



LANGSTON UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SURVEY

RESULTS

2008

Office of Institutional Research and Planning

Page Hall Room 309

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| METHODOLOGY..... | 1 |
| RESULTS | 3 |
| Section A. Quality of Langston University..... | 3 |
| Section B. Faculty Work Environment | 4 |
| Section C. Student Success..... | 4 |
| Section D. Research | 5 |
| Section F. Rewards and Recognition..... | 6 |
| Section G. Tenure | 6 |
| Regression Analysis..... | 7 |
| Factor Analysis..... | 8 |
| SUMMARY AND OBSERVATIONS..... | 9 |
| Overall..... | 9 |
| Demographic Differences..... | 9 |
| Year To Year Differences..... | 10 |
| APPENDIX: A..... | 11 |
| APPENDIX B: OVERALL RESPONSES | 13 |
| APPENDIX C: DIFFERENCES BY GENDER..... | 15 |
| APPENDIX D: DIFFERENCES BY RACE | 19 |
| APPENDIX E: DIFFERENCES BY CAMPUS | 23 |
| APPENDIX F: DIFFERENCES BY ACADEMIC RANK | 29 |
| APPENDIX G: REGRESSION PREDICTING JOB SATISFACTION FROM ITEMS..... | 35 |
| APPENDIX H: REGRESSION PREDICTING JOB SATISFACTION FROM DIMENSIONS | 36 |
| APPENDIX I: FACTOR ANALYSIS | 37 |

(This Page Intentionally Left Blank)

INTRODUCTION

This report details the results of the Langston University Faculty survey conducted during the Fall 2008 Faculty Institute. The content area of the 2008 survey is slightly different than the previous administration (2007). The new survey eliminated sections regarding the campus environment, campus climate, and perceptions of campus services and replaced them with items related to student success, research, and the tenure process. The 2008 version of the survey is considerably shorter (36 items) than the 2007 survey (60 items) and touches on areas of more direct interest to the faculty. In areas where the 2008 survey and 2007 survey have identical or very similar items, the scores for both years are presented for comparison.

METHODOLOGY

The survey was administered in a paper form at the end of the Faculty Institute in August 2008. A link to an on-line form of the survey was e-mailed to all faculty members immediately following the faculty institute so those who were unable to attend the faculty institute would still be able to participate. The on-line version remained open for open for a 2 week period.

The survey consisted of a demographic section and 36 items that were broken down into 6 main sections:

- A. Quality of Langston (1-9);
- B. The Faculty Work Environment (10-17);
- C. Student Success (18-23);
- D. Research(24-30);
- E. Rewards and Recognition (31-33) and:
- F. Tenure (34-36).

The demographic section (appendix A) included gender, race, campus location, Full-time status, and faculty rank. Race was dichotomized as African American or other due to the small sample size and the demographics of the school faculty that would make comparisons based on race difficult.

The items were analyzed by calculating their mean score and running an ANOVA procedure to identify if statistically significant differences existed in the group means based on their demographic factors. For each group of comparisons in the appendices, the number of responses for each category "N", the groups mean score "Mean", and the ANOVA values "F" and "p" are reported. Only ANOVA tests that had a significance level of less than .05 are reported.

Item responses for the university as a whole (appendix B) and for each demographic comparison (appendices C-F) contain a breakdown of the responses by endorsed item along with a percentage calculation of positively endorsed (%+) items. For example, the percentage of people who endorsed an item as "good" or "excellent" as opposed to "fair" or "poor".

Two multiple regression analyses were also performed to determine the items and dimension that were most predictive of global job satisfaction (item 17). Multiple regression is a technique used to account for variance (predict) in a dependent variable based on a linear combination of dependent variables. For the first analysis, overall job satisfaction (item 17) served as the dependent variable and items 1-36 will serve as the independent variables used to predict job satisfaction. The results of the analysis reveal the items most related to/ predictive of overall job satisfaction. The second regression utilized the dimension scores (un-weighted average of items) to predict job satisfaction.

Finally, an exploratory factor analysis was performed to investigate the distinct factors that were accounting for the majority of the variance in the scores and to gauge how well the instrument was working at differentiating different themes. Factor analysis is a data reduction technique used to explain variability among observed random variables in terms of fewer unobserved random variables called factors. The observed variables are modeled as linear combinations of the factors, plus "error" terms. For the purposes of this survey, the items will be analyzed to look for the underlying factors that account for the variability in the scores. As a practical application, the factor analysis produces a matrix of factors, in this case 7, and factor loadings for the items. Items are grouped together based on their factor loadings (usually above .6) and those items represent an underlying factor that accounts for the variance in their scores. For example, the technical support items in the survey should be grouped because they are all assessing the level of technical support, but each one in a slightly different way.

The results are listed in the Appendices at the back of the report and include:

Appendix A – Demographics

Appendix B – Overall Responses

Appendix C – Differences by Gender

Appendix D – Differences by Race

Appendix E – Differences by Campus

Appendix F – Differences by Faculty Rank

Appendix G – Regression Predicting Job Satisfaction with Items

Appendix H – Regression Predicting Job Satisfaction with Dimension

Appendix I – Factor Analysis of the Survey Instrument

RESULTS

Section A. Quality of Langston University

The first part of the survey asked faculty members to rate 9 items related to the quality of various aspects of Langston University and their departments specifically. They indicated their responses on a scale of 4 = Excellent, 3 = Good, 2 = Fair, and 1 = Poor

Results

Faculty generally gave good scores (80%+ positive response) to the quality of teaching in their department (88%), which is an increase from 2007 (81%).

Moderate scores (60% - 80% positive responses) were given to the quality of faculty service (79%), a 1% decrease from 2007 (80%), program reputation nationally (70%), increased from 2007 (61%), quality of administrative leadership in my department (67%) decreased from 2007 (75%), quality of administrative leadership in my school (67%) decreased from 2007 (79%), and the quality of leadership from the campus administration (63%) decreased from 2007 (84%).

Low scores (under 60% positive responses) were given to the academic reputation of Langston University nationally (51%), a decrease from 2007 (61%), the reputation of Langston in Oklahoma (47%), decreased from 2007 (52%) and the quality of research in the departments (47%) Increased from 2007 (45%).

Gender Difference

No significant gender differences existed

Racial Difference

No significant racial differences existed.

Campus Differences

No significant campus differences existed.

Differences by Academic Rank

No significant gender differences existed for those who identified their rank. Those who chose not to respond (47) had a significantly lower score 2.51 than those who identified their rank (range from 3.35 to 3.55).

Observation

Faculty are still fairly positive about the overall quality of teaching at Langston, but a lowering of scores from last year has shown a mild concern for departmental and school administrative leadership. The faculty also maintains a high concern for the reputation of the school and quality of research done.

Section B. Faculty Work Environment

Eight survey items asked the faculty to rate their satisfaction with their work environment. The response scale ranged from 5 = Very Satisfied, 4 = Satisfied, 3 = Neutral, 2 = Dissatisfied, to 1 = Very Dissatisfied.

Results

Responses to this section revealed no item had above an 80% positive rating. Scores were all moderate (60% - 80% positive responses) which is a significant improvement from last year where some scores were below moderate ratings (under 60% positive responses). Faculty and morale in my department (66%) increased from 2007 (55%), faculty development opportunities (66%) increased from 2007 (61%), the use of time spent on committees and task forces (78%) increased from 2007 (59%), my overall workload (73%) decreased from 2007 (74%), overall job satisfaction (75%) increased from 2007 (64%). Technical support (69%) had the most significant improvement from 2007 (all positive were ratings below 50%).

Gender differences

No significant gender differences existed

Racial Differences

No significant racial differences existed

Campus Differences

The Tulsa campus rated faculty development opportunities significantly lower than the Main and OKC campuses.

Differences by Academic Rank

No significant Academic Rank differences existed

Section C. Student Success

This section of the survey was designed to assess how the faculty felt that student success was stressed at Langston University. It asked faculty for their opinions about the extent different aspects of student life were emphasized by the university. Six survey items asked the faculty to rate their satisfaction with student success. The response scale ranged from 5 = Very Satisfied, 4 = Satisfied, 3 = Neutral, 2 = Dissatisfied, to 1 = Very Dissatisfied.

Results

Faculty generally gave good scores (80%+ positive response) for quality of graduates Langston University produces (89%) and quality of academic advising students receive (80%). The quality of student academic support programs and services, such as mentoring, tutoring etc. (73%), increased significantly from 2007(49%). Overall, this dimension received the highest average ratings (3.67) from the faculty even though lower scores were given to the study skills of students (42%).

Gender differences

No significant gender differences existed

Racial Differences

No significant racial differences existed

Campus Differences

The main campus rated academic preparedness of students, study skills of students, conduct of students, lower than the OKC and Tulsa campuses. The Tulsa campus rated university resources for applying for research grants significantly lower than the Main and OKC campuses.

Differences by Academic Rank

No significant Academic Rank differences existed

Section D. Research

This section of the survey was designed to assess how the faculty felt that research was stressed at Langston University. It asked faculty for their opinions about the extent different aspects of research and research support were emphasized by the university. Seven survey items asked the faculty to rate their satisfaction. The response scale ranged from 5 = Very Satisfied, 4 = Satisfied, 3 = Neutral, 2 = Dissatisfied, to 1 = Very Dissatisfied.

Results

Faculty generally gave good scores (80%+ positive response) for the freedom to pursue areas of interest (80%). Collaboration with other faculty members on research (60%) decreased slight from 2007 (65%).

Lower scores (under 45% positive responses) were given to compensation structure for performing externally funded research (32%) and university resources for applying for research grants (47%).

Gender differences

No significant gender differences existed

Racial Differences

No significant racial differences existed

Campus Differences

The OKC campus rated the compensation structure for performing externally funded research, university resources for applying for grants, research submission process, and oversight of grants significantly higher than the Main and Tulsa campuses.

The Tulsa campus (1.6) and those who did not indicate a campus (Blank) (1.5) rated university resources for applying for research grants significantly lower than the Main and OKC campuses.

Differences by Academic Rank

No significant Academic Rank differences existed

Section F. Rewards and Recognition

Three survey items asked the faculty to rate their satisfaction with the rewards and recognition they receive for research, teaching and service. The response scale ranged from 5 = Very Satisfied, 4 = Satisfied, 2 = Dissatisfied, to 1 = Very Dissatisfied.

Results

Responses to this section revealed no item had above a 56% positive rating. Scores for this dimension had the second lowest average (3.02) for the survey. Scores ranged from a low of 2.90 for item 32 “Rewards and recognition for teaching and scholarly activity” to a high of 3.14 for item 31 “Rewards and recognition for teaching”. The scores did not change significantly from the 2007 scores although 2 of the 3 items were lower.

Gender differences

No significant gender differences existed for those who identified their gender. Those who chose not to respond (6) had a significantly lower score (1.40) on all 3 of the items. Male and female scores were 2.8 to 3.5 depending on the item..

Racial Differences

No significant racial differences existed for those who identified their race. Those who chose not to identify race (5) scored significantly lower (1.50) than those who chose to on item 32 “Rewards for research”.

Campus Differences

The main campus rated faculty development opportunities significantly lower than the OKC and Tulsa campuses.

Differences by Academic Rank

No significant gender differences existed for those who identified their rank. Those who chose not to respond (47) had a significantly lower score 2.51 than those who identified their rank (range from 3.35 to 3.55).

Section G. Tenure

Three survey items asked the faculty to rate their satisfaction with their work environment. The response scale ranged from 5 = Very Satisfied, 4 = Satisfied, 2 = Dissatisfied, to 1 = Very Dissatisfied.

Results

Responses to this section revealed no item had above a 55% positive rating. Scores for this dimension had the lowest average (2.95) for the survey. Scores ranged from a low of 2.82 for item 34 “The tenure process is clearly defined” to a high of 3.09 for item 35 “the process and criteria used to make tenure decisions are evenly applied”.

Gender differences

No significant gender differences existed for those who identified their gender. Those who chose not to respond (1.86) had a significantly lower score than those who identified themselves as male (3.09) or female (3.30).

Racial Differences

No significant racial differences existed

Campus Differences

The main campus rated faculty development opportunities significantly lower than the OKC and Tulsa campuses.

Differences by Academic Rank

No significant gender differences existed for those who identified their rank. Those who chose not to respond (47) had a significantly lower score 2.51 than those who identified their rank (range from 3.35 to 3.55).

Regression Analysis

Predicting Job Satisfaction from Items

A multiple linear regression analysis using a forward selection methodology was utilized to determine which items 1-36 were most predictive of overall job satisfaction (item 17). The results of the analysis are presented in Appendix G and show that 6 items contributed significantly to the prediction of overall job satisfaction. The items are:

10. Faculty morale in my department
16. Academic freedom at the university
23. The quality of graduates Langston University produces
22. The quality of academic advising students receive
35. The processes and criteria used to make tenure decisions are evenly applied
18. The academic preparedness of students

These items accounted for over 88% of the variance (adjusted R-square) in overall job satisfaction, which is extremely high. Some of the items make sense in that morale, academic freedom, tenure decisions, and the academic preparedness of student can drastically impact satisfaction, but the quality of advising

seems to be an artifact of the high interrelatedness of the items (multicollinearity) and may not be a meaningfully related to job satisfaction.

Predicting Job Satisfaction from Dimensions

A multiple linear regression analysis using a forward selection methodology was utilized to determine which dimensions were most predictive of overall job satisfaction (item 17). The results of the analysis are presented in Appendix H and show that 3 dimensions contributed significantly to the prediction of overall job satisfaction. The items are:

Faculty Work Environment (items 10-16)

Rewards and Recognition (items 34-36)

Student Success (items 18-23)

These 3 composite items accounted for 65% of the variance (adjusted R-square) in overall job satisfaction, which is fairly high. Work environment and rewards and recognition both are direct reflections of the day to day environment that workers are subjected to that would impact job satisfaction. The student success dimension has both student qualities and items related to how well the faculty feels that the university serves the students academically. Rewards and recognition continues to play a large role in satisfaction as it did in the 2007 survey as well as the staff survey conducted in 2008. Lack of perceived appreciation is associated with lower levels of job satisfaction.

Factor Analysis

An exploratory principal components analysis (appendix I)using a varimax rotation was performed on items 1-36 to see how many distinct factors were present in the survey and to test the functioning of the survey instrument. If too few factors are present then it shows that the survey instrument is really only assessing one or two factors such as general satisfaction or mood.

The results of the factor analysis show the presence of 7 distinct factors and few of the dimensions disambiguate themselves from the other items. When examining the rotated factor matrix, a more liberal criterion of factor loadings above .6 on the main factor and below .4 on all other factors was used to determine the factors. The ideal solution will have high factor loadings (>.6) on only 1 factor and low (<.4) on the other dimensions. This solution show that the first factor derived groups items 15-17 and 25-36 together in one factor. This indicates that the survey is picking up a more general factor rather than what is trying to be captured by the items. For example, in a survey like this, when a single, large factor is picked up respondents may be answering each item based on overall mood rather than what each item is assessing.

The second factor represented items 18-20 which all dealt with student preparedness and conduct. The third and fourth factors picked up most of the items from the first section, the Quality of Langston, and separated them by reputation and Leadership. The remaining factors 5-7 were not really distinguishable.

Overall, the factor Analysis of the survey responses indicated that a large overall factor tended to influence the results more than the individual items and sections which is not uncommon for this type of survey.

SUMMARY AND OBSERVATIONS

Overall

The survey saw an increase in participation from 76 to 118 due primarily to the inclusion of the on-line portion which accounted for over 40 surveys from people who were not able to attend the faculty institute.

Overall, this survey revealed some mixed results. Some areas, the faculty rated very high, while others showed room to improve. Of the 36 items, 9 were rated below a 3.0 based on the 5 point scale indicating that a majority of the respondents endorsed it negatively. Only 2 items were above the 4.0 mark. The dimensions that had the highest average scores were for Student Success (3.67), Faculty Work Environment (3.64), and Quality of Langston University (3.35). Respondents generally endorsed the items in these dimensions in a positive fashion over 60% of the time. The lowest scoring dimensions on average were Research (3.11), Rewards and recognition (3.02), and Tenure (2.95). These dimensions contained items that were endorsed negatively close to 50% of the time and contained some of the lower scoring items.

The low scores on the tenure process indicate a lack of faith and understanding of the system and can be somewhat expected due to the recent changes that were made to the system. Still, it is an area that has to be monitored to gauge faculty members' views of the system. Year to year results should show improvement.

Low scores on research were primarily due to the perceived lack of support from the university as far as resources, oversight, and compensation for performing research. Faculty were generally satisfied with the academic freedom, but wanted more support for research. This again was an expected result due to turnover in the administration in the department of sponsored programs, so this should show improvement in the future.

Demographic Differences

There were several differences based on demographics that appeared in the analysis, but the majority of these seemed to be differences between non responders to the demographic question than between those who responded. Generally, those who chose not to respond (Blank) endorsed the items more negatively than those who had provided the demographic information. This means that there are very few statistically significant and meaningful differences based on the demographic categories presented in appendices B through E. The exception to this seems to be campus differences.

Campus differences indicated that Tulsa and Oklahoma City had higher scores for items related to student preparedness, study habits and conduct. This is to be expected due to the fact that they have older and more experienced undergraduates and graduate students. As for research, Tulsa by far seems the least satisfied with the research support, process, and oversight. Oklahoma City rated these areas the highest.

Year To Year Differences

Due to changes in the survey items, all items were not included in the 2007 survey, but of the 20 items that were comparable, 6 showed a change of .3 or more and 5 of those were below last year's scores. The items that showed the greatest decrease were related to the national reputation of Langston, administrative leadership at all levels of the university, and collaboration among faculty. The single item to show a significant increase was the quality of academic support programs.

Largest Changes Year to Year

| Questions | N | 2008 Mean | 2007 Mean | Change |
|--|-----|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| 2. The academic reputation of Langston University nationally | 109 | 2.96 | 3.33 | -.37 |
| 7. The quality of administrative leadership in my department | 113 | 3.45 | 3.81 | -.36 |
| 8. The quality of administrative leadership in my school | 112 | 3.43 | 3.82 | -.39 |
| 9. The quality of leadership from the campus administration | 114 | 3.22 | 3.96 | -.74 |
| 21. The quality of student academic support programs and services, such as mentoring, tutoring, etc. | 99 | 3.78 | 3.36 | +.42 |
| 24. Collaboration with other faculty members on research | 97 | 3.33 | 3.69 | -.36 |

APPENDIX: A

The results from the 2008 faculty survey are tabulated using the responses from 118 faculty.

| Gender | N | Percent |
|-------------|-----|---------|
| Male | 55 | 47% |
| Female | 51 | 43% |
| Total | 106 | 90% |
| No Response | 12 | 10% |

| Race/Ethnicity | N | Percent |
|------------------|-----|---------|
| African American | 58 | 49% |
| Other | 49 | 42% |
| Total | 107 | 91% |
| No Response | 11 | 9% |

| Academic Rank | N | Percent |
|---------------------|----|---------|
| Professor | 11 | 9% |
| Associate Professor | 23 | 19% |
| Assistant Professor | 14 | 12% |
| Lecturer/Instructor | 19 | 16% |
| Total | 67 | 57% |
| No Response | 51 | 43% |

| Campus | N | Percent |
|-------------|-----|---------|
| Main | 92 | 78% |
| OKC | 8 | 7% |
| Tulsa | 7 | 6% |
| Total | 107 | 91% |
| No Response | 11 | 9% |

(This Page Intentionally Left Blank)

APPENDIX B: OVERALL RESPONSES

| Questions | N | 2008 Mean | 2007 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | | |
|--|-----|-------------|-----------|------|------|------|------|-----------|-----|--|--|
| QUALITY OF LANGSTON UNIVERSITY | | 3.35 | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. The academic reputation of Langston University In Oklahoma | 116 | 2.88 | 3.04 | 1.27 | 14% | 39% | 41% | 7% | 47% | | |
| 2. The academic reputation of Langston University nationally | 109 | 2.96 | 3.33 | 1.19 | 10% | 39% | 48% | 4% | 51% | | |
| 3. The national reputation of my program (discipline) | 102 | 3.54 | 3.46 | 1.28 | 8% | 23% | 47% | 23% | 70% | | |
| 4. The quality of overall teaching in my department | 110 | 4.00 | 3.94 | 0.91 | 2% | 10% | 63% | 25% | 88% | | |
| 5. The quality of overall research in my department | 103 | 2.89 | 2.86 | 1.49 | 22% | 31% | 28% | 18% | 47% | | |
| 6. The quality of faculty service to the institution in my department | 110 | 3.81 | 3.87 | 1.07 | 2% | 19% | 55% | 25% | 79% | | |
| 7. The quality of administrative leadership in my department | 113 | 3.45 | 3.81 | 1.39 | 13% | 19% | 43% | 24% | 67% | | |
| 8. The quality of administrative leadership in my school | 112 | 3.43 | 3.82 | 1.38 | 13% | 20% | 45% | 22% | 67% | | |
| 9. The quality of leadership from the campus administration | 114 | 3.22 | 3.96 | 1.34 | 16% | 21% | 52% | 11% | 63% | | |
| FACULTY WORK ENVIRONMENT | | 3.64 | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Faculty morale in my department | 113 | 3.46 | 3.41 | 1.43 | 14% | 19% | 39% | 27% | 66% | | |
| 11. Faculty development opportunities | 106 | 3.57 | 3.67 | 1.37 | 8% | 26% | 34% | 32% | 66% | | |
| 12. Technology support | 113 | 3.66 | | 1.32 | 5% | 26% | 35% | 34% | 69% | | |
| 13. The use of my time spent on committees and task forces | 108 | 3.89 | 3.54 | 1.15 | 2% | 20% | 43% | 35% | 78% | | |
| 14. My overall workload | 113 | 3.75 | 3.76 | 1.29 | 7% | 19% | 41% | 34% | 74% | | |
| 15. Administrative support for faculty | 109 | 3.26 | | 1.48 | 17% | 23% | 36% | 24% | 60% | | |
| 16. Academic freedom at the university | 103 | 3.70 | | 1.40 | 13% | 14% | 39% | 35% | 74% | | |
| 17. My overall job satisfaction | 114 | 3.80 | 3.65 | 1.35 | 9% | 17% | 35% | 39% | 75% | | |
| STUDENT SUCCESS | | 3.67 | | | | | | | | | |
| 18. The academic preparedness of students | 109 | 3.33 | | 1.39 | 7% | 36% | 30% | 27% | 57% | | |
| 19. The study skills of students | 110 | 2.92 | | 1.36 | 10% | 48% | 24% | 18% | 42% | | |
| 20. The conduct of students in the classroom | 108 | 3.77 | | 1.23 | 4% | 22% | 42% | 32% | 74% | | |
| 21. The quality of student academic support programs and services, such as mentoring, tutoring, etc. | 99 | 3.78 | 3.36 | 1.25 | 3% | 24% | 37% | 35% | 73% | | |
| 22. The quality of academic advising students receive | 102 | 3.96 | 3.82 | 1.13 | 2% | 18% | 43% | 37% | 80% | | |
| 23. The quality of graduates Langston University produces | 108 | 4.24 | | 0.93 | 0% | 11% | 43% | 46% | 89% | | |
| RESEARCH | | 3.11 | | | | | | | | | |
| 24. Collaboration with other faculty members on research | 97 | 3.33 | 3.69 | 1.39 | 10% | 30% | 36% | 24% | 60% | | |
| 25. Freedom to pursue research areas of interest | 102 | 3.89 | | 1.31 | 11% | 9% | 41% | 39% | 80% | | |
| 26. Administrative support for research | 97 | 3.15 | | 1.56 | 23% | 21% | 32% | 25% | 57% | | |
| 27. Compensation structure for performing externally funded research | 81 | 2.47 | | 1.36 | 27% | 41% | 22% | 10% | 32% | | |
| 28. University resources for applying for research grants | 93 | 2.87 | | 1.46 | 23% | 30% | 32% | 15% | 47% | | |
| 29. Research submission process | 88 | 3.06 | | 1.46 | 17% | 32% | 31% | 20% | 51% | | |
| 30. University oversight of grants | 86 | 3.02 | | 1.44 | 17% | 31% | 34% | 17% | 51% | | |
| REWARDS AND RECOGNITION | | 3.02 | | | | | | | | | |

APPENDIX B: OVERALL RESPONSES

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-------------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| 31. Rewards and recognition for teaching | 95 | 3.14 | 3.00 | 1.46 | 18% | 26% | 36% | 20% | 56% | | |
| 32. Rewards and recognition for research and scholarly activity | 84 | 2.90 | 3.16 | 1.44 | 21% | 30% | 35% | 14% | 49% | | |
| 33. Rewards and recognition for institutional service | 82 | 3.01 | 3.13 | 1.44 | 22% | 23% | 41% | 13% | 55% | | |
| TENURE | | 2.95 | | | | | | | | | |
| 34. The tenure process is clearly defined | 101 | 2.82 | | 1.38 | 18% | 39% | 31% | 13% | 44% | | |
| 35. The processes and criteria used to make tenure decisions are evenly applied | 98 | 3.09 | | 1.44 | 18% | 27% | 38% | 17% | 55% | | |
| 36. The criteria used to make tenure decisions are fair | 101 | 2.93 | | 1.40 | 18% | 34% | 35% | 14% | 49% | | |

APPENDIX C: DIFFERENCES BY GENDER

| Questions | Gender | N | 2008 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | ANOVA | |
|---|--------|----|-----------|------|------|------|------|-----------|-----|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | F | p |
| 1. The academic reputation of Langston University In Oklahoma | Female | 51 | 2.98 | 1.17 | 8% | 41% | 47% | 4% | 51% | | |
| | Male | 54 | 2.91 | 1.32 | 15% | 37% | 39% | 9% | 48% | | |
| | Blank | 11 | 2.27 | 1.42 | 36% | 36% | 18% | 9% | 27% | | |
| 2. The academic reputation of Langston University nationally | Female | 47 | 2.96 | 1.22 | 9% | 43% | 43% | 6% | 49% | | |
| | Male | 51 | 3.06 | 1.17 | 10% | 33% | 55% | 2% | 57% | | |
| | Blank | 11 | 2.55 | 1.21 | 18% | 45% | 36% | 0% | 36% | | |
| 3. The national reputation of my program (discipline) | Female | 44 | 3.66 | 1.27 | 5% | 25% | 41% | 30% | 70% | | |
| | Male | 49 | 3.49 | 1.26 | 8% | 22% | 51% | 18% | 69% | | |
| | Blank | 9 | 3.22 | 1.48 | 22% | 11% | 56% | 11% | 67% | | |
| 4. The quality of overall teaching in my department | Female | 49 | 4.00 | 0.87 | 0% | 12% | 63% | 24% | 88% | | |
| | Male | 53 | 4.00 | 0.96 | 4% | 8% | 62% | 26% | 89% | | |
| | Blank | 8 | 4.00 | 0.93 | 0% | 13% | 63% | 25% | 88% | | |
| 5. The quality of overall research in my department | Female | 46 | 2.78 | 1.43 | 20% | 39% | 26% | 15% | 41% | | |
| | Male | 49 | 2.94 | 1.55 | 24% | 27% | 29% | 20% | 49% | | |
| | Blank | 8 | 3.25 | 1.67 | 25% | 13% | 38% | 25% | 63% | | |
| 6. The quality of faculty service to the institution in my department | Female | 49 | 3.78 | 1.05 | 0% | 22% | 55% | 22% | 78% | | |
| | Male | 53 | 3.85 | 1.10 | 4% | 15% | 55% | 26% | 81% | | |
| | Blank | 8 | 3.75 | 1.16 | 0% | 25% | 50% | 25% | 75% | | |
| 7. The quality of administrative leadership in my department | Female | 51 | 3.53 | 1.35 | 10% | 22% | 43% | 25% | 69% | | |
| | Male | 53 | 3.43 | 1.41 | 15% | 17% | 45% | 23% | 68% | | |
| | Blank | 9 | 3.11 | 1.62 | 22% | 22% | 33% | 22% | 56% | | |
| 8. The quality of administrative leadership in my school | Female | 50 | 3.54 | 1.37 | 14% | 14% | 48% | 24% | 72% | | |
| | Male | 53 | 3.47 | 1.35 | 11% | 21% | 45% | 23% | 68% | | |
| | Blank | 9 | 2.56 | 1.42 | 22% | 44% | 22% | 11% | 33% | | |
| 9. The quality of leadership from the campus administration | Female | 49 | 3.33 | 1.26 | 14% | 16% | 61% | 8% | 69% | | |
| | Male | 55 | 3.24 | 1.40 | 16% | 22% | 45% | 16% | 62% | | |
| | Blank | 10 | 2.60 | 1.26 | 20% | 40% | 40% | 0% | 40% | | |
| 10. Faculty morale in my department | Female | 50 | 3.62 | 1.34 | 10% | 18% | 44% | 28% | 72% | | |
| | Male | 55 | 3.38 | 1.48 | 16% | 20% | 36% | 27% | 64% | | |
| | Blank | 8 | 3.00 | 1.69 | 25% | 25% | 25% | 25% | 50% | | |

APPENDIX C: DIFFERENCES BY GENDER

| Questions | Gender | N | 2008 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | ANOVA | |
|--|--------|----|-----------|------|------|------|------|-----------|-----|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | F | p |
| 11. Faculty development opportunities | Female | 48 | 3.52 | 1.40 | 8% | 27% | 33% | 31% | 65% | | |
| | Male | 53 | 3.62 | 1.38 | 8% | 25% | 34% | 34% | 68% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 3.40 | 1.34 | 0% | 40% | 40% | 20% | 60% | | |
| 12. Technology support | Female | 50 | 3.52 | 1.36 | 6% | 30% | 34% | 30% | 64% | | |
| | Male | 55 | 3.75 | 1.29 | 5% | 22% | 38% | 35% | 73% | | |
| | Blank | 8 | 4.00 | 1.31 | 0% | 25% | 25% | 50% | 75% | | |
| 13. The use of my time spent on committees and task forces | Female | 50 | 3.80 | 1.16 | 2% | 22% | 46% | 30% | 76% | | |
| | Male | 52 | 4.00 | 1.14 | 2% | 17% | 40% | 40% | 81% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 3.67 | 1.37 | 0% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 67% | | |
| 14. My overall workload | Female | 50 | 3.76 | 1.29 | 8% | 16% | 44% | 32% | 76% | | |
| | Male | 55 | 3.71 | 1.31 | 7% | 20% | 40% | 33% | 73% | | |
| | Blank | 8 | 4.00 | 1.31 | 0% | 25% | 25% | 50% | 75% | | |
| 15. Administrative support for faculty | Female | 50 | 3.12 | 1.45 | 18% | 26% | 38% | 18% | 56% | | |
| | Male | 53 | 3.43 | 1.49 | 15% | 21% | 34% | 30% | 64% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 2.83 | 1.72 | 33% | 17% | 33% | 17% | 50% | | |
| 16. Academic freedom at the university | Female | 46 | 3.59 | 1.44 | 13% | 17% | 37% | 33% | 70% | | |
| | Male | 51 | 3.90 | 1.30 | 10% | 10% | 41% | 39% | 80% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 2.83 | 1.72 | 33% | 17% | 33% | 17% | 50% | | |
| 17. My overall job satisfaction | Female | 51 | 3.92 | 1.26 | 8% | 12% | 41% | 39% | 80% | | |
| | Male | 55 | 3.80 | 1.37 | 7% | 20% | 31% | 42% | 73% | | |
| | Blank | 8 | 3.00 | 1.69 | 25% | 25% | 25% | 25% | 50% | | |
| 18. The academic preparedness of students | Female | 50 | 3.04 | 1.37 | 10% | 42% | 30% | 18% | 48% | | |
| | Male | 53 | 3.60 | 1.36 | 6% | 28% | 32% | 34% | 66% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 3.33 | 1.51 | 0% | 50% | 17% | 33% | 50% | | |
| 19. The study skills of students | Female | 50 | 2.74 | 1.32 | 12% | 52% | 22% | 14% | 36% | | |
| | Male | 53 | 3.09 | 1.39 | 9% | 42% | 28% | 21% | 49% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 2.86 | 1.46 | 0% | 71% | 0% | 29% | 29% | | |
| 20. The conduct of students in the classroom | Female | 50 | 3.72 | 1.26 | 4% | 24% | 40% | 32% | 72% | | |
| | Male | 51 | 3.80 | 1.20 | 4% | 20% | 45% | 31% | 76% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 3.86 | 1.35 | 0% | 29% | 29% | 43% | 71% | | |
| 21. The quality of student academic support programs and services, such as mentoring, tutoring, etc. | Female | 45 | 3.78 | 1.22 | 2% | 24% | 40% | 33% | 73% | | |
| | Male | 49 | 3.80 | 1.27 | 4% | 22% | 37% | 37% | 73% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 3.60 | 1.52 | 0% | 40% | 20% | 40% | 60% | | |

APPENDIX C: DIFFERENCES BY GENDER

| Questions | Gender | N | 2008 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | ANOVA | |
|--|---------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | F | p |
| 22. The quality of academic advising students receive | Female | 47 | 3.72 | 1.21 | 4% | 21% | 47% | 28% | 74% | | |
| | Male | 50 | 4.20 | 0.95 | 0% | 12% | 44% | 44% | 88% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 3.80 | 1.64 | 0% | 40% | 0% | 60% | 60% | | |
| 23. The quality of graduates Langston University produces | Female | 50 | 4.16 | 1.00 | 0% | 14% | 42% | 44% | 86% | | |
| | Male | 53 | 4.32 | 0.83 | 0% | 8% | 45% | 47% | 92% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 4.20 | 1.30 | 0% | 20% | 20% | 60% | 80% | | |
| 24. Collaboration with other faculty members on research | Female | 42 | 3.45 | 1.38 | 10% | 26% | 38% | 26% | 64% | | |
| | Male | 48 | 3.23 | 1.39 | 10% | 33% | 35% | 21% | 56% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 3.29 | 1.60 | 14% | 29% | 29% | 29% | 57% | | |
| 25. Freedom to pursue research areas of interest | Female | 46 | 3.93 | 1.29 | 9% | 11% | 39% | 41% | 80% | | |
| | Male | 49 | 3.86 | 1.31 | 12% | 6% | 47% | 35% | 82% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 3.86 | 1.68 | 14% | 14% | 14% | 57% | 71% | | |
| 26. Administrative support for research | Female | 44 | 3.02 | 1.53 | 23% | 25% | 32% | 20% | 52% | | |
| | Male | 46 | 3.35 | 1.54 | 20% | 17% | 35% | 28% | 63% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 2.71 | 1.89 | 43% | 14% | 14% | 29% | 43% | | |
| 27. Compensation structure for performing externally funded research | Female | 37 | 2.59 | 1.36 | 22% | 43% | 24% | 11% | 35% | | |
| | Male | 38 | 2.50 | 1.41 | 29% | 37% | 24% | 11% | 34% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 1.50 | 0.55 | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | | |
| 28. University resources for applying for research grants | Female | 42 | 2.81 | 1.52 | 26% | 29% | 29% | 17% | 45% | | |
| | Male | 44 | 3.02 | 1.39 | 16% | 32% | 39% | 14% | 52% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 2.29 | 1.60 | 43% | 29% | 14% | 14% | 29% | | |
| 29. Research submission process | Female | 41 | 2.98 | 1.49 | 20% | 32% | 29% | 20% | 49% | | |
| | Male | 41 | 3.22 | 1.42 | 12% | 32% | 34% | 22% | 56% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 2.50 | 1.64 | 33% | 33% | 17% | 17% | 33% | | |
| 30. University oversight of grants | Female | 36 | 3.11 | 1.43 | 17% | 28% | 39% | 17% | 56% | | |
| | Male | 43 | 3.00 | 1.40 | 14% | 37% | 33% | 16% | 49% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 2.71 | 1.89 | 43% | 14% | 14% | 29% | 43% | | |
| 31. Rewards and recognition for teaching | Female | 47 | 3.45 | 1.41 | 15% | 17% | 45% | 23% | 68% | 3.918 | 0.023 |
| | Male | 42 | 2.98 | 1.46 | 17% | 36% | 29% | 19% | 48% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 1.83 | 1.17 | 50% | 33% | 17% | 0% | 17% | | |

APPENDIX C: DIFFERENCES BY GENDER

| | | | | | | | | | | ANOVA | |
|--|---------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
| Questions | Gender | N | 2008 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | F | p |
| 32. Rewards and recognition for research and scholarly activity | Female | 40 | 3.20 | 1.44 | 18% | 23% | 43% | 18% | 60% | 3.918 | 0.024 |
| | Male | 39 | 2.79 | 1.42 | 21% | 36% | 31% | 13% | 44% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 1.40 | 0.55 | 60% | 40% | 0% | 0% | 0% | | |
| 33. Rewards and recognition for institutional service | Female | 38 | 3.18 | 1.43 | 21% | 16% | 50% | 13% | 63% | 3.618 | 0.031 |
| | Male | 39 | 3.05 | 1.43 | 18% | 28% | 38% | 15% | 54% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 1.40 | 0.55 | 60% | 40% | 0% | 0% | 0% | | |
| 34. The tenure process is clearly defined | Female | 47 | 2.83 | 1.31 | 15% | 40% | 36% | 9% | 45% | | |
| | Male | 48 | 2.88 | 1.42 | 17% | 40% | 27% | 17% | 44% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 2.33 | 1.75 | 50% | 17% | 17% | 17% | 33% | | |
| 35. The processes and criteria used to make tenure decisions are evenly applied | Female | 44 | 3.30 | 1.36 | 14% | 23% | 48% | 16% | 64% | 3.130 | 0.048 |
| | Male | 47 | 3.09 | 1.46 | 17% | 30% | 34% | 19% | 53% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 1.86 | 1.46 | 57% | 29% | 0% | 14% | 14% | | |
| 36. The criteria used to make tenure decisions are fair | Female | 46 | 3.02 | 1.37 | 15% | 33% | 39% | 13% | 52% | | |
| | Male | 50 | 2.96 | 1.41 | 16% | 36% | 32% | 16% | 48% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 1.80 | 1.30 | 60% | 20% | 20% | 0% | 20% | | |

APPENDIX D: DIFFERENCES BY RACE

| Questions | RACE | N | 2008 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | ANOVA | |
|---|-------|----|-----------|------|------|------|------|-----------|-----|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | F | p |
| 1. The academic reputation of Langston University In Oklahoma | Black | 58 | 3.02 | 1.22 | 9% | 40% | 45% | 7% | 52% | | |
| | Other | 48 | 2.77 | 1.29 | 17% | 40% | 38% | 6% | 44% | | |
| | Blank | 10 | 2.60 | 1.51 | 30% | 30% | 30% | 10% | 40% | | |
| 2. The academic reputation of Langston University nationally | Black | 57 | 3.09 | 1.15 | 5% | 40% | 49% | 5% | 54% | | |
| | Other | 42 | 2.83 | 1.23 | 14% | 38% | 45% | 2% | 48% | | |
| | Blank | 10 | 2.80 | 1.32 | 20% | 30% | 50% | 0% | 50% | | |
| 3. The national reputation of my program (discipline) | Black | 53 | 3.66 | 1.27 | 6% | 23% | 43% | 28% | 72% | | |
| | Other | 41 | 3.46 | 1.25 | 7% | 24% | 51% | 17% | 68% | | |
| | Blank | 8 | 3.13 | 1.55 | 25% | 13% | 50% | 13% | 63% | | |
| 4. The quality of overall teaching in my department | Black | 56 | 3.95 | 0.96 | 2% | 13% | 61% | 25% | 86% | | |
| | Other | 47 | 4.06 | 0.84 | 2% | 6% | 66% | 26% | 91% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 4.00 | 1.00 | 0% | 14% | 57% | 29% | 86% | | |
| 5. The quality of overall research in my department | Black | 54 | 2.78 | 1.53 | 26% | 31% | 24% | 19% | 43% | | |
| | Other | 42 | 2.88 | 1.45 | 19% | 36% | 29% | 17% | 45% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 3.86 | 1.35 | 14% | 0% | 57% | 29% | 86% | | |
| 6. The quality of faculty service to the institution in my department | Black | 56 | 3.66 | 1.18 | 4% | 23% | 50% | 23% | 73% | | |
| | Other | 47 | 4.00 | 0.88 | 0% | 13% | 62% | 26% | 87% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 3.71 | 1.25 | 0% | 29% | 43% | 29% | 71% | | |
| 7. The quality of administrative leadership in my department | Black | 57 | 3.28 | 1.40 | 16% | 21% | 46% | 18% | 63% | | |
| | Other | 48 | 3.67 | 1.36 | 10% | 17% | 42% | 31% | 73% | | |
| | Blank | 8 | 3.38 | 1.51 | 13% | 25% | 38% | 25% | 63% | | |
| 8. The quality of administrative leadership in my school | Black | 57 | 3.42 | 1.36 | 11% | 25% | 42% | 23% | 65% | | |
| | Other | 47 | 3.55 | 1.40 | 17% | 9% | 51% | 23% | 74% | | |
| | Blank | 8 | 2.75 | 1.39 | 13% | 50% | 25% | 13% | 38% | | |
| 9. The quality of leadership from the campus administration | Black | 57 | 3.39 | 1.29 | 12% | 19% | 54% | 14% | 68% | | |
| | Other | 48 | 3.10 | 1.40 | 21% | 19% | 50% | 10% | 60% | | |
| | Blank | 9 | 2.78 | 1.20 | 11% | 44% | 44% | 0% | 44% | | |
| 10. Faculty morale in my department | Black | 57 | 3.44 | 1.45 | 16% | 18% | 40% | 26% | 67% | | |
| | Other | 49 | 3.55 | 1.40 | 12% | 18% | 41% | 29% | 69% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 3.00 | 1.63 | 14% | 43% | 14% | 29% | 43% | | |

APPENDIX D: DIFFERENCES BY RACE

| Questions | RACE | N | 2008 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | ANOVA | |
|--|-------|----|-----------|------|------|------|------|-----------|-----|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | F | p |
| 11. Faculty development opportunities | Black | 54 | 3.57 | 1.45 | 9% | 26% | 28% | 37% | 65% | | |
| | Other | 48 | 3.56 | 1.34 | 6% | 27% | 38% | 29% | 67% | | |
| | Blank | 4 | 3.50 | 1.00 | 0% | 25% | 75% | 0% | 75% | | |
| 12. Technology support | Black | 58 | 3.78 | 1.31 | 5% | 22% | 34% | 38% | 72% | | |
| | Other | 48 | 3.50 | 1.34 | 6% | 29% | 38% | 27% | 65% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 3.86 | 1.35 | 0% | 29% | 29% | 43% | 71% | | |
| 13. The use of my time spent on committees and task forces | Black | 56 | 3.91 | 1.15 | 2% | 20% | 43% | 36% | 79% | | |
| | Other | 47 | 3.91 | 1.16 | 2% | 19% | 43% | 36% | 79% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 3.40 | 1.34 | 0% | 40% | 40% | 20% | 60% | | |
| 14. My overall workload | Black | 58 | 3.69 | 1.34 | 10% | 16% | 43% | 31% | 74% | | |
| | Other | 48 | 3.81 | 1.25 | 4% | 21% | 40% | 35% | 75% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 3.86 | 1.35 | 0% | 29% | 29% | 43% | 71% | | |
| 15. Administrative support for faculty | Black | 56 | 3.32 | 1.42 | 14% | 23% | 41% | 21% | 63% | | |
| | Other | 48 | 3.15 | 1.57 | 21% | 25% | 27% | 27% | 54% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 3.60 | 1.52 | 20% | 0% | 60% | 20% | 80% | | |
| 16. Academic freedom at the university | Black | 51 | 3.78 | 1.24 | 10% | 10% | 53% | 27% | 80% | | |
| | Other | 47 | 3.62 | 1.57 | 15% | 19% | 21% | 45% | 66% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 3.60 | 1.52 | 20% | 0% | 60% | 20% | 80% | | |
| 17. My overall job satisfaction | Black | 58 | 3.78 | 1.35 | 9% | 17% | 36% | 38% | 74% | | |
| | Other | 49 | 3.90 | 1.33 | 8% | 14% | 35% | 43% | 78% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 3.29 | 1.60 | 14% | 29% | 29% | 29% | 57% | | |
| 18. The academic preparedness of students | Black | 56 | 3.46 | 1.33 | 5% | 32% | 36% | 27% | 63% | | |
| | Other | 48 | 3.21 | 1.46 | 10% | 38% | 25% | 27% | 52% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 3.00 | 1.41 | 0% | 60% | 20% | 20% | 40% | | |
| 19. The study skills of students | Black | 56 | 2.86 | 1.33 | 11% | 48% | 27% | 14% | 41% | | |
| | Other | 48 | 3.04 | 1.43 | 10% | 44% | 23% | 23% | 46% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 2.50 | 1.22 | 0% | 83% | 0% | 17% | 17% | | |
| 20. The conduct of students in the classroom | Black | 55 | 3.75 | 1.16 | 4% | 20% | 51% | 25% | 76% | | |
| | Other | 47 | 3.79 | 1.30 | 4% | 23% | 34% | 38% | 72% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 3.83 | 1.47 | 0% | 33% | 17% | 50% | 67% | | |
| 21. The quality of student academic support programs and services, such as mentoring, tutoring, etc. | Black | 54 | 3.74 | 1.22 | 4% | 22% | 44% | 30% | 74% | | |
| | Other | 41 | 3.88 | 1.29 | 2% | 24% | 29% | 44% | 73% | | |
| | Blank | 4 | 3.25 | 1.50 | 0% | 50% | 25% | 25% | 50% | | |

APPENDIX D: DIFFERENCES BY RACE

| Questions | RACE | N | 2008 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | ANOVA | |
|--|-------|----|-----------|------|------|------|------|-----------|-----|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | F | p |
| 22. The quality of academic advising students receive | Black | 55 | 3.95 | 1.13 | 4% | 15% | 47% | 35% | 82% | | |
| | Other | 43 | 4.02 | 1.08 | 0% | 19% | 42% | 40% | 81% | | |
| | Blank | 4 | 3.50 | 1.73 | 0% | 50% | 0% | 50% | 50% | | |
| 23. The quality of graduates Langston University produces | Black | 56 | 4.25 | 0.92 | 0% | 11% | 43% | 46% | 89% | | |
| | Other | 48 | 4.25 | 0.91 | 0% | 10% | 44% | 46% | 90% | | |
| | Blank | 4 | 4.00 | 1.41 | 0% | 25% | 25% | 50% | 75% | | |
| 24. Collaboration with other faculty members on research | Black | 50 | 3.12 | 1.36 | 12% | 34% | 38% | 16% | 54% | | |
| | Other | 41 | 3.54 | 1.42 | 10% | 24% | 34% | 32% | 66% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 3.67 | 1.37 | 0% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 67% | | |
| 25. Freedom to pursue research areas of interest | Black | 52 | 3.88 | 1.32 | 12% | 8% | 42% | 38% | 81% | | |
| | Other | 44 | 3.84 | 1.33 | 11% | 9% | 43% | 36% | 80% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 4.33 | 1.21 | 0% | 17% | 17% | 67% | 83% | | |
| 26. Administrative support for research | Black | 47 | 3.15 | 1.60 | 23% | 21% | 28% | 28% | 55% | | |
| | Other | 44 | 3.14 | 1.50 | 20% | 23% | 36% | 20% | 57% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 3.33 | 1.86 | 33% | 0% | 33% | 33% | 67% | | |
| 27. Compensation structure for performing externally funded research | Black | 41 | 2.41 | 1.28 | 24% | 46% | 22% | 7% | 29% | | |
| | Other | 35 | 2.66 | 1.49 | 29% | 31% | 26% | 14% | 40% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 1.60 | 0.55 | 40% | 60% | 0% | 0% | 0% | | |
| 28. University resources for applying for research grants | Black | 45 | 2.91 | 1.47 | 20% | 33% | 29% | 18% | 47% | | |
| | Other | 42 | 2.88 | 1.45 | 24% | 26% | 38% | 12% | 50% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 2.50 | 1.64 | 33% | 33% | 17% | 17% | 33% | | |
| 29. Research submission process | Black | 46 | 3.13 | 1.44 | 13% | 35% | 30% | 22% | 52% | | |
| | Other | 37 | 3.00 | 1.51 | 22% | 27% | 32% | 19% | 51% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 2.80 | 1.64 | 20% | 40% | 20% | 20% | 40% | | |
| 30. University oversight of grants | Black | 45 | 3.07 | 1.40 | 13% | 36% | 33% | 18% | 51% | | |
| | Other | 35 | 2.97 | 1.44 | 20% | 29% | 37% | 14% | 51% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 3.00 | 1.90 | 33% | 17% | 17% | 33% | 50% | | |
| 31. Rewards and recognition for teaching | Black | 50 | 3.30 | 1.40 | 12% | 28% | 38% | 22% | 60% | | |
| | Other | 40 | 3.08 | 1.53 | 23% | 23% | 35% | 20% | 55% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 2.00 | 1.22 | 40% | 40% | 20% | 0% | 20% | | |

APPENDIX D: DIFFERENCES BY RACE

| Questions | RACE | N | 2008 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | ANOVA | |
|---|--------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | F | p |
| 32. Rewards and recognition for research and scholarly activity | Black | 46 | 3.17 | 1.43 | 17% | 24% | 41% | 17% | 59% | 3.169 | 0.047 |
| | Other | 34 | 2.71 | 1.43 | 24% | 35% | 29% | 12% | 41% | | |
| | Blank | 4 | 1.50 | 0.58 | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | | |
| 33. Rewards and recognition for institutional service | Black | 43 | 3.12 | 1.37 | 19% | 21% | 51% | 9% | 60% | | |
| | Other | 35 | 3.06 | 1.53 | 23% | 23% | 34% | 20% | 54% | | |
| | Blank | 4 | 1.50 | 0.58 | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | | |
| 34. The tenure process is clearly defined | Black | 51 | 2.73 | 1.31 | 16% | 45% | 29% | 10% | 39% | | |
| | Other | 45 | 2.96 | 1.43 | 18% | 33% | 33% | 16% | 49% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 2.60 | 1.82 | 40% | 20% | 20% | 20% | 40% | | |
| 35. The processes and criteria used to make tenure decisions are evenly applied | Black | 50 | 3.16 | 1.40 | 16% | 26% | 42% | 16% | 58% | | |
| | Other | 42 | 3.17 | 1.45 | 17% | 26% | 38% | 19% | 57% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 2.00 | 1.55 | 50% | 33% | 0% | 17% | 17% | | |
| 36. The criteria used to make tenure decisions are fair | Black | 52 | 2.94 | 1.38 | 17% | 33% | 38% | 12% | 50% | | |
| | Other | 45 | 3.00 | 1.43 | 16% | 36% | 31% | 18% | 49% | | |
| | Blank | 4 | 2.00 | 1.41 | 50% | 25% | 25% | 0% | 25% | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

APPENDIX E: DIFFERENCES BY CAMPUS

| Questions | Campus | N | 2008 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | ANOVA | |
|---|--------|----|-----------|------|------|------|------|-----------|------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | F | p |
| 1. The academic reputation of Langston University In Oklahoma | Main | 91 | 2.81 | 1.26 | 14% | 41% | 40% | 5% | 45% | | |
| | OKC | 8 | 4.00 | 0.93 | 0% | 13% | 63% | 25% | 88% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 2.86 | 1.07 | 0% | 57% | 43% | 0% | 43% | | |
| | Blank | 10 | 2.60 | 1.51 | 30% | 30% | 30% | 10% | 40% | | |
| 2. The academic reputation of Langston University nationally | Main | 87 | 2.91 | 1.24 | 13% | 38% | 45% | 5% | 49% | | |
| | OKC | 7 | 4.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 100% | | |
| | TULSA | 6 | 2.67 | 1.03 | 0% | 67% | 33% | 0% | 33% | | |
| | Blank | 9 | 2.89 | 1.05 | 0% | 56% | 44% | 0% | 44% | | |
| 3. The national reputation of my program (discipline) | Main | 81 | 3.40 | 1.31 | 10% | 25% | 47% | 19% | 65% | | |
| | OKC | 7 | 4.43 | 1.13 | 0% | 14% | 14% | 71% | 86% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 4.00 | 1.00 | 0% | 14% | 57% | 29% | 86% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 3.86 | 0.90 | 0% | 14% | 71% | 14% | 86% | | |
| 4. The quality of overall teaching in my department | Main | 88 | 3.91 | 0.97 | 2% | 13% | 63% | 23% | 85% | | |
| | OKC | 8 | 4.38 | 0.52 | 0% | 0% | 63% | 38% | 100% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 4.43 | 0.53 | 0% | 0% | 57% | 43% | 100% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 4.29 | 0.49 | 0% | 0% | 71% | 29% | 100% | | |
| 5. The quality of overall research in my department | Main | 83 | 2.81 | 1.45 | 23% | 33% | 30% | 14% | 45% | | |
| | OKC | 7 | 3.57 | 1.81 | 14% | 29% | 0% | 57% | 57% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 2.71 | 1.60 | 29% | 29% | 29% | 14% | 43% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 3.50 | 1.64 | 17% | 17% | 33% | 33% | 67% | | |
| 6. The quality of faculty service to the institution in my department | Main | 88 | 3.80 | 1.06 | 1% | 20% | 55% | 24% | 78% | | |
| | OKC | 8 | 4.13 | 0.99 | 0% | 13% | 50% | 38% | 88% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 3.86 | 0.90 | 0% | 14% | 71% | 14% | 86% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 3.57 | 1.51 | 14% | 14% | 43% | 29% | 71% | | |
| 7. The quality of administrative leadership in my department | Main | 90 | 3.33 | 1.38 | 14% | 21% | 46% | 19% | 64% | | |
| | OKC | 8 | 4.25 | 1.39 | 13% | 0% | 25% | 63% | 88% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 3.57 | 1.51 | 14% | 14% | 43% | 29% | 71% | | |
| | Blank | 8 | 3.88 | 1.25 | 0% | 25% | 38% | 38% | 75% | | |
| 8. The quality of administrative leadership in my school | Main | 90 | 3.40 | 1.39 | 14% | 19% | 46% | 21% | 67% | | |
| | OKC | 7 | 4.14 | 1.07 | 0% | 14% | 43% | 43% | 86% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 3.43 | 1.40 | 14% | 14% | 57% | 14% | 71% | | |
| | Blank | 8 | 3.13 | 1.55 | 13% | 38% | 25% | 25% | 50% | | |

APPENDIX E: DIFFERENCES BY CAMPUS

| Questions | | N | 2008 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | ANOVA | |
|---|--------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | F | p |
| 9. The quality of leadership from the campus administration | Main | 90 | 3.20 | 1.31 | 16% | 21% | 54% | 9% | 63% | | |
| | OKC | 8 | 4.13 | 1.36 | 13% | 0% | 38% | 50% | 88% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 2.71 | 1.60 | 29% | 29% | 29% | 14% | 43% | | |
| | Blank | 9 | 3.00 | 1.22 | 11% | 33% | 56% | 0% | 56% | | |
| 10. Faculty morale in my department | Main | 91 | 3.31 | 1.44 | 16% | 21% | 41% | 22% | 63% | | |
| | OKC | 8 | 4.25 | 1.04 | 0% | 13% | 38% | 50% | 88% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 4.14 | 1.46 | 14% | 0% | 29% | 57% | 86% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 3.86 | 1.35 | 0% | 29% | 29% | 43% | 71% | | |
| 11. Faculty development opportunities | Main | 86 | 3.58 | 1.34 | 7% | 26% | 37% | 30% | 67% | 2.705 | 0.049 |
| | OKC | 8 | 4.50 | 1.07 | 0% | 13% | 13% | 75% | 88% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 2.57 | 1.40 | 14% | 57% | 14% | 14% | 29% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 3.20 | 1.64 | 20% | 20% | 40% | 20% | 60% | | |
| 12. Technology support | Main | 92 | 3.51 | 1.35 | 7% | 29% | 35% | 29% | 64% | | |
| | OKC | 8 | 4.13 | 0.99 | 0% | 13% | 50% | 38% | 88% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 4.71 | 0.49 | 0% | 0% | 29% | 71% | 100% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 4.17 | 1.17 | 0% | 17% | 33% | 50% | 83% | | |
| 13. The use of my time spent on committees and task forces | Main | 88 | 3.80 | 1.19 | 2% | 23% | 43% | 32% | 75% | | |
| | OKC | 8 | 4.13 | 0.99 | 0% | 13% | 50% | 38% | 88% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 4.71 | 0.49 | 0% | 0% | 29% | 71% | 100% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 4.00 | 1.22 | 0% | 20% | 40% | 40% | 80% | | |
| 14. My overall workload | Main | 91 | 3.66 | 1.32 | 9% | 19% | 43% | 30% | 73% | | |
| | OKC | 8 | 4.25 | 1.04 | 0% | 13% | 38% | 50% | 88% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 3.86 | 1.35 | 0% | 29% | 29% | 43% | 71% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 4.29 | 1.11 | 0% | 14% | 29% | 57% | 86% | | |
| 15. Administrative support for faculty | Main | 89 | 3.18 | 1.45 | 18% | 24% | 39% | 19% | 58% | | |
| | OKC | 8 | 4.50 | 1.07 | 0% | 13% | 13% | 75% | 88% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 2.86 | 1.77 | 29% | 29% | 14% | 29% | 43% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 3.20 | 1.64 | 20% | 20% | 40% | 20% | 60% | | |
| 16. Academic freedom at the university | Main | 84 | 3.61 | 1.41 | 14% | 13% | 43% | 30% | 73% | | |
| | OKC | 8 | 4.50 | 1.07 | 0% | 13% | 13% | 75% | 88% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 3.86 | 1.68 | 14% | 14% | 14% | 57% | 71% | | |
| | Blank | 4 | 3.75 | 1.26 | 0% | 25% | 50% | 25% | 75% | | |
| 17. My overall job satisfaction | Main | 92 | 3.70 | 1.36 | 10% | 17% | 39% | 34% | 73% | | |
| | OKC | 8 | 4.50 | 1.07 | 0% | 13% | 13% | 75% | 88% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 4.29 | 1.50 | 14% | 0% | 14% | 71% | 86% | | |
| | Blank | 7 | 3.86 | 1.35 | 0% | 29% | 29% | 43% | 71% | | |

APPENDIX E: DIFFERENCES BY CAMPUS

| Questions | | N | 2008 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | ANOVA | |
|--|-------|----|-----------|------|------|------|------|-----------|------|-------|-------|
| | | | | | | | | | | F | p |
| 18. The academic preparedness of students | Main | 89 | 3.12 | 1.37 | 9% | 40% | 30% | 20% | 51% | 4.494 | 0.005 |
| | OKC | 8 | 4.38 | 0.52 | 0% | 0% | 63% | 38% | 100% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 4.57 | 1.13 | 0% | 14% | 0% | 86% | 86% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 3.60 | 1.52 | 0% | 40% | 20% | 40% | 60% | | |
| 19. The study skills of students | Main | 89 | 2.75 | 1.32 | 12% | 51% | 24% | 13% | 37% | 3.077 | 0.031 |
| | OKC | 8 | 3.75 | 1.16 | 0% | 25% | 50% | 25% | 75% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 4.00 | 1.41 | 0% | 29% | 14% | 57% | 71% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 3.00 | 1.55 | 0% | 67% | 0% | 33% | 33% | | |
| 20. The conduct of students in the classroom | Main | 88 | 3.61 | 1.26 | 5% | 26% | 42% | 27% | 69% | 2.756 | 0.046 |
| | OKC | 7 | 4.29 | 0.49 | 0% | 0% | 71% | 29% | 100% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 4.43 | 1.13 | 0% | 14% | 14% | 71% | 86% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 4.67 | 0.52 | 0% | 0% | 33% | 67% | 100% | | |
| 21. The quality of student academic support programs and services, such as mentoring, tutoring, etc. | Main | 82 | 3.67 | 1.28 | 4% | 27% | 38% | 32% | 70% | | |
| | OKC | 6 | 4.50 | 0.55 | 0% | 0% | 50% | 50% | 100% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 4.29 | 1.11 | 0% | 14% | 29% | 57% | 86% | | |
| | Blank | 4 | 4.00 | 1.41 | 0% | 25% | 25% | 50% | 75% | | |
| 22. The quality of academic advising students receive | Main | 83 | 3.88 | 1.15 | 2% | 19% | 45% | 34% | 78% | | |
| | OKC | 7 | 3.86 | 0.90 | 0% | 14% | 71% | 14% | 86% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 4.71 | 0.49 | 0% | 0% | 29% | 71% | 100% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 4.40 | 1.34 | 0% | 20% | 0% | 80% | 80% | | |
| 23. The quality of graduates Langston University produces | Main | 89 | 4.15 | 0.97 | 0% | 13% | 45% | 42% | 87% | | |
| | OKC | 8 | 4.50 | 0.53 | 0% | 0% | 50% | 50% | 100% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 4.86 | 0.38 | 0% | 0% | 14% | 86% | 100% | | |
| | Blank | 4 | 4.75 | 0.50 | 0% | 0% | 25% | 75% | 100% | | |
| 24. Collaboration with other faculty members on research | Main | 77 | 3.27 | 1.37 | 12% | 29% | 40% | 19% | 60% | | |
| | OKC | 7 | 4.00 | 1.41 | 0% | 29% | 14% | 57% | 71% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 2.57 | 1.40 | 14% | 57% | 14% | 14% | 29% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 4.17 | 1.17 | 0% | 17% | 33% | 50% | 83% | | |
| 25. Freedom to pursue research areas of interest | Main | 81 | 3.88 | 1.29 | 11% | 7% | 46% | 36% | 81% | | |
| | OKC | 8 | 4.63 | 0.52 | 0% | 0% | 38% | 63% | 100% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 2.86 | 1.77 | 29% | 29% | 14% | 29% | 43% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 4.33 | 1.21 | 0% | 17% | 17% | 67% | 83% | | |

APPENDIX E: DIFFERENCES BY CAMPUS

| Questions | | N | 2008 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | ANOVA | |
|---|--------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | F | p |
| 26. Administrative support for research | Main | 78 | 3.13 | 1.55 | 23% | 21% | 33% | 23% | 56% | | |
| | OKC | 6 | 4.00 | 1.10 | 0% | 17% | 50% | 33% | 83% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 2.86 | 1.77 | 29% | 29% | 14% | 29% | 43% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 3.00 | 1.90 | 33% | 17% | 17% | 33% | 50% | | |
| 27. Compensation structure for performing externally funded research | Main | 65 | 2.45 | 1.33 | 28% | 40% | 25% | 8% | 32% | 4.251 | 0.008 |
| | OKC | 7 | 3.86 | 1.35 | 0% | 29% | 29% | 43% | 71% | | |
| | TULSA | 5 | 1.60 | 0.55 | 40% | 60% | 0% | 0% | 0% | | |
| | Blank | 4 | 1.50 | 0.58 | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | | |
| 28. University resources for applying for research grants | Main | 74 | 2.80 | 1.44 | 24% | 30% | 34% | 12% | 46% | 2.952 | 0.037 |
| | OKC | 6 | 4.50 | 0.55 | 0% | 0% | 50% | 50% | 100% | | |
| | TULSA | 7 | 2.57 | 1.40 | 14% | 57% | 14% | 14% | 29% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 2.50 | 1.64 | 33% | 33% | 17% | 17% | 33% | | |
| 29. Research submission process | Main | 72 | 2.90 | 1.44 | 18% | 36% | 29% | 17% | 46% | 2.859 | 0.042 |
| | OKC | 6 | 4.50 | 0.55 | 0% | 0% | 50% | 50% | 100% | | |
| | TULSA | 5 | 3.80 | 1.64 | 20% | 0% | 40% | 40% | 80% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 2.80 | 1.64 | 20% | 40% | 20% | 20% | 40% | | |
| 30. University oversight of grants | Main | 69 | 2.90 | 1.41 | 19% | 33% | 35% | 13% | 48% | 3.105 | 0.030 |
| | OKC | 6 | 4.17 | 1.17 | 0% | 17% | 33% | 50% | 83% | | |
| | TULSA | 6 | 3.50 | 1.64 | 17% | 17% | 33% | 33% | 67% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 2.80 | 1.64 | 20% | 40% | 20% | 20% | 40% | | |
| 31. Rewards and recognition for teaching | Main | 78 | 3.08 | 1.42 | 17% | 29% | 37% | 17% | 54% | | |
| | OKC | 6 | 4.50 | 0.55 | 0% | 0% | 50% | 50% | 100% | | |
| | TULSA | 6 | 3.50 | 1.97 | 33% | 0% | 17% | 50% | 67% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 2.00 | 1.22 | 40% | 40% | 20% | 0% | 20% | | |
| 32. Rewards and recognition for research and scholarly activity | Main | 73 | 2.89 | 1.40 | 21% | 30% | 38% | 11% | 49% | | |
| | OKC | 5 | 4.20 | 1.30 | 0% | 20% | 20% | 60% | 80% | | |
| | TULSA | 3 | 2.33 | 2.31 | 67% | 0% | 0% | 33% | 33% | | |
| | Blank | 3 | 1.67 | 0.58 | 33% | 67% | 0% | 0% | 0% | | |
| 33. Rewards and recognition for institutional service | Main | 69 | 2.96 | 1.41 | 23% | 22% | 46% | 9% | 55% | | |
| | OKC | 6 | 4.17 | 1.17 | 0% | 17% | 33% | 50% | 83% | | |
| | TULSA | 4 | 3.25 | 2.06 | 25% | 25% | 0% | 50% | 50% | | |
| | Blank | 3 | 1.67 | 0.58 | 33% | 67% | 0% | 0% | 0% | | |

APPENDIX E: DIFFERENCES BY CAMPUS

| Questions | | N | 2008 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | ANOVA | |
|---|-------|----|-----------|------|------|------|------|-----------|-----|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | F | p |
| 34. The tenure process is clearly defined | Main | 82 | 2.70 | 1.33 | 20% | 40% | 32% | 9% | 40% | | |
| | OKC | 7 | 4.00 | 1.00 | 0% | 14% | 57% | 29% | 86% | | |
| | TULSA | 6 | 2.83 | 1.72 | 17% | 50% | 0% | 33% | 33% | | |
| | Blank | 6 | 3.17 | 1.72 | 17% | 33% | 17% | 33% | 50% | | |
| 35. The processes and criteria used to make tenure decisions are evenly applied | Main | 82 | 3.01 | 1.42 | 20% | 27% | 40% | 13% | 54% | | |
| | OKC | 7 | 4.00 | 1.00 | 0% | 14% | 57% | 29% | 86% | | |
| | TULSA | 4 | 3.25 | 2.06 | 25% | 25% | 0% | 50% | 50% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 3.00 | 1.87 | 20% | 40% | 0% | 40% | 40% | | |
| 36. The criteria used to make tenure decisions are fair | Main | 83 | 2.86 | 1.38 | 19% | 34% | 36% | 11% | 47% | | |
| | OKC | 7 | 4.00 | 1.00 | 0% | 14% | 57% | 29% | 86% | | |
| | TULSA | 6 | 2.83 | 1.72 | 17% | 50% | 0% | 33% | 33% | | |
| | Blank | 5 | 2.80 | 1.64 | 20% | 40% | 20% | 20% | 40% | | |

(This Page Intentionally Left Blank)

APPENDIX F: DIFFERENCES BY ACADEMIC RANK

| Questions | RANK | N | 2008 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | ANOVA | |
|--|--------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | F | p |
| 1. The academic reputation of Langston University In Oklahoma | PROF | 11 | 2.91 | 1.51 | 18% | 36% | 27% | 18% | 45% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 3.14 | 1.03 | 0% | 43% | 57% | 0% | 57% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 23 | 3.09 | 1.20 | 9% | 35% | 52% | 4% | 57% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 19 | 3.05 | 1.31 | 16% | 26% | 53% | 5% | 58% | | |
| | BLANK | 49 | 2.63 | 1.30 | 18% | 45% | 29% | 8% | 37% | | |
| 2. The academic reputation of Langston University nationally | PROF | 11 | 3.09 | 1.51 | 18% | 27% | 36% | 18% | 55% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 13 | 2.69 | 1.11 | 8% | 54% | 38% | 0% | 38% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 20 | 3.35 | 1.04 | 0% | 35% | 60% | 5% | 65% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 18 | 3.00 | 1.33 | 22% | 17% | 61% | 0% | 61% | | |
| | BLANK | 47 | 2.83 | 1.15 | 9% | 47% | 43% | 2% | 45% | | |
| 3. The national reputation of my program (discipline) | PROF | 9 | 4.00 | 1.22 | 0% | 22% | 33% | 44% | 78% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 3.64 | 1.15 | 0% | 29% | 50% | 21% | 71% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 21 | 3.67 | 1.28 | 10% | 14% | 52% | 24% | 76% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 14 | 3.50 | 1.22 | 7% | 21% | 57% | 14% | 71% | | |
| | BLANK | 44 | 3.36 | 1.37 | 11% | 25% | 43% | 20% | 64% | | |
| 4. The quality of overall teaching in my department | PROF | 11 | 4.00 | 1.10 | 0% | 18% | 45% | 36% | 82% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 4.07 | 0.73 | 0% | 7% | 71% | 21% | 93% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 23 | 4.35 | 0.71 | 0% | 4% | 52% | 43% | 96% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 18 | 3.83 | 1.10 | 6% | 11% | 61% | 22% | 83% | | |
| | BLANK | 44 | 3.86 | 0.90 | 2% | 11% | 70% | 16% | 86% | | |
| 5. The quality of overall research in my department | PROF | 11 | 2.91 | 1.30 | 0% | 64% | 18% | 18% | 36% | 2.932 | 0.025 |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 2.71 | 1.38 | 14% | 50% | 21% | 14% | 36% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 21 | 3.76 | 1.45 | 14% | 10% | 38% | 38% | 76% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 17 | 3.00 | 1.41 | 18% | 29% | 41% | 12% | 53% | | |
| | BLANK | 40 | 2.45 | 1.50 | 38% | 28% | 23% | 13% | 35% | | |
| 6. The quality of faculty service to the institution in my department | PROF | 11 | 3.73 | 1.19 | 0% | 27% | 45% | 27% | 73% | 2.651 | 0.037 |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 4.00 | 0.68 | 0% | 7% | 79% | 14% | 93% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 23 | 4.26 | 0.86 | 0% | 9% | 48% | 43% | 91% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 18 | 4.00 | 0.59 | 0% | 6% | 83% | 11% | 94% | | |
| | BLANK | 44 | 3.45 | 1.28 | 5% | 32% | 41% | 23% | 64% | | |

APPENDIX F: DIFFERENCES BY ACADEMIC RANK

| Questions | RANK | N | 2008 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | ANOVA | |
|---|-------------|----|-----------|------|------|------|------|-----------|-----|-------|-------|
| | | | | | | | | | | F | p |
| 7. The quality of administrative leadership in my department | PROF | 11 | 3.27 | 1.49 | 18% | 18% | 45% | 18% | 64% | 5.104 | 0.001 |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 3.86 | 0.86 | 0% | 14% | 71% | 14% | 86% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 22 | 4.00 | 0.93 | 0% | 14% | 59% | 27% | 86% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 19 | 4.11 | 1.20 | 5% | 11% | 37% | 47% | 84% | | |
| | BLANK | 47 | 2.85 | 1.52 | 26% | 28% | 30% | 17% | 47% | | |
| 8. The quality of administrative leadership in my school | PROF | 11 | 4.00 | 1.10 | 0% | 18% | 45% | 36% | 82% | 5.934 | 0.000 |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 3.64 | 0.93 | 0% | 21% | 71% | 7% | 79% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 23 | 3.96 | 1.02 | 4% | 9% | 61% | 26% | 87% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 18 | 4.00 | 1.19 | 6% | 11% | 44% | 39% | 83% | | |
| | BLANK | 46 | 2.74 | 1.51 | 28% | 28% | 28% | 15% | 43% | | |
| 9. The quality of leadership from the campus administration | PROF | 11 | 3.64 | 1.36 | 9% | 18% | 45% | 27% | 73% | 8.069 | 0.000 |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 3.86 | 1.10 | 7% | 7% | 64% | 21% | 86% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 22 | 3.77 | 0.75 | 0% | 14% | 82% | 5% | 86% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 18 | 3.78 | 0.88 | 0% | 17% | 72% | 11% | 83% | | |
| | BLANK | 49 | 2.49 | 1.42 | 33% | 31% | 29% | 8% | 37% | | |
| 10. Faculty morale in my department | PROF | 11 | 3.64 | 1.12 | 0% | 27% | 55% | 18% | 73% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 3.79 | 1.05 | 7% | 7% | 71% | 14% | 86% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 23 | 3.52 | 1.08 | 4% | 22% | 65% | 9% | 74% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 19 | 3.63 | 1.07 | 0% | 26% | 58% | 16% | 74% | | |
| | BLANK | 46 | 3.22 | 1.84 | 30% | 17% | 4% | 48% | 52% | | |
| 11. Faculty development opportunities | PROF | 11 | 3.91 | 1.30 | 0% | 27% | 27% | 45% | 73% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 3.36 | 1.08 | 0% | 36% | 57% | 7% | 64% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 23 | 3.74 | 1.14 | 0% | 26% | 48% | 26% | 74% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 18 | 3.72 | 1.02 | 0% | 22% | 61% | 17% | 78% | | |
| | BLANK | 40 | 3.38 | 1.72 | 20% | 25% | 8% | 48% | 55% | | |
| 12. Technology support | PROF | 11 | 4.18 | 0.87 | 0% | 9% | 55% | 36% | 91% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 3.50 | 1.02 | 0% | 29% | 64% | 7% | 71% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 23 | 3.78 | 1.04 | 0% | 22% | 57% | 22% | 78% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 19 | 3.16 | 1.17 | 5% | 37% | 53% | 5% | 58% | | |
| | BLANK | 46 | 3.74 | 1.61 | 11% | 26% | 4% | 59% | 63% | | |

APPENDIX F: DIFFERENCES BY ACADEMIC RANK

| Questions | RANK | N | 2008 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | ANOVA | |
|--|-------------|----|-----------|------|------|------|------|-----------|-----|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | F | p |
| 13. The use of my time spent on committees and task forces | PROF | 11 | 3.45 | 1.21 | 0% | 36% | 45% | 18% | 64% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 13 | 3.62 | 0.96 | 0% | 23% | 69% | 8% | 77% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 23 | 3.83 | 0.94 | 0% | 17% | 65% | 17% | 83% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 18 | 3.61 | 0.92 | 6% | 11% | 83% | 0% | 83% | | |
| | BLANK | 43 | 4.23 | 1.32 | 2% | 21% | 5% | 72% | 77% | | |
| 14. My overall workload | PROF | 11 | 3.55 | 1.29 | 9% | 18% | 55% | 18% | 73% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 3.43 | 1.16 | 7% | 21% | 64% | 7% | 71% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 22 | 3.50 | 1.34 | 14% | 14% | 55% | 18% | 73% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 19 | 3.63 | 0.90 | 5% | 11% | 84% | 0% | 84% | | |
| | BLANK | 47 | 4.06 | 1.42 | 4% | 23% | 6% | 66% | 72% | | |
| 15. Administrative support for faculty | PROF | 11 | 3.36 | 1.36 | 9% | 27% | 45% | 18% | 64% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 3.29 | 1.38 | 14% | 21% | 50% | 14% | 64% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 23 | 3.48 | 1.16 | 4% | 26% | 57% | 13% | 70% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 19 | 3.42 | 1.30 | 11% | 21% | 53% | 16% | 68% | | |
| | BLANK | 42 | 3.02 | 1.77 | 31% | 21% | 10% | 38% | 48% | | |
| 16. Academic freedom at the university | PROF | 10 | 3.70 | 1.25 | 10% | 10% | 60% | 20% | 80% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 3.93 | 0.92 | 0% | 14% | 64% | 21% | 86% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 22 | 4.09 | 0.97 | 5% | 5% | 59% | 32% | 91% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 19 | 3.84 | 1.21 | 5% | 16% | 47% | 32% | 79% | | |
| | BLANK | 38 | 3.32 | 1.79 | 26% | 18% | 8% | 47% | 55% | | |
| 17. My overall job satisfaction | PROF | 11 | 4.00 | 1.10 | 0% | 18% | 45% | 36% | 82% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 4.00 | 0.96 | 0% | 14% | 57% | 29% | 86% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 23 | 3.87 | 0.97 | 0% | 17% | 61% | 22% | 83% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 19 | 4.00 | 1.00 | 0% | 16% | 53% | 32% | 84% | | |
| | BLANK | 47 | 3.57 | 1.74 | 21% | 17% | 6% | 55% | 62% | | |
| 18. The academic preparedness of students | PROF | 10 | 3.70 | 0.95 | 0% | 20% | 70% | 10% | 80% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 3.57 | 1.09 | 0% | 29% | 57% | 14% | 71% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 23 | 2.70 | 1.33 | 17% | 43% | 30% | 9% | 39% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 19 | 3.11 | 1.24 | 11% | 32% | 53% | 5% | 58% | | |
| | BLANK | 43 | 3.60 | 1.56 | 5% | 40% | 2% | 53% | 56% | | |
| 19. The study skills of students | PROF | 10 | 2.80 | 1.03 | 0% | 60% | 40% | 0% | 40% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 2.93 | 1.14 | 7% | 43% | 50% | 0% | 50% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 23 | 2.43 | 1.12 | 17% | 52% | 30% | 0% | 30% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 19 | 2.68 | 1.20 | 16% | 42% | 42% | 0% | 42% | | |
| | BLANK | 44 | 3.30 | 1.59 | 7% | 48% | 0% | 45% | 45% | | |

APPENDIX F: DIFFERENCES BY ACADEMIC RANK

| Questions | RANK | N | 2008 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | ANOVA | |
|--|--------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | F | p |
| 20. The conduct of students in the classroom | PROF | 10 | 4.10 | 0.32 | 0% | 0% | 90% | 10% | 100% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 3.64 | 0.93 | 0% | 21% | 71% | 7% | 79% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 23 | 3.61 | 1.16 | 4% | 22% | 57% | 17% | 74% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 18 | 3.44 | 1.25 | 11% | 17% | 61% | 11% | 72% | | |
| | BLANK | 43 | 3.95 | 1.45 | 2% | 30% | 5% | 63% | 67% | | |
| 21. The quality of student academic support programs and services, such as mentoring, tutoring, etc. | PROF | 9 | 3.89 | 1.17 | 0% | 22% | 44% | 33% | 78% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 3.36 | 1.08 | 0% | 36% | 57% | 7% | 64% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 20 | 3.70 | 1.08 | 0% | 25% | 55% | 20% | 75% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 15 | 3.53 | 0.99 | 7% | 13% | 80% | 0% | 80% | | |
| | BLANK | 41 | 4.02 | 1.46 | 5% | 24% | 5% | 66% | 71% | | |
| 22. The quality of academic advising students receive | PROF | 10 | 4.00 | 0.82 | 0% | 10% | 70% | 20% | 90% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 3.64 | 0.93 | 0% | 21% | 71% | 7% | 79% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 21 | 4.29 | 0.46 | 0% | 0% | 71% | 29% | 100% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 16 | 3.50 | 0.89 | 0% | 25% | 75% | 0% | 75% | | |
| | BLANK | 41 | 4.07 | 1.47 | 5% | 24% | 0% | 71% | 71% | | |
| 23. The quality of graduates Langston University produces | PROF | 9 | 4.22 | 0.97 | 0% | 11% | 44% | 44% | 89% | 4.835 | 0.001 |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 3.86 | 0.86 | 0% | 14% | 71% | 14% | 86% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 23 | 4.00 | 0.74 | 0% | 9% | 74% | 17% | 91% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 19 | 3.84 | 0.90 | 0% | 16% | 68% | 16% | 84% | | |
| | BLANK | 43 | 4.67 | 0.89 | 0% | 9% | 5% | 86% | 91% | | |
| 24. Collaboration with other faculty members on research | PROF | 8 | 3.88 | 1.25 | 0% | 25% | 38% | 38% | 75% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 3.36 | 1.08 | 0% | 36% | 57% | 7% | 64% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 22 | 3.73 | 1.03 | 0% | 23% | 59% | 18% | 77% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 15 | 3.33 | 1.18 | 7% | 27% | 60% | 7% | 67% | | |
| | BLANK | 38 | 2.97 | 1.70 | 24% | 34% | 5% | 37% | 42% | | |
| 25. Freedom to pursue research areas of interest | PROF | 9 | 4.11 | 0.93 | 0% | 11% | 56% | 33% | 89% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 4.21 | 0.43 | 0% | 0% | 79% | 21% | 100% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 23 | 4.04 | 0.93 | 0% | 13% | 57% | 30% | 87% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 17 | 3.88 | 0.99 | 6% | 6% | 71% | 18% | 88% | | |
| | BLANK | 39 | 3.64 | 1.81 | 26% | 10% | 3% | 62% | 64% | | |

APPENDIX F: DIFFERENCES BY ACADEMIC RANK

| Questions | RANK | N | 2008 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | ANOVA | |
|--|--------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | F | p |
| 26. Administrative support for research | PROF | 8 | 3.38 | 1.51 | 0% | 50% | 13% | 38% | 50% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 13 | 3.08 | 1.26 | 8% | 38% | 46% | 8% | 54% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 22 | 3.14 | 1.42 | 18% | 23% | 45% | 14% | 59% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 16 | 3.31 | 1.25 | 19% | 6% | 75% | 0% | 75% | | |
| | BLANK | 38 | 3.08 | 1.88 | 37% | 13% | 5% | 45% | 50% | | |
| 27. Compensation structure for performing externally funded research | PROF | 8 | 3.25 | 1.39 | 0% | 50% | 25% | 25% | 50% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 13 | 2.46 | 1.13 | 8% | 69% | 15% | 8% | 23% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 15 | 2.67 | 1.50 | 33% | 20% | 40% | 7% | 47% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 15 | 2.87 | 1.30 | 20% | 27% | 53% | 0% | 53% | | |
| | BLANK | 30 | 1.97 | 1.30 | 43% | 43% | 0% | 13% | 13% | | |
| 28. University resources for applying for research grants | PROF | 7 | 3.57 | 1.51 | 0% | 43% | 14% | 43% | 57% | 2.744 | 0.033 |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 13 | 3.08 | 1.26 | 8% | 38% | 46% | 8% | 54% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 21 | 3.24 | 1.37 | 14% | 24% | 48% | 14% | 62% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 16 | 3.25 | 1.18 | 13% | 19% | 69% | 0% | 69% | | |
| | BLANK | 36 | 2.28 | 1.54 | 42% | 33% | 6% | 19% | 25% | | |
| 29. Research submission process | PROF | 7 | 3.43 | 1.40 | 0% | 43% | 29% | 29% | 57% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 14 | 3.07 | 1.14 | 0% | 50% | 43% | 7% | 50% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 19 | 3.42 | 1.17 | 5% | 26% | 58% | 11% | 68% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 15 | 2.80 | 1.21 | 13% | 40% | 47% | 0% | 47% | | |
| | BLANK | 33 | 2.88 | 1.83 | 36% | 21% | 3% | 39% | 42% | | |
| 30. University oversight of grants | PROF | 7 | 3.57 | 1.13 | 0% | 29% | 57% | 14% | 71% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 13 | 3.31 | 1.32 | 8% | 31% | 46% | 15% | 62% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 17 | 3.29 | 1.16 | 6% | 29% | 59% | 6% | 65% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 14 | 3.07 | 1.14 | 7% | 36% | 57% | 0% | 57% | | |
| | BLANK | 35 | 2.66 | 1.71 | 34% | 31% | 3% | 31% | 34% | | |
| 31. Rewards and recognition for teaching | PROF | 11 | 3.64 | 1.36 | 0% | 36% | 27% | 36% | 64% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 11 | 3.18 | 1.17 | 0% | 45% | 45% | 9% | 55% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 23 | 3.39 | 1.08 | 4% | 26% | 65% | 4% | 70% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 13 | 3.15 | 1.34 | 23% | 8% | 69% | 0% | 69% | | |
| | BLANK | 37 | 2.81 | 1.78 | 35% | 24% | 5% | 35% | 41% | | |

APPENDIX F: DIFFERENCES BY ACADEMIC RANK

| Questions | RANK | N | 2008 Mean | SD | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent | %+ | ANOVA | |
|--|--------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | F | p |
| 32. Rewards and recognition for research and scholarly activity | PROF | 10 | 3.60 | 1.43 | 10% | 20% | 40% | 30% | 70% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 11 | 3.00 | 1.18 | 0% | 55% | 36% | 9% | 45% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 20 | 3.10 | 1.29 | 20% | 15% | 65% | 0% | 65% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 11 | 3.18 | 1.17 | 9% | 27% | 64% | 0% | 64% | | |
| | BLANK | 32 | 2.44 | 1.63 | 38% | 34% | 3% | 25% | 28% | | |
| 33. Rewards and recognition for institutional service | PROF | 10 | 3.50 | 1.35 | 10% | 20% | 50% | 20% | 70% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 11 | 3.18 | 1.17 | 0% | 45% | 45% | 9% | 55% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 21 | 3.38 | 1.16 | 14% | 10% | 76% | 0% | 76% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 11 | 3.09 | 1.30 | 18% | 18% | 64% | 0% | 64% | | |
| | BLANK | 29 | 2.48 | 1.70 | 41% | 28% | 3% | 28% | 31% | | |
| 34. The tenure process is clearly defined | PROF | 10 | 2.70 | 1.16 | 0% | 70% | 20% | 10% | 30% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 13 | 3.15 | 1.14 | 0% | 46% | 46% | 8% | 54% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 22 | 2.91 | 1.27 | 14% | 36% | 45% | 5% | 50% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 17 | 3.24 | 1.09 | 6% | 29% | 65% | 0% | 65% | | |
| | BLANK | 39 | 2.51 | 1.64 | 36% | 33% | 5% | 26% | 31% | | |
| 35. The processes and criteria used to make tenure decisions are evenly applied | PROF | 9 | 3.44 | 1.13 | 0% | 33% | 56% | 11% | 67% | 2.594 | 0.041 |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 13 | 3.38 | 1.19 | 0% | 38% | 46% | 15% | 62% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 22 | 3.55 | 1.14 | 9% | 14% | 68% | 9% | 77% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 17 | 3.35 | 1.22 | 12% | 18% | 65% | 6% | 71% | | |
| | BLANK | 37 | 2.51 | 1.69 | 38% | 32% | 0% | 30% | 30% | | |
| 36. The criteria used to make tenure decisions are fair | PROF | 10 | 2.80 | 1.03 | 0% | 60% | 40% | 0% | 40% | | |
| | ASSOC. PROF | 13 | 3.23 | 1.24 | 8% | 31% | 54% | 8% | 62% | | |
| | ASST. PROF | 22 | 3.18 | 1.26 | 9% | 32% | 50% | 9% | 59% | | |
| | LECT/INTR | 17 | 3.24 | 1.09 | 6% | 29% | 65% | 0% | 65% | | |
| | BLANK | 39 | 2.59 | 1.68 | 36% | 31% | 5% | 28% | 33% | | |

APPENDIX G: REGRESSION PREDICTING JOB SATISFACTION FROM ITEMS

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | | | Model Summary | |
|--------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|--------|---------------|-------------------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig. | R | Adjusted R Square |
| 1 (Constant) | 0.773 | 0.282 | | 2.736 | 0.008 | 0.849 | 0.714 |
| q10 | 0.848 | 0.080 | 0.848 | 10.653 | 0.000 | | |
| 2 (Constant) | 0.291 | 0.274 | | 1.065 | 0.000 | 0.892 | 0.785 |
| q10 | 0.631 | 0.088 | 0.631 | 7.161 | 0.000 | | |
| q16 | 0.345 | 0.089 | 0.348 | 3.948 | 0.000 | | |
| 3 (Constant) | -2.232 | 0.810 | | -2.755 | 0.008 | 0.915 | 0.825 |
| q10 | 0.667 | 0.080 | 0.668 | 8.301 | 0.000 | | |
| q16 | 0.378 | 0.080 | 0.376 | 4.698 | 0.000 | | |
| q23 | 0.516 | 0.158 | 0.212 | 3.271 | 0.002 | | |
| 4 (Constant) | -1.400 | 0.780 | | -1.792 | 0.080 | 0.932 | 0.856 |
| q10 | 0.620 | 0.074 | 0.621 | 8.343 | 0.000 | | |
| q16 | 0.410 | 0.074 | 0.408 | 5.568 | 10.000 | | |
| q23 | 0.595 | 0.145 | 0.244 | 4.100 | 0.000 | | |
| q22 | -0.279 | 0.088 | -0.186 | -3.176 | 0.002 | | |
| 5 (Constant) | -1.570 | 0.752 | | -2.086 | 0.043 | 0.939 | 0.868 |
| q10 | 0.537 | 0.081 | 0.537 | 6.601 | 0.000 | | |
| q16 | 0.356 | 0.075 | 0.354 | 4.745 | 0.000 | | |
| q23 | 0.624 | 0.140 | 0.256 | 4.459 | 0.000 | | |
| q22 | -0.282 | 0.084 | -0.189 | -3.351 | 0.001 | | |
| q35 | 0.168 | 0.079 | 0.172 | 2.135 | 0.038 | | |
| 6 (Constant) | -1.879 | 0.721 | | -2.605 | 0.012 | 0.948 | 0.882 |
| q10 | 0.558 | 0.077 | 0.558 | 7.225 | 0.000 | | |
| q16 | 0.332 | 0.071 | 0.330 | 4.637 | 0.000 | | |
| q23 | 0.719 | 0.137 | 0.295 | 5.224 | 0.000 | | |
| q22 | -0.185 | 0.088 | -0.124 | -2.081 | 0.0440 | | |
| q35 | 0.197 | 0.075 | 0.201 | 2.615 | 0.0126 | | |
| q18 | -0.164 | 0.067 | -0.149 | -2.441 | 0.0192 | | |

*Forward Selection linear regression.

Dependent Variable:

17. Job Satisfaction

Independent Variables (predictors):

10. Faculty morale in my department

16. Academic freedom at the university

23. The quality of graduates Langston University produces

22. The quality of academic advising students receive

35. The processes and criteria used to make tenure decisions are evenly applied

18. The academic preparedness of students

APPENDIX H: REGRESSION PREDICTING JOB SATISFACTION FROM DIMENSIONS

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | | | Model Summary | |
|--------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|-------|---------------|-------------------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig. | R | Adjusted R Square |
| 1 (Constant) | -0.662 | 0.397 | | -1.666 | 0.099 | 0.757 | 0.569 |
| WORKENVIRO | 1.204 | 0.109 | 0.757 | 11.061 | 0.000 | | |
| 2 (Constant) | -0.644 | 0.367 | | -1.755 | 0.083 | 0.800 | 0.632 |
| WORKENVIRO | 0.935 | 0.120 | 0.589 | 7.795 | 0.000 | | |
| REWARDS | 0.328 | 0.080 | 0.309 | 4.088 | 0.000 | | |
| 3 (Constant) | -0.062 | 0.423 | | -0.146 | 0.884 | 0.815 | 0.654 |
| WORKENVIRO | 1.072 | 0.128 | 0.675 | 8.365 | 0.000 | | |
| REWARDS | 0.313 | 0.078 | 0.295 | 4.011 | 0.000 | | |
| STSUCCESS | -0.279 | 0.109 | -0.176 | -2.558 | 0.012 | | |

*Forward Selection linear regression.

Dependent Variable:

Item 17 Job Satisfaction

Independent Variables (predictors):

Faculty Work Environment (items 10-16)

Rewards and Recognition (items 34-36)

Student Success (items 18-23)

APPENDIX I: FACTOR ANALYSIS

| Component | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
|-----------|--------|---------------|--------------|
| 1 | 15.601 | 43.336 | 43.336 |
| 2 | 4.648 | 12.910 | 56.247 |
| 3 | 2.519 | 6.998 | 63.245 |
| 4 | 1.666 | 4.628 | 67.873 |
| 5 | 1.609 | 4.470 | 72.343 |
| 6 | 1.305 | 3.624 | 75.967 |
| 7 | 1.161 | 3.224 | 79.191 |

| ITEM | Component | | | | | | |
|------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| q1 | 0.382 | 0.131 | 0.720 | -0.032 | 0.123 | 0.081 | -0.012 |
| q2 | 0.426 | 0.106 | 0.641 | 0.120 | 0.051 | -0.034 | 0.166 |
| q3 | -0.070 | 0.204 | 0.698 | 0.361 | 0.089 | 0.005 | 0.111 |
| q4 | 0.203 | 0.109 | 0.519 | 0.575 | -0.035 | 0.317 | -0.116 |
| q5 | 0.378 | -0.077 | 0.127 | 0.730 | -0.133 | 0.010 | 0.041 |
| q6 | 0.257 | 0.236 | 0.186 | 0.657 | -0.200 | 0.199 | 0.014 |
| q7 | 0.555 | -0.132 | 0.388 | 0.386 | -0.434 | 0.164 | 0.098 |
| q8 | 0.559 | -0.071 | 0.465 | 0.111 | -0.428 | 0.231 | 0.042 |
| q9 | 0.660 | -0.027 | 0.466 | 0.162 | -0.352 | 0.195 | 0.024 |
| q10 | 0.727 | 0.013 | 0.048 | 0.437 | -0.051 | 0.002 | -0.193 |
| q11 | 0.316 | 0.273 | 0.169 | 0.313 | 0.265 | 0.536 | -0.067 |
| q12 | 0.041 | 0.200 | 0.036 | 0.114 | 0.088 | 0.844 | 0.084 |
| q13 | 0.144 | 0.230 | 0.183 | -0.020 | 0.627 | 0.169 | 0.437 |
| q14 | 0.339 | 0.001 | 0.365 | -0.080 | 0.729 | -0.077 | -0.046 |
| q15 | 0.763 | 0.091 | 0.305 | 0.136 | -0.076 | 0.326 | 0.054 |
| q16 | 0.684 | -0.162 | 0.344 | 0.241 | -0.163 | 0.263 | -0.003 |
| q17 | 0.750 | -0.159 | 0.048 | 0.380 | 0.108 | 0.129 | -0.305 |
| q18 | 0.041 | 0.864 | 0.230 | -0.107 | 0.168 | 0.139 | 0.097 |
| q19 | -0.086 | 0.848 | 0.157 | -0.104 | 0.255 | 0.123 | 0.066 |
| q20 | 0.221 | 0.768 | -0.102 | 0.137 | -0.199 | 0.121 | -0.014 |
| q21 | -0.058 | 0.678 | 0.071 | 0.429 | 0.250 | -0.012 | 0.220 |
| q22 | -0.070 | 0.381 | 0.241 | 0.003 | 0.174 | 0.033 | 0.679 |
| q23 | -0.133 | 0.183 | -0.141 | -0.103 | 0.712 | 0.218 | 0.095 |
| q24 | 0.596 | -0.104 | 0.041 | 0.635 | -0.039 | 0.110 | -0.177 |
| q25 | 0.775 | -0.391 | -0.070 | 0.107 | 0.066 | 0.224 | -0.160 |
| q26 | 0.910 | 0.044 | 0.081 | -0.069 | 0.068 | 0.110 | -0.037 |
| q27 | 0.866 | 0.252 | 0.119 | -0.022 | 0.005 | 0.098 | -0.112 |
| q28 | 0.879 | 0.267 | 0.110 | 0.080 | 0.024 | 0.150 | -0.047 |
| q29 | 0.775 | 0.024 | 0.157 | 0.290 | 0.094 | 0.220 | 0.157 |
| q30 | 0.880 | 0.125 | 0.271 | 0.002 | -0.030 | 0.104 | 0.007 |
| q31 | 0.872 | -0.078 | 0.067 | 0.225 | 0.060 | -0.144 | 0.210 |
| q32 | 0.874 | -0.044 | 0.032 | 0.267 | 0.069 | -0.111 | 0.199 |
| q33 | 0.874 | -0.051 | 0.043 | 0.287 | 0.072 | -0.123 | 0.197 |
| q34 | 0.750 | 0.126 | 0.293 | 0.147 | -0.138 | -0.086 | -0.327 |
| q35 | 0.742 | 0.062 | 0.306 | 0.191 | -0.087 | -0.081 | -0.382 |
| q36 | 0.726 | 0.046 | 0.294 | 0.241 | 0.003 | -0.159 | -0.380 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
 Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
 Eigen Values above .6 and less than .4.