to acquire the doctoral degree as they began their academic careers. One faculty member said, “I wanted to teach in college. I didn’t have a doctorate, and I really didn’t plan on getting one—to teach.”

Another participant reported having originally considered the community college a temporary step along a career path. “Coming to the community college was a means to an end—finishing the doctorate. And I never expected to teach in a community college.”

A participant who had started out teaching in a four-year institution but was unable to complete the required doctoral work related:

When I went to the university, I had all the classes finished. I still had to take the language qualifying exams and the qualifying exam for the PhD. I also had a wife and an infant daughter at that time. After four years there, they gave me an extra year because they liked my teaching, hoping that I was going to finish, but I didn’t finish. And so, I was looking around for jobs.

Dislike for research and publishing. Some of the participants verbalized a lack of enjoyment for publishing. One participant who was in an applied area stated, “Well, I never was a traditional college professor type. I never enjoyed writing particularly. I never set out to be a scholar in my field.”

Another interviewee who is also in an applied area revealed, “I don’t enjoy
publishing. In fact at every opportunity I have had to publish, I have turned the other way.” A faculty member who is in a traditional discipline stated:

It doesn’t bother me at all [not publishing or doing research]. Never wanted to do that. Never wanted a PhD because of that. I did not want to play that game; I just didn’t want to spend the rest of my life writing articles and presenting papers at conferences. I really wanted to roll my sleeves up and work with people, faculty, and students.

A faculty member who came to the community college with a PhD in a “soft” discipline stated that she was not sure what her expectations were in the community college. She stated:

I don’t think I ever intended to write books for a living. I certainly didn’t want to spend the rest of my life in a library. I don’t really like historical research much. I kind of stumbled into teaching. I didn’t have any grand design.

Enjoyment in teaching introductory courses. Several faculty members verbalized that they enjoyed teaching survey or introductory courses in their previous teaching experiences and thought that the community college sector of education would fulfill their needs. One participant who had only applied to community colleges said, “I liked freshman- and sophomore-level introductory courses, and I knew that is what a community college taught.”

An interviewee who has had 40 years’ teaching experience in two- and four-year educational institutions stated, “All my life I taught these two chemistries—general and
organic. These two chemistries I teach here too.”

**Dissatisfaction with other sectors of education.** Several of the participants in this study had begun teaching in the high school sector of education. Some felt dissatisfaction with this sector while others felt the need for professional growth.

One individual stated, “High school teaching had deteriorated and the discipline problems were growing—fights in hallways—and I just didn’t particularly enjoy teaching in the milieu.” Additionally, she said:

And I wanted to focus on my subject matter and not spend time disciplining; I wanted a change. I had the opportunity to basically be in on the ground floor of starting a department. That was exciting and it gave me the opportunity to develop courses and as a result, we have more health education courses here than in the neighboring four-year institutions.

When asked why he had entered community college teaching, one participant responded:

A high school kid was going to smash me over the head with a stick. I was threatened with a pipe. There were fires; they set fires in the school. There were riots outside. They arrested ten kids; there were about ten police cars. I would have gone anywhere.

Another participant who had taught in four-year institutions and high school said:

I needed to be teaching at the postsecondary level because it was absolutely unstimulating academically to teach at the secondary level and I was losing rather than gaining professionally. I was losing skills. Not only that, I felt that people in the secondary schools were actually threatened by
my presence and they were antagonistic, consequently, to my being there.

So I figured I have to get with my peers; I have to be with people who are interested in not who it is, but what is being done at the college level.

A participant made the decision not to teach in high school while doing student teaching. He related the story about his practice teaching experience. “When I was an undergraduate about to graduate, a basketball player walked into my classroom the first day and set the waste basket on fire, and I knew then that I didn’t want to teach in high school.”

Several of the participants had taught in four-year institutions before coming to the community college sector. Their reasons varied for leaving the four-year institutions to come to the community college. One interviewee told the story of a dean who had appointed a head of department although he did not have credentials in that discipline. “[The faculty] were furious. In fact everyone who was in the department with me at that time left within two years.”

Another interviewee had specifically been hired to teach large undergraduate sections in his discipline in a four-year institution. He did not have access to a laboratory to do research. When he came up for tenure, the administrators who had hired him had left and since he had not done research, he was not awarded tenure by the administrators even though the faculty had voted to approve tenure.

**Personal Motivators for Staying in the Community College**

The common themes that emerged from the participants’ discussion about why they stayed in the community college could be categorized into personal and professional
motivations, just as was true for their reasons for selecting the community college. The 
personal motivations were grouped into (a) personal “fit,” (b) personal security, and (c) community college atmosphere.

**Personal “fit.”** By far, the personal satisfaction gained while teaching in the community college was the most common response. The nonverbal and verbal responses congruent when the interviewees were discussed why they liked the community college.

One respondent said:

This sounds very altruistic, but it [teaching in the community college] has been extremely satisfying. You get most of your good feelings out of the students rather than because the administration loves you or because the state has decided that you have become so important that they are going to raise your salary and not try to balance the budget by not giving you anything this year . . .

Another respondent said, “There are so many students that you can so easily admire. And I like that! It is a nice goodness of ‘fit,’ kind of like, I guess, but it is kind of hard to verbalize.”

An interviewee who had teaching experience at various levels stated:

And this is a way of combining my experiences in teacher training, and to give back to the community in a way that I don’t think I would have found in a four-year college level. So I just see that there is an opportunity to serve greater groups of people through education than what is more typical there in an academic elite [institution].
A faculty member who had years of teaching experience in secondary and post-secondary education stated, "I do see myself being a vehicle for change for a lot of students, for the better. They get a more global view of things."

A participant who considered himself to be an elitist before coming to the community college stated that after teaching nearly 30 years in the community college, "I feel like I've done something for humanity maybe. I offered something of what I had to try to make other peoples' lives a little bit better maybe. And I take great satisfaction in that particularly." This faculty member offered an anecdote following this comment:

I have a student right now who is really extremely slow. I really love this young man to death here. He struggles. I had him for developmental English and he had no punctuation whatsoever. But he really works hard. I will spend hours with people like that. I don't mind reading his compositions over and over. He calls me all the time at home. But that is real satisfaction. I think I am doing something for somebody.

Another commented:

There is just nothing like it! Seeing my students really work to their potential. Sometimes it is unspoken and sometimes it's pretty loud—seeing people come into class, afraid to establish eye contact and six weeks later walking out with their shoulders high and their head strung back—not arrogantly, but just glad to be alive.

A faculty member who never wanted to teach in a community college and felt embarrassed to tell his faculty advisor that he was teaching in a community college said,
“It sort of turned out; it is one of those things you think you want to do one thing, but you realize that maybe almost by chance, something far better. I really loved teaching in the community college.” His thoughts were confirmed when he returned to defend his dissertation and talked to an individual at the university who said, “I would never teach anywhere except in a community college.”

A faculty member who came to teach in the community college after earning his doctorate said:

If you teach at a community college, you do useful things. If your school weren’t there, most of those kids wouldn’t get any higher education at all. The people that it is more rewarding to teach are not the ones who are dazed, running on automatic pilot, 18-year-old [students] who are delivered by the conveyor belt of life to the classroom. It is the somewhat older student who is juggling the job, the uncooperative husband (God, there are some Neanderthal males that some of these women are married to). The things they have to put up with from the attitudes of hubby. It is people like that who are here in some cases just because they have a great deal of drive and determination.

Another faculty member who considered himself as coming from an elite background and also having taught in a four-year institution, stated, “I have really grown too. Yeh, I’ve really seen another side of life here. I am so glad I didn’t go the other way at this point.”

**Personal Security.** The participants in the study mentioned that although they had
come to the community college because of lack of jobs in higher education, once they became established it was difficult to give up the benefits and security. One participant said:

I can just about choose what times I want to teach. I certainly choose what I want to teach. I've never been without work in the summer... I have the best office space that I've ever had. I have a wonderful relationship with my colleagues. My salary now is competitive with a salary in a four-year institution.

A participant who initially accepted a job in the community college because a job was not available in a four-year institution said:

But basically, I'm happy here. And you know also when you are older, it is harder to get jobs in a four-year college that would pay as much as I'm getting here as full-time full professor. It probably would not happen, so financially it is not worth moving.

While talking about the struggle he had at one point in his career as he agonized over whether to remain in a community college or move to a different place where he could be more involved in research, one interviewee said:

There was a point where there was a strong sense that I should be in research, but then every time we've looked at that, we would think about that we'd have to move. Where would we move? What kind of place would that be? Where would the kids go to school? Would you be as happy there as you are here? And so when you weigh all the factors
together, it all came out on the plus side to stay here. And I enjoyed what I was doing.

**Community college atmosphere—positive aspects.** Many of the faculty members have learned to adapt to teaching in the community college even though it may not have been their first choice. Several specifically mentioned the atmosphere in the community college as a motivator for their remaining in the system. One participant commented:

> At this point in my life, I would select the community college over the four-year institution. The community college atmosphere is much more relaxed. You don't have to worry about tenure. Not having that tenure clout over you, I think, allows you more flexibility and gives you the time to concentrate on method and process—so it is more positive than negative.

One of the newer faculty members interviewed for this study indicated, “I think the atmosphere of the community college is dynamic. And a lot of things that people may not be aware [of] are that the facilities here could be better than a senior college.”

A participant who had taught in a research institution before coming to the community college and at the time had no plans to stay in the community college system said:

> I sort of began sensing it in my colleagues. No one asked if you published or . . . in fact, we were pretty much all family. We were all working together. Some of my best friends are in other disciplines—math,
philosophy, and . . . Whereas, in a four-year college, it is pretty much a clique of English professors who kept to themselves: scientists kept to themselves. The sense of everyone working together for the common goal of providing education for people who would not have had it otherwise, right.

An interviewee who had several years of experience in a four-year institution, commented about the difference in atmosphere between a two- and a four-year institution related to the type of student. He said:

It was the kind of student I really didn't have in the university, particularly women 30 and over. These are wonderful students. They have families. For some reason or another they never had a chance to do anything with their talents. Here they are starting where I started many years before and it is really exciting to work with people like that for whom the whole world of education is opening up. They don't have any confidence and suddenly they begin finding that confidence. A couple of years ago this woman came running up to me and gave me a hug and said, "Oh, I want to tell you that you have changed my life. I didn't believe in myself, but now I finished my four-year degree and I am now teaching." . . . I never would have seen these people [if I had taught in an Ivy League school]. They fall through the cracks in society. We are more worthwhile than that to try to help people like that to bring them along and share some of what I had—and try to bring them up so their lives could be a little bit better.
While referring to the community college atmosphere, another faculty member remarked:

I came here and everyone was so wonderful. I loved the faculty first of all. And began realizing that they are quite different from the faculty at four-year colleges. There is very little snobbism and competition (what have you published or what are you planning to publish?). [In the four-year institution] the senior faculty would always look down on junior faculty. There is always this hierarchy there. When I came here, there was absolutely none of that. It was almost as if we were all equals. We all have this mission that we are going to make education accessible to all the people in our area. I really sort of fell in love with the idea—a highly idealistic venture there. The longer I stayed, I began to see how beautiful the idea was.

Community college atmosphere—negative aspects. Although all of the participants made positive comments about the atmosphere of the community college, there were negative ones as well. Several of the comments related to the personal struggle that occurred between individuals and the community college. One participant expressed concerns about a lack of professional pride:

When I first arrived here, I had the sense in terms of faculty attitudes—some administrative attitudes—that I had gone back into high school. A number of the teachers had high school backgrounds and had moved into the community college system. They had the attitude that we are
employees rather than the professional staff running the place. Of course, the community college is different from the four-year school—at least the "ideal model" is run from the top down. It is an industrial model. In my undergraduate program (an Ivy League school), the academic deans were faculty members who rotated in and out of dean spots. Somebody had to do the administrative dirty work. Then they would go back to teaching and research. Whereas in the community college, the administrator is how you get ahead. It is a hierarchical model rather than a collegial model. For a number of years my least favorite phrase was when a student would come around and say that the counselor said that "the instructor will work with you," which usually meant to cut some slack, show up every third week, not hassle him for coming in late, etc. etc.

Other comments were related to academic integrity. One respondent said, "I have tried to resist vigorously adapting the content and the level of the demands to what is referred to as the needs of the community college student, which usually means water it down."

One interviewee, dismayed that national standards that had developed in the discipline were not being implemented on the community college level, summed up the problem in these words:

It has become increasingly clear that the community college is less developed as an institution and less able then to digest how national standards would guide or lead other national institutions in raising
standards. . . . We are so far off the chart in terms of what the national standards would say that as not to really resemble quality, anything you could describe as having quality. So I think there is a disconnect between what the profession would describe to be and what at my institution we are free to do.

While discussing rigor within their classes, several faculty members indicated that there are unwritten pressures to lower the level of instruction to meet the needs of all student capabilities.

One faculty member said that she had to make a lot of changes in her concept of the role of college professor “although I try to minimize it.” She continued:

That is the tough part because I try to put them through what I consider college level. And that is not always appreciated. So far I think I have been lucky that I have never come to the point where I have been challenged on what I am doing in class. That is where the system gets corrupted. The students lose out when that happens, but there are students who complain that I grade too hard.

Another participant who has been teaching in the community college for three decades also verbalized concern about quality education:

One thing that gripes me is that I think we do a certain amount of what they call in the stock market as “churning.”—taking students who really shouldn’t be here and leading them on through two or three semesters of academic probation rather than telling them, “Kid, you are not going to get a degree. Go
do something you can do.” I think we need to be reminding ourselves a little more often than we do that we are educators as well as trainers.

A participant expressed concern for what she called “a kind of underground resistance, opposition to education [in the community college].” She went on, “The community college is almost the place to get a degree without an education.”

Professional Motivators for Staying in the Community College

The professional motivators for staying in the community college were categorized into professional adaptation to the community college environment and the teaching challenge.

Professional adaptation to the community college. Many of the participants in this study came to community colleges expecting to move on to four-year institutions. Others came from four-year institutions to community colleges for a variety of reasons. A few selected the community college because they only had a master’s degree at the time and had not wanted to pursue a doctoral degree. In all of these cases, the faculty members remained in the community after earning their doctorates, some remaining for up to 30 years.

Many of the interviewees reported that a period of adaptation took place during the early years of community college teaching. For many, the focus was on the students. One participant expressed it in these words:

It was the kind of student I really didn’t have at the university. These are people who had never made it to a four-year college, but because our doors are open we are here and they found us. Wow, that is exciting to be
doing that! So, it wasn’t an idea I had ahead of time; it was something I
discovered after my being here with the students.

Another individual who had taught at a university epitomizes the experiences many
other faculty members also recall about their first year in the community college:

Well, there is always a problem of knowing too much. I think my first year
of teaching, I thought I was speaking to graduate students. I am a fast
learner with a quick learning curve because I am very aware of my
audience. I met my first class by writing on the blackboard, “Language,
Structure, Thoughts.” I was thinking about the sort of impact this was
going to have on them. I tried to integrate these concepts to *Brave New
World*. It was a pretty good lecture; I had everything together. I asked if
there were any questions. This girl said, “What kind of notebook would
you recommend for this course?”

This faculty member said that this student’s question quickly pulled him back to
the reality of the community college classroom. He has never forgotten that experience
and has not repeated it.

Another interviewee also talked about the discrepancy that often occurs between
community college teachers’ expectations and those of many students:

Well, like all teachers teaching the first year, they are astonished at why
they can’t make majors out of all the students they teach. And that
students are as illiterate, unprepared, unwilling to work and generally
apathetic. And now [after teaching for a time in the community college],
all that is gone."

While many of the participants related positive adaptations to the community college atmosphere, there were expressions of discontent. By far the most dissatisfaction was verbalized about the number of mandated teaching hours that decreased their ability to perform research and publish. They also mentioned the lack of respect and reward in the community college system for scholarly work. Several faculty members described the number of credit hours they were expected to teach every semester as a "scandal." In addition to the 15 or 16 credit hours they were teaching, some were expected to be department administrators. Such work was on top of their teaching load, with no release time or financial remuneration provided. One individual said, "I am putting in 65-70 hours per week. It’s ridiculous! It is true of most committed teachers in the community college who have doctorates."

Another interviewee mentioned that during the first few years she was teaching in the community college, she had listed research and publication of at least two articles a year as her professional goals. This is what happened to her goals:

Well, I don’t do research here now. I was shocked at how much was expected of us. Not only teaching, but in the committee work, and all of the rest that is involved in a community college. The emphasis is supposed to be on teaching, but we are sort of pulled over to other things a lot of the time.

Another interviewee stated, "The PhD is not really valued here in a community college because it is so far beyond the minimum requirements, and so any scholarly stuff
you do is primarily for the purpose of staying abreast of the field."

One faculty member who would like to do research said, “The basic problem I see about changes as a scholar are the heavy teaching loads in the community college. It is just so time consuming that my research is still in my head, but I just don’t have time to do it.”

The previous comments by faculty reflect Seidman’s (1985) conclusion that since the community college professoriate have been denied respect within their disciplines, they have defined themselves as teachers rather than as biologists, chemists, or psychologists. This group are pushed away from their discipline simply by teaching in a community college. This is how Gouldner’s “locals” concept may be applied to the community college faculty.

Few of the participants mentioned thoughts about seeking a position in a four-year institution. Even if they desired to do so, they felt such aspirations were not realistic. One said,

I haven’t published a paper since 1990—an original work, you know, research paper. So if I wanted to go to a university, it would be impossible because I haven’t published anything in the last ten years. So you are kind of caught in a perpetuating circle that you can’t get out of.

Despite the heavy teaching loads, many faculty members found that the absence of pressures associated with tenure (namely, research and publishing) freed them to enhance their personal and professional interests. After 30 years, one participant has renewed his trumpet-playing skills by taking lessons and playing in two bands. Another individual who
had been an administrator wanted to amplify her knowledge of art and has taken up photography. She spends her free time walking in the woods, taking pictures of nature, and has had several showings of her photographs. Some of her work has won awards. She has been asked to teach a photography course at the community college, but needs further education to become credentialed.

Another faculty member uses his scholarly discipline skills as a consultant to the military and nonprofit organizations in the area. He also stated that he feels he is contributing to scientific research and regional education by his activity in a professional organization where he serves as president.

Another individual, who admitted not having time to do research and publish, described her responsibilities: she is the sole faculty member for her discipline, is the administrator of the program, and is the manager of the laboratory where her students gain experience while they serve the community. She has made a commitment, however, to international accreditation programs within her discipline in other countries, such as Africa and Norway.

A faculty member in math told the story of his interest in seeing Steven Hawking speak at a meeting. This faculty member is writing a textbook in his field and thought the meeting would add depth to the book. However, he was told by administrators that the community college would not provide funding since the topic did not relate to community college students and curricula. But the chairperson did allow him the time to go, so he attended at his own expense. He described it as a stimulating conference.

A science faculty member spends time singing in a classical A cappella choir that
performs regionally. A history professor enhances his knowledge of what is being taught in the high schools by grading advanced placement exams for high school students. A faculty member who is in charge of a program, as well as her normal teaching load of 15 hours, spoke of the necessity of self-care and personal growth in the midst of an exhausting schedule. She said:

I loved research, and I think I would have been an excellent researcher if I had gone that direction. I have published. I edited a national newsletter. I have forced myself in recent years to enrich myself professionally because the niche of what I do is rather draining. I think that I work as hard to constantly renew myself as I do to run a program. And that is my success story for not being burned out.

Faculty members have engaged in a variety of activities to enrich their professional and personal lives as an adaptation to the community college atmosphere. These activities also add a dimension to the lives of faculty members that can have a positive influence and provide positive role modeling for the students.

**Teaching challenge.** Many of the respondents considered the diversity of the student body to be the major teaching challenge in the community college. All of these participants presented a positive angle to this challenge. A participant who had recently joined the community college faculty said, “[One challenge] is the communication of the language of science to someone with a 10th-grade background in the subject, so you must make some changes, make some adjustments.”
An interviewee who had taught before in four-year institutions said, "My teaching was on a higher level before I got here. And I think that was the biggest adjustment. It was like going back to the basics." A faculty member who was newer to the community college summarized the challenges:

There is also something about the community college. The backgrounds of the community college students [are] much more diverse. You will have some who are just as competent as any student you would have in a four-year institution. You have another segment of the students who is much lower. So with an interest in teaching, you are trying to communicate with this broad spectrum of backgrounds—some who see concepts fast; and some with virtually zero background. To blend these together in the same setting is challenging to teaching. It is kind of a developed skill that is unique to you. Nobody tells you how to teach students with diverse backgrounds. You must develop it.

An interviewee in an applied program related some of the challenges with the age and ability variations in her classes:

I love to see the growth of my students. The oldest student I ever taught was 89, and he had three master's degrees. And he was working on an associate degree in art. Then I have a fellow who was in special classes all through high school and came with a learning problem to one of my classes. I verbally beat him and sent him back to learn how to study, and he was on the dean's list last semester.
These teaching challenges have helped the faculty stay in the community college. However, despite the many positive responses as to why these participants either selected the community college or elected to remain there, concerns were voiced.

Concerns about Teaching in the Community College

Many of the concerns discussed by the participants revolved around the conflict between the mission of the community college and actual activities within the colleges. Other concerns were related to the lack of respect that community college faculty receive from four-year institutions, their faculty, state legislatures, and society in general.

Several faculty members were concerned about the market-driven push toward distance learning. Some pointed out that not all courses lend themselves to distance learning. One faculty member said, "It is not teaching. Somebody here is pushing it. It is market-driven." A participant who teaches in the business/technology programs expressed it this way:

I don't think the technology drive has anything to do with learning. I think it has to do with competition. Other schools are doing this. It has to do with that we want to stay state-of-the-art. I think we are doing it for all the wrong reasons. Yeh, I enjoy the classroom. I enjoy teaching. Teaching to me is not teaching an Internet course where I never see the student and I never walk into a classroom and I do everything by e-mail. To me, to me, to me now, teaching is what? Interpersonal contact with the student, the discussion, and so
forth. [Interaction with faculty and students] is how a student grows socially.

While discussing her concerns about the mission of the community college as just expressed, she concluded, “Let’s just define what the community college does and let’s just do that very well. And let’s not try to do everything.”

Other comments related to the lack of prestige and respect that exist for community college faculty. One participant reflected, “The only other thing that I wonder is if it [teaching in a community college] didn’t mark me as maybe some reasons why some of the universities I applied to didn’t call me for an interview. There is a real culture within that university system. ‘Well, you know, she has taught in a community college.’”

Several faculty members referred to the lack of prestige afforded them by four-year faculty members, the public, and the state legislature. One faculty member, who had taught for as many years in four-year institutions as in the community college, spoke about the lower social standing of community college faculty members:

You are not teaching in a four-year college. You know if you tell someone that you are teaching in a community college, they look down on you I feel sometimes. People don’t know. I know faculty members in the local four-year institution and they just look down on you that you are teaching in a community college. They don’t say anything, but you can see, feel it. That sometimes hurts. But these guys don’t know. They have false egos that they are in a four-year college.

A participant who earned his doctorate after coming to the community college explained his motivation in obtaining the advanced degree:
I just did it for myself—to get the credentials to be recognized. And it [the community college] seems like a half-way house when you have a doctorate because you may not be respected in the university. . . . [T]hey call the school “Timmy Tech,” so it is looked down upon. When you go to a conference and you have “community college” on your name tag, there are certain people who would turn away. You are not as respected. If I wanted to write a differential equation book, some publishers would not consider me; others might. Some publishers wouldn’t because I am only community college.

A faculty member who had been teaching in the community college before getting her doctorate said that her dissertation committee was very disappointed when she told them that she had accepted a position in the community college. Another interviewee expressed the opinion that this lack of respect was also reflected in the state legislature:

And I think that this state has a long way to go in terms of legislative attitudes toward higher education—period. I think we might suffer a special stigma with the legislature. I don’t think we have advocates that we need.

Both the state legislature and the community college governing board were criticized by one participant who said:

I like least how this state treats us as employees. I dislike what I think is the anti-intellectual attitude of everybody from the governor all the way down to the local administration. There was a point back in the ’70s where
we actually got a memo that referred to us as "processing" students, and I really feel that there is an assembly line mentality.

Yet another faculty member commented:

The state is such a cheapskate. They want to do everything on the cheap. Not only do they want to pay us as little as possible, but they also use far, far too many adjunct faculty. [Additionally,] the benefits really stink. They treat their employees pretty badly, I would say.

Several participants verbalized their discontent with academic standards. A veteran faculty member stated:

I think what bothers me [is] that within disciplines, within departments, there is no real evaluation of standards, what faculty are using. We all have played the game of "is this an easy professor or is this one going to demand a lot of work?" Students are very good at finding out who does what. And I think what the community college here has not done adequately is to establish standards within a discipline so that whoever is teaching it, whether full-time or part-time, the standards are comparable, so that the students are not running off to one person simply because it's an easy course with an easy grade.

Another faculty member said, "There is a lack of good evaluation on how each discipline tests the students. I think some disciplines make it too easy allowing them to retake the exam." Yet another participant verbalized:
There are no peer discussions about how we are doing things from campus to campus, within a campus. What are our testing devices and measurement? How are we serving students to give them skills? What this ultimately leads to is [that] the community colleges are not doing as well as they should—is accountability for the quality and level of education when they leave. Can these students do certain things?

A veteran faculty member with years of experience in four-year institutions, but relatively new to the community college, summed up the heavy responsibilities that community college faculty members are expected to shoulder:

[The students] seem to be less prepared for college level work than those I taught in the past. They seem to be less prepared each year. And it is kind of a dilemma, knowing how to deal with that. Of course, we are supposed to deal with that and not lower our standards at all—and also retain the students at the same time. And we are accountable for all of these things.

Chapter Summary

The chi square distribution results reveal that full-time teaching faculty with doctorates from the two types of institutions differed in the following ways: average time spent in academic duties; opinions about research being rewarded more than teaching; opinions about teaching opportunity, research opportunity, and no publishing pressure;
classroom credit hours; total career publications; importance of job security; tenure; salary; and the educational attainment of fathers.

The two cohorts differ in the average time spent in the three major academic duties of teaching, research, and administration. Although both groups spend over half of their time teaching, the two-year faculty spend an average of 69% of their time teaching compared to 50% for the four-year faculty. In contrast, two-year faculty spend an average of 12% of their time performing research, compared to 30% for the four-year.

Congruent with the mission of community colleges and the faculty role, 95% of two-year faculty agree that teaching should be a determinant of promotion, with the majority agreeing strongly. Although four-year faculty also agree that teaching should be a criterion for promotion, fewer than half stated that they agreed strongly.

Corresponding with the missions of four-year institutions, 63% of four-year faculty agree strongly or agree somewhat that research should be rewarded more than teaching. Two-year faculty, however, reported that they disagree strongly that research should be rewarded more than teaching (75%).

Another major finding relates to the opinions about teaching opportunity, research opportunity, and no pressure to publish if faculty members were to leave their current academic position. Two- and four-year faculties expressed opposing opinions. The percentage of two-year faculty who thought teaching opportunity was very important was equal to the percentage of four-year faculty who thought it was not important. In contrast, 39% of two-year faculty thought research opportunity was not important, while 39% of four-year faculty thought research opportunity was very important. Two-year
faculty felt the lack of publishing pressure was very important (43%) while 44% of four-year faculty thought it was not important.

The average number of teaching credit hours per semester is higher for community college faculty than for four-year faculty. Fifty-four percent of two-year faculty teach from 9 to 17 or more credit hours per semester. More than half of the four-year faculty teach from three to nine credit hours per semester.

A higher percentage of four-year faculty reported more than 26 total career publications (53% of faculty at four-year institutions compared to 26% of faculty at the two-year institutions). However, almost 75% of two-year faculty had published up to 11 recent publications. Almost the same percentage of four-year faculty had published up to 14 recent publications.

Another difference pertains to the educational attainment of fathers. Thirty-seven percent of four-year faculty fathers held bachelor’s degrees and higher, compared to 28% for fathers of two-year faculty. Sixty-two percent of four-year faculty held associate’s degrees or less, compared to 71% for fathers of two-year faculty.

The personal and professional motivators that emerged from the interviews with community college faculty indicated that although many had not selected the community college as their initial career choice, they have experienced intrinsic satisfactions that have reinforced their decisions to remain in this sector of academe. Their satisfactions revolve around the egalitarian mission of the community college, the enjoyment of teaching, and the challenges of teaching students from diverse backgrounds and capabilities.
Although all faculty agreed that their doctoral education prepared them to do research and to publish, most faculty learned to readily adapt to the community college atmosphere. Most defended the community college and their commitment to its educational mission.

Some faculty, however, discussed certain negative aspects of the community college. Some of the negative aspects expressed were (a) lack of professional respect and prestige, (b) insufficient administrative support for academic integrity, (c) not enough legislative and public support for quality education, (d) time constraints that prevent research and publication even if the desire is there, and (e) incongruent market-driven enterprises, such as on-line courses for community college students who would likely benefit from personal interaction.

The major role the academic disciplines played was related to the job market. At a time when they were seeking employment, many faculty members found that jobs were available in community colleges when they were not available in their disciplines in four-year institutions.

Chapter five stresses the meaning of these data as they relate to key points in the literature. These key points are: (a) the differences in the missions among higher education institutions—the community college having a strong teaching mission, (b) the differences among the disciplines, (c) the intrinsic satisfaction found in teaching in the community college, and (d) the faculty identification as locals/cosmopolitans concept. The implications are discussed as well as suggestions for state and institutional policy making. Suggestions for further research are explored.
The importance of education cannot be overstressed in what has been aptly called “the information age.” Community colleges and their faculties may be expected to play an increasingly significant role in extending educational opportunities to many who might otherwise be denied such opportunities. Yet, community college faculty have often been perceived inaccurately and stereotypically as being less important—even less capable—than faculty in four-year institutions. Despite this perception, more faculty with doctorates are teaching at community colleges. In this study, a combination of data from an existing national data base and interviews with 21 community college faculty has yielded new information about full-time community college faculty with doctorates. The research was undertaken to search for answers to three questions:

1. Who are the full-time faculty with doctoral degrees teaching in community colleges?
2. How is this group different from or similar to faculty in four-year institutions?
3. Why have faculty with PhDs decided either to enter or remain in the community college sector of higher education?
To the degree of the limitations listed below, the research findings suggest at least partial answers to each of these questions. The data, discussed along with findings and interpretations from the work of other researchers, have implications for practice in higher education that are discussed in this chapter. Also, because the data suggest further research needs as well, recommendations for future investigations are introduced. But first, certain limitations must be kept in mind.

Limitations

Limitations in the Quantitative Part of the Study

The first limitation is time-related. The public access files of the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93) national database were used for the first two steps of the study (corresponding to the first two questions). However, the NSOPF-93 data were collected in 1992, making the information eight years old now.

Secondly, I was restricted to the variables used in this database. One constraint in these variables was the "faculty status" control. Since I had bounded my study by teaching faculty, I selected from among the variables "faculty status or instructional duties for credit." However, faculty classification is not consistent in all institutions, therefore this classification in the NSOPF-93 may not have coincided fully with my definition of teaching faculty.

A third limitation in the variables was that not all of my questions could be addressed by this database. The type of information sought in the large national sample was limited to the sort that could be asked in a questionnaire format and that was considered important by the designing committee for that particular study.
Limitations in the Qualitative Part of the Study

The qualitative step in this study also had limitations. First, it was limited to full-time teaching faculty with doctoral degrees in three community colleges in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States.

Second, care must be taken not to generalize from the information on the disciplines. Faculty members listed among the "soft-applied" disciplines included one in counseling and one in the library. These faculty members did teach courses in the community college and were considered faculty by the institutions, so they were accepted to be participants for this study. Only two faculty members listed among the "hard-applied" disciplines participated in this study.

A third limitation in the qualitative part of the research related to the fact that participation was voluntary. Thus, those who responded may have held (and been eager to share) either strong negative or strong positive views about teaching in community colleges.

Although the respondents were varied in terms of gender and discipline, they were not greatly varied in length of service. The majority of the participants came to the community colleges over 20 years ago and may not represent more recent additions to the faculty of two-year colleges.

Another limitation was related to locale. Although the community colleges I selected were varied in size—one considered large (19,000 students), one moderately sized (7,000 students), and one small (1,500 students)—they were located in a similar geographic region. They were also varied in composition—not exclusively urban or rural.
The Two-Year Faculty

Grouping together data from the NSOPF-93 study has produced a portrait of full-time two-year teaching faculty with doctorates. These results parallel somewhat the two-year faculty as a whole described by Cohen and Brawer (1996) and Vaughan (1995). But there are some exceptions. Cohen and Brawer (1996) stated that there have been recent increases in women (from 38% to 44%) and minorities (from 9% to 14.5%) in the total community college faculty. In the portrait of full-time teaching faculty with doctorates drawn from the NSOPF-93 data, 33% of the faculty members were female, slightly lower than the percentage of Cohen and Brawer's portrayal of community college total faculty; and 15% were minorities, slightly higher than the percentage reported by Cohen and Brawer.

This demographic portrait is similar in many respects also to the four-year faculty. There were, however, slightly more non-American citizens among the four-year faculty. The fathers' education was significantly higher among the four-year faculty.

The distinguishing characteristic of the community college faculty cohort lies in the fact that they are in teaching institutions, and that is what they most like about being in the two-year institutions. This faculty cohort are positive about their academic positions in community colleges. Most have found strong intrinsic appeal in their faculty role in the two-year institutions. Cohen and Brawer (1996) suggested that intrinsic attitudes are considered responsible for satisfaction. Despite their basic satisfaction, however, the faculty did identify ways in which this role could be made more appealing.
The relatively negative picture of the community college professoriate painted by McGrath and Spear (1994) was not apparent among the participants in this study. In their monograph, these authors suggested that community college professors have entered their positions as a second-best choice, a way of having a job that is at least close to the profession they would prefer. These authors write, “The image of the university professor lingers for them still, though it may beckon them far less than it threatens” (p. 357).

Although most of the participants in this study came to community colleges to get a job, they are for the most part pleased with their choice and defend their allegiance to the community college. Only two of the interviewees would prefer to be teaching in a four-year institution.

**Locals Versus Cosmopolitans**

The three themes that emerged from the qualitative component of this study as to why the faculty remained in the community college harmonize with Gouldner’s (1957) cosmopolitan versus locals concept. Cosmopolitans are more committed to the discipline, whereas locals are more committed to the institution. The two-year faculty were comfortable with the institution and its mission.

The locals versus cosmopolitan concept is reinforced by Seidman (1985), who suggested from his faculty interviews that since the community college professoriate have been denied respect, they have defined themselves as teachers rather than as biologists, chemists, or psychologists. This group is pushed away from their discipline simply by teaching in a community college. McGrath and Spear (1994) submitted that community
college faculty returning to graduate school do so in order to enhance their pedagogical skills or pursue degrees in education rather than in their discipline.

Among some of the participants in this study, there was no clear-cut identification as either locals or cosmopolitans. The faculty are maintaining contacts with their disciplines by memberships in their disciplinary organizations, publishing in the discipline professional journals, and presenting at discipline meetings, albeit not as often as they would like. Others, however, expressed frustration with the fact that they did not have time to publish in their disciplines, and spent more of their time attending state and national meetings related to community colleges and teaching. One community college faculty member stated that she did not have stimulating colleagues in her discipline with whom to discuss and debate.

Community colleges seem to perpetuate the locals concept by some policies, such as limiting discipline participation if there is no direct benefit to the institution and its mission. Some policies do not support faculty research either financially or by providing time for faculty participation. Instead, state and local conferences about pedagogical techniques are encouraged. Cohen and Brawer (1996) commented about how some authors have reasoned that community colleges are “best served by a group of instructors with minimal allegiance to a profession.” Persons who hold this opinion contend that professionalism invariably leads to a form of cosmopolitanism that ill suits a community-centered institution, that once faculty members find common cause with their counterparts in other institutions, they lose their loyalty to their own colleges. This argument stems from a view of professionalism among university faculties that has allegedly been
detrimental to teaching at the senior institutions: that is, as faculty allegiance turned more to research, scholarship, and academic disciplinary concerns, interest in teaching waned (p.96-97). Among the participants in this study, the "local" idea seems predominant by default and not necessarily by choice.

**Institutional Fragmentation**

Institutional fragmentation in the context of this study refers to the institutional hierarchy existing in American higher education—"small worlds" (Altbach, 1997; Altbach & Finkelstein, 1997; Clark, 1987; Ruscio, 1987). The framing of institutional fragmentation occurs with differences in missions. The "academic procession" (Riesman, 1958) is led by the research universities with a mission that is dominated by scholarly research. The "procession" winds downward through comprehensive universities, liberal arts colleges, and finally community colleges with a mission that is dominated by teaching.

Institutional differences found in both the quantitative and qualitative sections of this research were related, as expected, to the specific missions of the two-year and four-year institutions. Research is a major part of four-year institutions' missions. Teaching is the major part of two-year institutions' missions. Teaching, therefore, is the major role for the two-year faculty. Evaluation of faculty at both types of institutions is related to their respective missions. Four-year faculty are evaluated and rewarded not only for teaching, but for research and service. Two-year faculty are mostly evaluated on teaching, and (depending on the system and individual school) not necessarily evaluated or rewarded for research.
Research has never been a part of the community college mission, and therefore not part of the community college role. Cohen and Brawer (1996) suggest that professionalism in the community college faculty develops “in a different direction entirely, tending neither toward the esoterica of the disciplines nor toward research and scholarship on disciplinary concerns” (p. 97). A graduate from a doctoral program entering academe is socialized to the ideals that fit the four-year faculty role consisting of teaching, research, and administrative responsibilities (Altbach & Finkelstein, 1997). Some of the participants in this study expressed ambivalence between their love of teaching and their wanting to do research.

Ruscio (1987) reported findings that demonstrate that faculty tend to seek the type of institution where they can fulfill their desired roles of teacher, researcher, or a combination of the two. Research universities emphasize scholarly work in their missions, drawing to their faculty those who are more interested in disciplinary inquiry. Community college faculty tend to identify themselves more with the institution and fulfilling its mission of providing an opportunity for all to experience higher education.

Feelings of inferiority and lack of prestige for those teaching in two-year institutions were found in another study (Seidman, 1985). Buttenwieser in a 1987 Ford Foundation report (cited in McGrath & Spear, 1994), noticed from his interviews of community college faculty teaching in liberal arts fields that faculty exhibited a pronounced inferiority complex, which they did not readily acknowledge. Hints of inferiority feelings were also revealed in the interviews for this study. Two participants registered disappointment in their academic careers because they are in a community
college. Several reported disappointment on the part of others, including their doctoral committee advisors, because they had accepted positions in community colleges.

**Disciplinary Fragmentation**

Disciplinary fragmentation in the context of this study refers to the "different worlds" of the disciplines in American higher education (Altbach & Finkelstein, 1997; Becher, 1987; Clark, 1987). Biglan (1973 a,b) examined 36 academic subject areas. He identified three features of academic subject matter—existence of a single paradigm (hard vs. soft), concern with practical application (pure versus applied), and concern with life systems (life system versus nonlife system). Becher (1987) studied the nature of knowledge in disciplinary groups by using a portion of Biglan's classification— "hard-pure," "soft-pure," "hard-applied," and "soft-applied." I have applied Becher's classification in this study.

The traditional organization of four-year institutions is around disciplines, such as history and English. Within disciplines there is also further compartmentalization by subspecialization. A history department may have specialists in early and late American history, French, and 17th and 18th century British history.

Two-year institutions are organized in more general ways. For example, the disciplines of English, foreign languages, history, sociology, and psychology may be grouped together in some institutions under the humanities department. With recent economic constraints more disciplines may be grouped together, for example, business, mathematics, and natural sciences. This type of disciplinary grouping has both positive and negative outcomes. A major positive outcome is that disciplines can become more
interrelated and communication can increase among them. One negative outcome is an increase in the gap between the discipline and practice. It reinforces the community college faculty atmosphere as one composed of “generalists” rather than “specialists.” This type of division of disciplines also emphasizes Gouldner’s (1957) local rather than cosmopolitan separation.

A two-year faculty member with a doctorate would be obliged to put aside disciplinary specialization and become a generalist, teaching basic introductory courses to freshmen and sophomores. Not only do these faculty teach introductory-level courses, they teach them to a student population with diverse backgrounds and abilities. There is no opportunity to teach students at higher levels. Faculty often focus as much on the best pedagogy to teach the introductory content to stimulate the students as on the content itself.

A disciplinary department in four-year institutions has faculty who have doctorates in that discipline and are focused on specific areas within that specialty. This can create an atmosphere of academic stimulation and competitiveness. Two-year institutions have a more diverse faculty, some with master’s degrees or less and some with doctoral degrees. Faculty with master’s degrees may have different ways of looking at their disciplines than those with doctorates. This can promote an atmosphere that is not as stimulating and academically challenging as if all faculty were at the same academic level. One participant said, “It’s really discouraging. It is also not having the colleagues, the community, the scholars to support that kind of research.”
In this atmosphere, two-year faculty make conscious or unconscious adjustments. The conscious adjustments verbalized in the interviews were (a) forcing oneself to publish and present even without reward or recognition, (b) refocusing one’s discipline and retooling one’s skills in a different area, for example, from English to remedial reading; (c) accepting a temporary administrative position to keep stimulated and use different skills; (d) resurrecting latent talents such as playing an instrument or singing in a classical A capella choir; (e) adding breadth to one’s repertoire by learning an entirely new avocation, such as photography; and (f) sponsoring discipline-related clubs and activities for student interaction, such as language and drama clubs.

Depending on the individual, unconscious adjustments may include (a) not engaging in any type of inquiry since it is not recognized in the community college, (b) not making efforts to attend local or national discipline meetings, (c) performing more administrative duties, and (d) teaching more classes.

Several participants in this study admitted that they did not like to spend their time doing research and writing in their disciplines. Several conceded that they enjoyed the absence of “publishing pressure” at the community college. But others enjoyed doing research and publishing and felt cheated by not being rewarded or even given recognition for their efforts.

The data from NSOPF-93 and the interviews in this study demonstrated that community college faculty do participate in scholarly work despite the fact that two-year colleges de-emphasize activities associated with scholarship. Shecket (1995) stated, “Community college commentators note that the ‘professionalization’ of instructors is a
situation that some educational leaders and politicians hope can be avoided. They fear that allowing a more professional faculty would lead to overspecialization, unresponsiveness to students, and allegiances to groups outside their own colleges and communities.” In his study, Schecket (1995) found that the veteran community college teachers used some of these scholarly activities to help them manage their careers. I found in this study that many of the participants engaged in scholarship not only for their own growth and benefit, but for the sake of the students. One mathematics faculty member said that he writes and presents papers in national meetings, the content of which may not directly impact the community college student in some immediately obvious way. But he has increased his knowledge, and he can pass it on to his students. He said that even if he stimulates one student to learn more, it is worth it.

McGrath and Spear (1994) discussed the frustration those in various disciplines feel over the ambiguities of the community college. Citing Richardson, et al., (1983) and Caldwell (1986), they suggested that those in the applied disciplines were not as frustrated as those in the pure disciplines because they had different expectations and different roles. Faculty in applied disciplines had more sustained relationships with the students than those teaching introductory courses. Satisfaction with teaching was higher among faculty in applied fields because they could see student improvement. In my study, the applied discipline faculties were satisfied with their academic positions, but for other reasons. They enjoyed their work in the community college because they were the sole practitioners in their disciplines. They had control over the development, delivery, and
evaluation of their course content. They liked the freedom and expectation to use independent creativity. They showed a great deal of pride in their programs.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Although this brief study cannot provide current and generalizable results from this cohort of full-time teaching faculty with doctorates, some implications for practice and policy may be suggested. Institutional fragmentation is stronger than disciplinary fragmentation for community college faculty. This is important because the implications for practice relate more to the realities marking differences of community colleges from other strata than to disciplines. Some implications for policy and practice are related to socialization and induction of faculty into academic life during the early stages of their careers into academic life.

1. Include the community college in discussions with graduate students about opportunities for academic employment. Recruit directly from doctoral programs. Four-year faculty who teach graduate students may not have a clear picture of what the community college is and what the faculty role is. The first step in educating graduate students about the community college would be to educate the faculty. A tenured professor in economics at The College of William and Mary, in discussing the topic with me, said he had a brother who taught in a community college. The economics professor said that we (four-year faculty) could learn a lot from community colleges. He added that four-year faculty members do not know what goes on in community colleges; and because they think such institutions are below the four-year level, they do not want to know.
Perhaps the community college should be offered as an option to aspiring academics along with the four-year institutions.

Direct recruitment from graduate schools may have two effects. The community colleges can see what kinds of policies and conditions graduate students are looking for in academe. At the same time, the community colleges can inform the graduates about the institutional differences, but explain policies that may "fit" their lives or professional interests. Hiring new graduates should add "cutting edge" disciplinary knowledge and enthusiasm to the campuses.

2. Encourage clearer standards in teaching and learning at the community college level. The community college is in a unique situation because it has an open admissions policy and was created as "democracy's college" (Roueche & Baker, 1987, p.4). This does not necessarily mean, however, that everyone who enters needs to graduate with a degree. A dilemma occurs when the community college must "reconcile such conflicting values as equity, competence, and individual choice . . . and has to effect compromise procedures that allow for some of each" (Clark, 1980, p.30).

Brint and Karabel (1989) argued that the community college accentuated prevailing patterns of social and class inequality. In a 1960 study, which he revisited 30 years later, Clark (1994) concluded that community colleges froze ambitions of students and chilled their minds. Zwerling (1976) maintained that the community college plays a role in sustaining the pyramid of American social and economic structure where students are channeled into the same relative positions in the social structure that their parents occupy.
In more recent times, the criticisms of perpetuation of mediocrity in the community colleges have come from within faculty ranks. Several faculty interviewed in this study cited this as one of their main concerns and would like the administration to be more aware of this issue. One participant called for “more understanding of the needs to run a genuinely collegiate level of instruction.” Another faculty member stated, “I think accountability is an issue. Are you going to graduate somebody with a two-year college degree and still can’t read and write? I think courses have to have a rigor that the college’s name means something.”

Improved educational standards may, in time, increase the credibility of community colleges with four-year institutions, signifying that indeed the associate degree does mean satisfactory completion of two years of college.

The community college still struggles with standards because it is designed to address the needs of a population that differs in preparation and motivation from the population typically served by four-year colleges and universities. Thus, faculty must struggle with the norms with which they were socialized and the divergent norms they experience in their faculty roles in the community college. Success in their adaptation to the community college is dependent on how each individual internally manages this conflict.

3. **Encourage scholarly activities in the community college faculty.** Scholarly work done by faculty should be encouraged in the community college culture. This encouragement should not be added to the already burdensome list of faculty responsibilities. Nor should it take the form of mandated standards—either publish or
forsgo merit pay or promotion (Palmer, 1994 a,b). Instead, encouragement of scholarly activity should be done on an individual basis. It should also be recognized that some prefer to participate in more scholarly activities than others and that sometimes scholarly activities may take different forms (Creamer, 1998).

Scholarly activity can be used in the broader sense that Boyer (1990) suggested:

• "scholarship of discovery" (p. 17), the pursuit of new knowledge;
• "scholarship of integration" (p. 18) or making connections across disciplines;
• "scholarship of application" (p. 21), applying the new information to individuals, communities, and to further investigation; and
• "scholarship of teaching" (p. 23) including curriculum development and innovative pedagogical techniques.

Encouragement can be offered in ways suggested by the participants in my study. One is to individualize release time requests. Among those I interviewed, scholarly activities are personalized. Some are engaged in writing books, preparing papers, and giving presentations. Different amounts of time are needed to complete the work. All of those who were interested in some form of scholarship said that they absolutely did not have enough time to do it with heavy teaching loads. They said that as much as they enjoyed their teaching positions, they would feel more fulfilled if they could pursue some level of scholarship.
4. Encourage administrators to participate in scholarly activities. In the community college moving into administration is seen as a promotion. One of the participants in this study said,

I never really understood when they prescribe that if you want to get ahead you need to go into administration. That seems to me absolutely backwards and perverse. Some of the very best teachers I have known have gone that direction simply because that is where the opportunities offer to move up the ladder, but it really is a terrible, terrible shame. None of the least of which [it is] for the students—that these wonderful teachers are going into administration, which is something they are not necessarily going to be good at anyway.

As faculty move into administrative positions, as one participant described it, they get further and further away from the classroom and “where the action is.” One way administrators could identify with and understand what is going on in the classroom and in the community college is to participate in scholarly activities themselves. By doing this, they also provide an example to faculty, and an unexpected result might be to garner more respect by faculty. Some interviewees suggested that administrators could remain in touch with reality if they would return to the classroom and teach a course every semester.

Recommendations for Future Research

In this study, I investigated the full-time teaching faculty with doctorates in three different-sized community colleges in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States. A different perspective might be reached by studying the same bounded group in different
regions of the country. The three community colleges used in this study ranged in size, but none was an all-urban community college, although two campuses of a multicampus community college were urban. Faculty teaching in entirely urban colleges might add yet another dimension. Not only are there possibilities of regional differences arising in the institutions, but disciplinary differences may be more obvious than they were in my study.

In my study, there were few full-time applied discipline faculty members with doctorates. However, a comparison of the pure and applied disciplines in the community college might produce information that could suggest different hiring practices, rewards, and evaluation. A question that may arise is this: because of the importance of skills maintenance in the applied disciplines, is there a difference in the characteristics and work patterns in the two areas?

The majority of the participants in my study were veteran faculty, averaging over 20 years experience. Another study could be designed dividing the groups into veteran faculty and newer faculty, defined as having fewer than ten years in academe. A comparison of these two groups could be made to see if responses to existing policy and procedure differ.

My study included only parent educational backgrounds reported in the NSOPF-93 study. Fathers' educational background was significantly different between the two- and four-year faculty, however I found little research related to educational backgrounds for individuals with doctoral degrees. The focus of research in the last decade has been on student achievement and parental involvement, especially for the elementary school-age and adolescent age-group (Henderson, 1999; Linville, 1999; Steinberg, 2000). Parents'
education was not a prominent determinant for student achievement. Lemp (1980), in her doctoral dissertation, studied predictive factors for doctoral degree completion. Parents’ education was not a predominant variable for doctoral degree completion.

Hints of family backgrounds and the role they played in their academic selection emerged from the interviews. An interesting point to explore more fully would be upward mobility of faculty members from blue collar to professional. Prior association with community colleges through parents, children, or personal experiences may also be a factor in selection of the community college as an academic career choice.

In this study, most participants said that they had no orientation to the community college, except for a day-long statewide meeting that they felt was a waste of time. Moreover, they thought that no sort of orientation was necessary. But there is evidence that such programs can be effective. Leidig’s (1996) doctoral dissertation explored the effects of socialization tactics for new faculty. The process was a committed effort by Miami-Dade Community College to orient and mentor new faculty to the culture of that institution. Her findings indicated that faculty participants were highly creative, dedicated, and student-centered—the kinds of qualities any school would want in its faculty. These conflicting views suggest an “experiment” to compare one faculty group that has essentially no orientation, and one that has a consistent and organized effort to provide a professionalization program for new faculty.

Another approach to a study about differences between two- and four-year faculty with doctorates might be to explore responses among new graduates who have selected four-year institutions as their teaching arena of choice. In such a study, one could explore
questions about their knowledge of the community college, their reasons for not selecting a community college, and their long-range academic plans. This could provide some interesting information, particularly to community college administrators and policy makers to see what could be done to entice more new graduates into the community college sector.

Concluding Comments

The fragmentation—"small worlds"—of the higher education professoriate in the United States is still in existence. The full-time community college faculty with the same degrees (doctorates) are similar in many ways to those who teach in four-year institutions. But the missions of community colleges are teaching-oriented with no mention of research, and the roles of faculty relate to the missions of the institutions. Faculty members are contracted to teach—and to teach many hours per semester. The heavy teaching load almost entirely precludes any engagement in research. It is mainly on this dimension, as well as on the dimension of personal satisfaction in teaching, that community college faculty with PhDs differ from those whose careers have been principally in four-year institutions.

Some of the community college faculty intentionally selected this type of institution as the setting for their academic careers. Others, however, accepted and adapted to the community college because they needed jobs. The interesting part is that many of those who originally came with reservations have elected to stay. They have cited positive reasons for remaining in the two-year setting, among them the "fit" with
personal and professional philosophies, the atmosphere of the community college, the lack of pressure to publish, and the pure enjoyment of teaching diverse students.

Few outstanding differences were found between two-year and four-year faculty with regard to disciplines—the “different worlds” concept. Except for those disciplines in which it is difficult to find academic positions anywhere, such as English, history, and political science, those in various disciplines who accepted community college positions enjoyed teaching and particularly enjoyed teaching the introductory-level courses. They found teaching the introductory courses at a community college more enjoyable than in four-year institutions because of the small class sizes and diverse student population. Indications exist from the interviews that there is a “locals” type of thinking in the community college based on work load and restrictions of support for discipline-related activities.

The perceived low regard for the community college by four-year faculty, according to my interviews, may be related to the lack of knowledge and understanding of what the community college is and who the faculty are. Increased disciplinary participation by community college faculty may improve their credibility in the eyes of four-year faculty.

Community college faculty with doctorates seem to be attracted to the challenges and milieu of a two-year institution. Additionally, the faculty reveal personal satisfaction in their work, which has more intrinsic than extrinsic rewards.

As I was interviewing the faculty for this study, I could not help but think how fortunate the students were to have such talent teaching them. The idea that these faculty
members are teaching in the community college because "they couldn’t get a job anywhere else" was refuted. But it is also clear that the role could be made more appealing and attractive to prospective faculty whose values and interests are consistent with the teaching mission. This message may require a wider hearing.
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1. During the 1992 Fall Term, did you have any instructional duties at this institution (e.g., teaching one or more courses, or advising or supervising students' academic activities)? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Yes (ANSWER 1A)  2. No (SKIP TO QUESTION 2)

1A. During the 1992 Fall Term, were . . . (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. all of your instructional duties related to credit courses,

2. some of your instructional duties related to credit courses or advising or supervising academic activities for credit, or

3. all of your instructional duties related to noncredit courses or advising or supervising noncredit academic activities?

2. What was your principal activity at this institution during the 1992 Fall Term? If you have equal responsibilities, please select one. (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Teaching
2. Research
3. Technical activities (e.g., programmer, technician, chemist, engineer, etc.)
4. Clinical service
5. Community/public service
6. Administration (WRITE IN TITLE OR POSITION)
7. On sabbatical from this institution
8. Other (subsidized performer, artist-in-residence, etc.)

3. During the 1992 Fall Term, did you have faculty status at this institution? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Yes
2. No, I did not have faculty status
3. No, no one has faculty status at this institution
SECTION A. NATURE OF EMPLOYMENT

4. During the 1992 Fall Term, did this institution consider you to be employed part-time or full-time? 
   (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)
   1. Part-time (ANSWER 4A)  2. Full-time (SKIP TO QUESTION 5)

   4A. Did you hold a part-time position at this institution during the 1992 Fall Term because . . .
   (CIRCLE "1" OR "2" FOR EACH REASON)

   Yes  No
   1  2  a. you preferred working on a part-time basis?
   1  2  b. a full-time position was not available?
   1  2  c. you were supplementing your income from other employment?
   1  2  d. you wanted to be part of an academic environment?
   1  2  e. you were finishing a graduate degree?
   1  2  f. of other reasons?

5. Were you chairperson of a department or division at this institution during the 1992 Fall Term?
   (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)
   1. Yes
   2. No

6. In what year did you begin the job you held at this institution during the 1992 Fall Term? Include
   promotions in rank as part of your Fall 1992 job. (WRITE IN YEAR)

   19  

7. What was your tenure status at this institution during the 1992 Fall Term?
   (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)
   1. Tenured — 7A. In what year did you achieve tenure at this institution? 19
      (SKIP TO QUESTION 9)
   2. On tenure track but not tenured
   3. Not on tenure track
   4. No tenure system for my faculty status
   5. No tenure system at this institution

8. During the 1992 Fall Term, what was the duration of your contract or appointment at this institution?
   (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)
   1. One academic term
   2. One academic/calendar year
   3. A limited number of years (i.e., two or more academic/calendar years)
   4. Unspecified duration
   5. Other
9. Which of the following best describes your academic rank, title, or position at this institution during the 1992 Fall Term? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER, OR "NA")

NA. Not applicable: no ranks designated at this institution (SKIP TO QUESTION 11)

1. Professor
2. Associate Professor
3. Assistant Professor
4. Instructor
5. Lecturer
6. Other (WRITE IN) ______________________________________

10. In what year did you first achieve this rank? (WRITE IN YEAR)

19 [ ] [ ]

11. During the 1992 Fall Term, which of the following kinds of appointments did you hold at this institution? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

1. Acting
2. Affiliate or adjunct
3. Visiting
4. Assigned by religious order
5. Clinical
   (WRITE IN TITLE OR POSITION) ________________________________
6. Research
   (WRITE IN TITLE OR POSITION) ________________________________
7. None of the above
12. What is your principal field or discipline of teaching? (Refer to the list of major fields of study on pages 5 and 6 and enter the appropriate code number and name below. If you have no field of teaching, circle "NA").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE FOR FIELD OR DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>NAME OF PRINCIPAL FIELD/DISCIPLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. What is your principal area of research? If equal areas, select one. (If you have no research area, circle "NA").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE FOR FIELD OR DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>NAME OF PRINCIPAL FIELD/DISCIPLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Codes for Major Fields of Study and Academic Disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field/Discipline</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; Environmental Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Computer Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SubField</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer &amp; Information Sciences</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Programming</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Analysis</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Computer Science</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SubField</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education, General</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual/Cross-cultural Education</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Administration</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Evaluation &amp; Research</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Counseling &amp; Personnel Svcs.</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Education</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teacher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SubField</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Elementary</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult &amp; Continuing</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other General Teacher Ed. Programs</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education in Specific Subjects</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SubField</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, General</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical, Electronics, &amp; Communication Engineering</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Engineering</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering-Related Technologies</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### English and Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SubField</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English, General</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition &amp; Creative Writing</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Literature</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Literature</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech, Debate, &amp; Forensics</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, Other</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>940</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>980</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>990</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION B. ACADEMIC/PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND

14. Which of the following undergraduate academic honors or awards, if any, did you receive? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

1. National academic honor society, such as Phi Beta Kappa, Tau Beta Pi, or other field-specific national honor society
2. Cum laude or honors
3. Magna cum laude or high honors
4. Summa cum laude or highest honors
5. Other undergraduate academic achievement award
6. None of the above

15. When you were in graduate school, which of the following forms of financial assistance, if any, did you receive? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY, OR CIRCLE "NA")

NA. Not applicable; did not attend graduate school (GO TO QUESTION 16)

1. Teaching assistantship
2. Research assistantship
3. Program or residence hall assistantship
4. Fellowship
5. Scholarship or traineeship
6. Grant
7. G.I. Bill or other veterans' financial aid
8. Federal or state loan
9. Other loan
10. None of the above
16. Please list below the degrees or other formal awards that you hold, the year you received each one, the field code (from pages 5-6) that applies, name of the field, and the name and location of the institution from which you received each degree or award. Do not list honorary degrees. **(COMPLETE ALL COLUMNS FOR EACH DEGREE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Degree Code (see above)</th>
<th>B. Field Code</th>
<th>C. Year Received</th>
<th>D. Name of Field (from pp. 5-6)</th>
<th>E. Name of Institution (a) and City and State/Country of Institution (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Highest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Next Highest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Next Highest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Next Highest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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17. During the 1992 Fall Term, were you employed only at this institution, or did you also have other employment including any outside consulting or self-owned business, or private practice? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Employed only at this institution (SKIP TO QUESTION 19)

2. Had other employment, consulting, self-owned business, or private practice

17A. How many different jobs, other than your employment at this institution, did you have during the 1992 Fall Term? Include all outside consulting, self-owned business, and private practice. (WRITE IN NUMBER)

——— Number of Jobs

18. Not counting any employment at this institution, what was the employment sector of the main other job you held during Fall 1992? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. 4-year college or university, graduate or professional school

2. 2-year or other postsecondary institution

3. Elementary or secondary school

4. Consulting, freelance work, self-owned business, or private practice

5. Hospital or other health care or clinical setting

6. Foundation or other nonprofit organization other than health care organization

7. For-profit business or industry in the private sector

8. Federal government, including military, or state or local government

9. Other (WRITE IN) ———————————————————————————————————————————

18A. What year did you begin that job? (WRITE IN YEAR)

19 □ □

18B. What was your primary responsibility in that job? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Teaching

2. Research

3. Technical activities (e.g., programmer, technician, chemist, engineer, etc.)

4. Clinical service

5. Community/public service

6. Administration

7. Other

18C. Was that job full-time or part-time? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Full-time

2. Part-time

9
19. The next questions ask about jobs that ended before the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term. For the three most recent and significant main jobs that you held during the past 15 years, indicate below the year you began and the year you left each job, the employment sector, your primary responsibility, and whether you were employed full-time or part-time.

- Do not list promotions in rank at one place of employment as different jobs.
- Do not include temporary positions (i.e., summer positions) or work as a graduate student.
- List each job (other than promotion in rank) separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If not applicable, circle “NA”</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) YEARS JOB HELD</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>B.</td>
<td>C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST RECENT MAIN JOB (PRIOR TO FALL 1992)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FROM: 19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO: 19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMLOYMENT SECTOR</td>
<td>(CIRCLE ONE)</td>
<td>(CIRCLE ONE)</td>
<td>(CIRCLE ONE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college or university, graduate or professional school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-year or other postsecondary institutions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary or secondary school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting, freelance work, self-owned business, or private practice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital or other health care or clinical setting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation or other nonprofit organization other than health care organization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-profit business or industry in the private sector</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government, including military, or state or local government</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>(CIRCLE ONE)</td>
<td>(CIRCLE ONE)</td>
<td>(CIRCLE ONE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical activities (e.g., programmer, technician, chemist, engineer, etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/public service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL-TIME/PART-TIME</td>
<td>(CIRCLE ONE)</td>
<td>(CIRCLE ONE)</td>
<td>(CIRCLE ONE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. About how many of each of the following have you presented/published/etc. during your entire career and during
the last 2 years? For publications, please include only works that have been accepted for publication. Count
multiple presentations/publications of the same work only once. (CIRCLE "NA" IF YOU HAVE NOT PUBLISHED
OR PRESENTED)

NA. No presentations/publications/etc. (GO TO QUESTION 31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Presentation/Publication/etc.</th>
<th>A. Total during career</th>
<th>B. Number in past 2 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Articles published in refereed professional or trade journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Articles published in nonrefereed professional or trade journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Creative works published in juried media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Creative works published in nonjuried media or in-house newsletters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Published reviews of books, articles, or creative works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Chapters in edited volumes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Textbooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Other books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Monographs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Research or technical reports disseminated internally or to clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Presentations at conferences, workshops, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Exhibitions or performances in the fine or applied arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Patents or copyrights (excluding thesis or dissertation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Computer software products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0"
SECTION C. INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND WORKLOAD

21. During the 1992 Fall Term, how many undergraduate or graduate thesis or dissertation committees, comprehensive exams, orals committees, or examination or certification committees did you chair and/or serve on at this institution? (CIRCLE "NA" IF YOU DID NOT SERVE ON ANY COMMITTEES)

NA. Did not serve on any undergraduate or graduate committees (GO TO QUESTION 22)

(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE, IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Committee</th>
<th>A. Number served on</th>
<th>B. Of that number, how many did you chair?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Undergraduate thesis or dissertation committees</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Undergraduate comprehensive exams or orals committees (other than as part of thesis/dissertation committees)</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Undergraduate examination/certification committees</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Graduate thesis or dissertation committees</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Graduate comprehensive exams or orals committees (other than as part of thesis/dissertation committees)</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Graduate examination/certification committees</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. During the 1992 Fall Term, what was the total number of classes or sections you taught at this institution? Do not include individualized instruction, such as independent study or individual performance classes. Count multiple sections of the same course as a separate class, but not the lab section of a course. (WRITE IN A NUMBER, OR CIRCLE "0")

0. No classes taught (SKIP TO QUESTION 23)

Number of classes/sections (ANSWER 22A)

22A. How many of those classes were classes for credit?

0. No classes for credit (SKIP TO QUESTION 23)

Number of classes/sections for credit (ANSWER QUESTION 23 ON THE NEXT PAGE)
23. For each class or section that you taught for credit at this institution during the 1992 Fall Term, please answer the following items. Do not include individualized instruction, such as independent study or individual one-on-one performance classes.

If you taught multiple sections of the same course, count them as separate classes, but do not include the lab section of the course as a separate class. For each class, enter the code for the academic discipline of the class. (Refer to pages 5-6 for the codes. Please enter the code rather than the course name.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FIRST FOR-CREDIT CLASS</th>
<th>SECOND FOR-CREDIT CLASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CODE FOR ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE OF CLASS (from pp. 5-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DURING 1992 FALL TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of weeks the class met?</td>
<td>a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of credit hours?</td>
<td>b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of hours the class met per week?</td>
<td>c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of teaching assistants, readers?</td>
<td>d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of students enrolled?</td>
<td>e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was this class taught?</td>
<td>f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average / hours per week you taught the class?</td>
<td>g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PRIMARY LEVEL OF STUDENTS</td>
<td>(CIRCLE ONE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower division students (first or second year postsecondary)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper division students (third or fourth year postsecondary)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate or any other post-baccalaureate students</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All other students?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PRIMARY INSTRUCTIONAL METHOD USED</td>
<td>(CIRCLE ONE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion group or class presentations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lab, clinic or problem session</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship, internship, field work, or field trips</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role playing, simulation, or other performance (e.g., art, music, drama)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TV or radio</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group projects</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperative learning groups</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. THIRD FOR-CREDIT CLASS</td>
<td>D. FOURTH FOR-CREDIT CLASS</td>
<td>E. FIFTH FOR-CREDIT CLASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. _____</td>
<td>a. _____</td>
<td>a. _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. _____</td>
<td>b. _____</td>
<td>b. _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. _____</td>
<td>c. _____</td>
<td>c. _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. _____</td>
<td>d. _____</td>
<td>d. _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. _____</td>
<td>e. _____</td>
<td>e. _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. _____</td>
<td>g. _____</td>
<td>g. _____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CIRCLE ONE) | (CIRCLE ONE) | (CIRCLE ONE) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CIRCLE ONE) | (CIRCLE ONE) | (CIRCLE ONE) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Number of weeks the class met
b. Number of credit hours
c. Number of hours the class met per week
d. Number of teaching assistants, readers
e. Number of students enrolled
f. Was this class team taught
g. Average # hours per week you taught

Lower division students
Upper division students
Graduate, post-baccalaureate students
All other students

Lecture
Seminar
Discussion group or class presentations
Lab, clinic or problem session
Apprenticeship, internship, etc.
Role playing, simulation, performance, etc.
TV or radio
Group projects
Cooperative learning groups

(CIRCLE ONE) | (CIRCLE ONE) | (CIRCLE ONE) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
24. Did you teach any undergraduate courses for credit during the 1992 Fall Term at this institution?

1. Yes (ANSWER 24A) 2. No (SKIP TO QUESTION 25)

24A. In how many of the undergraduate courses that you taught for credit during the 1992 Fall Term did you use... (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

- [ ] None
- [ ] Some
- [ ] All

1. [ ] a. Computational tools or software?
2. [ ] b. Computer-aided or machine-aided instruction?
3. [ ] c. Student presentations?
4. [ ] d. Student evaluations of each other's work?
5. [ ] e. Multiple-choice midterm and/or final exam?
6. [ ] f. Essay midterm and/or final exams?
7. [ ] g. Short-answer midterm and/or final exams?
8. [ ] h. Term/research papers?
9. [ ] i. Multiple drafts of written work?
10. [ ] j. Grading on a curve?
11. [ ] k. Competency-based grading?

25. For each type of student listed below, please indicate how many students received individual instruction from you during the 1992 Fall Term, (e.g., independent study or one-on-one instruction, including working with individual students in a clinical or research setting), and the total number of contact hours with these students per week. Do not count regularly scheduled office hours. (WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE. IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of students receiving Formal Individualized Instruction</th>
<th>A. Number of students</th>
<th>B. Total contact hours per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Lower division students (first or second year postsecondary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Upper division students (third or fourth year postsecondary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Graduate or any other post-baccalaureate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) All other students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. During the 1992 Fall Term, how many regularly scheduled office hours did you have per week? (WRITE IN A NUMBER. IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")

[ ] Number of hours per week

27. During the 1992 Fall Term, how much informal contact with students did you have each week outside of the classroom? Do not count individual instruction, independent study, etc., or regularly scheduled office hours. (WRITE IN A NUMBER. IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")

[ ] Number of hours per week

28. During the 1992 Fall Term, were you engaged in any professional research, writing, or creative works?

1. Yes (ANSWER QUESTION 29) 2. No (SKIP TO QUESTION 34)
29. How would you describe your primary professional research, writing, or creative work during the 1992 Fall Term? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Pure or basic research  
2. Applied research  
3. Policy-oriented research or analysis  
4. Literary or expressive  
5. Program/curriculum design and development  
6. Other

30. During the 1992 Fall Term, were you engaged in any funded research or funded creative endeavors? Include any grants, contracts, or institutional awards. Do not include consulting services. (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Yes  
2. No (SKIP TO QUESTION 34)

31. During the 1992 Fall Term, were you a principal investigator (PI) or co-principal investigator (Co-PI) for any grants or contracts? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Yes  
2. No (SKIP TO QUESTION 33)

32. During the 1992 Fall Term, how many individuals other than yourself were supported by all the grants and contracts for which you were PI or Co-PI? (WRITE IN NUMBER; IF NONE, WRITE IN '0')

Number of individuals

33. Fill out the information below for each funding source during the 1992 Fall Term. If not sure, give your best estimate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Funding source (CIRCLE ‘1’ OR ‘2’ FOR EACH SOURCE)</th>
<th>B. Number of Grants/Contracts</th>
<th>C. Work done as... (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)</th>
<th>D. Total funds for 1992-93 academic year</th>
<th>E. How funds were used (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
34. How would you rate each of the following facilities or resources at this institution that were available for your own use during the 1992 Fall Term? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER, OR "NA" ON EACH LINE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Available/</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Basic research equipment/instruments
b. Laboratory space and supplies
c. Availability of research assistants
d. Personal computers
e. Centralized (main frame) computer facilities
f. Computer networks with other institutions
g. Audio-visual equipment
h. Classroom space
i. Office space
j. Studio/performance space
k. Secretarial support
l. Library holdings

35. Listed below are some ways that institutions and departments may use internal funds for the professional development of faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Was institutional or department funding available for your use during the past two years for...</th>
<th>B. Did you use any of those funds at this institution?</th>
<th>C. Were those funds adequate for your purposes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Union remission at this or other institutions?</td>
<td>1. Yes → 1. Yes → 1. Yes</td>
<td>1. Yes → 1. Yes → 1. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK. Don't know → DK. Don't know → DK. Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK. Don't know → DK. Don't know → DK. Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK. Don’t know → DK. Don’t know → DK. Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Training to improve research or teaching skills?</td>
<td>1. Yes → 1. Yes → 1. Yes</td>
<td>1. Yes → 1. Yes → 1. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK. Don’t know → DK. Don’t know → DK. Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK. Don’t know → DK. Don’t know → DK. Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK. Don’t know → DK. Don’t know → DK. Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36. On the average, how many hours per week did you spend at each of the following kinds of activities during the 1992 Fall Term? *(IF NOT SURE, GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATES)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average number hours per week during the 1992 Fall Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. All paid activities at this institution (teaching, research, administration, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. All unpaid activities at this institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Any other paid activities outside this institution (e.g., consulting, working on other jobs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Unpaid (pro bono) professional service activities outside this institution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. In column A, we ask you to allocate your total work time in the Fall of 1992 (as reported in Question 36) into several categories. We realize that they are not mutually exclusive categories (e.g., research may include teaching; preparing a course may be part of professional growth). We ask, however, that you allocate as best you can the proportion of your time spent in activities whose primary focus falls within the indicated categories. In column B, indicate what percentage of your time you would prefer to spend in each of the listed categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. % of Work Time Spent</th>
<th>B. % of Work Time Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE IN A PERCENTAGE ON EACH LINE. IF NOT SURE, GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE. IF NONE, WRITE IN *)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% PLEASE BE SURE THAT THE PERCENTAGES YOU PROVIDE ADD UP TO 100% OF THE TOTAL TIME.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
38. Are you a member of the union (or other bargaining association) that represents faculty at this institution?

1. Union is available, but I am not eligible
2. I am eligible, but not a member
3. I am eligible, and a member
4. Union is not available at this institution

SECTION D. JOB SATISFACTION ISSUES

39. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each of the following aspects of your instructional duties at this institution? (CIRCLE "NA" IF YOU HAD NO INSTRUCTIONAL DUTIES)

NA. No instructional duties (GO TO QUESTION 40)

(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM; IF AN ITEM DOES NOT APPLY TO YOU, WRITE IN "NA" NEXT TO THE ITEM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The authority I have to make decisions about content and methods in the courses I teach
b. The authority I have to make decisions about other (non-instructional) aspects of my job
c. The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach
d. Time available for working with students as an advisor, mentor, etc.
e. Quality of undergraduate students whom I have taught here
f. Quality of graduate students whom I have taught here

40. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the following aspects of your job at this institution? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. My work load
b. My job security
c. Opportunity for advancement in rank at this institution
d. Time available for keeping current in my field
e. Freedom to do outside consulting
f. My salary
g. My benefits, generally
h. Spouse or partner employment opportunities in this geographic area
i. My job here, overall
41. During the next three years, how likely is it that you will leave this job to...
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not At All Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. accept a part-time job at a different postsecondary institution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. accept a full-time job at a different postsecondary institution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. accept a part-time job not at a postsecondary institution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. accept a full-time job not at a postsecondary institution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. retire from the labor force?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. At what age do you think you are most likely to stop working at a postsecondary institution?
(WRITE THE AGE, OR CIRCLE 'DK')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DK. Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. If you were to leave your current position in academia to accept another position inside or outside of academia, how important would each of the following be in your decision? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Salary level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Tenure-track/tenured position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Job security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Opportunities for advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. No pressure to publish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Good research facilities and equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Good instructional facilities and equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Good job or job opportunities for my spouse or partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Good geographic location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Good environment/schools for my children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Greater opportunity to teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Greater opportunity to do research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Greater opportunity for administrative responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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44. If you could elect to draw on your retirement and still continue working at your institution on a part-time basis, would you do so?  (CIRCLE ONE)
   1. Yes
   2. No
   DK. Don't know

45. If an early retirement option were offered to you at your institution, would you take it?  (CIRCLE ONE)
   1. Yes
   2. No
   DK. Don't know

46. At which age do you think you are most likely to retire from all paid employment?  (WRITE IN AGE, OR CIRCLE "DK")
   _______ Years of age
   DK. Don't know
SECTION E. COMPENSATION

Note: Your responses to these items as with all other items in this questionnaire are voluntary and strictly confidential. They will be used only in statistical summaries, and will not be disclosed to your institution or to any individual or group. Furthermore, all information that would permit identification of individuals or institutions will be removed from the survey files.

47. For the calendar year 1992, estimate your gross compensation before taxes from each of the sources listed below.

(IF NOT SURE, GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATES. IF NO COMPENSATION FROM A SOURCE, WRITE IN 'O')

Compensation from this institution:

$ _______ a. Basic salary

$ _______ b. Type of appointment (e.g., 9 months)

$ _______ # of months

$ _______ c. Other teaching at this institution not included in basic salary (e.g., for summer session)

$ _______ d. Supplements not included in basic salary (for administration, research, coaching sports, etc.)

$ _______ e. Non-monetary compensation, such as food, housing, car (Do not include employee benefits such as medical, dental, or life insurance)

$ _______ f. Any other income from this institution

Compensation from other sources:

$ _______ g. Employment at another academic institution

$ _______ h. Legal or medical services or psychological counseling

$ _______ i. Outside consulting, consulting business or freelance work

$ _______ j. Self-owned business (other than consulting)

$ _______ k. Professional performances or exhibitions

$ _______ l. Speaking fees, honoraria

$ _______ m. Royalties or commissions

$ _______ n. Any other employment

$ _______ o. Non-monetary compensation, such as food, housing, car (Do not include employee benefits such as medical, dental, or life insurance)

Other sources of earned income (WRITE IN BELOW):

$ _______ p. ________________________________

$ _______ q. ________________________________

48. For the calendar year 1992, how many persons were in your household including yourself?

_______ Total number in household

49. For the calendar year 1992, what was your total household income?

$ _______ Total household income

50. For the calendar year 1992, how many dependents did you have? Do not include yourself. (A dependent is someone receiving at least half of his or her support from you.)

_______ Number of dependents
SECTION F. SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

51. Are you...
   1. male, or
   2. female?

52. In what month and year were you born?
   (WRITE IN MONTH AND YEAR)
   MONTH YEAR

53. What is your race? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)
   1. American Indian or Alaskan Native
   2. Asian or Pacific Islander (ANSWER 53A)
   3. African American/Black
   4. White
   5. Other (WRITE IN BELOW)

54. Are you of Hispanic descent?
   (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)
   1. Yes (ANSWER 54A)
   2. No (SKIP TO QUESTION 55)

54A. What is your Spanish/Hispanic origin?
     If more than one, circle the one you consider the most important part of
     your background.
     1. Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano
     2. Cuban, Cubano
     3. Puerto Rican, Puertorriqueño, or Bouricuan
     4. Other (WRITE IN BELOW)

55. What is your current marital status?
    (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)
    1. Single, never married
    2. Married
    3. Living with someone in a marriage-like relationship
    4. Separated
    5. Divorced
    6. Widowed
56. In what country were you born?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)
1. USA
2. Other (WRITE IN)________________________

57. What is your citizenship status?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)
1. United States citizen, native
2. United States citizen, naturalized
3. Permanent resident of the United States (immigrant visa)
   COUNTRY OF PRESENT CITIZENSHIP
4. Temporary resident of United States (non-immigrant visa)
   COUNTRY OF PRESENT CITIZENSHIP

58. What is the highest level of formal education completed by your mother and your father?
(CIRCLE ONE FOR EACH PERSON)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>B.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a. Less than high school diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>b. High school diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>c. Some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>d. Associate's degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>e. Bachelor's degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>f. Master's degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>g. Doctorate or professional degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., D.V.M., J.D./LL.B.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>h. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>i. Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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59. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. 
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH STATEMENT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of college teachers at this institution.

b. Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college teachers at this institution.

c. At this institution, research is rewarded more than teaching.

d. State or federally mandated assessment requirements will improve the quality of undergraduate education.

e. Female faculty members are treated fairly at this institution.

f. Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at this institution.

g. If I had it to do over again, I would still choose an academic career.

60. Please indicate your opinion regarding whether each of the following has worsened, stayed the same, or improved in recent years at this institution. (CIRCLE ONE FOR EACH ITEM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worsened</th>
<th>Stayed the Same</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The quality of students who choose to pursue academic careers in my field.

b. The opportunities junior faculty have for advancement in my field.

c. The professional competence of individuals entering my academic field.

d. The ability of this institution to meet the educational needs of entering students.

e. The ability of faculty to obtain external funding.

f. Pressure to increase faculty workload at this institution.

g. The quality of undergraduate education at this institution.

h. The atmosphere for free expression of ideas.

i. The quality of research at this institution.
THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

Return this completed questionnaire in the enclosed prepaid envelope to:

National Opinion Research Center (NORC)
University of Chicago
1125 East 59th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60615
APPENDIX B

Letter of Invitation to Participate in Research Study
Invitation to Participate in a Research Study

Proposed Title of Study
Doctoral Level Faculty at Community Colleges: Institutional-Discipline Dialectic

Dear Faculty Member:

You are invited to participate in a study of the professional careers of full-time teaching faculty members in the community college who have doctoral degrees (EdD or PhD). I am a doctoral candidate at The College of William and Mary in the Educational Policy, Planning, and Leadership program in higher education. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you have a doctorate and have been identified as a full-time faculty member in a community college.

If you decide to participate, I will ask to interview you for about one hour at your convenience. Interviews will be audiotaped. The tapes and transcripts will be confidential and kept only in my personal files. After the dissertation is completed and accepted by The College of William and Mary, the audiotapes will be destroyed. Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential. Neither you nor the institution will be identified by name or by any combination of characteristics that would permit interviews to be traced to you as an individual or to the institution.

You are under no obligation to participate. If you decide to participate, you are free to discontinue participation at any time.

If you have any questions, please call me at 757/423-1004 or e-mail me at jazar@infinet. You may also contact my dissertation chairperson, Dr. David Leslie at dwlesl@facstaff.wm.edu. If you consent to participating in this study, please sign, date, and return the original to me:

Janet Azar
421 Ridgeley Road
Norfolk, VA 23505

You may keep a copy of this form.

Consent:
I agree to be interviewed for this study.

_____________________________  _________________________
Signature                  Date
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