

Senate Ad hoc Committee for the Assessment of the
Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Faculty Survey

Report on 2013-2014 Findings

Members

Felicia Lask, Associate Professor of Marketing, D'Amore-McKim School of Business, Chair

Janet H. Randall, Professor, College of Social Sciences and Humanities

Yiannis Leventis, Distinguished Professor, College of Engineering

Ann C. Golub-Victor, Associate Clinical Professor, Bouvé College of Health Sciences

March 12, 2016

Executive Summary

In Fall 2015, the Senate Agenda Committee convened an Ad hoc Committee on the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Faculty Survey. The committee was charged with examining the Northeastern University (NU) results on the HERI Survey for the purpose of identifying key strengths and concerns pertaining to the faculty's perceptions of the University.

The committee reviewed (1) hard copy reports prepared by HERI at UCLA, (2) exhibits created by NU's Office of Institutional Research (OIR) and (3) the corresponding data sets (2013-14, 2010-11, 2007-08, 2004-05). All faculty were invited to participate in the 2013-14 survey. Table 1 presents results that were prepared by OIR on job satisfaction, professional satisfaction, work climate and institutional identification. Our committee prepared Tables 2 and 3 to display HERI survey items concerning governance, teaching, research and funding, and diversity.

From our review of the items in Tables 1 and 2, select major findings of the 2013-14 HERI faculty surveyed show:

- Over 75% were “satisfied overall with their job.”
- Criteria for advancement and promotion are not clear to more than one third of the faculty.
- Almost 25% agreed that “faculty are at odds with the administration” is a very descriptive statement and about 49% agreed that this statement is “somewhat descriptive.”
- About half (49.8%) agreed that “faculty here respect each other” is a very descriptive statement.
- Despite the importance of teaching at the University, only a small portion of the faculty (12.9%) labeled “faculty are rewarded for being good teachers” as a very descriptive statement.

The Ad hoc Committee recommends sharing the 2013-14 HERI results with faculty and convening an ad hoc Faculty Senate to explore the underlying reasons for the concerns identified in this report.

I. Background

Charge: The Senate Ad hoc Committee was charged with examining Northeastern University's results on the Higher Education Research Institute's (HERI) Survey for the purpose of identifying key strengths and concerns pertaining to the faculty's perceptions of the University. Specifically, the committee was asked to summarize the Northeastern results (a) longitudinally, (b) in comparison to a peer group of private universities, and (c) with particular attention to faculty's role in university decision-making.

Process: The committee met seven times between October 2015 and March 2016. Over these six months, the committee reviewed in hard copy (1) reports prepared by HERI at UCLA and (2) reports created by NU's OIR. As we examined the material provided to us, we requested additional information that had not been provided in a useful format. Subsequently, the committee was provided with raw data sets for the following surveys: 2004-2005; 2007-2008, 2010-2011, 2013-2014.

We were informed that all NU faculty were invited to participate in the 2013-14 HERI faculty survey. An email invitation was sent in June 2014.

The Private Universities 2013-14 (PU) results come from the *Undergraduate Teaching Faculty: The 2013-2014 HERI Faculty Survey* report. HERI classifies these private universities as "medium, high and very high selectivity" institutions¹ and Northeastern University is classified in the "very high selectivity" group. Note that the committee did not have access to the raw PU comparison data.

We combined the data for 2013-2014 and 2010-2011 for comparison and included tenured (T), tenure track (TT), and non-tenure track (NTT) faculty who had responded to at least one of the items listed in Tables 1 and 2.² Please note that our sample sizes do not exactly match those listed in Table 1 that were supplied by the OIR.

II. Results

Table 1

Table 1 presents a series of HERI items that reflect faculty (A) job satisfaction, (B) professional satisfaction, (C) work climate and (D) institutional identification. This table is a compilation of the original data supplied by OIR plus additional 2010-11 data that was originally labeled NA, which we were able to retrieve from the raw data sets (highlighted in light green). The items' response categories are provided in Appendix A. Below we provide tables highlighting differences between 2013-14 and PU results, excerpted from Table 1.

¹ Eagan, M. K., Stolzenberg, E. B., Berdan Lozano, J., Aragon, M. C., Suchard, M. R., Hurtado, S. (2014), *Undergraduate Teaching Faculty: The 2013-2014 HERI Faculty Survey*, Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

² The committee would like to thank Melis Unsal, Full-Time MBA student, for her help in combining the 2013-14 and 2010-11 data and preparing the report tables.

Table 1: Faculty Satisfaction and Engagement HERI Items

HERI FACULTY SURVEY 2004 TO 2014 (NORTHEASTERN) WITH PEER AND PRIVATE UNIVERSITY COMPARISON GROUPS (2014): FACULTY SATISFACTION AND ENGAGEMENT FOCUS																					
Categories	2013-14					2010-11				2007-2008				2004-2005				Private Uni. 2013-14			
	Total	T	TT	NTT	Item Resp	Total	T	TT	NTT	Total	T	TT	NTT	Total	T	TT	NTT	Total	T	TT	NTT
Sample Sizes	515	244	97	174	.	272	127	53	92	241	123	53	65	387	209	71	107	2,528	1,453	506	569
Job Satisfaction (% Very Satisfied or Satisfied)																					
1. Opportunity for scholarly pursuits	66.5	78.5	73.0	47.0	79.0	61.2	65.4	73.6	46.3	60.7	63.4	61.1	55.4	59.9	60.7	64.2	55.1	70.0	75.0	70.0	54.0
2. Professional relations with other faculty*	75.0	78.0	77.0	70.0	79.5	71.1	69.3	71.7	73.1	74.0	76.4	66.7	75.4	74.3	73.9	70.6	77.5	80.0	78.5	79.5	79.8
3. Competency of colleagues	81.2	79.0	81.0	83.0	79.5	77.9	74.0	78.8	82.8	77.7	79.7	64.8	84.6	73.0	71.6	64.7	81.2	84.0	84.0	81.0	86.0
4. Departmental leadership*	66.0	67.8	68.0	62.0	78.0	57.0	48.4	66.0	63.4	56.6	56.1	55.6	58.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	72.0	73.0	73.0	68.0
5. Prospects for career advancement*	54.0	67.0	69.0	28.0	72.0	49.8	56.1	68.6	29.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	63.0	68.0	72.0	38.0
6. Satisfied overall with job*	75.3	78.0	73.3	72.0	78.5	70.0	72.4	71.7	65.6	67.8	70.7	57.4	70.8	75.3	76.6	72.4	74.6	81.0	83.0	79.0	77.0
Professional Satisfaction (Items 1-3: % Agree Strongly or Agree Somewhat, Item 4: % Definitely Yes or Probably Yes)																					
1. My teaching is valued by dept colleagues	88.0	89.7	85.0	86.8	81.7	86.4	88.8	88.4	81.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	88.0	87.0	90.0	87.0
2. My research is valued by dept colleagues*	73.0	78.9	85.0	54.0	80.0	68.8	76.0	81.1	51.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	78.0	81.0	84.0	64.0
3. Criteria for advancement and promotion decisions are clear*	59.0	65.0	57.5	51.0	81.0	63.4	63.2	70.6	59.6	61.8	71.5	47.2	55.4	66.5	75.3	62.5	50.0	70.0	74.0	70.0	59.0
4. Would still want to come to this institution if beginning career**	70.0	70.2	69.0	69.0	78.9	67.9	62.2	64.1	78.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	77.0	76.0	78.0	76.0
Work Climate (Items 1-2: % Very Descriptive, Items 3-4: % Agree Strongly or Agree)																					
1. Faculty are at odds w/ administration***	24.6	29.9	20.3	19.1	77.0	24.7	32.3	19.6	17.2	17.5	15.6	20.8	18.5	12.0	11.6	12.5	12.3	18.0	20.0	13.0	17.0
2. Faculty here respect each other***	49.8	50.7	55.4	44.7	78.0	45.0	44.9	51.0	41.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	58.0	58.0	64.0	51.0
3. Faculty are committed to welfare of institution	90.0	88.7	93.7	87.3	81.0	87.6	84.6	90.6	89.7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	93.0	95.0	93.0	90.0
4. Faculty are sufficiently involved in campus decision making	42.0	38.3	46.3	47.0	81.0	48.3	35.2	66.7	56.7	48.9	42.9	51.9	57.4	40.7	44.9	39.1	33.3	45.0	40.0	49.0	55.0
Institutional Identification (% Agree Strongly or Agree)																					
1. I am happy w/ the pace of institutional change at NU	62.8	62.3	67.1	61.4	75.2	68.5	63.2	69.6	75.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2. I am proud to be a faculty member at NU	89.1	87.8	87.8	91.3	75.2	90.7	91.3	82.0	94.6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
3. I feel confident recommending that strong students apply to NU	88.1	91.0	83.8	85.7	75.4	90.6	90.4	85.7	93.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 1 continued

Additional Notes on Data:
* Definitely Yes/Probably Yes
** Very Descriptive
^a indicates a 5% or more difference between 2013-14 NU and Private U.
NOTE: Original chart prepared by the Office of Institutional Research. Percentages in light green reflect 271 respondents from the 2010-11 dataset (1 less NTT.)

A. Job Satisfaction. In Table 1, the percentage of “very satisfied” and “satisfied” responses for the six job satisfaction items ranged from 54% to 81.2%. Four of these items stood out as diverging considerably from the PU results. (1) NU faculty’s satisfaction rating of 75% for “professional relations with other faculty” (#2) is 5% lower than the PU result. Notably, this difference may come from the lower rating by the NTT faculty (70%) as compared with T/TT (78%/77%). (2) “Departmental leadership” (#4) is rated by NU faculty at 66% compared to the PU rating of 72%. (3) “Prospects for career advancement” (#5) (54%) is rated 9% lower by NU faculty than the PU rating of 63%. This result appears to be driven by the NTT responses (28.0%). (4) “Overall job satisfaction” (#6) is rated at 75.3%, over 5% below the PU result of 81%.

Table 1A

Job Satisfaction Items	2013-14 Result	PU Result
2. Professional relations with others.	75.0%	80.0%
4. Departmental leadership.	66.0	72.0
5. Prospects for career advancement.	54.0	63.0
6. Overall job satisfaction	75.3	81.0

B. Professional Satisfaction. Professional satisfaction items focus on the value of teaching and research, clear criteria for advancement and promotion, and on the question: would you still come to NU to begin your career? The percentage of “Agree Strongly” or “Agree Somewhat” responses for the first three professional satisfaction items range from 59% to 88% with 70% answering “definitely yes” or “probably yes” that they would “still want to come to this institution if beginning their career.” Three of these items stood out as diverging greatly from the PU results. Five percent differences between NU and PU results emerged on items #2 “my research is valued by department colleagues” (73% vs. 78%) and #4 “would you still want to come to this institution if beginning career” (70% vs. 77%). The most striking difference in this category, however, was in item #3, “Criteria for advancement and promotion decisions are clear” at 59% vs. 70% PU. Over 40% of the NU faculty respondents are unclear about these criteria.

Table 1B

Professional Satisfaction Items	2013-14 Result	PU Result
2. My research is valued by department colleagues.	73.0%	78.0%
3. Criteria for advancement and promotion decisions are clear.	59.0	70.0
4. Would you still want to come to this institution if beginning career.	70.0	77.0

C. Work Climate. Some NU faculty surveyed describe a non-inclusive work environment, unreceptive to faculty input, both in comparison to other PU faculty currently and over time. In

2013-14, 24.6% report that (#1) “faculty are at odds with the administration”³ as “very descriptive” in comparison with 18.0% PU faculty. Over the last 10 years, this feeling at NU has steeply increased from 12% (2004-05) to 24.6%. Along the same lines are the results of (#4) “faculty are sufficiently involved in campus decision making.” Here, less than half of the faculty respondents (42%) feel included, despite their interest, as evidenced by (#3) an overwhelming 90% “are committed to the welfare of the institution.” Another noteworthy result in this category is (#2) “faculty here respect each other” at 49.8%⁴ in comparison to a 58% PU result.

Table 1C

Work Climate Items	2013-14 Result	PU Result
1. Faculty are at odds with administration.	24.6%	18.0%
2. Faculty here respect each other.	49.8	58.0

D. Institutional Identification. Although we do not have comparison data from other PU institutions we note that a majority of NU faculty (62.8%) are (#1) “happy with the pace of institutional change at NU.” Almost 90% of NU faculty are (#2) “proud to be a faculty member at NU (89.1%)” and (#3) “confident recommending that strong students apply to NU (88.1%).”

E. Comparison of the 2013-14 and 2010-11. The 2013-14 and 2010-11 results of all of the items in Table 1 were compared. Statistical differences were found for four of the 17 items. For Job Satisfaction items, when 2013-14 mean results were compared with 2010-11 mean results, items #2, “professional relations with other faculty,” (p=.031) and #4, “departmental leadership,” (p= .018) showed a statistical increase in satisfaction. For Professional Satisfaction items, when 2013-14 mean results were compared with 2010-11 mean results, items #1, “my teaching is valued by department colleagues,” (p=.024) and #2, “my research is valued by department colleagues,” (p= .009) showed an increase in agreement. For Work Climate and Institutional Identification items, no differences were found between 2013-14 and 2010-11 results.

Tables 2 and 3 present the results of some additional items that the committee was interested in reviewing across four HERI studies and PU. These items reflect (F) Governance, (G) Teaching, (H) Research and Funding and (I) Diversity. The items response categories are provided in Appendix A. Below we provide tables for the 2013-14 and PU results, excerpted from Table 2.

Table 2

F. Governance. Item #1 “Administrators consider faculty concerns when making policy,” in this table echoes the sentiment reported in section C. Work Climate items #1 and #4 above: “Faculty are at odds with administration” (#1) and “Faculty are sufficiently involved in campus

³ About 49.1% of the faculty surveyed described this item (#1) as “somewhat descriptive.”

⁴ About 43.3% of the faculty surveyed described this item (#2) as “somewhat descriptive.”

Table 2: 2013-14 Additional Items

Item Description (Item Response Rate 2013-2014)	2013-2014	2010-2011	2007-2008	2004-2005	Priv. 2013-'14
Sample Size (n)	511	271	242	469	2232^b
1. Administrators consider faculty concerns when making policy. (78.9%)	10.2%	10.8%	10.4%	NA	13.6%
2. Faculty are rewarded for being good teachers. ^a (80.2%)	12.9	13.4	10.0	11.9	23.6
3. Taught an exclusively web-based course. ^a (97.5%)	16.3	14.4	8.3	3.8	8.5
4. Taught a capstone course. (97.5%)	29.9	31.9	NA	NA	30.5
5. Engaged in academic research that spans multiple disciplines. (98.6%)	72.2	64.1	43.8	41.2	76.9
6. Received funding from foundations. ^a (93.9%)	21.9	18.5	21.1	24.6	30
7. Received funding from State/Federal. ^a (95.7%)	33.3	28.5	31.5	30	25.2
8. Received funding from Business and Industry. (93.5%)	16.3	15.6	19.4	20.2	12.3
9. Racial and ethnic diversity is reflected in the curriculum. (82.0%)	61.8	NA	NA	NA	61.6
10. Racial and ethnic diversity should be more strongly reflected in the curriculum.	NA	49.4	45.6	45.9	NA
11. Faculty are not prepared to deal with conflict over diversity issues in class. (79.3%)	41.7	NA	NA	NA	42.3

Additional Notes on Data:
Item 1, 2: The percentage of those who responded "Very Descriptive"
Items 3-8: The percentage of those who responded "Yes".
Items 9-11: The percentage of those who responded "Agree Strongly" and "Agree Somewhat."
NA: Data not available.
^a Indicates a 5% or more difference between 2013-14 NU and Private Universities.
^b Eagan et al. 2014, p. 26

decision making” (#4). Only 10.2% of NU faculty responded that “Administrators consider faculty concerns when making policy” is “very descriptive.”⁵

Table 2F

Governance Item	2013-14 Result	PU Result
1. Administrators consider faculty concerns when making policy.	10.2%	13.6%

G. Teaching. Items #2, #3, and #4 focus on teaching. For item #2, “Faculty are rewarded for being good teachers,” the NU percentages rating it as “very descriptive” are consistently low over the years. We note that the percentage of NU respondents who rated “Faculty are rewarded for being good teachers” as “very descriptive” (12.9%)⁶ is drastically lower – almost half – as compared with the PU percentage (23.6%). Reflecting NU’s growing leadership position in global online education, over 16% of faculty reported that they had (#3) “taught an exclusively web-based course” in the past two years, 7.8% higher than PU. On item #4, 29.9% of the faculty responded that they had “taught a capstone course” in the past two years. This result is in line with PU faculty (30.5%).

Table 2G

Teaching Items	2013-14 Result	PU Result
2. Faculty are rewarded for being good teachers.	12.9%	23.6%
3. Taught an exclusively web-based course.	16.3	8.5
4. Taught a capstone course.	29.9	30.5

H. Research and Funding. Items #5-#8 in Table 2 report on research focus and funding. Across the years, faculty who report engaging in academic research that spans multiple disciplines has increased, 72.2% in 2013-14 from 41.2% in 2004-05. During the past two years, NU respondents noted that 21.9% had received foundation funding, 33.3% had received State/Federal funding and 16.3% had received funding from business and industry. NU reported that funding from foundations was about 8% lower and funding from State and Federal sources was about 8% higher than the percentages reported by PU. Given Northeastern University’s new Research 1 designation, it is not surprising - and a strength - that our faculty reports higher State and Federal funding than peer private universities.

⁵ Another 46.7% of the faculty surveyed described this item (#4) as “somewhat descriptive.”

⁶ Another 46.6% of the faculty surveyed described this item (#2) as “somewhat descriptive.”

Table 2H

Research and Funding Items	2013-14 Result	PU Result
5. Engaged in academic research that spans multiple disciplines.	72.2%	76.9%
6. Received funding from foundations.	21.9	30.0
7. Received funding from State/Federal.	33.3	25.2
8. Received funding from Business and Industry.	16.3	12.3

I. Diversity. The last three items in Table 2 (#9-#11) explore diversity issues. In 2013-14, 61.8% of NU respondents agreed (strongly or somewhat) that (#9) “Racial and ethnic diversity is reflected in the curriculum.” While not directly comparable to item #9, item #10 results are included from the earlier data collection periods. A new item (#11) appears in the 2013-14 survey, “Faculty are not prepared to deal with conflict over diversity issues in class.” NU faculty reported that 41.7% strongly or somewhat agreed with this statement. Both of these results (#9, #11) are in line with the PU percentages.

Table 2I

Diversity Items	2013-14 Result	PU Result
9. Racial and ethnic diversity is reflected in the curriculum.	61.8%	61.6%
11. Faculty are not prepared to deal with conflict over diversity issues in class.	41.7	42.3

K. Comparison of 2013-14 and 2010-11. Items #1-#8 were compared using the 2013-14 and 2010-11 data. Statistical differences were found for two of the eight items: #2 and #5. For item #2, while the percentages for “very descriptive” were consistent, there was a significant increase from 2010-11 to 2013-14 in faculty who responded that the statement “Faculty are rewarded for being good teachers” is “not descriptive” from 31.6% to 40.5% ($p=.055$). Agreement with item #5, faculty “engaged in academic research that spans multiple disciplines,” also significantly increased between 2010-11 and 2013-14 from 64.1% to 72.2% ($p=.019$).

Table 3

Table 3 presents the additional 2013-14 items by tenure status. Significant differences were found among the ranks in all but two items. A higher percentage of T (50.2%) faculty than TT (32.9%) and NTT (38.0%) faculty rated item #1, “Administrators consider faculty concerns when making policy,” as “not descriptive” ($p=.065$). For #3, a higher percentage of NTT (29.9%) faculty reported teaching an exclusively web-based course than T (12.1%) and TT (2.2%) faculty ($p = .000$). Items #5 – #8 reflect a higher percentage of T and TT faculty than NTT faculty stated that they were engaged in multi-disciplinary research ($p = .000$), received funding from foundations ($p=.000$), state/federal governments ($p = .000$) and business and industry ($p = .000$). The T, TT and NTT percentages for items #5-#8 are shown in Table 3. For items #9 and #11, TT faculty (mean = 2.47) disagreed more than T (mean = 2.68) and NTT

Table 3: 2013-14 Additional Items by Tenure Status

Item Description	T	TT	NTT	p-value
Sample Size (n)	248	92	171	
1. Administrators consider faculty concerns when making policy.	9.5%	11%	10.9%	p<.10
2. Faculty are rewarded for being good teachers.	12.7	17.6	10.6	ns
3. Taught an exclusively web-based course.	12.1	2.2	29.9	p<.01
4. Taught a capstone course.	32.2	21.7	31.1	ns
5. Engaged in academic research that spans multiple disciplines.	82.1	84.6	50.9	p<.01
6. Received funding from foundations.	25.2	33	10.8	p<.01
7. Received funding from State/Federal.	43.3	47.2	11.1	p<.01
8. Received funding from Business and Industry.	22.9	18.4	5.6	p<.01
9. Racial and ethnic diversity is reflected in curriculum.	61.7	53.2	67.1	p<.05
11. Faculty are not prepared to deal with conflict over diversity issues in class.	45.5	44	34.6	p<.05

Additional Notes on Data:
Cross-tabs were run for Items 1-8 by Tenure Status
ANOVAs were run for Items 9, 11 by Tenure Status

faculty (mean = 2.80) that “racial and ethnic diversity is reflected in curriculum,” where 1 is “Disagree Strongly” and 4 is “Agree Strongly” ($p=.021$). NTT faculty (mean = 2.22) disagreed more than T faculty (mean = 2.45) that “faculty are not prepared to deal with conflict over diversity issues in the classroom,” where 1 is “Disagree Strongly” and 4 is “Agree Strongly” ($p=.037$).

III. Major Findings

As revealed in a range of response items, the findings from the 2013-14 faculty surveyed show:

On research:

- Over 72% reported that they are engaged in multidisciplinary academic research.
- About one third stated that they had received State or Federal funding to support their academic research.

On teaching:

- Despite the importance of teaching at the University, only a small portion of the faculty (12.9%) labeled “faculty are rewarded for being good teachers” as a very descriptive statement.
- Almost 17% have taught an exclusively web-based course.

On satisfaction with their careers at NU (job and professional satisfaction):

- Over 75% were “satisfied overall with their job.”
- Just over half (54%) were satisfied with their “prospects for career advancement.” Only 28% of NTT were satisfied.
- Criteria for advancement and promotion are not clear to more than one third of the faculty.

On relationships among the faculty and between faculty and administration (work climate):

- Almost 25% agreed that “faculty are at odds with the administration” is a very descriptive statement and about 49% agreed that this statement is “somewhat descriptive.”
- About half (49.8%) agreed that “faculty here respect each other” is a very descriptive statement.

IV. Recommendations

- We recommend that Northeastern University’s 2013-14 HERI Faculty Survey results be shared with the Northeastern full-time faculty through Sharepoint. We expect that some of the HERI information could be useful to University entities including the Center for Teaching and Learning through Research, the Faculty Senate Financial Affairs committee, and others.

- We recommend setting up an ad hoc Faculty Senate committee to address key concerns revealed by this report.
 - We propose that the goal of this ad hoc committee is to identify the underlying reasons for these concerns and to make recommendations for addressing them.
 - We suggest that the ad hoc committee provide a series of University-wide meetings spanning an academic year for the faculty and the administration to discuss issues highlighted in this report.
 - Some members of this committee are willing to serve on this task force and Professor Randall would consider leading this effort.
 - We also suggest that database and clerical assistance be provided to the ad hoc committee.

Appendix A – Scale Response Categories

Table 1

Job Satisfaction Items #1 - #6
1 = Not Applicable
2 = Not Satisfied
3 = Marginally Satisfied
4 = Satisfied
5 = Very Satisfied
Professional Satisfaction Items #1-3, Work Climate Items #3-#4
1 = Disagree Strongly
2 = Disagree Somewhat
3 = Agree Somewhat
4 = Agree Strongly
Professional Satisfaction Item #4
1 = Definitely No
2 = Probably No
3 = Not Sure
4 = Probably Yes
5 = Definitely Yes
Work Climate Items #1-#2
1 = Not Descriptive
2 = Somewhat Descriptive
3 = Very Descriptive
Institutional Identification Items #1-#3
1 = No Basis for Judgment
2 = Strongly Disagree
3 = Disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

Tables 2A and 2B

Items #1 - #2
1 = Not Descriptive
2 = Somewhat Descriptive
3 = Very Descriptive
Items #3 - #8
1 = No
2 = Yes
Items #9 - #11
1 = Disagree Strongly
2 = Disagree Somewhat
3 = Agree Somewhat
4 = Agree Strongly