1990

The Motivation of a Collegiate Level Educator is Mobility Within the Profession

Andrew V. Carter

THE MOTIVATION OF A COLLEGIATE LEVEL EDUCATOR IS MOBILITY WITHIN THE PROFESSION

Andrew V. Carter, B.S.

An Abstract Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Lindenwood College is Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Business Administration

1990

Abstract

For as long as there have been Colleges and Universities, graduates have been making career decisions. The decision one makes to become a collegiate level educator has been made by thousands since this time. Due to this, the motivations these educators have felt are quite interesting.

This project will examine the motivations of the collegiate level educator. It will attempt to prove that the mobility within education is the greatest motivator.

The reader will become familiarized with history of the educator and the motivations that are present.

After the reader has been brought up to date, the author will attempt, through the use of a survey instrument, to test a hypothesis that states that mobility is the number one motivator of the collegiate level educator.

THE MOTIVATION OF A COLLEGIATE LEVEL EDUCATOR IS MOBILITY WITHIN THE PROFESSION

Andrew V. Carter, B. S.

A Culminating Project Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Lindenwood College in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Business Administration

1990

COMMITTEE IN CHARGE OF CANDIDACY:

Assistant Professor William Meyer,
Chairperson and Advisor

Assistant Professor Daniel Kemper
Assistant Professor Edward Stewart

Dedication

This study is dedicated to my wife Rena, and our children Aaron and Becca. Without their patience it would not have been possible to complete.

Also, I would like to mention my parents, Ken and Sharon Carter. They were the ones that taught me to understand the value of an education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

There are usually a variety of reasons why a person chooses a specific career path. The variables involved are the crux of the decision making process. College level educators are somewhat of a mystery in that no one really has an understanding of exactly where and how they are produced and what motivates them to teach this level of education.

This study will attempt to determine what motivates a young person to consider collegiate teaching as a chosen profession.

With respect to research, three major areas of significance will be considered: First, the "make up" of a college level professor. Second, historical motivational trends will be considered. Finally, teaching credentials needed to have access to this career.

The world of academia is seen as somewhat mysterious, because someone with this knowledge could benefit monetarily working elsewhere.

Traditionally, those who aspired to be college faculty began with a high school diploma and bachelors degree, then entered graduate or professional school. This outline is not the direction that all present faculty have followed, but it is a basic standard in the academic world. The traditional career favored those who took the advanced degree, and thus became eligible for a continuous contract appointment (tenure-track), known today as the assistant professorship (Furniss 55).

The assistant professor usually puts in five to six years of service before being formally considered for tenure. If tenure is not reached then the employer would use the general rule of "up" or "out", which means that if after five or six years of service you are not promoted to tenure stature (up), then you are terminated (out). For those faculty members who receive tenure, they move into a period where they start to teach more specialized courses, usually to upper division students. Along with the increase in specialization there is also an increase in departmental policy making and in overall administration, as a professor, the faculty member is assumed to be competent enough to tackle many activities. These activities will keep the professor busy and productive until retirement, usually at age sixty-five (57).

There are two different types of mobility with teaching that this thesis will consider; forced mobility and voluntary mobility. Forced mobility occurs when a professor does not progress as well as the administration desires. This most often occurs with older professors, and, in this case, salary increases usually do not keep up with the market.

> After 1950 there was an inverse relationship between the age and salary of full professors... there was a suggestion that the salaries of the younger full professors have recently become more responsive to the labor market than the salaries of older full professors regardless of their eminence. It appears that younger professors are paid more than older professors in an accelerating market because the latter, generally speaking, are less mobile for social and psychological reasons. (Caplow & McGee 127)

The older full professor, if he is not happy with his department is not happy with him, could be in serious trouble. His mobility is limited because his high rank and salary usually prohibit employment at another institution. In fact, once the professor reaches a certain point in seniority, then his potential mobility declines sharply (127).

In contrast, voluntary mobility is very prevalent with young college professors. Job-switching seems to be the rule rather than the exception. The idea of working ones way up at a single school, without seriously considering jobs at other schools, is a foreign idea to many faculty. The first appointment, usually at a school other than the one who awarded the terminal degree, is only temporary. A professor may move three or four times before settling down in a school to live out his career. Some never do settle down (Brown 128). This can lead to the industry viewing these professors as nomads and therefore less marketable. In some instances, faculty have passed up very good opportunities due to the fact that they did not want the reputation of being too moble. In any one year not all professors are actively looking for a new job, however, few consider their present job as permanent (42). The reward that all job movers look for is that job changing usually pays. Because the new employer has to make the salary attractive to offset the cost of movement, the instructor almost always advances in salary and often in rank (assistant, associate, and full professors) and in the quality of the school. In studies conducted in 1963-65, the following statistics were revealed. 69% of moves resulted in annual income increases, 28% advanced in rank, and 30% moved to better institutions (58).

There are also various sources of immobility in the market. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the Association of American Colleges (AAC) offer some guidelines for the movement of employment within the industry. For example, a professor cannot terminate his employment in the middle of an academic term. Similarly, he cannot give notice of resignation after May 15 for the following academic year. Accordingly, the employer must let the professor know his status for September by May 15. Also, all faculty raiding after March 1st is condemned. All of these restrictions are good for the industry, but tend to lead to less movement throughout the market. Other immobilizing factors are promotion from within, inbreeding and outbreeding, tenure (which may freeze professors in place by decreasing competition), and fringe benefits.

> It is said seniority systems, health and welfare plans, and negotiated pensions have chained the worker to his job; the adaptability and flexibility of the labor force are being sacrificed and that a new industrial feudalism is being built. The crux of the problem, it is held, is that the worker can no longer afford to quit his job. (77)

For generations, a membership in a college faculty has implied the enviable prospect of lifetime employment, with job security through the granting of tenure. This has come to pass. Since the late 1970's academics have suffered an enormous overflow of doctoral candidate as baby boom enrollments have leveled off and universities continued to turn out future professors faster than the shrinking job market could absorb them.

While the issues relating to this mass of doctoral candidates go largely unresolved, Ezra Bowen, in a recent article states that, "universities are staffing classrooms in increasing measure with part-timers, creating a new class of "academic Gypsies" (Bowen 166). Among the 32,000 professors in California's university system, the country's largest, about 33% are temporary. Nationally, of 70,000 faculty, 30% of the professors in some of the liberal arts are not permanent. The percentages ranges downward in other fields (166). Emily Able, a researcher at the University of California, Los Angeles and author of a book on college enrollment, says of the growing race of Gypsies, "They're like any part-time employee that McDonalds would hire... cheap labor that colleges and universities are relying on to save money" (Bowen 167). This cheap labor and the supply of doctorates are having a negative effect on the mobility of the full professor, but on the other hand, the part-time teacher is enjoying the greatest mobility ever within this profession. Consider Alice Roy, an assistant professor of English at California State University in Los Angeles. For five years she flourished as a part-timer on various faculties. One semester she taught courses at three different colleges. The reason more adjunct positions are open is simple. As a full professor with tenure retires, the institutions are filling the opening with a part-time instructor so they will not have to appoint another tenure-track faculty or pay any benefits (170).

Administrators claim that in using "Gypsies" they are only doing what they have to in the face of higher education's changing needs and hardening realities.

> Moreover, states Bowen, laymen and even some independent-minded faculty scorn tenure as refuge for the insecure or the marginally competent. But the fact is the tenure or some analogous security blanket is basic or the role of the university as an arena for open inquiry. (198)

Most temporary instructors and junior professors are subservient to administrators and senior faculty in their own departments and think twice about saying or doing anything too controversial. Norma Feshbach, chair of the UCLA Department of Education, notes,

> Some apprehensive juniors tailor their work, down to the smallest details of research methodologies, with an eye to supervisor approval and eventual publication. This may not contribute to society or science, but it does to tenure. (200)

Both students and junior faculty agree that the quality of classroom instruction suffers when untenured instructors are distracted by pursuing requirements that have become too political. The one great hope of those who have not yet been granted tenure is during the next eight years some 40% of tenured faculty will reach conventional retirement ages of 62-65. But federal law now forbids any mandatory retirements that are based on age. For academia, this blanket rule is phased to take final effect in 1994, raising the possibility that after that date, professors might enjoy tenure till death. However, says Mary Gray, a mathematician at American University in Washington and a member of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), "Universities and colleges are no longer willing to commit to having faculty on forever (202).

Bowen's article shows that a few colleges are trying to move with the times and act on the found problems facing higher education. The California state-university system is trying to ease the pressure at the top by offering sweetened early-retirement inducements to 55 years olds who can receive normal benefits plus up to 40% of salary by going part-time themselves. During the past two years nearly 1,800 have brought the package. Haverford College, outside Philadelphia, is considering offering new tenure candidates 25 to 30 year contracts. While quite business-like on the surface, such contracts could trigger are discrimination charges if new short-term agreements are offered to some older faculty members, but not to others (200).

The purpose of this study is to reveal the mobility that is present within the collegiate level educational system. The opportunities to move and upgrade employment ranges from part-time instructing (adjunct) to tenure-track assistant professorships, and/or from research development to administration. Moreover, all of these are available in almost every educational discipline with varied changes of prospering further up the salary and rank scale and are within the reach of most collegiate level educators. Hopefully, this research will show that the motivation behind the collegiate level educator is the mobility within the profession.

Chapter II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Around 1970, the American faculty's condition probably reached its most robust state. Higher education was enjoying tremendous and sustained growth, and faculty participated in many of the benefits. For example, faculty compensation, after adjustments for inflation, was nearing its all-time peak (attained in 1972-73). The campus work environment was very favorable, and faculty prestige was high. More fundamentally, the academic profession had achieved substantial influence over curricular matters and over the selection and promotion of academic personnel. Thus, in important ways, by 1970 the American faculty had "arrived". However, in the fifteen years since then, various developments have eroded those hard-won accomplishments and jeopardized the well-being of the academic profession, and with it the quality of American higher education (Shuster13).

Some of these elements are directly related to the fact that there are two many doctoral graduates being produced without the market calling for such production. The underlying problem is that there are too many doctoral graduates needing/wanting tenure-track positions in education and the colleges and universities are already in abundance of tenured faculty. So these new graduates are steered to accept part-time or temporary positions. This creates a very mobile work environment but also harsh feelings on behalf of the non-tenure-track instructor. The faculty's condition is also

affected by an inhospitable academic labor market. With relatively few (tenured) job openings in most academic fields, aspirants to faculty positions are frequently frustrated, and the existing teaching corps finds itself with little economic leverage and dwindling mobility among campuses.

High education is beginning to have difficulty attracting able young people into academe. Given the decline in compensation, the detioration of working conditions, the formidable pressures on young faculty, and a more dispirited faculty, generally one might well anticipate problems attracting talented undergraduates, who have plenty career options, to the academic profession. However, this unhappy prospect is only dimly perceived, after all, the current American faculty is almost certainly the best to yet inhabit our campuses. Furthermore, given the small number of new hires, recent recruits have on the whole been excellent. Nevertheless, considerable evidence has been amassed that colleges and universities may have a difficult time in recruiting a sufficient number of highly capable persons over the next twenty-five years (20).

Five major issues are affecting and will continue to affect higher education faculty members in the Eighties. These issues are: 1) faculty authority in academic decisions and the influence on this authority of federal and state governance and regulation, 2) the role of faculty within an institution's organizational structure, 3) faculty security in relation to enrollment trends and retrenchment policies, 4) the career mobility of higher education faculty, and 5) faculty development and curriculum changes (Hendrickson 338).

In the past, researchers have always commanded greater prestige and generally higher salaries than academies who concentrated on teaching, especially at the undergraduate level. But all academies are increasingly encouraged to publish in scholarly journals and to write books. Merely teaching is no longer a choice at many universities. As competition for scarce tenured positions becomes more fierce, teaching and research are minimal requirements. However, there is no corresponding reduction in teaching load or increase in compensation. The more research a college or university wants out of a position the more likely they are to hire a full time (usually tenure-track) member over a part-time or temporary instructor. Part-time and/or temporary instructors have more mobility during employment than does the full-time (tenured) faculty, but the full-time (tenured) faculty member has more mobility while looking for or considering movement (Blackburn 5).

The recent growth of part-time faculty positions (now over 50% of the total faculty in two-year colleges) including the non-tenured-track appointments and the one year only (OYO) contracts, has been phenomenal. This institutional practice, justified on the basis of enrollment and economic uncertainties, has already created a new breed of academic nomads, a distinct group of second class citizens whose scholarly and academic careers are not only aborted but more than likely destroyed. They will not become knowledge producers because they are never in place long enough to establish a research program (Blackburn 34). For example, Barbara Townsend describes the opinions of many tenured faculty and the temporary or one year only instructors. She states:

> At a department meeting last year, as options for filling a soon-to-be-vacated positions were being discussed, a caveat vehemently expressed by one participant was, "We've got to make it a three-year appointment, so we can get somebody good. Nobody decent is going to come for just one year.

This seems to be the prevailing attitude of many tenured faculty. They seem to take it for granted that people who accept temporary appointments are somehow deficient or suspect academically (Townsend 53).

However, regardless of the opinions of full-time faculty, many part-timers continue academic employment in the hopes of finding a full time position. Motivation for full-time employment seems to vary from one employee to another. In fact, the different origins of motivation for the collegiate level educator are as various as the disciplines that these educators teach.

For example, prestige of the job has lured many into the profession. There are many areas where prestige can be involved. Departmental prestige not only gives the professors involved an extra leg up in the academic world, but also lends a great deal of publicity to the institution.

Prestige can also be sensed as a type of flattery. If the competition wants the services of an already employed professor a recruitment process can evolve into a very profitable salary bidding war. Ideally this is not good for the profession, but the traditionally low salaries have forced this to be prevalent. Not coincidentally, the prestige is validated with these offers.

The faculty at any given institution has, sometimes secretly, formed their own little "prestige clubs". Faculty members can be blackballed or admitted without knowing. These private cliques are dangerous to the profession if they are allowed to impede someone's professional career. There are times that these clubs can produce very creative works, but since the presence in the club is exclusive, the outcome of the creativeness is often one-sided.

There is a theory that there is a measuring stick for prestige that a professor can receive. "The value of a position to its incumbent is determined not only by his status within the organization but by the prestige of the whole organization in its external environment." (Caplow 99). This translates to say that an instructorship at a great university is more desirable than a deanship at a local denominational college. The perception of the profession changes from person to person depending on different variables such as their background and education.

It is a traditional feeling that professors are very prestigious due to their devotion to higher education. This devotion is not only to their students but to themselves as well. These professors also have such a high impact on society that they are naturally looked up to and are highly respected. For the professor to be able to motivate the student to learn, to be able to communicate the knowledge to the student, and to keep in touch with the cutting edge of his field, is challenging to say the least and might be referred to as an art or science. "Teaching at its best is a great art, and great art of any kind is rare." (Eble 77).

Lastly, one of the areas that may give the professor the greatest amount of prestige among his students is being one of their mentors. Professors take

great pride in sharing their thoughts and ideas with students. Prestige is a derivative of this educational transference.

In the past, academics would have said that the lure of money was non-existent. The professor was not lured into the education field by money, but was held there by money. Once a graduate attained a position in education, better paying jobs would arise. In this field, the more experience you get, to a certain point, the more valuable you are top a prospective institution. Since standards of salaries were adopted pretty much for all academic ranks, the processes went a little more smoothly. These standards removed some of the uglier aspects of personal rivalry and helped to hold down salary as a status symbol. If anything negative, according to the faculty, came about, it was that these standards reduced the bidding power of outside institutions. This limits mobility. The increases in salary in the past did not come easily. The education field raised salaries to try and keep industry from luring new graduates. Also, the high demand fields in education(liberal arts) were at a shortage of graduates because they were leaving graduates school for lucrative jobs.

Salary could also be a reason for dissatisfaction. Studies done at major universities during 1954 to 1956 revealed an interesting pattern. Reportedly, only 18% of the men who left their jobs were reported to have been unhappy with their salaries while they were still there, but 58% of them were reported to have been attracted by a better salary in the new position they accepted elsewhere. Along with this, only 21% of the replacements for these men were to have been unhappy with their former salaries, but 48% of them were said to have been attracted by the offer of a better salary (Caplow 112). We

can theorize that academic men, for the most part, are content with their current position and salary. However, an offer of a higher salary elsewhere may produce discontent with their current position. "The greater salary dissatisfaction of full and assistant professors at the high salary universities lends further support to the conclusion that faculty mobility is not a simple function of salary differential. "(Flygare 76).

It is no secret that faculty leave positions for better salaries but it is not the only reason.

Terms of employment are determined sometimes by business officers who identify themselves with non-academic employees and sometimes by deans who are more sympathetic to the need of the student than to those of the professors. Several universities have a policy that members of the faculty must not be given any privileges not equally available to the students. This leaves out of account the special problems faced by the young faculty member as a middle class professional with a lower-class income (81). The including of fringe benefits in the salary package is very beneficial to the faculty member and can be the deciding factor on whether or not he will stay on board. A list of some more commonly offered fringe benefits including: family medical and hospital insurance, a reasonable retirement plan, mortgage loans for the financing of permanent housing, travel expenses to major professional meetings, tuition waiver for self and all family members attending class. Another type of benefit is sabbatical leave but according to traditional views this is not a privilege, it is a right. Also, according to traditional views it should not be necessary for the faculty member to satisfy the dean that the leave will "assist" his professional development (111).

Traditionally the role of the professor was less flexible than it is right now. The factors that contribute to this are the fact that the professor was required to teach a full course load as well as have time for advisement, research (to stay on the cutting edge of his field), and to help mandate departmental policy. These duties took most of the faculty's time and was designed to do so. Even so, this schedule is more flexible than most jobs. The majority of college teaching positions are 9 or 10 month contract positions with the professor getting paid extra if he should teach in the summer. If he choose not to teach, then summers are pretty much left open to him. During the 9 or 10 month contract period the faculty are given off all holidays that the students have as well as the traditional Christmas and Spring breaks.

The faculty's actual teaching load is 12-15 hours per week of classroom time with another 10-15 hours weekly spent in the office. Traditionally, professors teach and various other duties prescribed by the institution. There was not much entrepreneurship among the college faculty, mainly because the administration frowned heavily upon it. There was a lot of animosity between faculty and administration due to the fact that a lot of professors desired "outside" employment to stimulate their economic growth. From receiving grants for research (from which the administration figured they should receive all profits from discoveries) to being paid for consulting, and even part time teaching at another school, these "outside" employment opportunities were a great plus to the professors, but the administration felt that it detracted from the total efforts of the professor (Helwig 45).

In the past, there has been informal lists of "acceptable" and "unacceptable" forms of outside employment. This has in a way restricted the mobility of the professor. The academic world has tried to push the notion of a professional standard of acceptability. This is not to say business people and the self-employed are unrespectful, it is trying to say that those who wish the benefits of the academic profession must limit their activities to "approved" ones (49). At the time of these restrictions, the academic world was said to be concerned that the limitations were too limited. All of this leads up to what the administration of higher education is trying to get across: The traditional career assumes that the professor will give full-time to those duties that he performs for that institution.

By the time the young man has attained his degree and is ready to start his teaching career he should have gained some sort of expertise in his chosen field of study. This feeling of knowledge can be the driving force behind the professor. In his role, the teacher is constantly saying, without words, "Watch me. See how I work and try to do likewise in your own way." It is not good enough for the student to see the correct answer to the problem, but he must watch the technique of the professor to see the processes in which he arrived at the answer. Expertise can be a great force in teaching, but it can also detract from teaching depending on the manner in which the professor uses the expertise. If the expertise is used correctly the professor can give the student the ability of full effectiveness at the next higher level.

The rewards that a professor gets from seeing one of his students achieve, has to be one of the most recognized motivations for a professor. In

most cases that professor appeared to that student as a mentor, then the enjoyment could be tenfold.

All of the motivations (previously mentioned) are valid. But, the biggest factor leading to mobility is faculty morale. Two of the factors that influence faculty morale, according to author Jack Schuster, are declining employment mobility since 1970 and the shifting reward structures on our campuses. First, declining employment mobility for faculty members since the 1970's has caused a large number of them to feel "stuck". Second, many faculty members are disgruntled over differential pay policies on many campuses that yield higher salaries for professors in high demand fields than for professors in fields characterized by low student demand. Differential pay has always existed, but not to the extent that is now prevalent.

"The Orwellian Consequence", that some faculty are more equal than others, causes much distress, especially among senior professors in the arts and sciences, who make up the heart of the faculty but whose courses seem to be out of favor with career-driven students." (Schuster 278).

Schuster goes on to state:

> We also found that the reward structure is shifting. A great many campuses, able to hire excellent faculty members in the strong buyers' market that currently prevails, are insisting on scholarly productivity as a prerequisite for retention, promotion, and tenure. At many institutions, the emphasis on scholarly productivity is not a new development. But on many other campuses, which have long been committed to effective teaching, a new "gospel of research" has taken hold. (278, 279).

In their concern for the interuption of the flow of new scholars into university research environments the Carnegie Council has recommended a "Junior Scholars Program." It calls for 1,000 or more research professorships and post-doctorate fellowships over five year periods into the 1990's, funded by the government, positions that eventually would be converted into the full-time academic appointments. A National Research Council committee has recommended that the National Science Foundation grant 250 awards a year to outstanding faculty to pay a part of their salary for five years thereby freeing institutional funds to hire new faculty. The 20 year program would cost $381,000,000 (Blackburn 34).

Sometimes, tenured and tenure-track faculty members may view temporaries as not having a commitment to the department or institution. Their opinions on governance issues may seem unimportant or even worthless, since "they don't really know what the department (or institution) is all about." (Townsend 54). The idea that a fresh perspective, unhampered by present or past allegiance to particular factions, might be valuable apparently doesn't occur to the people responsible for assignments to governance committees. Also, new tenure-track faculty members are frequently advised by their department chairmen on ways to increase their professional visibility and improve their chances for being tenured. Or they are steered toward a particular area of research or asked to work on a project with other department members (55).

Temporaries are rarely given that kind of advice or professional opportunity. Even though they are obviously not going to be tenured at the institution where they are currently appointed, learning some professional do's and don't and being given the opportunity for some experience would be very helpful in terms of their work in the department and of their future attainments (55).

Of course, since the tenure process is usually an agonizing time for those undergoing it, one could agree that exclusion from it is a plus for temporaries, just as they could be said to be lucky not to have to attend the often-interminalbe meetings involved in governance. A final plus could be that being excluded from these affairs could be used as another source of motivation to attain tenure.

Leaving these questionable pluses aside, the net effect of being only participant-observers in important areas of the academic world is that temporary faculty members are left feeling frustrated and deprived. Frustrated because they cannot fully participate in the institutional and professional cultures, and deprived because they may never be able to do so if tenure-track positions do not materialize. The academic world is also deprived of the talents and energies that it fails to tap in its temporary faculty members (55).

Studies indicate approximately 30% of California's part-time faculty are working at several institutions. Many of these freeway flyers want full-time positions, so they match full-time faculty in their commitment, the duties they

perform, and their commitment, the duties they perform, and their academic qualifications. But these part-timers have become a group of second-class migrant workers whose exploitation erodes the teaching profession and the quality of education (Maitland 8).

The numbers of part-time faculty in California increased rapidly during the 1970's. By 1980, the 107 community colleges in the state had 70% of their faculties in temporary status. In some urbandistricts the number was 80% and a few districts had created colleges staffed solely with part-time faculty. In the California State University system, which has nineteen campuses, the temporary faculty comprised 40% of the total faculty (8).

Studies have shown that two-thirds of the part-time faculty have full-time jobs elsewhere, which means they also arrive to teach at night after a day's work. And many of them miss class because of business travel. It is not uncommon for a department to have three or four part-time faculty quit in the middle of the semester because of the demands of their full-time positions (54).

> I quit my teaching position because I had come to dislike teaching, states collegiate teachers union representative Dr. Christine Maitland, I needed a sabbatical or an unpaid leave to renew my course materials, but such benefits are not available to part-time faculty. I also quit because I was no longer giving my students a good education. If all the part-time faculty worked as I did, doing nothing beyond what they are paid for, the system could not continue to function. (54).

In recent years the California legislature has placed a limit on the numbers of part-time faculty that can be hired and existing tenured faculty have begun to retire in large numbers. The result has been an increase in the availability of full-time positions (54).

Authors Jack H. Schuster and Howard R. Bowen collaborated on research regarding campus reward systems. They state:

> At most of the campuses we visited, we were struck by the rapidly changing value system present. Taking advantage of a strong buyers' market, campus after campus has been moving aggressively to upgrade the importance of scholarly productivity as a criterion for academic personnel decisions. (15)

Under prevailing labor market conditions, such a strategy has been easy to adopt because, in most fields, the supply of well trained would-be professors considerably exceeds current demand. Thus, almost every institution of higher education, from leading research universities to the most modest of campuses, has been able to hire, by its standards, excellent faculty, and a considerable number of institutions have moved rapidly toward new reward structures for faculty. The result is a surge toward research (Schuster & Bowen 15).

Schuster in his own publication, The Faculty Dilemma: A Short Course, talks about market demand. "We found that some 450,000 to 500,000 academic appointments will have to be made between now and the year

2010, in order to fill anticipated vacancies." (Schuster 280) This surge in the number of openings will be a function of two parallel developments: 1) retirements, as large cohorts of faculty members hired during the period of explosive growth in the late 1950's and the 1960's reaches retirement age; and 2) an anticipated upswing in college enrollment in the mid-1990's, when the baby boomlets reach college age. Most of the new faculty hirings will be compressed into the 15 year period between 1995 and 2010, since relatively few openings will materialize in most fields prior to 1995 (280).

Clearly, half a million new hirings is a very large number. The entire U.S. faculty today numbers about 460,000 full-time members and another 220,000 or so part-timers. Therefore, hiring half a million new faculty members is just like replacing a sizable portion of the existing professorate (280). Salaries have always been a major influencer in hiring decisions.

Schuster and Bowen reiterate their facts on market-driven salaries.

> Consider one aspect of the compensation conundrum to which we all used earlier; The dysfunction of market-driven salaries. The marketplace has, of course, always influenced faculty salaries. However, at almost every campus we visited the administration was tightening the linkage between salaries and the marketplace, a strategy works to the serious disadvantage of most humanists and many social scientists. (19)

Bidding high in order to attract academic talent is an understandable tactic, but,

> our concern is that institutions tend to under-estimate the liabilities of this particular strategy. In our travels we found wide-spread resentment among senior arts and sciences faculty, as well as a sense of helplessness and resignation in coping with the forces of the marketplace. (20)

The effects of bidding high can lead to problems within the profession. High bidding often leads to out and out pirating of academic personnel.

The long range result of pirating might not be healthy for academe. As universities, like professional sports owners, become caught up in bidding for a few known, stars, they may stint on finding creative ways to build a team. Larry Palmer, Cornell's vice president for academic programs, worries about developing a two-tier system of gold-plated prima donnas and underpaid working stiffs (Bowen 69). Furthermore, says Mario T. Garcia, chairman of Chicano studies at the University of California at Santa Barbara. "One campus gains at the expense of another." (69) This is what disturbs N.Y.U.'s Duncan Rice, dean of the faculty of arts and sciences, as he ponders the consequences of too much raiding. "It terrifies me out of my wits," he concedes. "I worry either about having a faculty of kids or having to replace a faculty in a market that will be much more fiercely competitive than it is now." (69)

Higher education has to not only anticipate but to deliver the future. Fortunately, the timing could not be better. Irving H. Buchen, President of Westfield College in Westfield, Massachusetts, answers, "Institutions have the significant opportunity of replacing so many faculty, of being offered a

blank slate," (25) This also means that there will be significant salary savings when so many high priced professors retire and are replaced with relatively lower priced instructors and assistant professors. Buchen goes on to mention that, "A percentage of those savings could be put into a future fund earmarked to training new faculty to be future faculty." (25)

"Such historic opportunities are not given often to an entire profession. It's time to write some want ads for the future." (25)

To form a conclusion on the previously mentioned quotes, Robert Blackburn, author of "Careers for Academics and the Future Production of Knowledge", states,

> The paradox of the current knowledge explosion and a predicted generation gap of new scholars is analyzed with regard to its consequences, the evidence relating to the essential conditions for knowledge production, the realities of opportunities for young Ph. D. s, their need in the growth of disciplines, and the possible courses of action for dealing with a serious problem. The historical record was not f
> found to be especially helpful. Analysis of studies on the personal and organization characteristics related to scholarly productivity identified critical variables. The gloomy forecasts for academic openings were acknowledged, although contradictions in the reported data call for more careful examination. (25)

In Schuster and Bowen's article, "The Faulty at Risk", they studied the value systems on todays campuses. They conclude,

> We recognize that keeping abreast of one's discipline is critically important for a vital faculty and that research and scholarship contribute to this end. However, we doubt that the stampede toward publishable research and scholarship, or what sometimes passes for scholarship, serves the nation's needs, or the longer term interests of those campuses historically committed to effective teaching. (16)

Finally, Buchen believes that future collegiate level faculty must cultivate relationships with members of disciplines other that their own. One of the most deplorable records of higher education has been the failure of multi disciplinary relationships. These types of relationships are the backbone to stable faculty at one's institution. The political power base of single departments has traditionally been so strong and their hold on faculty evaluation and rewards so tenacious that they have rendered many of these multi disciplinary efforts feeble and vulnerable. Indeed, the mortality rate of such ideas is often the same as the mortality rate of the faculty who try to push them (25). "Such petty isolationism", adds Buchen, "which has resulted in one of the longest-lived failures of higher education, is now threatening the ability of institutions to build a future with greater interaction." (25)

In summary, we could assume that mobility is good for the faculty member but not for the institution from which the "mobile" faculty leaves. According to author Christine Maitland, who was a part-time faculty for years.

> the unavailability of a tenure-track position kept me on the move. When I was first teaching I spent hours preparing for class, going

> to the library, looking for new textbooks, and updating course materials. (54)

Her last three years of teaching she spent as little time as possible on preparation. She was unwilling to prepare for a course until she knew if she was going to teach it. She gave the same midterms and finals each time. "My skills improved but I refused to volunteer to do activities outside the classroom." (54) Maitland finally left teaching. She was a victim of part-time teaching and the vast mobility that part-time teaching provides. It can be an arena for experience and monetary gain, but as in Maitland case it was fatal for her teaching career.

Faculty in the 1980's will see their security threatened by financial exigencies. According to Robert M. Hendrickson a financial exigency is a financial crisis within the institution that may result in the resection of personnel (340). The 1974 policies on academic freedom and tenure of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) provide guidelines on the removal of tenured faculty due to financial exigencies. Case law indicates that a financial exigency need only exist in a program, not institution wide, to remove faculty from that program. The courts have also ruled that, using a rationale focused on program needs, a tenured faculty member can be removed while a nontenured faculty member is retained (340). This leads to the realization that tenure may be headed out the door as the clutch that lures educators to pursue a career in closegiate level education. The new "approach" will be to be mobile because that will be the way to achieve financial security that tenure previously granted. Mobility

within the profession is the motivation behind a person choosing to be a collegiate level educator.

Specifically it is hypothesized that mobility within the collegiate educational profession serves as a motivator for the collegiate level professor.

Chapter III

Research Methodology

This research is intended to be the first unbiased academic study of motivations of a collegiate level educator. The researcher's intent is to get into the minds of educators, to try and collect their thoughts and perceptions, and to find out why they teach at the collegiate level.

Because there has been no study strictly pertaining to the perceptions of the people most involved in the decision making process, the most attractive research method appears to be the survey. The intent of this study is to obtain information form educators of various levels at four year institution, chosen at random.

The research for this study has been of an exploratory nature. The book, Business Research Methods, by William Zikmund defines exploratory research as:

> ... a progressive narrowing of the scope of the research topic and a transformation of the discovered problems into defined ones, incorporating specific research objectives. By analyzing any existing studies on the subject, by talking with knowledgeable individuals, and by informally investigating the situation, the researchers can progressively sharpen the concepts. After such exploration the researchers should know exactly what data to collect during the formal project and how the project will be conducted (Zikmund 381).

The early focal point of the research was to study the motivation of a collegiate level educator to be mobility within the profession. Because this the only study strictly on collegiate level educators, it was discovered that several other topics could be studied as well. But due to the possibility of altering the original statement the researcher declined to include them.

Surveys were chosen as the method best suited for the information gathering that is necessary for this type of research. Since there has been so little up-to-date published data on the subject, a survey will provide most of he information necessary to test the hypotheses listed in Chapter 1.

The surveys provide the ability to question collegiate level educators throughout the united States. The survey seems the most economical method for gathering the necessary information of such a diverse population. It also allows the respondents the opportunity to be candid since the questionnaires are returned anonymously.

With a 1989 copy of Petersens Guide to Colleges, it was extremely easy to gain access to 200 four year colleges in the United States. The names and addresses of these 200 colleges were printed onto small cards and dropped into a large bucket. They were then randomly selected until twenty colleges were chosen. A cove letter of explanation was sent to the Dean of Academics at each of the twenty institutions. The instructions stated that the Dean was to disperse the enclosed surveys in the following manner:

2 copies to two different faculty members in each of the following discipline areas: Business, Education Natural Science, Behavioral Science, and Physical Education.

Each individual was to complete the survey and return anonymously. This is a form of purposive, or judgmental sampling (Babbie 106). People that are teaching at the college level have had to make the decision to do so at one time, so they will be knowledgeable about this topic by just relaying their own motivations. A purposive sampling is deemed necessary due the need of an informed survey respondent. Only an informed respondent will provide the information that a survey of this type requires.

It is difficult to determine what the response rate will be. Both Zikmund and Babbie state that a 50 percent response is desirable for analysis and reporting (Zikmund 123; Babbie 65). The response of the collegiate level educator will hopefully reach the 50 percent level, since the topic of discussion directly correlates with their profession.

When studying survey research, Babbie and Zikmund list possible errors that may arise. Babbie mentioned several ethics violations that can theoretically occur. The ethics violations are errors that may occur when the researcher gathers the information. While it is the author's intention to avoid these problems, they should be reviewed

Voluntary Participation - Babbie states that there should be no forced participation in a survey. He also states that "volunteers are motivated by the

belief that they will personally benefit from their cooperation" (Babbie 348). The author has tried to accommodate both of these beliefs. There is no way that this mail servey can be a forced item. The survey letter asks the potential respondents for their cooperation to make them feel that they are an important part of the survey.

No Harm To Respondent - "Survey research should never injure the respondents who have volunteered to cooperate with the researcher" (Babbie 349). To many, this is a common sense approach to the handling of the information gathered. The surveys used will be anonymous, this will assure confidentiality.

Identifying Purpose and Sponsor - another ethic violation mentioned by Babbie is that of the researcher revealing the survey's purpose and sponsor; this could affect the respondents answers (Babbie 352). This potential violation has hopefully been avoided. The survey request states that the survey is to obtain information about what motivates a collegiate level professor, and the results are to be used as part of a thesis project. This is very general statement that does not reveal much about the aim of the survey.

Zikmund also mentioned several possible respondent errors that are possible with surveys.

A non-respones error occurs when a potential respondent does not answer the survey (Zikmund 145). It is impossible to say that the non-respondents will be representative of the respondents to the survey. The

potential for this error will be reduced in that all potential respondents have been selected in the random mode mentioned earlier.

Another error mentioned by Zikmund is self-selection. This has the potential of being a problem. Zikmund states that self-selection may bias a survey because "it allows extreme positions to be overrepresented" (Zikmund 145). The author interprets this as a potentially serious problem with the survey. One must remember that the Academic Dean will handle the dispersement of the surveys. This would be an attractive chance for the Dean to disperse them to someone with an extreme position to answer them. Hopefully they will take a great deal of pride in being chosen for the survey and therefore will take a thoughtful approach in giving their answers. To reduce the chance of this error Zikmund suggests trying to increase the response rate of the surveys (Zikmund 146).

There are several response biases that may occur. According to Zikmund, "A response bias occurs when respondents tend to answer in a certain direction. People may consciously misrepresent the truth" (Zikmund 146).

One type of response bias is deliberate falsification. This occurs when a respondent gives false answers (Zikmund 146). It will be assumed that this error will not be present because both surveys will be anonymous. One cannot imagine why someone would intentionally be dishonest when answering the survey because it would not serve any purpose to do so.

Unconscious Misrepresentation can occur when a respondent does not give the answer full thought or if the question is 'sprung' on him (Zikmund 147). It is doubtful that this will occur. At the end of the survey there is space for comments in case there is something else the respondent wants to add. Also each respondent will answer the survey at his own leisure, at a convenient time. This should reduce the chance of an unconscious misrepresentation bias.

Acquiescence Bias can occur when respondents tend to agree with most questions, especially in research on new ideas (Zikmund 148). Since this survey specifically asks ranking of motivations and not yes or no answers, this type of bias should not be prevalent.

Finally, Social Desirability Bias may occur. This can happen when the respondent answers the questions in a manner that makes them look 'respectable' or to 'gain prestige' (Zikmund 149). It may be the belief that a response can affect the results of the survey by giving false information. The integrity of educators and the fact that all of the surveys are anonymous will help deter this bias.

Zikmund mentions several administrative errors. In each case, they will be avoided.

"Sample Selection Error is a systematic error that results in an unrepresentative sample because of an error in either the sample design or

execution of the sampling procedure" (Zikmund 150). As stated earlier, the educators will be chosen in a random method in that the colleges chosen for this sample were selected at random.

A copy of the survey is inserted as Appendix 3.

Question 1 asks for age of the educator. This was asked to find the average age of all respondents. Also the respondent's ranking might variety with age. This question is an example of information that might be useful in future research. Question 1 is not directly associated with the hypothesis, but the information revealed will be valuable when comparing the ages with the different attitudes.

Question 2, the respondents highest level of education completed. The results of this question will be helpful in understanding a particular respondents rankings. It also has no direct application to the hypothesis, but tends to correlate with some of the ranking motivations to be discussed later.

Question 3 is trying to discover the number of college years experience. This correlates to almost all of the motivations to be ranked, but not directly to the hypothesis.

The information found in the first three questions are all examples of information that may be useful in future research.

Questions 4 is the meat of the survey. This is where the most data to test the hypothesis will be collected. The respondent is asked to rate the greatest motivating factors that helped them choose the field of collegiate level education. The respondents are asked to rate the six factors 1-6. The factors to choose from are as follows:

Prestige of the Job. The feeling of the collegiate level educator, that due to his education and his position in the field of education, he is in a prestigious situation.

Money. Motivated by the salary and benefits that are earned by the collegiate level educator.

Flexibility of Schedule. The ability of the collegiate level educator to have flexible working hours and conditions.

Mobility Within the Profession. The educators ability to be mobile within his profession. The capability to teach at more than one school.

The Feeling of Expertness. The feeling that due to his vast education and experience in his field, he has gained a certain expertise.

Helping and Benefiting The Student. A motivation that the student is the most important factor in the educational process. Also, the collegiate level educator feels this action is what his career is all

about.

Chapter IV

Results and Discussion

The response to the survey was not as great as expected. A total of 200 surveys were mailed in late February 1990. Of those, 16 were returned unanswered or not completed satisfactorily and 65 completed surveys were returned. This equates to a 32.50 percent response rate. This response rate is not very close to the 50 percent figure that both Babbie and Zikmund suggest, as mentioned in Chapter 3. The researcher will assume that this response rate is acceptable to assure accurate results.

Some demographics of the respondents are as follows. Surveys were sent randomly to 20 different colleges in 17 different states. Answered responses arrived form only 10 states. The average age of the educator was 46.3 years.

There are several reason for the low response. The idea of mailing the surveys to the Academic Dean instead of directly to the students was to eliminate cost as will as bias. The bias eliminated was the ability to pick and choose which faculty member the researcher wanted to complete the survey. Another possible reason for the low response rate was the survey was sent to colleges that did not contain one or more of the following department:

Business, Education, Natural Sciences, Behavioral Science, or Physical Science. This might have lead to a number of surveys never being distributed beyond the desk of the Academic Dean. This might have been avoided by directing the Dean to disperse the surveys to 10 individuals with no more than two coming from the same department.

Finally, another factor that might have led to the low response rate is the timing of the survey. The survey was mailed in middle to late February, which might conflict with a college's spring break period. If an educator received the survey close to the time of their spring break they would be more apt not to take the time to complete it.

For a complete listing of all answers, see appendix 3, Complete Results of the Motivations Survey.

When comparing the actual numbers, however, one can assume that an acceptable response level was reached. Of the 81 responses received, 80 percent were completed fully and accurately, with comments where deemed necessary and 10 states were represented. Because neither Babbie or Zikmund addressed the issue of published surveys, the researcher will assume that an acceptable response rate has been received.

Of the 65 respondents to question 2, highest level of education, 63.1 percent had attained a doctoral degree, 24.6 percent received a masters, 6 percent received an Ed. D, and 1.5 percent an ABD.

Questions 3 asked for the respondents number of years of technical experience. Of the survey sample taken, 16.6 years experience was found to be the average. For the researcher this helps validify the results. The average age of the respondent is 46.3 and the average number of years of technical experience is 16.6. This indicates that these educators have been in the profession for a while.

At this point the hypothesis will be analyzed, with the results discussed. The hypothesis, found on page 10, states that the motivation of the collegiate level educator is mobility within the profession. The survey results did not support this statement. Of the 65 respondents that ranked mobility within the profession as a motivator, only 6.2 percent felt that it was the number one motivator. A complete listing of all results of the survey can be found in Appendix 3.

The following is a breakdown of how mobility was chosen as a motivation to the collegiate level educator. As the number 5 motivator, out of six listed on the survey, mobility was chosen by the highest percentage, 27.7 percent. As the number 6 motivator, mobility was chosen at a 26.2 percent clip, 18.5 percent as the number three, 16.9 percent as the number 4, and 4.6 percent as the number 2 motivator.

Mobility within the profession was stacked up against five other possible motivations for the respondent to choose from. The motivations and their results will be discussed in the following paragraphs and can also be found in Appendix 3.

Helping and benefiting the student was chosen 55.4 percent of the time as the greatest, number one, motivator by the respondents. This is a motivation that the student is the most important factor in the educational process. Also, the collegiate level educator feels this action is what a career in education is all about. This motivation was chosen 23.1 percent of the time as the number 2 motivator, 12.3 percent as number 6, 6.2 percent as number 3, and 1.5 percent as the number 4 and 5 motivators.

Flexibility of schedule, the ability of the collegiate educator to have flexible working hours and conditions, was the second choice as the number one motivator with being chosen 23.1 percent of the time. It was also chosen the most as the number 2 motivator at 32.3 percent of the time. It was chosen as the number 3 motivator 20 percent the time, number 4 18.5 percent of the time, number 5 4.6 percent, and as the number 6 motivator 1.5 percent of the time.

The feeling of expertness is the feeling that due to an educators vast education and experience in his field, he has gained a certain expertise. This was chosen third as the number one motivator of a collegiate level educator with it being supported 12.3 percent of the time. This motivation ranked close as thew second, third, and fourth motivator being chosen 27.7, 20. 21.5 percent of the tome respectively. The feeling of expertise was chosen as the number 6 motivator 10.8 percent of the time and as the number 5 7.7 percent of the time.

Prestige of the job was chosen as the top motivator only 10.8 percent of the time. The majority of the time it was chosen as the third (21.5 percent), fourth (24.6 percent), and fifth (21.5 percent) motivators. As the number 2 motivator it was chosen 9.2 percent of the time and as the number 6 motivator, 12.3 percent of the time.

Money as a motivator, along with mobility within the profession, was chosen the least amount of times as the number one motivator. Money was also chosen 6.2 percent of the time. Money was also chosen 6.2 percent of the time as the number 2 motivator, 9.2 percent of the time as the number 3, and 4.6 percent of the time as the number 4 motivator. Money as a motivator was chosen the greatest percentage of the time as the last thing that would motivate a college educator to choose this profession. It was chosen 27.7 percent of the time as the number 5 motivator also.

There were many comments on the surveys that were returned. A few of them were questioning the validity of such a survey. One respondent feels that the questions and ranking are too restrictive and not enough leverage to express their real feelings. Another one feels that this study may be flawed because those who were surveyed knew that the researcher was trying to gather data to research the motivations of a collegiate level educator. And finally, one respondent testifies that one motivation, helping and benefiting the student, is the strongest motivator for him now, but that another motivator, not listed, was the greatest motivator when he entered the profession. The

respondent answered the survey by stating that helping and benefiting the student was the number one motivator. This kind of 'false reporting' could deviate the results.

In conclusion, the results of this study supports the theory of the traditional educator. This theory is based on the idea that the educator is in the field for the student, not the money.

APPENDIX 1
GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Tenure track - The direction an up- and -coming educator must gain access to. The path towards tenure.

Assistant professor - The first step in the path towards tenure.

Forced mobility - The result of when a professor does not progress as will as his administration desires. Most often occurs with older educators.

Voluntary mobility - The action of looking for another job.

AAUP - The American Association of University Professors. Helps to set guidelines for the movement within the education profession.

AAC - The Association of American Colleges. Another organization that sets guidelines for the movement of employment within the education profession.

Academic gypsies - Also referred to as nomads. The faction within the education profession that teach a class here and a class there. They can't or won't get on the tenure track.

Mentor - The person, usually a knowledge producer, that the student would most want to emulate. The student relies on this person for guidance and leadership.

The Orwellian Consequence - A major cause of distress among senior professors. The idea that some faculty are more equal than others.

The Carnegie Council - A foundation that is concerned for the interuption of the flow of new scholars into university research environment. They have given a recommendation called "Junior Scholars Programs."

Pirating - The out and out bidding for top academic personnel.

This survey is being conducted to research the motivation behind someone choosing to be a collegiate level educator. Please complete the questionnaire and thank you for your responses.

Survey Questionnaire

1) Age
2) Highest level of education:
3) Years of technical experience (college)
4) Please rate the greatest motivating factors that helped you choose the field of college level education.

(Rate 1-6, put numbers in the blanks)

___ Prestige of the job. The feeling of the collegiate level educator, that due to his education and his position in the field of education and his position in the field of education, he is in a prestigious situation.

___ Money. Motivated by the salary and benefits that are earned by the collegiate level educator.

___ Flexibility of schedule. The ability of the collegiate level educator to have flexible working hours and conditions.

___ The feeling of expertness. The feeling that due to his vast education and experience in his field, he has gained a certain expertise.

___ Helping and benefiting the student. A motivation that the student is the most important factor in the educational process. Also, the collegiate level educator feels this action is what his career is all about.

Comments_____

COMPLETE RESULTS OF THE MOTIVATION SURVEY

1) Age:

Average years of age: 46.3

2) Highest level of education:

Doctorate:	41	63.1%
Masters:	16	24.6%
Ed. D.:	6	9.2%
ABD:	1	1.5%
No answer:	1	1.5%

3) Years of technical experience (college):

Average years of experience 16.6

4) Please rate the greatest motivating factors that helped you choose the field of college level education.

Helping and benefiting the student. A motivation that the student is the most important factor in the educational process. Also, the collegiate level educator feels this action is what his career is all about.

Ranked #	1:	55.4	percent of the time.
Ranked #	2:	23.1	percent of the time.
Ranked #	3:	6.2	percent of the time.
Ranked #	4:	1.5	percent of the time.
Ranked #	5:	1.5	percent of the time.
Ranked #	6:	12.3	percent of the time.

Flexibility of schedule. The ability of the collegiate level educator to have flexible working hours and conditions.

Ranked #	1:	23.1	percent of the time.
Ranked #	2:	32.3	percent of the time.
Ranked #	3:	20.0	percent of the time.
Ranked #	4:	18.5	percent of the time.
Ranked #	5:	4.6	percent of the time.
Ranked #	6:	1.5	percent of the time.

The feeling of expertness. The feeling that due to his vast education and experience in his field, he has gained a certain expertise.

Ranked #	1:	12.3	percent of the time.
Ranked #	2:	27.7	percent of the time.
Ranked #	3:	20.0	percent of the time.
Ranked #	4:	21.5	percent of the time.
Ranked #	5:	7.7	percent of the time.
Ranked #	6:	10.8	percent of the time.

Prestige of the job. The feeling of the collegiate level educator, that due to his education and his position in the field of education, he is in a prestigious situation.

Ranked #	1:	10.8	percent of the time.
Ranked #	2:	9.2	percent of the time.
Ranked #	3:	21.5	percent of the time.
Ranked #	4:	24.6	percent of the time.
Ranked #	5:	21.5	percent of the time.
Ranked #	6:	12.3	percent of the time.

Mobility within the profession. The motivation of the collegiate level educator being his ability to be mobile in his profession. The capability to teach at more than one school.

Ranked #	1:	6.2	percent of the time.
Ranked #	2:	4.6	percent of the time.
Ranked #	3:	18.5	percent of the time.
Ranked #	4:	16.9	percent of the time.
Ranked #	5:	27.7	percent of the time.
Ranked #	6:	26.2	percent of the time.

Money. Motivated by the salary and benefits that are earned by the collegiate level educator.

Ranked #	1:	6.2	percent of the time.
Ranked #	2:	6.2	percent of the time.
Ranked #	3:	9.2	percent of the time.
Ranked #	4:	4.6	percent of the time.
Ranked #	5:	27.7	percent of the time.
Ranked #	6:	46.2	percent of the time.

Works Cited

Babbie, Earl R. Survey Research Methods. Belmont, California. Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

Blackburn, Robert T. "Careers for Academics and the Future Production of Knowledge." Annals of the American Academy March 1980: 25-35.

Bowen, Ezra. "Academia's New 'Gypsies'." Time 12 January 1987:65

Bowen, Ezra. "Raiders in the Groves of Academe." Time 23 November 1987:69.

Brown, David A. The Mobile Professors. Washington: American Council on Education, 1987.

Buchen, Irving H. "Faculty for the Future." The Futurist November/December 1987:22-25.

Caplow, Theodore., and Reece J. McGee. The Academic Marketplace. New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1957.

Eble, Kenneth E. The Recognition and Evaluation of Teaching. Washington: 1974.

Furniss, Todd W. Reshaping Faculty Careers. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1981.

Hedrickson, Robert M. "Faculty Issues in the Eighties." Phi Delta Kappan January 1982: 338-341.

Helwig, David. "The Profit-Minded Professors." Canadian Business January 1988: 46-49, 82-84.

Maitland, Christine. "Tales of a Freeway Flyer." Change January.February 1987: 69.

Shuster, Jack H. "The Faculty Dilemma: A Short Course." Phi Delta Kappan December 1986: 275-282.

Shuster, Jack H., and Howard R. Bowen. "The Faculty at Risk." Change September/October 1985: 13-21.

Townsend, Barbara K. "Temporary College Teachers: Outsiders Inside Academe." The Education Digest October 1986: 53-55.

Zikmund, William G. Business Research Methods. New York: The Dryden Press, 1988.