

# **2007 Langston University Faculty Survey**

## **Campus Report**

**Office of Institutional Research and Planning**

**September 2007**

(This page intentionally left blank)

## **Introduction**

This represents the first year conducting the Langston University Faculty Survey in the new format. Unfortunately, because of the new format, the results cannot be compared with previous efforts to gauge changes in attitudes. However, this administration sets the baseline for successive yearly surveys to monitor faculty satisfaction by providing a starting point for yearly tracking of attitudes, and by establishing the initial dimensions that the survey will assess. As this is the first administration, items will be evaluated as to their usefulness for future inclusion.

This report discusses the results of the 2007 which was administered during the Faculty Institute. A total of 72 surveys were returned which represents over 40% of the faculty and instructors at Langston University. Following the introduction the report is broken down into six main sections that correspond with sections on the survey instrument.

Each report section includes:

- Highlights of the 2007 results
- Discussion of the results and any demographic differences
- Description of the differences

The report concludes with a methodological review of the survey instrument and overall observations of the survey results. Faculty and administrators are urged to review the survey's item-by-item results, which can be found in the appendices.

## **Methodology**

The survey consisted of 60 items that were broken down into 6 main sections:

- A. Quality of Langston
- B. The Faculty Work Environment
- C. The Campus Environment
- D. Perceptions of Student Welfare
- E. The Campus Climate
- F. Perceptions of Campus Service

The items were analyzed by calculating their mean and running an ANOVA procedure to identify if statistically significant differences existed in the group means. For each comparison, the number of response "N", the means "Ave", the ANOVA values "F", and the significance "p" are reported.

Appendix A - Compares the Academic Schools

Appendix B - Compares Campuses

Appendix C - Compares Racial Differences

Appendix D – Compares Gender Differences

Appendix E – Regression Predicting Job Satisfaction

Appendix F – Factor Analysis of the Survey Instrument

## **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 (81%), the quality of faculty service (80%), and the quality of leadership from the campus administration (84%).

Moderate scores (60% - 80% positive responses) were given to the reputation of Langston nationally (61%), program reputation nationally (63%), departmental leadership (75%), and academic school leadership (79%).

Low scores (under 60% positive responses) were given for the reputation of Langston in Oklahoma (52%), and the quality of research in the departments (45%).

### **Academic School Differences**

Scores differed from school to school, but the only significant differences that were detected were on item 2 where Nursing had a significantly higher positive endorsement rate (100%) on the national reputation of Langston.

### **Campus Differences**

Both the OKC and Tulsa faculty had significantly higher scores on the quality of research in the department and the quality of leadership from the campus administration.

### **Racial Differences**

Non-African American faculty had a significantly higher score on the quality of departmental leadership

### **Gender Differences**

No significant gender differences existed

### **Observations**

The faculty are fairly positive about the leadership and teaching at Langston, but they have a more negative view about the reputation of the school and the quality of the research done here. An interesting finding is that most faculty feel that Langston has a better national reputation than it does in the state of Oklahoma.

## **Section B. The Faculty Work Environment**

Fifteen 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**

The responses to this section revealed no item that had above an 80% positive rating. Most were in the 50%- 60% range with some lower. Faculty morale seems to be fairly low in some academic schools. These results are a little deceiving when aggregated because of the sample size issues. Arts and Science seems to have the lowest levels of satisfaction and they are the largest school and the largest identified group of respondents. Their scores have a much greater influence on the total score than other schools and will mask the positives of the smaller schools like Physical Therapy and Nursing which appear to have higher levels of satisfaction and morale.

The lowest scores were for technological support for teaching and rewards and recognition for teaching, service, and research.

#### Campus Differences

Both OKC and Tulsa faculty have significantly higher scores in collaboration within the department, recognition for teaching, and technological support than does the main campus.

#### Racial Differences

Non African American faculty have significantly higher scores recognition for teaching, and technological support than does the main campus.

#### Gender Differences

No gender differences were present.

C.

## DEMOGRAPHICS

The results from the 2007 faculty survey are tabulated using the responses from 72 faculty.

<b>Gender</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Male	35	49%
Female	31	43%
Total	66	92%
No Response	6	8%

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Asian American	1	1%
American Indian	1	1%
African American	38	53%
Non-US Citizen	2	3%
Other	6	8%
Caucasian	16	22%
Total	64	89%

No  
Response/Unknown 8 11%

<b>Academic Rank</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Professor	8	11%
Associate Professor	13	18%
Assistant Professor	25	35%
Lecturer/Instructor	20	28%
Total	66	92%

No  
Response/Unknown 6 8%

<b>Academic School</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Agriculture	7	10%
Arts and Science	19	26%
Business	4	6%
Education	11	15%
Nursing	5	7%
Physical Therapy	6	8%
Other	1	1%
Total	53	74%

No  
Response/Unknown 19 26%

<b>Campus</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Main	50	69%
OKC	5	7%
		4%
Tulsa	3	
Total	58	81%

No  
Response/Unknown 14 19%

## A. THE QUALITY OF LANGSTON UNIVERSITY

Items		N	Mean	STD	Percentage					ANOVA	
					PR	FR	GD	EX	% +	F	p
<b>1. The reputation of Langston University In Oklahoma</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>1.27</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>52%</b>		
	AG	7	2.86	1.46	14%	43%	29%	14%	43%		
	AS	19	2.79	1.36	16%	42%	32%	11%	42%		
	BS	4	3.00	1.15	0%	50%	50%	0%	50%		
	ED	11	3.73	0.90	0%	18%	73%	9%	82%		
	NS	5	3.80	1.10	0%	20%	60%	20%	80%		
	PT	5	2.80	1.10	0%	60%	40%	0%	40%		
	Unk	20	2.85	1.35	15%	40%	35%	10%	45%		
<b>2. The reputation of Langston University nationally</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>1.17</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>2.688</b>	<b>.034</b>
	AG	7	4.00	1.00	0%	14%	57%	29%	86%		
	AS	18	3.11	1.02	0%	44%	56%	0%	56%		
	BS	4	3.00	1.15	0%	50%	50%	0%	50%		
	ED	10	3.90	1.10	0%	20%	50%	30%	80%		
	<b>NS</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.60</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>100%</b>		
	PT	4	3.00	1.15	0%	50%	50%	0%	50%		
	<b>Unk</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>1.17</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>39%</b>		
<b>3. The national reputation of my program (discipline)</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>1.29</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>63%</b>		
	AG	7	3.86	1.35	0%	29%	29%	43%	71%		
	<b>AS</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>1.39</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>50%</b>		
	BS	4	3.25	1.50	0%	50%	25%	25%	50%		
	ED	10	3.80	1.03	0%	20%	60%	20%	80%		
	<b>NS</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>1.41</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>75%</b>		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>1.22</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>80%</b>		
	Unk	15	3.40	1.24	0%	40%	40%	20%	60%		

\* Scale – Poor = "PR", Fair = "FR", Good = "GD", Excellent = "EX", Not Applicable = "N/A"

\*\* "% +" = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents

A. QUALITY OF LANGSTON UNIVERSITY Items		N	Mean	STD	Percentage					ANOVA	
					PR	FR	GD	EX	% +	F	p
<b>4. The quality of overall teaching in my department</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>3.94</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>81%</b>		
	AG	6	4.17	0.41	0%	0%	83%	17%	100%		
	AS	19	3.74	0.99	0%	21%	63%	16%	79%		
	<b>BS</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>50%</b>		
	ED	11	4.27	0.90	0%	9%	45%	45%	91%		
	NS	5	4.40	1.34	0%	20%	0%	80%	80%		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4.50</b>	<b>1.22</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>83%</b>		
	Unk	16	3.69	1.08	0%	25%	56%	19%	75%		
<b>5. The quality of overall research in my department</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>2.86</b>	<b>1.39</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>45%</b>		
	<b>AG</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3.57</b>	<b>1.51</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>57%</b>		
	AS	19	2.53	1.35	21%	47%	21%	11%	32%		
	BS	4	3.00	1.83	25%	25%	25%	25%	50%		
	ED	11	2.45	1.29	27%	36%	36%	0%	36%		
	<b>NS</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2.20</b>	<b>1.10</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>20%</b>		
	PT	6	2.83	1.33	17%	33%	50%	0%	50%		
	Unk	17	3.35	1.37	12%	24%	47%	18%	65%		
<b>6. The quality of faculty service to the institution in my department</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>80%</b>		
	<b>AG</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4.43</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>100%</b>		
	<b>AS</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>1.12</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>74%</b>		
	BS	4	3.75	1.26	0%	25%	50%	25%	75%		
	ED	11	4.27	0.90	0%	9%	45%	45%	91%		
	NS	5	4.00	1.22	0%	20%	40%	40%	80%		
	PT	6	4.17	1.17	0%	17%	33%	50%	83%		
	Unk	19	3.68	1.11	0%	26%	53%	21%	74%		

\* Scale – Poor = "PR", Fair = "FR", Good = "GD", Excellent = "EX", Not Applicable = "N/A"

\*\* "% +" = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents

<b>A. QUALITY OF LANGSTON UNIVERSITY</b>					<b>Percentage</b>					<b>ANOVA</b>	
<b>Items</b>		<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>PR</b>	<b>FR</b>	<b>GD</b>	<b>EX</b>	<b>% +</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>
<b>7. The quality of administrative leadership in my department</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>1.34</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>75%</b>		
	AG	7	3.71	1.25	0%	29%	43%	29%	71%		
	<b>AS</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>1.28</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>67%</b>		
	BS	4	3.75	1.26	0%	25%	50%	25%	75%		
	ED	11	4.27	1.42	9%	9%	9%	73%	82%		
	NS	5	4.40	0.55	0%	0%	60%	40%	100%		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4.83</b>	<b>0.41</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>100%</b>		
	Unk	18	3.56	1.58	17%	17%	28%	39%	67%		
<b>8. The quality of administrative leadership in my school</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>1.23</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>79%</b>		
	AG	7	3.86	0.90	0%	14%	71%	14%	86%		
	AS	18	3.78	1.06	6%	11%	67%	17%	83%		
	BS	4	3.75	1.26	0%	25%	50%	25%	75%		
	ED	11	4.18	1.40	9%	9%	18%	64%	82%		
	NS	5	4.40	0.55	0%	0%	60%	40%	100%		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4.83</b>	<b>0.41</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>100%</b>		
	Unk	16	3.06	1.44	19%	25%	44%	13%	56%		
<b>9. The quality of leadership from the campus administration</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>3.96</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>84%</b>		
	AG	7	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%		
	AS	18	3.89	0.96	6%	6%	72%	17%	89%		
	BS	4	4.00	1.41	0%	25%	25%	50%	75%		
	ED	11	4.55	0.52	0%	0%	45%	55%	100%		
	<b>NS</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.60</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>100%</b>		
	PT	6	4.00	1.10	0%	17%	50%	33%	83%		
	<b>Unk</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>1.47</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>32%</b>		

\* Scale – Poor = “PR”, Fair = “FR”, Good = “GD”, Excellent = “EX”, Not Applicable = “N/A”

\*\* “% +” = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents

## B. THE FACULTY WORK ENVIRONMENT

Items		N	Mean	STD	Percentage						ANOVA	
					VD	D	N	S	VS	% +	F	p
<b>10. Faculty morale in my department</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>55%</b>		
	AG	7	3.29	0.76	0%	14%	43%	43%	0%	43%		
	<b>AS</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>33%</b>		
	BS	4	3.25	1.50	25%	0%	0%	75%	0%	75%		
	ED	11	3.64	1.03	0%	18%	18%	45%	18%	64%		
	NS	5	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>0.82</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>83%</b>		
	Unk	20	3.30	1.30	10%	20%	20%	30%	20%	50%		
<b>11. Faculty development opportunities through my school</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>59%</b>		
	AG	7	3.86	0.90	0%	0%	43%	29%	29%	57%		
	AS	17	3.41	1.18	6%	18%	24%	35%	18%	53%		
	BS	4	3.50	1.73	25%	0%	0%	50%	25%	75%		
	<b>ED</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>55%</b>		
	NS	5	3.80	0.84	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	60%		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>0.82</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>83%</b>		
	Unk	19	3.53	1.02	0%	21%	21%	42%	16%	58%		
<b>12. Faculty development opportunities at Langston</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>61%</b>		
	AG	7	4.00	0.58	0%	0%	14%	71%	14%	86%		
	AS	19	3.68	1.06	5%	5%	26%	42%	21%	63%		
	<b>BS</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>1.71</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>50%</b>		
	ED	10	3.40	0.84	0%	20%	20%	60%	0%	60%		
	NS	5	3.80	0.84	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	60%		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>1.10</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>60%</b>		
	Unk	19	3.58	0.77	0%	5%	42%	42%	11%	53%		

\* Scale – Very Dissatisfied = “VD”, Dissatisfied = “D”, Neutral = “N”, Satisfied = “S”, Very Satisfied = “VS”, Not Applicable = “N/A”

\*\* “% +” = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents

B. THE FACULTY WORK ENVIRONMENT Items		N	Mean	STD	Percentage						ANOVA	
					VD	D	N	S	VS	% +	F	p
<b>13. Collaboration among my colleagues on projects of mutual interest</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>3.69</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>65%</b>		
	AG	7	4.00	0.82	0%	0%	29%	43%	29%	71%		
	<b>AS</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>1.13</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>41%</b>		
	BS	4	3.50	1.73	25%	0%	0%	50%	25%	75%		
	<b>ED</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>78%</b>		
	NS	5	3.80	0.45	0%	0%	20%	80%	0%	80%		
	PT	6	4.00	1.55	17%	0%	0%	33%	50%	83%		
	Unk	20	3.65	0.93	0%	15%	20%	50%	15%	65%		
<b>14. Rewards and recognition for teaching</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>1.10</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>38%</b>		
	AG	7	3.00	0.58	0%	14%	71%	14%	0%	14%		
	<b>AS</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>21%</b>		
	BS	4	3.00	1.41	25%	0%	25%	50%	0%	50%		
	ED	11	2.91	1.14	9%	36%	9%	45%	0%	45%		
	NS	5	3.40	0.89	0%	20%	20%	60%	0%	60%		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>1.51</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>67%</b>		
	Unk	17	3.18	1.07	0%	35%	24%	29%	12%	41%		
<b>15. Rewards and recognition for research and scholarly activity</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>3.16</b>	<b>1.11</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>2.868</b>	<b>.025</b>
	AG	7	3.71	0.49	0%	0%	29%	71%	0%	71%		
	<b>AS</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2.68</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>21%</b>		
	BS	4	3.00	1.41	25%	0%	25%	50%	0%	50%		
	ED	9	3.11	1.05	0%	44%	0%	56%	0%	56%		
	NS	4	3.25	0.96	0%	25%	25%	50%	0%	50%		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>1.21</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>83%</b>		
	Unk	18	3.11	1.13	6%	33%	11%	44%	6%	50%		
<b>16. Rewards and recognition for institutional service</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>0.98</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>41%</b>		
	AG	7	3.29	0.49	0%	0%	71%	29%	0%	29%		
	AS	19	3.11	1.05	0%	37%	26%	26%	11%	37%		
	BS	4	3.00	1.41	25%	0%	25%	50%	0%	50%		
	ED	11	3.00	1.18	9%	36%	0%	55%	0%	55%		
	NS	5	3.00	0.71	0%	20%	60%	20%	0%	20%		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>0.98</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>50%</b>		
	Unk	19	3.00	0.94	0%	42%	16%	42%	0%	42%		

\* Scale – Very Dissatisfied = “VD”, Dissatisfied = “D”, Neutral = “N”, Satisfied = “S”, Very Satisfied = “VS”, Not Applicable = “N/A”

\*\* “% +” = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents

B. THE FACULTY WORK ENVIRONMENT Items		N	Mean	STD	Percentage						ANOVA	
					VD	D	N	S	VS	% +	F	p
<b>17. Technology support for research and scholarly activity</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>1.21</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>43%</b>		
	AG	7	2.57	1.13	14%	43%	14%	29%	0%	29%		
	AS	18	2.72	1.07	11%	39%	17%	33%	0%	33%		
	BS	4	3.25	1.71	25%	0%	25%	25%	25%	50%		
	ED	10	3.50	1.08	0%	30%	0%	60%	10%	70%		
	NS	5	3.00	1.00	0%	40%	20%	40%	0%	40%		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>1.51</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>67%</b>		
	Unk	19	2.84	1.26	11%	42%	11%	26%	11%	37%		
<b>18. Technology support for teaching</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>1.14</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>43%</b>		
	AG	7	3.14	1.21	14%	14%	14%	57%	0%	57%		
	AS	19	2.89	1.05	11%	26%	26%	37%	0%	37%		
	BS	4	3.50	1.73	25%	0%	0%	50%	25%	75%		
	ED	10	3.30	1.06	0%	30%	20%	40%	10%	50%		
	<b>NS</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>20%</b>		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>1.51</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>67%</b>		
	Unk	19	2.95	1.13	5%	37%	26%	21%	11%	32%		
<b>19. Technology support for students taking classes</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>1.15</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>41%</b>		
	AG	7	3.00	1.41	29%	0%	14%	57%	0%	57%		
	AS	18	2.72	1.02	11%	33%	28%	28%	0%	28%		
	BS	4	3.50	1.73	25%	0%	0%	50%	25%	75%		
	ED	11	3.36	1.03	0%	27%	18%	45%	9%	55%		
	<b>NS</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>1.47</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>83%</b>		
	Unk	19	2.89	1.05	5%	37%	26%	26%	5%	32%		
<b>20. Technology support for administrative activities</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>1.11</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>45%</b>		
	AG	7	3.14	1.07	14%	0%	43%	43%	0%	43%		
	<b>AS</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>1.03</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>33%</b>		
	BS	4	3.25	1.50	25%	0%	0%	75%	0%	75%		
	ED	11	3.55	0.93	0%	18%	18%	55%	9%	64%		
	NS	4	3.00	0.82	0%	25%	50%	25%	0%	25%		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>1.73</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>80%</b>		
	Unk	20	3.05	1.10	5%	30%	30%	25%	10%	35%		

\* Scale – Very Dissatisfied = “VD”, Dissatisfied = “D”, Neutral = “N”, Satisfied = “S”, Very Satisfied = “VS”, Not Applicable = “N/A”

\*\* “% +” = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents

B. THE FACULTY WORK ENVIRONMENT Items		N	Mean	STD	Percentage						ANOVA	
					VD	D	N	S	VS	% +	F	p
<b>21. The use of my time spent in department committees and task forces</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>0.98</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>59%</b>		
	AG	7	3.43	0.79	0%	0%	71%	14%	14%	29%		
	<b>AS</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>1.15</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>47%</b>		
	BS	4	3.50	1.73	25%	0%	0%	50%	25%	75%		
	ED	11	4.18	0.60	0%	0%	9%	64%	27%	91%		
	<b>NS</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>100%</b>		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>80%</b>		
	Unk	18	3.28	0.75	0%	17%	39%	44%	0%	44%		
<b>22. The use of my time spent in school committees and task forces</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>57%</b>		
	<b>AG</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>0.49</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>29%</b>		
	AS	18	3.39	0.98	6%	11%	28%	50%	6%	56%		
	BS	4	3.50	1.73	25%	0%	0%	50%	25%	75%		
	ED	11	3.91	0.83	0%	9%	9%	64%	18%	82%		
	NS	5	3.60	0.55	0%	0%	40%	60%	0%	60%		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>67%</b>		
	Unk	17	3.47	0.87	0%	12%	41%	35%	12%	47%		
<b>23. The use of my time spent in campus-wide committees and task forces</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>59%</b>		
	AG	7	3.43	0.53	0%	0%	57%	43%	0%	43%		
	AS	19	3.47	1.02	5%	11%	26%	47%	11%	58%		
	<b>BS</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>75%</b>		
	<b>ED</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4.09</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>82%</b>		
	NS	5	3.40	0.55	0%	0%	60%	40%	0%	40%		
	PT	6	3.67	1.03	0%	17%	17%	50%	17%	67%		
	Unk	16	3.38	0.72	0%	13%	38%	50%	0%	50%		
<b>24. My overall job satisfaction</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>1.12</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>64%</b>		
	AG	7	4.29	0.76	0%	0%	14%	43%	43%	86%		
	<b>AS</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>42%</b>		
	BS	4	3.50	1.73	25%	0%	0%	50%	25%	75%		
	ED	11	3.91	0.94	0%	9%	18%	45%	27%	73%		
	NS	5	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>80%</b>		
	Unk	18	3.39	1.33	11%	17%	17%	33%	22%	56%		

\* Scale – Very Dissatisfied = “VD”, Dissatisfied = “D”, Neutral = “N”, Satisfied = “S”, Very Satisfied = “VS”, Not Applicable = “N/A”

\*\* “% +” = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents

### C. THE CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT

Items		N	Mean	STD	Percentage						ANOVA	
					VD	D	N	S	VS	% +	F	p
<b>25. The identity and sense of community at Langston</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>61%</b>		
	AG	7	3.14	0.69	0%	14%	57%	29%	0%	29%		
	AS	19	3.47	0.96	5%	11%	21%	58%	5%	63%		
	BS	4	3.25	1.71	25%	0%	25%	25%	25%	50%		
	ED	11	3.91	0.70	0%	0%	27%	55%	18%	73%		
	<b>NS</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>0.71</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>80%</b>		
	PT	6	3.67	1.03	0%	17%	17%	50%	17%	67%		
	Unk	19	3.42	0.90	0%	21%	21%	53%	5%	58%		
<b>26. Langston's connection with the local community</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>0.94</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>46%</b>		
	AG	7	3.57	0.98	0%	14%	29%	43%	14%	57%		
	<b>AS</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>39%</b>		
	<b>BS</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>1.26</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>75%</b>		
	ED	11	3.45	0.93	0%	9%	55%	18%	18%	36%		
	NS	5	3.80	1.10	0%	0%	60%	0%	40%	40%		
	PT	6	3.33	0.82	0%	17%	33%	50%	0%	50%		
	Unk	18	3.28	0.83	0%	22%	28%	50%	0%	50%		
<b>27. The quality of student academic support programs and services, such as mentoring, advising, etc</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>3.36</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>49%</b>		
	AG	7	3.57	0.98	0%	14%	29%	43%	14%	57%		
	AS	19	3.32	1.25	11%	16%	21%	37%	16%	53%		
	BS	4	3.50	1.29	0%	25%	25%	25%	25%	50%		
	ED	11	3.27	1.10	0%	27%	36%	18%	18%	36%		
	<b>NS</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>60%</b>		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>40%</b>		
	Unk	19	3.32	0.89	0%	21%	32%	42%	5%	47%		

\* Scale – Very Dissatisfied = "VD", Dissatisfied = "D", Neutral = "N", Satisfied = "S", Very Satisfied = "VS", Not Applicable = "N/A"

\*\* "% +" = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents

C. THE CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT		N	Mean	STD	Percentage						ANOVA	
Items					VD	D	N	S	VS	% +	F	p
<b>28. The quality of student activity programs and services</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>58%</b>		
	AG	7	3.71	0.76	0%	0%	43%	43%	14%	57%		
	AS	19	3.53	1.02	0%	21%	21%	42%	16%	58%		
	BS	4	3.50	1.29	0%	25%	25%	25%	25%	50%		
	<b>ED</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>73%</b>		
	NS	5	3.40	0.55	0%	0%	60%	40%	0%	40%		
	PT	5	3.40	0.89	0%	20%	20%	60%	0%	60%		
	<b>Unk</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>0.98</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>56%</b>		

\* Scale – Very Dissatisfied = “VD”, Dissatisfied = “D”, Neutral = “N”, Satisfied = “S”, Very Satisfied = “VS”, Not Applicable = “N/A”

\*\* “% +” = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents

#### D. PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT WELFARE

		N	Mean	STD	Percentage					ANOVA	
Items					VL	S	QB	VM	% +	F	p
<b>29. The need for students to spend significant amounts of time studying and on academic work</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>61%</b>		
	AG	7	3.86	1.35	0%	29%	29%	43%	71%		
	<b>AS</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>1.52</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>42%</b>		
	BS	4	3.00	1.83	25%	25%	25%	25%	50%		
	ED	10	4.10	1.20	0%	20%	30%	50%	80%		
	<b>NS</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>1.34</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>		
	PT	5	4.20	1.30	0%	20%	20%	60%	80%		
	Unk	19	3.21	1.47	16%	26%	37%	21%	58%		
<b>30. Providing the support students need to help them succeed academically</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>3.37</b>	<b>1.42</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>63%</b>		
	AG	7	3.71	1.25	0%	29%	43%	29%	71%		
	AS	19	3.11	1.49	16%	32%	32%	21%	53%		
	BS	4	3.50	1.00	0%	25%	75%	0%	75%		
	ED	11	3.45	1.44	9%	27%	36%	27%	64%		
	<b>NS</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>1.30</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>80%</b>		
	PT	5	4.00	1.22	0%	20%	40%	40%	80%		
	<b>Unk</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>1.54</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>58%</b>		

\* Scale – Very Little = “VL”, Some = “S”, Quite a Bit = “QB”, Very Much = “VM”, Not Applicable = “N/A”

\*\* “% +” = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents

D. PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT WELFARE Items		N	Mean	STD	Percentage					ANOVA	
					VL	S	QB	VM	% +	F	p
<b>31. Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>1.45</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>54%</b>		
	AG	7	3.57	1.51	14%	14%	43%	29%	71%		
	<b>AS</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>1.34</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>33%</b>		
	BS	4	3.75	1.26	0%	25%	50%	25%	75%		
	ED	11	3.36	1.36	0%	45%	27%	27%	55%		
	NS	5	3.80	1.10	0%	20%	60%	20%	80%		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>1.30</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>80%</b>		
	Unk	19	2.95	1.54	21%	32%	26%	21%	47%		
<b>32. Helping students cope with their non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>1.38</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>51%</b>		
	AG	7	3.00	1.29	14%	29%	57%	0%	57%		
	<b>AS</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>1.41</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>39%</b>		
	BS	4	3.00	1.15	0%	50%	50%	0%	50%		
	ED	11	3.18	1.40	9%	36%	36%	18%	55%		
	<b>NS</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>1.52</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>80%</b>		
	PT	5	3.40	1.34	0%	40%	40%	20%	60%		
	Unk	19	2.89	1.49	21%	32%	32%	16%	47%		
<b>33. Providing support for students to thrive socially</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>1.25</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>59%</b>		
	AG	7	3.00	1.29	0%	57%	29%	14%	43%		
	AS	19	3.42	1.17	5%	26%	58%	11%	68%		
	BS	4	3.50	1.00	0%	25%	75%	0%	75%		
	ED	11	3.55	1.29	0%	36%	36%	27%	64%		
	<b>NS</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>80%</b>		
	PT	5	3.00	1.41	0%	60%	20%	20%	40%		
	<b>Unk</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>1.43</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>47%</b>		

\* Scale – Very Little = “VL”, Some = “S”, Quite a Bit = “QB”, Very Much = “VM”, Not Applicable = “N/A”

\*\* “% +” = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents

D. PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT WELFARE					Percentage					ANOVA	
Items		N	Mean	STD	PR	FR	GD	EX	% +	F	p
<b>34. Overall, how would you rate the quality of academic advising available in your unit?</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>2.541</b>	<b>.041</b>
	<b>AG</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>0.98</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>71%</b>		
	AS	18	3.50	1.15	6%	22%	61%	11%	72%		
	<b>BS</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.50</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>100%</b>		
	ED	11	4.18	0.40	0%	0%	82%	18%	100%		
	NS	5	4.20	0.45	0%	0%	80%	20%	100%		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4.50</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>100%</b>		
	Unk	14	3.50	1.22	7%	21%	57%	14%	71%		

\* Scale – Poor = “PR”, Fair = “FR”, Good = “GD”, Excellent = “EX”, Not Applicable = “N/A”

\*\* “% +” = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents

## E. THE CAMPUS CLIMATE

E. THE CAMPUS CLIMATE					Percentage					ANOVA		
Items		N	Mean	STD	VD	D	N	S	VS	% +	F	p
<b>35. I am treated fairly in my unit regarding workload assignments</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>73%</b>		
	AG	7	3.43	1.13	0%	29%	14%	43%	14%	57%		
	AS	18	3.72	1.23	6%	17%	6%	44%	28%	72%		
	<b>BS</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>1.73</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>75%</b>		
	<b>ED</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>1.35</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>70%</b>		
	NS	5	4.20	0.45	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%	100%		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>1.21</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>83%</b>		
	Unk	17	3.82	1.13	6%	6%	18%	41%	29%	71%		
<b>36. The work I do is valued as highly as the work of other faculty in my department</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>1.21</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>66%</b>		
	<b>AG</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>1.35</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>29%</b>		
	AS	18	3.67	1.03	6%	6%	22%	50%	17%	67%		
	BS	4	3.75	1.89	25%	0%	0%	25%	50%	75%		
	ED	10	3.80	1.23	0%	20%	20%	20%	40%	60%		
	NS	5	4.40	0.55	0%	0%	0%	60%	40%	100%		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4.83</b>	<b>0.41</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>100%</b>		
	Unk	18	3.56	1.34	11%	11%	17%	33%	28%	61%		

\* Scale – Very Dissatisfied = “VD”, Dissatisfied = “D”, Neutral = “N”, Satisfied = “S”, Very Satisfied = “VS”, Not Applicable = “N/A”

\*\* “% +” = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents

E. THE CAMPUS CLIMATE Items		N	Mean	STD	Percentage						ANOVA	
					VD	D	N	S	VS	% +	F	p
<b>37. Faculty in my department are supportive of colleagues who want to balance their family and career lives</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>73%</b>		
	AG	7	3.57	0.98	0%	14%	29%	43%	14%	57%		
	AS	17	3.71	0.77	0%	6%	29%	53%	12%	65%		
	<b>BS</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>1.73</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>75%</b>		
	ED	9	4.33	0.71	0%	0%	11%	44%	44%	89%		
	NS	5	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4.50</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>100%</b>		
	Unk	18	3.61	1.14	6%	11%	22%	39%	22%	61%		
<b>38. My department is a comfortable working environment for individuals of varied backgrounds and perspectives</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>1.12</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>78%</b>		
	AG	7	3.86	1.68	14%	14%	0%	14%	57%	71%		
	<b>AS</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>0.94</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>72%</b>		
	BS	4	3.50	1.73	25%	0%	0%	50%	25%	75%		
	ED	10	4.50	0.71	0%	0%	10%	30%	60%	90%		
	NS	5	4.20	0.84	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	80%		
	<b>PT</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4.67</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>100%</b>		
	Unk	18	3.83	1.25	11%	0%	17%	39%	33%	72%		

\* Scale – Very Dissatisfied = “VD”, Dissatisfied = “D”, Neutral = “N”, Satisfied = “S”, Very Satisfied = “VS”, Not Applicable = “N/A”

\*\* “% +” = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents

\*\*\* High and low Schools scores in bold

## F. PERCEPTIONS OF CAMPUS SERVICES

Office/Department		N	Mean	STD	Percentage					ANOVA	
					PR	FR	GD	EX	% +	F	p
<b>39. Office of Academic Affairs</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>1.39</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>76%</b>		
	AG	5	3.80	1.10	0%	20%	60%	20%	80%		
	AS	15	3.40	1.55	20%	13%	40%	27%	67%		
	BS	3	3.33	2.08	33%	0%	33%	33%	67%		
	ED	7	4.43	1.13	0%	14%	14%	71%	86%		
	NS	3	4.67	0.58	0%	0%	33%	67%	100%		
	PT	3	4.33	0.58	0%	0%	67%	33%	100%		
	Unk	13	3.54	1.51	15%	15%	31%		31%		
<b>40. Library</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>93%</b>		
	AG	6	4.67	0.52	0%	0%	33%	67%	100%		
	AS	15	4.40	0.51	0%	0%	60%	40%	100%		
	BS	4	3.75	1.26	0%	25%	50%	25%	75%		
	ED	9	4.67	0.50	0%	0%	33%	67%	100%		
	NS	5	4.20	0.45	0%	0%	80%	20%	100%		
	PT	6	4.33	0.52	0%	0%	67%	33%	100%		
	Unk	15	4.13	1.19	0%	20%	53%		53%		
<b>41. Career Center</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>1.22</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>73%</b>		
	AG	1	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%		
	AS	6	3.83	0.98	0%	17%	67%	17%	83%		
	BS	2	3.00	1.41	0%	50%	50%	0%	50%		
	ED	5	3.40	1.34	0%	40%	40%	20%	60%		
	NS	0	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%		
	PT	1	5.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%		
	Unk	7	3.57	1.51	14%	14%	43%	29%	71%		
<b>42A. Computer Technology Integration</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>3.84</b>	<b>1.31</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>78%</b>		
	AG	6	4.33	1.21	0%	17%	17%	67%	83%		
	AS	13	3.62	1.39	15%	8%	54%	23%	77%		
	BS	4	4.00	1.41	0%	25%	25%	50%	75%		
	ED	10	3.70	1.49	10%	20%	30%	40%	70%		
	NS	5	4.40	0.55	0%	0%	60%	40%	100%		
	PT	5	4.60	0.55	0%	0%	40%	60%	100%		
	Unk	15	3.47	1.46	13%	20%	40%	27%	67%		

\* Scale – Poor = “PR”, Fair = “FR”, Good = “GD”, Excellent = “EX”, Not Applicable = “N/A”

\*\* “% +” = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents

<b>F. CAMPUS SERVICES</b>											<b>ANOVA</b>	
<b>Office/Department</b>		<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>Percentage</b>					<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>	
					<b>PR</b>	<b>FR</b>	<b>GD</b>	<b>EX</b>	<b>% +</b>			
<b>43. Center for Creative Services/Copy Center</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>4.31</b>	<b>0.94</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>91%</b>			
	AG	6	4.67	0.52	0%	0%	33%	67%	100%			
	AS	16	4.50	1.03	6%	0%	25%	69%	94%			
	BS	3	4.00	1.73	0%	33%	0%	67%	67%			
	ED	7	4.29	1.11	0%	14%	29%	57%	86%			
	NS	4	4.50	0.58	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%			
	PT	5	4.40	0.55	0%	0%	60%	40%	100%			
	Unk	14	3.93	0.92	0%	14%	64%	21%	86%			
<b>44A. Campus Facility Services/Building Maintenance</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>65%</b>			
	AG	6	3.33	1.51	17%	17%	50%	17%	67%			
	AS	16	3.75	1.29	6%	19%	44%	31%	75%			
	BS	2	3.00	1.41	0%	50%	50%	0%	50%			
	ED	7	3.71	1.25	0%	29%	43%	29%	71%			
	NS	4	3.00	1.15	0%	50%	50%	0%	50%			
	PT	5	3.60	0.89	0%	20%	80%	0%	80%			
	Unk	14	3.00	1.24	7%	43%	43%	7%	50%			
<b>45. Campus Parking Services</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>1.35</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>62%</b>			
	AG	6	3.17	1.33	17%	17%	67%	0%	67%			
	AS	16	3.25	1.34	19%	13%	63%	6%	69%			
	BS	4	4.25	0.50	0%	0%	75%	25%	100%			
	ED	8	2.63	1.77	38%	25%	13%	25%	38%			
	NS	5	3.00	1.41	20%	20%	60%	0%	60%			
	PT	4	3.50	1.00	0%	25%	75%	0%	75%			
	Unk	12	2.92	1.38	17%	33%	42%	8%	50%			
<b>46. Human Resources</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>1.31</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>70%</b>			
	AG	7	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%			
	AS	18	3.33	1.53	17%	22%	33%	28%	61%			
	BS	3	3.33	2.08	33%	0%	33%	33%	67%			
	ED	10	3.50	1.35	10%	20%	50%	20%	70%			
	NS	5	3.00	1.41	0%	60%	20%	20%	40%			
	PT	5	3.80	1.10	0%	20%	60%	20%	80%			
	Unk	13	3.77	1.30	8%	15%	46%	31%	77%			

\* Scale – Poor = “PR”, Fair = “FR”, Good = “GD”, Excellent = “EX”, Not Applicable = “N/A”

\*\* “% +” = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents

F. CAMPUS SERVICES					Percentage					ANOVA	
Office/Department		N	Mean	STD	PR	FR	GD	EX	% +	F	p
<b>47. Admissions</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>1.04</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>79%</b>		
	AG	4	3.50	1.00	0%	25%	75%	0%	75%		
	AS	13	3.92	0.95	0%	15%	62%	23%	85%		
	BS	2	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%		
	ED	7	3.71	1.25	0%	29%	43%	29%	71%		
	NS	3	2.67	1.15	0%	67%	33%	0%	33%		
	PT	2	4.50	0.71	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%		
	Unk	8	3.75	1.16	13%	0%	75%	13%	88%		
<b>48. Enrollment</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>3.57</b>	<b>1.17</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>70%</b>		
	AG	4	3.50	1.00	0%	25%	75%	0%	75%		
	AS	11	3.45	1.21	0%	36%	45%	18%	64%		
	BS	3	4.33	0.58	0%	0%	67%	33%	100%		
	ED	7	3.71	1.25	0%	29%	43%	29%	71%		
	NS	2	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%		
	PT	2	4.50	0.71	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%		
	Unk	8	3.00	1.41	13%	38%	38%	13%	50%		
<b>49. Bursar Office</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>81%</b>		
	AG	3	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%		
	AS	12	4.00	1.04	0%	17%	50%	33%	83%		
	BS	2	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%		
	ED	7	3.86	1.35	0%	29%	29%	43%	71%		
	NS	3	3.67	1.53	0%	33%	33%	33%	67%		
	PT	1	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%		
	Unk	8	3.50	1.31	13%	13%	63%	13%	75%		
<b>50. Office of the Registrar</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>4.11</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>91%</b>		
	AG	5	4.00	1.22	0%	20%	40%	40%	80%		
	AS	16	4.31	0.79	0%	6%	50%	44%	94%		
	BS	2	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%		
	ED	7	4.29	0.49	0%	0%	71%	29%	100%		
	NS	5	3.60	0.89	0%	20%	80%	0%	80%		
	PT	3	4.67	0.58	0%	0%	33%	67%	100%		
	Unk	7	3.71	1.25	14%	0%	71%	14%	86%		

\* Scale – Poor = "PR", Fair = "FR", Good = "GD", Excellent = "EX", Not Applicable = "N/A"

\*\* "% +" = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents

<b>F. CAMPUS SERVICES</b>					<b>Percentage</b>					<b>ANOVA</b>	
<b>Office/Department</b>		<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>PR</b>	<b>FR</b>	<b>GD</b>	<b>EX</b>	<b>% +</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>
<b>51. Public Relations</b>		<b>LU</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>86%</b>	
		AG	5	4.40	0.55	0%	0%	60%	40%	100%	
		AS	12	4.17	0.83	0%	8%	58%	33%	92%	
		BS	2	4.50	0.71	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%	
		ED	8	4.38	0.52	0%	0%	63%	38%	100%	
		NS	2	3.50	2.12	0%	50%	0%	50%	50%	
		PT	2	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	
		Unk	11	3.27	1.27	9%	27%	55%	9%	64%	
<b>52. Office of Development</b>		<b>LU</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>3.96</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>85%</b>	
		AG	3	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	
		AS	7	4.29	1.11	0%	14%	29%	57%	86%	
		BS	2	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	
		ED	4	4.00	1.41	0%	25%	25%	50%	75%	
		NS	1	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	
		PT	1	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	
		Unk	8	3.63	1.41	13%	13%	50%	25%	75%	
<b>53. Athletics</b>		<b>LU</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>84%</b>	
		AG	4	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	
		AS	8	3.88	0.83	0%	13%	75%	13%	88%	
		BS	2	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	
		ED	5	3.80	1.10	0%	20%	60%	20%	80%	
		NS	0	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
		PT	1	5.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	
		Unk	5	3.20	1.10	0%	40%	60%	0%	60%	
<b>54. Testing and Assessment Center</b>		<b>LU</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>1.41</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>58%</b>	
		AG	5	3.20	1.64	20%	20%	40%	20%	60%	
		AS	8	2.63	1.51	25%	38%	25%	13%	38%	
		BS	2	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	
		ED	5	3.20	1.64	20%	20%	40%	20%	60%	
		NS	1	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	
		PT	0	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
		Unk	5	3.00	1.41	20%	20%	60%	0%	60%	

\* Scale – Poor = “PR”, Fair = “FR”, Good = “GD”, Excellent = “EX”, Not Applicable = “N/A”

\*\* “% +” = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents

<b>F. CAMPUS SERVICES</b>							<b>Percentage</b>					<b>ANOVA</b>	
<b>Office/Department</b>		<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>	<b>PR</b>	<b>FR</b>	<b>GD</b>	<b>EX</b>	<b>% +</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>		
<b>55. Institutional Research &amp; Planning (IRP)</b>		<b>LU</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>3.59</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>77%</b>			
	AG	4	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%				
	AS	6	3.50	1.22	0%	33%	50%	17%	67%				
	BS	2	4.50	0.71	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%				
	ED	3	3.67	1.53	0%	33%	33%	33%	67%				
	NS	1	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%				
	PT	2	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%				
	Unk	4	2.75	1.50	25%	25%	50%	0%	50%				
<b>56. Sponsored Program Administration (Federal Grants and Contracts)</b>		<b>LU</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>3.03</b>	<b>1.56</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>47%</b>			
	AG	5	2.80	1.10	0%	60%	40%	0%	40%				
	AS	6	2.67	1.86	33%	33%	0%	33%	33%				
	BS	3	3.33	1.15	0%	33%	67%	0%	67%				
	ED	5	3.40	1.82	20%	20%	20%	40%	60%				
	NS	0	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%				
	PT	1	1.00	0.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%				
	Unk	10	3.30	1.70	20%	20%	40%	10%	50%				
<b>57. Student Affairs</b>		<b>LU</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>1.15</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>71%</b>			
	AG	4	3.50	1.73	25%	0%	50%	25%	75%				
	AS	11	3.27	1.27	9%	27%	55%	9%	64%				
	BS	2	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%				
	ED	7	3.86	0.90	0%	14%	71%	14%	86%				
	NS	2	3.00	1.41	0%	50%	50%	0%	50%				
	PT	1	2.00	0.00	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%				
	Unk	8	3.63	1.06	0%	25%	63%	13%	75%				
<b>58. Campus Housing</b>		<b>LU</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>3.63</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>74%</b>			
	AG	1	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%				
	AS	5	3.20	1.10	0%	40%	60%	0%	60%				
	BS	1	4.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%				
	ED	5	4.00	1.22	0%	20%	40%	40%	80%				
	NS	0	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%				
	PT	0	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%				
	Unk	7	3.57	1.13	0%	29%	57%	14%	71%				

\* Scale – Poor = “PR”, Fair = “FR”, Good = “GD”, Excellent = “EX”, Not Applicable = “N/A”

\*\* “% +” = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents

F. CAMPUS SERVICES					Percentage					ANOVA	
Office/Department		N	Mean	STD	PR	FR	GD	EX	% +	F	p
<b>59. Information Technology Services (ITS)</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>3.10</b>	<b>1.36</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>56%</b>		
	AG	7	3.57	1.13	0%	29%	57%	14%	71%		
	AS	16	2.94	1.29	13%	38%	44%	6%	50%		
	BS	4	2.75	2.06	50%	0%	25%	25%	50%		
	ED	9	3.56	1.74	22%	11%	22%	44%	67%		
	NS	5	3.20	1.10	0%	40%	60%	0%	60%		
	PT	5	3.80	1.10	0%	20%	60%	20%	80%		
	Unk	15	2.60	1.24	20%	40%	40%	0%	40%		
<b>60A. Campus Security</b>	<b>LU</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>1.17</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>74%</b>		
	AG	5	3.00	1.41	0%	60%	20%	20%	40%		
	AS	16	3.63	1.36	6%	25%	38%	31%	69%		
	BS	3	4.67	0.58	0%	0%	33%	67%	100%		
	ED	7	3.43	1.40	0%	43%	29%	29%	57%		
	NS	5	4.40	0.55	0%	0%	60%	40%	100%		
	PT	5	4.20	0.45	0%	0%	80%	20%	100%		
	Unk	12	3.58	1.00	0%	25%	67%	8%	75%		

\* Scale – Poor = "PR", Fair = "FR", Good = "GD", Excellent = "EX", Not Applicable = "N/A"

\*\* "% +" = Percentage of responses that were positively endorsed by the respondents



CAMPUS COMARISONS	CAMPUS						ANOVA	
	MAIN		OKC		TULSA			
	N	Ave	N	Ave	N	Ave	F	p
A. THE QUALITY OF LANGSTON UNIVERSITY								
1. The reputation of Langston University In Oklahoma	48	2.71	5	3.40	3	4.00		
2. The reputation of Langston University nationally	46	3.26	4	3.00	2	3.00		
3. The national reputation of my program (discipline)	43	3.21	4	3.75	3	3.33		
4. The quality of overall teaching in my department	47	3.85	4	4.50	3	4.67		
<b>5. The quality of overall research in my department</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>2.34</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>4.049</b>	<b>.023</b>
6. The quality of faculty service to the institution in my department	48	3.75	5	4.80	3	4.33		
7. The quality of administrative leadership in my department	46	3.70	5	4.40	3	5.00		
8. The quality of administrative leadership in my school	47	3.79	4	4.25	3	5.00		
<b>9. The quality of leadership from the campus administration</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.80</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>3.415</b>	<b>.040</b>
B. THE FACULTY WORK ENVORONMENT								
10. Faculty morale in my department	48	3.23	5	3.80	3	4.33		
11. Faculty development opportunities through my school	49	3.47	5	3.80	3	4.00		
12. Faculty development opportunities at Langston	48	3.58	4	3.75	3	4.00		
<b>13. Collaboration among my colleagues on projects of mutual interest</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>3.638</b>	<b>.033</b>
<b>14. Rewards and recognition for teaching</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.083</b>	<b>.023</b>
15. Rewards and recognition for research and scholarly activity	44	2.95	5	3.80	3	4.00		
16. Rewards and recognition for institutional service	48	2.98	5	3.60	3	4.00		
<b>17. Technology support for research and scholarly activity</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>4.407</b>	<b>.017</b>
<b>18. Technology support for teaching</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>3.231</b>	<b>.047</b>
19. Technology support for students taking classes	48	2.75	5	3.60	3	4.00		
20. Technology support for administrative activities	44	3.00	5	3.80	3	4.00		
21. The use of my time spent in department committees and task forces	47	3.40	5	4.00	3	4.33		
22. The use of my time spent in school committees and task forces	46	3.37	5	4.20	3	4.33		
23. The use of my time spent in campus-wide committees and task forces	47	3.34	4	3.75	3	4.33		
24. My overall job satisfaction	47	3.53	5	4.20	3	4.33		

\* Statistically significant F values reported.

CAMPUS COMPARISONS	CAMPUS						ANOVA	
	MAIN		OKC		TULSA		F	p
c. THE CAMPUS ENVORNMENT	<b>N</b>	<b>Ave</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Ave</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Ave</b>		
25. The identity and sense of community at Langston	49	3.35	4	4.25	3	4.00		
26. Langston's connection with the local community	47	3.15	4	4.25	3	3.33		
27. The quality of student academic support programs and services, such as mentoring, advising, etc	48	3.17	4	3.75	3	3.00		
28. The quality of student activity programs and services	47	3.45	4	3.75	3	3.00		
D. PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT WELFARE								
29. The need for students to spend significant amounts of time studying and on academic work	47	3.26	5	4.60	2	3.00		
30. Providing the support students need to help them succeed academically	47	3.26	5	3.80	3	3.33		
31. Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds	46	2.83	5	3.80	3	4.33		
32. Helping students cope with their non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	46	2.72	5	3.20	3	4.00		
33. Providing support for students to thrive socially	47	3.09	5	3.60	3	3.67		
34. Overall, how would you rate the quality of academic advising available in your unit?	45	3.71	4	4.25	3	4.33		
E. THE CAMPUS CLIMATE								
35. I am treated fairly in my unit regarding workload assignments	48	3.63	5	4.00	2	4.00		
36. The work I do is valued as highly as the work of other faculty in my department	48	3.69	5	4.20	2	4.50		
37. Faculty in my department are supportive of colleagues who want to balance their family and career lives	46	3.74	5	4.20	2	5.00		
38. My department is a comfortable working environment for individuals of varied backgrounds and perspectives	48	3.94	5	4.40	2	4.50		

\* Statistically significant F values reported.

CAMPUS COMPARISONS	CAMPUS						ANOVA	
	MAIN		OKC		TULSA		F	p
F. PERCEPTIONS OF CAMPUS SERVICES	N	Ave	N	Ave	N	Ave		
39. Office of Academic Affairs	37	3.65	2	4.50	0	.		
40. Library	44	4.30	5	4.40	1	5.00		
41. Career Center	14	3.36	1	4.00	0	.		
42. Computer Technology Integration	42	3.76	4	4.00	2	3.50		
43. Center for Creative Services/Copy Center	43	4.30	2	4.00	0	.		
44. Campus Facility Services/Building Maintenance	42	3.33	2	3.00	0	.		
45. Campus Parking Services	44	3.00	2	4.50	1	5.00		
46. Human Resources	45	3.31	4	4.50	2	3.00		
47. Admissions	29	3.59	1	4.00	1	4.00		
48. Enrollment	26	3.35	2	4.50	1	4.00		
49. Bursar Office	25	3.72	1	4.00	1	4.00		
50. Office of the Registrar	36	4.03	1	4.00	1	4.00		
51. Public Relations	28	3.86	3	4.00	0	.		
52. Office of Development	16	3.94	1	4.00	0	.		
53. Athletics	18	3.83	1	4.00	0	.		
54. Testing and Assessment Center	20	2.85	1	4.00	0	.		
55. Institutional Research & Planning (IRP)	15	3.40	1	4.00	0	.		
56. Sponsored Program Administration (Federal Grants and Contracts)	20	2.65	3	3.67	0	.		
57. Student Affairs	26	3.31	1	4.00	0	.		
58. Campus Housing	14	3.57	1	4.00	0	.		
59. Information Technology Services (ITS)	45	2.89	4	3.75	1	5.00		
60. Campus Security	43	3.65	1	4.00	0	0.00		

<b>RACIAL COMPARISONS</b>						
<b>African American and Non African American</b>	<b>Non AA</b>		<b>AA</b>		<b>ANOVA</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>Ave</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Ave</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>
<b>A. THE QUALITY OF LANGSTON UNIVERSITY</b>						
1. The reputation of Langston University In Oklahoma	26	3.00	38	3.05		
2. The reputation of Langston University nationally	23	3.13	36	3.53		
3. The national reputation of my program (discipline)	21	3.48	35	3.37		
4. The quality of overall teaching in my department	23	4.30	38	3.82		
5. The quality of overall research in my department	23	3.13	38	2.55		
6. The quality of faculty service to the institution in my department	25	3.96	38	3.89		
7. The quality of administrative leadership in my department	<b>24</b>	<b>4.25</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>3.59</b>	<b>4.036</b>	<b>.049</b>
8. The quality of administrative leadership in my school	23	3.87	37	3.92		
9. The quality of leadership from the campus administration	25	4.08	37	3.89		
<b>B. THE FACULTY WORK ENVORONMENT</b>						
10. Faculty morale in my department	26	3.50	37	3.32		
11. Faculty morale in my department	25	3.64	37	3.54		
12. Faculty development opportunities through my school	26	3.58	36	3.72		
13. Faculty development opportunities at Langston	25	3.96	35	3.51		
14. Collaboration among my colleagues on projects of mutual interest	24	3.29	38	2.74		
15. Rewards and recognition for teaching	<b>24</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>4.096</b>	<b>.047</b>
16. Rewards and recognition for research and scholarly activity	25	3.12	38	3.13		
17. Rewards and recognition for institutional service	25	3.24	36	2.72		
18. Technology support for research and scholarly activity	26	3.38	37	2.81		
19. Technology support for teaching	<b>25</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>4.659</b>	<b>.035</b>
20. Technology support for students taking classes	<b>24</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>4.673</b>	<b>.035</b>
21. Technology support for administrative activities	24	3.75	38	3.50		
22. The use of my time spent in department committees and task forces	24	3.75	37	3.46		
23. The use of my time spent in school committees and task forces	24	3.67	37	3.51		
24. The use of my time spent in campus-wide committees and task forces	24	3.67	37	3.65		
25. My overall job satisfaction	26	3.50	37	3.32		

\* Statistically significant F values reported.

	Non AA		AA		ANOVA	
	N	Ave	N	Ave	F	p
<b>C. THE CAMPUS ENVORNMENT</b>						
25. The identity and sense of community at Langston	25	3.72	38	3.37		
26. Langston's connection with the local community	23	3.43	38	3.32		
27. The quality of student academic support programs and services, such as mentoring, advising, etc	24	3.13	38	3.47		
28. The quality of student activity programs and services	23	3.39	38	3.61		
<b>D. PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT WELFARE</b>						
29. The need for students to spend significant amounts of time studying and on academic work	23	3.57	38	3.39		
30. Providing the support students need to help them succeed academically	24	3.33	38	3.39		
31. Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds	24	3.50	37	2.84		
32. Helping students cope with their non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	24	3.29	37	2.73		
33. Providing support for students to thrive socially	24	3.42	38	3.18		
34. Overall, how would you rate the quality of academic advising available in your unit?	22	4.00	36	3.69		
<b>E. THE CAMPUS CLIMATE</b>						
35. I am treated fairly in my unit regarding workload assignments	24	3.79	37	3.73		
36. The work I do is valued as highly as the work of other faculty in my department	24	3.92	38	3.74		
37. Faculty in my department are supportive of colleagues who want to balance their family and career lives	24	3.88	36	3.83		
38. My department is a comfortable working environment for individuals of varied backgrounds and perspectives	24	4.25	38	3.92		

<b>GENDER COMPARISON</b>						
	<b>FEMALE</b>		<b>MALE</b>		<b>ANOVA</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>Ave</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Ave</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>
<b>A. THE QUALITY OF LANGSTON UNIVERSITY</b>						
1. The reputation of Langston University In Oklahoma	31	2.94	34	3.09		
2. The reputation of Langston University nationally	31	3.45	29	3.24		
3. The national reputation of my program (discipline)	27	3.56	30	3.23		
4. The quality of overall teaching in my department	30	4.03	33	3.94		
5. The quality of overall research in my department	30	2.47	33	3.00		
6. The quality of faculty service to the institution in my department	30	3.80	35	3.97		
7. The quality of administrative leadership in my department	29	3.72	34	3.94		
8. The quality of administrative leadership in my school	30	4.03	32	3.75		
9. The quality of leadership from the campus administration	29	4.17	35	3.74		
<b>B. THE FACULTY WORK ENVORONMENT</b>						
10. Faculty morale in my department	30	3.20	35	3.54		
11. Faculty development opportunities through my school	31	3.61	33	3.52		
12. Faculty development opportunities at Langston	30	3.63	34	3.65		
13. Collaboration among my colleagues on projects of mutual interest	29	3.52	33	3.82		
14. Rewards and recognition for teaching	30	3.03	34	2.88		
15. Rewards and recognition for research and scholarly activity	28	3.07	33	3.18		
16. Rewards and recognition for institutional service	30	3.10	35	3.14		
17. Technology support for research and scholarly activity	30	2.80	33	3.06		
18. Technology support for teaching	31	2.81	34	3.26		
19. Technology support for students taking classes	30	2.80	34	3.12		
20. Technology support for administrative activities	27	3.11	33	3.24		
21. The use of my time spent in department committees and task forces	29	3.55	35	3.60		
22. The use of my time spent in school committees and task forces	29	3.52	34	3.59		
23. The use of my time spent in campus-wide committees and task forces	29	3.62	34	3.47		
24. My overall job satisfaction	29	3.55	34	3.71		

\* Statistically significant F values reported.

\*\* No statistically significant gender differences

<b>GENDER COMPARISON</b>						
	<b>FEMALE</b>		<b>MALE</b>		<b>ANOVA</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>Ave</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Ave</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>
<b>C. THE CAMPUS ENVORNMENT</b>						
25. The identity and sense of community at Langston	31	3.58	34	3.38		
26. Langston's connection with the local community	30	3.30	33	3.36		
27. The quality of student academic support programs and services, such as mentoring, advising, etc	30	3.23	34	3.38		
28. The quality of student activity programs and services	29	3.48	34	3.53		
<b>D. PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT WELFARE</b>						
29. The need for students to spend significant amounts of time studying and on academic work	29	3.79	34	3.15		
30. Providing the support students need to help them succeed academically	29	3.17	35	3.54		
31. Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds	28	2.89	35	3.29		
32. Helping students cope with their non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	29	2.72	34	3.15		
33. Providing support for students to thrive socially	29	3.28	35	3.20		
34. Overall, how would you rate the quality of academic advising available in your unit?	29	3.76	31	3.90		
<b>E. THE CAMPUS CLIMATE</b>						
35. I am treated fairly in my unit regarding workload assignments	30	3.70	33	3.76		
36. The work I do is valued as highly as the work of other faculty in my department	31	3.74	33	3.82		
37. Faculty in my department are supportive of colleagues who want to balance their family and career lives	29	3.79	33	3.85		
38. My department is a comfortable working environment for individuals of varied backgrounds and perspectives	31	4.00	33	4.03		

\* Statistically significant F values reported.

\*\* No statistically significant gender differences

**REGRESSION PREDICTING OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Model Summary		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	R	Adjusted R Square	
1	(Constant)	1.418	0.400		3.544	0.001	0.720	0.504
	Q14	0.754	0.125	0.720	6.042	0.000		
2	(Constant)	0.479	0.488		0.980	0.334	0.784	0.591
	Q14	0.448	0.155	0.427	2.881	0.007		
	Q22	0.523	0.182	0.427	2.876	0.007		
3	(Constant)	-0.045	0.484		-0.094	0.926	0.830	0.660
	Q14	0.200	0.168	0.191	1.192	0.242		
	Q22	0.553	0.166	0.451	3.328	0.002		
	Q13	0.328	0.118	0.351	2.775	0.009		
4	(Constant)	-0.265	0.454		-0.584	0.564	0.862	0.711
	Q14	-0.063	0.185	-0.060	-0.339	0.737		
	Q22	0.547	0.153	0.446	3.566	0.001		
	Q13	0.315	0.109	0.338	2.889	0.007		
	Q15	0.338	0.132	0.352	2.573	0.015		

\*Forward selection of variables

**Dependent Variable**

24. My overall job satisfaction

**Independent Variables (predictors)**

- 14. Rewards and recognition for teaching
- 22. The use of my time spent in school committees and task forces
- 13. Collaboration among my colleagues on projects of mutual interest
- 15. Rewards and recognition for research and scholarly activity

## FACTOR ANALYSIS

Component	% of		
	Eigen Values	Variance	Cumulative %
1	14.96	39%	39%
2	3.54	9%	49%
3	2.96	8%	56%
4	2.40	6%	63%
5	1.84	5%	68%
6	1.65	4%	72%
7	1.37	4%	76%
8	1.18	3%	79%
9	1.04	3%	81%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Q1	-0.001	0.116	0.220	0.255	0.525	0.530	0.122	-0.007	0.323
Q2	0.267	0.061	-0.110	0.214	-0.028	<b>0.817</b>	0.106	0.069	0.041
Q3	0.106	0.082	0.050	-0.190	0.336	<b>0.763</b>	0.037	0.246	0.169
Q4	0.211	0.252	0.088	-0.163	<b>0.614</b>	0.392	0.082	0.281	-0.075
Q5	0.109	0.575	0.100	-0.068	0.316	0.421	-0.114	0.143	-0.121
Q6	-0.082	0.210	0.046	-0.093	<b>0.738</b>	-0.007	0.292	0.239	-0.003
Q7	0.359	0.252	0.517	0.104	0.531	0.260	0.001	-0.151	-0.045
Q8	0.651	0.076	0.451	-0.182	0.074	0.402	0.039	-0.086	0.061
Q9	0.533	0.118	0.407	-0.195	0.159	0.224	0.254	0.001	-0.139
Q10	0.419	0.219	0.470	0.216	0.481	0.168	0.069	0.177	-0.019
Q11	0.601	0.443	0.038	0.249	0.217	0.245	-0.028	0.300	0.039
Q12	0.544	0.393	0.005	-0.062	0.002	0.194	0.194	0.147	0.523
Q13	0.429	0.240	0.199	0.061	0.357	0.076	0.078	0.609	0.009
Q14	0.682	0.011	0.225	0.098	0.206	-0.023	0.479	0.192	0.207
Q15	<b>0.774</b>	0.202	0.150	-0.015	0.022	0.127	0.314	0.136	-0.041
Q16	<b>0.849</b>	0.191	0.090	0.068	-0.064	-0.023	0.132	0.222	0.125
Q17	0.336	0.681	0.138	0.243	-0.082	0.021	0.119	0.319	0.053
Q18	0.116	<b>0.857</b>	0.097	0.203	0.028	0.111	0.269	0.075	0.200
Q19	0.133	<b>0.782</b>	0.183	0.250	0.277	0.044	0.114	0.166	0.067
Q20	0.272	<b>0.803</b>	0.094	0.224	0.287	0.046	0.132	0.031	0.152
Q21	0.368	0.085	0.200	0.301	0.338	0.132	0.641	0.059	-0.072
Q22	0.267	0.201	0.399	0.100	0.117	0.139	0.758	0.039	-0.016
Q23	0.276	0.220	0.233	0.042	0.135	0.045	0.764	-0.030	0.282
Q24	0.468	0.200	0.297	0.141	0.133	0.068	0.473	0.368	0.141
Q25	0.310	0.291	0.219	0.112	-0.030	0.200	0.151	<b>0.696</b>	0.015
Q26	0.150	0.069	0.071	0.319	0.218	0.264	0.010	<b>0.718</b>	0.155
Q27	0.097	0.151	0.168	0.217	0.098	0.201	0.110	0.114	<b>0.830</b>
Q28	-0.079	0.281	0.215	0.078	-0.154	0.587	0.075	0.446	0.385
Q29	0.092	0.181	0.217	0.555	0.298	-0.022	-0.199	0.433	0.165
Q30	0.276	0.284	0.222	0.562	0.322	0.083	-0.191	0.299	0.197
Q31	0.017	0.293	0.106	<b>0.734</b>	0.328	0.132	-0.042	0.251	0.269
Q32	-0.125	0.279	0.050	<b>0.771</b>	0.015	0.084	0.210	0.081	-0.031
Q33	0.046	0.063	0.180	<b>0.812</b>	-0.106	-0.063	0.212	0.004	0.027
Q34	0.052	0.037	0.167	0.370	<b>0.767</b>	0.010	0.118	-0.031	0.137
Q35	0.111	0.011	<b>0.801</b>	0.194	0.110	0.346	0.075	0.172	0.012
Q36	0.258	0.053	<b>0.703</b>	0.198	0.034	-0.143	0.383	0.205	0.066
Q37	0.219	0.084	<b>0.767</b>	0.088	0.142	-0.141	0.288	0.231	0.106
Q38	0.053	0.330	<b>0.732</b>	0.182	0.140	-0.076	0.189	0.015	0.232

\* Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

\*\* Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

\*\*\* Highlighted loadings above .6 and lower than .4 on other factors

