

# Faculty Worklife Study

## Part II

### Analysis of Research/Creative Activity, Service Activity, Support, Salary, and Healthcare Benefits

#### A Report by the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee

In March 2002, the WKU University Senate Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee surveyed the Western Kentucky University faculty concerning aspects of their jobs. This study was undertaken, in part, due to concern over the number of the faculty leaving the university. Of the possible 614 faculty, 367 responded, making the response rate 59.8%. This report outlines and examines the faculty's responses to the research/creative and service activity sections of this survey as well as the sections dealing with support, salary, and healthcare benefits.

#### Recap of Distribution of Faculty

Looking at Table 1, we see the distribution of the survey responses based on respondents' rank at WKU. Official WKU data provided by the Office of the Provost and the Office of Institutional Research are included to assess the representativeness of the sample. Comparison of the official WKU numbers to the sample using a test for a proportion (Agresti and Finlay 1986: 132-134) demonstrates that the sample is not significantly different from official WKU faculty rank percentages.

Table 1. Frequency Distribution of WKU Faculty by Rank.

	Sample Percentage	Official Percentage
Instructor	15.3%	18.4%
Assistant Professor	29.8%	27.4%
Associate Professor	28.4%	24.8%
Full Professor	26.5%	27.4%
Combined	-	2.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

In Table 2 the distribution of the respondents by college is presented. Comparison of official proportions to the sample proportions shows the Community College, the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Potter College, Ogden College, and University Libraries proportions are not significantly different. However, it appears that the faculty in both the

Gordon Ford College of Business and the College of Health and Human Services are slightly underrepresented in the sample.

Table 2. Frequency Distribution of WKU Faculty by College.

	Sample Number	Sample Percentage	Official Percentage
Bowling Green Community College	32	8.9%	7.3%
College of Education and Behavioral Sciences	80	22.2%	19.2%
Gordon Ford College of Business	22	6.1%	9.9%
Libraries	21	5.8%	4.7%
Potter College of the Arts, Humanities, & Social Science	101	28.1%	28.3%
Ogden College of Science	93	25.8%	23.0%
College of Health and Human Services	11	3.1%	7.0%
No answer	7	-	NA
Interdisciplinary	NA	NA	0.5%
Total	367	100.0%	100.0%

While the sample of respondents is fairly representative overall in terms of their distribution by college, the small number of respondents in some colleges prohibits detailed analysis. For more detailed analysis, the respondents in the Bowling Green Community College, the Gordon Ford College of Business, and the College of Health and Human Services will be combined together and referred to as the Combined Colleges. University Libraries responses will not be included in the analyses of teaching load and advising.

## RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY

### SATISFACTION WITH RESEARCH/CREATIVITY EXPECTATIONS

Satisfaction with one's research/creativity load was elicited by the following closed-ended question: "What is your level of satisfaction regarding the research/creativity you are expected to engage in?" Valid responses were: 1 "Extremely Dissatisfied," 2 "Moderately Dissatisfied," 3 "Somewhat Satisfied," 4 "Moderately Satisfied," 5 "Extremely Satisfied." In Table 3 slightly less than half of the respondents indicated that they were moderately or extremely satisfied with their research expectations. However, an additional quarter of the faculty was extremely or moderately dissatisfied. Examination of satisfaction with research expectations did not significantly differ either by faculty rank or by college.

Table 3. Frequency Distribution of Satisfaction with Research/Creativity Expectations (n = 326)

	Percentage
1 Extremely Dissatisfied	6.1%
2 Moderately Dissatisfied	18.4%
3 Somewhat Satisfied	25.8%
4 Moderately Satisfied	32.2%
5 Extremely Satisfied	17.5%

Mean = 3.37                      Standard Dev. = 1.15                      Median = 3.00                      Mode = 4

## DEPARTMENTAL EXPECTATIONS FOR RESEARCH

Respondents' attitudes toward departmental expectations for research were elicited by the open-ended question: "The expectations for research/creative activity in my department are:" Valid response categories were "too high," "about right," and "too low." As can be seen from Table 4, a clear majority (71%) of faculty believes that their department's expectations are about right. The remaining 29 percent of the faculty are evenly divided between feeling that the expectations are too high or feeling that the expectations are too low. Examination of faculty attitudes about departmental research/creativity also did not significantly differ either by faculty rank or by college.

Table 4. Frequency Distribution of Attitude about Departmental Research/Creativity Expectations (n = 324)

	Percentage
1 Too high	15.7%
2 About right	71.0%
3 Too low	13.3%

Mean = 1.98                      Standard Dev. = 0.54                      Median = 2.00                      Mode = 2

## DESIRED RESEARCH REQUIREMENTS

Attitude toward desired research requirement was elicited by the following closed-ended question: "I would like to see the research/creative activity requirements:" Valid responses were: 1 "Increase," 2 "Remain the Same," and 3 "Decrease." Table 5 shows that a majority (60.9%) of faculty desired their research requirement to remain the same.

Table 5. Frequency Distribution of Desired Research Requirements (n = 327)

	Percentage
1 Increase	17.4%
2 Remain the same	60.9%
3 Decrease	21.7%

Mean = 2.04                      Standard Dev. = 0.63                      Median = 2.00                      Mode = 2

Table 6 examines the distribution of desired research requirements by college. The trend among the faculty in each college was that a majority desired their research requirements to remain the same. Statistically significant differences among colleges become evident when one looks at the remaining faculty members' responses. The remaining faculty members in Potter and Ogden colleges were more likely to lean toward increasing the research requirements in their colleges while the remaining faculty members in the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences and in the Combined colleges were more likely to favor a decrease in their research requirements.

Table 6. Desired Research Requirements by College

	CEBS	Potter	Ogden	Combined	Total
Increase	11 14.9%	19 20.2%	18 22.8%	6 8.0%	54 16.8%
Remain the same	39 52.7%	62 66.0%	48 60.8%	50 66.7%	199 61.8%
Decrease	24 32.4%	13 13.8%	13 16.5%	19 25.3%	69 21.4%
Total	74 100.0%	94 100.0%	79 100.0%	75 100.0%	322 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 15.68; p = .016$

Lambda = .000

Uncertainty Coefficient = .027

## REASSIGNED RESEARCH/CREATIVE TIME

Respondents were asked the following open-ended question: "I have received \_\_\_\_\_ credit hours of reassigned time for research/creative activity over the past two academic years (including graduate credit hour deductions)." As can be seen from Table 7, the majority of faculty receives no reassignments for research or creative activity.

Table 7. Frequency Distribution of Reassigned Research/Creative Time (n = 309)

	Percentage
0 – 2 hours	59.5%
3 – 5 hours	13.3%
6 – 8 hours	14.5%
9 – 11 hours	1.9%
12 – 14 hours	7.8%
15 – 17 hours	0.6%
18 – 20 hours	0.6%
21 – 23 hours	0.3%
24 – 26 hours	1.0%
27 – 29 hours	0.0%
30 – 32 hours	0.3%

Mean = 3.04

Standard Dev. = 4.89

Median = 0.00

Mode = 0

In Table 8 mean reassigned research/creative time (in hours) by faculty rank are presented. Instructors are significantly less likely to have received any research reassignment

when compared to all other faculty ranks. In addition, assistant professors are, on average, reassigned for research and creative activity significantly less than full professors.

Table 8. Mean Reassigned Research/Creative Time by Faculty Rank (n = 304)

Faculty Rank	Mean Reassigned Research/Creative Time
Instructor	0.22 hours
Assistant Professor	2.58 hours
Associate Professor	2.81 hours
Full Professor	5.04 hours

F = 9.93; p = .000 Significant Difference

Additional examination of reassigned research/creative time was done to determine whether reassignment differed by college. Looking at Table 9, the analysis of variance statistics indicate that Ogden College professors receive significantly more reassignment time than those professors in the Combined Colleges.

Table 9. Mean Reassigned Research/Creative Time by College (n = 303)

College	Mean Current Teaching Load
Other Combined Colleges	1.42 hours
Potter College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences	2.69 hours
College of Education and Behavioral Sciences	2.92 hours
Ogden College of Sciences and Engineering	4.70 hours

F = 5.84; p = .001 Significant Difference

A quick examination of the correlations between receiving research reassignment and the other research activity variables reveals that more research reassignment time faculty members receive, the more likely they are to be satisfied with their level of research/creative activity ( $r = .143$ ;  $p = .015$ ), the more likely to believe that the research requirements are too low ( $r = .200$ ;  $p = .001$ ), and the more likely to want research/creativity requirements to increase ( $r = -.174$ ;  $p = .003$ ).

## SUMMARY

In summary, half of the faculty members were satisfied with the research/creativity requirements of their departments. Most feel that the expectations are about right and wish the research/creativity expectations to remain the same. The majority of the faculty received no reassigned time for research/creativity purposes. Faculty that do receive research reassignment are more likely to be full professors than assistant professors and are much more likely to be any rank of professor rather than an instructor. They are also more likely to be in OCSE than in other colleges. Moreover, the faculty members that received research reassignments appeared to have been more satisfied with research/creativity requirements than their colleagues that did not receive a reassignment.

# SERVICE

Service was examined using two questions to assess the amount of departmental/university and community service each faculty member performed in a week. In addition, each faculty member was asked about their views on service expectations, their satisfaction with their service requirements and whether they wished their service requirements to change.

## DEPARTMENTAL/UNIVERSITY SERVICE

Information about departmental/university service was elicited by the question "My current level of involvement in departmental/university service activities is:" Valid responses were "0-1 hrs/week," "1-2 hrs/week," "3-4 hrs/week," and "5+ hrs/week." From Table 10, we see that a third of the faculty estimated that they perform 3 to 4 hours of departmental/university service per week and an additional third estimated that they perform 5 or more hours of departmental/university service a week.

Table 10. Frequency Distribution of Departmental/University Service (n= 359)

	Percentage
1 0-1 hrs/week	7.8%
2 1-2 hrs/week	23.4%
3 3-4 hrs/week	32.9%
4 5+ hrs/week	35.9%

Mean = 2.97      Standard Dev. = 0.95      Median = 3.00      Mode = 4

There were significant differences in departmental/university service by faculty rank (See Table 11). It appears that the higher one's faculty rank, the greater the number of hours of departmental/university service reported. The crosstabulation of departmental/university service by college was not significant.

Table 11. Departmental/University Service by Faculty Rank

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Total
1 0-1 hrs/week	11 20.8%	11 10.3%	6 6.0%	0 0.0%	28 8.0%
2 1-2 hrs/week	16 30.2%	26 24.3%	17 17.0%	23 25.0%	82 23.3%
3 3-4 hrs/week	15 28.3%	40 37.4%	35 35.0%	25 27.2%	115 32.7%
4 5+ hrs/week	11 20.8%	30 28.0%	42 42.0%	44 47.8%	127 36.1%
Total	53 100.0%	107 100.0%	100 100.0%	92 100.0%	352 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 34.30; p = .000$

Lambda = .067

Gamma = .288

Tau c = .201

## COMMUNITY SERVICE

Information about community service was elicited by the question "My current level of involvement in community service activities is:" Valid responses were "0-1 hrs/week," "1-2 hrs/week," "3-4 hrs/week," and "5+ hrs/week." Comparing Table 10 and Table 12, we see that fewer faculty performed high levels of community service compared to department/university service each week. Only a third of the faculty performed 3 or more hours of community service a week.

Table 12. Frequency Distribution of Community Service (n= 356)

	Percentage
1 0-1 hrs/week	37.4%
2 1-2 hrs/week	29.8%
3 3-4 hrs/week	16.0%
4 5+ hrs/week	16.9%

Mean = 2.12                      Standard Dev. = 1.09                      Median = 2.00                      Mode = 1

The crosstabulation of departmental/university service by faculty rank is not significant. However, there are significant differences in departmental/university service by college (See Table 13). We see that members of the CEBS and the Combined Colleges reported more community service per week than their counterparts in Potter or Ogden colleges.

Table 13. Community Service by College

	CEBS	Potter	Ogden	Other Combined	Total
1 0-1 hrs/week	16 20.8%	43 44.3%	45 50.0%	27 31.8%	131 37.5%
2 1-2 hrs/week	24 31.2%	30 30.9%	22 24.4%	27 31.8%	103 29.5%
3 3-4 hrs/week	23 29.9%	10 10.3%	11 12.2%	13 15.3%	57 16.3%
4 5+ hrs/week	14 18.2%	14 14.4%	12 13.3%	18 21.2%	58 16.6%
Total	77 100.0%	97 100.0%	90 100.0%	85 100.0%	349 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 26.32$ ;  $p = .002$                       Lambda = .037                      Uncertainty Coefficient = .028

## DEPARTMENTAL EXPECTATIONS FOR SERVICE

Respondents' attitudes toward departmental expectations for service were elicited by the open-ended question: "The expectations for service activity in my department are." Valid response categories were "too high," "about right," and "too low." As can be seen from Table 14, a strong majority of faculty members believed that their department's service expectations were about right.

Table 14. Frequency Distribution of Attitude about Service Expectations (n = 322)

	<b>Percentage</b>
1 Too high	14.9%
2 About right	79.8%
3 Too low	5.3%

Mean = 1.90                  Standard Dev. = 0.44                  Median = 2.00                  Mode = 2

In table 15, respondent's attitudes toward service are crosstabulated with faculty rank. While over three quarters of the faculty at all ranks feel the service requirements to be about right, we see that one of every five assistant professors are likely to view service requirements as too high while this percentage decreased to less than one in ten full professors feeling the same way. There were no significant differences between attitudes concerning service expectations by college.

Table 15. Attitude about Service Expectations by Faculty Rank

	<b>Instructor</b>	<b>Assistant</b>	<b>Associate</b>	<b>Full</b>	<b>Total</b>
1 Too high	3 7.3%	21 22.6%	17 17.9%	7 8.1%	48 15.2%
2 About right	35 85.4%	70 75.3%	74 77.9%	72 83.7%	251 79.7%
3 Too low	3 7.3%	2 2.2%	4 4.2%	7 8.1%	16 5.1%
Total	41 100.0%	78 100.0%	95 100.0%	86 100.0%	315 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 12.57; p = .050$                   Lambda = .000                  Gamma = .151                  Tau c = .056

## **SATISFACTION WITH SERVICE EXPECTATIONS**

Satisfaction with one's service expectations was elicited by the following closed-ended question: "What is your level of satisfaction regarding the service activities requirements?" Valid responses were: 1 "Extremely Dissatisfied," 2 "Moderately Dissatisfied," 3 "Somewhat Satisfied," 4 "Moderately Satisfied," 5 "Extremely Satisfied." In Table 16 we see that over half of the faculty reported that they were either moderately or extremely satisfied with service expectations. Examination of satisfaction with service expectations did not significantly differ either by faculty rank or by college.

Table 16. Frequency Distribution of Satisfaction with Service Expectations (n = 326)

	<b>Percentage</b>
1 Extremely Dissatisfied	3.6%
2 Moderately Dissatisfied	11.7%
3 Somewhat Satisfied	29.5%
4 Moderately Satisfied	41.6%
5 Extremely Satisfied	13.6%



Mean = 3.50

Standard Dev. = 0.99

Median = 4.00

Mode = 4

## DESIRED SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

Attitude toward desired research requirement was elicited by the following closed-ended question: "I would like to see the service requirements:" Valid responses were: 1 "Increase," 2 "Remain the Same," and 3 "Decrease." In Table 17 we see that the majority (60.9%) of faculty desired their research requirement to remain the same.

Table 17. Frequency Distribution of Desired Service Requirements (n = 339)

	<b>Percentage</b>
1 Increase	6.8%
2 Remain the same	70.8%
3 Decrease	22.4%
Mean = 2.16	Standard Dev. = 0.52
	Median = 2.00
	Mode = 2

When desired service requirements is crosstabulated by faculty rank, it is evident that the same groups that believed that the service requirements were too high were also more likely to desire decreased service requirements (please see Table 18). While the majority of faculty at each rank would like the service requirements to stay the same, assistant and associate professors were twice as likely to desire a decrease in the service requirement compared to full professors and instructors.

Table 18. Desired Service Requirements by Faculty Rank

	<b>Instructor</b>	<b>Assistant</b>	<b>Associate</b>	<b>Full</b>	<b>Total</b>
Increase	7 <b>15.2%</b>	3 <b>3.1%</b>	4 <b>4.0%</b>	8 <b>8.9%</b>	22 <b>6.6%</b>
Remain the same	32 <b>69.6%</b>	65 <b>67.7%</b>	68 <b>68.0%</b>	69 <b>76.7%</b>	234 <b>70.5%</b>
Decrease	7 <b>15.2%</b>	28 <b>29.2%</b>	28 <b>28.0%</b>	13 <b>14.4%</b>	76 <b>22.9%</b>
Total	46 <b>100.0%</b>	96 <b>100.0%</b>	100 <b>100.0%</b>	90 <b>100.0%</b>	332 <b>100.0%</b>

$\chi^2 = 16.10; p = .013$

Lambda = .000

Gamma = -.062

Tau c = -.031

## SUMMARY

In summary, WKU faculty members report that they perform significant amounts of departmental/university and community service. While departmental/university service activity increases at higher faculty ranks, nearly two-thirds of assistant professors report 3 or more hours of service a week. While the majority of the faculty believes that service requirements are about right, a significant proportion of assistant and associate professor feel the service requirements are too high and would like to see them decrease.

## SUPPORT

The next set of questions on the worklife survey dealt with several different forms of departmental and university support.

### SATISFACTION WITH DEPARTMENTAL COLLEGIALITY

Satisfaction with departmental collegiality was elicited by the following closed-ended question: "Please rate your level of satisfaction in the following areas: Collegiality in your department—with collegiality defined as a supportive atmosphere that allows you to develop fully in your profession and promotes your willingness to assist others and to ask others for assistance" Valid responses were: 1 "Extremely Dissatisfied," 2 "Moderately Dissatisfied," 3 "Somewhat Satisfied," 4 "Moderately Satisfied," 5 "Extremely Satisfied." In Table 19, we see that nearly 70% of the faculty members were either moderately or extremely satisfied with their departmental collegiality. Examination of satisfaction with departmental collegiality did not significantly differ either by faculty rank or by college.

Table 19. Frequency Distribution of Satisfaction with Departmental Collegiality (n = 355)

	Percentage
1 Extremely Dissatisfied	5.9%
2 Moderately Dissatisfied	12.1%
3 Somewhat Satisfied	12.4%
4 Moderately Satisfied	31.5%
5 Extremely Satisfied	38.0%

Mean = 3.84

Standard Dev. = 1.22

Median = 4.00

Mode = 5

### SATISFACTION WITH PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT

Satisfaction with professional development support was elicited by the following closed-ended question: "Please rate your level of satisfaction in the following areas: Professional development support (e.g., funding for travel, reassigned time) available through the university" Valid responses were: 1 "Extremely Dissatisfied," 2 "Moderately Dissatisfied," 3 "Somewhat Satisfied," 4 "Moderately Satisfied," 5 "Extremely Satisfied." In Table 20 we find a high percentage of faculty are dissatisfied with professional development support. Nearly half of the faculty members were either moderately or extremely dissatisfied with professional development support at the university.

Table 20. Frequency Distribution of Satisfaction with Professional Development Support (n = 355)

	Percentage
1 Extremely Dissatisfied	22.3%
2 Moderately Dissatisfied	25.1%
3 Somewhat Satisfied	22.0%
4 Moderately Satisfied	22.5%

5 Extremely Satisfied	8.2%		
Mean = 2.69	Standard Dev. = 1.27	Median = 3.00	Mode = 2

Examination of satisfaction with professional development support by faculty rank shows no statistically significant differences; however, there is a statistically significant difference by college in satisfaction with professional development support (Please see Table 21). Some colleges were almost evenly divided on the issue of professional development support. Looking at Potter College and the Combined College category we see that nearly a third of the faculty in those colleges were satisfied with their professional development support, nearly a third were somewhat satisfied and slightly more than a third were dissatisfied. Compared to these colleges, CEBS and Ogden are more polarized. That is, they appear less likely to be somewhat satisfied and more likely to be either dissatisfied or satisfied.

Table 21. Satisfaction with Professional Development Support by College

	CEBS	Potter	Ogden	Other Combined	Total
Extremely Dissatisfied	20 25.3%	11 11.3%	32 37.2%	13 15.1%	76 21.8%
Moderately Dissatisfied	16 20.3%	27 27.8%	23 26.7%	21 24.4%	87 25.0%
Somewhat Satisfied	18 22.8%	29 29.9%	8 9.3%	23 26.7%	78 22.4%
Moderately Satisfied	16 20.3%	23 23.7%	18 20.9%	21 24.4%	78 22.4%
Extremely Satisfied	9 11.4%	7 7.2%	5 5.8%	8 9.3%	29 8.3%
Total	79 100.0%	97 100.0%	86 100.0%	86 100.0%	348 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 29.56; p = .003$

Lambda = .065

Uncertainty Coefficient = .028

## SATISFACTION WITH MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES

Satisfaction with materials and supplies was elicited by the following closed-ended question: "Please rate your level of satisfaction in the following areas: Materials and supplies (e.g., copying, office supplies) available to support your teaching and research efforts." Valid responses were: 1 "Extremely Dissatisfied," 2 "Moderately Dissatisfied," 3 "Somewhat Satisfied," 4 "Moderately Satisfied," 5 "Extremely Satisfied." In Table 22, we see that the majority of faculty members were either moderately or extremely satisfied. Still, a quarter of the faculty were either extremely or moderately dissatisfied with their materials and supplies; however, further examination of satisfaction with materials and supplies did not find significant differences either by faculty rank or by college.

Table 22. Frequency Distribution of Satisfaction with Materials and Supplies (n = 363)

	<b>Percentage</b>
1 Extremely Dissatisfied	8.3%
2 Moderately Dissatisfied	18.5%
3 Somewhat Satisfied	19.8%
4 Moderately Satisfied	32.0%
5 Extremely Satisfied	21.5%

Mean = 3.40

Standard Dev. = 1.24

Median = 4.00

Mode = 4

## **SATISFACTION WITH TECHNOLOGY**

Satisfaction with technology was elicited by the following closed-ended question: "Please rate your level of satisfaction in the following areas: Technology (e.g., computers, software, training) available to support your teaching and research efforts." Valid responses were: 1 "Extremely Dissatisfied," 2 "Moderately Dissatisfied," 3 "Somewhat Satisfied," 4 "Moderately Satisfied," 5 "Extremely Satisfied." In Table 23 we see that the majority of the faculty was either extremely or moderately satisfied with WKU technology. Examination of satisfaction with technology did not significantly differ either by faculty rank or by college.

Table 23. Frequency Distribution of Satisfaction with Technology (n = 360)

	<b>Percentage</b>
1 Extremely Dissatisfied	7.5%
2 Moderately Dissatisfied	16.7%
3 Somewhat Satisfied	23.3%
4 Moderately Satisfied	34.4%
5 Extremely Satisfied	18.1%

Mean = 3.39

Standard Dev. = 1.18

Median = 4.00

Mode = 4

## **SATISFACTION WITH EXTERNAL FUNDING**

Satisfaction with external funding support was elicited by the following closed-ended question: "Please rate your level of satisfaction in the following areas: External funding support to assist you with identifying, writing, and administering external grants." Valid responses were: 1 "Extremely Dissatisfied," 2 "Moderately Dissatisfied," 3 "Somewhat Satisfied," 4 "Moderately Satisfied," 5 "Extremely Satisfied." In Table 24 we find slightly less than half of the faculty members (41.5%) were moderately or extremely satisfied with external funding support at WKU. Examination of satisfaction with external funding support did not significantly differ either by faculty rank or by college.

Table 24. Frequency Distribution of Satisfaction with External Funding Support (n = 267)

	<b>Percentage</b>
1 Extremely Dissatisfied	7.1%
2 Moderately Dissatisfied	17.2%
3 Somewhat Satisfied	33.7%
4 Moderately Satisfied	31.5%
5 Extremely Satisfied	10.5%

Mean = 3.21

Standard Dev. = 1.07

Median = 3.00

Mode = 3

## **SATISFACTION WITH SUPPORT FOR LEADERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES**

Satisfaction with support for leadership opportunities was elicited by the following closed-ended question: "Please rate your level of satisfaction in the following areas: Support for leadership opportunities (e.g., funding for costs associated with serving as an officer in national organizations or chairing local/regional community groups." Valid responses were: 1 "Extremely Dissatisfied," 2 "Moderately Dissatisfied," 3 "Somewhat Satisfied," 4 "Moderately Satisfied," 5 "Extremely Satisfied." In Table 25 we see that only a quarter of the faculty was moderately or extremely satisfied with support for leadership opportunities at WKU. In fact, one out of five faculty members were extremely dissatisfied with these opportunities. Examination of satisfaction with support for leadership opportunities did not significantly differ either by faculty rank or by college.

Table 25. Frequency Distribution of Satisfaction with Support for Leadership Opportunities (n = 245)

	<b>Percentage</b>
1 Extremely Dissatisfied	20.0%
2 Moderately Dissatisfied	26.1%
3 Somewhat Satisfied	28.2%
4 Moderately Satisfied	18.8%
5 Extremely Satisfied	6.9%

Mean = 2.67

Standard Dev. = 1.19

Median = 3.00

Mode = 3

## **SUMMARY**

In terms of various types of institutional support, WKU faculty members appeared to be most satisfied with their departmental collegiality, technology, external funding support, and materials and supplies. At the same time the faculty was least satisfied with professional development and leadership opportunities.

# SALARY AND BENEFITS

## SALARY COMPARISON

Belief about how WKU salaries compared with salaries at other institutions was elicited by the following closed-ended question: "Compared to the faculty in my field at comparable institutions, I feel my salary is:" Valid response categories were "\$10,000+," "\$5,000+," "\$2,500+," "About the same," "\$2,500-," "\$5,000-," and "\$10,000-." Table 26 shows the distribution of faculty responses concerning salary comparison. The overwhelming majority of faculty believed that WKU salaries were below those of other faculty at comparable institutions. Slightly more than a quarter of faculty believe that their salaries are \$10,000 below those of their colleagues elsewhere. However, the most frequent response (42.1%) was that WKU salaries were \$5,000 less than their counterparts elsewhere.

Table 26. Frequency Distribution of Salary Comparison Beliefs (n = 290)

	<b>Percentage</b>
1 \$10,000+	0.0%
2 \$5,000+	0.0%
3 \$2,500+	0.3%
4 About the same	14.8%
5 \$2,500-	15.5%
6 \$5,000-	42.1%
7 \$10,000-	27.2%

Mean = 5.81      Standard Dev. = 1.01      Median = 6.00      Mode = 6

Looking at the Table 27, we see that as faculty rank increases, the estimate of the salary disparity also increases. Full professors were more likely to view their salaries as \$10,000 dollars lower than their counterparts at other universities.

Table 27. Salary Comparison Belief by Faculty Rank

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Total
1 \$10,000+	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
2 \$5,000+	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
3 \$2,500+	0 0.0%	1 1.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 0.4%
4 About the same	8 23.5%	15 16.5%	14 16.3%	6 8.2%	43 15.1%
5 \$2,500-	9 26.5%	16 17.6%	13 15.1%	6 8.2%	44 15.5%
6 \$5,000-	13 38.2%	42 46.2%	34 39.5%	29 39.7%	118 41.5%
7 \$10,000-	4 11.8%	17 18.7%	25 29.1%	32 43.8%	78 27.5%
Total	34 100.0%	91 100.0%	86 100.0%	73 100.0%	284 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 25.10$ ;  $p = .014$       Lambda = .018      Gamma = .312      Tau c = .215

In Table 28 salary comparison belief is crosstabulated by college. Looking at the table, we see that Potter college faculty were least likely to view their salaries as lower than their counterparts at other universities.

Table 28. Salary Comparison Belief by College

	CEBS	Potter	Ogden	Other Combined	Total
1 \$10,000+	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
2 \$5,000+	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
3 \$2,500+	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.5%	1 0.4%
4 About the same	8 13.3%	23 27.4%	6 8.0%	6 9.2%	43 15.1%
5 \$2,500-	5 8.3%	17 20.2%	14 18.7%	8 12.3%	44 15.5%
6 \$5,000-	31 51.7%	31 36.9%	29 38.7%	28 43.1%	119 41.9%
7 \$10,000-	16 26.7%	13 15.5%	26 34.7%	22 33.8%	77 27.1%
Total	60 100.0%	84 100.0%	75 100.0%	65 100.0%	284 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 28.90$ ;  $p = .004$       Lambda = .000      Uncertainty Coefficient = .038

Several faculty members declined to circle a particular dollar amount, but did indicate that they believed the salary fell above or below the norm. Therefore, the salary comparison categories were collapsed to three responses “Above the norm,” “About the same,” and “Below the norm.” This collapsed comparison is presented in Table 29. Here we see that 86.2% of the faculty members believed their salaries were below those at other institutions.

Table 29. Frequency Distribution of Salary Comparison Beliefs – Collapsed (n = 325)

	<b>Percentage</b>
1 Above the norm	0.9%
2 About the same	12.9%
3 Below the norm	86.2%

Mean = 2.85                      Standard Dev. = 0.38                      Median = 3.00                      Mode = 3

Once the response categories were collapsed, there was no difference in salary comparison beliefs by faculty rank. However, there were differences in salary comparison belief by college (Please see Table 30). Potter College faculty members were again much less likely to view their salaries as below the norm.

Table 30. Salary Comparison Belief – Collapsed by College

	<b>CEBS</b>	<b>Potter</b>	<b>Ogden</b>	<b>Other Combined</b>	<b>Total</b>
1 Above the norm	0 <b>0.0%</b>	1 <b>1.1%</b>	0 <b>0.0%</b>	1 <b>1.3%</b>	2 <b>0.6%</b>
2 About the same	8 <b>11.4%</b>	22 <b>24.2%</b>	6 <b>7.3%</b>	6 <b>8.0%</b>	42 <b>13.2%</b>
3 Below the norm	62 <b>88.6%</b>	68 <b>74.7%</b>	76 <b>92.7%</b>	68 <b>90.7%</b>	274 <b>86.2%</b>
Total	70 <b>100.0%</b>	91 <b>100.0%</b>	82 <b>100.0%</b>	75 <b>100.0%</b>	318 <b>100.0%</b>

$\chi^2 = 16.03$ ;  $p = .014$

Lambda = .000

Uncertainty Coefficient = .058

## **SALARY INCREASE**

Belief about WKU salary increases was elicited by the following closed-ended question: “I feel the average salary increases offered by this University are:” Valid response categories were “High,” “Acceptable,” “Moderately Low,” and “Extremely Low.” Only 10% of the faculty found the salary increases at WKU to be acceptable. The other ninety percent of the faculty was nearly evenly divided between believing the increases to be moderately low or extremely low. These beliefs differed by faculty rank but not by college.



Table 31. Frequency Distribution of Salary Increase Belief (n = 340)

	Percentage
1 High	0.0%
2 Acceptable	10.3%
3 Moderately Low	43.5%
4 Extremely Low	46.2%

Mean = 3.36      Standard Dev. = 0.66      Median = 3.00      Mode = 4

When beliefs about salary increases are broken out by faculty rank, we see that assistant professors are more likely to believe that their salary increases are extremely low as compared to the other faculty ranks.

Table 32. Salary Increase Belief by Faculty Rank

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Total
1 High	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
2 Acceptable	6 13.3%	13 13.4%	7 7.1%	9 9.8%	35 10.5%
3 Moderately Low	21 46.7%	26 26.8%	52 52.5%	45 48.9%	144 43.2%
4 Extremely Low	18 40.0%	58 59.8%	40 40.4%	38 41.3%	154 46.2%
Total	45 100.0%	97 100.0%	99 100.0%	92 100.0%	333 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 16.56; p = .011$       Lambda = .123      Gamma = -.069      Tau c = -.045

## MERIT PAY DECISIONS

Belief about merit pay decisions was elicited by the question: "I feel the process by which merit pay decisions are made in my area is:" Valid response categories were "Excellent," "Good," "Moderately Flawed," and "Severely Flawed." Over half (57.6%) of the faculty believed merit pay decisions in their areas to be moderately flawed or severely flawed. These beliefs did not differ by faculty rank but did differ by college.

Table 33. Frequency Distribution of Merit Pay Belief (n = 269)

	Percentage
1 Excellent	3.7%
2 Good	38.7%
3 Moderately Flawed	32.7%
4 Severely Flawed	24.9%

Mean = 2.79      Standard Dev. = 0.86      Median = 3.00      Mode = 2

When looking at merit pay beliefs across colleges, Potter college faculty are more likely to find merit pay decisions in their area to be good or excellent and much less likely to believe that their merit pay decisions are severely flawed. At the other end of the spectrum, those faculty

in the combined colleges are much more likely to believe that merit pay decisions in their areas are moderately or severely flawed.

Table 34. Merit Pay Belief by College

	CEBS	Potter	Ogden	Other Combined	Total
1 Excellent	3 4.4%	4 5.8%	1 1.5%	2 3.4%	10 3.8%
2 Good	28 41.2%	32 46.4%	28 41.2%	15 25.4%	103 39.0%
3 Moderately Flawed	16 23.5%	25 36.2%	19 27.9%	26 44.1%	86 32.6%
4 Severely Flawed	21 30.9%	8 11.6%	20 29.4%	16 27.1%	65 24.6%
Total	68 100.0%	69 100.0%	68 100.0%	59 100.0%	264 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 17.16; p = .046$

Lambda = .068

Uncertainty Coefficient = .029

## HEALTHCARE PLAN COMPARISON

Belief about how the WKU healthcare plan coverage compared with the plans at comparable universities was elicited by asking “Compared to plans available to faculty at comparable institutions, my health care plan is:” Valid responses were “Far Above Average,” “Slightly Above Average,” “About the Same,” “Slightly Below Average,” and “Far Below Average.” Nearly one third of the faculty members feel that WKU healthcare plans are about the same as healthcare offered at other institutions (Please see Table 35). In addition nearly half of the faculty members responding believed the healthcare plan to be slightly or far below average. There were no significant differences in belief about healthcare plans by either faculty rank or college.

Table 35. Frequency Distribution of Health Care Plan Comparison Beliefs (n = 268)

	Percentage
1 Far Above Average	5.6%
2 Slightly Above Average	13.4%
3 About the Same	31.7%
4 Slightly Below Average	26.5%
5 Far Below Average	22.8%

Mean = 3.47

Standard Dev. = 1.15

Median = 3.00

Mode = 3

## HEALTH CARE COST COMPARISON

Belief about how the WKU healthcare plan costs compared with the costs of plans at comparable universities was elicited by asking “Compared to costs for faculty at comparable institutions, my out-of-pocket health care costs are:” Valid responses were “Far Above Average,” “Slightly Above Average,” “About the Same,” “Slightly Below Average,” and “Far

Below Average.” Looking at Table 36, slightly more than one third of the faculty believed that WKU healthcare costs are about the same as healthcare costs at other institutions. Nearly half of the faculty responding believed the healthcare plan to be slightly or far above average. Again, no significant differences in belief about healthcare plan costs by either faculty rank or college were found.

Table 36. Frequency Distribution of Healthcare Cost Comparison Beliefs (n = 251)

	<b>Percentage</b>
1 Far Above Average	18.3%
2 Slightly Above Average	25.5%
3 About the Same	35.9%
4 Slightly Below Average	12.4%
5 Far Below Average	8.0%

Mean = 2.66

Standard Dev. = 1.15

Median = 3.00

Mode = 3

## **SUMMARY**

To summarize, the majority of the faculty believed that their salaries do not compare favorably with their colleagues at other similar institutions. The majority of faculty also believed that their salary increases were moderately or extremely low and that merit pay decision-making at WKU was moderately or severely flawed. With regards to healthcare coverage and costs, the majority of the faculty believed their healthcare to cost more than the average and be of less than average in quality.