

FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE "OTHER-RACE"  
FACULTY DECISIONS TO ACCEPT, REMAIN IN,  
AND CONSIDER LEAVING FACULTY POSITIONS AT  
FOUR SOUTHEASTERN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

by

Margaret L. Curry-Williams

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
in  
Public Administration and Public Affairs

APPROVED:

---

Dr. James Wolf

---

Dr. James McLean

---

Dr. John Rohr

---

Dr. Gary Wamsley

---

Dr. Linda Wolf

January, 1985  
Blacksburg, Virginia

FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE "OTHER-RACE"  
FACULTY DECISIONS TO ACCEPT, REMAIN IN,  
AND CONSIDER LEAVING FACULTY POSITIONS AT  
FOUR SOUTHEASTERN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

by

Margaret L. Curry-Williams

Committee Chairman: James F. Wolf  
Public Administration and Public Affairs

(ABSTRACT)

In this study, the dilemmas faced by higher education managers who attempt faculty desegregation within the narrow framework (affirmative action) provided by the courts and the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) were explored (e.g., merit vs. affirmative action, maintenance of a value consensus while facilitating change, the need for sensitive leadership). Some managers are successful in hiring minority faculty but not in retaining them. Others are still trying to determine how they can successfully recruit and retain these faculty.

This exploratory study on faculty desegregation is designed to identify the factors that influence the decisions of black faculty at two public traditionally white institutions (TWIs) and of white faculty at two public traditionally black institutions (TBIs) to accept, remain in and consider leaving faculty positions at such institutions. (In this study, white faculty at TBIs and black faculty at

TWIs are referred to as "other-race" faculty.) The study also assesses the viability of affirmative action as a strategy for desegregation.

The research methodology included a survey of higher education managers, and interviews with and a survey of other-race faculty opinions.

### Conclusions

1. Black faculty express strong sentiments in support of affirmative action which influence them to remain in their jobs but could influence them to leave TWIs.
2. Fewer black than white faculty expect promotions when accepting jobs at TWIs.
3. Black faculty are influenced, in part, to accept jobs at TWIs due to campus recreational facilities.
4. More white than black faculty will consider leaving their jobs due to compensation concerns.
5. White faculty will consider leaving TBIs due to concerns about the poor reputations of TBIs and low academic level of students.
6. All other-race faculty employment decisions are influenced by the geographical location of their universities.

This study does not support alternative methods for desegregation (e.g., freedom of choice, closing of TBIs) but

indicates that affirmative action is the least destructive and most feasible option for faculty desegregation.

Higher education managers must and can provide sensitive leadership while maneuvering within the narrow framework provided by OCR and the courts to desegregate their faculties.

## DEDICATION

To my husband, \_\_\_\_\_, whose love, unwavering support, and whose own enthusiastic determination to achieve have been my sources of inspiration.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

So many people supported me during the development of this study. Special thanks go to: my advisory committee - Jim Wolf (chairman), Gary Wamsley, John Rohr, James McLean and Linda Wolf; my typists - \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ ; my mentor \_\_\_\_\_ ; and my colleagues and friends at the Center for Public Administration and Policy, at Virginia Tech and at Old Dominion University. No words can express my heartfelt appreciation to you.

I also wish to thank the administrators and faculty at the universities I studied for your cooperation.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                            |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| DEDICATION . . . . .       | ii  |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . . | iii |

### Chapter

|  | <u>page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| I. THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING . . . . .   | 1           |
| The Role of Leadership . . . . .   | 12          |
| The Role of Management Processes . . . . .   | 15          |
| Significance of the Study . . . . .  | 16          |
| Objectives of the Study . . . . .  | 21          |
| Assumptions . . . . .  | 22          |
| Research Questions . . . . .   | 23          |
| Limits of the Study . . . . .  | 25          |
| Definition of Terms . . . . .  | 25          |
| Overview of the Study . . . . .  | 27          |
| II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .   | 28          |
| Background . . . . .   | 28          |
| Higher Education Desegregation Court Cases . . . . .   | 29          |
| Obstacles to the Desegregation of Faculty in<br>Higher Education . . . . .   | 35          |
| Affirmative Action: Arguments For and<br>Against . . . . .   | 39          |
| Role of Recruitment and Retention in the<br>Desegregation of Faculty . . . . .   | 50          |
| Organization Behavior: Job/Organization<br>Choice, Organizational Commitment, Job<br>Satisfaction and Turnover . . . . . | 52          |
| Job/Organization Choice . . . . .  | 52          |
| Organizational Commitment . . . . .  | 57          |
| Job Satisfaction . . . . .   | 62          |
| Turnover . . . . .   | 65          |
| Summary of Organization Behavior Literature . . . . .  | 67          |
| Faculty Mobility . . . . .   | 69          |
| Factors Influencing Faculty Decisions to<br>Accept Positions . . . . .   | 70          |
| Factors Influencing Faculty Decisions to<br>Remain in Positions at their<br>Universities . . . . .                       | 74          |
| Factors Influencing Faculty to Leave Their<br>Universities . . . . .   | 75          |
| Summary of Faculty Mobility Literature . . . . .   | 78          |

|      |   |     |
|------|---|-----|
| III. | METHODOLOGY . . . . .   | 80  |
|      | The Population and the Sample . . . . .   | 82  |
|      | Faculty Population and Sample . . . . .   | 83  |
|      | Steps in the Sampling Procedure . . . . .   | 84  |
|      | Data Collection . . . . .   | 86  |
|      | Faculty Interview Guide . . . . .   | 90  |
|      | Questionnaires . . . . .  | 91  |
|      | Assessment of the Validity and Reliability of<br>Data Collection Instruments . . . . .                                    | 93  |
| IV.  | ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .  | 96  |
|      | EEO, Personnel, And Academic Affairs Survey . . . . .   | 97  |
|      | Faculty Interviews at TBIs and TWIs . . . . .   | 103 |
|      | Faculty Interview Responses To Questions<br>About Special/Preferential Treatment . . . . .                                | 111 |
|      | Comparison of Faculty Interview Responses To<br>Manager Survey Responses . . . . .  | 112 |
|      | Analyses of Faculty Responses To<br>Questionnaire . . . . .   | 119 |
|      | Influence of Factors on Faculty Employment<br>Decisions . . . . .   | 121 |
|      | Job Acceptance . . . . .  | 121 |
|      | Job Continuation . . . . .  | 122 |
|      | Consideration To Leave Jobs . . . . .   | 134 |
|      | Comparison of Managerial Survey And<br>Faculty Interview Data . . . . .   | 144 |
|      | Influence of Race-related Issues . . . . .  | 145 |
|      | Relationships Between Faculty Classification<br>(Administrative and Instructional) And<br>The Factors . . . . .           | 145 |
|      | Relationships Between Faculty Classification<br>(Administrative and Instructional) And<br>Categories of Factors . . . . . | 153 |
|      | Relationship Between Race (Black and White)<br>of Faculty And The Factors . . . . .                                       | 155 |
|      | Race of Faculty And The Categories of<br>Factors . . . . .  | 169 |
|      | Strength of Relationships Revealed By Chi-<br>Square . . . . .  | 170 |
|      | Discussion of Data Analysis . . . . .   | 173 |
|      | Relationship of Findings to Existing<br>Literature . . . . .  | 173 |
|      | Interview Data . . . . .  | 175 |
|      | Questionnaire Data . . . . .  | 177 |
|      | Relationships Between Faculty<br>Classification (Administrative And<br>Instructional) and the Factors . . . . .           | 177 |



|    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
|    | Relationships Between Race (Black and White) and the Factors . . . . . | 179 |
|    | Summary . . . . .  | 185 |
| V. | CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .                              | 187 |
|    | Conclusions From The Research . . . . .                                | 188 |
|    | Making Affirmative Action Work . . . . .                               | 188 |
|    | Importance of Progress In Affirmative Action . . . . .                 | 190 |
|    | Importance of Recreational Facilities . . . . .                        | 191 |
|    | Promotion . . . . .  | 192 |
|    | Compensation . . . . .   | 192 |
|    | Quality of Students and Reputations of TBIs . . . . .                  | 193 |
|    | Geographic Location . . . . .  | 194 |
|    | Policy Implications . . . . .  | 195 |
|    | Recommendations For Future Research . . . . .                          | 201 |
|    | Recommendations For Managers . . . . .                                 | 202 |
|    | Final Reflections . . . . .  | 208 |
|    | BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .   | 210 |

Appendix

|            | <u>page</u> |
|------------|-------------|
| A. . . . . | 220         |
| B. . . . . | 223         |
| C. . . . . | 225         |
| D. . . . . | 228         |
| E. . . . . | 234         |
| F. . . . . | 241         |
| G. . . . . | 248         |
| H. . . . . | 251         |
| I. . . . . | 258         |
| J. . . . . | 265         |

## LIST OF TABLES

| <u>Table</u>   | <u>page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| 1. Summary of Literature on Organizational Commitment . . . . .  | 59          |
| 2. Composite Rank Order of Categories by EEO, Personnel<br>and Academic Affairs Managers at TBIs . . . . .               | 99          |
| 3. Composite Rank Order of Categories by EEO, Personnel<br>and Academic Managers of TWIs . . . . .                       | 101         |
| 4. Top Five Managerial Rankings of Categories for All<br>Topical Headings for All Four Universities . . . . .            | 102         |
| 5. Composite Rank Order of Categories by White Faculty<br>At TBIs . . . . .  | 105         |
| 6. Composite Rank Order of Categories by Black Faculty<br>At TWIs . . . . .  | 107         |
| 7. Faculty Rankings of Top Four Categories For All<br>Topical Headings For All Four Universities . . . . .               | 109         |
| 8. Comparisons of Rankings From Survey and Interview<br>Responses For Caperton University (TWI) . . . . .                | 115         |
| 9. Comparisons of Rankings From Survey And Interview<br>Responses For Falstaff State University (TBI) . . . . .          | 116         |
| 10. Comparisons of Rankings From Survey And Interview<br>Responses For Morilla University (TBI) . . . . .                | 117         |
| 11. Comparisons of Rankings From Survey And Interviews<br>Responses For Longman University (TWI) . . . . .               | 118         |
| 12. Mean Responses to Factor Categories by Faculty<br>Classification at CU (TWI) Relative To Job<br>Acceptance . . . . . | 123         |
| 13. Mean Responses to Factor Categories by Faculty<br>Classification at LU (TWI) Relative To Job<br>Acceptance . . . . . | 124         |
| 14. Mean Responses to Factor Categories by Faculty<br>Classification at MU (TBI) Relative To Job<br>Acceptance . . . . . | 125         |

|     |  |     |
|-----|--|-----|
| 15. | Mean Responses to Factor Categories by Faculty<br>Classification at FSU (TBI) Relative To Job<br>Acceptance . . . . .  | 126 |
| 16. | Mean Responses to Factor Categories by Faculty<br>Classification Relative To Job Acceptance . . .                      | 127 |
| 17. | Mean Responses to Factor Categories by Race For Job<br>Acceptance . . . . .  | 128 |
| 18. | Mean Responses to Factor Categories by Faculty<br>Classification at CU (TWI) for Job Continuation                      | 130 |
| 19. | Mean Responses to Factor Categories by Faculty<br>Classification at LU (TWI) for Job Continuation                      | 131 |
| 20. | Mean Responses to Factor Categories by Faculty<br>Classification for Job Continuation . . . . .                        | 132 |
| 21. | Mean Responses to Factor Categories by Race For Job<br>Continuation . . . . .  | 133 |
| 22. | Mean Responses to Factor Categories by Faculty<br>Classification at MU (TBI) for Job Continuation                      | 135 |
| 23. | Mean Responses to Factor Categories by Faculty<br>Classification at LU (TBI) for Job Continuation                      | 136 |
| 24. | Mean Responses to Factor Categories by Faculty<br>Classification for Considerations To Leave . .                       | 137 |
| 25. | Mean Responses to Factor Categories by Race For<br>Considerations to Leave . . . . .                                   | 138 |
| 26. | Mean Responses to Factor Categories by Faculty<br>Classification at CU (TWI) for Considerations To<br>Leave . . . . .  | 139 |
| 27. | Mean Responses to Factor Categories by Faculty<br>Classification at LU (TWI) for Considerations To<br>Leave . . . . .  | 140 |
| 28. | Mean Responses to Factor Categories by Faculty<br>Classification at MU (TBI) for Considerations To<br>Leave . . . . .  | 141 |
| 29. | Mean Responses to Factor Categories by Faculty<br>Classification at FSU (TBI) for Considerations To<br>Leave . . . . . | 142 |

|     |  |     |
|-----|--|-----|
| 30. | Tabulation of Frequencies of Response to Factors by Faculty Classification At All Universities . . . | 147 |
| 31. | Tabulation of Frequencies of Responses to Factors by Faculty Classification At MU (TBI) . . . . .    | 149 |
| 32. | Response to Factors by Faculty Classification For Job Continuation At All Universities . . . . .     | 150 |
| 33. | Response to Factors by Faculty Classification Relative to Considerations to Leave At MU (TBI)        | 151 |
| 34. | Mean Response to Factor Categories by Faculty Classification at MU (TBI) . . . . .                   | 152 |
| 35. | Tabulation of Frequencies of Response to Job Acceptance Factors by Race . . . . .                    | 157 |
| 36. | Tabulation of Frequencies of Response to Job Continuation Factors by Race . . . . .                  | 159 |
| 37. | Tabulation of Frequencies of Response to Factors by Race Relative to Considerations To Leave . . .   | 160 |
| 38. | Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Race (Family) . . . . .      | 161 |
| 39. | Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Race (Racial Factor) .       | 162 |
| 40. | Contingency Coefficients for Relationships Revealed by Chi-Square for Faculty Classifications . . .  | 172 |
| 41. | Contingency Coefficients for Relationships Revealed by Chi Square For Race . . . . .                 | 174 |
| 42. | Comparisons of Extrinsic Factors Influencing Black Faculty Employment Decisions . . . . .            | 184 |
| 43. | Comparison of Black Faculty (at TWIs) and White Faculty (at TBIs) Employment Decisions . . . .       | 186 |
| 44. | Summary of Significant Findings . . . . .  | 189 |

## Chapter I

### THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

Historically, higher education in America has been pulled in two directions by apparent dichotomous forces. On the one hand, higher education is driven by the desire and necessity to be apart from society, to be an institution in which admission and employment decisions are made on the basis of merit and capability (rather than ascription). By following this path, access to higher education became the privilege of a minority (Astin, 1982).

Early on, however, higher education officials tried to reconcile this mission of higher education with the democratic principles of equality and social justice. In order to pursue equality in higher education, colleges needed to educate not only the "best minds" or elites but also more of the masses and provide a more universal education (Astin, 1982). As Gunnar Myrdal so aptly pointed out (in 1944).. "education has always been the great hope for both the individual and society...[It] has been the main ground upon which equal opportunity for the individual could be based" (Myrdal, 1944).

The attempt to accommodate these dichotomous values created problems for higher education officials who did not

believe that colleges should become a microcosm of society. However, they realized that colleges were dependent upon society for economic, moral, intellectual, and political support. These realizations created and continue to create dilemmas for higher education officials who believe they must, on the one hand, maintain meritocratic standards for admission and employment and on the other hand, develop ways to include those who have had limited access to higher education (e.g., blacks, women, the poor). The current push for desegregation in higher education is but one more example of this dilemma.

The goal of desegregation in higher education is to provide equal access to higher education for blacks. Such access is crucial in a democratic republic in which higher education is a necessity for social and economic mobility, "a crucial vehicle for access to the mainstream of American society" (Myrdal, 1944). When we consider the developments leading to the current push for desegregation, knowledge of the history of racial segregation in American higher education contributes to our understanding.

Public systems of higher education were developed in the latter half of the 19th century as a means of democratizing higher education--making it available to the large majority of Americans (U.S. Commission on Civil

Rights, 1981). Prior to this time, higher education opportunities for blacks were limited to black normal schools developed through white philanthropic contributions to black education. Relative to public higher education, a so-called separate-but-equal system of public institutions developed primarily in southern and border states (Preer, 1982). As a result, a dual system of public higher education was established, one for whites and one for blacks.

Under the dual system, traditionally black public institutions (TBIs) were "subjected to decades of fiscal deprivation, racial discrimination...and underdevelopment" (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1981). They survived, however, and succeeded in educating generations of blacks, some of whom not only entered the mainstream of society but excelled to positions of power and leadership. However, segregation in public higher education has effectively denied equality of educational opportunity for blacks since TBIs were never provided the resources to fully provide all blacks the educational basis for moving into the mainstream.

The recognition of the need to provide blacks the vehicle for economic and social mobility led to the NAACP's deliberate legal attack on segregation. In the 1930's, the NAACP initiated a series of lawsuits to secure black

admission to traditionally white graduate and professional schools (TWIs)(Fleming, 1978). And they continued pursuing access on a case-by-case basis until the early 1950's.

In the 1950's, blacks in several states, (e.g., Kansas, Virginia, Delaware, South Carolina) through the NAACP, challenged the constitutionality of segregation in public elementary and secondary schools. The Supreme Court's landmark decision in Brown v. Board of Education emerged from this litigation. The Court concluded that "in the field of public education, the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place" (247 U.S. 495, 1954). And the Court ordered that the dual system be dismantled "with all deliberate speed."

After this decision, the NAACP focused its efforts on the desegregation of public elementary and secondary schools. However, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund continued to challenge desegregation in higher education before a determination was made about the applicability of the Brown decision to higher education (Preer, 1982). This litigation was deemed necessary to combat the newly created obstacles to black access in higher education (e.g., the requirements of admission tests, recommendations from alumni or judges).

As is common knowledge, public elementary and secondary schools were not desegregated "with all deliberate speed."



However, with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the question of whether blacks must be provided equal opportunities in education and employment was answered affirmatively. Specifically, Titles VI and VII prohibited discrimination on the basis of race (among others) in federally funded programs. The regulations which interpreted these titles require institutions receiving federal funds (including higher education institutions) to provide equal opportunities in education and employment. These regulations, however, do not require that affirmative efforts be made to include minorities.

The frustration of pushing for black access to higher education on a case-by-case basis led the NAACP Legal Defense Fund to file a class action suit against the Secretary of HEW to enforce the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The details of that litigation are provided in Chapter II, but it is important to note that it forced the court to review the options for dismantling the dual system of higher education. These options emerged from the precedents of elementary and secondary school desegregation efforts but included an "assessment of the significance of a variety of factors" peculiar to higher education ( Adams v. Richardson, 480 F 2d 1159, 1163 D.C. Cir., 1973).

One option was that faculty and students should be free to choose the universities they wanted to work at or attend. This option was predicated on the belief that a racial mix at both TWIs and TBIs would occur on a voluntary basis. Since legal barriers to desegregation had been removed by the Civil Rights Act, some believed this method would be effective. This option, however, had proved unsuccessful in the desegregation of elementary and secondary public schools. And there was really no reason to believe that this would work for higher education desegregation.

Another consideration was whether or not to eliminate traditionally black institutions (TBIs). This option was predicated on the belief that a racial mix would occur because the faculty and students at TBIs (who are primarily black) would be hired at or admitted to traditionally white institutions (TWIs) and the dual system would be eliminated. In order to believe this was a viable option, one had to make several sweeping assumptions: 1) that blacks would rush to enroll or work at TWIs rather than at TBIs; 2) that those blacks who had received inferior education in segregated public schools could meet the admissions or employment requirements at TWIs; and 3) that blacks would be welcomed at TWIs. The racial cleavage developing from the closing of black elementary and secondary schools was one

example of what could happen if TBIs were closed. Blacks actively demonstrated their anger about the displacement of black principals, other administrators, and teachers which resulted from the closing of black public schools. Another factor considered was the unique role of TBIs (as educators of the disadvantaged) as well as the hope that these institutions represent in the black community. And all of these factors indicated that eliminating TBIs was not the best mechanism for dismantling the dual system of higher education.

Another option was for states to allocate additional funds to TBIs and to increase their attractiveness to white faculty and students by placing high demand programs at TBIs. This option provided mechanisms to produce a better racial mix at TBIs, but it was recognized that these mechanisms could not contribute to increasing the numbers of blacks at TBIs. Additionally, it was recognized that increased financial resources for TBIs would not necessarily make them competitive with TWIs. Decades of deprivation and racial discrimination left many TBIs with a limited range of academic programs, inadequate facilities, missions that emphasize the provision of remedial education for disadvantaged students, faculty and administrators who were educated in inferior segregated schools, and severe fiscal

management problems (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1981). The recognition that these problems could not be solved overnight but that they could be improved in the long run, made this option a viable one.

Since the implementation of this option could not contribute to increasing the numbers of blacks at TWIs, another option was considered to supplement the enhancement of TBIs. That option involved the use of affirmative action programs at the institutional level to provide for the proportional representation of blacks in TWI student, faculty and staff populations. Such programs could be incorporated through existing management processes (e.g., personnel, budgeting) at each institution. And since such programs were required by E.O. 11246 for institutions with government contracts, this option appeared viable for the desegregation of higher education.

The Executive Order (11246) that requires affirmative action for government contractors was signed into law by President Lyndon Johnson in 1965. It requires that development of affirmative action plans which detail the steps that will be taken to "recruit, employ and promote qualified members of groups formerly excluded...The premise of the affirmative action concept...is that positive action [must be] taken to overcome the effects of systemic

institutional forms of exclusion and discrimination" (HEW, 1971). Positive action means that a "good faith effort" (an honest and sincere intention to fulfill affirmative action obligations) must be made to recruit and retain minorities (Fleming, 1978).

While affirmative action began as a requirement to undertake "good faith" efforts to employ blacks (and other minorities), it evolved into a requirement for achieving results through the establishment of numerical hiring goals and timetables for meeting these goals. Further, the interpretation of federal affirmative action statutes led some higher education officials to establish quotas for the admission and employment of blacks. These actions, in turn, led to critical attacks on the concept of affirmative action and on the specific programs designed to carry out the affirmative action mandate. "So rapid was its expansion, both as a concept and a set of operating programs, that authoritative judicial resolution of the severe disputes it provoked inevitably lagged well behind. The resulting uncertainty about what was constitutionally permissible or impermissible in the generic name of affirmative action intensified public conflict over the appropriateness of the policy." (Sindler, 1983).

Affirmative action has come to be seen as a catchword for discrimination against whites. This is partly due to liberal interpretations of Supreme Court decisions in Bakke, Weber and Fullilove which provided judicial interpretations of the legal boundaries of acceptable affirmative action (see Chapter II, Affirmative Action: Arguments For And Against).

Though it has not been determined that the enhancement of TBIs and affirmative action requirements at TWIs will eliminate the dual system of higher education, higher education managers must operate within these constraints to make "good faith efforts" toward and achieve results in faculty desegregation.

The emphasis on "good faith effort" and achievement of results in faculty (and student) desegregation resulted from the court's and the Office of Civil Rights' (part of HEW) determinations that some higher education officials were not taking appropriate affirmative action steps to desegregate. Few records about the procedures used to identify and evaluate blacks were maintained at TWIs. Black faculty at TWIs were not included on search committees or in the selection process. Few personal contacts were made to locate and recruit black faculty. TWI managers provided no additional resources for meeting the effects of supply and

demand on black faculty salaries. And Affirmative Action Officers were provided little support and few resources to do their jobs effectively. Since these limited affirmative action efforts resulted in few black faculty appointments, OCR emphasized good faith efforts and the court emphasized results in faculty desegregation (Adams v. Bell, Civ. Action No. 3095-70, D.D.C., 1983).

As a mechanism for contributing to the desegregation of higher education, affirmative action programs must be designed and implemented (through management process) to ensure that blacks are included in higher education. However, "by its very nature the practice of affirmative action imposes constraints on [those] subject to its requirements. The choice of procedures and methods for operating [higher education institutions] is limited by the requirement that any procedure selected must meet the prior test of being able to ensure" the inclusion of blacks among TWI student, faculty and staff populations (Fleming, 1978).

These constraints in addition to the necessity of dismantling the dual system of higher education present additional dilemmas for higher education managers. One of the key dilemmas is how does the university manager maintain the value consensus on merit and at the same time implement affirmative action? As is the case with all public

officials, "the operation of [their agencies] necessitate choices among alternative lines of actions, the exercise of discretion (Turner, 1971). "Statutes [or policies] may broadly guide, but they cannot precisely determine all or even most of the day-to-day decisions of [public officials]" (Turner, 1971). However, the discretion which remains with higher education managers may be utilized to maneuver within the constraints which have resulted from the "bundle of compromises" made by the legislatures and courts.

### The Role of Leadership

While managers can make changes in management processes to assist them in desegregating their faculties, they must recognize that these processes are embedded in institutional values. Consequently some of the issues about affirmative action must be addressed at the managerial or leadership level as well as at the management processes level. Effective leadership is required because management processes are not easily changed due to the values that surround the institution.

In order to desegregate their faculties, higher education managers must provide sensitive leadership in managing both the operations of their universities and their employees. Such leadership should move the institution



beyond the status quo and exclusiveness to a posture of inclusiveness. Selznick notes that the "building of special values...is the prime function of leadership" (Selznick, 1983). The successful desegregation of faculty in higher education demands changes in existing institutional structures or operations and in the behaviors of individuals. And higher education managers must assume leadership in making these changes.

Within the institution, changes must be made at two levels--in institutional values and in management processes. These changes however are "infused with values" and "whenever individuals become attached to an institution or a way of doing things..., the result is a prizing of the device for its own sake" (Selznick, 1983). According to Selznick, these commitments are costly, however, because they greatly "limit the freedom of the leadership to deploy its resources" and reduces the institution's capacity to survive under new conditions.

Relative to "infused values," TBIs have come to symbolize the aspirations of the black community, its sense of identity. Moreover, TBIs represent the hope for the future of black Americans since they have fulfilled these hopes in the past. They represent, in part, inexpensive remedial access to higher education for those who have

received inadequate education in public schools. They provide faculty employment and leadership opportunities in an environment which inherently values black culture and which values teaching. And they embody and provide a cultural experience that is absent or merely supplemental at TWIs.

TWIs also embody values--values which primarily derive from the predominantly white society in which they evolved. TWIs represent a variety of missions in higher education. Some have a regional focus while others have or seek national reputations. "The values of most faculty members are strongly oriented toward technical competence and scholarly achievement" (Bowen, 1982). The evolution of some of these institutions was based on exclusivity and a philosophy based on social Darwinism. Some reflect ethnic influences in their program offerings. And many place major emphasis on research and scholarly productivity.

Changing some of the values that are infused in these institutions will not be easy. "As an organization acquires a self, a distinctive identity, it becomes an institution. This involves the taking on of values, ways of acting, and believing that are deemed important for their own sake. After this occurs, institutional members struggle to preserve their uniqueness in the face of...altered

circumstances" (Selznick, 1983). However, higher education managers can, through effectual leadership, enhance the success of changing the structure of institutions to accommodate the requirements of desegregation.

### The Role of Management Processes

Changes must be made in management process (e.g., personnel, budgeting) in order to desegregate faculties in higher education. Such processes are difficult to change because they become routinized and entrenched. They tend to take on a power of their own. What were designed as means to an end (e.g., the recruitment and retention of employees) have become ends in themselves.

Higher education managers, however, have some leverage to make changes in personnel and budgeting systems which will enhance their chances of successfully desegregating their faculties. As is done to achieve other institutional goals, these processes must be altered in ways that will facilitate the achievement of desired ends. In this case the end is faculty desegregation and the means are structuring incentives through the personnel and budgeting processes (e.g., additional money and efforts to recruit faculty, personal and financial incentives to retain faculty).

Before incentives can be restructured, however, higher education managers need to know the factors that influence other-race faculty to accept and remain in their positions at their universities. This study is designed to provide information about other-race faculty attitudes and concerns which might assist managers to exercise their discretion within the constraints identified earlier.

Specifically, the purpose of this exploratory study is to identify the factors that influence the decisions of administrative and instructional black faculty at two traditionally white institutions (TWIs) and of administrative and instructional white faculty at two traditionally black institutions (TBIs) to accept, remain in, and consider leaving faculty positions at such institutions. (For the purposes of this study, white faculty at TBIs and black faculty at TWIs are referred to as "other-race" faculty.)

#### Significance of the Study

The magnitude of the problem of faculty desegregation has been documented and publicized nationally through the press (e.g., the Chronicle of Higher Education, the Wall Street Journal and the Washington Post). Since eighteen

state systems of higher education (listed below),<sup>1</sup> which include over 200 universities, have been required by the courts (through the Adams case) to desegregate their faculty, staff and student populations, their attempts to do so have received critical analysis by scholars and the press. Most recently, the American Council on Education published a report which re-emphasized the severity of the problem of faculty desegregation. Not only are there few blacks with Ph.D.s (approximately 3.3%) but the "number of minorities preparing for careers in higher education is rapidly declining" (Higher Education and National Affairs, 1984). So despite serious efforts to recruit black faculty to TWIs, the situation is getting worse because the potential pool of black professors is getting smaller (Wall Street Journal, 1984), departments are tenured in and enrollments and financial support are declining.

These recent developments are not reassuring, but they point to the need for higher education managers to develop more attractive incentives to attract and retain other-race faculty. This effort is made even more difficult due to the need to maintain a university consensus on other important values that may seem contradictory to affirmative action

<sup>1</sup> The eighteen state systems are: Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Florida, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Georgia, Maryland, Virginia, Alabama, Delaware, Kentucky, Missouri, Ohio, South Carolina, Texas, and West Virginia.

(e.g., merit). In order to develop incentives, they must have information about the factors that influence the attitudes and viewpoints of such faculty (e.g., is geographical location a major influence in their decisions to accept and remain in their jobs? Do they need support systems?).

The original contribution of this study to the analysis of the problem of faculty desegregation is that it provides information to managers about the attitudes and viewpoints of other-race faculty. Other-race faculty must be recruited for and retained in their faculty positions to achieve faculty desegregation. If higher education managers are to be successful in desegregating their faculties, efforts must be made to identify and understand the factors that influence the decisions of other-race faculty to accept and, more importantly, remain in faculty positions. This study examines the relationships between race and the factors in an effort to determine if black faculty at TWIs and white faculty at TBIs are influenced by similar or different factors in their employment decisions.

The findings of the study can assist higher education managers in determining whether or not they should or can change their management processes to meet the identified needs of other-race faculty. Additionally, information

about the factors that influence other-race faculty to accept, remain in and consider leaving their jobs provides managers with explanations for their relative success or failure in attracting and retaining other-race faculty.

In addition to the above, this study:

1. might create more research interest in studying the desegregation of faculty from the viewpoints of faculty;
2. generates hypotheses or theory relative to the reasons that other-race faculty accept, remain in, and consider leaving faculty positions in universities;
3. provides information useful to higher education managers in states where court-ordered affirmative action or desegregation plans are being implemented; and
4. provides insights into the strengths and weaknesses of current personnel policies and practices aimed at the desegregation of employees in both the public and private sectors.

The study of factors that influence the employment decisions of other-race faculty is both timely and relevant due to the increased emphasis by the courts, the Office of Civil Rights (OCR), and state higher education officials to

ensure that higher education managers desegregate their faculty, staff and student populations. The increased emphasis on faculty desegregation is detailed in Adams state desegregation plans for higher education and in higher education tabloids.

All Adams' state plans include descriptions of new recruitment and retention programs which are based on both state studies of the retention, attrition, promotion and tenure of other-race faculty and the affirmative action plans at individual universities. The efforts made by state officials to study the retention and attrition of other-race faculty lends support to the researcher's belief that studying faculty perceptions of the factors that influence their employment decisions is important to the successful desegregation of university faculties. Other studies did not emphasize and examine the factors that influence other-race faculty to remain in their jobs but this study does. The researcher believes that management processes can be used to influence other-race faculty to remain in their jobs.

Few research studies have been published which examine, from the viewpoints of faculty, efforts to desegregate faculties at colleges and universities. Such research includes studies of black faculty attitudes toward the



desegregation of TBIs (Jackson, 1967), and of the reasons that black educators accept and leave jobs at TWIs (Moore and Wagstaff, 1974; Swinn and Witt, 1982; Mommsen, 1974). No studies were found, however, which examine the attitudes of white faculty at TBIs.

No single study has been published which utilized a comprehensive listing of the factors that influence decisions of other-race faculty to accept, remain in, and consider leaving their positions in universities. There is a need for such a study to provide insights into the relative importance of factors which impinge upon or contribute to the desegregation of faculties in higher education. Such insights may prove useful to higher education managers who are responsible for achieving results in faculty desegregation.

#### Objectives of the Study

Specific objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To identify, from the faculty point-of-view, those factors that influence their decisions to accept, remain in and consider leaving faculty positions at universities in which they are a racial minority;
2. To determine the extent to which faculty employment decisions are influenced by factors that are

- perceived by such faculty as related to race or minority status;
3. To determine the influence of intrinsic and extrinsic factors in other-race faculty employment decisions;
  4. To determine the relationship between race and/or faculty classification and the identified factors;
  5. To examine the policy implications of affirmative action for faculty desegregation in higher education based on the findings of this study; and
  6. To provide recommendations to university policy makers for possible future action and to other scholars for future study of this important aspect of public higher education management.

### Assumptions

This study is based on the following assumptions:

1. Faculty decide to accept and remain in, as well as consider leaving, faculty positions at universities on an individual basis;
2. Such decisions are based on their perceptions of the benefits and costs associated with accepting, remaining in and leaving faculty positions at universities;

3. Issues pertaining to the minority status or race of such faculty may be influential factors in such decisions;
4. Faculty are reasonably aware of those factors that influence their employment decisions and are able to identify them; and
5. An understanding of those factors can be obtained from faculty responses to interview and survey questions.

#### Research Questions

Based on the foregoing objectives and assumptions, the following research questions guided the data collection and analysis for this study:

1. What factors do other-race faculty consider important influences in their decisions to accept faculty positions at four southeastern universities? (Four universities were selected for study from a border state in the southeast because they are representative of the majority of Adams' states.)
2. What factors do other-race faculty consider important influences in their decisions to remain at four southeastern universities?

3. What factors do other-race faculty consider as important in influencing them to consider leaving four southeastern universities?
  4. Are there differences between the factors identified through the survey of EEO, Personnel and Academic Affairs Managers<sup>2</sup> and the factors identified by other-race faculty as influencing faculty decisions to accept, remain in, and consider leaving faculty positions?
  5. How influential are the factors perceived to be associated with race in other-race faculty employment decisions?
  6. Is there a relationship between: a) faculty classification and the factors; and b) faculty classification and the categories of factors<sup>3</sup> that influence other-race faculty employment decisions?
  7. Is there a relationship between: a) race and the factors; and b) race and the categories of factors that influence other-race faculty employment decisions?
- 

<sup>2</sup> The survey, done as part of the study, requested their opinions about why other-race faculty at their universities accept, remain in or leave faculty positions.

<sup>3</sup> Factors are specific variables (e.g., climate, racial composition of the community) whereas categories of factors are the general headings under which the factors fit (e.g., geographic location).

### Limits of the Study

This study was conducted to identify, within selected groups of faculty, the factors that influence the decisions of other-race faculty to accept, remain in, and consider leaving faculty positions at four public southeastern universities. The study did not specifically examine the legality, necessity or appropriateness of personnel policies and procedures used to recruit and retain faculty at those universities. However, the findings of the study inform such policies and procedures.

The results of the study are limited to the other-race faculty at four public southeastern universities during the last half of the 1983-84 school year and are not necessarily valid for other-race faculty at other institutions of higher education. The findings, however, may be adaptable to other other-race faculty in other colleges and universities, particularly those in other southern or border-states where court-ordered affirmative action or desegregation plans are being implemented.

### Definition of Terms

Accept - agree to or regard with favor or approval the offer of a job.

Adams' States - the first group of states<sup>4</sup> identified by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) as maintaining racially segregated systems of higher education. They are: Louisiana; Mississippi; Oklahoma; Arkansas; Florida; North Carolina; Pennsylvania; Georgia; Maryland; and Virginia.

Administrative Faculty - university employees holding faculty rank whose primary responsibilities are administrative.

Considerations to Leave - to contemplate leaving a job.

Desegregation - "to eliminate provisions and practices requiring the isolation of the members of a particular race in separate" universities (Webster) and to add other-race persons to the organization.

Employment Decisions - decisions to accept and remain in and considerations to leave employment at universities.

Instructional Faculty - university employees holding faculty rank whose primary responsibilities are teaching, research and service.

Other-Race Faculty - a racially-identifiable group of administrative and instructional faculty who constitute a numerical minority at higher education institutions. For the purposes of this study, they are white faculty at

---

<sup>4</sup> The second group of states, identified in 1980, are: Texas, Alabama, Delaware, South Carolina, Missouri, Kentucky, West Virginia and Ohio.

traditionally black institutions and black faculty at traditionally white institutions.

Remain In - continue in some place or position/job.

Revised Order Number 4 - an order issued by the Department of Labor in 1972 which required colleges and universities, as federal contractors, to develop affirmative action plans.

### Overview of the Study

Chapter 1 is the first of five chapters presented in this study. Chapter 2, the Review of Literature, contains background information about desegregation in higher education as well as a brief review of organizational behavior research related to the factors that influence employees to accept, remain in and leave their jobs. Chapter 3 describes the methodology employed in this study. Chapter 4 presents the results of the data analysis and Chapter 5, contains the conclusions relative to why other-race faculty accept, remain in, and consider leaving faculty positions at four southeastern universities and recommendations for action and future research.

## Chapter II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### Background

In order to determine the status of the research related to the primary questions of this study, a detailed review of the literature was undertaken. This review describes the research that is applicable to this study in several broad areas. These areas include: 1) higher education desegregation court cases; 2) obstacles to faculty desegregation; 3) arguments for and against affirmative action; 4) the role of recruitment and retention in faculty desegregation; 5) job/organization choice; 6) organizational commitment; 7) job satisfaction; 8) employee turnover; and 9) faculty mobility. The first three areas of literature provide background information for the study of faculty desegregation. Several studies in the latter four areas of literature provide the conceptual framework for this study while others are directly related to the problem under study.



### Higher Education Desegregation Court Cases

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka is the court case most referred to in discussions about the desegregation of elementary and secondary public schools (247 U.S. 483, 1954). In this case, the U.S. Supreme Court concluded that "in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' [established in Plessy v. Ferguson, (163 U.S. 537, 1896)] has no place. Separate education facilities are inherently unequal." (Supra at 495). Because the issue in Brown was segregation in elementary and secondary schools, the applicability of the decision to higher education was challenged many times in the courts.

The court case most noted relative to the desegregation of public higher education is Adams v. Richardson (356 F. Supp. 92, D.D.C., 1973). In this case, the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc. (LDF) filed a class action<sup>5</sup> suit on behalf of black students (one being Kenneth Adams), citizens and taxpayers against the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW). The LDF charged that HEW had not effectively administered Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VI of the act

<sup>5</sup> A class action is a lawsuit brought by a representative member(s) of a large group of persons on behalf of all the members of the group. The Adams class action extended initially to ten states operating dual (segregated) systems of higher education (and later to eighteen such systems).

states:

No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, or be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. (42 U.S.C., sec. 2000d, 1976).

In actions said to have placed an executive agency in "judicial receivership"<sup>6</sup> the U.S. District Court in D.C. found HEW's enforcement performance inadequate and ordered HEW to "institute compliance procedures against ten state-operated systems of higher education within 60 days" and to "make periodic reports to the Legal Defense Fund on their activities" (Edwards and Nordin, 1979). The ten states initially found by the court to be operating segregated systems of higher education, in violation of Title VI were: Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, North Carolina, Florida, Arkansas, Pennsylvania, Georgia, Maryland, and Virginia.

On appeal to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals (D.C.) in 1973, the court modified the injunction and required HEW officials to have the officials in the ten states develop and submit desegregation plans. In providing HEW additional time to obtain acceptable desegregation plans, the Circuit Court observed that "HEW must carefully assess the

<sup>6</sup> "...allowing a single federal judge--and a handful of private civil rights lawyers--to determine how [HEW] should enforce civil rights laws Congress has confided to the agency's responsibility." (Rabkin, 1984).

significance of a variety of new factors as it moves into an unaccustomed area." Adams v. Richardson, 480 F.2d 1159, 1163 (D.C. Cir. 1973). In June, 1974, HEW accepted eight of the ten desegregation plans and referred the plans of Louisiana and Mississippi to the Justice Department for enforcement.

Three years later (1977), the Adams' plaintiffs returned to court to challenge HEW's acceptance of the eight desegregation plans. (Adams v. Califano, 430 F. Supp. 118, D.D.C., 1977). The court found and HEW admitted that the plans accepted by HEW in 1974 were inadequate. The court, in a bold example of judicial policymaking, ordered HEW to develop criteria for acceptable desegregation plans. The policymaking aspect of the court order was apparent and its directive was that HEW should consider "the unique importance of black colleges" (430 F. Supp. at 120). (See Appendix C)

The criteria developed by HEW were applicable only to six of the eight states under review because Pennsylvania officials were negotiating with HEW, and Maryland officials had obtained a temporary injunction against further HEW enforcement (Mandell v. U.S. Department of HEW, 411 F. Supp. 542, D. Md., 1976.)

The criteria for desegregation focused on three major objectives:

1. the disestablishment of the structure of the dual system of higher education;
2. the desegregation of student enrollments; and
3. the desegregation of faculty, administrative staffs, non-academic personnel and governing boards.

Relative to the first criterion, officials in Adams' state systems of higher education were required to: define university missions on a basis other than race; provide comparable resources; eliminate unnecessary non-core academic program duplication among TBIs and TWIs in the same service areas; and place new programs at TBIs which are consistent with their missions (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1981). The goal is to "develop TBIs so that they can become integral components of state systems, able to attract [people] of all races on the basis of the quality of their academic programs (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1981).

NOTE: For the purposes of this dissertation, the role of TBIs reveals the intricate complexity of affirmative action. The Adams litigation which began in support of a student's right to an integrated education soon raised questions about the legitimacy of TBIs. Issues of individual rights were

transformed into issues of institutional survival under the magic wand of affirmative action. Historically, TBIs had born the heat of the day in educating generations of blacks under a regime of separate-but-equal. Once TBIs were open to blacks, it was inevitable that questions should arise about the need, and indeed, the legitimacy of TBIs.

Several troublesome issues emerged relative to the legitimacy of TBIs:

1. The NAFEO brief (Appendix C) suggests questions of black institutional identity which enjoys no constitutional protection; these questions were hopelessly confused with questions of the individual rights of black students which are constitutionally protected;
2. As noted earlier, HEW set out to define the mission of TBIs on some basis other than race, yet had to do so under a court order that protected the traditional character of TBIs; and
3. The rights of individual blacks were on a collision course with sentiment in the black community of loyalty toward TBIs (and therefore to the faculty of TBIs whether black or white) for previous services rendered as well as for current services rendered. Also there was a danger the upshot of integration for

some blacks would result in net decline in the population of college educated blacks. The problem of fewer college educated blacks would be a social and political problem of the first order, but its status as a matter of constitutional law is not clear.

Though Rabkin (1984) (in a critique of the requirements for and the court's role in desegregation) said that "a successful process of integration, by its nature, would end the existence of [TBIs], at least as distinctly black institutions," these criteria were "designed to bring black access to higher education to parity with white access" (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1981). And since the majority of college-educated blacks have received their educations at TBIs, and TBIs currently provide the greatest access to higher education for blacks, their maintenance is crucial (Carnegie Council, 1975).

Using the above criteria, state desegregation plans were coordinated by state higher education officials and HEW accepted the revised plans of Arkansas, Florida, Oklahoma and Virginia.

However, in 1983, the Adams' plaintiffs returned to court (for the third time) claiming that the Department of Education (formerly part of HEW) had not made adequate

enforcement efforts to ensure progress toward desegregation as ordered by the court in 1977. (Adams v. Bell, Civ. Action No. 3095-70, D.D.C., 1983). The court ordered the Department of Education "to commence not later than September 15, 1984, formal Title VI enforcement proceedings against any state which has failed to achieve substantial progress [toward desegregation] in the 1983-84 academic year" (Civ. Action No. 3095-70, D.D.C., 1983). The injunction applies to Arkansas, Georgia, Oklahoma, Florida, and Virginia.

Though this injunction applies only to five states, currently, officials in eighteen<sup>7</sup> state systems of higher education are attempting to desegregate their systems. And the desegregation of faculties has become a major problem.

#### Obstacles to the Desegregation of Faculty in Higher Education

While the foregoing constitutes the legal background of the problems in desegregating higher education, several other factors have been obstacles to the desegregation of faculty.

---

<sup>7</sup> A 1980 D.C. District Court consent order required the Department of Education to issue findings of compliance or non-compliance with Title VI for the states of Alabama, Delaware, Kentucky, Missouri, Ohio, South Carolina, Texas and West Virginia.

The desegregation of faculty requires affirmative action in the recruitment, selection, and retention of black faculty at TWIs. "Affirmative action requires that [university managers] expand their recruitment by making special efforts to see that blacks [and other minorities] are notified of employment opportunities, have a fair opportunity to apply and be considered, and once hired, have a fair opportunity for promotion" (Fleming, 1978).

While TBI managers must provide such opportunities to white faculty, they are not required by OCR or the courts to make additional efforts to desegregate their faculties. Such is the case because white faculty are generally well represented among the faculty at TBIs and the courts have agreed with U.S. education officials that efforts must be made to maintain the viability of TBIs. (See Appendix C.) Therefore, the majority of the remaining discussion about the obstacles to the desegregation of faculty in higher education pertains to TWIs.

During the rapid growth period in higher education (the 1960's), affirmative action was not required in higher education since the regulation that requires it was not issued until 1972 (Carnegie Council, 1975). Faculty vacancies were not advertised or publicized. Consequently, only selected persons were told about such vacancies.



Additionally, while managers at TWIs responded to the civil rights movement of the 1960's by admitting more black students, "many did not alter their hiring practices to make their faculties more reflective of the society at large" (Fleming, 1978).

Subsequent to Revised Order No. 4, (which was issued by the Department of Labor in 1972 and required colleges and universities as federal contractors to take affirmative action), progress toward desegregation has been minimal. As noted by Wamsley and Zald (1973), "change does not come easily in a public organization or policy subsystem [in this case, personnel practices] either by dint of its manipulation or impingements of the environment" (in this case, Revised Order No. 4). Requirements for affirmative action for desegregation in higher education were certainly environmental impingements and little was done by higher education managers to manipulate their personnel policies to achieve results.

Now that higher education institutions are required by law to desegregate, the stabilization and decline of enrollment growth and of federal and state financial support present additional obstacles to desegregation. Over the past several years, higher education managers have made fewer faculty appointments and some have even contemplated

reductions in faculty (Carnegie Council, 1975). It appears, however, that while faculty "hiring will [decline] in the near future, it will gradually increase over the next twenty-five years" (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1984). Therefore, at least some of the obstacles which now limit faculty mobility, and consequently faculty desegregation, may be surmounted through adequate planning.

Another obstacle to the desegregation of faculty at TWIs has been the limited availability of blacks for such positions. Approximately 3.3% of all Ph.D.s, since 1973, have been awarded to blacks (ISEP, 1978). And while the numbers of black Ph.D.'s is increasing, it was recently determined that "the number of minorities preparing for careers in higher education is rapidly declining" (Higher Education and National Affairs, 1984). "So despite active recruiting by [predominantly] white colleges, the situation is getting worse because the potential pool of black professors is getting smaller" (Wall Street Journal, 1984).

Additionally, both private and public sector employers are competing to hire blacks with graduate degrees. Faculty employment requirements in higher education (e.g., advanced graduate degrees in particular disciplines and specialties; experience in teaching; and publication records), coupled with past limited access to education for blacks, have

served to limit further the number of blacks who can compete for faculty positions.

Affirmative Action: Arguments For and Against

Other obstacles to the desegregation of faculty at TWIs can be identified when one reviews the criticisms of affirmative action in higher education. The criticisms and the response to such criticisms reflect the strong feelings that are aroused by affirmative action programs which are designed to compensate for past injustices to blacks.

One major criticism is that affirmative action regulations represent an "unwarranted intervention" by federal government officials in the recruitment, selection and retention practices of academia (Roche, 1974; Hook, 1975 and Sowell, 1975). According to Steele and Green (1976), "The federal affirmative action program has imposed employment regulations on academic hiring practices that derive more from general societal values than from academic goals."

Further, critics of affirmative action allege that affirmative action and merit are antithetical (Seabury, 1973). "The defenders of [merit] insist that the most qualified individual should be selected for a faculty position without the intervention of such irrelevant

criteria as race or sex." (Fleming, 1978). To utilize such criteria, they claim, is to engage in "reverse discrimination" and to lower faculty selection standards" (Hook, 1974; Gross, 1977).

Other criticisms include:

1. affirmative action goals are actually quotas (Roche, 1974);
2. affirmative actions taken to hire blacks for faculty positions at TWIs result in a "brain drain" of TBIs (Roche, 1974);
3. affirmative action has no positive benefits in terms of costs and results for TWIs, particularly in an era of retrenchment (Sowell, 1975); and
4. affirmative action has no positive educational benefits for TWIs (Hook, 1974).

While the above criticisms of the affirmative action requirements for desegregation focus on federal interference with higher education management, another criticism of Roche's focuses on the inherent problems of "treating people as members of groups rather than as individuals." Roche notes that one of the "cornerstones of American self-assumption is that each person...will be judged as an individual, on the basis of his merit." Additionally, Roche admonishes that a "quota, goal, guideline or whatever that

enforces hiring [or promotion] preferences according to...race can do so only be denying otherwise qualified candidates proper consideration..." (Roche, 1974). In this sense, through affirmative action, historical discrimination is brought to bear on contemporary whites who did not contribute to that discrimination. These criticisms highlight the difficulties higher education managers face in dealing with these apparently conflicting values. And one need not be considered a racist for recognizing that the values important in universities (f.g., merit, affirmative action) oftentimes are in conflict. Such a realization makes it even more important for managers to provide sensitive leadership in managing these conflicting values.

Such criticisms raise some very unsettling questions about the appropriateness of affirmative action and court-ordered desegregation. Dr. John E. Fleming, a noted scholar on higher education desegregation, responded to the foregoing criticisms in several ways. His response is based on an extensive study of affirmative action progress (as of 1978) in higher education. The criticisms of affirmative action and Fleming's response exemplify the polarity of views on this issue.

Relative to the criticism of unwarranted federal intervention, Fleming notes that such criticisms are

"directed mainly at affirmative action and not other forms of intervention that are viewed as helping higher education." He argues that "federal intervention is essential if higher education is to be opened to all" since "academicians made no serious effort to bring blacks into the academe" after segregation was declared unconstitutional (Fleming, 1978).

Relative to charges of reverse discrimination and the criticism that pits affirmative action against merit, Fleming argues that: 1) "university officials have not behaved meritocratically"; 2) a "vast majority of those hired are white males"; and 3) there are "no real objective criteria for selection" of faculty. Additionally, Fleming states emphatically that since race (or being part of a racial group) was the "criterion in limiting the career opportunities for black scholars, such exclusion necessarily warrants the consideration of race [or being part of a racial group] as a means to rectify this injustice." He also states that faculty selection standards are "not lowered but broadened" by affirmative action recruitment and selection processes (Fleming, 1978).

Another criticism, which has been attributed primarily to the Jewish community, is that goals are actually quotas. This criticism is of particular significance since blacks

and Jews, who have long been allies in the struggle for civil rights, are pitted against one another on this issue. However, Fleming responds to this criticism by saying that... "Goals and timetables are definitely not quotas" (Fleming, 1978). They are not "rigid and inflexible quotas which must be met, but [are] targets attainable by means of applying every good faith effort to make all aspects of the entire affirmative action program work" (HEW, 1971). Fleming goes on to acknowledge that the "word 'quota' evokes from many educators bitter memories of religious and ethnic exclusion from colleges and universities in days past" (e.g., Jews). Despite the obstacle of quotas, there is a high concentration of Jewish students and faculty in higher education institutions. However, the goals established to include blacks may be viewed by Jews as a means to further limit their inclusion in colleges and universities (Roche, 1974).

Fleming goes on to note that Mommsen's study, "which was designed to measure the effects of the 'brain drain' [on TBIs], reported that the loss of black scholars to white institutions was small in relation to the number of black Ph.D.s who stay on black campuses" (Fleming, 1978).

In discussing the costs and benefits of affirmative action, Fleming acknowledges the costs but admonishes that

"the costs...should not be evaluated in a vacuum" but should be evaluated in light of the total costs of federal program implementation. He also notes that "the very presence of minorities brings a much needed racial and ethnic diversity to academia. These minorities can and do serve as effective role models for both black and white students."

The polarity of views described above relative to affirmative action emerged in three Supreme Court cases which sought to clarify the legal boundaries of permissible affirmative action relative to education, employment, and minority business enterprises (Bakke, Weber, and Fullilove). The texts of and decisions in these court cases reflect the dilemma faced by justices who are "torn between the ingrained [American] ideology of individualism and equality and the pressing claims for new realization of social justice with the inherent corrective inequalities that that entails" (Maguire, 1980).

Supreme Court Justice Powell, who delivered the opinion in Bakke, stated that the University of California, Davis' voluntary affirmative action program was "flawed" in its disregard for individual rights as guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. Since Davis had not been determined to have discriminated against minorities and its program was structured so that whites could not compete for a portion of



Davis' admission slots, Powell said the individual rights of whites were denied. Powell also noted the "inequity in forcing innocent persons...to bear the burden of redressing past grievances not of their making (438 U.S. 265).

However, Powell appears ultimately to compromise on individual rights and to have worked out of an implied assumption that individual goals and opportunities may at times be sacrificed for significant social purpose [substantial or compelling state interest]. This is apparent when he says that race may be a "plus" in the admissions decision and acknowledges the educational value of diversity among students. "A monolithic environment," says Powell, "would not prepare students for the culturally diversified nation and world into which they graduate."

In a dissenting opinion, Brennan challenged Powell's notion that illegal program discrimination must precede the use of voluntary affirmative action programs. He said that it is sufficient that illegal discrimination occurred in "society at large." Brennan indicated that the state has a substantial state interest for using race-conscious remedies to compensate for past racial discrimination.

Relative to the legal boundaries of affirmative action in employment, the Supreme Court, in Weber, (1979) decided that Title VII "does not forbid voluntary affirmative action

agreements that accord racial preference" (443 U.S. 193). Specifically, the Court upheld a private sector corporation's (Kaiser Aluminum) use of goals designed to include blacks in their training programs. The Court appears to have "recognized the need to eliminate traditional patterns of racial segregation [which are] patterned, hierarchical and systemic" (Maguire, 1980). The elimination of such systemic discrimination requires the kind of restructuring that the Kaiser plan provides (Maguire, 1980).

In determining the limits of affirmative action in this case, the Court examined the legislative history of Title VII--the balancing act involved in its creation. It was discovered that several amendments were rejected that would have prohibited "so-called reverse discrimination." And while Title VII does not require the use of race-conscious remedies for past racial discrimination, it does not prohibit their use.

Brennan, who wrote the opinion of the Court, also emphasized that "a thing may be within the letter of the statute and yet not within the spirit nor intention of its maker" (Holy Trinity v U.S., 143 U.S. 457, 459, 1892). The intention of Title VII's maker (Congress) was to end systemic, unjust discrimination against blacks. And the

Court leaned heavily on the spirit of the law rather than the letter of the law.

Relative to the constitutionality of Congress' minority set-aside program (Fullilove v. Klutznick, 448 U.S. 448, 1980), the Court upheld the "limited use of racial and ethnic criteria" as a "constitutionally permissible means of remedying the present effects of past racial discrimination." The Court decided that the adverse affects on those who do not receive preference are not by themselves sufficient grounds for invalidating affirmative action programs.

What emerged from these decisions was the importance of pursuing not only the letter but the spirit of the law. By deciding these issues on a case-by-case basis, the courts lead us to question whether we can flatly decide that what is called affirmative action is legal and appropriate in all situations. It appears that as affirmative action methods differ, their legality must be determined.

Thus far it has been determined through the cases discussed above that:

1. while race may be a "plus" in admissions decisions, admissions slots cannot be segregated solely for minorities;

2. voluntary affirmative action plans may be utilized in the private sector where it is clear that an employer has practiced racial discrimination; and
3. Congress, through its spending power, may establish benchmarks for minority inclusion in the economic benefits of business.

Generally, what is gleaned from all three cases is that the Court has interpreted the law as allowing for the limited use of racial and ethnic criteria as a means of remedying the present effects of past racial discrimination. The notion of color blindness is wholly inadequate for this purpose.

Most significantly for this study, affirmative action for the desegregation of higher education appears to fall within the range of permissible affirmative action. Equal opportunity is not enough to ensure black access to higher education. "The ideology of equal opportunity assumes that competition in the real world is pure. There is no bias. There are no carefully regarded monopolies of power. [Children] of distinguished alumni and [children] of peasants are all treated the same" (Maguire, 1980).

While this reflects an American hope and dream, it does not reflect the reality of a nation (and its institutions) that has only recently acknowledged the need to include

those who have had limited access to quality education and employment. The recognition of this reality has led to the establishment of programs designed to compensate for injustices predicated upon race (e.g., affirmative action) which have, in turn, aroused criticisms about their legality and appropriateness.

It should be noted that affirmative action and the desegregation guidelines have also been criticized for not going far enough in eliminating the vestiges of past discrimination and for their "failure to increase the numbers of traditionally underrepresented minority...faculty members in higher education." However, no single program or policy could accomplish that monumental feat (Reed, 1982).

Regardless of whether one agrees with the arguments for or against affirmative action, the criticisms (e.g., affirmative action is reverse discrimination, antithetical to merit and individual rights) are reflective of or influential in the attitudes and actions of some academic managers and have produced greater obstacles to the desegregation of faculty at TWIs. Roy I. Jones found that the majority of academic department heads in southern and border states agreed with the criticisms (Jones, 1981).

Certainly, the obstacles to the desegregation of faculties at TWIs noted above have limited the desegregation

of higher education. In order to surmount these obstacles, higher education managers have developed affirmative action change strategies which describe the interventions to be made, by whom and in what time frame to desegregate faculties at their universities. Their efforts are briefly described in the following section. While these change strategies will certainly assist in the desegregation of faculty, the manager's dilemma of managing the conflicting values addressed above is not lessened. In fact, sensitive leadership is essential for the effective implementation of these strategies.

#### Role of Recruitment and Retention in the Desegregation of Faculty

If colleges and university managers are to be successful in desegregating their faculties, particular attention must be given to personnel recruitment and retention policies and practices. Good faith efforts must be made to recruit and retain other-race faculty. In order to do so, managers must be aware of the factors that influence other-race faculty to accept, remain in, and consider leaving their faculty positions. It is possible that other-race faculty decisions to accept positions at and leave such universities are influenced by their perceptions of personnel policies and practices.

Higher education administrators have placed major emphasis, heretofore, on recruitment practices. Detailed procedures for advertising and filling positions have included the oversight and approval of top university managers and AA/EEO officials. Additionally, academic department chairpersons have been required to demonstrate that they have searched for black applicants for all positions advertised in TWIs. The additional costs of such recruitment activities have been supported through university budgeting processes. Additionally, it should be noted that TWI managers recently have developed activities designed to assist them in recruitment and retaining black faculty (e.g., vita banks, salary supplements, reduced teaching loads and secretarial support for blacks having completed All But [the] Dissertation [ABD]).

The above initiatives have been only moderately successful in faculty desegregation. However, since a recent study on faculty turnover trends revealed that higher education managers must plan now for a resurgence in faculty hiring over the next twenty-five years, the opportunities for increased faculty desegregation are forthcoming (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1984).

The above change strategies and initiatives utilized by state and university managers provide support for the

researcher's belief that emphasis on both recruitment and retention are crucial to faculty desegregation in higher education. It is even more important to know whether or not such initiatives are influential in the employment decisions of other-race faculty.

Organization Behavior: Job/Organization Choice, Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Turnover

Since this study focused on the factors that influence other-race faculty to: 1) accept 2) remain in and 3) consider leaving faculty positions at universities, the researcher examined significant studies in the areas of: 1) job and organization choice; 2) organizational commitment and job satisfaction; and 3) turnover. While the researcher did not seek to test models developed in these areas, the review of this literature provided a theoretical framework for organizing and conceptualizing the problem under study, and background information for developing data-collection instruments and for categorizing and analyzing responses to these instruments.

Job/Organization Choice

Most research on job choice is focused on the organizational activities associated with recruitment and selection rather than on the individual choice process



(Wanous, 1977). "Although representatives of organizations need to devise methods for attracting and choosing new members, the individual must also make a decision to choose one [organization] and job over others... (O'Reilly and Caldwell, 1980). The question is on what basis (bases) does an individual make this decision?

Several studies in job/organization choice have focused on the information sought by the individual and how the information is used (Vroom, 1966; Sheard, 1970) and on testing the predictive ability of job choice theories (Huber, et al, 1971 [expectancy theory] and Vroom and Deci, 1971; Misra and Kalro, 1972 [dissonance theory]). The results of the study by Huber et al. supports Vroom's findings that a person's attitude toward an object can be predicted from measures of his/her goals or values and of his/her beliefs regarding the instrumentality of the object for the attainment of these goals or values. Relative to job/organization choice, people will choose the organization which they perceive has the greatest probability of leading to outcomes that they desire.

Those who tested dissonance theory relative to job/organization choice found that the attractiveness of the chosen organization increased and that of the unchosen organization decreased significantly (from before to after

choice). These findings support Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance which states that it occurs when an individual comes to terms with his/her choice of one object or situation over another (Festinger, 1957).

Additionally, studies have examined the influence of extrinsic and intrinsic factors on job/organization choice and subsequent commitment and job satisfaction. These studies adapted Herzberg's two-factor theory (1966) and applied it to the relationship between job/organization choice and subsequent organizational commitment and job dissatisfaction. Herzberg's "motivating" factors were labeled intrinsic and his "hygiene" factors were labeled extrinsic. Intrinsic factors are capable of increasing an individual's motivation and satisfaction with his/her job (e.g., interest in the job, job responsibilities, advancement opportunities). And extrinsic factors can keep employees from becoming dissatisfied (e.g., family, finances, salary, geographical location).

Prior to several authors noting the substantive problems with Herzberg's theory<sup>8</sup> (King, 1970; Locke, 1976),

---

<sup>8</sup> These authors noted the difficulty in determining which variables are extrinsic or intrinsic and the problem in distinguishing between variables/factors which satisfy or dissatisfy. As used in the dissertation, extrinsic and intrinsic factors serve as conceptual frameworks for categorizing the factors that influence other-race faculty employment decisions.

it generally had been found that the intrinsic aspects of work contributed to greater satisfaction than did the extrinsic aspects (Dunnette, et al, 1967).

However, several studies conducted in the 1970's illustrated the influence of extrinsic factors on organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Staw (1974) found that the removal of extrinsic pressures (the draft) increased the commitment of ROTC cadets. And two studies, published in 1975, revealed that when a person perceives his/her job choice to be based on extrinsic constraints, the person is less satisfied and less committed once on the job (Lepper and Greene; Wortman). Further, it appears that work that is done for instrumental (extrinsic) reasons--e.g., pay--is less satisfying (Deci, 1972; Calder and Staw, 1975).

In a more recent study, O'Reilly and Caldwell (1980) more specifically identified the intrinsic and extrinsic factors that influence people to accept jobs. Intrinsic factors included: job responsibilities; interest in the job itself; personal feelings about the job; and opportunities for advancement. Extrinsic factors included factors external to the individual which place pressures on him/her to choose. They were: family; finances; geographical location; advice from others; and salary. Misra and Kalro (1972) used a similar schema to examine cognitive

consistency in organization choice. In that study, the intrinsic factors were advancement, autonomy, growth, prestige, responsibility, and the opportunity to use special abilities. The extrinsic factors were fringe benefits, work-group and working conditions and competence of the supervisor.

While O'Reilly and Caldwell concluded that both intrinsic and extrinsic factors are positively related to subsequent job satisfaction and commitment, they also found that MBA students who made job choices based on extrinsic job features (e.g., salary and geographic location) expressed greater satisfaction and organizational commitment than those who made job choices based on intrinsic factors.

These studies of the influence of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on job choice produced conflicting results. While pre-1970 studies found choices made based on intrinsic factors to be most influential in subsequent job satisfaction and organizational commitment, post-1970 studies revealed that when choices are based on extrinsic factors, employees are no less satisfied or committed.

It is possible that extrinsic factors are more valued by current employees than they were by those employed before 1970. This hypothesis will be tested for other-race faculty as the influence of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on them is examined.

The review of these studies was helpful in framing the problem under study--that is, for determining the variables or factors that might influence other-race faculty employment decisions. And since these studies did not provide data or results by race, this study might determine whether intrinsic or extrinsic factors primarily influence other-race faculty job/organization choices.

#### Organizational Commitment

An employee's commitment to the organization and satisfaction with his/her job are factors that influence the employee to remain. In order to provide a conceptual framework for this area, it was necessary to examine the variables which have been determined to influence organizational commitment and job satisfaction. "Employees come to organizations with certain needs, desires, etc. and expect to find an environment where they can use their abilities and satisfy many of their basic needs. Whether or not the organization provides vehicles for such satisfaction affects commitment levels." (Mowday, et al., 1982.)

Mowday, et al. differentiate between job satisfaction ("which is one's response either to one's job or to certain aspects of one's job") and organizational commitment which has to do with the "employees identification and linkages to

the goals and values of the organization." Organization commitment might, in fact, be an antecedent to job satisfaction (Bateman and Strasser, 1984).

The theory underlying commitment suggests that committed people are more likely to remain within the organization and to work toward goal attainment (Mowday, et al.). The influence of four categories of variables on organizational commitment emerged in the literature: personal characteristics; job- or role-related variables; work experiences; and structural variables.

Among the personal characteristics, age and tenure in the organization were found to be positively related to commitment (See Table 1 to locate theorists). Education was inversely related to commitment and gender was positively related (women are more committed than men).

Relative to job- or role-related variables, it was found that the more challenging the job, the more committed the individual.

Work experiences were also found to affect organizational commitment. When the employee perceives that: 1) the organization is dependable; 2) (s)he is personally important to the organization; 3) his/her expectations are met; 4) there is pay equity; and/or 5) (s)he has increasing social involvement with colleagues,

TABLE 1

## Summary of Literature on Organizational Commitment

| <u>Topic/Variable</u>                       | <u>Author(s)</u>             | <u>Findings Rel. to Org. Com.</u>  |
|---|------------------------------|--|
| <u>Personal Characteristics</u>             |                              |  |
| age, tenure,<br>length of<br>service        | (a) Angle & Perry, 1981      | positively<br>related (the<br>longer the<br>employee stays<br>& the older<br>(s)he is, the<br>greater the<br>commitment. |
|   | (b) Brown, 1969              |  |
|   | (c) Hall, et al., 1970       |  |
|   | (d) Hrebiniak, 1974          |  |
|   | (e) Lee, 1971                |  |
|   | (f) Morris & Sherman, 1981   |  |
|   | (g) Sheldon, 1971            |  |
| education                                   | (a) above                    | inversely<br>related (the<br>higher the<br>education<br>level, the<br>less com-<br>mitted.                               |
|   | (f) above                    |  |
|   | (h) Morris & Steers, 1980    |  |
|   | (i) Steers, 1977             |  |
| gender                                      | (a) above                    | positively<br>related<br>(women more<br>committed<br>than men.   |
|   | (j) Grusky, 1966             |  |
|   | (k) Hrebiniak & Alutto, 1972 |  |
| <u>Job- or Role-Related Characteristics</u> |                              |  |
| job challenge                               | (b) above                    | the more<br>challenging<br>the job, the<br>more committed<br>the employee.   |
|   | (l) Buchanon, 1974           |  |
|   | (c) above                    |  |
|   | (m) Hall & Schneider, 1972   |  |
|   | (n) Marsh & Mannari, 1977    |  |
|   | (i) above                    |  |
|   | (o) Steers & Spencer, 1977   |  |
|   | (p) Stevens, et al., 1978    |  |
| <u>Work Experiences</u>                     |                              |  |
| dependable                                  | (d) above                    | when employees<br>can depend on<br>the organiza-<br>tion (job se-<br>curity), they<br>are more<br>committed.             |
| organization                                | (h) above                    |  |
|   | (i) above                    |  |

Table 1 (cont'd)

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| personal importance                                       | (h) above<br>(i) above                                | employee perception of importance in the organization related to increased commitment. |
| met expectations  | (i) above<br>(j) above                                | when employee expectations are met in the organization, commitment increases.          |
| pay equity  | (l) above<br>(q) Rhodes & Steers, 1983                | pay equity positively related.   |
| social involvement  | (g) above<br>(h) above<br>(r) Rotondi, 1975           | the more social involvement, the more committed the employee feels.                    |
| role conflict/overload                                    | (s) Morris & Koch, 1979<br>(t) Morris & Sherman, 1981 | role conflict or overload leads to reduced commitment.                                 |
| <u>Structural Characteristics</u><br>structural variables | (p) above   | size, union presence, span of control not significantly related to commitment.         |
| participation in decision-making                          | (q) above   | increased participation related to increased commitment.                               |



(s)he is more likely to be increasingly committed to the organization. However, when the employee experiences role conflict or role overload, (s)he is less committed.

While structural characteristics such as size, union presence, and span of control were found not to be significantly related to organization commitment, increased participation in decision making was related to increased commitment (Rhodes and Steers, 1983).

While the findings of these studies are not conflicting and identify variables that influence organizational commitment, they provide no clear direction for assessing the influence of a variety of factors on employee organizational commitment. The lack of clear direction may be accounted for by the different methodologies used in studying this problem.

The major significance of these studies to the present study is that they identify variables that might influence other-race faculty to remain in their jobs (e.g., sex, age, job challenge, social involvement, feelings of importance, participation in decision-making). And since these studies do not provide results by race, this study might determine which variables influence other-race faculty decisions to remain in their jobs as well as the influence of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on their decisions.

### Job Satisfaction

How the employee responds to his/her job or some aspect of the job is an expression of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is a multidimensional concept encompassing the attitudes an employee has toward such important variables as the organization, immediate supervision, financial rewards, fellow employees, and the job. Employees also have attitudes related to the work environment, job security or uncertainty, prestige of the department or organization, and organization location. Their attitudes toward these factors are indicative of their apathy or enthusiasm toward the activities and objectives of the organization and influence them to either remain with the organization or leave it.

While there are numerous studies on this topic (some of which were noted in the preceding sections of this study), several theorists have examined factors more relevant to this study (e.g., job content [intrinsic] and context [extrinsic] factors; race).

As noted earlier, Herzberg (1966) proposed that factors associated with the job context (hygiene factors) can keep employees from becoming dissatisfied while factors associated with the job content (motivators) are capable of increasing an individual's motivation and satisfaction with his/her job.

Building on Herzberg's findings and on Friedlander's (1964) study of college students, Starcevich (1972) found that job content (intrinsic) factors were more important for job satisfaction and dissatisfaction while job context (extrinsic) factors were of minor importance. In his study, job content factors included feelings of achievement, use of abilities, challenge, growth on the job, and recognition/rewards. Job context factors included fringe benefits, home life, merit increases (salary), work load, and technical competence of supervisors.

The variables identified in these studies are similar to those identified in studies on job choice and commitment. Two things are apparent: 1) intrinsic factors are as important for job satisfaction as they are for job choice and organizational commitment; and 2) the variables that influence employee job choice decisions (e.g., advancement, salary, job challenge) are important influences in organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

While the majority of studies on job satisfaction in general have yielded consistent findings, the findings of studies which examined the relationship between race and job satisfaction are somewhat inconsistent (Moch, 1980).

Slocum and Strawser (1972) found that blacks report more need dissatisfaction than whites (in organizations

where blacks are in the minority). Similar findings were reported by O'Reilly and Roberts (1973), Smith, et al. (1974), Weaver (1974) and Milutinovich (1977).

However, another study in 1972 revealed that the job attitudes of blacks are not markedly different from those of whites. Where there are differences, blacks are slightly more satisfied (Greenhaus and Gavin). In this study it was noted that blacks generally have more favorable expectations of job related rewards than do whites.

A later study by Gavin and Ewen (1974) provided support for Greenhaus and Gavin's findings. It revealed that while blacks are significantly more satisfied than whites, blacks and whites in similar jobs demonstrate highly similar job attitudes.

Moch (1980) sought to explain the differential satisfaction by race and found that social and social psychological factors are statistically significant relative to blacks when race is controlled. Social (extrinsic) factors include interpersonal relationships with and treatment by co-workers where as social psychological (intrinsic) factors include expressions of relative deprivation based on racial discrimination.

The job satisfaction studies above indicate that in general, job content (intrinsic) factors are more important

influences of whether or not employees are satisfied on the job, while job context (extrinsic) factors are of minor importance. However, for blacks, studies indicate that extrinsic factors are most influential in job dissatisfaction. It was revealed, however, that blacks express greater or similar satisfaction with their jobs when compared to whites. The differences in reported satisfaction or dissatisfaction might have been influenced by whether or not the respondents were of the majority race or minority race in their organizations. This study can determine if the attitudes of black and white faculty toward their jobs are, indeed, similar (based on the factors they identify as important) or can build on Moch's findings, if it is determined that co-worker relations or racial discrimination influence more black faculty than white faculty to remain in or consider leaving their jobs.

### Turnover

There are well over 1,000 studies about turnover in the organization behavior and industrial psychology literature. Therefore, only those which have implications for this study are cited below.

Beginning with the studies of Brayfield and Crockett (1955) and Herzberg, et al. (1957), a significant

relationship between employee dissatisfaction and turnover was found. The early 1970's brought several studies of factors that influence turnover. Lefkowitz (1971) found that in addition to job satisfaction, initial job expectations, physical work environment, compensation, intrinsic aspects of the job, supervisor style, and work group dynamics influence turnover. Similarly, Porter and Steers (1973) concluded that organizational environment (pay and promotion policies), immediate work environment (size, supervisor style, co-worker relationships), the job itself (requirements and nature), and individual characteristics (age, tenure) influence turnover. However, Dunnette, et al. (1973) found that the most important job factors that influence turnover are salary, advancement, accomplishment, interesting work and use of abilities. Least important are company policies, security, working conditions, and high status.

The factors identified in these studies on turnover are similar to those which influence job choice, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction. However, it appears that while intrinsic factors influence turnover, they are no more influential than extrinsic factors.

Furthermore, these studies were designed to determine why employees left their organizations. And they provide no

results by race. In this study, the factors that might influence other-race faculty to leave are examined and the variables identified in turnover studies support the conceptual framework developed through the other organization behavior literature reviewed in this chapter. The results of this study might, also, illuminate the impact of intrinsic factors on potential turnover of black and white faculty.

Authors of two recent reviews of the literature on job/organization choice, commitment, job satisfaction and turnover concluded that although "these phenomena have received considerable attention, and despite significant advances in our understanding of these phenomena, much remains to be explored." (Mobley, et al., 1979; Mowday, et al., 1982) Certainly, more research is needed to determine the relationship of race to the factors found influencing job/organization choice, commitment, satisfaction and turnover.

#### Summary of Organization Behavior Literature

As noted earlier, the organization behavior literatures provides a theoretical framework for organizing and conceptualizing the problem under study and background information for developing data-collection instruments and

for categorizing and analyzing responses to these instruments.

The recent studies on job/organization choice and turnover reveal that extrinsic factors have become more influential than intrinsic factors. These extrinsic factors are: family, geographical location, salary, fringe benefits, co-worker relationships, work environment, and supervision style. However, the studies on organizational commitment and job satisfaction reveal that employees are influenced to remain in their jobs primarily by intrinsic factors (e.g., job responsibilities, prestige, growth, social involvement, autonomy, opportunity for advancement). Few of the above studies reported their results by race.

In order to assess the influence of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on other-race faculty employment decisions, all the extrinsic and intrinsic factors discussed in the paragraph above are utilized in this study.

While this study does not attempt to test models found in these studies, it can determine the influence of both intrinsic and extrinsic factors on the employment decisions of black faculty at TWIs and of white faculty at TBIs as well as identify the specific factors that influence their decisions.



### Faculty Mobility

While there are numerous studies of factors that influence employment decisions, few researchers have studied the reasons that faculty accept, remain in and leave faculty positions at their universities (faculty mobility). However, there are many references in related literature to the need for such studies (Suinn and Witt, 1982; Brown, 1967; Marshall, 1964; Moore and Sagaria, 1981 and 1982). The findings of such studies may assist academic administrators in developing appropriate strategies for the recruitment and retention of other-race faculty.

Even fewer researchers have studied the factors influencing mobility of racial and ethnic minority faculty, and no studies have been found which examine the factors influencing mobility of white faculty at TBIs.

Consequently, the faculty mobility literature reviewed for this study is limited. Such limited literature on this topic, however, provides the researcher the opportunity to contribute to or generate hypotheses about faculty mobility (generally) and other-race faculty mobility (specifically).

### Factors Influencing Faculty Decisions to Accept Positions

Job choice is individualistic, that is, factors are rarely given the same weight by different people. Even for the same individual, the importance assigned to a given job characteristic often changes as (s)he moves from a decision to leave a job to a judgment about what types of offers to seek and finally to a choice between the two best offers (Brown, 1967).

Additionally, "any statement about motivations for job choice which is based upon the post hoc reflections of the choosers is immediately suspect..." because the choosers may not know or may not be willing to reveal the rationales for their choices (Brown, 1967). With this in mind, Brown (1967) surveyed 10,000 faculty at two-year and four-year institutions of higher education to determine, among other things, the reasons that faculty accept and leave faculty positions. He found that the following factors were most influential in faculty decisions to accept positions:

courses taught; teaching load; research facilities and opportunities; competency of colleagues; salary; reputation of school; quality of students; and competency of administrators.

These factors were selected most frequently by faculty from a list of seventeen factors identified by Brown as potentially influential in "select-versus-reject" decisions. Generally, however, Brown found that issues considered by

faculty before accepting positions were: "what s/he will be doing; how much s/he will be paid; and academic environment." The major significance of Brown's findings (for this study) is his identification of some of the variables that influence faculty mobility and the apparent influence of intrinsic factors on job choice. However, since Brown's study was published in 1967, when fewer than 1% of faculty were black, his study reveals no "significant data for [blacks]" and he recommended that "racial empiricism be left for future research" (Brown, 1967).

A study more directly related to this study is that of Moore and Wagstaff (1974). Moore and Wagstaff (1974), in surveying 6,000 black educators in TWIs, found that the factors most influential in their decisions to accept positions were:

interest in students and teaching; the opportunity to work in an intellectual atmosphere; salary; and prestige and status of the school.

Since salary and reputation of universities are the only common factors in the two studies above, it appears that black and white faculty are influenced by substantially different factors in their employment decisions.

The studies above were conducted utilizing faculty in all university departments and found that a variety of factors influence faculty employment decisions. However,

Suinn and Witt (1982) found that ethnic minority psychology faculty rated salary, preferred geographic location and the presence of minority persons in the local community as factors most influential in their decisions to accept positions. While it is conceivable that Swinn's and Witt's findings represent only the views of ethnic minority psychology faculty, it is possible that preferred geographic location and the presence of minority persons in the community might influence black faculty in other disciplines to accept their jobs.

In the studies above, it appears that extrinsic factors (e.g., salary, geographic location, racial composition of the community) are more influential among black faculty than are intrinsic factors in job/organization choice. However, a study by Mommsen (1974) of 1,383 black doctoral degree holders, revealed that the racial context of the future employment situation was relatively unimportant. More than 32% did not respond to that questionnaire item and another 30% said that racial context was not important. The most influential were intrinsic factors such as presence of colleagues with similar interests (91%); existence of adequate research facilities (87%); and opportunities for specialization (82%).

The findings of the three studies on black faculty job choice present conflicting results--Moore and Wagstaff and Swinn and Witt found extrinsic factors most influential and Mommsen found intrinsic factors most influential in job choice. And Brown's study on faculty job choice revealed the primary influence of intrinsic factors in white faculty job choices.

However, the differences in faculty responses might not be based on race but may be attributed to the difference in data-collection instruments. All researchers used questionnaires which required a rank-ordering of a list of factors; however, the factors listed were different for each questionnaire.

The wide range of factors identified in these studies was useful to the researcher in compiling a more comprehensive list of factors that influence faculty job choices and in analyzing data collected with the comprehensive list. Additionally, this study might provide a clearer picture of the influence of either extrinsic or intrinsic factors on black faculty decisions to accept jobs at TWIs and might break new ground in identifying the factors that influence white faculty to choose jobs at TBIs.

Factors Influencing Faculty Decisions to Remain in Positions at their Universities

Marshall (1964) surveyed economic faculty to determine the factors that influenced their decisions to remain in and leave their positions. He found that the following factors were influential in decisions to remain:

satisfactory conditions of work; salary; geographic location; promotion opportunities; local community; tenure; spouses' employment; fringe benefits; and health considerations. (Satisfactory conditions of work include such factors as: reputation of school and department; quality of students; friends in the school; and courses taught.)

Since Marshall's study, like Brown's, was conducted in the 1960s when blacks represented less than 1% of all faculty, his findings are not directly related to black faculty retention. However, Marshall's study indicates that white faculty (similarly to black faculty) are influenced by geographic location, the local community and salary factors. And his study identifies several additional extrinsic factors that might influence faculty to accept jobs and remain at their universities (e.g., fringe benefits, tenure, spouses' employment and promotion opportunities).

Pfeffer and Lawler (1980) in a study of 4,058 college and university faculty found that "satisfaction with the organization and expressed intentions to remain were positively related to salary, length of time in the

organization, and tenure and were negatively related to availability of job alternatives. The results of the study identified two extrinsic factors--salary and tenure--as most influential to these faculty decisions to remain.

It appears from these studies that the factors found to be influential in faculty decisions to accept positions remain influential once the faculty member begins working in those positions. This is consistent with the literature on job choice and organization commitment. Based on these studies, it is anticipated that other-race faculty in this study will indicate that similar factors influence their decisions to accept and remain in their jobs and that the factors that primarily influence such decisions are extrinsic factors.

#### Factors Influencing Faculty to Leave Their Universities

A myriad of factors have been found influential in faculty decisions to leave their universities. Brown (1967) found the following factors were most influential in faculty decisions to leave their universities:

competency of administrators; research facilities and opportunities; teaching load; salary; courses taught; competency of colleagues; and congeniality of colleagues.

Salary, lack of promotion opportunities, geographic location, unsatisfactory work conditions, and fringe

benefits were prioritized as reasons that faculty in economic departments leave their jobs (Marshall, 1964).

While the limitations of these studies are noted in previous sections, they do point out that the factors which influence faculty decisions to leave are similar to those which influence them to accept and remain in positions. And since their samples were predominantly white, these findings provide insights into the factors that influence white faculty to leave their jobs.

Relative to black faculty, Moore and Wagstaff (1974) found that:

perceived racial discrimination; desire to work at TBIs; difficulty of obtaining tenure and promotion; low priority of teaching at the school; and the expectation to participate in black activities and groups

influenced them to leave TWIs.

Consistent with these findings were the findings of a national survey of 457 black administrators. Hoskins (1978) found that limited opportunities for promotion, perceived racial discrimination, extra efforts required for promotion (due to their race), low seniority, and poor relationships with colleagues were the factors most influential in decisions of black administrators to leave TWIs.

So it appears that black instructional and administrative faculty are influenced to leave their jobs at



TWIs by similar extrinsic factors (e.g., perceived racial discrimination, difficulty of obtaining tenure and promotion). And these factors are different from the ones which influence white faculty decisions to leave. The results of these studies support Moch's (1980) findings that blacks experience job dissatisfaction primarily due to perceived racial discrimination and poor relationships with colleagues. These factors have not been determined to have significant influence on white employees. In fact, a 1983 study of tenure-track arts and science faculty revealed that blacks and whites have similar views regarding work effort, scholarly productivity, racial climate, and reward systems. (Elmore and Blackburn, 1983) While their study was limited to Big Ten universities, the results did not substantiate the beliefs that "black faculty receive special favors, have extra heavy assignments, are overburdened with committee assignments, or must work twice as hard [as white faculty] to get half as far" at TWIs.

The similarity in views of black and white faculty noted by Elmore and Blackburn is consistent with part of the literature on job satisfaction where blacks and whites hold similar jobs. That study is particularly noteworthy since it included a representative sample of both black and white faculty at the same universities. And because it is the

only study on faculty mobility reviewed in this section that indicates that blacks and whites have similar attitudes toward their work.

#### Summary of Faculty Mobility Literature

The literature on faculty mobility is directly related to the study in that those studies examined the factors that influence black faculty and/or white faculty employment decisions. Though only seven studies were found, they yielded approximately 40 variables which were included in data-collection instruments for this study.

The studies by Brown, Marshall, and Pfeffer and Lawler indicate that white faculty are primarily influenced by extrinsic factors to accept, remain in and leave their jobs (e.g., salary, tenure, geographic location, local community). However, both Brown and Marshall noted the influence of two intrinsic factors--reputation of the university and quality of students--on white faculty employment decisions. This study might determine if these factors influence TBI white faculty employment decisions.

<sup>o</sup> The national surveys of black faculty indicate that extrinsic factors (e.g., salary, geographic location, fringe benefits) are more influential in their decisions to leave their universities than are intrinsic ones. Additionally,

it appears that some of the factors that influenced black instructional and administrative faculty to accept and leave their universities are related to issues of race (e.g., perceived racial discrimination, to work at TBIs, difficulty in obtaining promotion and tenure). Some of the research questions for this study were designed to determine if factors associated with race are identified by other-race faculty and to determine the relative influence of such factors in other-race faculty employment decisions. Therefore, this study might provide new insights into the influence of both intrinsic and extrinsic factors on other-race faculty employment decisions as well as the identification of the specific variables that influence their decisions.

## Chapter III

### METHODOLOGY

The research methodology for this study was a "mixed methodology" (Patton, 1980). According to Patton, triangulation is one way "in which methodological mixes are achieved" (Patton, 1978).

The methodology for this study involved:

- \* the compilation of factors that influence faculty employment decisions from the literature;
- \* obtaining opinions of university EEO, Personnel, and Academic Affairs managers relative to the list of factors compiled from the literature;
- \* the in-depth interviewing of a random sample of black faculty at TWIs by a black interviewer (See Appendix A);
- \* the in-depth interviewing of a random sample of white faculty of TBIs by a white interviewer (See Appendix A);
- \* the analysis of interview data;
- \* the use of a questionnaire designed to produce data about the relative influence of factors on other-race faculty employment decisions;

- \* the statistical analysis of questionnaire data using chi-square and the contingency coefficient;
- \* the development of hypotheses and conclusions relative to the problem under study; and
- \* the development of recommendations for future action and for future research.

From a review of the aforementioned description of the study, one can determine that the study consisted of data triangulation--"the use of a variety of data sources," investigator triangulation--"the use of [two investigators or interviewers]," and methodological triangulation--"the use of multiple methods to study a single problem" (Denzin, 1978). Multiple sources of information were sought and multiple resources were used because no single source or resource "can be trusted to provide a comprehensive perspective" of the problem. Additionally, triangulation "can be used to validate and cross-check study findings" (Patton, 1980). A multi-methods approach increases both the validity and reliability of study data.

The description of the methodology above provides a general overview of the study. What follows is a detailed description of the research design which incorporates the purposes and justifications for utilizing the various research techniques and methods. Additionally, this

detailed description of the research design indicates how the steps in the research are linked to the research questions listed in the first section of the study.

### The Population and the Sample

The selection of the universities studied resulted from a "purposive sample" (Patton, 1978). The selected universities are Morilla University (MU), Falstaff State University (FSU), Caperton University (CU), and Longman University (LU).<sup>9</sup>

Falstaff University and Morilla University were selected for the following reasons:

1. FSU and MU are public traditionally black universities employing white faculty;
2. Both FSU and MU are located in southeastern states where court-ordered desegregation plans are being implemented; and
3. FSU and MU are classified by state officials as "comprehensive colleges."<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Fictitious names are used to protect the identities of the universities being studied.

<sup>10</sup> Comprehensive colleges-institutions offering liberal arts and sciences, technological and professional programs at the baccaloureate and master's levels.

Caperton University and Longman University were selected for the following reasons:

1. CU and LU are two public traditionally white universities employing black faculty;
2. Both CU and LU are located in southeastern states where court-ordered desegregation plans are being implemented; and
3. CU and LU are classified by state officials as "doctoral degree-granting universities."<sup>11</sup>

All of the above factors influenced the researcher's decision to study the faculty at these four universities.

#### Faculty Population and Sample

The population studied are blacks holding faculty rank in permanent positions at CU and LU (TWIs), and whites holding faculty rank in permanent positions at MU and FSU (TBIs). The population includes both instructional and administrative faculty because both categories of faculty must be desegregated according to OCR desegregation criteria.

Faculty were selected for interviews by random sample. Faculty who received the follow-up questionnaire were selected utilizing a stratified random sampling method.

<sup>11</sup> Doctoral degree-granting universities-institutions emphasizing doctoral programs and/or research.

Such a method enabled the researcher to ensure that each strata in the population was represented in the sample.

#### Steps in the Sampling Procedure

The researcher requested from university EEO officers listings of blacks holding faculty rank in permanent positions at CU and LU (TWIs) and of whites holding faculty rank in permanent positions at MU and FSU (TBIs). The listing of faculty contained information about the following strata variables:

1. department or discipline;
2. faculty rank;
3. administrative or instructional;
4. non-tenured and tenured;
5. male or female;
6. black or white; and
7. school or administrative division.

A listing of the strata are located in Appendix B.

Faculty who were interviewed were selected by a random sample of one per school or administrative division. Each faculty in each school was assigned an identification number. Using a table of random numbers, the researcher placed her finger on a number and accepted the first digit of that number. Those digits were matched with the



identification numbers of the faculty within each school or division. That procedure was followed until one faculty per school or division was included in the sample.

Forty other-race faculty were selected for interviews through this procedure:

9 from MU (TBI)(6 instructional, 3 administrative);  
 12 from CU (TWIs)(6 instructional, 6 administrative);  
 8 from FSU (TBIs)(5 instructional, 3 administrative);

and

11 from LU (TWI)(7 instructional, 4 administrative).

Due to scheduling conflicts and nonavailability of faculty for interviews, only thirty-seven faculty were interviewed:

MU - 5 instructional, 3 administrative;  
 CU - 6 instructional, 6 administrative;  
 FSU - 4 instructional, 3 administrative; and  
 LU - 6 instructional, 4 administrative

Faculty who were sent questionnaires were selected by a random sample of each strata. Each faculty in each strata was assigned an identification number. Using a table of random numbers, the researcher placed her finger on a number and accepted the first digit of that number. Those digits were matched with the identification numbers of the faculty within one strata. That procedure was followed to select faculty for each strata until a maximum of twenty-five percent of the faculty in each strata was included in the sample. At minimum, one faculty from each strata was included in the sample. Though there were 172 other-race faculty employed at the four universities under study, one

hundred and twenty (120) faculty were selected through this procedure to receive the final questionnaire (49 blacks and 71 whites). Responses were received from sixty-six (66) faculty - 34 blacks and 32 whites - for a return rate of fifty-five percent. The questionnaire was piloted using two faculty from LU (TWI) and three faculty from each of the other universities.

Each faculty within the samples was sent a letter which briefly described the study and requested their participation in the study. (See Appendix D.)

### Data Collection

#### The Literature

Through a review of related literature, those factors that influence employees and/or faculty to accept, remain in, and consider leaving their jobs were identified. Factors found in the literature were categorized under the following topical headings:

- a) acceptance of faculty positions;
- b) continuance in faculty positions; and
- c) leaving faculty positions.

Additionally, the following categories were developed for each topical heading:

- \* Family - factors affecting the spouse or child(ren)

- \* Geographic Location - factors related to location, climate, size of the city/town; proximity to friends, relatives, and recreational or other areas of interest
- \* Job Characteristics and Responsibilities - factors related to the actual work itself
- \* Department - factors related to the people in and the environment of the department
- \* University - factors related to the people, environment, and facilities at the university
- \* Compensation - factors related to salary, fringe benefits, and opportunities for outside or additional income
- \* Advancement - factors related to professional development, promotion(s), or tenure.

Those topical headings were utilized: to categorize the factors found in the literature; to categorize the data collected from the interviews and questionnaires; and to categorize the analysis of data.

After categories were defined and factors from the literature were included under them, a listing of categories for each topical heading was developed.

The purpose of developing this listing was three-fold: to guide the development of questions for the interviews and for the follow-up questionnaires; to guide the coding of

data from the interviews and questionnaires; and to provide a list of factors for university EEO, Personnel and Academic Affairs managers to review (as detailed below).

EEO, Personnel, Academic Affairs Manager Survey

In order to ground the data collected from the literature for each university, a survey was sent to one EEO, one Personnel, and one Academic Affairs manager at each university. This was done because those individuals were expected to know the reasons that other-race faculty accept, remain in, and leave faculty positions at their universities.

The survey instrument included a list of factors that might influence faculty decisions to accept, remain in, and leave faculty positions at their universities. (See Appendix E). The survey served two purposes:

1. to help the researcher determine if the list of factors collected through the literature review was comprehensive and representative of the reasons that other-race faculty accept, remain in, and leave their faculty positions at the universities under study; and
2. to provide a basis for comparing the responses of EEO, Personnel and Academic Affairs managers to those

of other-race faculty gathered during interviews. The objective of this comparison was to determine if such administrators knew the factors that actually influence faculty mobility at their universities.

The managerial survey was piloted using three administrative faculty at CU (TWI), selected at random, to determine if the survey instrument was understandable and if it yielded the data needed for analysis. The results of the pilot indicated that revisions to the instrument were unnecessary.

On the survey, EEO, Personnel and Academic Affairs managers were asked to: 1) rank order the top ten factors that influence other-race faculty to accept, remain in, and leave their universities; and 2) place Xs next to the remaining unranked factors that they believed (or knew) to be influential.

Their ratings were based on information provided them by other-race faculty and/or on their expert judgment. Additionally, space was provided for them to add other factors which were influential in faculty employment decisions.

Since the EEO and Personnel functions are combined in one position description at FSU, eleven surveys (instead of twelve) were distributed with self-addressed, stamped envelopes and cover letters describing the study.

Ten surveys were returned before the deadline date and one follow-up letter was sent to request the completion of the other survey (which, then, was returned).

### Faculty Interview Guide

A guide sheet for faculty interviews was developed on the basis the categories noted on page 60. (See Appendix E for guide sheet.)

Faculty interviews were conducted for three reasons:

1. to generate additional factors and categories for the questionnaire (23 new factors emerged);
2. to determine if additional literature review was necessary; and
3. to provide faculty response data for comparisons to responses to the managerial survey.

The interview guide sheet was piloted using three CU (TWI) faculty, selected at random, to determine if the questions were understandable and if the instrument yielded the data needed for the study. The results of the pilot indicated that revisions were unnecessary.

Using the interview guide sheet, interviews of other-race faculty were conducted. Each faculty was asked the same initial questions and their responses were manually recorded. The interviewer probed faculty responses as

necessary to attempt a clearer understanding of their responses. The interview data for each university was maintained separately for this portion of the study.

In order to determine if other-race faculty were offered or received benefits that might be viewed by their colleagues as special or preferential treatment, two questions were included on the interview guide sheet to capture that information. (See Appendix E, questions 9 and 18.) The notion here was that if other-race faculty received special treatment, the reactions of their colleagues to them might be affected by that treatment. Additionally, negative reactions by their colleagues might influence the interview responses of other-race faculty.

As noted earlier, thirty-seven faculty were interviewed--15 white faculty and 22 black faculty. A white interviewer was contracted to interview white faculty in order to mediate the experimenter effects of race (see Appendix A). The procedures used to train and monitor the interviewer are included in Appendix G.

### Questionnaires

Based on the literature review, managerial survey responses, and faculty interviews, a list of factors that influence faculty employment decisions was developed. The

listing was used to develop a questionnaire which contained four sections: factors influencing decisions to accept positions; factors influencing decisions to remain in positions; factors influencing faculty to consider leaving their universities; and demographic data.

The factors were listed on the questionnaire in the form of statements about which faculty could indicate the degree of influence of those factors in their decisions to accept, remain in, and consider leaving faculty positions at their universities. The factor statements were grouped into the seven categories for each topical heading as noted on page 49.

The questionnaire was designed to have faculty: 1) prioritize the major categories under each topical heading; and 2) respond to a Likert scale relative to each factor statement under each category.

Once the pilot questionnaire was developed, it was sent to a random sample of three faculty at each university who were not included in the samples for interviews or final questionnaire. (At LU (TWI), only two faculty met those requirements.) The pilot was conducted to validate the factor statements and to ensure clarity of the survey instrument. The questionnaire was revised based on comments made by the faculty who completed it (10 of 11). The revised questionnaire is included in Appendix I.



Assessment of the Validity and Reliability of Data Collection Instruments

In designing the methodology for this study, the researcher was determined to strengthen the design and yield dependable data so that the results would not be convoluted by problems of validity and reliability. Concern about several parts of the methodology led the researcher to take steps to avoid such problems. The potential problems identified were related to:

1. appropriate methods for data collection;
2. experimenter bias in the interviews;
3. the small number of universities sampled;
4. the large number of questions in the questionnaire;  
and
5. the effective measurement of faculty attitudes.

As noted earlier, the study consisted of data and methodological triangulation. Since no single source of information and no single method of data collection provides a comprehensive perspective of the problem, triangulation was used to validate and cross-check study findings (Patton, 1980). Triangulation has been determined to increase both the validity and reliability of study data (Patton, 1980).

In order to mediate the effects of experimenter bias during interviews, the researcher, who is black, conducted the interviews with black faculty and hired and trained a

white interviewer to conduct interviews with white faculty (see Appendix A).

Relative to the small number of universities (4) studied, the researcher interviewed a random sample of other-race faculty (37) and sent questionnaires to a stratified random sample (70%) of such faculty (120). Since those who were interviewed did not receive the questionnaire, ninety-one (91%) of other-race faculty were included in the samples.

Sixty-six other-race faculty returned the questionnaires for a return rate of 55%. When the number of other-race faculty who were interviewed is added to the number who returned the questionnaire, and divided by the total number of other-race faculty (172) employed at the four universities, the response rate for this study is sixty percent (60%).

Additionally, all instruments used in this study were pilot tested for content validity and clarity. Revisions to the instruments were made accordingly.

Due to the large number of variables/questions included in the questionnaire, the increased probability of error by chance was mediated by setting the level of statistical significance for chi-square and the contingency coefficient at 0.01. Additionally, the questionnaire included clear and

standard instructions for completion. These precautions were taken to increase the reliability of the study results.

In order to measure the opinions/attitudes of other-race faculty, the Likert summated rating scale was used in the questionnaire. The items/ questions were stated such that faculty could indicate the items' relative influence on their employment decisions. The Likert scale allowed the researcher to measure the intensity of faculty responses and/or attitudes.

The researcher feels comfortable that the validity and reliability of this study were increased by the above techniques.

Chapter IV  
ANALYSIS OF DATA

Three sets of data were collected and analyzed for this study. The first set of data was collected by use of a survey distributed to EEO, Personnel, and Academic Affairs representatives at each of the four universities under study. That survey, which included a list of factors that influence faculty employment decisions, was administered for two reasons:

1. to request suggestions for making the list of factors more comprehensive; and
2. to determine if these managers were aware of the factors that influence other-race faculty at their universities to accept, remain in and leave faculty positions.

The second set of data was collected through interviews of a random sample of other-race faculty. In the interviews, faculty were asked to respond to open-ended questions about the factors that influenced their employment decisions. That interviewing format provided the researcher a means for identifying additional variables for the questionnaire through probing faculty responses to the open-ended questions. Additionally, the researcher was able to

compare the results of those faculty interviews to the results of the EEO, Personnel, and Academic Affairs survey.

The third set of data was collected by a questionnaire designed to measure the influence of factors on faculty employment decisions. The questionnaire was distributed to a stratified random sample of other-race faculty. The results of the questionnaire comprise the bulk of this data analysis section.

The different methods for analyzing the three sets of data are included in the sections below where they are discussed.

#### EEO, Personnel, And Academic Affairs Survey

In preparation for comparing the rankings of EEO, Personnel, and Academic Affairs managers to faculty interview responses for each university, the survey factors were divided into seven categories for each topical heading (e.g., family, geographical location, job responsibilities, department, university, compensation, advancement). The categories correspond directly to the questions listed on the faculty interview guide sheet.

The rank ordering of factors by managers were summed and then divided by the number of managers responding to the survey for each university. The numbers resulting from

those computations were summed for each category. The resulting category numbers were ranked from highest to lowest and the factors that were marked by Xs were listed and ranked according to the frequencies of Xs. Tables 2 and 3 represent the results of that data analysis for each university.

Since no new employment factors were provided by these managers, the researcher proceeded to examine for each university the top five managerial rankings of categories for the three topical headings (accept, remain in, leave). This was done in order to determine which of the top five categories were believed to be influential in all other-race faculty decisions (see Table 4).

Managers at MU (TBI) said compensation and advancement are influential in white faculty decisions to accept, remain in and leave faculty positions. FSU (TBI) managers included compensation, advancement and job responsibilities among the top five concerns of white faculty in all three areas. LU managers, also, cited compensation and advancement as influential in white faculty decisions in all three areas. However, departmental factors were also cited as influential at that university.

It is interesting that at CU (TWI), the top five categories for all three areas were the same, though in

TABLE 2

Composite Rank Order of Categories by EEO, Personnel and  
Academic Affairs Managers at TBIs

## MORILLA UNIVERSITY

| <u>ACCEPT</u><br><u>POSITIONS</u> | <u>CONTINUE IN</u><br><u>POSITIONS</u> | <u>LEAVE</u><br><u>UNIVERSITY</u> |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| Compensation (16.2)               | Compensation (19.9)                    | Advancement (13.3)                |
| University (13.2)                 | Job (9.6)                              | Compensation (13.1)               |
| Job (10.0)                        | Advancement (9.2)                      | Other (10.6)                      |
| Geographical                      | University (6.3)                       | Family (7.6)                      |
| Location (6.9)                    | Department (3.9)                       | Geographical                      |
| Advancement (6.0)                 | Family, Other (2.6)                    | Location (5.6)                    |
| Family (4.0)                      | Geographical                           | University (4.2)                  |
| Department (1.6)                  | Location (1.9)                         | Department, Job (0)               |
| Other (0)                         |  |                                   |

## FALSTAFF STATE UNIVERSITY

| <u>ACCEPT</u><br><u>POSITIONS</u> | <u>CONTINUE IN</u><br><u>POSITIONS</u> | <u>LEAVE</u><br><u>UNIVERSITY</u> |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| Geographical                      | Advancement (13.0)                     | Advancement (24.5)                |
| Location (8)                      | Job (11.0)                             | Compensation (9)                  |
| Advancement,                      | Compensation (9.5)                     | Family (7.5)                      |
| Compensation (6.5)                | Geographical                           | Job (5.5)                         |
| Job (5.5)                         | Location (5.0)                         | Other (4.5)                       |
| University (3.75)                 | Family (4.5)                           | Department (2.5)                  |
| Department (1.5)                  | University (3.5)                       | University (1.0)                  |
| Family, Other (0)                 | Department (2.5)                       | Geographical                      |
|                                   | Other (0)                              | Location (0)                      |

different order. They were compensation, advancement, job responsibilities, university factors and departmental factors. This indicates that while managers believe that the same five categories of factors influence CU black faculty to accept, remain in, and consider leaving faculty positions, they also believe that the emphasis placed on these factors by faculty shifts depending on the decision that is being made.

We see that advancement and compensation were cited among the top five important categories of factors at all four universities, while job, university and departmental factors were included for different universities. In order to determine if these same factors were included among the top five by managers at all universities, the researcher examined the top five rankings for each topical heading (accept, remain, leave).

Relative to other-race faculty decisions to accept jobs, managers at all four universities cited compensation, advancement, job and university among the top five factors influential in faculty decisions. Advancement and compensation factors were said to be influential in faculty decisions to remain in and leave their positions at all four



TABLE 3

Composite Rank Order of Categories by EEO, Personnel and Academic Managers of TWIs

## LONGMAN UNIVERSITY

| <u>ACCEPT POSITIONS</u> | <u>CONTINUE IN POSITIONS</u> | <u>LEAVE UNIVERSITY</u> |        |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|--------|
| University              | (22.0) Advancement           | (22.2) Advancement      | (13.6) |
| Compensation            | (19.0) University            | (14.5) Geographical     |        |
| Advancement             | (5.9) Compensation           | (9.6) Location          | (11.6) |
| Department              | (3.5) Department             | (7.6) Other             | (10.2) |
| Job                     | (3.3) Family                 | (4.0) Compensation      | (9.6)  |
| Geographical            | Other                        | (0.9) Department        | (6.5)  |
| Location                | (2.0) Geographical           | University              | (2.0)  |
| Family                  | (1.6) Location               | (0) Job                 | (0.9)  |
| Other                   | (0)                          | Family                  | (0)    |

## CAPERTON UNIVERSITY

| <u>ACCEPT POSITIONS</u> | <u>CONTINUE IN POSITIONS</u> | <u>LEAVE UNIVERSITY</u> |        |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|--------|
| University              | (19.2) Department            | (15.2) Advancement      | (15.3) |
| Department              | (10.5) Advancement           | (10.2) Department       | (13.6) |
| Job                     | (8.9) University             | (8.8) Compensation      | (7.9)  |
| Compensation            | (8.3) Job                    | (6.2) Job               | (7.2)  |
| Advancement             | (3.6) Compensation           | (5.3) University        | (4.5)  |
| Geographical            | Other                        | (3.3) Other             | (2.9)  |
| Location                | (3.3) Geographical           | Family                  | (2.0)  |
| Family                  | (0.6) Location, Family       | (2.6) Geographical      |        |
| Other                   | (0)                          | Location                | (0)    |

TABLE 4  
Top Five Managerial Rankings of Categories For All Topical Headings For All Four Universities

|          | <u>TBIs</u>   |   | <u>TWIs</u>   |  |
|----------|---|---|---|--|
|          | <u>Morilla University</u>   | <u>Falstaff University</u>  | <u>Longman University</u>   | <u>Caperton University</u>                                     |
| ACCEPT   | Compensation<br>University<br>Job<br>Geographical Location<br>Advancement | Geographical Location<br>Advancement, Compensation<br>Job<br>University<br>Department | University<br>Compensation<br>Advancement<br>Department<br>Job              | University<br>Department<br>Job<br>Compensation<br>Advancement |
| CONTINUE | Compensation<br>Job<br>Advancement<br>University<br>Department            | Advancement<br>Job<br>Compensation<br>Geographical Location<br>Family                 | Advancement<br>University<br>Compensation<br>Department<br>Family           | Department<br>Advancement<br>University<br>Job<br>Compensation |
| LEAVE    | Advancement<br>Compensation<br>Other<br>Family<br>Geographical Location   | Advancement<br>Compensation<br>Family<br>Job<br>Other                                 | Advancement<br>Geographical Location<br>Other<br>Compensation<br>Department | Advancement<br>Department<br>Compensation<br>Job<br>University |

universities. It is clear that managers at all four universities believe advancement and compensation factors are the most influential factors in other-race faculty decisions to accept, remain in and leave their positions.

When managerial opinions about the factors that influence other-race faculty decisions are compared to the opinions of those faculty, it will be interesting to see if advancement and compensation are the most influential factors. If those factors are as influential as managers believe, managers should be able to address these concerns through management processes (e.g., promotion, tenure, and budgeting process).

#### Faculty Interviews at TBIs and TWIs

To analyze data from administrative and instructional other-race faculty interviews, the actual responses of faculty to each question were recorded during the interviews. As noted earlier, each question represents a category. Next, the responses were reviewed to determine if they fit into the category under which they were listed. If they did not fit, they were moved to the appropriate category. Similar responses were grouped under each

category based on the list of factors in the managerial survey. The total number of responses for each factor within each category was tabulated and the categories were ranked from high to low according to the total number of responses. When the response totals for the categories were equal, the categories were determined to have equal influence and were listed side-by-side.

Composite faculty ratings of categories of factors that influence their employment decisions are displayed in Tables 5-6. The numbers represent the frequency of response with no weight given to the importance of factors.

Relative to job acceptance, white faculty at FSU ranked geographic location, job, compensation, advancement, and university factors as most influential in their decisions.

Geographic location is, also, the most important factor influencing faculty to remain at FSU (TBI); however, department, job, and advancement, family factors also are influential in holding faculty in their jobs. Relative to their considerations to leave, FSU faculty indicated that job, other, department, and university, compensation, family factors would be important.

At MU (TBI), university, geographic location, department and job factors are most influential in white faculty decisions to accept positions. Additionally, MU

TABLE 5

Composite Rank Order of Categories by White Faculty At TBIs

## Falstaff State University

| <u>ACCEPT<br/>POSITIONS</u> |      | <u>CONTINUE IN<br/>POSITIONS</u> |      | <u>CONTINUE LEAVING<br/>UNIVERSITY</u> |     |
|-----------------------------|------|----------------------------------|------|--|-----|
| Geographical                |      | Geographical                     |      | Job                                    | (0) |
| Location                    | (12) | Location                         | (17) | Other                                  | (6) |
| Job                         | (7)  | Department                       | (15) | Department                             | (5) |
| Compensation,               |      | Job                              | (8)  | University, Compen-                    |     |
| Advancement                 | (4)  | Advancement,                     |      | sation, Family                         | (4) |
| University                  | (3)  | Family                           | (6)  | Advancement,                           |     |
| Department                  | (2)  | Other                            | (5)  | Geographical                           |     |
| Family, Other               | (1)  | University                       | (3)  | Location                               | (2) |
|                             |      | Compensation                     | (2)  |  |     |

## Morilla University

| <u>ACCEPT<br/>POSITIONS</u> |      | <u>CONTINUE IN<br/>POSITIONS</u> |      | <u>CONSIDER LEAVING<br/>UNIVERSITY</u> |      |
|-----------------------------|------|----------------------------------|------|--|------|
| University                  | (11) | University                       | (22) | University                             | (11) |
| Geographical                |      | Geographical                     |      | Job                                    | (9)  |
| Location                    | (10) | Location                         | (12) | Compensation,                          |      |
| Department                  | (8)  | Job                              | (11) | Other                                  | (5)  |
| Job                         | (7)  | Department                       | (10) | Department                             | (4)  |
| Advancement                 | (4)  | Other, Compen-                   |      | Advancement                            | (3)  |
| Compensation                | (3)  | tion, Advancement                | (3)  | Family                                 | (2)  |
| Family                      | (2)  | Family                           | (2)  | Geographical                           |      |
| Other                       | (0)  |                                  |      | Location                               | (1)  |

faculty interview data indicates that the factors that influenced them to accept their jobs also influence them to remain in their jobs. Relative to their considerations to leave MU, university, job and department factors are important considerations. However, MU faculty indicated that compensation would, also, be influential in their considerations to leave.

For black faculty at LU (TWI), job, geographical location, department, and university, advancement factors most heavily influenced their decisions to accept faculty positions. And while job, geographical location, university factors are influential in their decisions to remain in their jobs, department and compensation, advancement factors became more important. Relative to LU faculty considerations to leave, advancement, compensation were ranked higher than they were for accepting and remaining. It's interesting that geographic location is most important in their considerations to leave as it is in their decisions to remain. That category was ranked as the second most important factor influencing their decisions to accept their jobs.

TABLE 6

Composite Rank Order of Categories by Black Faculty At TWIs

## Longman University

| <u>ACCEPT<br/>POSITIONS</u> | <u>CONTINUE IN<br/>POSITIONS</u> | <u>CONSIDER LEAVING<br/>UNIVERSITY</u> |      |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|------|
| Job                         | (11) Geographical                | Geographical                           |      |
| Geographical                | Location, Job,                   | Location                               | (11) |
| Location,                   | University                       | Advancement,                           | (9)  |
| Department                  | (10) Department                  | Compensation                           | (7)  |
| University,                 | Compensation,                    | Job                                    | (6)  |
| Advancement                 | (7) Advancement                  | University                             | (5)  |
| Compensation                | (5) Other                        | Other, Family                          | (4)  |
| Other                       | (3) Family                       | Department                             | (2)  |
| Family                      | (1)                              |  |      |

## Caperton University

| <u>ACCEPT<br/>POSITIONS</u> | <u>CONTINUE IN<br/>POSITIONS</u> | <u>CONSIDER LEAVING<br/>UNIVERSITY</u> |      |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|------|
| University                  | (16) Job                         | Family                                 | (11) |
| Department                  | (14) Geographical                | Department,                            |      |
| Geographical                | Location                         | Compensation                           | (9)  |
| Location                    | (13) Advancement                 | Advancement, Job                       | (8)  |
| Job                         | (10) Department                  | University                             | (2)  |
| Advancement                 | (8) University                   | Other, Geograph-                       |      |
| Compensation                | (6) Compensation                 | ical Location                          | (0)  |
| Family                      | (3) Family                       |  |      |
| Other                       | (0) Other                        |  |      |

Relative to job acceptance, black CU (TWI) faculty ranked university, department, geographic location, and job as the most influential factors in their decisions. Advancement was added as a factor influential in their decisions to remain, with job factors being most influential. It is apparent that family considerations are most influential for faculty contemplating leaving CU. However, department, compensation as well as advancement, job and university factors are also important.

When all faculty interview rankings of the top four categories were examined across institutions, it was found that university, geographic location, and job factors were most influential (at all four universities) in faculty decisions to accept their jobs. Relative to faculty decisions to remain, department factors were substituted for university factors while geographic location and job factors continued to be influential in faculty decisions to remain. And job, compensation and university factors were important in their considerations to leave (see Table 7).

Through further analysis, it is clear that only job factors were found to be influential in faculty decisions to accept, remain, and consider leaving all four universities.



TABLE 7

Faculty Rankings of Top Four Categories For All Topical Headings For All Four Universities

|                     | <u>TBIs</u>   |  |   |   | <u>TWIs</u> |  |
|---------------------|---|--|---|---|-------------|--|
|                     | <u>Falstaff University</u>  | <u>Morilla University</u>                                | <u>Longman University</u>   | <u>Caperton University</u>  |             |  |
| ACCEPT              | Geographical Location<br>Job<br>Compensation, Advancement<br>University | University<br>Geographical Location<br>Department<br>Job | Job<br>Geographical Location<br>Department<br>University, Advancement                               | University<br>Department<br>Geographical Location<br>Job                |             |  |
| CONTINUE            | Geographical Location<br>Department<br>Job<br>Advancement,<br>Family    | University<br>Geographical Location<br>Job<br>Department | Geographical Location,<br>Job,<br>University<br>Department<br>Compensation,<br>Advancement<br>Other | Job<br>Geographical Location<br>Department<br>Advancement<br>Department |             |  |
| CONSIDER<br>LEAVING | Job<br>Other<br>Department<br>University, Compensation,<br>Family       | University<br>Job<br>Other, Compensation<br>Department   | Geographical Location<br>Advancement,<br>Compensation<br>Job<br>University                          | Family<br>Department,<br>Compensation<br>Advancement, Job<br>University |             |  |

The importance of the work to be or being performed is emphasized. However, university factors were also found to be influential in faculty decisions to accept and considerations to leave their jobs. This finding suggests that faculty assess the organizational environment in which they will perform before accepting jobs and when contemplating leaving them.

Additionally, we see that geographical location was very influential in faculty decisions to accept and remain in jobs at all four universities. This means that variables external to the university are assessed by faculty before accepting jobs and that these variables influence their decisions to remain in their jobs.

Relative to the factors above (job, university, and geographical location), job, university and geographical location factors can be manipulated and improved by managers to increase other-race faculty satisfaction on the job. However, geographical location factors are not as easily manipulated by managers. Since geographical location has been cited as very influential in other-race faculty decisions to accept and remain in their jobs, this finding might help explain the relative success or failure of university managers to recruit and retain such faculty. It appears at this point in the study that geographical location factors contribute to such efforts.

Faculty Interview Responses To Questions About  
Special/Preferential Treatment

Only five (13.5%) of thirty-seven other-race faculty indicated that they received some form of preferential treatment when they were offered their jobs (4 instructional and 1 administrative). Four blacks responded that they received higher salaries because they were black and a white faculty said (s)he had received a dean's grant, leave with half-pay to finish his/her degree and a "higher than usual" salary.

When asked if they received treatment while on the job that might be viewed by others as special or preferential, four instructional faculty responded affirmatively. A white faculty said that "race might have influenced his/her receipt of promotions and tenure." Additionally, one white and one black faculty said that some of their colleagues believe that they received special treatment but they, in fact, did not receive such treatment.

One black faculty who received special treatment and the white and black faculty who were perceived as receiving such treatment indicated that their colleagues have not treated them differently as a result. However, another black faculty, who received a higher salary than his white colleagues, said that "others knowing that [(s)he] received a higher salary" has resulted in unfavorable comments from

his/her colleagues and has caused him/her to "consider leaving." (In this instance, the competency of the black faculty member is not at issue since (s)he is highly sought after by the private sector as well as by other colleges and universities based on his/her research record.)

Since only 13.5% of the faculty interviewed indicated that they receive special or preferential treatment, it appears to be limited at these universities. However, it is possible that other faculty did not feel comfortable reporting such treatment. Nevertheless, special or preferential treatment has not been influential in the treatment of other-race faculty by their colleagues (with one exception). This is consistent with Elmore and Blackburn's findings that minority faculty do not perceive that they receive special favors. The implications of these findings are addressed in Chapter V.

#### Comparison of Faculty Interview Responses To Manager Survey Responses

The final rank orderings of faculty interview responses were compared to the rank ordered responses of EEO, Personnel, and Academic Affairs managers for each university to determine the similarities between these two groups of responses.

The comparisons were made despite the fact that faculty had the option to provide unlimited responses/factors for each category since they responded to open-ended questions. EEO, Personnel, and Academic Affairs administrators ranked the factors provided in a survey, though they had the option to add factors. Additionally, the managers were asked to indicate the factors that influence other-race faculty decisions to "leave" their universities whereas faculty were asked about the factors that would be important in influencing them to leave. The latter required some conjecture on the part of faculty since only a few indicated that they were considering leaving.

As noted earlier in this chapter, manager rankings of categories for each university were prioritized and listed from high to low. Faculty interview data from each university was also ranked from high to low by category. The prioritized listings were placed side-by-side for each university so the researcher could determine the similarities between responses.

As Table 8 illustrates, CU (TWI) managers have the best grasp of why their black faculty accept, remain in, and consider leaving their jobs. However, while CU managers considered geographical location as least important in all faculty decisions, black CU faculty indicated that

geographical location was very influential in their decisions to accept and remain in their jobs. Relative to their considerations to leave, CU faculty indicated that family factors were most important. However, CU managers said that family factors were least important in influencing faculty to leave.

Both FSU (TBI) and MU (TBI) managers have a good grasp of why their other-race faculty accept their jobs (see Tables 9 and 10). LU (TWI) managers have a better grasp of why their black faculty leave (Table 11) than of why the faculty accept and remain in their jobs.

The results of comparisons indicate that CU (TWI) managers are most aware of the factors that influence other-race faculty to accept, remain in, and consider leaving faculty positions at CU. The managers at the other three universities are only aware of factors that influence other-race faculty decisions to accept or consider leaving positions at their universities, but have little or no knowledge about what leads to retention. These findings indicate that information yielded by this study will prove useful to these managers.

TABLE 8

Comparisons of Rankings From Survey and Interview Responses  
For Caperton University (TWI)

| <u>EEO, Personnel, Academic<br/>Affairs Administrator Responses</u> | <u>Faculty Interview<br/>Responses</u> |
|---|--|
| ACCEPTING   |  |
| 1) University   | 1) University                          |
| 2) Department   | 2) Department                          |
| 3) Job  | 3) Geographical<br>Location            |
| 4) Compensation   | 4) Job                                 |
| 5) Advancement  | 5) Advancement                         |
| 6) Geographical Location  | 6) Compensation                        |
| 7) Family   | 7) Family                              |
| 8) Other  | 8) Other                               |
| CONTINUE  |  |
| 1) Department   | 1) Job                                 |
| 2) Advancement  | 2) Geographical<br>Location            |
| 3) University   | 3) Advancement                         |
| 4) Job  | 4) Department                          |
| 5) Compensation   | 5) University                          |
| 6) Other  | 6) Compensation                        |
| 7) Geographical Location,<br>Family                                 | 7) Family                              |
|   | 8) Other                               |
| LEAVE<br>(CONSIDER<br>LEAVING)                                      |  |
| 1) Advancement  | 1) Family                              |
| 2) Department   | 2) Department,<br>Compensation         |
| 3) Compensation   | 3) Advancement, Job                    |
| 4) Job  | 4) University                          |
| 5) University   | 5) Other, Geograph-<br>ical Location   |
| 6) Other  |  |
| 7) Family   |  |
| 8) Geographical Location  |  |

TABLE 9

Comparisons of Rankings From Survey And Interview Responses  
For Falstaff State University (TBI)

| <u>EEO, Personnel and Academic<br/>Administrator Responses</u> | <u>Faculty Interview<br/>Responses</u> |
|--|--|
| ACCEPTING  |  |
| 1) Geographical Location                                       | 1) Geographical Location               |
| 2) Advancement, Compensation                                   | 2) Job                                 |
| 3) Job   | 3) Compensation, Advancement           |
| 4) University  | 4) University                          |
| 5) Department  | 5) Department                          |
| 6) Family, Other   | 6) Family, Other                       |
| CONTINUE   |  |
| 1) Advancement   | 1) Geographical Location               |
| 2) Job   | 2) Department                          |
| 3) Compensation  | 3) Job                                 |
| 4) Geographical Location                                       | 4) Advancement, Family                 |
| 5) Family  | 5) Other                               |
| 6) University  | 6) University                          |
| 7) Department  | 7) Compensation                        |
| 8) Other   |  |
| LEAVE<br>(CONSIDER<br>LEAVING)                                 |  |
| 1) Advancement   | 1) Job                                 |
| 2) Compensation  | 2) Other                               |
| 3) Family  | 3) Department                          |
| 4) Job   | 4) University, Compensation, Family    |
| 5) Other   | 5) Advancement, Geographical Location  |
| 6) Department  |  |
| 7) University  |  |
| 8) Geographical Location                                       |  |



TABLE 10

Comparisons of Rankings From Survey And Interview Responses  
For Morilla University (TBI)

| <u>EEO, Personnel and Academic<br/>Affairs Administrator Responses</u> | <u>Faculty Interview<br/>Responses</u>    |
|--|---|
| ACCEPT   |   |
| 1) Compensation  | 1) University                             |
| 2) University  | 2) Geographical<br>Location               |
| 3) Job   | 3) Department                             |
| 4) Geographical Location   | 4) Job                                    |
| 5) Advancement   | 5) Advancement                            |
| 6) Family  | 6) Compensation                           |
| 7) Department  | 7) Family                                 |
| 8) Other   | 8) Other                                  |
| CONTINUE   |   |
| 1) Compensation  | 1) University                             |
| 2) Job   | 2) Geographical<br>Location               |
| 3) Advancement   | 3) Job                                    |
| 4) University  | 4) Department                             |
| 5) Department  | 5) Compensation,<br>Advancement,<br>Other |
| 6) Family, Other   | 6) Family                                 |
| 7) Geographical Location   |   |
| LEAVE<br>(CONSIDER<br>LEAVING)   |   |
| 1) Advancement   | 1) University                             |
| 2) Compensation  | 2) Job                                    |
| 3) Other   | 3) Compensation,<br>Other                 |
| 4) Family  | 4) Department                             |
| 5) Geographical Location   | 5) Advancement                            |
| 6) University  | 6) Family                                 |
| 7) Department, Job   | 7) Geographical<br>Location               |

TABLE 11

Comparisons of Rankings From Survey And Interviews Responses  
For Longman University (TWI)

| <u>EEO, Personnel And Academic<br/>Affairs Administrator Responses</u>   | <u>Faculty Interview<br/>Responses</u>  |
|--|---|
| ACCEPT<br>1) University<br>2) Compensation<br>3) Advancement<br>4) Department<br>5) Job<br>6) Geographical Location<br>7) Family<br>8) Other                         | 1) Job<br>2) Geographical<br>Location,<br>Department<br>3) University,<br>Advancement<br>4) Compensation<br>5) Other<br>6) Family |
| CONTINUE<br>1) Advancement<br>2) University<br>3) Compensation<br>4) Department<br>5) Family<br>6) Job<br>7) Other<br>8) Geographical Location                       | 1) Geographical<br>Location, Job,<br>University<br>2) Department<br>3) Compensation,<br>Advancement<br>4) Other<br>5) Family      |
| LEAVE<br>(CONSIDER<br>LEAVING)<br>1) Advancement<br>2) Geographical Location<br>3) Other<br>4) Compensation<br>5) Department<br>6) University<br>7) Job<br>8) Family | 1) Geographical<br>Location<br>2) Advancement,<br>Compensation<br>3) Job<br>4) University<br>5) Other, Family<br>6) Department    |

### Analyses of Faculty Responses To Questionnaire

In order to yield as much information as possible, the chi-square test of association was conducted for all Likert scale responses to determine if a significant relationship exists between the factors or categories of factors and the respondent's faculty classification (administrative or instructional) and race. The statistical package program SSPS, Version H, Release 8.01 chi-square test of association was used. Further analysis of data using the contingency coefficient was conducted to determine the strength of the relationship revealed by the chi-square test of association. Due to the large number of variables and increased possibility of error by chance, the level of significance was set at 0.01 for chi-square and the contingency coefficient.

The chi-square test of association was selected to analyze the questionnaire data for several reasons. First, this portion of the study is intended to determine whether or not a significant relationship existed among the variables identified. Chi-square tests for that relationship. Further, chi-square is suitable for use with a large sample size and can be used with discrete, non-parametric data (which this study contains). Finally, chi-square is generally recognized among researchers as an acceptable and

understood means of determining if relationships exist among selected variables.

The contingency coefficient was computed to determine the strength of relationships revealed by chi-square. That is, how strong is the relationship between the group (administrative, instructional; black, white) and the factors or categories and at what level of statistical significance?

The equation for the contingency coefficient statistic is:

$$C = \frac{x^2}{n + x^2}$$

where C is the contingency coefficient statistic, n is the total number of observed frequencies, and  $x^2$  is the chi-square statistic. Generally, the minimum value of C is zero, and the maximum value of C is 1.00. However, for the tables analyzed in this study, the maximum value of C is .70711.

The data obtained for this portion of the study were tabulated and analyzed so that the research questions posed in Chapter 1 could be answered. Section 1, (Questions 1-68), concerned the influence of factors in faculty decisions to accept their jobs. (Only questions 8-68 were

analyzed using chi-square and the contingency coefficient.) Questions in Section II (Questions 69-140) concerned the influence of factors in faculty decisions to continue in their jobs. (Questions 76-140 were analyzed using the statistics above.) In Section III questions 141-160 concerned the importance of factors if the faculty considered leaving their universities. Questions 161-218 concerned whether or not the factors were true and if so, how important would those factors be in influencing faculty to leave their universities. (Only questions 148-218 were analyzed using the statistics above.)

### Influence of Factors on Faculty Employment Decisions

#### Job Acceptance

The first research question addressed in this study is: "What factors do other-race faculty consider important influences in their decisions to accept faculty positions at four southeastern universities?" In order to address this question, the researcher examined the frequencies of mean response data in which faculty responses to factor statements were grouped into categories.

When job acceptance mean responses by faculty classification for the Very Influential ratings were examined, job factors were the most influential for faculty

at CU (TWI) (Table 12), LU (TWI)(Table 13), and MU (TBI)(Table 14) relative to job acceptance. The combined ratings of all administrative and instructional faculty indicate that job factors are most influential (Table 16) as did the combined ratings of blacks and whites (Table 17). For FSU (TBI) faculty, compensation factors are most influential (Table 15).

The second most influential factors relative to job acceptance are:

1. advancement for faculty at CU (TWI), MU (TBI), for all administrative and instructional faculty and for all blacks and whites;
2. university factors for LU (TWI) faculty; and
3. job factors for FSU (TBI) faculty.

These findings (about faculty) are consistent with the results of the university managers survey analysis. Job and advancement factors appear to be attracting other-race faculty to the four universities under study and can be enhanced through management processes to increase their attractiveness.

#### Job Continuation

The second research question addressed in this study is "What factors do other-race faculty consider important

TABLE 12

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Faculty Classification Relative To Job Acceptance (Caperton University)

| Influence of Categories On Job Acceptance | CAT1<br>Geographic Location |   | CAT2<br>Family |   | CAT3<br>Job |   | CAT4<br>Department |   | CAT5<br>Compen- sation |   | CAT6<br>University |   | CAT7<br>Advance- ment |   | CAT8<br>Racial |   |
|---|-----------------------------|---|----------------|---|-------------|---|--------------------|---|------------------------|---|--------------------|---|-----------------------|---|----------------|---|
|   | A                           | I | A              | I | A           | I | A                  | I | A                      | I | A                  | I | A                     | I | A              | I |
| Not Applicable/No Response                | 0                           | 0 | 2              | 3 | 0           | 0 | 0                  | 0 | 0                      | 0 | 0                  | 0 | 0                     | 0 | 0              | 0 |
| Not Influential                           | 2                           | 0 | 3              | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0                  | 0 | 3                      | 1 | 3                  | 2 | 2                     | 1 | 2              | 2 |
| Somewhat Influential                      | 8                           | 4 | 2              | 1 | 6           | 3 | 8                  | 3 | 5                      | 4 | 6                  | 2 | 5                     | 2 | 7              | 2 |
| Very Influential                          | 0                           | 1 | 3              | 1 | 4           | 2 | 2                  | 2 | 2                      | 0 | 1                  | 1 | 3                     | 2 | 1              | 1 |
| Column Totals                             | 10                          | 5 | 10             | 5 | 10          | 5 | 10                 | 5 | 10                     | 5 | 10                 | 5 | 10                    | 5 | 10             | 5 |

A=Administrative  
I=Instructional

TABLE 13

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Faculty Classification  
Relative To Job Acceptance  
(Longman University)

| Influence of Categories On<br>Job Acceptance | CAT1<br>Geographic<br>Location | CAT2<br>Family | CAT3<br>Job | CAT4<br>Department | CAT5<br>Compen-<br>sation | CAT6<br>University | CAT7<br>Advance-<br>ment | CAT8<br>Racial |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
|  | A I                            | A I            | A I         | A I                | A I                       | A I                | A I                      | A I            |
| Not Applicable/No Response                   | 0 0                            | 5 1            | 0 0         | 0 0                | 0 0                       | 0 0                | 2 0                      | 0 0            |
| Not Influential                              | 3 4                            | 0 0            | 0 1         | 0 0                | 1 1                       | 1 1                | 1 1                      | 2 3            |
| Somewhat Influential                         | 5 2                            | 3 4            | 3 1         | 6 5                | 6 5                       | 4 2                | 4 2                      | 4 3            |
| Very Influential                             | 0 0                            | 0 1            | 5 4         | 2 1                | 1 0                       | 3 3                | 1 3                      | 2 0            |
| Column Totals                                | <u>8 6</u>                     | <u>8 6</u>     | <u>8 6</u>  | <u>8 6</u>         | <u>8 6</u>                | <u>8 6</u>         | <u>8 6</u>               | <u>8 6</u>     |

A=Administrative  
I=Instructional



TABLE 14

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Faculty Classification  
Relative To Job Acceptance  
(Morilla University)

| Influence of Categories On Job Acceptance | CAT1<br>Geographic Location | CAT2<br>Family | CAT3<br>Job | CAT4<br>Department | CAT5<br>Compen- sation | CAT6<br>University | CAT7<br>Advance- ment | CAT8<br>Racial |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
|   | A I                         | A I            | A I         | A I                | A I                    | A I                | A I                   | A I            |
| Not Applicable/No Response                | 0 1                         | 0 3            | 0 0         | 0 1                | 0 0                    | 0 0                | 0 1                   | 0 1            |
| Not Influential                           | 0 5                         | 1 3            | 0 0         | 1 3                | 1 2                    | 1 3                | 1 0                   | 2 8            |
| Somewhat Influential                      | 1 5                         | 1 4            | 0 9         | 1 6                | 1 8                    | 1 8                | 1 8                   | 0 1            |
| Very Influential                          | 1 0                         | 0 1            | 2 2         | 0 1                | 0 1                    | 0 0                | 0 2                   | 0 1            |
| Column Totals                             | <u>2 II</u>                 | <u>2 II</u>    | <u>2 II</u> | <u>2 II</u>        | <u>2 II</u>            | <u>2 II</u>        | <u>2 II</u>           | <u>2 II</u>    |

A=Administrative  
I=Instructional

TABLE 15

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Faculty Classification  
Relative To Job Acceptance  
(Falstaff State University)

| Influence of Categories On | CAT1<br>Geographic<br>Location | CAT2<br>Family | CAT3<br>Job | CAT4<br>Department | CAT5<br>Compen-<br>sation | CAT6<br>University | CAT7<br>Advance-<br>ment | CAT8<br>Racial |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Job Acceptance             | A I                            | A I            | A I         | A I                | A I                       | A I                | A I                      | A I            |
| Not Applicable/No Response | 0 0                            | 4 3            | 0 0         | 0 0                | 0 0                       | 0 0                | 1 0                      | 0 0            |
| Not Influential            | 1 0                            | 0 1            | 0 0         | 1 3                | 0 3                       | 1 6                | 1 2                      | 4 8            |
| Somewhat Influential       | 7 11                           | 4 7            | 6 9         | 7 7                | 6 5                       | 7 5                | 6 9                      | 4 3            |
| Very Influential           | 0 0                            | 0 0            | 2 2         | 0 1                | 2 3                       | 0 0                | 0 0                      | 0 0            |
| Column Totals              | 8 11                           | 8 11           | 8 11        | 8 11               | 8 11                      | 8 11               | 8 11                     | 8 11           |

A=Administrative  
I=Instructional

TABLE 16

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Faculty Classification  
Relative To Job Acceptance  
(All Universities)

| Influence of Categories On<br>Job Acceptance | CAT1<br>Geographic<br>Location | CAT2<br>Family | CAT3<br>Job | CAT4<br>Department | CAT5<br>Compen-<br>sation | CAT6<br>University | CAT7<br>Advance-<br>ment | CAT8<br>Racial |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
|  | A I                            | A I            | A I         | A I                | A I                       | A I                | A I                      | A I            |
| Not Applicable/No Response                   | 0 1                            | 11 10          | 0 0         | 0 1                | 0 0                       | 0 0                | 3 1                      | 0 1            |
| Not Influential                              | 6 11                           | 4 6            | 0 1         | 2 7                | 5 7                       | 6 14               | 5 6                      | 10 23          |
| Somewhat Influential                         | 21 25                          | 10 19          | 15 25       | 22 24              | 18 25                     | 18 20              | 16 23                    | 15 11          |
| Very Influential                             | 1 1                            | 3 3            | 13 12       | 4 6                | 5 6                       | 4 4                | 4 8                      | 3 3            |
| Column Totals                                | 28 38                          | 28 38          | 28 38       | 28 38              | 28 38                     | 28 38              | 28 38                    | 28 38          |

A=Administrative  
I=Instructional

TABLE 17

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Race Relative To Job Acceptance (All Universities)

| Influence of Categories On Job Acceptance | CAT1<br>Geographic Location |    | CAT2<br>Family |    | CAT3<br>Job |    | CAT4<br>Department |    | CAT5<br>Compen-<br>sation |    | CAT6<br>University |    | CAT7<br>Advance-<br>ment |    | CAT8<br>Racial |    |
|---|-----------------------------|----|----------------|----|-------------|----|--------------------|----|---------------------------|----|--------------------|----|--------------------------|----|----------------|----|
|   | B                           | W  | B              | W  | B           | W  | B                  | W  | B                         | W  | B                  | W  | B                        | W  | B              | W  |
| Not Applicable/No Response                | 0                           | 1  | 11             | 10 | 0           | 0  | 0                  | 1  | 0                         | 0  | 0                  | 0  | 2                        | 2  | 0              | 1  |
| Not Influential                           | 11                          | 6  | 5              | 5  | 1           | 0  | 1                  | 8  | 6                         | 6  | 9                  | 11 | 7                        | 4  | 11             | 22 |
| Somewhat Influential                      | 22                          | 24 | 13             | 16 | 16          | 24 | 25                 | 21 | 23                        | 20 | 17                 | 21 | 15                       | 24 | 18             | 8  |
| Very Influential                          | 1                           | 1  | 5              | 1  | 17          | 8  | 8                  | 2  | 5                         | 6  | 8                  | 0  | 10                       | 2  | 5              | 1  |
| Column Totals                             | 34                          | 32 | 34             | 32 | 34          | 32 | 34                 | 32 | 34                        | 32 | 34                 | 32 | 34                       | 32 | 34             | 32 |

B=Blacks  
W=Whites

influences on their decisions to remain at four southeastern universities?"

Relative to the factors that influence faculty to remain in their jobs, job factors remained most influential for CU (TWI) (Table 18) and LU (TWI) (Table 19) faculty and for faculty at all universities when data was combined by faculty classification (Table 20) and by race (Table 21). However, for MU (TBI) white faculty compensation factors are most influential (Table 22) while departmental and compensation factors primarily influence FSU (TBI) faculty to remain in jobs (Table 23). Advancement factors are second in importance for white faculty at MU and FSU and for combined universities. At CU, advancement and family factors ranked second and at LU, family factors were found to be second in influence.

While job factors emerged as most influential for black faculty to remain at TWIs, family factors ranked a surprising second. Certainly job factors can be enhanced by managers (if necessary); however, issues related to the families of black faculty cannot be as easily influenced by university managers. Such issues include educational opportunities for children, social comfort of spouse/children, racial composition of communities, and spouse's employment opportunities. This finding is

TABLE 18

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Faculty Classification  
 Relative To Job Continuation  
 (Caperton University)

| Influence of Categories On<br>Job Continuation | CAT1<br>Geographic<br>Location | CAT2<br>Family | CAT3<br>Job | CAT4<br>Department | CAT5<br>Compen-<br>sation | CAT6<br>University | CAT7<br>Advance-<br>ment | CAT8<br>Racial |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
|  | A                              | I              | A           | I                  | A                         | I                  | A                        | I              |
| Not Applicable/No Response                     | 0                              | 0              | 0           | 0                  | 0                         | 0                  | 0                        | 0              |
| Not Influential                                | 4                              | 0              | 0           | 2                  | 1                         | 0                  | 3                        | 1              |
| Somewhat Influential                           | 6                              | 3              | 6           | 7                  | 2                         | 8                  | 2                        | 5              |
| Very Influential                               | 0                              | 3              | 4           | 1                  | 2                         | 0                  | 2                        | 1              |
| <u>Column Totals</u>                           | <u>10</u>                      | <u>5</u>       | <u>10</u>   | <u>5</u>           | <u>10</u>                 | <u>5</u>           | <u>10</u>                | <u>5</u>       |

A=Administrative  
 I=Instructional

TABLE 19

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Faculty Classification  
Relative To Job Continuation  
(Longman University)

| Influence of Categories On<br>Job Continuation | CAT1<br>Geographic<br>Location |   | CAT2<br>Family |   | CAT3<br>Job |   | CAT4<br>Department |   | CAT5<br>Compen-<br>sation |   | CAT6<br>University |   | CAT7<br>Advance-<br>ment |   | CAT8<br>Racial |   |
|--|--------------------------------|---|----------------|---|-------------|---|--------------------|---|---------------------------|---|--------------------|---|--------------------------|---|----------------|---|
|  | A                              | I | A              | I | A           | I | A                  | I | A                         | I | A                  | I | A                        | I | A              | I |
| Not Applicable/No Response                     | 0                              | 0 | 4              | 1 | 0           | 0 | 1                  | 0 | 0                         | 0 | 0                  | 0 | 0                        | 0 | 0              | 0 |
| Not Influential                                | 2                              | 3 | 0              | 1 | 0           | 0 | 1                  | 0 | 1                         | 0 | 1                  | 0 | 1                        | 0 | 2              | 1 |
| Somewhat Influential                           | 5                              | 3 | 1              | 0 | 4           | 2 | 4                  | 3 | 6                         | 5 | 3                  | 5 | 4                        | 2 | 4              | 4 |
| Very Influential                               | 1                              | 0 | 3              | 4 | 4           | 4 | 3                  | 3 | 1                         | 1 | 4                  | 1 | 2                        | 4 | 2              | 1 |
| Column Totals                                  | 8                              | 6 | 8              | 6 | 8           | 6 | 8                  | 6 | 8                         | 6 | 8                  | 6 | 8                        | 6 | 8              | 6 |

A=Administrative  
I=Instructional

TABLE 20

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Faculty Classification  
Relative To Job Continuation  
(All Universities)

| Influence of Categories On<br>Job Continuation | CAT1<br>Geographic<br>Location | CAT2<br>Family | CAT3<br>Job | CAT4<br>Department | CAT5<br>Compen-<br>sation | CAT6<br>University | CAT7<br>Advance-<br>ment | CAT8<br>Racial |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
|  | A I                            | A I            | A I         | A I                | A I                       | A I                | A I                      | A I            |
| Not Applicable/No Response                     | 0 0                            | 8 7            | 0 0         | 0 0                | 0 0                       | 0 1                | 2 0                      | 0 0            |
| Not Influential                                | 9 7                            | 4 4            | 0 0         | 3 8                | 4 3                       | 6 10               | 7 5                      | 8 19           |
| Somewhat Influential                           | 18 30                          | 9 20           | 17 27       | 18 20              | 19 27                     | 18 22              | 12 22                    | 17 15          |
| Very Influential                               | 1 1                            | 7 7            | 11 11       | 7 10               | 5 8                       | 4 5                | 7 11                     | 3 4            |
| Column Totals                                  | 28 38                          | 28 38          | 28 38       | 28 38              | 28 38                     | 28 38              | 28 38                    | 28 38          |

A=Administrative  
I=Instructional



TABLE 21

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Race Relative To Job

Continuation (All Universities)

| Influence of Categories On<br>Job Continuation | CAT1<br>Geographic Location |    | CAT2<br>Family |    | CAT3<br>Job |    | CAT4<br>Department |    | CAT5<br>Compen-<br>sation |    | CAT6<br>University |    | CAT7<br>Advance-<br>ment |    | CAT8<br>Racial |    |
|--|-----------------------------|----|----------------|----|-------------|----|--------------------|----|---------------------------|----|--------------------|----|--------------------------|----|----------------|----|
|  | B                           | W  | B              | W  | B           | W  | B                  | W  | B                         | W  | B                  | W  | B                        | W  | B              | W  |
| Not Applicable/No Response                     | 0                           | 8  | 7              | 0  | 0           | 0  | 0                  | 0  | 0                         | 0  | 0                  | 1  | 1                        | 1  | 0              | 0  |
| Not Influential                                | 9                           | 7  | 6              | 2  | 0           | 0  | 5                  | 6  | 2                         | 5  | 6                  | 10 | 5                        | 7  | 6              | 21 |
| Somewhat Influential                           | 23                          | 25 | 8              | 21 | 18          | 26 | 18                 | 20 | 26                        | 20 | 21                 | 19 | 15                       | 19 | 21             | 11 |
| Very Influential                               | 2                           | 0  | 12             | 2  | 16          | 6  | 11                 | 6  | 6                         | 7  | 7                  | 2  | 13                       | 5  | 7              | 0  |
| Column Totals                                  | 34                          | 32 | 34             | 32 | 34          | 32 | 34                 | 32 | 34                        | 32 | 34                 | 32 | 34                       | 32 | 34             | 32 |

B=Blacks  
W=Whites

significant, however, because it might serve as an explanation for TWI managers success or failure in retaining black faculty.

Relative to all white faculty at TBIs, compensation and advancement factors are most influential in their decisions to remain. The influence of compensation and advancement on white faculty decisions to remain indicates that they are satisfied with both. However, both these factors can be improved through management processes.

#### Consideration To Leave Jobs

The third research question addressed in this study is: "What factors do other-race faculty consider important in influencing them to consider leaving four southeastern universities?"

Relative to the factors that would influence other-race faculty to consider leaving their universities, family and advancement factors ranked number one for combined universities (Tables 24 and 25). Family factors ranked first for CU (TWI) black faculty (Table 26), while the primary factors that would influence faculty to consider leaving the other universities were as follows:

1. advancement for LU (TWI) black faculty (Table 27)
2. compensation for MU (TBI) white faculty (Table 28)
- and
3. racial issues for FSU (TBI) white faculty (Table 29).

TABLE 22

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Faculty Classification  
 Relative To Job Continuation  
 (Morilla University)

| Influence of Categories On<br>Job Continuation | CAT1<br>Geographic<br>Location      | CAT2<br>Family | CAT3<br>Job | CAT4<br>Department | CAT5<br>Compen-<br>sation | CAT6<br>University | CAT7<br>Advance-<br>ment | CAT8<br>Racial |
|--|-------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
|  | A I                                 | A I            | A I         | A I                | A I                       | A I                | A I                      | A I            |
| Not Applicable/No Response                     | 0 0                                 | 0 2            | 0 0         | 0 0                | 0 0                       | 0 1                | 0 0                      | 0 0            |
| Not Influential                                | 2 3                                 | 0 0            | 1 9         | 0 2                | 1 1                       | 0 2                | 1 2                      | 0 8            |
| Somewhat Influential                           | 0 8                                 | 2 8            | 1 2         | 2 8                | 1 8                       | 2 7                | 1 8                      | 2 3            |
| Very Influential                               | 0 0                                 | 0 1            | 0 0         | 0 1                | 0 2                       | 0 1                | 0 1                      | 0 0            |
| Column Totals                                  | <u>2 11</u>                         | <u>2 11</u>    | <u>2 11</u> | <u>2 11</u>        | <u>2 11</u>               | <u>2 11</u>        | <u>2 11</u>              | <u>2 11</u>    |
|  | A=Administrative<br>I=Instructional |                |             |                    |                           |                    |                          |                |

TABLE 23

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Faculty Classification  
 Relative To Job Continuation  
 (Falstaff State University)

| Influence of Categories On<br>Job Continuation | CAT1<br>Geographic<br>Location | CAT2<br>Family | CAT3<br>Job | CAT4<br>Department | CAT5<br>Compen-<br>sation | CAT6<br>University | CAT7<br>Advance-<br>ment | CAT8<br>Racial |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
|  | A I                            | A I            | A I         | A I                | A I                       | A I                | A I                      | A I            |
| Not Applicable/No Response                     | 0 0                            | 4 1            | 0 0         | 0 0                | 0 0                       | 0 0                | 1 0                      | 0 0            |
| Not Influential                                | 1 1                            | 0 2            | 0 0         | 0 4                | 1 2                       | 3 5                | 2 2                      | 5 8            |
| Somewhat Influential                           | 7 10                           | 3 8            | 6 10        | 5 5                | 4 7                       | 5 5                | 2 8                      | 3 3            |
| Very Influential                               | 0 0                            | 1 0            | 2 1         | 3 2                | 3 2                       | 0 1                | 3 1                      | 0 0            |
| Column Totals                                  | 8 11                           | 8 11           | 8 11        | 8 11               | 8 11                      | 8 11               | 8 11                     | 8 11           |

A=Administrative  
 I=Instructional

TABLE 24

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Faculty Classification  
Relative To Considerations To Leave  
(All Universities)

| Influence of Categories On Considerations to Leave | *CAT1<br>Geographic Location | *CAT2<br>Family | CAT3<br>Job | CAT4<br>Department | CAT5<br>Compen-<br>sation | CAT6<br>University | CAT7<br>Advance-<br>ment | CAT8<br>Racial |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
|  | A I                          | A I             | A I         | A I                | A I                       | A I                | A I                      | A I            |
| False/No Response                                  | 0 1                          | 8 8             | 16 17       | 9 4                | 6 9                       | 6 9                | 5 6                      | 2 5            |
| Not Influential                                    | 10 12                        | 2 7             | 8 12        | 1 7                | 4 5                       | 6 5                | 5 4                      | 5 3            |
| Somewhat Influential                               | 17 24                        | 11 13           | 4 9         | 11 18              | 12 14                     | 11 22              | 11 18                    | 14 23          |
| Very Influential                                   | 1 1                          | 7 10            | 0 9         | 7 9                | 6 10                      | 5 2                | 7 10                     | 7 7            |
| Column Totals                                      | 28 38                        | 28 38           | 28 38       | 28 38              | 28 38                     | 28 38              | 28 38                    | 28 38          |

A=Administrative  
I=Instructional

\*Responses for these two categories are Not Applicable/No Response rather than False/No Response.

TABLE 25

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Race Relative To Considerations To Leave (All Universities)

| Influence of Categories On Considerations To Leave | *CAT1<br>Geographic Location |    | *CAT2<br>Family |    | CAT3<br>Job |    | CAT4<br>Department |    | CAT5<br>Compensation |    | CAT6<br>University |    | CAT7<br>Advance-ment |    | CAT8<br>Racial |    |
|--|------------------------------|----|-----------------|----|-------------|----|--------------------|----|----------------------|----|--------------------|----|----------------------|----|----------------|----|
|  | B                            | W  | B               | W  | B           | W  | B                  | W  | B                    | W  | B                  | W  | B                    | W  | B              | W  |
| False/No Response                                  | 0                            | 1  | 9               | 7  | 15          | 18 | 9                  | 4  | 6                    | 9  | 8                  | 7  | 6                    | 5  | 2              | 5  |
| Not Influential                                    | 13                           | 9  | 2               | 7  | 9           | 11 | 2                  | 8  | 4                    | 5  | 3                  | 8  | 4                    | 5  | 2              | 6  |
| Somewhat Influential                               | 19                           | 22 | 10              | 14 | 10          | 3  | 11                 | 18 | 16                   | 10 | 16                 | 17 | 13                   | 16 | 23             | 14 |
| Very Influential                                   | 2                            | 0  | 13              | 4  | 0           | 0  | 12                 | 4  | 8                    | 8  | 7                  | 0  | 11                   | 6  | 7              | 7  |
| Column Totals                                      | 34                           | 32 | 34              | 32 | 34          | 32 | 34                 | 32 | 34                   | 32 | 34                 | 32 | 34                   | 32 | 34             | 32 |

B=Blacks  
W=Whites

\*Responses for these two categories are Not Applicable/No Response rather than False/No Response.

TABLE 26

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Faculty Classification  
 Relative To Considerations To Leave  
 (Caperton University)

| Influence of Categories On Considerations to Leave | *CAT1<br>Geographic Location | *CAT2<br>Family | CAT3<br>Job | CAT4<br>Department | CAT5<br>Compensation | CAT6<br>University | CAT7<br>Advance-ment | CAT8<br>Racial |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
|  | A I                          | A I             | A I         | A I                | A I                  | A I                | A I                  | A I            |
| False/No Response                                  | 0 0                          | 0 3             | 4 2         | 3 1                | 2 0                  | 3 1                | 2 0                  | 1 0            |
| Not Influential                                    | 5 2                          | 2 0             | 3 2         | 0 1                | 0 2                  | 0 0                | 1 1                  | 2 0            |
| Somewhat Influential                               | 5 2                          | 2 1             | 3 1         | 3 1                | 6 1                  | 4 3                | 4 2                  | 5 3            |
| Very Influential                                   | 0 1                          | 6 1             | 0 0         | 4 2                | 2 2                  | 3 1                | 3 2                  | 2 2            |
| Column Totals                                      | 10 5                         | 10 5            | 10 5        | 10 5               | 10 5                 | 10 5               | 10 5                 | 10 5           |

A=Administrative  
 I=Instructional

\*Responses for these two categories are Not Applicable/No Response rather than False/No Response.

TABLE 27

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Faculty Classification  
Relative To Considerations To Leave  
(Longman University)

| Influence of Categories On<br>Considerations to Leave | *CAT1<br>Geographic<br>Location | *CAT2<br>Family | CAT3<br>Job | CAT4<br>Department | CAT5<br>Compen-<br>sation | CAT6<br>University | CAT7<br>Advance-<br>ment | CAT8<br>Racial |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
|   | A I                             | A I             | A I         | A I                | A I                       | A I                | A I                      | A I            |
| False/No Response                                     | 0 0                             | 4 1             | 5 1         | 4 1                | 3 1                       | 2 2                | 2 2                      | 0 0            |
| Not Influential                                       | 2 2                             | 0 0             | 2 2         | 0 0                | 0 1                       | 2 0                | 1 0                      | 0 0            |
| Somewhat Influential                                  | 5 4                             | 3 2             | 1 3         | 2 3                | 3 2                       | 2 4                | 2 2                      | 6 6            |
| Very Influential                                      | 1 0                             | 1 3             | 0 0         | 2 2                | 2 2                       | 2 0                | 3 2                      | 2 0            |
| Column Totals   | 8 6                             | 8 6             | 8 6         | 8 6                | 8 6                       | 8 6                | 8 6                      | 8 6            |

A=Administrative  
I=Instructional

\*Responses for these two categories are Not Applicable/No Response rather than False/No Response.



TABLE 28

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Faculty Classification  
 Relative To Considerations To Leave  
 (Morilla University)

| Influence of Categories On<br>Considerations to Leave | *CAT1<br>Geographic<br>Location | *CAT2<br>Family | CAT3<br>Job | CAT4<br>Department | CAT5<br>Compen-<br>sation | CAT6<br>University | CAT7<br>Advance-<br>ment | CAT8<br>Racial |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
|   | A I                             | A I             | A I         | A I                | A I                       | A I                | A I                      | A I            |
| False/No Response                                     | 0 1                             | 0 1             | 2 5         | 0 2                | 0 4                       | 0 4                | 0 3                      | 0 2            |
| Not Influential                                       | 1 4                             | 0 5             | 0 4         | 1 2                | 2 0                       | 1 3                | 1 1                      | 2 2            |
| Somewhat Influential                                  | 1 6                             | 2 4             | 0 2         | 1 6                | 0 3                       | 1 4                | 1 4                      | 0 5            |
| Very Influential                                      | 0 0                             | 0 1             | 0 0         | 0 1                | 0 4                       | 0 0                | 0 3                      | 0 2            |
| Column Totals   | 2 11                            | 2 11            | 2 11        | 2 11               | 2 11                      | 2 11               | 2 11                     | 2 11           |

A=Administrative  
 I=Instructional

\*Responses for these two categories are Not Applicable/No Response rather than False/No Response.

TABLE 29

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors by Faculty Classification  
 Relative To Considerations To Leave  
 (Falstaff State University)

| Influence of Categories On<br>Considerations to Leave | *CAT1<br>Geographic<br>Location | *CAT2<br>Family | CAT3<br>Job | CAT4<br>Department | CAT5<br>Compen-<br>sation | CAT6<br>University | CAT7<br>Advance-<br>ment | CAT8<br>Racial |   |    |   |    |   |    |   |    |   |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---|----|---|----|---|----|---|----|---|
|   | A                               | I               | A           | I                  | A                         | I                  | A                        | I              |   |    |   |    |   |    |   |    |   |
| False/No Response                                     | 0                               | 0               | 4           | 2                  | 5                         | 6                  | 2                        | 0              | 1 | 4  | 1 | 2  | 1 | 1  | 2 |    |   |
| Not Influential                                       | 2                               | 2               | 0           | 2                  | 3                         | 4                  | 0                        | 3              | 2 | 1  | 3 | 1  | 2 | 1  | 1 |    |   |
| Somewhat Influential                                  | 6                               | 9               | 4           | 4                  | 4                         | 0                  | 1                        | 5              | 6 | 3  | 4 | 4  | 8 | 4  | 7 | 3  | 6 |
| Very Influential                                      | 0                               | 0               | 0           | 3                  | 0                         | 0                  | 1                        | 2              | 2 | 2  | 0 | 0  | 1 | 2  | 3 | 2  |   |
| Column Totals   | 8                               | 11              | 8           | 11                 | 8                         | 11                 | 8                        | 11             | 8 | 11 | 8 | 11 | 8 | 11 | 8 | 11 |   |

A=Administrative  
 I=Instructional

\*Responses for these two categories are Not Applicable/No Response rather than False/No Response.

Departmental factors ranked second in influence for CU faculty, department, family and compensation factors for LU faculty, and department and compensation factors for combined universities. Compensation also ranked second at FSU (TBI), and advancement ranked second at MU (TBI). Racial factors were third in importance for white faculty at MU and for faculty at combined universities.

Again, we see that family factors are as important in influencing black faculty to consider leaving TWIs as they generally are in influencing them to remain. Though such factors are primarily outside the TWI managers' control, their importance must be recognized. Factors that can be most readily influenced by managers are the department and compensation factors cited by black faculty. (The data analysis of the specific departmental variables will help identify the specific department factors that influence black faculty considerations to leave.)

Relative to white faculty at TBIs, compensation and advancement are as important in their considerations to leave TBIs as they are in influencing them to remain. These can be improved by management. However, the influence of racial factors on white faculty is surprising and may not be

readily managed. Since we are unable, at this point in the study, to isolate variables that raise these concerns, it is best that we see if they emerge in the analysis of individual variables. This finding, however, raises some interesting questions about whether those race-related issues are internal or external to TBIs.

#### Comparison of Managerial Survey And Faculty Interview Data

The fourth research question addressed in this study is: "Are there differences between the factors identified through the EEO, Personnel and Academic Affairs Survey and the factors identified by other-race faculty as influencing faculty decisions to accept, remain in and consider leaving faculty positions?"

This question was addressed fully in this chapter under the heading Comparisons of Faculty Interview Responses to Manager Survey Responses. It was determined that CU (TWI) managers are most aware of the factors that influence all of their other-race faculty employment decisions. And while the managers at the other three universities were aware of factors that influence their other-race faculty to accept or leave they were not aware of the factors that influence them to remain. Since retention of faculty is crucial, the findings of this study should be useful.

### Influence of Race-related Issues

The fifth research question addressed in this study is: "How influential are the factors perceived to be associated with race in other-race faculty employment decisions?" As noted above, racial issues were ranked highest by FSU (TBI) white faculty relative to their considerations to leave. Additionally, racial issues ranked third among influences on white faculty to consider leaving MU (TBI), and for combined universities.

Since the specific race-related variables cannot be identified at this point in the study, we will see if they emerge in the analysis of individual variables. If it is determined that the race-related variables are internal to TBIs, it is possible that they can be improved by managers. If they are external variables, they cannot be as easily influenced by managers.

### Relationships Between Faculty Classification (Administrative and Instructional) And The Factors

The sixth research question addressed in this study is: "Is there a relationship between (a) faculty classification and the factors; and (b) faculty classification and the categories of factors that influence other-race faculty employment decisions?"

The data shown in Table 30 suggests a relationship between faculty classification and the factor expectation of tenure. The data analysis for this factor produced a chi-square of 15.71953 which is statistically significant at the 0.01 level. Through further analysis of the data, it was determined that more instructional faculty said that the expectation of tenure was more influential in their decisions to accept jobs than did administrators. Since administrative faculty do not compete for tenure once on the job, it is understandable that they would not be influenced to accept jobs by the expectation of tenure.

Relative to the factors that influence other-race faculty to remain in their jobs, the data shown in Tables 31-33 suggest a relationship between faculty classifications and several factors.

For white MU (TBI) instructional faculty, several factors are related to faculty classification as follows (see Table 31):

1. the cost of living (73% instructional compared to 0 administrators)
2. having received tenure (81% compared to 0)
3. fringe benefits package (100% compared to 0).

Again, more instructional than administrative faculty indicated that these factors are influential in their

TABLE 30

Tabulation of Frequencies of Response To Factors by Faculty Classification  
 (All Universities)  
 Variable # A62 = expectation of tenure.

| Influence of Factor on Job Acceptance | *Responses       |                  | Instructional % | Total |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------|
|                                       | Administrative n | Administrative % |                 |       |
| Not Applicable                        | 10               | 36%              | 3               | 13    |
| Not Influential                       | 10               | 36%              | 8               | 18    |
| Somewhat Influential                  | 4                | 14%              | 13              | 17    |
| Very Influential                      | 3                | 11%              | 14              | 17    |
| No Response                           | 1                | 3%               | 0               | 1     |
| Column TOTAL                          | 28               |                  | 38              | 66    |

df= 4  
 chi-square= 15.71953  
 significant at p=0.01

\*percentages rounded to nearest whole number

decisions to remain at MU. The finding relative to the receipt of tenure is not surprising. The percentage differences can be explained by the fact that only 2 of the 13 faculty responding to the questionnaire are administrators. What is significant here is since fringe benefits are considered part of the compensation package, this finding is consistent with the results of the faculty interview analysis (that is, white faculty are very influenced by compensation factors).

What is surprising is the significance of the cost of living on white MU instructional faculty decisions to remain at TBIs. While there is a definite link between cost of living and compensation (which provides the ability to finance those expenses), the researcher is unaware of any differences in the costs of living within the area that MU (TBI) is located. And it is interesting that there was not a similar finding for white instructional faculty at FSU (TBI). However, this finding might result from the fact that only 2 of the 13 faculty responding to the questionnaire are administrators.

Only one factor--having received tenure--was significantly related to faculty classification for respondents at all universities and it, too, was cited most by instructional faculty (see Table 32).



TABLE 31  
 Tabulation of Frequencies of Responses To Job Continuation Factors by Faculty Classification  
 (Morilla University)

| Variable #/Name                       | Faculty Class. | * Responses          |               |                              |                                   |                               |                          |   |     |   |    |    | TOTAL                        | X <sup>2</sup><br>p<br>df |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---|-----|---|----|----|------------------------------|---------------------------|
|                                       |                | Applicable<br>n<br>% | Not<br>n<br>% | Not<br>Influential<br>n<br>% | Somewhat<br>Influential<br>n<br>% | Very<br>Influential<br>n<br>% | No<br>Response<br>n<br>% |   |     |   |    |    |                              |                           |
| #R77 -<br>the cost of<br>living       | Admin.         | 0                    | 0%            | 2                            | 100%                              | 0                             | 0%                       | 0 | 0%  | 0 | 0% | 2  | 13.00000<br>p<0.01<br>df = 3 |                           |
|                                       | Instr.         | 3                    | 27%           | 0                            | 0%                                | 6                             | 55%                      | 2 | 18% | 0 | 0% | 11 |                              |                           |
| #R89 -<br>having received<br>tenure   | Admin.         | 2                    | 100%          | 0                            | 0%                                | 0                             | 0%                       | 0 | 0%  | 0 | 0% | 2  | 13.00000<br>p<0.01<br>df = 3 |                           |
|                                       | Instr.         | 0                    | 0%            | 2                            | 18%                               | 4                             | 36%                      | 5 | 46% | 0 | 0% | 11 |                              |                           |
| #R113 -<br>fringe benefits<br>package | Admin.         | 1                    | 50%           | 1                            | 50%                               | 0                             | 0%                       | 0 | 0%  | 0 | 0% | 2  | 13.00000<br>p<0.01<br>df = 3 |                           |
|                                       | Instr.         | 0                    | 0%            | 0                            | 0%                                | 6                             | 55%                      | 5 | 45% | 0 | 0% | 11 |                              |                           |

\* Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

TABLE 32

Tabulation of Frequencies of Response To Factors by Faculty Classification  
Relative To Job Continuation  
(All Universities)

Variable # R89 = having received tenure.

| Influence of Factor on<br>Job Continuation | *Responses               |                         | Total |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------|
|  | Administrative<br>n<br>% | Instructional<br>n<br>% |       |
| Not Applicable                             | 20<br>71%                | 11<br>29%               | 31    |
| Not Influential                            | 3<br>11%                 | 4<br>11%                | 7     |
| Somewhat Influential                       | 1<br>4%                  | 7<br>18%                | 8     |
| Very Influential                           | 4<br>14%                 | 16<br>42%               | 20    |
| No Response                                | 0<br>0%                  | 0<br>0%                 | 0     |
| Column TOTAL                               | 28                       | 38                      | 66    |

df= 3  
chi-square= 13.24466  
significant at p=0.01

\*percentages rounded to nearest whole number

TABLE 33

Tabulation of Frequencies of Response To Factors by Faculty Classification Relative To Considerations To Leave (Morilla University)

Variable # L160 = inadequate numbers of people of your race/ethnicity in the community.

| Influence of Factor on Considerations to Leave | *Responses       |      | Instructional % | Total |
|--|------------------|------|-----------------|-------|
|  | Administrative n | %    |                 |       |
| False  | 0                | 0%   | 9 82%           | 9     |
| Not Influential                                | 2                | 100% | 0 0%            | 2     |
| Somewhat Influential                           | 0                | 0%   | 0 0%            | 0     |
| Very Influential                               | 0                | 0%   | 2 18%           | 2     |
| No Response                                    | 0                | 0%   | 0 0%            | 0     |
| Column TOTAL                                   | 2                |      | 11              | 13    |

df= 2  
 chi-square= 13.00000  
 significant at p=0.01

\*percentages rounded to nearest whole number

TABLE 34

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses to Categories of Factors  
 by Faculty Classification (Morilla University)  
 Category Variable #3 = Compensation Factors

| Influence of Factor on Considerations to Leave | *Responses               |                         |       | Total |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------|-------|
|  | Administrative<br>n<br>% | Instructional<br>n<br>% | Total |       |
| False  | 0<br>0%                  | 4<br>36%                | 4     |       |
| Not Influential                                | 2<br>100%                | 0<br>0%                 | 2     |       |
| Somewhat Influential                           | 0<br>0%                  | 3<br>28%                | 3     |       |
| Very Influential                               | 0<br>0%                  | 4<br>36%                | 4     |       |
| No Response                                    | 0<br>0%                  | 0<br>0%                 | 0     |       |
| Column TOTAL                                   | 2                        | 11                      | 13    |       |

df= 3  
 chi-square= 13.00000  
 significant at p=0.01

\*percentages rounded to nearest whole number

Relative to the factors that would be influential in faculty decisions to leave their universities the data shown on Table 33 suggests a relationship between faculty classification for MU (TBI) white faculty for the factor: adequacy of numbers of people of my race/ethnicity in the community. While nine of MU's instructional faculty indicated that the numbers were adequate, two (2) said that inadequate numbers would be very influential in their considerations to leave. The two administrative faculty said that the factor would not be influential. There is no way to determine why instructional faculty are more influenced by this factor than are administrative faculty. And since only two instructional faculty indicated that it was important, we should not place too much emphasis on this finding.

Relationships Between Faculty Classification (Administrative and Instructional) And Categories of Factors

In order to analyze faculty responses for each category of factors, a special computer program was developed for use with SPSS. The program was designed to calculate the mean response of each faculty for each category of factors. The program counted the responses of faculty for each factor (variable) within the category and calculated the mean response for the category. See Appendix J for the description of the program.

Relative to the relationship between faculty classification and the categories of factors, a significant relationship was revealed for MU (TBI) faculty relative to their considerations to leave. The data analysis produced a chi-square of 13.00000 which is statistically significant at the 0.01 level for the compensation category (Table 34). Seven of eleven instructional faculty said that compensation factors would be influential in their considerations to leave MU. Administrative faculty said compensation would not be influential in their considerations to leave.

Through checking the demographic data for MU white faculty, it was determined that these seven instructional faculty have been employed by MU over 11 years, while administrative faculty have been employed less than 6 years. Since the current entrance salaries of university employees generally exceed the salaries of those employed over a long period of time, this finding is not surprising. It is significant, however, because the white faculty who said that compensation would be an important consideration to leave MU, probably can demand higher compensation upon entering other universities. And TBI managers can improve compensation through management processes (e.g., salary increases).

Relationship Between Race (Black and White) of Faculty And The Factors

The seventh research question addressed in this study is: Is there a relationship between: (a) race and the factors; and (b) race and the categories of factors that influence other-race faculty employment decisions?"

The data suggest a relationship between race and eight factors influencing all such faculty to accept their jobs. As shown in Table 35, white faculty said that climate (84%), the expectation of promotion(s) (81%) and pursuing professional interests (100%) are more influential in their decisions to accept jobs than did black faculty (50%, 70%, and 97% respectively). The geographical location influence was noted earlier and climate is one variable of geographic location. A review of the specific responses of other-race faculty during interviews revealed that the emphasis placed on geographical location was primarily related to climate (which cannot be controlled by managers).

It is interesting, however, that black faculty are less influenced (than the whites) to accept jobs expecting promotion(s). While the vast majority of black faculty (70%) were influenced by such expectations, 30% were not. And since the majority of blacks surveyed are administrative faculty (18 of 30), it is possible that many are employed in positions which have no promotional lines (e.g. staff

generalists, jobs designed to serve the interests of black students or employees). If this is true, TWI managers can improve promotional opportunities for such black administrative faculty.

Additional relationships between race and factors influential in job acceptance were found to be significant. Black faculty considered the following factors more influential in their decisions to accept jobs than did white faculty:

1. educational opportunities for child(ren) (41% blacks compared to 34% whites);
2. serving as role models for students of your race/ethnicity (65% compared to 31%);
3. competency of colleagues (88% compared to 72%);
4. campus recreational facilities (47% compared to 13%);  
and
5. availability of advisees for research (38% compared to 9%).

Relative to these findings, the importance to black faculty of educational opportunities for their children reminds us of the importance of family factors to the black faculty interviewed. The significance of campus recreational facilities, however, presents an anomaly since nothing in the literature on faculty mobility or in the



TABLE 35  
 Tabulation of Frequencies of Response To Job Acceptance Factors by Race  
 (All Universities)

| Variable #/Name  | Race  | * Responses       |                           |                                |                            |                       |     |    |     |   |    | TOTAL | $\chi^2$<br>p<br>df          |
|--|-------|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----|----|-----|---|----|-------|------------------------------|
|  |       | Applicable<br>n % | Not<br>Influential<br>n % | Somewhat<br>Influential<br>n % | Very<br>Influential<br>n % | No<br>Response<br>n % |     |    |     |   |    |       |                              |
| #A8 -<br>the climate   | Black | 1                 | 3%                        | 16                             | 47%                        | 13                    | 38% | 4  | 12% | 0 | 0% | 34    | 14.12361<br>p 0.01<br>df = 3 |
|  | White | 3                 | 9%                        | 2                              | 6%                         | 21                    | 66% | 6  | 19% | 0 | 0% | 32    |                              |
| #A19 -<br>educational<br>opportunities<br>for your child(ren)  | Black | 14                | 41%                       | 4                              | 12%                        | 1                     | 3%  | 13 | 38% | 2 | 6% | 34    | 15.60895<br>p 0.01<br>df = 4 |
|  | White | 13                | 41%                       | 7                              | 22%                        | 9                     | 28% | 2  | 6%  | 1 | 3% | 32    |                              |
| #A30 -<br>pursuing<br>professional<br>interests                | Black | 0                 | 0%                        | 1                              | 3%                         | 3                     | 9%  | 30 | 88% | 0 | 0% | 34    | 9.66766<br>p 0.01<br>df = 2  |
|  | White | 0                 | 0%                        | 0                              | 0%                         | 13                    | 41% | 19 | 59% | 0 | 0% | 32    |                              |
| #A31 -<br>role model for<br>students of your<br>race/ethnicity | Black | 1                 | 3%                        | 11                             | 32%                        | 6                     | 18% | 16 | 47% | 0 | 0% | 34    | 11.86819<br>p 0.01<br>df = 3 |
|  | White | 2                 | 6%                        | 20                             | 63%                        | 7                     | 22% | 3  | 9%  | 0 | 0% | 32    |                              |

\* Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

TABLE 35 (cont.)  
 Tabulation of Frequencies of Response To Job Acceptance Factors by Race  
 (All Universities)

| Variable #/Name  | Race  | * Responses          |                              |                                   |                               |                          |    | TOTAL                        | χ <sup>2</sup><br>P<br>df |
|--|-------|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|----|------------------------------|---------------------------|
|  |       | Applicable<br>n<br>% | Not<br>Influential<br>n<br>% | Somewhat<br>Influential<br>n<br>% | Very<br>Influential<br>n<br>% | No<br>Response<br>n<br>% |    |                              |                           |
| #A33 -<br>availability of<br>advisees for re-<br>search assistance | Black | 13<br>38%            | 8<br>24%                     | 11<br>32%                         | 2<br>6%                       | 0<br>0%                  | 34 | 2.74954<br>P 0.01<br>df = 2  |                           |
|  | White | 10<br>31%            | 19<br>59%                    | 2<br>6%                           | 1<br>3%                       | 0<br>0%                  | 32 |                              |                           |
| #A35 -<br>competency of<br>colleagues                              | Black | 0<br>0%              | 4<br>12%                     | 11<br>32%                         | 19<br>56%                     | 0<br>0%                  | 34 | 12.62549<br>P 0.01<br>df = 3 |                           |
|  | White | 2<br>6%              | 7<br>22%                     | 18<br>56%                         | 5<br>16%                      | 0<br>0%                  | 32 |                              |                           |
| #A49 -<br>campus recrea-<br>tional facilities                      | Black | 2<br>6%              | 16<br>47%                    | 16<br>47%                         | 0<br>0%                       | 0<br>0%                  | 34 | 12.11192<br>P 0.01<br>df = 3 |                           |
|  | White | 4<br>13%             | 24<br>75%                    | 3<br>9%                           | 1<br>3%                       | 0<br>0%                  | 32 |                              |                           |
| #A63 -<br>expectation of<br>promotion(s)                           | Black | 2<br>6%              | 7<br>21%                     | 7<br>21%                          | 17<br>50%                     | 1<br>2%                  | 34 | 14.27263<br>P 0.01<br>df = 4 |                           |
|  | White | 3<br>9%              | 3<br>9%                      | 20<br>63%                         | 6<br>19%                      | 0<br>0%                  | 32 |                              |                           |

\* Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

TABLE 36  
 Tabulation of Frequencies of Response To Job Continuation Factors by Race  
 (All Universities)

| Variable #/Name   | Race  | * Responses    |     |                 |     |                      |     |                  |     |             |    | TOTAL | $\chi^2$<br>p<br>df            |
|---|-------|----------------|-----|-----------------|-----|----------------------|-----|------------------|-----|-------------|----|-------|--------------------------------|
|   |       | Not Applicable |     | Not Influential |     | Somewhat Influential |     | Very Influential |     | No Response |    |       |                                |
|   |       | n              | %   | n               | %   | n                    | %   | n                | %   | n           | %  |       |                                |
| #R84 - presence of people of your race/ethnicity in the community | Black | 1              | 3%  | 8               | 23% | 19                   | 56% | 6                | 18% | 0           | 0% | 34    | 17.26432<br>p < 0.01<br>df = 3 |
|   | White | 3              | 9%  | 21              | 66% | 8                    | 25% | 0                | 0%  | 0           | 0% | 32    |                                |
| #R100 - role model for students of your race/ethnicity            | Black | 0              | 0%  | 6               | 18% | 10                   | 29% | 18               | 53% | 0           | 0% | 34    | 12.84447<br>p < 0.01<br>df = 3 |
|   | White | 0              | 0%  | 16              | 50% | 10                   | 31% | 5                | 16% | 1           | 3% | 32    |                                |
| #R122 - commitment to affirmative action for blacks               | Black | 1              | 3%  | 6               | 18% | 9                    | 26% | 18               | 53% | 0           | 0% | 34    | 13.22953<br>p < 0.01<br>df = 3 |
|   | White | 8              | 25% | 8               | 25% | 11                   | 34% | 5                | 16% | 0           | 0% | 32    |                                |
| #R123 - faculty of your race/ethnicity (at the university)        | Black | 1              | 3%  | 7               | 21% | 15                   | 44% | 11               | 32% | 0           | 0% | 34    | 16.42781<br>p < 0.01<br>df = 3 |
|   | White | 4              | 13% | 18              | 56% | 9                    | 28% | 1                | 3%  | 0           | 0% | 32    |                                |
| #R124 - students staff of your race/ethnicity (at the university) | Black | 0              | 0%  | 6               | 18% | 18                   | 53% | 10               | 29% | 0           | 0% | 34    | 17.28860<br>p < 0.01<br>df = 3 |
|   | White | 3              | 9%  | 18              | 56% | 9                    | 28% | 2                | 7%  | 0           | 0% | 32    |                                |
| #R127 - campus recreational facilities                            | Black | 0              | 0%  | 17              | 50% | 17                   | 50% | 0                | 0%  | 0           | 0% | 34    | 13.89978<br>p < 0.01<br>df = 3 |
|   | White | 3              | 9%  | 23              | 72% | 4                    | 13% | 2                | 6%  | 0           | 0% | 32    |                                |

\* Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

TABLE 37  
 Tabulation of Frequencies of Response To Factors by Race Relative To  
 Considerations To Leave  
 (All Universities)

| Variable #/Name   | * Responses |            |     |                 |     |                        |     |                             |     |                         | TOTAL | X <sup>2</sup><br>p<br>df |                                |
|---|-------------|------------|-----|-----------------|-----|------------------------|-----|-----------------------------|-----|-------------------------|-------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
|   | Race        | False<br>n | %   | Influentia<br>n | %   | Not<br>Influentia<br>n | %   | Somewhat<br>Influentia<br>n | %   | Very<br>Influentia<br>n |       |                           | %                              |
| #L170 - academic level of students too low                  | Black       | 28         | 82% | 0               | 0%  | 1                      | 3%  | 4                           | 12% | 1                       | 3%    | 34                        | 17.34312<br>p < 0.01<br>df = 4 |
|   | White       | 13         | 41% | 6               | 19% | 7                      | 22% | 6                           | 18% | 0                       | 0%    | 32                        |                                |
| #L212 - limited commitment to affirmative action for blacks | Black       | 15         | 44% | 0               | 0%  | 9                      | 26% | 8                           | 24% | 2                       | 6%    | 34                        | 22.35993<br>p < 0.01<br>df = 4 |
|   | White       | 30         | 94% | 1               | 3%  | 1                      | 3%  | 0                           | 0%  | 0                       | 0%    | 32                        |                                |
| #L214 - poor reputation of the university                   | Black       | 26         | 76% | 1               | 3%  | 5                      | 15% | 0                           | 0%  | 2                       | 6%    | 34                        | 17.20294<br>p < 0.01<br>df = 4 |
|   | White       | 11         | 29% | 7               | 21% | 7                      | 21% | 6                           | 19% | 1                       | 3%    | 32                        |                                |

\* Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

TABLE 38

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses To Categories of Factors by Race  
(All Universities)

Category Variable # 3 = Family Factors

| Influence of Factor on<br>Job Continuation | *Responses  |             | Total |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------|
|  | Blacks<br># | Whites<br># |       |
| Not Applicable                             | 8 24%       | 7 22%       | 15    |
| Not Influential                            | 6 17%       | 2 6%        | 8     |
| Somewhat Influential                       | 8 24%       | 21 66%      | 29    |
| Very Influential                           | 12 35%      | 2 6%        | 14    |
| No Response                                | 0 0%        | 0 0%        | 0     |
| Column TOTAL                               | 34          | 32          | 66    |

df= 3

chi-square= 14.99027  
significant at p=0.01

\*percentages rounded to nearest whole number

TABLE 39

Tabulation of Frequencies of Mean Responses To Categories of Factors by Race  
(All Universities)

Category Variable # 8 = Racial Factors

| Influence of Factor on<br>Job Continuation | *Responses  |             | Total |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------|
|  | Blacks<br># | Whites<br># |       |
| Not Applicable                             | 0           | 0           | 0     |
| Not Influential                            | 6           | 21          | 27    |
| Somewhat Influential                       | 21          | 11          | 32    |
| Very Influential                           | 7           | 0           | 7     |
| No Response                                | 0           | 0           | 0     |
| Column TOTAL                               | 34          | 32          | 66    |

df= 2  
chi-square= 18.41464  
significant at p=0.01

\*percentages rounded to nearest whole number

faculty interview data support this finding. But it is important to note that 47% of black faculty assessed and were influenced by campus recreational facilities at TWIs when deciding to accept their jobs.

Additionally, more black faculty (88%) than white faculty (72%) were influenced by the competency of their colleagues when deciding to accept jobs. The vast majority of faculty of both races were influenced by this factor. The differential influence can be interpreted many ways. It is possible that black faculty judged the competency of their TWI colleagues on the basis of research productivity and the receipt of grants (both of which are not as important or valued at TBIs). Or their opinions might be based on their acceptance of the myth of the inherent academic inferiority of TBIs. If this is true, these black faculty might have accepted jobs at TWIs (and not at TBIs) to avoid being viewed as academically inferior and/or to legitimize their abilities. It is also possible that since critics of affirmative action question the competency of black faculty hired at TWIs, these faculty might be more sensitive to scrutinizing issues of competency than white faculty. It may simply mean that blacks are sensitive to issues of competency because of the prevalent myth about their competencies while whites are not similarly encumbered.

In any case, the fact that white faculty said that the competency of their colleagues was not important in their decisions to accept jobs at TBIs does not necessarily mean that the black, white and international faculties at TBIs are not competent or are less competent than white faculty at TWIs.

It is not surprising that black faculty considered the availability of advisees for research important because research productivity is a high priority at TWIs whereas teaching is the major emphasis at TBIs. "Research has emerged as the predominant basis for generating high prestige for faculty and national and international reputation for institutions" (Branson, 1984).

Relative to the factor, serving as role models for students of the same race/ethnicity, the majority of black faculty (65%) indicated that it was important. This response might be attributable to the kinship developed by blacks as minorities in the U.S. that is not apparent among whites. Some black faculty mentioned in their interviews that black students at TWIs need black role models and support from black faculty.

As noted earlier, 31% of TBI white faculty indicated that they were influenced to accept jobs at TBIs to serve as role models for white students. Though only half as many



white faculty as black faculty indicate that they serve as role models or mentors for other race students, such support might be important to the successful desegregation of the student populations at these universities.

Relative to the factors that influence other-race faculty of all universities to remain in their jobs, more black faculty than white faculty considered the following factors important (see Table 36):

1. presence of people of your race/ethnicity in the community (73% blacks compared to 25% whites);
2. serving as role model for students of your race/ethnicity (82% compared to 47%);
3. commitment to and progress in affirmative action for blacks (79% compared to 47%);
4. presence of faculty of your race/ethnicity (at the university) (76% compared to 31%);
5. presence of university students or staff of your race/ethnicity (82% compared to 34%); and
6. campus, recreational facilities (50% compared to 19%).

With the exception of one factor - campus recreational facilities - the factors most influential to black faculty in their decisions to remain are race-related. Based on the results of the analysis of Very Influential responses, race-

related issues were expected to be of more concern to white faculty than to black faculty. However, the result was the opposite. This occurrence might be attributable to the fact that only the very influential faculty responses were analyzed in that section whereas the mean responses are analyzed in this section.

As we can see, black faculty are most strongly influenced to remain in their jobs by the presence of black faculty, staff and students, by TWIs commitments to and progress in affirmative action and by their need to serve as role models for black students. These factors are all related since affirmative action is the mechanism or management process through which black faculty, staff and students are recruited and retained at TWIs.

At first glance, the importance to black faculty of having blacks in their communities might appear to be difficult for managers to impact. TWI managers should consider innovative ways to enhance this influence.

Relative to the factors that would influence all other-race faculty decisions to leave their universities, the data revealed a relationship between race and three factors (Table 37):

1. academic level of students too low with white faculty (41%) being significantly more influenced than blacks (12%);

2. commitment to and progress in affirmative action for blacks with blacks (50%) being significantly more influenced than whites (3%); and
3. reputation of the university with whites (41%) being significantly more influenced than blacks (15%).

The instructions for completing this section of the questionnaire differed from the sections on accepting and remaining. Faculty were asked to indicate whether each factor was true or false; if they responded that the factor was true, they also indicated how important the factor would be in their considerations to leave.

Therefore, more white faculty (41%) than black faculty (12%) indicate that the low academic level of students would be an important influence to leave. The opinions of those who believe the low level of academic achievement of TBI students might influence them to leave might develop that outlook from the commitment of TBI managers to educating academically disadvantaged students. This commitment on the part of TBI managers might, also, help explain the concern expressed by 41% of white faculty about the poor reputations of TBIs because they feel academic reputation rests on more than teaching alone. The emphasis at TBIs on educating disadvantaged students has led to a stronger emphasis on teaching than on research. Other factors that might have

contributed to white faculty concerns are: inadequate state funding to TBIs prior to desegregation plan requirements; inadequate institutional marketing strategies; and negative press coverage of TBIs by local newspapers. TBI managers can improve some of these situations through management processes.

Unlike other factors, only one factor emerged as being more important to black faculty than to white faculty in their considerations to leave and that is, limited commitment to and progress in affirmative action for blacks. Progress in affirmative action also emerged as a factor that influenced black faculty to remain in their jobs. It is interesting to note that 82% of black faculty mentioned that such progress was influential in their decisions to remain, while 50% indicate that it is limited. This can be interpreted to mean that continued or increased emphasis on affirmative action for blacks will influence black faculty to remain at TWIs. And since retention of black faculty at TWIs is of primary importance, this finding is particularly significant. (See Table 43 for comparison of black and white faculty employment decisions.)

### Race of Faculty And The Categories of Factors

The data shown in Tables 38-39 revealed a relationship between faculty race and two categories of factors influencing all other-race faculty to remain in their jobs. The data analysis produced a chi-square of 14.99027 which is significant at the 0.01 level for the family category (Table 38). Blacks (72%) were more influenced by family factors to remain in their jobs than white (59%). Since family factors were found to be very important to blacks through the analysis of faculty interview data, this finding is not surprising.

Most significant for the purposes of this study is the relationship suggested by the data shown in Table 39 between faculty race and the category of factors associated with racial issues. The data analysis produced a chi-square of 18.41464 which is statistically significant at the 0.01 level as the factor was cited by more (83%) whites as being influential in their decisions to remain at their universities than by blacks (34%).

Since racial issues were found to be very important to whites through the analysis of the Very Influential response category, this finding is consistent. It is possible that the factor, racial composition of MU white faculty communities, is the specific race-related variable that

influenced the results of the Very Influential faculty response analysis. If so, maybe race-related factors that are external to TBIs influence white faculty to remain in their jobs.

#### Strength of Relationships Revealed By Chi-Square

The researcher determined through the use of chi-square that relationships exist between faculty classifications, several factors and one category of factors. Relationships also were apparent between race, several factors and several categories of factors. The question which had to be addressed was, "What is the strength of those relations?"

As noted earlier in Chapter IV, the contingency coefficient (C) was used to determine strengths of relationships. The maximum value of C is .70711 for the tables analyzed in this study. Since the minimum value of the contingency coefficient is zero (0), the researcher divided the range (from 7-0) for C into three segments:

- \* a strong relationship exists if C is equal to or greater than .50000;
- \* a moderate relationship exists if C is less than .50000 and equal to or greater than .30000; and
- \* a weak relationship exists if C is less than .30000.

Relative to the factors that influence other-race faculty employment decisions, the strongest relationships were found for MU data as shown in Table 40. The contingency coefficient was .70711 for those factors, which indicates that there is a strong relationship between faculty classification and cost of living, receipt of tenure, and fringe benefits relative to the reasons that MU (TBI) white faculty remain in their jobs. A strong relationship (.70711) exists between faculty classification and the racial/ethnic composition of MU white instructional faculty communities. The latter relationship would be important in MU faculty considerations to leave. Additionally, there is a strong relationship (.70711) between faculty classification and the compensations category of factors which influence MU faculty to remain on their jobs.<sup>12</sup>

Only one other factor emerged as a strong relationship and it pertained to the relationship between race and the factor, commitment to and progress in affirmative action for blacks (where  $C = .50305$ ) (Table 41). This factor was cited by 50% of black faculty as being an important consideration

---

<sup>12</sup> In all cases, MU instructional faculty are more influenced than MU administrative faculty by these factors. The fact that only two administrative faculty responded to the questionnaire might account for the strength of this relationship.

TABLE 40

Contingency Coefficients for Relationships Revealed by Chi-Square for Faculty Classifications

| <u>Job Acceptance</u>              | <u>Job Continuation</u>   | <u>Consideration To Leave</u>   |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| <u>All Universities</u>            | <u>At MU</u>  | <u>At MU</u>  |
| expectation of tenure<br>C= .43859 | cost of living<br>C= .70711<br>having received<br>tenure - C=.70711<br>fringe benefits<br>package - C= .70711 | compensation<br>category<br>C= .70711<br>racial com-<br>pensation<br>of the com-<br>munity<br>C= .70711 |
|                                    | <u>All Universities</u><br>having received<br>tenure - C= .40882  |   |



if they contemplated leaving. The remainder of the relationships measured by the contingency coefficient statistic fell in the moderate relationship range and all had values greater than .40000 (except pursuing professional interests where  $C = .38273$ ).

## Discussion of Data Analysis

### Relationship of Findings to Existing Literature

In order to assess how the findings of this study extend, support or contradict existing knowledge (presented in Chapter II) of the factors that influence other-race faculty employment decisions, the significant findings from faculty interview and questionnaire data are discussed below in terms of the influence of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on such decisions. As presented in Chapter II, the literature on organization behavior (generally) and on faculty mobility (specifically) indicates that both intrinsic and extrinsic factors are positively related to organizational choice, commitment, job satisfaction and turnover. Intrinsic factors in this study include: job interest and responsibilities; advancement; prestige; and feelings of relative deprivation. Extrinsic factors in this study include: organizational environment; geographical location; family; salary; work-group; and community ties.

TABLE 41

Contingency Coefficients For Relationships Revealed by Chi Square For Race  
(All Universities)

| <u>Job Acceptance</u>                                     | <u>C</u> | <u>Job Continuation</u>   | <u>C</u> | <u>Considerations To Leave</u>                                      | <u>C</u> |
|---|----------|---|----------|---|----------|
| the climate   | .46259   | presence of people of your race/ethnicity in the community      | .45535   | academic level of students too low                                  | .45617   |
| educational opportunities for your child(ren)             | .48631   | serving as role model for students of your race/ethnicity       | .40362   | limited commitment to and progress in affirmative action for blacks | .50305   |
| pursuing professional interests                           | .38273   | commitment to and progress in affirmative action for blacks     | .40863   | poor reputation of the community                                    | .45471   |
| serving as role model for students of your race/ethnicity | .42405   | presence of university faculty of your race/ethnicity           | .44643   |   |          |
| availability of advisees for research assistance          | .41536   | presence of university students on staff of your race/ethnicity | .45560   |   |          |
| competency of colleagues                                  | .43737   | campus, recreational facilities                                 | .41790   |   |          |
| campus recreational facilities                            | .42839   | Family category   | .43022   |   |          |
| expectation of promotion                                  | .45503   | Racial issues category  | .46706   |   |          |

Intrinsic factors are those which motivate and satisfy employees and extrinsic factors are those which keep employees from becoming dissatisfied (Herzberg, 1966).

#### Interview Data

What is apparent about the results of the analysis of faculty interview data is that both intrinsic and extrinsic factors were found to influence other-race faculty decisions to accept, remain in and consider leaving their jobs. It was determined, when the interview data for all universities was combined, that job and advancement (intrinsic factors) and compensation and department (extrinsic factors) primarily influenced such decisions.

Relative to the factors that were most influential in other-race faculty decisions to accept their jobs, the results of this study support Brown's findings (1967) that what the faculty member will be doing, what (s)he will be paid and the environment are primary influences on job acceptance. (This support is not surprising since Brown's findings are so all-encompassing.) Job (intrinsic) and compensation (extrinsic) factors were determined to be most influential in job acceptance decisions for faculty in this study.

Relative to the factors that influence other-race faculty to remain in their jobs, job (intrinsic), compensation (extrinsic), and advancement (intrinsic) factors are most influential. And when the factors that would be most important in their considerations to leave their jobs were examined, advancement (intrinsic), compensation (extrinsic), and department (extrinsic) factors emerged as most important.

Therefore, the findings from the analysis of combined faculty interview data for both races do not reveal a trend of intrinsic or extrinsic factors influencing other-race faculty employment decisions. This is not surprising since clarity on this issue was not provided in the organizational behavior study findings (reviewed in Chapter II).

However, when the faculty interview data was separated and analyzed by race, it was determined that job (intrinsic) factors primarily influence black faculty to accept and remain in their jobs and that family (extrinsic) and advancement (intrinsic) factors are important in their considerations to leave TWIs. This finding contradicts those of Moore and Wagstaff (1974) and Suinn and Witt (1982) who found that extrinsic factors (e.g., salary, geographic location) primarily influence black faculty to accept and remain in jobs at TWIs. Additionally, Moore and Wagstaff's

findings that blacks leave TWIs due to extrinsic factors (e.g., racial discrimination, pressures to participate in black-related activities and to work at TBIs) are not supported by the finding above.

The analysis of faculty interview data for white faculty revealed that compensation (extrinsic) primarily influences their employment decisions. However, racial issues (extrinsic) were cited by white faculty at FSU as important considerations for leaving. These findings indicate that extrinsic factors primarily influence the employment decisions of white faculty. And since no studies were found that examine the reasons that white faculty accept, remain in, and consider leaving TBIs, these findings are particularly significant.

#### Questionnaire Data

##### Relationships Between Faculty Classification (Administrative And Instructional) and the Factors

Several factors that influence other-race faculty to accept, remain in and consider leaving their jobs were found to be related to faculty classification (administrative and instructional) and race. Since none of the studies reviewed for this study reported findings by faculty classification, the findings below represent an original contribution to existing knowledge on faculty mobility. Instructional

faculty at all universities were influenced to accept their jobs due to their expectations of tenure (advancement). In that administrative faculty do not pursue tenure once on the job, it follows that tenure would not be of concern to them.

The strongest relationship between faculty classification and the factor variables was found for instructional faculty at MU (TBI) relative to their decisions to remain at or consider leaving their universities. (There is no indication of why these findings apply only to MU white faculty.) As noted earlier, fringe benefits (extrinsic), tenure (intrinsic) and cost of living (extrinsic) factors are strongly related to the instructional faculty classification. MU white instructional faculty, more often than administrative faculty, indicate that those factors primarily influence them to remain at MU. Pfeffer and Lawler found salary and tenure influential in faculty decisions to remain at their universities, and Marshall found fringe benefits influential in faculty retention. Therefore, the above findings support those of Pfeffer and Lawler and Marshall.

The relationship between faculty classification--for instructional faculty at MU--and the compensation category of factors revealed the influence of this extrinsic factor for MU (TBI) instructional faculty considerations to leave.

Additionally, MU instructional faculty more often than administrative faculty cited the racial composition of their communities as a factor that would influence their decisions to leave. This factor is also extrinsic but more importantly for the purposes of this study, this finding reveals the influence of race-related issues on white instructional faculty. While Suinn and Witt found the racial composition of communities influential in black faculty decisions to accept their jobs at TWIs, no studies linked racial issues to white instructional faculty decisions.

#### Relationships Between Race (Black and White) and the Factors

Several factors that influence other-race faculty to accept, remain in and consider leaving their jobs were found to be moderately related to race in this study. Black faculty were primarily influenced to accept jobs by the competency of their departmental colleagues (extrinsic), the availability of advisees for research (extrinsic), the availability of recreational facilities (extrinsic), as well as by their interests in serving as role models for black students (intrinsic). The latter is consistent with one of Moore and Wagstaff's findings that black faculty are influenced to accept jobs by their interest in students.

The influence of extrinsic factors on black faculty are apparent but these extrinsic factors are not the ones cited in the literature on black faculty mobility (e.g., salary, geographic location). Therefore, these findings are particularly significant because they indicate that black faculty are very concerned about being in an environment supportive of their job responsibilities.

White faculty were influenced to accept jobs more than black faculty by the climate of their universities' geographical location and by the expectation of promotion(s). Again, no studies were found that examined the opinions of white faculty at TBIs; therefore, no direct comparisons to previous research are made.

Relative to the relationship between race and factor variables that influence other-race faculty to remain in their jobs, more black faculty than white faculty cited factors associated with racial issues. Moderate relationships were shown through the data analysis for the following factors: presence of black faculty, staff and students; racial composition of the community; affirmative action commitment and progress; and serving as role models for black students. Only one of these factors - racial composition of the community - was found (by Suinn and Witt, 1982) to influence black faculty employment decisions.



However, Moore and Wagstaff (1974) and Hoskins (1978) found that perceived racial discrimination influences blacks to leave TWIs. Since the above findings can be interpreted to mean that black faculty are influenced to remain in their jobs (rather than to leave) due to racial factors, Moore and Wagstaff's and Hoskins' findings are not supported by this study. They focused on the negative aspects of race whereas the findings in this study point to the positive aspects of race related issues.

It is interesting that when the relationship between categories of factors and race were revealed, family factors (extrinsic) were more often cited by blacks than whites and more whites than blacks cited racial factors as being influential in their decisions to remain. The emphasis placed by black faculty on family issues is not surprising since family factors were cited as very influential by the black faculty who were interviewed. Though family factors are extrinsic and external to the university (and therefore, less controllable by management), their positive influence on black faculty decisions to remain at TWIs must be considered.

However, the finding relative to white faculty - that is, racial factors influence their decisions to remain at TBIs - is not consistent with the analysis of the Very

Influential response categories, which indicated that white faculty would be influenced to leave TBIs because of racial factors. It is possible, therefore, that different race-related variables influence white faculty decisions to remain in or consider leaving their jobs. And the specific race-related variables which are influential cannot be determined through this study.

Race and the factor--limited commitment to and progress in affirmative action for blacks--(extrinsic) were found to be strongly related. More blacks than whites cited this factor as important in their considerations to leave their universities. Half of black faculty said that limited affirmative action efforts for blacks would influence them to leave. When this finding is combined with the influence of race-related factors on black faculty decisions to remain at TWIs, the importance placed by black faculty on race-related factors (and particularly affirmative action) is apparent.

Relative to considerations to leave, two factors - low academic level of students (extrinsic) and poor reputation of the university (intrinsic) - were found to be moderately related to race. More whites than blacks cited these factors. These findings are consistent with Brown's and Marshall's findings - that faculty are influenced to leave

their universities by the quality of students and the reputation of the university. However, no studies were found which examined the opinions of white faculty at TBIs. Therefore, these findings extend our knowledge in this area.

When the relationship between race and factors were revealed, nearly all of the factors that influenced black faculty to accept, remain in, and consider leaving their jobs were extrinsic factors. The influence of extrinsic factors on black faculty employment decisions is well represented in the literature. However, the extrinsic factors found in this study to influence black faculty decisions are different from those found in previous studies. Relative to black faculty the findings of this study point to positive influences of affirmative action, family, and recreation facilities at TWIs while previous studies pointed to issues of racial discrimination, pressure and negative aspects of working at TWIs. (Since the specific extrinsic factors are too numerous to list here, they are provided in Table 42).

When the relationship between race and factors were revealed for white faculty, extrinsic factors (compensation, racial issues) were also found primarily to influence their employment decisions. Similarly, instructional faculty were found to be most influenced by extrinsic factors (compensation, fringe benefits, cost of living, and tenure).

TABLE 42

Comparisons of Extrinsic Factors Influencing Black Faculty Employment Decisions

|        | Findings of <u>Other</u><br>Studies  | Findings of <u>This</u><br>Study   |
|--------|--|--|
| ACCEPT | <p>Moore and Wagstaff - interest in students, salary</p> <p>Suinn and Witt - salary, geographic location, racial composition of the community</p>  | <p>educational opportunities for children; role models; research advisee availability; competency of colleagues; campus recreational facilities</p>                            |
| REMAIN | NONE   | <p>racial composition of the community; role models; affirmative action for blacks; presence of black faculty, staff, and students; family; campus recreational facilities</p> |
| LEAVE  | <p>Moore and Wagstaff - perceived racial discrimination; to work at TBIs; pressure to participate in black activities; extra effort required for promotion and tenure</p> <p>Hoskins - perceived racial discrimination; poor relationships with colleagues; limited opportunities for promotion.</p> | <p>limited commitment to affirmative action for blacks</p>   |

SUMMARY

From the analysis of faculty interview and questionnaire data, it is apparent that other-race faculty are primarily influenced by extrinsic factors to accept, remain in, and consider leaving their jobs. For black faculty, many of these factors are race-related and for white faculty, these factors are related to compensation and race-related issues. (See Table 43.)

The findings of this study, relative to the influence of extrinsic and intrinsic factors on black faculty employment decisions, support previous faculty mobility literature findings (that black faculty are primarily influenced by extrinsic factors and some of these factors are race-related). However, the findings of this study do not provide support for studies which were conducted primarily on white faculty. Those studies found that intrinsic factors primarily influence faculty employment decisions while this study points to the influence of extrinsic factors on white faculty.

Since the emphasis in this study is on the specific factors (whether extrinsic or intrinsic) that influence other-race faculty employment decisions, the implications of these specific findings are presented in Chapter V along with conclusions and recommendations.

TABLE 43

Comparison of Black Faculty (at TWIs) and White Faculty (at TBIs) Employment Decisions

|                          | <u>Blacks</u> (at TWIs)   | <u>Whites</u> (at TBIs)  |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| <u>ACCEPT:</u>           | educational opportunities for children<br>serve as role models<br>competency of colleagues<br>campus recreational facilities<br>availability of advisees for research   | climate<br>expectation of promotion<br>pursuing professional interests |
| <u>REMAIN:</u>           | racial composition of community<br>serve as role models<br>university commitment to affirmative action<br>racial composition of university faculty<br>racial composition of university staff and students<br>campus recreational facilities<br>family (category of factors) | racial (category of factors)   |
| <u>CONSIDER LEAVING:</u> | university commitment to affirmative action   | low academic level of students<br>poor reputation of TBIs              |

## Chapter V

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the course of this study, the problems faced by higher education managers in the desegregation of faculties were described. These problems included: merit vs. affirmative action; maintenance of a value consensus while trying to introduce changes; and the need for sensitive leadership. Specifically, the dilemmas associated with trying to achieve faculty desegregation within the narrow framework (affirmative action) provided by the court and OCR were discussed. Higher education managers have attempted, through various recruitment and retention activities, to locate, hire and retain other-race faculty. Some have been successful in hiring other-race faculty but not in retaining them. Others are still trying to determine what they must do to successfully recruit and retain other-race faculty. The researcher believes that the results of this study provide insights which may assist such managers.

Despite the seemingly insurmountable problems of faculty desegregation (e.g., struggle between values of merit v. affirmative action, scarcity of black Ph.D.s, leveling off of faculty hiring, tenured-in composition of faculty) the results of this study indicate that managers

can make some progress by using resources available to them. Higher education managers should better be able to influence the decisions of such faculty by having information about the factors that influence other-race faculty decisions to accept, remain in and consider leaving faculty positions. And the results of this study provide managers with information about the attitudes and opinions of their other-race faculty.

#### CONCLUSIONS FROM THE RESEARCH

This study supports several conclusions about other-race faculty at four public southeastern universities. (See Table 44 for results.) These are described below in two sections: ways higher education managers can take effective affirmative action to desegregate their faculties; and the viability of the policy of affirmative action for faculty desegregation.

#### Making Affirmative Action Work

Six major conclusions are drawn from the results of this study which provide information to assist higher education managers in making affirmative action for desegregation more effective. These are: importance of progress in affirmative action; recreational facilities;



TABLE 44

## Summary of Significant Findings

| Research Question | Frequency Analysis of Factors/Categories (Very Influential)                      | Comparisons of Faculty Interview and Administrator Survey Responses  | Test for Relationships (Chi-square) | Test for Strength of Relationships (Contingency Co-efficient) |
|-------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| One               | Job & advancement for accepting jobs   | NA   | NA                                  | NA  |
| Two               | Job & compensation, for remaining in jobs  | NA   | NA                                  | NA  |
| Three             | Advancement, compensation & family & racial issues for considerations to leave   | NA   | NA                                  | NA  |
| Four              | NA   | CU administrators aware of factors influencing other-race faculty to accept, continue in & consider leaving jobs.<br>MU & FSU administrators aware of factors influencing their jobs.<br>LU administrators aware of factors influencing faculty to consider leaving. | NA                                  | NA  |
| Five              | Racial issues ranked highest by FSU faculty relative to considerations to leave. | NA   | NA                                  | NA  |

TABLE 44 (cont.)  
Summary of Significant Findings

| Research Question | Frequency Analysis of Factors/Categories (Very Influential)                            | Comparisons of Faculty Interview and Administrator Survey Responses | Test for Relationships (Chi-square)  | Test for Strength of Relationships (Contingency Co-efficient)  |
|-------------------|--|---|--|--|
|                   | Racial issues ranked third among influences to leave MU and for combined universities. |   |  |  |
| Six               | NA   | NA  | 1)relationship exists between faculty classification & expectation of tenure for all universities for job acceptance (0.01)<br>2)relationship exists between faculty classification & cost of living, tenure, & fringe benefits at MU for job continuation (0.01)<br>3)relationship exists between faculty classification & tenure for all universities for job continuation(0.01) | moderate-(.43859) more instructors than administrators<br>strong-(.70711) more instructors than administrators<br>moderate-(.40882) more instructors than administrators |

TABLE 44 (cont.)

Summary of Significant Findings

| Research Question | Frequency Analysis of Factors/Categories (Very Influential) | Comparisons of Faculty Interview and Administrator Survey Responses | Test for Relationships (Chi-square)   | Test for Strength of Relationships (Contingency Co-efficient)                     |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|
|                   |   |   | 4)relationship exists between faculty classification & racial composition of MU faculty communities relative to considerations to leave(0.01)         | strong-(.70711) more instructors than administrators                              |
|                   |   |   | 5)relationship exists between faculty classification & the compensation category of factors for MU faculty relative to considerations to leave (0.01) | strong-(.70711) more instructors than administrators                              |
| Seven             | NA  | NA  | 1)relationship exists between race & climate, expectation of promotion(s) and professional interests for job acceptance(0.01)                         | moderate-more whites than blacks (.46259<br>.45503<br>.38273)                     |
|                   |   |   | 2)relationship exists between race & the factors: availability of advisees;competency of colleagues;educational opportunities for children;           | moderate-more blacks than whites (.41536<br>.43737<br>.48631<br>.42839<br>.42405) |

TABLE 44 (cont.)

Summary of Significant Findings

| Research Question | Frequency Analysis of Factors/Categories (Very Influential) | Comparisons of Faculty Interview and Administrator Survey Responses   | Test for Relationships (Chi-square) | Test for Strength of Relationships (Contingency Co-efficient)                               |
|-------------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|
|                   |   | campus recreational facilities; and role model for black students for job acceptance(0.01)  |                                     |   |
|                   |   | 3)relationship exists between race & the factors: racial composition of community;role model for black students; commitment to & progress in affirmative action for blacks; racial composition of faculty; racial composition of students & staff; & campus recreational facilities for job continuation (0.01) |                                     | moderate-more blacks than whites (.45535<br>.40362<br>.40863<br>.44643<br>.45560<br>.41790) |
|                   |   | 4)relationship exists between race & the family whites  |                                     | moderate-(.43022)<br>more blacks than whites  |

TABLE 44 (cont.)  
Summary of Significant Findings

| Research Question | Frequency Analysis of Factors/Categories (Very Influential) | Comparisons of Faculty Interview and Administrator Survey Responses | Test for Relationships (Chi-square)  | Test for Strength of Relationships (Contingency Co-efficient) |
|-------------------|---|---|--|---|
|                   |   |   | category of factors for job continuation(0.01)   |   |
|                   |   |   | 5)relationship exists between race & the racial issues category of factors for job continuation(0.01)  | moderate-(.46706) more whites than blacks                     |
|                   |   |   | 6)relationship exists between race & commitment to & progress in affirmative action for blacks relative to considerations to leave (0.01)          | strong-(.50305) more blacks than whites                       |
|                   |   |   | 7)relationship exists between race & low academic level of students & poor reputation of the university relative to considerations to leave (0.01) | moderate-more whites than blacks (.45617 /45471)              |

promotion; compensation; quality of students and reputations at TBIs; and geographical location.

#### Importance of Progress In Affirmative Action

The first significant finding is that black faculty express strong sentiments about the necessity of the pursuit of affirmative action at TWIs. Several of the factors that influence them to remain at TWIs (e.g., the numbers of black faculty, staff and students) are directly related to affirmative action. It can be concluded that affirmative action is not only necessary to get desegregation underway but it is also necessary to sustain the momentum of desegregation. This finding contributes significantly to the literature on black faculty mobility since none of those studies cited affirmative action related issues as important in such faculty employment choices. Most significantly, however, the importance of the commitment to and progress in affirmative action at TWIs was not identified by higher education managers through the managerial survey. Therefore, this finding provides new information to managers about the continued importance of affirmative action to blacks.

### Importance of Recreational Facilities

Campus recreational facilities are influential in black faculty decisions to accept and remain in their jobs. This finding appeared to be an anomaly and the information did not seem particularly useful. However, some important implications emerged.

First, TWI managers can market their recreational facilities when recruiting black faculty rather than assuming that nothing can be done with/about this factor. This information supports current research which emphasizes the relationship between recreation or physical fitness and satisfactory job performance (National Safety News, 1984). The private sector has capitalized on this knowledge by creating on-site wellness programs or facilities. Many have found that their employee's attitudes toward their work have significantly improved as a result of their participation in the wellness programs (National Safety News, 1984). Recreational facilities are indeed a factor in the recruitment and retention of black faculty at TWIs.

Other findings from this study should, also, assist managers in retaining other-race faculty. They are related to promotion, compensation, the quality of students and the reputations of TBIs.

### Promotion

Fewer black faculty than white faculty accept jobs expecting to be promoted. This finding is consistent with the literature on black faculty mobility. While their reasons for not expecting promotions may be linked to perceived racial discrimination jobs, it is possible that their limited expectations for promotions are linked to perceptions of limited upward mobility at TWIs (e.g., due to the creation of positions to administer black-related activities).

Since, however, it can be concluded that black faculty have lower expectations of promotion than white faculty, TWI managers should be concerned about this finding and develop incentives for black faculty (e.g., inservice training and career counseling programs).

### Compensation

The third significant finding is that white faculty are concerned about compensation. The compensation concerns of white faculty emerged in this study time after time. Other faculty mobility studies pointed to the importance of compensation to faculty generally, however, this finding (relative to white faculty at TBIs) is significant because this finding is so strong. Also from this study, it can be



concluded that compensation is more important to white faculty than to black faculty in their decisions to remain and in their considerations to leave institutions in which they are a racial minority. The implications are that TBI managers must ensure that white faculty compensation packages are competitive.

This finding is particularly significant since compensation incentives have not been restructured to target this concern. The researcher is not aware of incentives developed to compensate white faculty at TBIs. Since it was determined that black faculty are more influenced to accept their jobs at TBIs for job and advancement related reasons, it appears that less emphasis should be placed on monetary incentives (not to say that they should be reduced) and more emphasis should be placed on supporting their job interests and advancement opportunities. This may present managers with difficulties if they overly emphasize either one. Black faculty, due to market demands, can command high salaries.

#### Quality of Students and Reputations of TBIs

Getting back to the factors that influence white faculty employment choices, another significant finding is their concerns about the low quality of students and the

poor reputations of TBIs may influence them to leave. And while these factors were cited as influential in the general faculty mobility literature, this finding contributes to that literature because it is such a strong finding. White faculty at TBIs will consider leaving due to their concerns about the low quality of students and the poor reputations of TBIs. There are, however, ways that TBI managers can address these concerns and suggestions are provided in the recommendations section.

#### Geographic Location

Geographical location proved to be very important to all other-race faculty. It is more significant than managers realize or the literature indicates. Certainly, geographical factors may be either positive or negative influences on other-race faculty decisions. It can be concluded that geographical location factors ought to be acknowledged and taken seriously as a matter to be addressed by managers.

It is easy for managers to conclude that nothing can be done to change the negative influence of a university's geographical location and that this is why their affirmative action efforts have not been successful. However, a more positive approach would be to examine more closely the

positive or negative influences of geographical location on other-race faculty decisions. And while ways to impact these influences may not be obvious or immediately at hand, managers can develop some imaginative and creative options that can be useful (e.g., emphasize the unique features of the university's geographical location).

### Policy Implications

In the section above, the conclusions of this study were discussed and their implications for managers were assessed. What follows is a discussion of the implications of the conclusions for those who are in positions to evaluate and/or alter the policy of affirmative action for desegregation (e.g., the courts, OCR, Adams' state higher education officials).

The controversies surrounding the implementation of guidelines (affirmative action) for desegregation were explored in assessing the viability of the policy of affirmative action for desegregation. They raise some unsettling questions that have yet to be satisfactorily answered. Those who argue for affirmative action note that desegregation cannot take place without race-conscious remedies. They cite the benefits of ethnic and racial diversity. They also emphasize the need to include those

who have been historically excluded from decision-making processes. Generally, they believe that affirmative action is needed to close the gap (in employment and compensation) created by centuries of discriminatory practices in our society. And affirmative action for desegregation in higher education will provide more blacks the crucial vehicle for access to the mainstream of American society and promote democratic principles of equality and social justice.

On the other hand, there are those who believe that affirmative action is a negative influence in higher education. It encourages a quota system that weakens sound personnel practices and policies. When preferential treatment is given to less qualified persons, those who are better qualified become victims of discrimination and those who are less qualified are placed in positions where they cannot successfully compete. Moreover, those minorities who are qualified are stigmatized by the belief (theirs and others) that they were hired or promoted because of their minority status.

The critics of affirmative action claim that policies should be consistent with American values and principles of individualism. They do not deny history, but suggest that affirmative action attempts are too costly and deal too swiftly with the problems of discrimination in a manner that

is inconsiderate and detrimental to other groups. Some advocate simple adherence to non-discriminatory policies (such as Title VII); others suggest that traditionally black institutions (TBIs) be eliminated as distinctly black institutions.

Undoubtedly, the very complex issues, questions, and problems raised through discussions of the appropriateness of affirmative action as a remedy for past discrimination have no simple solutions. Careful thought and implementation of remedies is, however, required.

Earlier in this study, several alternatives to affirmative action were presented. They are: freedom of choice desegregation; closing TBIs; and enhancing TBIs. And we know that the court ordered OCR to pursue desegregation through affirmative action and the enhancement of TBIs.

Prior to the 1970s, when the Adams suit was filed, and while the courts were deliberating about this case, blacks and whites had the freedom to choose whether they wanted to work at TWIs or TBIs. Their choices and the employment decisions of university managers resulted in little change in the racial compositions of universities in states with dual systems. It seems fair to conclude that freedom of choice is not a viable choice to solve this problem.

In the questionnaire for this study, other-race faculty were provided the opportunity to indicate if they would rather work at a university in which they would be part of the racial majority. Though some indicated they are uncomfortable at their universities (25%), they are not ready to "jump ship" (97%). This knowledge gives higher education managers potential leverage. Freedom of choice is a necessary but insufficient condition to affect the racial composition of TBIs and TWIs, and incentives can be structured to attract and retain other-race faculty.

Relative to the option of closing TBIs, the emphasis placed by white faculty on the low quality of students and the poor reputation of TBIs might appear to support this option. However, if we too hastily re-examine this option, we may be talking about reducing the number of black students receiving post-secondary education as well as foreclosing employment opportunities to many TBI faculty who generally have not developed the credentials to successfully compete for jobs at some TWIs. To adopt this option would be to create a more difficult and narrow a framework as the one we are currently pursuing. Whatever the merits of the logical argument for closing TBIs, sometimes "a page of history is worth a volume of logic" (Oliver Wendell Holmes). If the goal is to provide access to education and employment

for blacks, we must acknowledge the TBIs' unique role as an important channel of access and opportunity for blacks. And we must acknowledge that these institutions have graduated many very successful black professionals.

Also we must acknowledge that "quality" is a rather subjective criteria for assessing people, programs and institutions. Although some universities (both TBIs and TWIs) may not meet certain quality standards, they have provided socialization and credentials to academically disadvantaged students. They have helped blacks succeed. Whatever we might wish of our institutions of higher education, it isn't just knowledge that is important; the socializing and credentialing processes of education also contribute to success.

Even if the latter is true, opportunities to enhance the TBIs (both from internal and external sources) should be seized. In addition to providing the funding and academic programs necessary for their enhancement, the use of internal resources should be encouraged (see Recommendations).

Though this study provides some insight into the difficulties managers face when taking affirmative action to achieve desegregation, it is concluded that this course of action may be the least destructive and the most feasible of

the options facing higher education managers. Effective affirmative action to achieve desegregation, however, requires changes in values, behaviors and structures in organizations. The literature of organization behavior and design make it clear that changing any one of these is extremely difficult. Change is always confronted by strong opposing forces (Lewin, 1951). And when one tries to simultaneously change behaviors, values and structures, the strategies for change are difficult to manage (Boss, 1983).

However, we are also aware that it is possible, through management processes to make changes. And since some higher education managers are more effective than others in their affirmative action efforts, we should be encouraged.

It is apparent when examining the findings in this study (about the attitudes and opinions of other-race faculty) that incentives may be structured that will assist managers in faculty desegregation. And these findings provide a basis for such activities. Additionally, it is critical that higher education managers recognize, accept and utilize the discretion they do have in making affirmative action for desegregation successful. The following recommendations might be of assistance to managers.



### Recommendations For Future Research

In this exploratory study, the factors that influence other-race faculty decisions to accept, remain in, and consider leaving their jobs were described. It is hoped that the results will stimulate researchers and educators at the federal, state, and institutional levels to seek additional knowledge about the influence of such factors on the recruitment and retention of other-race faculty.

Future research on this topic might:

1. extend the examination of the influence of extrinsic (dissatisfying) and intrinsic (satisfying and motivating) factors on other-race faculty employment decisions because research relative to their influence is inconclusive;
2. continue to focus on the individual choice process in faculty employment decisions because such decisions are made on an individual basis;
3. utilize triangulation as a means of developing a comprehensive view of the problems of faculty desegregation because this methodology provides a more comprehensive picture of such problems;
4. increase the numbers of universities and other-race faculty studied because greater numbers might result in different findings; or

5. study both black and white faculty at TWIs and TBIs in order to determine if both black and white faculty at these universities are influenced by similar or different factors.

#### Recommendations For Managers

As noted in Chapter IV, many of the factors that influence other-race faculty employment decisions can be affected or improved through management processes (e.g., budgeting, personnel). To improve the retention of white faculty, TBI managers should determine if white faculty salaries are competitive. If they are not, TBI managers should consider providing extra compensation for white faculty in order to retain them.

And since white faculty indicate that they would be influenced to leave their universities due to the low academic level of students and the poor reputations of their universities, efforts should be made by TBI university leaders to attract more scholastically gifted students. This should be done in addition to providing educational opportunities to disadvantaged students.

It is also recommended that TBI managers inform potential hirees (from the outset) of the emphasis on educating the academically disadvantaged. In-service

training should also be offered which stresses the importance of this objective and which provides suggestions or tools for meeting this objective.

Using an alternative course of action, some TBI managers are gradually raising admissions and retention standards. This approach is recommended to improve the quality of students at TBIs and to enhance TBI reputation (which might lead to increased retention of faculty).

Additionally, TBI leaders should develop strategic marketing plans for reporting their achievements and enhancing their reputations internally and externally. Such strategies might include: publicizing (through local media) the accomplishments of successful TBI graduates; publicizing the accomplishments of the most innovative academic departments or schools; and increasing the emphasis on research and publication (which tend to be most respected in academic circles).

TBIs need not emulate TWIs by placing a heavy emphasis on research. Alternatively, TBI managers can be trailblazers through developing multiple specialized tracks toward tenure which have different valences for evaluating teaching, research and service. If such options are provided, faculty can be rewarded based on their accomplishments in the areas in which they choose to

specialize. If more faculty select the research emphasis and produce quality publications and/or obtain grants, the reputations of TBIs will be greatly enhanced. However, the teaching emphasis should not be diminished.

To improve the recruitment and retention of black faculty at TWIs, managers should legitimize black faculty efforts to serve as role models for black students through rewarding those efforts. Role model activities can be rewarded through evaluations of faculty for promotion and tenure without lowering standards for research. The framework for that evaluation can be developed by a task force or committee which would include black faculty, department chairs and deans.

The rewarding of such service might increase black faculty expectations of promotion (without damaging emphasis on research) if coupled with other programs designed to enhance promotional/advancement opportunities. Such programs might include: in-service training designed to better and earlier inform black faculty about promotion and tenure requirements; leadership training for black faculty who aspire to university leadership positions; and individual career planning sessions with department chairs. Career planning sessions can be enhanced if managers who hire faculty assess and determine the promotional lines and opportunities before faculty are hired.

It was determined through this study that black faculty are influenced to remain at their universities by factors related to racial issues (e.g., racial composition of faculty, students and staff, university commitment to affirmative action). Leaders at TWIs should continue their efforts to increase the numbers of blacks among the faculty, staff and student populations. By so doing, their commitment to affirmative action is likely to be recognized by black faculty as progressive.

Whether or not affirmative action efforts yield satisfactory numbers of black faculty, staff and students, TWI managers should consider sponsoring activities or programs with local black community organizations to provide additional support systems for black faculty. Additionally, more black community leaders should be appointed to university volunteer boards and committees and more black faculty should be appointed to community boards and committees. Also, TWI managers can structure support groups for/with black faculty particularly if there are few black faculty on campus.

It is further recommended that leaders at all universities conduct exit interviews to determine if the reasons that other-race faculty leave their universities are similar to the reasons that majority-status faculty leave.

In order to encourage faculty to remain, department chairs and/or deans should meet periodically with faculty to assess the progress and problems faculty are experiencing. By so doing, managers might be able to reduce the exodus of other-race at their universities.

The final recommendation is that managers must acknowledge the influence of geographical location factors on other-race faculty employment decisions. Since geographic location factors are important to all other-race faculty, it is recommended that managers emphasize the unique factors of their geographical locations when recruiting faculty. They should also provide advice on schools and neighborhoods for faculty who express concern about environments supportive of educational opportunities for their children and their living conditions. Though geographical location factors are difficult to manipulate they must be recognized as important factors that determine the success or failure of other-race faculty recruitment and retention.

The factors that influence other-race faculty to accept, remain in and consider leaving jobs at their universities are many and varied. The results of this study suggest that faculty classification and race are related to some of these factors, that extrinsic factors primarily

influence other-race faculty employment decisions and that many of these factors are race-related. And it is apparent that higher education officials can influence other-race faculty employment choices through the use of such management processes as budgeting and personnel.

Managers must provide sensitive leadership. As managers, they must acknowledge the range of opinions about the appropriateness and fairness of affirmative action for desegregation among those they supervise. It may be difficult to maintain the value consensus at the university while attempting to implement affirmative action. However, the findings of this study indicate that higher education managers can maintain that value consensus, take positive steps and achieve results in faculty desegregation. And this study provides recommendations about how managers can accomplish these objectives. Higher education managers can maneuver within the narrow framework provided by the competing values within the institution, courts and OCR and, thereby, achieve results in desegregating their faculties.

FINAL REFLECTIONS

A general assessment of the findings and conclusions in this study leads the researcher to believe that managers have not placed enough emphasis on retention programs for employees. We should be contemplating how we can make the job environment more attractive -- not just for other-race faculty--but for all employees. The sooner we come to terms with management's responsibility and ability to provide supportive working environments for all employees, the sooner affirmative action programs will be viewed as less of a thorn or burden for managers.

The researcher believes that the affirmative action activities and programs designed to recruit and retain other-race faculty are nothing more than what managers should provide for all of their employees. Such programs are designed to meet the needs of other-race faculty and have been labeled as special programs. However, if we examine our institutions more closely, we will find that different employees have different needs and that many majority-race employees would benefit from programs designed to meet their needs (e.g., support groups, coaching for tenure and promotions, in-service training, financial incentives). Managers must take more responsibility for assisting in the development of all human resources at our



colleges and universities. When this strategy is taken, programs that now suffer from special attention and consideration will be part of a university-wide effort of human resource development.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams v. Bell, Civ. Action No. 3095-70, D.D.C., 1983.
- Adams v. Califano, 430 F. Supp. 118, D.D.C., 1977.
- Adams v. Richardson, 356 F. Supp. 92, D.D.C. 1973, 480 F.2d 1159 (D.C. Cir 1973)
- American Council on Education (1984). "Quality Education for All Americans A Must" Higher Education and National Affairs, 33 (21).
- Angle, H.L., & Perry, J.L. An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1981, 26, 1-13.
- Astin, Alexander W. (1982). Minorities In American Higher Education, San Francisco: Jossey Bass Inc.
- Bateman, T.S. and Strasser, S. (1984) A Longitudinal Analysis of the Antecedents of Organizational Commitment. Academy of Management Journal 27, (1), '95.
- Bowen, Howard (1982). The State of The Nation and The Agenda For Higher Education, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Brayfield, A.H. & Crockett, W.H. Employee Attitudes and Employee Performance. Psychological Bulletin, 52, 396.
- Brown, David G. (1967). The Mobile Professors. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Brown, M.E. (1969) Identification and Some Conditions of Organizational Involvement. Administrative Science Quarterly, 14, 346.
- Buchanan, B. Building Organizational Commitment: The Socialization of Managers in Work Organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1974, 22, 533-546.
- Calder, B.J. and Staw, B.M. (1975) Interaction of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: Some Methodological Notes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 76.

- Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. (1975). Making Affirmative Action Work in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.
- Dahl, Robert A. (1972). Democracy In The U.S.: Promise and Performance, Chicago: Rand-McNally and Co.
- Deci, E.L. (1972) The Effects of Contingent and Non-Contingent Rewards and Controls on Intrinsic Motivation. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 8, 217.
- Denzin, Norman K. (1978). The Research Act. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Dunnette, M. Campbell, J. & Hakel, M. (1967) Factors Contributing to Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction in Six Occupational Groups. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 2, 143.
- Dunnette, M.D., Arvey, R.D., & Banas, P.A. (1973) Why Do They Leave? Personnel, (May/June), p. 25.
- Edwards, Harry T., & Nordon, Virginia Davis. Higher Education and the Law. Cambridge, MA: Institute for Educational Management.
- Eisenberg, Elliott R., & Galanti, Anthony. (1979, April). Why Engineers Leave Academia. Engineering Education, 71 (7), 700.
- Elmore, C.J. & Blackburn, R.T. (1983) Black And White Faculty In White Research Universities. Journal of Higher Education, 54 (1), 1.
- Evangelauf, Jean (1984) "Founding OUR Institutions Anew," Chronicle of Higher Education, 29, (11).
- Fedler, Fred & Courts, Jim. (1982, Fall). National J-Faculty Survey Reveals Job Likes, Dislikes, Journalism Education, 37(3), 3.
- Fleming, John E. (1976). The Lengthening Shadow of Slavery. D.C.: Howard University Press.
- Fleming, John E., Gill, Gerald R., & Swinton, David H. (1978). The Case for Affirmative Action for Blacks in Higher Education. Washington, DC: Howard University Press.

- Friedlander, F. (1964) Job Characteristics as Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 48, 388.
- Friedman, Neil. (1967). The Social Nature of Psychological Research. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Fullilove et al. v. Klutznick, 448 U.S. 448 (1980).
- Garibaldi, Antoine, ed. (1984) Black Colleges And Universities: Challenges For The Future. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Gavin, J.F., & Ewen, R.B. (1974) Racial Differences in Job Attitudes and Performance: Some Theoretical Considerations and Empirical Findings. Personnel Psychology, 27, 455.
- Greenhaus, J.H., & Gavin, J.F. (1972) The Relationship Between Expectations and Job Behavior For White and Black Employees. Personnel Psychology, 25, 449.
- Gross, Barry. (1977). Reverse Discrimination. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Grusky, O. (1966) Career Mobility and Organizational Commitment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 4, 468.
- Hall, D.T., Schneider, B. & Nygren, H.T. (1970) Personal Factors in Organizational Identification. Administrative Science Quarterly, 15, 176.
- Hall, D.T., & Schneider, B. (1972) Correlates of Organizational Identification as a Function of Career Pattern and Organizational Type. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 340-350.
- Haynes, Alfonso W. (1981) Disadvantaged Students and Minority Professionals in Higher Education: Precursors of the Affirmative Action Program in The Minority Administrator In Higher Education, George Mims, ed.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R.O., & Capwell, R. Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinions. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Psychological Services, 1957.
- Herzberg, F. Work and The Nature of Man. Cleveland, OH: World Publishers, 1966.

- HEW. (1978). "The Adams Case: An HEW Perspective," Washington, DC: HEW.
- Hook, Sidney, & Todorovich, Miro. (1975, Winter). The Tyranny of Reverse Discrimination. Change, p. 42.
- Hoskins, Robert L. (1978). Black Administrators in Higher Education: Conditions and Perspectives. New York: Praeger Publishers, Inc.
- Hrebiniak, L.G. (1974) Effects of Job Level and Participation On Employee Attitudes and Perceptions of Influence. Academy of Management Journal, 17, 649.
- Hrebiniak, L.G. & Alutto, J.G. (1972) Personal and Role-related Factors in the Development of Organizational Commitment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 555-573.
- Huber, G., Daneshgar, R., & Ford, D. (1971) An Empirical Comparison of Five Utility Models for Predicting Job Preferences. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 6, 267.
- Institute for the Study of Educational Policy (ISEP). (1978). Equal Educational Opportunity: More Promise than Progress. Washington, DC: Howard University Press.
- Jackson, Jacqueline Johnson (1967) An Exploration of Black Faculty Attitudes Toward Faculty Desegregation at Negro Colleges, Phylon, 28 (4).
- James, Roy Irving. (1981). Attitudes and Opinions of Academic Department Chairpersons in Selected Public and Private Southeastern Colleges toward Affirmative Action for Black Faculty in Higher Education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia.
- Katz, I. (1964). Review of Evidence Relating to Effects of Desegregation on the Intellectual Performance of Negroes. American Psychologist, 19, 381.
- Katz, I., Robinson, J., Epps, E., & Waly, Patricia. (1964). Race of Experimenter and Instructions in the Expression of Hostility by Negro Boys. Journal of Social Issues, 20, 54.
- King, N. (1970) Clarification and Evaluation of the Two-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction. Psychological Bulletin, 74, 18.

- Lee, S.M. (1971) An Empirical Assessment of Organizational Identification. Academy of Management Journal, 14, 213.
- Lefkowitz, J. (1971) Personnel Turnover in Progress In Clinical Psychology.
- Lepper, M.R. & Greene, D. (1975) Turning Play Into Work: Effects of Adult Surveillance and Extrinsic Rewards on Children's Intrinsic Motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 479.
- Locke, Edwin. (1976) The Nature and Courses of Job Satisfaction in M. Dunnette (ed.) Handbook of Industrial Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Mackay-Smith, Anne (1984) "Large Shortage of Black Professors In Higher Education Grows Worse." Wall Street Journal, June.
- Maguire, Daniel C. (1980). A New American Justice: Ending the White Male Monopolies. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Corp., Inc.
- March, J.G. & Simon, H.A. (1958) Organizations. NY: Wiley.
- Marsh, R.M., & Mannari, H. (1977) Organizational Commitment and Turnover: A Prediction Study. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22, 57-75.
- Marshall, Howard D. (1964). The Mobility of College Faculties. New York: Pageant Press, Inc.
- Milutinovich, J.S. (1977) Black-White Differences in Job Satisfaction, Group Cohesiveness and Leadership Style. Human Relations, 30, 1079.
- Misra, Sasi and Kalro, Amar (1972) Simulated Organization Choice: Postdecision Dissonance Reduction and Self-Perception. Journal of Applied Psychology, 56 (6), 461.
- Mobley, W.H., Griffeth, R.W., Hand, H.H., and Meglino, B.M. (1979) Review and Conceptual Analysis of the Employee Turnover Process. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 493.
- Moch, M.K. (1980) Racial Differences In Job Satisfaction: Testing Four Common Explanations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 65 (3), 299.

- Mommsen, K.G. (1974) Professionalism and The Racial Context of Career Patterns Among Black American Doctorates: A Note On the "Brain Drain" Hypothesis. Journal of Negro Education, p. 191.
- Mooney, Christopher (1982). Inequality and The American Conscience: Justice Through The Judicial System. Ramsey, N.J.: Paulist Press.
- Moore, Kathryn M., & Sagaria, Mary Ann. (1982). Differential Job Change and Stability Among Academic Administrators. Journal of Higher Education, 53(5).
- Moore, K.M., & Sagaria, M.A. (1981, Winter). Women Administrators and Mobility: The Second Struggle. Journal of NAWDAC, 44, 21.
- Moore, William, Jr., & Wagstaff, Lonnie. (1974). Black Educators in White Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.
- Morris, J., & Koch, J. (1979) Impacts of Role Perception on Organizational Commitment, Job Involvement, and Psychosomatic Illness Among Three Vocational Groupings. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14, 88.
- Morris, J.H., & Sherman, J.D. (1981) Generalizability of an Organizational Commitment Model. Academy of Management Journal, 24, 512-526.
- Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W., & Steers, R.M. Employee-Organizational Linkages. NY: Academic Press, 1982.
- Myrdal, Gunnar (1944). An American Dilemma. New York: Harper and Bros.
- O'Reilly, C.A., III & Roberts, K.H. (1973) Job Satisfaction Among Whites and Non-Whites: A Cross-cultural Approach. Journal of Applied Psychology, 57 (3), 295.
- O'Reilly, Charles A. and Caldwell, David F. (1980) Job Choice: The Impact of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Factors on Subsequent Satisfaction and Commitment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 65 (5), 559.
- Patches, M. Participation, Achievement, and Investment In The Job. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Patton, Michael Q. (1980). Qualitative Evaluation Methods. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

- Patton, Michael Q. (1978). Utilization-Focused Evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Pfeffer, J., & Lawler, J. (1980) Effects of Job Alternatives, Extrinsic Rewards, and Behavioral Commitment on Attitude Toward the Organization: A Field Test of the Insufficient Justification Paradigm. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25, 38.
- Porter, L.W., & Steers, R.M. (1973) Organizational, Work, and Personal Factors in Employee Turnover and Absenteeism. Psychological Bulletin, 80, 151.
- Preer, Jean L. (1982). Lawyers and Educators: Black Colleges and Desegregation In Public Higher Education. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- Rabkin, Jeremy. (1984) "Captive of the Court: A Federal Agency In Receivership." AEI Journal on Government and Society, May/June.
- Radin, Beryl (1977). "Equal Educational Opportunity" in Toward New Human Rights David C. Warner, ed.
- Rankin, R., & Campbell, D. (1955). Galvanic Skin Response to Negro and White Experimenters. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 51, 30.
- Reed, Rodney J. (1982) Affirmative Action in Higher Education: Is it Necessary? Journal of Negro Education.
- Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265 (1978).
- Rhodes, S.R., & Steers, R.M. (1983) Conventional vs. Worker-owned Organizations. Human Relations, 35, 402.
- Roche, George C., III. (1974). The Balancing Act: Quota Hiring in Higher Education. LaSalle, IL: Open Court Publishing Company.
- Rosenthal, R. (1966). Experimenter Effects in Behavioral Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Rotondi, T. (1975) Organizational Identification and Group Involvement. Academy of Management Journal, 18, 892.



- Rusbult, C.E., & Farrell, D. (1983) A Longitudinal Test of the Investment Model: The Impact on Job Satisfaction, Job Commitment and Turnover of Variations In Rewards, Costs, Alternatives and Investments. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68 (3), 429.
- Seabury, Paul. (1972, December). The Idea of Merit, Commentary, p. 41.
- Selznick, Phillip (1983). Leadership In Administration.
- Sheard, J. (1970) Intrasubject Prediction of Preferences for Organization Types. Journal of Applied Psychology, 54, 248.
- Sheldon, M.E. (1971) Investments and Involvements as Mechanisms Producing Commitment to the Organization. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, 143-150.
- Sindler, Allen P. (1983). Equal Opportunity: On The Policy And Politics of Compensatory Minority Preferences. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute.
- Slocum, J.W., & Stawser, R.H. (1972) Racial Differences in Job Attitudes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 56 (1), 28.
- Smith, P.C. Smith, O.W., & Rollo, J. (1974) Factor Structure for Blacks and Whites of the Job Descriptive Index and Its Discrimination of Job Satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59 (1), 99.
- Sowell, Thomas. (1975). Affirmative Action Reconsidered: Was it Necessary in Academia? Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.
- Starcevich, M.M. (1972) Job Factor Importance for Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction Across Different Occupational Levels. Journal of Applied Psychology, 56 (6), 467.
- Staw, B.M. (1974) Attitudinal and Behavioral Consequences of Changing a Major Organizational Reward: A Natural Field Experiment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30, 742.

- Steele, Claude and Green, Stephen. (1976, July/August) Affirmative Action and Academic Hiring: A Case Study of A Value Conflict. Journal of Higher Education, 47 (4), 413.
- Steers, R.M. (1977) Antecedents and Outcomes of Organizational Commitment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22, 46-56.
- Steers, R.M., & Spencer, D.G. (1977) The Role of Achievement Motivation in Job Design. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62, 472.
- Stevens, J.M., Beyer, J.M., & Trice, H.M. (1978) Assessing Personal, Role, and Organizational Predictors of Managerial Commitment. Academy of Management Journal, 21, 380-396.
- Suinn, Richard M., & Witt, Joseph C. (1982, November). Survey on Ethnic Minority Faculty Recruitment and Retention. American Psychologist, 37, (11) 1239.
- Trent, R.D. (1954). The Color of the Investigator as a Variable in Experimental Research with Negro Subjects. Journal of Social Psychology, 40, p. 281.
- Truman, David (1971). The Governmental Process. New York: Alfred A Knopf, Inc.
- United Steelworkers of America v. Weber, 443 U.S. 193 (1979).
- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "The Black/White Colleges: Dismantling the Dual Systems of Higher Education." Clearinghouse Publications 66, April 1981.
- Vroom, V.H. (1966) Organizational Choice: A Study of Pre- and Postdecision Processes. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1, 212.
- Vroom, V. Work and Motivation, NY: Wiley, 1964.
- Vroom, V.H., & Deci, E.L. (1971) The Stability of Post-decisional dissonance: A Follow-up Study of the Job Attitudes of Business School Graduates. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 6, 36.
- Wanous, J.P. (1977) Organizational Entry: Newcomers Moving From Outside to Inside. Psychological Bulletin, 84, 601.

Weaver, C.N. (1974) Negro-White Differences In Job Satisfaction. Business Horizons, 17, 67.

Wortman, C.B. (1975) Some Determinents of Perceived Control. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 282.

## Appendix A

The researcher decided to have a white interviewer conduct interviews with white faculty at MU and FSU after reading about the "significance of both [the] individual differences among experimenters--experimenter effect--and the attitudes of experimenters--experimenter bias" (Rosenthal, 1966).

Friedman devoted a major portion of his book, The Social Nature of Psychological Research (1967), to a review of the "growing literature which attests to various aspects of the impact of the experimenter on experimental results (p. 134). Friedman notes that when the literature "is organized in terms of so-called experimenter characteristics, at least: race; sex; status; warmth; likeability; and hostility have been found to be response relevant . . ." (p. 134). He goes on to say that such effects "have not been sufficiently studied . . ."

However, "studies of research have shown that the race of the experimenter can make a difference." (See Rankin and Campbell, 1955; Trent, 1954; Katz, 1964; and Katz, et al., 1964.) Such studies also indicate that the race of the experimenter is not the only factor that can cause experimenter effect or experimenter bias" (p. 116).

While Rosenthal (1966) discusses specific measures for mediating experimenter effects in behavioral research, this

researcher recognizes that all such effects cannot be mediated in this study. However, this researcher attempted to mediate the effect of race in this study since a major factor under study is the differences between responses of black faculty at TWIs and those of white faculty at TBIs.

This researcher, who is black, attempted to mediate the experimenter effect of race by conducting the interviews with black faculty at TWIs and by having a white interviewer conduct interviews with white faculty at TBIs.

Appendix B

The anticipated format for the listing of faculty is as follows:

Permanent by Department/Discipline

- I. (For CU and LU)
  - A. Instructional Faculty By Rank
    - 1) Tenured, black males  
Tenured, black females
    - 2) Non-tenured, black males  
Non-tenured, black females
  - B. Administrative Faculty By Rank
    - 1) Same as IA, 1&2, except Administrative  
(instead of Instructional)
- II. (For MU and FSU)
  - A. Instructional Faculty By Rank
    - 1) Same as IA, 1, except white males and females  
(instead of black males and females)
    - 2) Same as IA, 2, except white males and females  
(instead of black males and females)
  - B. Administrative Faculty By Rank
    - 1) Same as IB, 1, except white males and females  
(instead of black males and females)



## Appendix C

An increase in the proportion of white faculty at TBIs is not required for the desegregation of the higher education. After the District Court ruling in Adams v. Richardson, the D.C. Circuit Court observed that the desegregation of higher education was different from elementary and secondary school desegregation. The Court cautioned HEW to "carefully assess the significance of a variety of new factors as it moves into an unaccustomed area." 480 F2d 1159, 1163 (D.C. Cir. 1973)

One new factor that HEW assessed was how to desegregate state systems of higher education without dismantling TBIs. In 1973 and 1974, HEW officials attempted to address that concern when issuing letters to the ten state systems of higher education involved in the Adams litigation. The letters described in a generalized way the components of an acceptable desegregation plan. (HEW, 1978). Those letters included the following statement: "the plan must assure that the traditionally black institutions do not bear the burdens of desegregation and that they are provided resources of sufficient quantity and quality to enable them to overcome past discrimination..." (HEW, 1978).

However, concern over this issue persisted as exemplified in an amicus brief filed by the National Association For Equal Opportunity (NAFEO) in Adams v.

Califano. In the brief, NAFEO claimed that the desegregation would result in the absorption of black colleges into predominantly white institutions. (HEW, 1978) Additionally, D.C. District Court Judge Pratt "conveyed his concern that ultimately desegregation at the higher education level would undermine the continued viability of black institutions" Adams v. Califano, Supplemental Order, April 1, 1977.

Such concerns were reflected in the guidelines filed by HEW in 1977 relative to acceptable desegregation plans. In these guidelines, there was no requirement to increase the number of white faculty at TBIs.

Appendix D

Letters

March 30, 1984

I am writing to request your assistance relative to my dissertation study. In the study, I will examine the factors that influence decisions of black faculty at traditionally white institutions (TWIs) and of white faculty at traditionally black institutions (TBIs) to accept, continue in, and consider leaving faculty positions at such institutions. The president of your university has given me permission to include your university faculty in my study.

In order to ground my research in the realities of university life, I am asking EEO officers, Personnel staff, and academic administrators to review and comment on a preliminary listing of such factors that I developed from a review of the literature on faculty mobility. The instructions for your review and comments are provided with the enclosed listing.

Please complete the enclosed survey, and return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope by May 4, 1984.

Once I have interviewed the faculty at your university and have tabulated their responses, I will compare their responses to your rating of factors. The analysis of such data may prove insightful relative to the nuances of faculty mobility at your university.

I certainly appreciate your cooperation and your time. Feel free to contact me if you have questions about the survey.

Sincerely,

Maggi L. Curry-Williams

( :)

or

April 23, 1984

I am writing to request your participation in a study being conducted for my dissertation. I have already received permission from the president of your university to conduct my research.

In the study, I will examine the factors that influence the decisions of black faculty at traditionally white universities and white faculty at traditionally black universities to accept, continue in and consider leaving faculty positions. The study is the final requirement for my completion of a Ph.D. in Public Administration and Public Affairs at Virginia Tech.

I and my research assistant will conduct interviews with a small sample of faculty during late Spring in order to determine faculty perceptions of such factors. The interviews should take no longer than one hour. Additionally, during the summer, I will send questionnaires to a larger sample of faculty, which should take no longer than 10 minutes to complete. The findings of the study will be available to participating faculty.

Of course, all information provided by you will be kept in strict confidence, and all responses will be coded and not be attributable to individual faculty.

I am excited about this study, the findings of which will contribute to existing theory about faculty mobility and faculty desegregation.

I will contact you by phone within the next week to determine if you will participate in this study. If you agree to participate, an interview time, date, and place will be scheduled at that time.

Thank you for your cooperation and time. I look forward to talking with you in the near future.

Maggi L. Curry-Williams

May 14, 1984

---

As a Ph.D. candidate in Public Administration and Policy at Virginia Tech, I am conducting a study to examine the factors that influence black faculty at traditionally white universities and white faculty at traditionally black universities to accept, continue in, and consider leaving faculty positions.

The enclosed questionnaire was developed on the bases of a review of the literature on faculty mobility and on interview data provided by a random sample of such faculty. It will be sent to a stratified random sample of faculty at four southeastern universities within the next two weeks.

In order to pilot test the questionnaire, I selected a random sample of three faculty at each university. You are one of those faculty, and I hope that you will assist me in this regard.

I would appreciate your completing the questionnaire and encourage you to comment (on the last page) on the instrument, as to whether or not the questions/statements are understandable, confusing, etc. After doing so, please return the questionnaire with your comments in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope to me on or before May 23, 1984.

Your cooperation and assistance is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Maggi L. Curry-Williams

July 23, 1984

As a Ph.D. candidate in Public Administration at Virginia Tech, I am conducting a study to examine the factors that influence Black faculty at traditionally white universities and white faculty at traditionally Black universities to accept, continue in, and consider leaving faculty positions.

You are one of a small number of faculty being asked to give their opinions on these matters. Your name was drawn in a random sample of university faculty employed at universities in the southeast.

In order that the results of the study will more accurately reflect the thinking of faculty in the southeast, it is important that each questionnaire be completed and returned on or before Monday, August 6, 1984.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire, however, has an identification number so that I can check your name off of the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name will not be placed on the questionnaire.

The results of this research will be made available to academic administrators at the four southeastern universities under study. You may receive a summary of the results by writing "copy of results requested" on the back of the return envelope and printing your name and address below it. Please do not put this information on the questionnaire.

I would be most happy to answer any questions you might have about the study. Feel free to write or call me. My telephone number is

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Maggi L. Curry-Williams

MLCW/has

Enclosure



August 13, 1984

About three weeks ago, I wrote you seeking your opinion about the factors influencing your employment decisions. As of today, I have not received your completed questionnaire.

My study was undertaken because of the belief that faculty opinions should be taken into account by academic administrators when designing programs to recruit and retain faculty.

I am writing again because of the significance of each questionnaire to this study. In order for the results of the study to be truly representative of the opinions of faculty in southeastern universities, it is essential that each person in the sample return his/her questionnaire. In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed for your use. Please return it by Monday, August 27, 1984.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Cordially,

Maggi L. Curry-Williams

MLCW/has

Enclosure

## Appendix E

EEO, PERSONNEL AND ACADEMIC AFFAIRS SURVEY

Study Title:

Factors That Influence "Minority-Status" Faculty Decisions  
To Accept, Continue In, and Consider Leaving Four Virginia  
Colleges and Universities

Maggi L. Curry-Williams  
Ph.D. Candidate in Public Administration and Public Affairs  
Virginia Tech

April, 1984

Survey Instructions:

Please rate the attached lists of factors that (may) influence decisions of \_\_\_\_\_ faculty at \_\_\_\_\_ to accept, continue in, and leave faculty positions at your university.

It is acknowledged that the reasons for mobility may vary among faculty, and that no rating of factors by one individual provides a definitive assessment of such reasons. Therefore, your ratings should be based on information provided to you by \_\_\_\_\_ faculty and/or on your expert judgment. Space is provided for you to add other factors that may be influential in such faculty decisions.

Please rate the factors listed in each of the three categories below as follows:

- 1) Rank order the ten (10) most influential factors in each category--10=most influential, 1=least influential
- 2) Next, place an X next to the remaining unranked factors which you believe (or know) to be influential in such faculty decisions.
- 3) Leave blank spaces next to those factors about which you have no information or opinion.
- 4) Write any comments you wish to share with me on the last page of the survey.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

EEO, PERSONNEL AND ACADEMIC AFFAIRS SURVEY

Check one: Indicate your department

\_\_\_\_\_ Academic Affairs \_\_\_\_\_ EEO/AA \_\_\_\_\_ Personnel  
\_\_\_\_\_ both EEO and Personnel

Category I:

Factors Influencing \_\_\_\_\_ Faculty Decisions to Accept  
Positions at \_\_\_\_\_

(Review instructions before rating the factors in  
Category I)

\_\_\_\_\_ salary  
\_\_\_\_\_ fringe benefits  
\_\_\_\_\_ future salary prospects  
\_\_\_\_\_ opportunitites for additional/outside income

\_\_\_\_\_ prospects of getting promotions  
\_\_\_\_\_ prospects of getting tenure

\_\_\_\_\_ reputation of the university  
\_\_\_\_\_ competency of top administrators  
\_\_\_\_\_ mission of the university  
\_\_\_\_\_ assurances of academic freedom  
\_\_\_\_\_ research facilities and opportunities  
\_\_\_\_\_ types of students

\_\_\_\_\_ congeniality of colleagues  
\_\_\_\_\_ competency of colleagues  
\_\_\_\_\_ support from colleagues  
\_\_\_\_\_ support from departmental administration

\_\_\_\_\_ courses taught/work assigned  
\_\_\_\_\_ acceptable teaching/work load

\_\_\_\_\_ geographical location of the university  
\_\_\_\_\_ being near friends and relatives  
\_\_\_\_\_ cultural opportunities

\_\_\_\_\_ spouse gained employment in the same geographical area

Other:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Category II:

Factors Influencing \_\_\_\_\_ Faculty Decisions To Continue In  
Positions at \_\_\_\_\_

(Review instructions before rating the factors in  
Category II)

- \_\_\_\_\_ salary
- \_\_\_\_\_ fringe benefits
- \_\_\_\_\_ future salary prospects
- \_\_\_\_\_ opportunities for additional/outside income
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ prospects of getting tenure
- \_\_\_\_\_ prospects of getting promotions
- \_\_\_\_\_ received tenure
- \_\_\_\_\_ received promotion
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ reputation of the university
- \_\_\_\_\_ competency of top administrators
- \_\_\_\_\_ mission of the university
- \_\_\_\_\_ administrative support for academic freedom
- \_\_\_\_\_ research facilities and opportunities
- \_\_\_\_\_ types of students
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ congeniality of colleagues
- \_\_\_\_\_ competency of colleagues
- \_\_\_\_\_ support from colleagues
- \_\_\_\_\_ support from departmental administration
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ courses taught/work assigned
- \_\_\_\_\_ acceptable teaching/work load
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ geographical location of the university
- \_\_\_\_\_ being near friends and relatives
- \_\_\_\_\_ cultural opportunities
- \_\_\_\_\_ strong ties to local community
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ spouse employed in the same geographical area
- \_\_\_\_\_ hesitant to remove children from familiar school
- \_\_\_\_\_ health-related reasons
- \_\_\_\_\_ job market precludes leaving
- \_\_\_\_\_ cost of relocation prohibitive

Other:

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Category III:

Factors Influencing \_\_\_\_\_ Faculty to Leave \_\_\_\_\_

(Review instructions before rating the factors in Category III)

- \_\_\_\_\_ salary
- \_\_\_\_\_ fringe benefits
- \_\_\_\_\_ future salary prospects
- \_\_\_\_\_ opportunities for additional/outside income
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ limited prospects of getting tenure
- \_\_\_\_\_ limited prospects of getting promotions
- \_\_\_\_\_ unrenewed contract or appointment
- \_\_\_\_\_ to work outside academia
- \_\_\_\_\_ to resume graduate work
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ reputation of the university
- \_\_\_\_\_ competency of top administrators
- \_\_\_\_\_ mission of the university
- \_\_\_\_\_ limited academic freedom
- \_\_\_\_\_ limited research facilities and opportunities
- \_\_\_\_\_ types of students
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ lack of congeniality among colleagues
- \_\_\_\_\_ lack of competency of colleagues
- \_\_\_\_\_ lack of support from colleagues
- \_\_\_\_\_ lack of support from departmental administrators
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ undesirable courses/work assigned
- \_\_\_\_\_ teaching/work load excessive or undesirable
- \_\_\_\_\_ job changed in undesirable way
- \_\_\_\_\_ experienced racial discrimination
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ geographical location of the university
- \_\_\_\_\_ limited cultural opportunities
- \_\_\_\_\_ to be near friends and relatives
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ spouse gained employment in different geographical area
- \_\_\_\_\_ health-related reasons

Other:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS (about survey items, your ratings, etc.)

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Thank You For Your Cooperation



Appendix F

Interview Guide Sheet For Faculty Interviews

INTRODUCE YOURSELF AND MAKE SMALL TALK

READ TO FACULTY:

The purpose of this study is to examine the factors that influence decisions of white faculty at traditionally black universities and black faculty at traditionally white universities to accept, continue in, and consider leaving faculty positions at four southeastern universities.

Specifically, the responses from these interviews will be used to develop a questionnaire that will be sent to a larger sample of faculty. Also, the combined responses of interviewed faculty will be compared to responses from academic administrators to a survey about the factors that influence minority-status faculty decisions.

I will ask you three sets of questions--  
one set are related to the reasons that you accepted a job at \_\_\_\_\_;

one set are related to the reasons that you choose to stay at \_\_\_\_\_; and

one set are related to the reasons you would consider leaving \_\_\_\_\_.

Do you have any questions at this point? OK, let's begin.

Recall generally where you were and what you were doing before you accepted the offer to work at \_\_\_\_\_.

I.

1. Were there issues or concerns having to do with your immediate family (e.g., children, spouse) that influenced your decision to accept a job at \_\_\_\_\_?  
 YES     NO

If yes, what were those factors?

2. Were there issues or concerns having to do with the geographical location of this university...?  
 YES  NO If yes, what were those factors?
  
3. Were there issues or concerns having to do with the responsibilities of the job itself...?  
 YES  NO If yes, what were those factors?
  
4. Were there issues or concerns having to do with the people in and the environment of the department...?  
 YES  NO If yes, what were those factors?
  
5. Were there issues or concerns having to do with the environment, people or facilities of the university in general...?  
 YES  NO If yes, what were those factors?
  
6. Were these issues or concerns having to do with compensation or monetary rewards...?  
 YES  NO If yes, what were those factors?
  
7. Were there issues or concerns having to do with opportunities for advancement...?  
 YES  NO If yes, what were those factors?

8. Were there any other factors...?  
 YES  NO If yes, what were those factors?
9. Were you offered benefits/perks that might be viewed by some as special or preferential treatment?  
 YES  NO If yes, what were those benefits?

## II.

Now we will concentrate on the reasons that you have chosen to stay at \_\_\_\_\_.

10. Are there issues or concerns having to do with your immediate family that influence you to stay at \_\_\_\_\_?  
 YES  NO If yes, what are those factors?
11. Are there issues or concerns having to do with the geographical location of the university...?  
 YES  NO If yes, what are those factors?
12. ....responsibility of the job itself...?  
 YES  NO If yes, what are those factors?

13. ....the people in and the environment of the department...?  
\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_NO If yes, what are those factors?
14. ....the environment, people, or facilities of the university in general...?  
\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_NO If yes, what are those factors?
15. ....compensation or monetary rewards...?  
\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_NO If yes, what are those factors?
16. ....opportunities for advancement...?  
\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_NO If yes, what are those factors?
17. Are there any other factors...?  
\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_NO If yes, what are those factors?
18. Have you received benefits/perks that might be viewed by others as special or preferential treatment?  
\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_NO If yes, what are those benefits?

## III.

Now let's concentrate on those factors that you would consider if you were deciding to leave  
\_\_\_\_\_.

What issues or concerns would be important in influencing you to leave \_\_\_\_\_?

19. ...relative to your immediate family?
  
20. ...relative to the geographical location of this university?
  
21. to the responsibilities of the job itself?
  
22. ...relative to the people in and environment of the department?
  
23. ...relative to the environment, people and facilities of the university in general?
  
24. ...relative to compensation or monetary rewards?
  
25. ...relative to opportunities for advancement?

26. Are there any other factors that would be important in influencing you to leave \_\_\_\_\_?

READ TO FACULTY:

Thank you for answering my many questions. I just need a little more information from you.

\_\_\_\_\_ number of years employed at \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ administrative or instructional faculty

\_\_\_\_\_ school or administrative division \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ faculty rank (professor, asst. prof., asst. prof., instructor, asst. instructor)

\_\_\_\_\_ tenured or nontenured

\_\_\_\_\_ sex

\_\_\_\_\_ name of institution

## Appendix G



The researcher provided the interviewer with a copy of the dissertation prospectus to acquaint her with the research questions, literature and methodology of the study. Additionally, the researcher met with the interviewer to review and discuss: the administrator survey; the interview guide sheet; techniques for probing faculty responses; and our biases going into the interviews.

The biases discussed were:

1. white faculty work at TBIs due to limited job alternatives, altruism, and/or desires for new experiences or environment; and
2. black faculty work at TWIs for prestige, higher salaries, and to serve as role models for black students.

The researcher scheduled the interviews and the interviewer telephoned the researcher each day after interviews to discuss: problems with the interview guide (there were some); and problems in probing responses (there were none). We discovered that clarification was necessary relative to possible responses to each question.

After each set of interviews, the interviewer and the researcher met to discuss our general impressions and to discuss the procedure for coding interviewer data.

The interviewer's general impressions were:

1. At FSU, there was a striking emphasis on human relations, collegiality and mentoring of students. There was no emphasis on competition.
2. At MU, there was general consensus that black colleges place blacks in leadership roles and exclude most whites. There was general consensus that this is as it should be. Additionally, there were few comments about the race of colleagues and students.

The researcher's general impressions were:

1. faculty were extremely cooperative in granting interviews and scheduling time for them;
2. the black faculty who were interviewed seemed satisfied with their decisions to accept and remain in faculty positions at their universities though a couple revealed their intentions to leave. The reasons given for leaving were based on promotional opportunities or better opportunities for those faculty to fulfill their professional goals elsewhere.

Appendix H

## FACULTY SURVEY

## Study Title:

FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE MINORITY-STATUS FACULTY TO ACCEPT, CONTINUE IN,  
AND CONSIDER LEAVING FACULTY POSITIONS AT FOUR SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITIES

MAGGI L. CURRY-WILLIAMS

PH.D. CANDIDATE

IN

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

MAY, 1984

## GENERAL SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS

The questions in this survey will ask you:

- how influential certain factors are in your decisions to accept and remain in your faculty position
- how important certain factors would be if you considered leaving your university

Each of the questions is answered by circling the appropriate response.

For example, Mary Caperton was asked how influential was: 1) her immediate family; and 2) opportunities for collaborative efforts with colleagues in her decision to accept a job at Madera University. Since she was not married and had no children, she circled "NA" (not applicable) for the first factor. However, "opportunities for collaborative efforts" was one of the most important influences in her decision to accept the job at Madera. Therefore, she circled "VI" (very important) for the second factor.

Please follow the directions provided in the boxes at the beginning of each category of questions. Be Sure To Read The Response Choices BEFORE choosing and marking your answers. If none of the choices seems completely accurate, please choose the one that most closely represents your opinions or beliefs. If the question is not applicable to you, circle "NA".



FACTORS INFLUENCING JOB ACCEPTANCE...

| Relative to the environment, people, and facilities of your university, how influential was... |             | Relative to professional advancement, how influential was...    |             |
|--|-------------|---|-------------|
| computer, library or other educational facilities?   | NI SI VI NA | expectation of tenure?  | NI SI VI NA |
| campus recreational facilities?  | NI SI VI NA | expectation of promotion(s)?                                    | NI SI VI NA |
| university size?   | NI SI VI NA | receiving tenure?   | NI SI VI NA |
| reputation of the university?  | NI SI VI NA | job as stepping stone to career goal(s) within the university?  | NI SI VI NA |
| university mission?  | NI SI VI NA | job as stepping stone to career goal(s) outside the university? | NI SI VI NA |
| academic level of students?  | NI SI VI NA | opportunity and support for completing advanced degree(s)?      | NI SI VI NA |
| good morale among faculty, staff and students?   | NI SI VI NA | opportunity and support for "other" professional development?   | NI SI VI NA |
| administration philosophy and policies?  | NI SI VI NA |   |             |
| respect for central administrators?  | NI SI VI NA |   |             |
| professional support from central administrators?  | NI SI VI NA |   |             |
| commitment to and progress in affirmative action?  | NI SI VI NA |   |             |
| presence of faculty of your race/ethnicity?  | NI SI VI NA |   |             |
| presence of students or staff of your race/ethnicity?  | NI SI VI NA |   |             |

FACTORS INFLUENCING YOU TO REMAIN AT YOUR UNIVERSITY

In this section, please rank order the following factors relative to their influence on you decision to REMAIN at your university. 7=most influential; 1=least influential

- \_\_\_ Family Factors - see page 1 of this survey for description
- \_\_\_ Geographic Location Factors - see page 1
- \_\_\_ Job Characteristics and Responsibilities - see page 1
- \_\_\_ Departmental Factors - see page 1
- \_\_\_ University Factors - see page 1
- \_\_\_ Compensation Factors - see page 1
- \_\_\_ Advancement Factors - see page 1

The reasons that faculty decide to remain at their universities are influenced by a variety of factors. HOW INFLUENTIAL is each of the following factors in your decision to REMAIN at your university? (CIRCLE ONE FOR EACH FACTOR)  
 NI=not influential; SI=somewhat influential; VI=very influential; NA=not applicable

| Relative to the geographical location of your university, how influential is... |             | Relative to professional advancement, how influential is... |             |
|---|-------------|---|-------------|
| the climate?  | NI SI VI NA | proximity to large urban area(s)                            | NI SI VI NA |
| the cost of living?   | NI SI VI NA | your being a "native" of this area?                         | NI SI VI NA |
| the racial/ethnic composition of your city/town?                                | NI SI VI NA |   |             |
| the size of your city/town?   | NI SI VI NA | expectation of tenure?                                      | NI SI VI NA |
| real estate or business ownership in this area?                                 | NI SI VI NA | receiving tenure?   | NI SI VI NA |
| your desire to live in the southeast?   | NI SI VI NA | expectation of promotion(s) within your department?         | NI SI VI NA |
| working/living near friends and relatives?                                      | NI SI VI NA | receiving promotion(s)?                                     | NI SI VI NA |
| proximity to recreational or cultural opportunities                             | NI SI VI NA | expectation of promotion(s) to/in other departments?        | NI SI VI NA |
| presence of blacks in the community?  | NI SI VI NA | opportunity and support for professional development?       | NI SI VI NA |









## Appendix I

## FACULTY SURVEY

## Study Title:

FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE MINORITY-STATUS FACULTY TO ACCEPT, CONTINUE IN,  
AND CONSIDER LEAVING FACULTY POSITIONS AT FOUR SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITIES

MAGGI L. CURRY-WILLIAMS

PH.D. CANDIDATE

IN

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

JUNE, 1984

## GENERAL SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS

The questions in this survey will ask you:

- how influential certain factors are in your decisions to accept and remain in your faculty position
- how important certain factors would be if you considered leaving your university

Each of the questions is answered by circling the appropriate response.

For example, Mary Caperton was asked how influential was: 1) her immediate family; and 2) opportunities for collaborative efforts with colleagues in her decision to accept a job at Madiera University. Since she was not married and had no children, she circled "NA" (not applicable) for the first factor. However, "opportunities for collaborative efforts" was one of the most important influences in her decision to accept the job at Madiera. Therefore, she circled "VI" (very important) for the second factor.

Please follow the directions provided in the boxes at the beginning of each category of questions. Be Sure To Read The Response Choices BEFORE choosing and marking your answers. If none of the choices seems completely accurate, please choose the one that most closely represents your opinions or beliefs. If the question is not applicable to you, circle "NA".

FACTORS INFLUENCING JOB ACCEPTANCE

Please rank order the following list of factors relative to their influence on your decision to ACCEPT a faculty position at your university. 7=most influential; 1=least influential

- \_\_\_ Family - factors affecting your spouse or child(ren)
- \_\_\_ Geographic Location - factors related to location, climate, size of your city/town; proximity to friends, relatives, and recreational or other areas of interest
- \_\_\_ Job Characteristics and Responsibilities - factors related to the actual work itself (what you do)
- \_\_\_ Departmental - factors related to the people in and the environment of your department
- \_\_\_ University - factors related to the people, environment, and facilities at your university
- \_\_\_ Compensation - factors related to salary, fringe benefits, and opportunities for outside or additional income
- \_\_\_ Advancement - factors related to professional development, promotion(s), tenure

XX

There are various reasons for selecting a place of employment. HOW INFLUENTIAL was each of the following factors in your decision to ACCEPT a job at your university? (CIRCLE ONE FOR EACH FACTOR)  
 NI=not influential; SI=somewhat influential; VI=very influential; NA=not applicable

| Relative to the geographical location of your university, how influential was... |             | Relative to the responsibilities and characteristics of your job, how influential was...   |             |
|--|-------------|--|-------------|
| the climate?   | NI SI VI NA | the challenge of the job?  | NI SI VI NA |
| the cost of living?  | NI SI VI NA | work assignments and workload?   | NI SI VI NA |
| your desire to live in the southeast?  | NI SI VI NA | autonomy provided through the job?   | NI SI VI NA |
| the size of your city/town?  | NI SI VI NA | opportunities for work-related travel?   | NI SI VI NA |
| working/living near friends and relatives?                                       | NI SI VI NA | utilizing professional skills?   | NI SI VI NA |
| presence of people of your race/ethnicity in the community?                      | NI SI VI NA | pursuing professional interests?   | NI SI VI NA |
| proximity to large urban area(s)?  | NI SI VI NA | servicing as role model for students of your race/ethnicity?                               | NI SI VI NA |
| proximity to recreational or cultural opportunities?                             | NI SI VI NA | servicing as role model for all students?  | NI SI VI NA |
| your being a "native" of this area?  | NI SI VI NA | availability of advisees for research assistance?  | NI SI VI NA |
| living in this area before job was offered?                                      | NI SI VI NA | <u>Relative to the people in or environment of your department, how influential was...</u> |             |
| the racial/ethnic composition of the city/town?                                  | NI SI VI NA | congeniality of colleagues?  | NI SI VI NA |
| <u>Relative to your immediate family, how influential was...</u>                 |             | competency of colleagues?  | NI SI VI NA |
| educational opportunities for your child(ren)?                                   | NI SI VI NA | support from colleagues?   | NI SI VI NA |
| spouse employed in this geographical area?                                       | NI SI VI NA | support from departmental administrator(s)?  | NI SI VI NA |
| spouse being a "native" of this geographical area?                               | NI SI VI NA | feeling of community?  | NI SI VI NA |
| social comfort of spouse or child(ren) due to their race/ethnicity?              | NI SI VI NA | presence of departmental faculty of your race/ethnicity?                                   | NI SI VI NA |
| work permits adequate time with spouse or child(ren)?                            | NI SI VI NA | respect for departmental administration?   | NI SI VI NA |
| spouse or child(ren) enrolled at nearby university?                              | NI SI VI NA | opportunities for collaborative efforts with colleagues?                                   | NI SI VI NA |
|  |             | presence of students or staff of your race/ethnicity?                                      | NI SI VI NA |
|  |             | colleagues respect your professional competence?   | NI SI VI NA |
|  |             | <u>Relative to compensation, how influential was...</u>                                    |             |
|  |             | salary?  | NI SI VI NA |
|  |             | fringe benefits package?   | NI SI VI NA |
|  |             | opportunities for outside or additional income?  | NI SI VI NA |
|  |             | lack of more attractive job offer?   | NI SI VI NA |

FACTORS INFLUENCING JOB ACCEPTANCE...

Remember, NI=not influential; SI=somewhat influential; VI=very influential; NA=not applicable

Table with two columns: 'Relative to the environment, people, and facilities of your university, how influential was...' and 'Relative to professional advancement, how influential was...'. Rows include factors like 'computer, library or other educational facilities?' and 'expectation of tenure?'.

FACTORS INFLUENCING YOU TO REMAIN AT YOUR UNIVERSITY

In this section, please rank order the following factors relative to their influence on you decision to REMAIN at your university. 7=most influential; 1=least influential

- Family Factors - spouse, child(ren)
Geographic Location Factors - location, climate, towns; recreational opportunities; proximity to friends and relatives
Job Characteristics / Responsibilities - actual work itself
Departmental Factors - people and environment of your department
University Factors - people, environment, facilities at your university
Compensation Factors - salary, fringe benefits, opportunities for additional income
Advancement Factors - professional development, promotion(s), tenure

The reasons that faculty decide to remain at their universities are influenced by a variety of factors. NOW INFLUENTIAL is each of the following factors in your decision to REMAIN at your university? (CIRCLE ONE FOR EACH FACTOR)

NI=not influential; SI=somewhat influential; VI=very influential; NA=not applicable

Relative to the geographical location of your university, how influential is...

Table with two columns: 'Relative to the geographical location of your university, how influential is...' and 'Relative to professional advancement, how influential is...'. Rows include factors like 'the climate?' and 'expectation of tenure?'.









## Appendix J

```

          ***
          ***
          ***
          ***
        *** ** *** ***
        *****
    ***   ***   ***   ***
    ***   ***   ***   ***
        *****
          ***   ***   ***
    
```

\*START\* User CID-ALLEN (131102,61001) Job FACMOB Seq. 2398 Date 26-Sep-84  
 Monitor UDU KL109C 7.01A(1) \*START\*

```

CCCC   III   OOOO           AAA   L   L   EEEEE   N   N
C      I   O   O           A   A   L   L   E       N   N
C      I   O   O           A   A   L   L   E       NN  N
C      I   O   O   ----- A   A   L   L   EEEEE   N  N N
C      I   O   O           AAAAA  L   L   E       N  NN
C      I   O   O           A   A   L   L   E       N   N
CCCC   III   OOOO           A   A   LLLLL  LLLLL  EEEEE   N   N
    
```

```

FFFFF   AAA   CCCC   M   M   OOO   BBBB           SSSS   PPPP   SSSS
F      A   A   C           MM MM   O   O   B   B           S       P   P   S
F      A   A   C           M   M   O   O   B   B           S       P   P   S
FFFFF   A   A   C           M   M   O   O   BBBB           SSS   PPPP   SSS
F      AAAAA  C           M   M   O   O   B   B           S       S   P       S
F      A   A   C           M   M   O   O   B   B           ..   S   P       S
F      A   A   CCCC   M   M   OOO   BBBB           ..   SSSS   P       SSSS
    
```

\*START\* User CID-ALLEN (131102,61001) Job FACMOB Seq. 2398 Date 26-Sep-84 12:24  
 Monitor UDU KL109C 7.01A(1) \*START\*  
 File: USKH:FACMOB.SPS<057>(131102,61001,SPSS,FACMOB) Created: 26-Sep-84 10:30:21  
 Printed: 26-Sep-84 12:24:45  
 QUEUE Switches: /FILE:ASCII /COPIES:1  
 /SPACING:1 /LIMIT:218 /FORMS:NEWDOC

```

RUN NAME          STUDY OF FACULTY MOBILITY SURVEY (FACMOB)
FILE NAME        FACMOB
COMMENT          INPUT DATA FACMOB.DAT
                 SOURCE PROGRAM FACMOB.SPS
                 GET FILE FACMOB
VARIABLE LIST    A1 TO A32,A32A,A33 TO A41,A41A,A42 TO A58,A58A
                 A59 TO A65,R66 TO R83,R83A,R84 TO R104,R104A,R104B,R104C
                 R105 TO R121,R121A,R121B,R122 TO R130
                 R130A,L131 TO L148,L148A,L148B,L149 TO L158
                 L158A,L158B,L158C,L159 TO L173,L173A,L173B
                 L174 TO L182,L182A,L182B,L182C,L182D,L182E
                 L183 TO L195,L195A,PD196 TO PD203
INPUT MEDIUM     FACMOB.DAT
INPUT FORMAT     FIXED(36X,120A1/36X,106A1)
ALLOCATE         TRANSPOSE=1200
RECCDE          A1 TO A7 ('0'=1)('1'=2)('2'=3)('3'=4)('4'=5)
                 ('5'=6)('6'=7)('7'=99)('8'=8)('9'=99)(' '=99)('*'=99)
                 (CONVERT)
RECCDE          R66 TO R72 ('0'=1)('1'=2)('2'=3)('3'=4)('4'=5)
                 ('5'=6)('6'=7)('7'=99)('8'=8)('9'=99)(' '=99)('*'=99)
                 (CONVERT)
RECCDE          L131 TO L137 ('0'=1)('1'=2)('2'=3)('3'=4)('4'=5)
                 ('5'=6)('6'=7)('7'=99)('8'=8)('9'=99)(' '=99)('*'=99)
                 (CONVERT)
RECCDE          A8 TO A65, PD203 ('0'='A')('1'='B')('2'='C')('3'='D')
                 (ELSE=99)
RECCDE          R73 TO R130A ('0'='A')('1'='B')('2'='C')('3'='D')
                 (ELSE=99)
RECCDE          L138 TO L195A ('0'='A')('1'='B')('2'='C')('3'='D')
                 (ELSE=99)
RECCDE          PD196,PD197,PD199 ('0'='A')('1'='B') (ELSE=99)
RECCDE          PD198,PD200 ('0'='A')('1'='B')('2'='C')('3'='D')
                 ('4'='E') (ELSE=99)
RECCDE          PD202 ('0'='A')('1'='B')('2'='C')('3'='D')('4'='E')
                 ('5'='F')('6'='G') (ELSE=99)
RECCDE          PD201 ('0'='A')('1'='B')('2'='C') (ELSE=99)
MISSING VALUE    A1 TO PD203 (99)
VAR LABELS       A1 FAMILY FACTORS/
                 A2 GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION FACTORS/
                 A3 JOB CHARACTERISTICS AND RESPONSIBILITIES FACTORS/
                 A4 DEPARTMENTAL FACTORS/
                 A5 UNIVERSITY FACTORS/
                 A6 COMPENSATION FACTORS/
                 A7 ADVANCEMENT FACTORS/
                 R66 FAMILY FACTORS/
                 R67 GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION FACTORS/
                 R68 JOB CHARACTERISTICS AND RESPONSIBILITIES FACTORS/
                 R69 DEPARTMENTAL FACTORS/
                 R70 UNIVERSITY FACTORS/
                 R71 COMPENSATION FACTORS/
                 R72 ADVANCEMENT FACTORS/
                 L131 FAMILY FACTORS/
                 L132 GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION FACTORS/
                 L133 JOB CHARACTERISTICS AND RESPONSIBILITIES FACTORS/
                 L134 DEPARTMENTAL FACTORS/
                 L135 UNIVERSITY FACTORS/
                 L136 COMPENSATION FACTORS/
                 L137 ADVANCEMENT FACTORS/
                 PD196 YOUR RACE:/
                 PD197 YOUR SEX:/

```

## VALUE LABELS

PD198 YOUR AGE:/  
 PD199 FACULTY CLASSIFICATION:/  
 PD200 YEARS AT THE UNIVERSITY:/  
 PD201 TENURE STATUS:/  
 PD202 FACULTY RANK:/  
 PD203 UNIVERSITY NAME:  
 PD196 ('A') BLACK ('B') WHITE  
 (99) NO RESPONSE/  
 PD197 ('A') MALE ('B') FEMALE  
 (99) NO RESPONSE/  
 PD198 ('A') LESS THAN 30 ('B') 31 - 40 ('C') 41 - 50  
 ('D') 51 - 60 ('E') 61 AND OVER  
 (99) NO RESPONSE/  
 PD199 ('A') ADMINISTRATIVE ('B') INSTRUCTIONAL  
 (99) NO RESPONSE/  
 PD200 ('A') 0 - 2 ('B') 3 - 6 ('C') 7 - 10 ('D') 11 - 15  
 ('E') MORE THAN 15 (99) NO RESPONSE/  
 PD201 ('A') TENURED ('B') ON TRACK FOR TENURE  
 ('C') NOT ELIGIBLE FOR TENURE  
 (99) NO RESPONSE/  
 PD202 ('A') PROF. ('B') ASSOC. PROF. ('C') ASST. PROF.  
 ('D') INSTRUCTOR ('E') ASST. INSTRUCTOR ('F') LECTURER  
 ('G') OTHER (99) NO RESPONSE/  
 PD203 ('A') MANILLA UNIVERSITY ('B') FALSTAFF STATE  
 UNIVERSITY ('C') CAPERTON UNIVERSITY ('D') LANGMAN  
 UNIVERSITY (99) NO RESPONSE

READ INPUT DATA  
 SAVE FILE  
 FINISH

FACM08

```

          ***
          ***
          ***
          ***
        *** ** *** ***
        *****
        *** *** *** ***
        *** *** *** ***
        *****
        *** *** ***
    
```

\*START\* User CID-ALLEN [131102,61001] Job FACMOB Seq. 2398 Date 26-Sep-84  
 Monitor ODU KL1090 7.01A(1) \*START\*

```

CCCC III DDDD AAA L L EEEEE N N
C I U D A A L L E E N N
C I U D A A L L E NN N
C I U U ----- A A L L EEEE N N N
C I D D AAAAA L L E N NN
C I U J A A L L E N N
CCCC III DDDD A A LLLL LLLL EEEEE N N
    
```

```

AAA CCCC CCCC EEEEE PPPP TTTT SSSS PPPP SSSS
A A C C E P P T S P P S
A A C C E P P T S P P S
A A C C EEEE PPPP T SSS PPPP SSS
AAAAA C C E P T S P S
A A C C E P T .. S S P S
A A CCCC CCCC EEEEE P T .. SSSS P SSSS
    
```

\*START\* User CID-ALLEN [131102,61001] Job FACMOB Seq. 2398 Date 26-Sep-84 12:24  
 Monitor ODU KL1090 7.01A(1) \*START\*  
 File: DSKH:ACCEPT.SPS<157>[131102,61001,SPSS,FACMOB] Created: 26-Sep-84 12:15:44  
 Printed: 26-Sep-84 12:25:32  
 QUEUE Switches: /FILE:ASCII /COPIES:1  
 /SPACING:1 /LIMIT:213 /FORMS:NEWDOC

```

RUN NAME          STUDY OF FACULTY MOBILITY SURVEY (ACCEPTING)
FILE NAME        FACMOB
COMMENT          INPUT DATA FACMOB.DAT
                  SOURCE PROGRAM FACMOB.SPS
                  GET FILE FACMOB
GET FILE         FACMOB
ALLOCATE        TRANSPACE=3400
COUNT          CAT1A=A8 TO A18 ('A')
COUNT          CAT1B=A8 TO A18 ('B')
COUNT          CAT1C=A8 TO A18 ('C')
COUNT          CAT1D=A8 TO A18 ('D')
COUNT          NOANS1=A8 TO A18 (99)
COUNT          CAT2A=A19 TO A24 ('A')
COUNT          CAT2B=A19 TO A24 ('B')
COUNT          CAT2C=A19 TO A24 ('C')
COUNT          CAT2D=A19 TO A24 ('D')
COUNT          NOANS2=A19 TO A24 (99)
COUNT          CAT3A=A25 TO A32A ('A')
COUNT          CAT3B=A25 TO A32A ('B')
COUNT          CAT3C=A25 TO A32A ('C')
COUNT          CAT3D=A25 TO A32A ('D')
COUNT          NOANS3=A25 TO A32A (99)
COUNT          CAT4A=A33 TO A41A ('A')
COUNT          CAT4B=A33 TO A41A ('B')
COUNT          CAT4C=A33 TO A41A ('C')
COUNT          CAT4D=A33 TO A41A ('D')
COUNT          NOANS4=A33 TO A41A (99)
COUNT          CAT5A=A42 TO A45 ('A')
COUNT          CAT5B=A42 TO A45 ('B')
COUNT          CAT5C=A42 TO A45 ('C')
COUNT          CAT5D=A42 TO A45 ('D')
COUNT          NOANS5=A42 TO A45 (99)
COUNT          CAT6A=A46 TO A58A ('A')
COUNT          CAT6B=A46 TO A58A ('B')
COUNT          CAT6C=A46 TO A58A ('C')
COUNT          CAT6D=A46 TO A58A ('D')
COUNT          NOANS6=A46 TO A58A (99)
COUNT          CAT7A=A59 TO A65 ('A')
COUNT          CAT7B=A59 TO A65 ('B')
COUNT          CAT7C=A59 TO A65 ('C')
COUNT          CAT7D=A59 TO A65 ('D')
COUNT          NOANS7=A59 TO A65 (99)
COUNT          CAT8A=A13,A18,A22,A31,A38,A41,A56 TO A58 ('A')
COUNT          CAT8B=A13,A18,A22,A31,A38,A41,A56 TO A58 ('B')
COUNT          CAT8C=A13,A18,A22,A31,A38,A41,A56 TO A58 ('C')
COUNT          CAT8D=A13,A18,A22,A31,A38,A41,A56 TO A58 ('D')
COUNT          NOANS8=A13,A18,A22,A31,A38,A41,A56 TO A58 (99)
COMPUTE         CAT1=((CAT1A*1)+(CAT1B*2)+(CAT1C*3))/(11-(NOANS1+CAT1D))
COMPUTE         CAT2=((CAT2A*1)+(CAT2B*2)+(CAT2C*3))/(6-(NOANS2+CAT2D))
COMPUTE         CAT3=((CAT3A*1)+(CAT3B*2)+(CAT3C*3))/(9-(NOANS3+CAT3D))
COMPUTE         CAT4=((CAT4A*1)+(CAT4B*2)+(CAT4C*3))/(10-(NOANS4+CAT4D))
COMPUTE         CAT5=((CAT5A*1)+(CAT5B*2)+(CAT5C*3))/(4-(NOANS5+CAT5D))
COMPUTE         CAT6=((CAT6A*1)+(CAT6B*2)+(CAT6C*3))/(14-(NOANS6+CAT6D))
COMPUTE         CAT7=((CAT7A*1)+(CAT7B*2)+(CAT7C*3))/(7-(NOANS7+CAT7D))
COMPUTE         CAT8=((CAT8A*1)+(CAT8B*2)+(CAT8C*3))/(9-(NOANS8+CAT8D))
IF              (CAT1 LT 1.0) CAT1=0
IF              (CAT1 GE 1.0 AND CAT1 LE 1.5) CAT1=1
IF              (CAT1 GT 1.5 AND CAT1 LE 2.5) CAT1=2
IF              (CAT1 GT 2.5 AND CAT1 LE 3.5) CAT1=3
IF              (CAT2 LT 1.0) CAT2=0

```

```

IF          (CAT2 GE 1.0 AND CAT2 LE 1.5) CAT2=1
IF          (CAT2 GT 1.5 AND CAT2 LE 2.5) CAT2=2
IF          (CAT2 GT 2.5 AND CAT2 LE 3.5) CAT2=3
IF          (CAT3 LT 1.0) CAT3=0
IF          (CAT3 GE 1.0 AND CAT3 LE 1.5) CAT3=1
IF          (CAT3 GT 1.5 AND CAT3 LE 2.5) CAT3=2
IF          (CAT3 GT 2.5 AND CAT3 LE 3.5) CAT3=3
IF          (CAT4 LT 1.0) CAT4=0
IF          (CAT4 GE 1.0 AND CAT4 LE 1.5) CAT4=1
IF          (CAT4 GT 1.5 AND CAT4 LE 2.5) CAT4=2
IF          (CAT4 GT 2.5 AND CAT4 LE 3.5) CAT4=3
IF          (CAT5 LT 1.0) CAT5=0
IF          (CAT5 GE 1.0 AND CAT5 LE 1.5) CAT5=1
IF          (CAT5 GT 1.5 AND CAT5 LE 2.5) CAT5=2
IF          (CAT5 GT 2.5 AND CAT5 LE 3.5) CAT5=3
IF          (CAT6 LT 1.0) CAT6=0
IF          (CAT6 GE 1.0 AND CAT6 LE 1.5) CAT6=1
IF          (CAT6 GT 1.5 AND CAT6 LE 2.5) CAT6=2
IF          (CAT6 GT 2.5 AND CAT6 LE 3.5) CAT6=3
IF          (CAT7 LT 1.0) CAT7=0
IF          (CAT7 GE 1.0 AND CAT7 LE 1.5) CAT7=1
IF          (CAT7 GT 1.5 AND CAT7 LE 2.5) CAT7=2
IF          (CAT7 GT 2.5 AND CAT7 LE 3.5) CAT7=3
IF          (CAT8 LT 1.0) CAT8=0
IF          (CAT8 GE 1.0 AND CAT8 LE 1.5) CAT8=1
IF          (CAT8 GT 1.5 AND CAT8 LE 2.5) CAT8=2
IF          (CAT8 GT 2.5 AND CAT8 LE 3.5) CAT8=3
VAR LABELS  CAT1 GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION FACTORS/
              CAT2 FAMILY FACTORS/
              CAT3 JOB CHARACTER. AND RESPONSIB. FACTORS/
              CAT4 DEPARTMENTAL FACTORS/
              CAT5 COMPENSATION FACTORS/
              CAT6 UNIVERSITY FACTORS/
              CAT7 ADVANCEMENT FACTORS/
              CAT8 RACE FACTORS
VALUE LABEL CAT1 TO CAT8 (0) NA OR NC RESPONSE (1) NOT INFLUENTIAL
              (2) SOMEWHAT INFLUENTIAL (3) VERY INFLUENTIAL
LIST CASES  CASES=66/VARIABLES=A1 TO A7
READ INPUT DATA
LIST CASES  CASES=65/VARIABLES=CAT1 TO CAT8
READ INPUT DATA
*SELECT IF (PD196 EQ 'A' AND PD203 EQ 'C')
CRUSSTABS  TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
STATISTICS ALL
*SELECT IF (PD196 EQ 'A' AND PD203 EQ 'D')
CRUSSTABS  TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
STATISTICS ALL
*SELECT IF (PD196 EQ 'A' AND (PD203 EQ 'C' OR PD203 EQ 'D'))
CRUSSTABS  TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
STATISTICS ALL
*SELECT IF (PD196 EQ 'B' AND PD203 EQ 'A')
CRUSSTABS  TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
STATISTICS ALL
*SELECT IF (PD196 EQ 'B' AND PD203 EQ 'B')
CRUSSTABS  TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
STATISTICS ALL
*SELECT IF (PD196 EQ 'B' AND (PD203 EQ 'A' OR PD203 EQ 'B'))
CRUSSTABS  TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
STATISTICS ALL
*SELECT IF ((PD196 EQ 'A' OR PD196 EQ 'B') AND (PD203 EQ 'A' OR

```

```
CROSSTABS          PD203 EQ 'B' OR PD203 EQ 'C' OR PD203 EQ 'D'))
STATISTICS        TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
*SELECT IF       ALL
                  ((PD196 EQ 'A' OR PD196 EQ 'B') AND (PD203 EQ 'A' OR
PD203 EQ 'B' OR PD203 EQ 'C' OR PD203 EQ 'D'))
CROSSTABS          TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD196
STATISTICS        ALL
FINISH
```



```

***
***
***
***
*** ** ***
*****
***   ***   ***
***   ***   ***
*****
***   ***   ***

```

\*START\* User CID-ALLEN [131102,61001] Job FACM0B Seq. 2398 Date 26-Sep-84  
 Monitor UDU KL1090 7.01A(1) \*START\*

```

CCCC III  DDDD          AAA  L    L    EEEEE  N  N
C      I  U  J          A  A  L    L    E      N  N
C      I  U  J          A  A  L    L    E      NN N
C      I  U  J  ----- A  A  L    L    EEEEE  N N N
C      I  U  J          AAAAA L    L    E      N NN
C      I  U  J          A  A  L    L    E      N  N
CCCC III  DDDD          A  A  LLLLL LLLLL EEEEE  N  N

```

```

RRRR EEEEE  M  M  AAA  III  N  N          SSSS PPPP  SSSS
K  R  E      MM MM  A  A  I  N  N          S    P  P  S
K  R  E      M M M  A  A  I  NN N          S    P  P  S
RRRR EEEE  M  M  A  A  I  N  N          SSS  PPPP  SSS
K  R  E      M  M  AAAAA  I  N  NN          S    P          S
K  R  E      M  M  A  A  I  N  N          ..  S    P          S
K  R  EEEEE  M  M  A  A  III  N  N          .. SSSS  P          SSSS

```

\*START\* User CID-ALLEN [131102,61001] Job FACM0B Seq. 2398 Date 26-Sep-84 12:24  
 Monitor UDU KL1090 7.01A(1) \*START\*  
 File: USKH:REMAIN.SPS<197>[131102,61001,SPSS,FACM0B] Created: 26-Sep-84 12:00:00  
 Printed: 26-Sep-84 12:24:58  
 QUEUE Switches: /FILE:ASCII /COPIES:1  
 /SPACING:1 /LIP:IT:218 /FORMS:NEWDOC

```

RUN NAME          STUDY OF FACULTY MOBILITY SURVEY (REMAINING)
FILE NAME        FACMOB
COMMENT          INPUT DATA FACMOB.DAT
                  SOURCE PROGRAM FACMOB.SPS
                  GET FILE FACMOB
                  FACMOB
GET FILE
ALLOCATE         TRANSPACE=3400
COUNT          CAT1A=R73 TO R83A ('A')
COUNT          CAT1B=R73 TO R83A ('B')
COUNT          CAT1C=R73 TO R83A ('C')
COUNT          CAT1D=R73 TO R83A ('D')
COUNT          NOANS1=R73 TO R83A (99)
COUNT          CAT2A=R84 TO R89 ('A')
COUNT          CAT2B=R84 TO R89 ('B')
COUNT          CAT2C=R84 TO R89 ('C')
COUNT          CAT2D=R84 TO R89 ('D')
COUNT          NOANS2=R84 TO R89 (99)
COUNT          CAT3A=R90 TO R95 ('A')
COUNT          CAT3B=R90 TO R95 ('B')
COUNT          CAT3C=R90 TO R95 ('C')
COUNT          CAT3D=R90 TO R95 ('D')
COUNT          NOANS3=R90 TO R95 (99)
COUNT          CAT4A=R96 TO R104C ('A')
COUNT          CAT4B=R96 TO R104C ('B')
COUNT          CAT4C=R96 TO R104C ('C')
COUNT          CAT4D=R96 TO R104C ('D')
COUNT          NOANS4=R96 TO R104C (99)
COUNT          CAT5A=R105 TO R110 ('A')
COUNT          CAT5B=R105 TO R110 ('B')
COUNT          CAT5C=R105 TO R110 ('C')
COUNT          CAT5D=R105 TO R110 ('D')
COUNT          NOANS5=R105 TO R110 (99)
COUNT          CAT6A=R111 TO R121B ('A')
COUNT          CAT6B=R111 TO R121B ('B')
COUNT          CAT6C=R111 TO R121B ('C')
COUNT          CAT6D=R111 TO R121B ('D')
COUNT          NOANS6=R111 TO R121B (99)
COUNT          CAT7A=R122 TO R130A ('A')
COUNT          CAT7B=R122 TO R130A ('B')
COUNT          CAT7C=R122 TO R130A ('C')
COUNT          CAT7D=R122 TO R130A ('D')
COUNT          NOANS7=R122 TO R130A (99)
COMPUTE         CAT8A=C
IF              (R75 EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF              (R81 EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF              (R94 EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF              (R96 EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF              (R104C EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF              (R115 EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF              (R116 EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF              (R117 EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF              (R127 EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF              (R128 EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
COMPUTE         CAT8B=C
IF              (R75 EQ 'B') CAT8B=CAT8B+1
IF              (R81 EQ 'B') CAT8B=CAT8B+1
IF              (R94 EQ 'B') CAT8B=CAT8B+1
IF              (R96 EQ 'B') CAT8B=CAT8B+1
IF              (R104C EQ 'B') CAT8B=CAT8B+1
IF              (R115 EQ 'B') CAT8B=CAT8B+1

```

```

IF      (R116 EQ 'B') CAT85=CAT8E+1
IF      (R117 EQ 'B') CAT8B=CAT8B+1
IF      (R127 EQ 'B') CAT8B=CAT8B+1
IF      (R128 EQ 'B') CAT8E=CAT8B+1
COMPUTE CAT8C=0
IF      (R75 EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (R81 EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (R94 EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (R96 EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (R104C EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (R115 EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (R116 EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (R117 EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (R127 EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (R128 EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
COMPUTE CAT8D=0
IF      (R75 EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (R81 EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (R94 EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (R96 EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (R104C EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (R115 EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (R116 EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (R117 EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (R127 EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (R128 EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
COMPUTE NOANS8=0
IF      (R75 EQ 99) NOANS8=NOANS8+1
IF      (R81 EQ 99) NOANS8=NOANS8+1
IF      (R94 EQ 99) NOANS8=NOANS8+1
IF      (R96 EQ 99) NOANS8=NOANS8+1
IF      (R104C EQ 99) NOANS8=NOANS8+1
IF      (R115 EQ 99) NOANS8=NOANS8+1
IF      (R116 EQ 99) NOANS8=NOANS8+1
IF      (R117 EQ 99) NOANS8=NOANS8+1
IF      (R127 EQ 99) NOANS8=NOANS8+1
IF      (R128 EQ 99) NOANS8=NOANS8+1
COMPUTE CAT1=((CAT1A*1)+(CAT1B*2)+(CAT1C*3))/(12-(NOANS1+CAT1))
COMPUTE CAT2=((CAT2A*1)+(CAT2B*2)+(CAT2C*3))/(6-(NOANS2+CAT2))
COMPUTE CAT3=((CAT3A*1)+(CAT3B*2)+(CAT3C*3))/(6-(NOANS3+CAT3))
COMPUTE CAT4=((CAT4A*1)+(CAT4B*2)+(CAT4C*3))/(12-(NOANS4+CAT4))
COMPUTE CAT5=((CAT5A*1)+(CAT5B*2)+(CAT5C*3))/(6-(NOANS5+CAT5))
COMPUTE CAT6=((CAT6A*1)+(CAT6B*2)+(CAT6C*3))/(13-(NOANS6+CAT6))
COMPUTE CAT7=((CAT7A*1)+(CAT7B*2)+(CAT7C*3))/(10-(NOANS7+CAT7))
COMPUTE CAT8=((CAT8A*1)+(CAT8B*2)+(CAT8C*3))/(10-(NOANS8+CAT8))
IF      (CAT1 LT 1.0) CAT1=0
IF      (CAT1 GE 1.0 AND CAT1 LE 1.5) CAT1=1
IF      (CAT1 GT 1.5 AND CAT1 LE 2.5) CAT1=2
IF      (CAT1 GT 2.5 AND CAT1 LE 3.5) CAT1=3
IF      (CAT2 LT 1.0) CAT2=0
IF      (CAT2 GE 1.0 AND CAT2 LE 1.5) CAT2=1
IF      (CAT2 GT 1.5 AND CAT2 LE 2.5) CAT2=2
IF      (CAT2 GT 2.5 AND CAT2 LE 3.5) CAT2=3
IF      (CAT3 LT 1.0) CAT3=0
IF      (CAT3 GE 1.0 AND CAT3 LE 1.5) CAT3=1
IF      (CAT3 GT 1.5 AND CAT3 LE 2.5) CAT3=2
IF      (CAT3 GT 2.5 AND CAT3 LE 3.5) CAT3=3
IF      (CAT4 LT 1.0) CAT4=0
IF      (CAT4 GE 1.0 AND CAT4 LE 1.5) CAT4=1
IF      (CAT4 GT 1.5 AND CAT4 LE 2.5) CAT4=2

```

```

IF          (CAT4 GT 2.5 AND CAT4 LE 3.5) CAT4=3
IF          (CAT5 LT 1.0) CAT5=0
IF          (CAT5 GE 1.0 AND CAT5 LE 1.5) CAT5=1
IF          (CAT5 GT 1.5 AND CAT5 LE 2.5) CAT5=2
IF          (CAT5 GT 2.5 AND CAT5 LE 3.5) CAT5=3
IF          (CAT6 LT 1.0) CAT6=0
IF          (CAT6 GE 1.0 AND CAT6 LE 1.5) CAT6=1
IF          (CAT6 GT 1.5 AND CAT6 LE 2.5) CAT6=2
IF          (CAT6 GT 2.5 AND CAT6 LE 3.5) CAT6=3
IF          (CAT7 LT 1.0) CAT7=0
IF          (CAT7 GE 1.0 AND CAT7 LE 1.5) CAT7=1
IF          (CAT7 GT 1.5 AND CAT7 LE 2.5) CAT7=2
IF          (CAT7 GT 2.5 AND CAT7 LE 3.5) CAT7=3
IF          (CAT8 LT 1.0) CAT8=0
IF          (CAT8 GE 1.0 AND CAT8 LE 1.5) CAT8=1
IF          (CAT8 GT 1.5 AND CAT8 LE 2.5) CAT8=2
IF          (CAT8 GT 2.5 AND CAT8 LE 3.5) CAT8=3
VAR LABELS CAT1 GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION FACTORS/
           CAT2 ADVANCEMENT FACTORS/
           CAT3 FAMILY FACTORS/
           CAT4 JOB CHARACTER. AND RESPONSIB. FACTORS/
           CAT5 COMPENSATION FACTORS/
           CAT6 UNIVERSITY FACTORS/
           CAT7 DEPARTMENTAL FACTORS/
           CAT8 RACE FACTORS
VALUE LABEL CAT1 TO CAT8 (0) NA OR NO RESPONSE (1) NOT INFLUENTIAL
           (2) SOMEWHAT INFLUENTIAL (3) VERY INFLUENTIAL
LIST CASES CASES=66/VARIABLES=R66 TO R72
READ INPUT DATA
LIST CASES DATA
READ INPUT DATA
*SELECT IF (PD196 EQ 'A' AND PD203 EQ 'C')
CROSSTABS TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
STATISTICS ALL
*SELECT IF (PD196 EQ 'A' AND PD203 EQ 'D')
CROSSTABS TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
STATISTICS ALL
*SELECT IF (PD196 EQ 'A' AND (PD203 EQ 'C' OR PD203 EQ 'D'))
CROSSTABS TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
STATISTICS ALL
*SELECT IF (PD196 EQ 'B' AND PD203 EQ 'A')
CROSSTABS TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
STATISTICS ALL
*SELECT IF (PD196 EQ 'B' AND PD203 EQ 'B')
CROSSTABS TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
STATISTICS ALL
*SELECT IF (PD196 EQ 'B' AND (PD203 EQ 'A' OR PD203 EQ 'B'))
CROSSTABS TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
STATISTICS ALL
*SELECT IF ((PD196 EQ 'A' OR PD196 EQ 'B') AND (PD203 EQ 'A' OR
CROSSTABS PD203 EQ 'B' OR PD203 EQ 'C' OR PD203 EQ 'D'))
STATISTICS TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
ALL
*SELECT IF ((PD196 EQ 'A' OR PD196 EQ 'B') AND (PD203 EQ 'A' OR
CROSSTABS PD203 EQ 'B' OR PD203 EQ 'C' OR PD203 EQ 'D'))
STATISTICS TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD196
ALL
FINISH

```

```

***
***
***
***
*** ** ***
*****
*** ** ***
*** ** ***
*****
*** ** ***

```

\*START\* User CID-ALLEN [131102,61001] Job FACMOB Seq. 2398 Date 26-Sep-64  
 Monitor UDU KL1090 7.01A(1) \*START\*

```

CCCC III DDDD AAA L L EEEEE N N
C I U D A A L L E N N
C I U D A A L L E NN N
C I U D ---- A A L L EEEE N N N
C I U D AAAAA L L E N NN
C I U D A A L L E N N
CCCC III DDDD A A LLLLL LLLLL EEEEE N N

```

```

L EEEEE AAA V V EEEEE SSSS PPPP SSSS
L E A A V V E S P P S
L E A A V V E S P P S
L EEEE A A V V EEEE SSS PPPP SSS
L E AAAAA V V E S P S
L E A A V V E .. S P S
LLLLL EEEEE A A V EEEEE .. SSSS P SSS

```

\*START\* User CID-ALLEN [131102,61001] Job FACMOB Seq. 2398 Date 26-Sep-64 12:24  
 Monitor UDU KL1090 7.01A(1) \*START\*  
 File: DSKH:LEAVE.SPS<157>[131102,61001,SPSS,FACMOB] Created: 26-Sep-64 12:19:16  
 Printed: 26-Sep-64 12:25:14  
 QUEUE Switches: /FILE:ASCII /COPIES:1  
 /SPACING:1 /LIMIT:216 /FORMS:NECOCG

```

RUN NAME          STUDY OF FACULTY MOBILITY SURVEY (LEAVING)
FILE NAME        FACMOB
COMMENT          INPUT DATA FACMOB.DAT
                  SOURCE PROGRAM FACMOB.SPS
                  GET FILE FACMOB
GET FILE         FACMOB
ALLOCATE        TRANSPACE=3800
COUNT         CAT1A=L138 TO L141 ('A')
COUNT         CAT1B=L138 TO L141 ('B')
COUNT         CAT1C=L138 TO L141 ('C')
COUNT         CAT1D=L138 TO L141 ('D')
COUNT         NOANS1=L138 TO L141 (99)
COUNT         CAT2A=L142 TO L148B ('A')
COUNT         CAT2B=L142 TO L148B ('B')
COUNT         CAT2C=L142 TO L148B ('C')
COUNT         CAT2D=L142 TO L148B ('D')
COUNT         NOANS2=L142 TO L148B (99)
COUNT         CAT3A=L149 TO L151 ('A')
COUNT         CAT3B=L149 TO L151 ('B')
COUNT         CAT3C=L149 TO L151 ('C')
COUNT         CAT3D=L149 TO L151 ('D')
COUNT         NOANS3=L149 TO L151 (99)
COUNT         CAT4A=L152 TO L158C ('A')
COUNT         CAT4B=L152 TO L158C ('B')
COUNT         CAT4C=L152 TO L158C ('C')
COUNT         CAT4D=L152 TO L158C ('D')
COUNT         NOANS4=L152 TO L158C (99)
COUNT         CAT5A=L159 TO L173B ('A')
COUNT         CAT5B=L159 TO L173B ('B')
COUNT         CAT5C=L159 TO L173B ('C')
COUNT         CAT5D=L159 TO L173B ('D')
COUNT         NOANS5=L159 TO L173B (99)
COUNT         CAT6A=L174 TO L182E ('A')
COUNT         CAT6B=L174 TO L182E ('B')
COUNT         CAT6C=L174 TO L182E ('C')
COUNT         CAT6D=L174 TO L182E ('D')
COUNT         NOANS6=L174 TO L182E (99)
COUNT         CAT7A=L183 TO L195A ('A')
COUNT         CAT7B=L183 TO L195A ('B')
COUNT         CAT7C=L183 TO L195A ('C')
COUNT         CAT7D=L183 TO L195A ('D')
COUNT         NOANS7=L183 TO L195A (99)
COMPUTE        CAT8A=0
IF             (L141 EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF             (L148B EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF             (L158A EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF             (L165 EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF             (L166 EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF             (L172 EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF             (L182D EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF             (L192E EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF             (L186 EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF             (L189 EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF             (L190 EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF             (L193 EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
IF             (L174 EQ 'A') CAT8A=CAT8A+1
COMPUTE        CAT8B=0
IF             (L141 EQ 'B') CAT8B=CAT8B+1
IF             (L148B EQ 'B') CAT8B=CAT8B+1
IF             (L158A EQ 'B') CAT8B=CAT8B+1

```

```

IF      (L165 EQ 'B') CAT89=CAT8E+1
IF      (L166 EQ 'B') CAT90=CAT8E+1
IF      (L172 EQ 'B') CAT88=CAT8E+1
IF      (L182D EQ 'B') CAT8R=CAT8E+1
IF      (L182F EQ 'B') CAT3B=CAT8E+1
IF      (L188 EQ 'B') CAT8B=CAT8E+1
IF      (L189 EQ 'B') CAT8B=CAT8E+1
IF      (L190 EQ 'B') CAT8B=CAT8E+1
IF      (L193 EQ 'B') CAT8H=CAT8E+1
IF      (L194 EQ 'B') CAT8B=CAT8E+1
COMPUTE CAT8C=0
IF      (L141 EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (L148B EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (L158A EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (L165 EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (L166 EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (L172 EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (L182D EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (L182E EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (L188 EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (L189 EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (L190 EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (L193 EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
IF      (L194 EQ 'C') CAT8C=CAT8C+1
COMPUTE CAT8D=C
IF      (L141 EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (L148B EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (L158A EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (L165 EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (L166 EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (L172 EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (L182D EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (L182E EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (L188 EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (L189 EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (L190 EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (L193 EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
IF      (L194 EQ 'D') CAT8D=CAT8D+1
COMPUTE NCANS8=7
IF      (L141 EQ 99) NCANS8=NCANS8+1
IF      (L148B EQ 99) NCANS8=NCANS8+1
IF      (L158A EQ 99) NCANS8=NCANS8+1
IF      (L165 EQ 99) NCANS8=NCANS8+1
IF      (L166 EQ 99) NCANS8=NCANS8+1
IF      (L172 EQ 99) NCANS8=NCANS8+1
IF      (L182D EQ 99) NCANS8=NCANS8+1
IF      (L182E EQ 99) NCANS8=NCANS8+1
IF      (L188 EQ 99) NCANS8=NCANS8+1
IF      (L189 EQ 99) NCANS8=NCANS8+1
IF      (L190 EQ 99) NCANS8=NCANS8+1
IF      (L193 EQ 99) NCANS8=NCANS8+1
IF      (L194 EQ 99) NCANS8=NCANS8+1
COMPUTE CAT1=((CAT1A*1)+(CAT1B*2)+(CAT1C*3))/(4-(NCANS1+CAT1D))
COMPUTE CAT2=((CAT2A*1)+(CAT2B*2)+(CAT2C*3))/(9-(NCANS2+CAT2D))
COMPUTE CAT3=((CAT3A*1)+(CAT3C*2)+(CAT3D*3))/(3-(NCANS3+CAT3A))
COMPUTE CAT4=((CAT4A*1)+(CAT4C*2)+(CAT4D*3))/(13-(NCANS4+CAT4A))
COMPUTE CAT5=((CAT5A*1)+(CAT5C*2)+(CAT5D*3))/(17-(NCANS5+CAT5A))
COMPUTE CAT6=((CAT6A*1)+(CAT6C*2)+(CAT6D*3))/(14-(NCANS6+CAT6A))
COMPUTE CAT7=((CAT7A*1)+(CAT7C*2)+(CAT7D*3))/(14-(NCANS7+CAT7A))
COMPUTE CAT8=((CAT8A*1)+(CAT8C*2)+(CAT8D*3))/(13-(NCANS8+CAT8A))

```

```

IF      (CAT1 LT 1.0) CAT1=0
IF      (CAT1 GE 1.0 AND CAT1 LE 1.5) CAT1=1
IF      (CAT1 GT 1.5 AND CAT1 LE 2.5) CAT1=2
IF      (CAT1 GT 2.5 AND CAT1 LE 3.5) CAT1=3
IF      (CAT2 LT 1.0) CAT2=0
IF      (CAT2 GE 1.0 AND CAT2 LE 1.5) CAT2=1
IF      (CAT2 GT 1.5 AND CAT2 LE 2.5) CAT2=2
IF      (CAT2 GT 2.5 AND CAT2 LE 3.5) CAT2=3
IF      (CAT3 LT 1.0) CAT3=0
IF      (CAT3 GE 1.0 AND CAT3 LE 1.5) CAT3=1
IF      (CAT3 GT 1.5 AND CAT3 LE 2.5) CAT3=2
IF      (CAT3 GT 2.5 AND CAT3 LE 3.5) CAT3=3
IF      (CAT4 LT 1.0) CAT4=0
IF      (CAT4 GE 1.0 AND CAT4 LE 1.5) CAT4=1
IF      (CAT4 GT 1.5 AND CAT4 LE 2.5) CAT4=2
IF      (CAT4 GT 2.5 AND CAT4 LE 3.5) CAT4=3
IF      (CAT5 LT 1.0) CAT5=0
IF      (CAT5 GE 1.0 AND CAT5 LE 1.5) CAT5=1
IF      (CAT5 GT 1.5 AND CAT5 LE 2.5) CAT5=2
IF      (CAT5 GT 2.5 AND CAT5 LE 3.5) CAT5=3
IF      (CAT6 LT 1.0) CAT6=0
IF      (CAT6 GE 1.0 AND CAT6 LE 1.5) CAT6=1
IF      (CAT6 GT 1.5 AND CAT6 LE 2.5) CAT6=2
IF      (CAT6 GT 2.5 AND CAT6 LE 3.5) CAT6=3
IF      (CAT7 LT 1.0) CAT7=0
IF      (CAT7 GE 1.0 AND CAT7 LE 1.5) CAT7=1
IF      (CAT7 GT 1.5 AND CAT7 LE 2.5) CAT7=2
IF      (CAT7 GT 2.5 AND CAT7 LE 3.5) CAT7=3
IF      (CAT8 LT 1.0) CAT8=0
IF      (CAT8 GE 1.0 AND CAT8 LE 1.5) CAT8=1
IF      (CAT8 GT 1.5 AND CAT8 LE 2.5) CAT8=2
IF      (CAT8 GT 2.5 AND CAT8 LE 3.5) CAT8=3
VARIABLE LABELS
CAT1 FAMILY FACTORS/
CAT2 GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION FACTORS/
CAT3 COMPENSATION FACTORS/
CAT4 JOB CHARACTER. AND RESPONSIB. FACTORS/
CAT5 DEPARTMENTAL FACTORS/
CAT6 ADVANCEMENT FACTORS/
CAT7 UNIVERSITY FACTORS/
CAT8 RACE FACTORS
VALUE LABELS
CAT1 TO CAT2 (0) NA OR NO RESPONSE (1) NOT INFLUENTIAL
(2) SOMEWHAT INFLUENTIAL (3) VERY INFLUENTIAL/
CAT3 TO CAT8 (0) FALSE OR NO RESPONSE (1) NOT INFLUENTIAL
(2) SOMEWHAT INFLUENTIAL (3) VERY INFLUENTIAL
LIST CASES
READ INPUT DATA
LIST CASES
READ INPUT DATA
*SELECT IF
CRUSSTABS
STATISTICS
(PD196 EQ 'A' AND PD203 EQ 'C')
TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
ALL
*SELECT IF
CRUSSTABS
STATISTICS
(PD196 EQ 'A' AND PD203 EQ 'D')
TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
ALL
*SELECT IF
CRUSSTABS
STATISTICS
(PD196 EQ 'A' AND (PD203 EQ 'C' OR PD203 EQ 'D'))
TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
ALL
*SELECT IF
CRUSSTABS
STATISTICS
(PD196 EQ 'B' AND PD203 EQ 'A')
TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
ALL

```



```

*SELECT IF      (PD196 EQ 'B' AND PD203 EQ 'B')
CRUSSTABS      TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
STATISTICS     ALL
*SELECT IF      (PD196 EQ 'B' AND (PD203 EQ 'A' OR PD203 EQ 'B'))
CRUSSTABS      TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
STATISTICS     ALL
*SELECT IF      ((PD196 EQ 'A' OR PD196 EQ 'B') AND (PD203 EQ 'A' OR
CRUSSTABS      PD203 EQ 'B' OR PD203 EQ 'C' OR PD203 EQ 'D'))
STATISTICS     TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD199
*SELECT IF      ((PD196 EQ 'A' OR PD196 EQ 'B') AND (PD203 EQ 'A' OR
CRUSSTABS      PD203 EQ 'B' OR PD203 EQ 'C' OR PD203 EQ 'D'))
STATISTICS     TABLES = CAT1 TO CAT8 BY PD196
FINISH         ALL

```

**The vita has been removed from  
the scanned document**