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College student personnel (CSP) professional preparation program faculty are a unique group in higher education because their work spans both student affairs and academic affairs functions. The purpose of this Q methodology study was to explore the perspectives that full-time, tenure-track CSP faculty hold about full-time, tenure-track, non-CSP faculty. Specifically, this study examined what factors emerged when CSP faculty at Carnegie Classification Research Universities/High Research Activity institutions were asked to model their viewpoints about faculty via a Q sort. This process involved CSP faculty placing 36 statements about faculty and faculty life into a forced distribution grid representing the array of statements with which they most agreed to the statements with which they most disagreed.

A total of 28 CSP faculty participated, with 18 completing the sorts in person and 10 completing the sorts online. Post-sort interviews with participants and demographic data were also collected. Q factor analysis of the sorts revealed two viewpoints about faculty. One viewpoint focuses on the professional contributions of faculty. The second factor focuses on the difficulties of academic life and the mixed successes faculty have in meeting the demands of their job. This study serves as a foundation for further research into perceptions about faculty among student affairs faculty and practitioners.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Scenario

Imagine walking down the hall of a college of education. In doing so, you pass a series of classrooms, each of which is filled with graduate students. These students are attending graduate school so that they can find jobs working at colleges or universities in the area of student affairs. Some want to be academic advisors; others want to work in residence halls, admissions, or student life. The curriculum of their graduate program focuses on issues of student development, leadership skills, diversity concerns, assessment, university organization, and the history of higher education.

As you walk down the hall, you notice that although the classes mainly talk about students or university organization, the faculty members at the front of the classrooms make occasional comments about their faculty colleagues. Here is what you hear as you pass each room:

*Faculty member in room number one:* “Faculty are at the heart of the institution. Without them you don’t have a university.”

*Faculty member in room number two:* “It is hard for faculty because the institution says it wants both teaching and scholarship to be strong. But at the same time the institution really rewards them on scholarship while demanding most of their time for teaching.”

*Faculty member in room number three:* “Trying to get faculty to do anything is like trying to herd cats.”
Faculty member in room number four: “Many faculty are ghost faculty who rarely set foot on campus and have little interest in students.”

What do you know about faculty after walking down that hallway? It seems as though each faculty member has a different view about faculty and faculty life. Even though they say different things, are the faculty members’ viewpoints actually diverse? You might also question if the program has a message about faculty that it wants students to learn. One of the goals of student affairs is encouraging collaboration between student affairs practitioners and faculty. Do these messages about faculty promote collaboration when students enter the student affairs workforce?

**Context**

*The Student Personnel Point of View*, published by the American Council of Education in 1937, outlined the need for coordinated and cooperative efforts between academic and student personnel professionals to produce effective teaching. Similar calls for collaboration increased in volume in the 21st century (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001; Kezar, 2003). Despite an increase in the frequency and vehemence of these calls for collaboration, academic affairs and student affairs functionally remain separate because of perceived differences in mission, assumptions about student learning, and culture (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001).

College student personnel (CSP) professional preparation programs and their faculty fit into a unique niche between these two realms of higher education. These graduate programs are designed to prepare professionals to work in functional areas of higher education, particularly in student affairs positions (McEwen & Talbot, 1998). At
the same time, these programs are housed in academic departments and the faculty who teach in these programs has responsibilities to academic affairs. Consequently, faculty in these programs has dual affinities in the university: as teachers and practitioners they simultaneously navigate between the two worlds of academic faculty and student affairs administration (Evans & Williams, 1998).

Although CSP faculty represents a unique juncture in the university, little research has been done to study their unique professional role and their influence on future administrators. Current studies on CSP faculty have looked at faculty demographics, publishing habits, and job challenges; none has examined the perceptions that faculty in those programs hold about other faculty and faculty roles (Amey, Dannells, Lovell, & Heinmiller, 2005; Amey, Lovell, Heinmiller-King, Li, & Dannells, 2007; Keim, 2008). If a goal of the academy is greater cooperation and understanding between academic and student affairs, it is important to understand what perspectives are held by those who are familiar with and navigate both areas and who then socialize other people to do the same. To that end, this study examined the perceptions CSP professional preparation program faculty hold about a key component of academic affairs: full-time, tenure-track, non-CSP faculty.

**Purpose and Research Questions**

The purpose of this Q methodology study was to explore the perspectives that full-time, tenure-track college student personnel professional preparation program faculty hold about full-time, tenure-track faculty outside of college student personnel professional preparation programs. Specifically, this study examined what factors
emerged when CSP faculty at Carnegie Classification Research Universities/High Research Activity (RU/H) institutions were asked to agree and disagree with positive, negative, and neutral statements about areas of faculty life including teaching, research, and service. Three research questions guide this study.

*Research Question One:* What factors emerge from participants’ responses to a Q sort concerning their perceptions about full-time, tenure track, non-CSP faculty at their institution?

*Research Question Two:* How do these factors differ?

*Research Question Three:* Are there common sentiments across factors?

**Significance**

The primary significance of this study stems from the need for CSP faculty to foster collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs and to model positive attitudes for the students to take with them into their future careers. According to Carpenter, Patitu, and Cuyjet, “students who are graduated from student affairs preparation programs are immediately on the firing line . . . they need to have had good role models during their brief stint of professional education” (Carpenter et al., 1999, p. 22). As administrators trained to manage a university, CSP graduates can create bridges between student affairs and academic affairs and foster an atmosphere of cooperation and understanding in the organization. Consequently, the results of this study affect not only faculty of CSP programs, but also students of the programs and other college administrators who will depend upon the CSP students’ skills upon graduation.
Research Methodology

This study was approached from a Q methodology framework. Developed by William Stephenson in the 1930s, Q methodology is the study of people’s subjective, self-referent perspectives (Brown, 1980). The method for capturing these points of view is a Q sort, a process by which participants sort a set of stimuli into a forced distribution grid according to the extent to which they agree or disagree with the stimuli. In this way, participants model their points of view around a given “domain of subjectivity,” or “communication concourse” (Stephenson, 1978). Once a set of Q sorts is collected, factor analysis is used to examine the intercorrelations of these sorts and to see what common perspectives, or factors, emerge. These emergent factors can then be examined in regards to “consensual and divergent subjectivity,” giving the researcher the opportunity to explore the nature of multiple perspectives around the topic of study (p. 13).

Delimitations of the Study

This study was delimited by the following factors:

1. This study examined the perspectives held by full-time, tenure-track faculty about other full-time, tenure-track faculty. Perspectives by or about part-time or non-tenure-track faculty were not included.

2. Only perspectives held by CSP faculty were included.

3. Only perspectives from Carnegie classification RU/H institutions were included.
4. Perspectives are limited to those that CSP faculty have about other faculty, not academic affairs as a whole.

5. Only perspectives about faculty life in the areas of teaching, research, and service were explored.

Assumptions

A few key assumptions were made in the design of this study. The first is that “faculty” is a concept that can be explored as a whole. Although all faculty are unique individuals and have different experiences during their academic careers, people both inside and outside of higher education frequently refer to faculty as a singular group. This study seeks to explore the reactions that CSP faculty have to statements that refer to faculty in this way. This study is based on the assumption that there are common experiences and realities of faculty life that, although they may be interpreted or experienced in different ways, create a common faculty experience within an institution.

Another assumption is that the CSP faculty participants will be able to think about these statements about faculty and sort them to reflect accurately their personal views. Inherent in this assumption are three different conditions. The first is that CSP faculty will be able to think about full-time, tenure-track, non-CSP faculty in the general sense and not become stymied by the knowledge that the statements are generalizations that do not take into account individual differences among faculty. The second condition in this assumption is that faculty will be able to read the statements as if they are talking about other people and not about themselves in their roles as faculty. The third condition is that
the CSP faculty participants will sort the statements such that they accurately reflect their views and not just views that might be considered socially desirable.

**Key Terms and Definitions**

Academic Affairs: This division of the university typically includes faculty, instructors, academic department support staff and academic administrators such as deans, and academic chairs. Academic affairs divisions traditionally have focused on student learning in the classroom, curriculum development, and students’ cognitive development (Cook, Ghering, & Lewis, 2007). For this study, the term academic affairs is represented by a core group of this division: full-time, tenure-track faculty.

Carnegie Classification Research University/High Research Productivity (RU/H): Since 1970 the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education has maintained a classification system of higher education institutions in which institutions are classified according to (a) Basic Classification, (b) Undergraduate and Graduate Instructional Program classifications, (c) Enrollment Profile and Undergraduate Profile classifications, and (d) Size and Setting classifications (Carnegie Foundation, n.d.). This study focused on institutions with the basic classification level of Research University/High Research Productivity (RU/H). These institutions fall under the broader category of Doctorate-Granting Universities, a category that includes institutions that awarded at least 20 doctoral degrees in the year prior to classification, excluding professional practice doctorates and special focus or tribal institutions. The level of research activity is determined through measures that include expenditures, numbers of staff, and degrees conferred in both science and engineering (S&E) and non S&E areas.
College Student Personnel Professional Preparation Programs: College student personnel professional preparation programs, also known as student affairs preparation programs, are graduate-level degree granting academic programs designed to prepare individuals for professional careers as administrators in student affairs within institutions of higher education (Amey et al., 2007). The curricula of these programs are designed to “provide thorough theoretical background and knowledge related to understanding students, higher education, and the practice of student affairs and . . . to develop effective student affairs practitioners through guided and supervised experiences in student affairs” (McEwen & Talbot, 1998, p. 128). CSP programs may include both masters- and doctoral-granting programs and are sometimes combined into programs focusing on higher education administration or counseling.

College Student Personnel Professional Preparation Program Faculty: For this study, college student personnel professional preparation program faculty are defined as individuals who are full-time, tenure-track faculty who self-identify as teaching in CSP type programs.

Communication Concourse: The domain of subjective opinions surrounding a topic. Q samples are drawn from this dialogue about the topic (McKeown & Thomas, 1988).

Q Sort: A process by which a respondent models his or her perspective on a topic by rank ordering a set of purposively sampled stimuli based on a set condition of instruction. Conditions of instruction can either be “simple,” in which participants are asked to rate how much they agree or disagree with a statement, or “operationalizations
of theoretical constructs,“ in which participants are asked to identify things that are most like/most unlike a given object or person (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p. 30).

Student Affairs: Student affairs divisions in colleges and universities are often comprised of departments such as admissions, academic advising, career services, counseling, judicial affairs, residential life, orientation, student activities, student health services, and student financial aid (MacKinnon & Associates, 2004). Services in this area tend to focus on affective or personal student development (Cook, Ghering, et al., 2007).

Organization of the Study

The remainder of this study is presented in four additional chapters, appendixes, and a list of references. Chapter 2 is a review of the literature related to this topic including discussions about student affairs, academic affairs, CSP programs, CSP faculty, faculty, and socialization of graduate students to their field of study. Chapter 3 outlines the research design of the study, including samples, data collection, analysis, and limitations of the study. Chapter 4 presents the results of the study, including demographic characteristics of the participants, factors that emerged from the study, and statements of consensus between the factors. Chapter 5 recaps the preceding chapters, summarizes the results and the research questions, discusses implications of the results, and presents recommendations for practitioners and for future research on this topic.

Summary

CSP faculty sits at the crossroads of student affairs and academic affairs, a unique position in universities where these two divisions are often separated on the basis of
assumed differences in philosophies and goals. From this position, CSP faculty have a
unique opportunity and perhaps an obligation to socialize new student affairs
administrators in a way that fosters collaboration between these two sometimes
conflicting areas of universities. In light of this important role that CSP faculty play, this
study examined what perspectives these faculty hold about a core part of academic
affairs: full-time, tenure-track faculty. Finding out views CSP faculty have about their
faculty colleagues is a first step in understanding how CSP students are prepared for
cross-divisional and collaborative work.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This study examined the perspectives that full-time, tenure-track college student personnel professional preparation program faculty hold about full-time, tenure-track faculty outside of their disciplinary area. Although there currently are no studies directly related to this topic, the following review of literature looks at the information that surrounds this topic, providing the “who, what and why” of this study. First, the question of “who” is addressed by looking at what are college student personnel professional preparation programs and what is known about their faculty. Second, the “what” aspect looks at university faculty broadly defined. Finally, the “why” of this study is examined in two parts: (a) the relationship between student affairs and academic affairs and the calls for collaboration between the two areas and (b) socialization of graduate students.

Who: College Student Personnel Professional Preparation Programs

College student personnel (CSP) professional preparation programs were created to provide a pool of professionals trained in a broad range of student affairs areas, including student development and college and university administration. To achieve this goal, CSP graduate training has taken both a theoretical and a practical approach to professional development (McEwen & Talbot, 1998). Consequently, training in CSP programs has historically followed a two-pronged approach. The first prong involves providing “thorough theoretical background and knowledge related to understanding students, higher education, and the practice of student affairs,” while the second prong is
focused on developing “effective student affairs practitioners through guided and supervised experiences in student affairs” (p. 128).

The first formal graduate program in student affairs administration was created at Teachers College, Columbia University in 1913. This program was designed to train deans and advisers of women (McEwen & Talbot, 1988). By 1946, a study found 50 institutions offering college personnel training, with 37 of these programs offering doctoral degrees in the field. According to the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) Directory of Graduate Programs, by 2010 there were 134 graduate programs in the United States geared toward the preparation of individuals to enter the student affairs profession (Directory of Graduate Programs Preparing Student Affairs Professionals, n.d.). These programs include approximately 130 master’s degree granting programs, 60 doctoral degree granting programs, and 7 educational specialist degree granting programs. Many of the programs offer more than one level of degrees.

Programs that prepare individuals to work within student affairs areas can be known by a variety of different names or be housed in departments with focuses outside of student affairs and college personnel. Academic programs such as higher education administration, community college administration, and counseling are all areas in which CSP programs or affiliated majors may be housed (Keim, 2008). The result of these different types of programs can be different areas of focus across programs. For example, CSP programs affiliated with counseling programs may have a greater focus on student development and developing interpersonal competencies while programs
affiliated with higher education administration programs may have a greater focus on business administration of student affairs and policy issues.

Despite different focuses in particular programs, there are standards that have been identified for professional preparation. In 1964 the Council of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education released a document titled *A Proposal for Professional Preparation in College Student Personnel Work* (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2006). This document outlined standards for professional preparation in student personnel fields. These guidelines have evolved over time to become the “Masters-Level Student Affairs Professional Preparation Guidelines” (2006) presented by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). These standards outline principles for CSP program missions and objectives, recruitment and admission, curriculum policies, pedagogy, academic and student support, professional ethics and legal responsibilities, and program evaluation. According to these standards, the CSP curriculum should be centered on three areas of study: Foundation Studies, Professional Studies, and Supervised Practice. Foundation studies include the “historical, philosophical, ethical, cultural, and research foundations of higher education” (p. 351). Professional studies are to include (a) student development theory; (b) individual and group interventions; (c) organization and administration of student affairs; (d) assessment and evaluation research; and (e) the effect of college on students. Finally, Supervised Practice requires a minimum of 300 hours of practical experiences outside the classroom that expose students to “the breadth and depth of student affairs work,” including experiences in program planning and evaluation, training, advising, and
administration (p. 353). There are currently no officially recognized standards for
doctoral preparation in college student personnel.

In addition to the Council for Advancement of Standards in Higher Education,
there are other notable professional communities formed to study and enhance CSP
programs and the training of future student personnel administrators. The mission of the
ACPA Commission for Professional Preparation states that the group is committed to
providing graduate and continuing education that is designed to:

Create opportunities for the recruitment of those interested in entering the student
affairs profession; promote advanced learning opportunities that embrace critical
values of the profession such as the development of the whole student, diversity,
and ethics; and that seek to address the professional development of student
affairs teaching faculty through collaborative opportunities for networking,
scholarship, and service with colleagues. (ACPA Commission for Professional
Preparation, n.d.)

Similarly, the Council for the Advancement of Higher Education Programs (CAHEP) is a
standing committee of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE).
Founded in 1997, the primary purpose of this council is to “enrich the teaching and
learning experiences of students and faculty in the Association’s constituent Higher
Education Programs” (Council for the Advancement of Higher Education Programs,
n.d.).

The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) offers a
slightly different contribution to the CSP community through the Faculty Fellows
Program. Unlike the commission and councils through ACPA and ASHE, Faculty Fellows consists of 12 CSP faculty members appointed to three-year terms. This group was established to be the “voice” of CSP faculty in NASPA (NASPA, n.d.). Faculty Fellows are involved in research and service in a wide range of topics related to CSP programs, including (a) the impact of adjunct faculty; (b) professional competencies, standards, and career development; (c) theory-to-practice models for enhancing student learning; and (d) research about CSP faculty.

In addition to the CAS standards for professional preparation, there are also professional standards for student affairs. The Joint Task Force on Professional Competencies and Standards was commissioned by ACPA and NASPA to develop guiding principles for the skills and knowledge necessary for effective student affairs practice (Joint Task Force on Professional Competencies and Standards, 2010). Ten competency areas were identified: (a) Advising and Helping; (b) Assessment, Evaluation and Research; (c) Equity, Diversity and Inclusion; (d) Ethical Professional Practice; (e) History, Philosophy, and Values; (f) Human and Organizational Resources; (g) Law, Policy, and Governance; (h) Leadership; (i) Personal Foundations; and (j) Student Learning and Development. Under each competency area there are skills, knowledge, and attitudes that student affairs professionals should strive to demonstrate in their professional work. These skills and attitudes are further delineated by standards that should be achieved at basic, intermediate, and advanced levels. Although these professional standards were not specifically devised to guide CSP professional preparation programs, the Joint Task Force recommends that CSP faculty use the
standards to “develop or refine their curriculum to better address the competencies expected of practitioners in the field” (p. 4).

**Who: CSP Faculty**

CSP faculty have been studied in terms of their general characteristics: demographic characteristics, work and publication behaviors, and professional and educational backgrounds (Amey et al., 2007; Creamer, 1998; Creamer & McGuire, 1998; Keim, 2008; Newell & Kuh, 1989). According to Evans and Williams (1998), CSP faculty are unique from most faculty in liberal arts and sciences because they face the dual demands of representing an academic discipline and professional standards, often serving as one-person departments who must teach the full range of CSP program topics while simultaneously serving in various capacities as advisors, recruiters, career counselors, researchers, and program promoters. In terms of demographics, Evans and Williams found that one-third of CSP faculty are assistant professors and fewer than half are full professors; male faculty outnumber female faculty; CSP faculty are relatively young with a mean age of 49; and they are primarily Caucasian. CSP faculty come from a range of academic backgrounds, with more than one-third having a masters degree in a field other than CSP or counseling, and 14% with a doctorate from a field other than CSP, higher education, or counseling (p. 107). Of CSP faculty, 84% held full-time student affairs staff positions before taking a faculty role.

A comparison of a more recent study to the Evans and Williams’ study highlights some of the difficulties of enumerating this population. While Evans and Williams found a total of 95 full-time CSP faculty, a study by Amey et al. (2007) reported much higher
numbers of CSP faculty. They determined the population of CSP faculty, including both full-time and part-time, to be approximately 830 individuals. Of the respondents to Amey et al.’s survey, approximately 62% were full-time. One explanation for this discrepancy may be differences in how each research team determined who qualified as a CSP faculty member. For example, the Amey et al. study included faculty from programs that have a counseling focus while the Evans and Williams study was limited to faculty from programs designated as CSP programs.

In Fall 2004, Amey et al. (2007) conducted a survey of people who teach in CSP programs to determine (a) the demographic profile of faculty teaching in higher education and student affairs preparation programs; (b) to what extent those faculty are involved in teaching, research, and service; (c) to what extent CSP faculty are satisfied with institutional and individual factors; and (d) differences between full-time faculty and administrators who teach. Amey et al. based their survey from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty and added questions to the instrument based on focus groups held at national conferences. Results of this survey indicate that Caucasian males dominate the senior ranks of both full-time faculty and administrators who teach in CSP programs. Caucasian women are well-represented in the population, but make slow progress in rank. People of color were underrepresented at all levels. In terms of workload and satisfaction, CSP faculty reported a disconnect between what work they prefer to do and the work with which they actually spend time.

Patton and Catching (2009) studied the experiences of African American faculty in student affairs programs. They approached this topic from a critical race theory
framework and utilized counterstorytelling to present the data they collected. The counterstory is a composite of the literature about experiences of African American faculty and narratives collected from 13 African American faculty in student affairs programs. The authors found that the composite experiences of the faculty in this study validated previous research about the struggles that African American faculty face in their academic careers. In the classroom they encounter oppressive experiences where White students offer African American faculty less respect, resist discussions about diversity, and construe constructive criticism as personal attacks. They struggle with a lack of mentors and a tenure system that is ambiguous and awards tenure and rewards differentially according to race. The authors also outline microagressions that these faculty face from White faculty colleagues who may mean well, but make subconscious racial attacks and perpetuate the status quo by ignoring racial issues and the dominant racist paradigms in their field. Issues of gender, the hyper-visibility of African American faculty, and critical race theory as a “liberatory framework” are also discussed (Patton & Catching, 2009, p. 722).

Other studies about CSP faculty have focused on research and publication productivity (Creamer, 1998; Creamer & McGuire, 1998). The most recent study on this topic was conducted by Keim (2008). Keim identified 269 faculty in student affairs graduate programs and conducted a search of Wilson Education Abstracts to determine the number of publications by each faculty member from 1983 to 2005. The results of this study showed that male faculty had greater publication productivity than female faculty; full professors published at higher rates than other ranks of faculty; faculty at
institutions with a Carnegie classification of Research Extensive published at higher rates than faculty at other types of institutions; full-time faculty were more productive than part-time faculty; and full professors published fewer articles about student affairs than expected when compared to other faculty ranks.

This relatively small number of studies and articles about CSP faculty illuminates that while there is an interest in studying CSP faculty, at this point little has been done beyond trying to define the population and its research output. The research about CSP faculty backgrounds, qualifications, and job responsibilities demonstrates the unique niche these individuals hold in the university and the potential they have for demonstrating a broad understanding of institutional culture. However, no research has probed this population to discover the perspectives they hold about academic affairs in general and other faculty in particular.

**What: Faculty**

Faculty are the core of academic affairs and the featured topic of discussion in this study. On a national level, in Fall 2007 there were 702,491 full-time faculty at Title IV degree-granting institutions in the United States (Knapp, Kelly-Reid, & Ginder, 2008, p. 8). Of these, 50.4% taught at public 4-year colleges, 30.6% at private not-for-profit 4-year colleges, 16.1% at public 2-year colleges, with the remainder teaching at private for-profit 4-year colleges, private for-profit 2-year colleges, and private not-for-profits 2-year colleges (1.5%, 1.2%, and 0.2% respectively). Full-time faculty are predominately male (58.2%) and Caucasian (76.8%). They are Asian/Pacific Islander (7.6%), Black, non-Hispanic (5.4%), Nonresident Alien (4.4%), Hispanic (3.6%),
American Indian/Alaskan Native (1.7%), and Race/Ethnicity Unknown (1.7%). The total of 425,407 full-time faculty were tenured or tenure-track.

As a group, faculty have been studied extensively. Major areas of study about faculty include (a) faculty workload and productivity (Middaugh, 2001); (b) faculty compensation (American Association of University Professors, 2010; Knapp et al., 2008); (c) faculty employment issues such as faculty diversity (Cole & Barber, 2003; Moody, 2004; Samble, 2008; Thompson, 2008), tenure-track versus non-tenure track faculty (Thedwall, 2008), and use of part-time faculty (Christensen, 2008; Gappa & Leslie, 1997); (d) faculty evaluation (Colbeck, 2002; Licata & Morreale, 2002; Paulsen, 2002); and (e) faculty preparation, development, and advancement (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Fairweather, 2002; Huber, 2002).

One of the most comprehensive examinations of faculty in the United States was National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF), a large-scale survey conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics, part of the U.S. Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences. There were three main components to the survey: (a) an institution survey that focused on “counts of faculty; faculty hires and departures; tenure of faculty; tenure policies; retirement and other benefits of faculty;” (b) a department chairperson survey that focused on “faculty composition in department; tenure of faculty in department; faculty hires and departures in department; hiring practices; activities to assess faculty performance; professional and developmental activities;” and (c) a faculty survey that focused on “sociodemographic characteristics; academic and professional background; field of instruction; employment history; current employment status.
including rank and tenure; workload; courses taught; publications; job satisfaction and attitudes; career and retirement plans; benefits and compensation” (National Center for Education Statistics, n.d.). All three of these surveys were conducted in 1988, and the first and third sections were conducted subsequently in 1993, 1999, and 2004.

One area of research about faculty that impacts this study is discussion about faculty groups and culture. In the ASHE-ERIC Education Report *The Invisible Tapestry*, Kuh and Whitt (1988) synthesized the literature surrounding the topic of culture in higher education institutions and described the multiple layers of identity and cultural association that exist for academic faculty. They debated the existence of a “monolithic subculture” of faculty versus a proliferation of discipline-based subcultures that impede any delineation of an overarching faculty culture. The belief in a common faculty culture is based on

> The assumption that all college and university faculty members share a common view on the world and scholarship . . . based on similar understandings about the nature and purposes of higher education and of colleges and universities, and the role of faculty within them. (p. 76)

These shared assumptions or values include (a) that the purpose of higher education is the “pursuit and dissemination of knowledge,” (b) that autonomous academic freedom is essential to faculty work, and (c) that faculty life should be characterized by collegiality in creating a community of scholars and shared faculty governance.

The opposing view is one that sees distinct and often conflicting discipline-based subcultures among faculty that override any occupational commonalities. According to
Kuh and Whitt, in this view the “culture of the discipline is the primary source of faculty identity and expertise and typically engenders stronger bonds than those developed with the institution of employment, particularly in large universities” (p. 77). Becher and Trowler’s book Academic Tribes and Territories (2001) extensively delineates just such divisions and boundaries among discipline based academic communities. They wrote that these divisions interconnected with epistemological differences between academic fields and that the different “ways in which academics engage with their subject matter, and the narratives they develop about this, are important structural factors in the formulation of disciplinary cultures” (p. 23). Faculty subcultures also vary according to institution type: faculty at a research intensive institution may perceive themselves as having more in common with faculty in a different discipline at the same type of research institution than with faculty in the same discipline at a teaching focused liberal arts college. Despite the influences of these discipline and institution based subcultures, however, Kuh and Whitt argued that an academic subculture encompassing all of the fragmented subcultures does indeed exist. Overarching basic values bring together a professional identity that is greater than the sum of its parts.

**Why: Conflict and Cooperation Between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs**

The landscape in which this study of CSP faculty perceptions sits is a college and university setting in which there are typically two major players seemingly at odds with one another: student affairs and academic affairs. Although both groups are essential to creating successful and effective learning environments for students, collaborative efforts between the two areas seem to be disjointed and infrequent (Keeling, 2004). Challenges
to promoting a collaborative atmosphere between academic affairs and student affairs include having historically distinct and separate roles on campus, a habit of isolation stemming from a history of individual contributor faculty, different discipline-based language and cultures, ineffective communication, an assumption that each group does not understand the other, a lack of a clear shared institutional mission, and the lack of sufficient impetus to change (Cook, Eaker, Ghering, & Sells, 2007).

In the face of these differences, calls for collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs are being made with increasing frequency. Since the rallying cry for collaboration was included in the 1937 Student Personnel Point of View, this plea for cross division coordination to enhance student learning and university effectiveness and collegiality has only picked up urgency (American Council on Education, 1937; Bourassa & Kruger, 2001). The foundation under all of these discussions is the belief that problems of clashing assumptions and organization ultimately hinder the students in their growth during college.

Countless permutations of these issues at institutions of higher education across the country create and perpetuate disconnects and misunderstandings that translate into a disjointed educational experience for which the student ultimately pays…. Although traditionally students’ social and emotional development are left to student affairs professionals and intellection development reserved for faculty, it has recently become apparent that both the academic and student affairs sides of campus must work together if students are to learn and growth throughout their college experience. (Cook, Ghering, et al., 2007, p. 7)
The ideal result of proposed collaborative efforts between student affairs and academic affairs would take the form of a transformative educational environment in which “integrated, intertwined academic and developmental outcomes” actively engage students in learning both inside and outside the classroom (Keeling, 2004, p. 17).

The focus of these calls for collaboration has not been on changing either division, but rather on finding ways to build a university environment conducive to collaborative behaviors (Cook, Ghering, et al., 2007). Articles and studies in this area give anecdotal examples of successful collaboration efforts at a variety of institutions of higher education (Johnson & Rayman, 2007; Philpott & Strange, 2003) or discuss theories of change and organizational behavior as they relate to student affairs/academic affairs collaboration (Kezar, 2001, 2003). Collaborative efforts often take forms such as academic support initiatives; co-curricular and orientation activities; service activities, including community service and service learning; residential student experiences such as learning communities and residential colleges; policy development; and institutional planning (O’Halloran, 2007).

Several surveys have also been conducted to gauge the climate of collaboration (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001; Kezar, 2003; O’Halloran, 2007). A 2004 survey of chief student affairs officers at higher education institutions in the United States found that the most common collaborative activities and issues are distance learning, academic policy, revision of general education curricula, and institutional effectiveness and planning (O’Halloran, 2007). The author interpreted these efforts as systems issues that somewhat ineffectively relate to the two most frequently stated reasons the survey respondents
noted for having collaborative efforts in the first place: to “enhance academic performance” and to “increase retention or persistence” (p. 44). Other surveys found that student affairs staff attitudes, common goals, and individuals’ personalities were factors to success in collaborative efforts while at the same time collaborative efforts are becoming more common and some of the gaps between student and academic affairs cultures are being overcome (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001; Kezar, 2003).

Overall, the literature about student affairs and academic affairs works extensively to outline the historical and current relationship between the two areas, including why the divide exists, why institutions would be more effective if the two areas collaborated, and what collaboration efforts are currently in practice. The literature emphasizes an imperative for student affairs practitioners to reach out to faculty to try to get them to collaborate on these projects. What is not discussed much, however, is what individuals or programs on campuses may already span the two divisions. Consequently, further study of CSP faculty and the perspectives they communicate about academic affairs and faculty would help to fill in this gap.

**Why: Socialization of Graduate Students**

In addition to helping to fill in the knowledge gap about the faculty who cross the student affairs/academic affairs divide, this study examines the knowledge, values, and attitudes that can be passed from CSP faculty to future administrators during the course of completing a CSP degree. This transfer of knowledge and attitudes occurs not only formally through explicit coursework and assignments, but also through a process of socializing students to a way of thinking and behaving in a discipline or profession.
In the ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report *Socialization of Graduate and Professional Students in Higher Education: A Perilous Passage*, Weidman, Twale, and Stein (2001) synthesized the existing literature on student socialization and propose a conceptual model of socialization of graduate and professional students. The center of Weidman et al.’s model is a core socialization experience comprised of normative contexts, socialization processes, and core elements. Surrounding this core are the four dimensions of prospective students, personal communities, professional communities, and novice professional practitioners. This model is envisioned as dynamic and iterative, incorporating forces outside of the academic program that influence socialization and making connections across various types of academic and professional fields.

Of particular interest to this study is the role that faculty play in this socialization process. In the core socialization processes they determine standards for teaching, research, and service, organize social relationships in the program, determine admission to the program, and offer financial aid to students in the form of assistantships and scholarships. In addition to these more organizational influences, faculty shape the socialization of students through the knowledge acquisition element of this model. Faculty create the official curriculum, but students also pick up on underlying values and assumptions the faculty hold about the field. The effect of this hidden curriculum in the socialization process is that “students learn to conform to their professors’ beliefs and the normative expectations of their program and, at the very least, passively accept faculty ideology and world views” (p. 60).
However, other discussions of student socialization disagree with the suggestion that faculty hold such influence on students’ professional identities. Another view is that students “construct rather than simply adopt a particular ‘way of being,’ a personal and professional identity, set of values, attitudes, taken-for-granted knowledge and recurrent practices” (Becher & Trowler, 2001, p. 47). This view holds that graduate students are not passive adapters of their new identity in a field and do not simply absorb faculty perspectives. Still, this identity construction also does not occur in a vacuum; faculty, along with other figures such as student peers, community members, and professionals in the field, provide the context in which students make the transition to a disciplinary identity. Consequently, it could be argued that because of the faculty’s role in shaping the core socialization processes, their perspectives and values are worth examining because they contribute to the context of socialization, even if the students do not directly adopt their beliefs.

**Summary**

This chapter discussed the whos, whats, and whys of this study on CSP faculty perceptions about non-CSP faculty. CSP programs first emerged in 1913 and teach a graduate curriculum that is based on standards of foundational studies, professional studies, and supervised practice. CSP faculty often come from a variety of educational and professional backgrounds. Few studies have been done about CSP faculty beyond looking at demographics and publishing histories. Faculty as a group, however, have been studied extensively. Research about faculty has covered a broad spectrum of topics, from demographics and professional preparation, to workload and compensation.
Student affairs and academic affairs have a history of seeking collaboration between the two divisions, but not achieving it because of perceived differences in culture and ineffective communication. Finally, this study is important because it examines values and attitudes that may be communicated to CSP students through the socialization process of graduate study.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

Current literature on the topic of CSP programs and faculty examines their demographics, backgrounds, and publishing habits. However, no research has been produced that examines who these people are in term of their attitudes, values, and beliefs. CSP faculty perspectives about other faculty need to be studied because of the important part CSP faculty play in socializing graduate students into a professional identity as student affairs administrators. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research design of this Q methodology study of full-time, tenure-track CSP faculty perceptions of full-time, tenure-track, non-CSP faculty. Sampling framework and rationale, data collection, and data analysis procedures used in this study are presented.

Samples

Statement Sample

Unlike traditional quantitative studies, the most pivotal sample involved in a Q study is not the participants, or person sample, but rather the sample of stimuli drawn from the general communication concourse or universe about the topic (Brown, 1980; McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Q samples can take any number of forms, from quotations taken from interviews and written down on index cards, to excerpts from literature, photos, audio clips, or tangible objects. Any of these can represent the range of perspectives on the topic about which participants make explicit their subjective points of view (Brown, 1980).
For this study, the primary source for the Q sample was interviews conducted with four full-time, tenure-track CSP faculty members at an Ohio university. These interviews were conducted during the summer and fall of 2008 at the participants’ home institution. The interviews were conducted as part of an exploratory qualitative study looking at how CSP faculty members view (a) the nature of faculty work and workload, (b) what responsibilities faculty have in promoting student learning, (c) the relationship between academic affairs and student affairs, and (d) how faculty fit into the overall institutional structure or hierarchy of a university. This initial study was an exploratory study of perceptions; consequently, the interviews were unstructured and conversation-style to enable the interviewee to direct the conversation and illuminate the breadth of ideas about the topic (Krathwohl, 2004). The interview transcripts were analyzed to identify themes that emerged across subjects around the topic of full-time faculty.

The results of this preliminary study provided the primary basis for the communication concourse surrounding the topic of CSP faculty perceptions about full-time faculty. The majority of the statements that were included in the Q sort came from the interviews in the preliminary study. Other statements were drawn from literature about faculty to augment the interview statements, thereby ensuring as diverse of a sample of the communication concourse as possible. The result was a set of statements than could be considered representative of, but not exhaustive of, the communication concourse of CSP faculty perceptions of faculty outside of CSP programs.
Two methods to ensure a balanced set of statements were used in this study. First, the interviews were structured such that they asked the participants to consider not only their own points of view as a CSP faculty member, but also how they think other CSP faculty, student affairs administrators, and students in their program would respond to the questions. The purpose of this was to tease out not only their own sentiments, but also other perspectives they have encountered in the context of CSP programs. Second, a deductive factorial design was used to create a structured sample of Q statements for the Q sort in this study (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Statements were selected in a 4×3 block format, with statements reflecting dimensions of faculty work (teaching, research, service, and other/combination) and sentiment (positive, negative, and neutral/mixed). The direction of some statements was altered, shifting them from negative statements to positive statements in order to assure equal distribution across sentiments. Three statements of each combination of work dimension and sentiment were included, resulting in a 36-statement Q sample. The statement sample for this study is presented in Appendix C.

**Person Sample**

The person sample, or P set, for this study was full-time, tenure-track faculty in CSP programs at Carnegie classification RU-H institutions of higher education. Individuals from these types of institutions and programs were selected because it is assumed that faculty work requirements and performance expectations would be similar to the original four faculty from whom the statements for the Q sort were obtained. Estimates of the number of CSP faculty range from 95 to 830, depending on the criteria
used to define the group (Amey et al., 2007; Evans & Williams, 1998). How many of these faculty are at RU/H institutions is not clear. However, the number of participants in Q studies need not be as extensive as they are in traditional quantitative studies because of the reversed role of subjects and statements as variables and sample elements (Brown, 1980).

Two methods were used to recruit participants for this study. CSP faculty in Ohio were contacted individually to see if they would be willing to meet in-person to complete the Q sort or if they would be willing to complete the Q sort online. A request for participation was also sent out through CSPTalk, an email listserv for CSP faculty facilitated through the ACPA Commission for Professional Preparation. This second method recruited faculty participants from across the United States.

**Procedures**

**Data Collection**

The data collected for this study consisted of three parts: Q sorts, demographics questionnaires, and interview questions. For the Q sort, the participants were asked to read each of the 36 statements about faculty and sort them into three piles: those with which they agree, those with which they disagree, and those about which they are neutral or have mixed feelings. The conditions of instruction asked participants to interpret the statements as they apply to full-time, tenure-track, non-CSP faculty at the participants’ own institutions. Participants were then asked to further refine their feelings about the statements by sorting them into a grid ranking them from most disagree (-4) to most
agree (+4). The statement numbers were recorded in the forced distribution grid depicted in Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+3</th>
<th>+4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Figure 1.* Q sort distribution grid used during in-person data collection. The values at the top of the grid represent most disagree (-4) to most agree (+4).

The demographics questionnaire was designed to collect information about the study participants in order to provide a clear picture of participant demographics to enhance interpretation of the factors that emerged from the study. It included questions about participants’ work history, educational attainment, history in the academy, CSP program, and their institutions. The demographics questionnaire is included in Appendix A.

Once the participants completed the demographics questionnaire and Q sort they were asked a series of questions about their experiences completing the Q sort. The first question asked them to reflect on how they felt completing the Q sort. Then came a series of questions asking why they placed the statements they did at the positive and
negative poles of the sort, what statements they had trouble sorting, and if there were any statements they wish had been included in the Q sample. After the first few participants had completed the Q sort process, a question was added asking what experience the participants had with teaching or researching about faculty.

The data collection process occurred in two phases: in-person data collection and online data collection. A total of 28 full-time, tenure-track CSP faculty participated in this study: 18 participated in the face-to-face data collection and 10 completed the Q sort and related questionnaires online. The in-person phase ran from February 2011 to May 2011 and involved visiting with CSP faculty at their home institution. The participants sorted statements that had been printed on index cards and could be affixed to a poster board grid using Velcro strips. The responses to the interview questions were audio recorded and the process took around one hour to complete. The in-person versions of the study permissions, Q sort grid, demographics questionnaire, and open-ended questions are presented in Appendix A.

The online data collection period ran from May 2011 until October 2011. FlashQ software was used to set up the online data collection (Hackert & Braehler, 2007). The Q sort was identical between the in-person and online versions, with the online version using a computer card game method of sorting and ranking statements in place of the index cards and poster board. Changes were made to the demographics questionnaire and interview questions based on the capabilities of the software. Questions were added to the demographics section to find out the Carnegie classification and region of the United States where the participants’ institutions were located. Responses received from
participants in non-RU/H institutions were removed from the data analysis and saved for inclusion in future studies.

Interview questions about how the participants felt about the Q sort and whether there were any statements they found difficult to sort were removed for the online sort. The following interview question topics were included as open-ended textboxes in which participants could provide commentary: (a) the statements placed in the +4 and -4 rankings, (b) the types of research and teaching done about faculty, and (c) whether there were any other statements that should have been added to the Q sort. The online versions of the study permissions, introduction, demographics questionnaire, and open-ended questions are presented in Appendix B. The online process took about 45 minutes to complete.

Data Analysis

Analysis of the Q sort was completed using PQMethod software (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2001), a dedicated analytic package that correlates and factor analyzes the Q sorts. The first step in the analytic process is correlating all pairs of Q sorts in the study. This produces a correlation matrix of each participant to each other. The next step is to look for “groups of Q sorts which, on the basis of their correlations, appear to go together as a group, or type” (Brown 1980, p. 207). Factor analytic procedures are used to “lend statistical clarity” to the process of looking for these groups, by simplifying the task of comparing correlations and “bringing to attention the typological nature of audience segments on any given subjective issue” (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p. 50).
Centroid factor analysis, also known as the simple summation method of factor analysis, was used in this study because it incorporates a degree of indeterminacy; it assumes no “mathematically correct solution out of the infinite numbers possible,” thereby allowing the researcher to apply his or her own judgment in deciding a final factor solution (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p. 53). According to Brown (1980), centroid factor analysis produces statistical results that are virtually identical to those produced by more precise factor analytic methods such as principal components analysis. However, the indeterminacy inherent in centroid factor analysis gives the researcher greater ability to choose a factor solution that makes sense logically as well as statistically.

Where this difference is the greatest is not in the computation of factor loadings, which, as has been noted, is similar between centroid analysis and other factor analytic methods. But rather the difference is in determining the number of factors and the ability to rotate those factors to achieve maximum clarity of meaning. From a purely statistical point of view, there are multiple measures for choosing the number of factors (Brown, 1980). One is choosing factors with Eigenvalues greater than 1. This study had three unrotated factors that met this criterion. Another way for determining the number of factors is accepting factors if two of the factor loadings exceed 1.96 times the standard error (SE), meaning that they are significant at the 0.05 level (p. 223). The factor loading for an individual Q sort is the amount to which that Q sort correlates with the underlying dimension of a given factor. For this study, the SE was 0.17 and $1.96(\text{SE}) = 0.33$. Therefore, a Q sort needed to correlate with a factor at 0.33 or greater in order to
significantly load on that factor. A third method is applying Humphrey’s rule, which states that factors should be accepted if the cross product of the two largest loadings exceeds two times the standard error (0.34).

The next step is factor rotation. One recommended technique for factor rotation is judgmental rotation based on abductive logic, in which the researcher rotates the factors to bring to light certain Q sorts based on hunches and knowledge of the context of the study (Brown, 1980). Another approach is the use of mathematical schemes such as varimax rotation, which are designed to approximate simple structure. While the use of judgmental rotation is compatible with the theoretical underpinnings of centroid factor analysis, this compatibility does not preclude the use of varimax rotation. The key to rotation is that the results are meaningful rather than being tied to a particular method of achieving factor structure. In this study, varimax rotation was used because the factor structure it produced was “theoretically acceptable,” a situation that Brown called “a happy accident that saves much time” (p. 261).

After rotating the factors, individuals with loadings that are significant at the $p < 0.05$ level (in this case, greater than 0.33) on one factor only are flagged. Their Q sorts are merged together to form an array of factor scores for each factor. These factor arrays are the basis for the final step of the analysis: factor interpretation. The arrangements of Q statements are “operational definitions” of attitudes (p. 55). Factors were interpreted by looking at where individual statements were placed in the factor arrays and the comments participants who loaded on those factors made about the statements. These comments were taken from the responses to the interview questions and remarks
participants made while doing the in-person sorts. Select demographics variables were tested for significant relationships with participants’ factor loadings.

**Limitations of the Study**

In Q analysis, it is not assumed that the viewpoints illuminated through the Q sort represent the full range of perspectives that exist. Person samples are often created pragmatically based on the participants available (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). In addition, Q analysis focuses on illuminating the range of meanings rather than the number of people who hold each perspective (Thomas & Baas, 1992/1993). The results, while presenting perspectives that are present in the general population of full-time, tenure-track CSP faculty, cannot be interpreted to represent the full range of perspectives in the population of all CSP faculty nationally, nor is that the intent.

This study only examined perspectives held by full-time, tenure track faculty in CSP programs. However, many of the courses in CSP preparation programs may be taught by non-tenure track, adjunct, or part-time instructors. Consequently, the study is not looking at a full range of perspectives that are held by individuals who are instructors in CSP preparation programs. This study also only asked participants about their perspectives about full-time, tenure-track faculty, not their perspectives about the range of faculty types present in their institution.

Another limitation is that this study only examined perspectives by and about faculty at one classification level of institutions. By limiting the sample to Carnegie classification RU/H institutions, this study does not look at the range of institution types at which faculty teach. Institutional missions regarding teaching and research vary
between colleges and universities of different Carnegie Classifications. Such differences could produce varying results in a study that asks participants to reflect on faculty roles and performance in these areas.

Finally, the Q sample was limited to 36 statements and, although efforts were made to capture the range of opinions held in the general communication concourse around faculty and faculty life, they may not all be captured in the stimuli for the Q sample. As a result of these limitations, the results of this study are not directly generalizable in the traditional sense to the CSP faculty population. However, an alternative application of generalizability is to consider the substantive inferences, or “generalization about,” rather than the statistical inferences, or “generalization to,” of the study (Thomas & Baas, 1992/1993, p. 22). The results of this study are “schematically reliable” statements about the phenomenon under study that may be transferable to other groups of participants, even if they cannot be statistically inferred to the population as a whole.

Summary

This chapter presented the methods used for the design and analytic procedures in this study. The statement and person samples used in this study were discussed. Data collection procedures were outlined, including (a) discussion of the two phases of data collection (in-person Q sorts and on-line Q sorts); and (b) the data collected (Q sorts of statements about faculty, answers to open-ended interview questions, and demographic information about the participants). Data analysis procedures including factor analysis, factor rotation, and factor interpretation were also discussed. Finally, limitations of this
study and the implications of those limitations on the generalizability of the results were presented. The results of this study are presented in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of this study that examined the perceptions full-time, tenure-track CSP faculty hold about full-time, tenure track professors outside of CSP programs. Analysis of the Q sorts produced two factors called “Professional Contributions” and “The Conflicted Life of the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly.” This chapter outlines the results of this study including the demographics of the participants, participants’ factor loadings, the two factors that emerged from the study, consensus statements between factors, a discussion of a rejected three factor solution, an examination of a non-loading participant, and the researcher’s factor loading.

Demographics and Factor Loadings

Twenty-eight full-time, tenure-track CSP faculty members completed Q sorts for this study. Twelve participants were male and 16 female. All participants identified as being from Carnegie classification High Research Activity institutions. These participants represented a range of experience as faculty. The person sample for this study included 10 assistant professors, 10 associate professors, and 8 full professors. Time as CSP faculty members ranged from nine participants with 5 or fewer years as CSP faculty, five participants with 6 to 10 years, five participants with 11 to 20 years, and eight participants with 21 or more years. One person had missing data on this variable. Eighteen participants completed the Q sorts in person and 10 completed the sorts online.

The 28 Q sorts were analyzed using the centroid method of factor analysis. The emergent factors were rotated using varimax rotation, resulting in a two factor solution.
As described in Chapter 3, participants were considered to load on a factor if their factor loading was significant at the $p < 0.05$ level. Given the 36 factor statements, loadings were considered to be significant if they exceeded 0.33 (Brown, 1980). Individuals who had significant loadings on more than one factor were considered mixed or confounded cases and therefore were not included as defining sorts in examining the factors. Factor loadings and demographic characteristics for individual participants are listed in Table 1.

When participants load together on a factor, this indicates that these CSP faculty share a common perspective or point of view on full-time, tenure-track faculty based on their subjective responses to the statements in the Q sample. Factor 1 is defined by 10 participants whereas Factor 2 is defined by 7 participants. These factors are correlated at $r = 0.38$. Ten participants were confounded cases, meaning that they share common perspectives with both factors. One participant did not load on either factor. This indicates that he holds a perspective outside of the two shared factors discussed later in this chapter. Figure 2 is a graphical representation of the relationship among the participants’ loadings on the two factors.

The demographic variables of rank (Assistant, Associate, or Professor), gender (Male or Female), and type of sort (in-person or online) were tested for relationships between these demographic categories and membership on Factor 1 and 2. The number of years as a faculty person was also examined after collapsing categories from the original ranges of 5 years or less, 6-10 years, 11-20 years, and 21 or more years to two categories of 10 or fewer years and 11 or more years. Given the small number of cases included in this study, Fisher’s Exact Test was used to test for significance. None of the demographic
Table 1

*Factor Loadings and Demographic Characteristics of Individual Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rs</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>069</td>
<td>Assistant, female, 6-10 years, in-person sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>Associate, male, 11-20 years, in-person sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(68)</td>
<td>Associate, male, 21 or more years, in-person sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Associate, female, 6-10 years, in-person sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>069</td>
<td>Assistant, female, 5 years or less, in-person sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(80)</td>
<td>Professor, female, 21 or more years, in-person sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Professor, male, 11-20 years, in-person sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Professor, male, 21 or more years, in-person sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>051</td>
<td>Associate, female, 11-20 years, in-person sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(80)</td>
<td>Associate, female, 21 or more years, in-person sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>Associate, male, 11-20 years, in-person sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>008</td>
<td>Associate, male, 6-10 years, in-person sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Assistant, female, 5 years or less, in-person sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>Professor, male, 21 or more years, in-person sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Professor, male, 21 or more years, in-person sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>Associate, female, 6-10 years, in-person sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>037</td>
<td>Professor, female, 21 or more years, in-person sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>Assistant, male, unknown years, in-person sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Assistant, female, 5 years or less, online sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>034</td>
<td>Professor, female, 5 years or less, online sort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 1 (continued)

Factor Loadings and Demographic Characteristics of Individual Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rs</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>14 Assistant, female, 5 years or less, online sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45 Assistant, male, 5 years or less, online sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>(75)</td>
<td>21 Associate, male, 6-10 years, online sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(45) Associate, male, 21 or more years, online sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>25 Assistant, female, 5 years or less, online sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>(68)</td>
<td>04 Assistant, female, 5 years or less, online sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(48) Professor, female, 11-20 years, online sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53 Assistant, female, 5 years or less, online sort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Decimals have been omitted. Loadings in bold are significant at the .05 level. Loadings in parentheses are significant on one factor only and are considered defining sorts for that factor.
Figure 2. Scatterplot of participant loadings on Factors 1 and 2. Participants with a factor loading above the dotted line (0.33) are considered to load significantly on that factor.

variables was significant at the $p < .05$ level in two-tailed tests. Missing variables were excluded case-wise from these analyses.

Q methodology relies on factor scores to bring meaning to the factors that emerge from the statistical factor analysis. Factor scores are derived from the Q sorts of participants who load significantly and solely on one factor (Brown, 1980). These individual sorts are then merged to create a factor array with each of the statements in the Q sample having a factor score of -4 to +4 corresponding to the structure of the original Q sort distribution. It is this composite set of factor scores that enables the researcher to
examine in detail the nature of each factor’s point of view. The factor scores of individual statements in this study are shown in Appendix D.

**Factor Interpretations**

**Factor 1: Professional Contributions**

The Factor 1 view of full-time, tenure-track faculty stresses the professional contributions and commitments of faculty. This viewpoint sees faculty as independent thinkers and scholars who work hard to improve both their institutions and their academic fields. Table 2 shows the statements that Factor 1 respondents placed at the most positive and most negative (+4, +3, -3 and -4) ends of the distribution. Four themes, presented in no meaningful order, emerge from this factor array: (a) faculty contributions to service; (b) centrality of faculty to the institution; (c) interrelation of research and teaching; and (d) faculty independence.

**Faculty contributions to service.** Statements regarding faculty service placed at both the positive and negative poles of the Factor 1 factor array. Statements 27 and 15 were ranked at the positive end of the array and reflect the view that faculty are actively engaged in service activities and that those activities are of value to their universities and individual programs:

27. Faculty involvement in service in their field increases the visibility of the institution and makes their programs stronger and able to attract better candidates. (+4)
Table 2

*Descending Array of Factor Scores and Statements for Factor 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Faculty research contributes to knowledge, which in turn contributes to the students’ education. It enriches the classroom experience. So you need to have the researchers, or you don’t have the content for the teachers to teach.</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Faculty involvement in service in their field increases the visibility of the institution and makes their programs stronger and able to attract better candidates.</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Faculty are at the heart of the institution. Without them you don’t have a university.</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Some of your absolute best researchers are also some of your best teachers and it’s not just by happenstance. It’s because they are really committed to being instructors first and foremost, and they know that to be a good instructor they have got to be a good writer and researcher and contribute to their field.</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Faculty spend a lot of time on service commitments both inside and outside the university, ranging from institutional projects such as accreditation and faculty governance to leadership positions in national organizations.</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Faculty have the freedom to make independent decisions. At the end of the day, they are the “captains of their own scholarly schooners—if it sails on gloriously or crashes into the shoals, it’s largely to their own credit or blame.”</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Many faculty are “ghost faculty” who rarely set foot on campus and have little interest in students.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>No one should be on a university campus and have a faculty appointment who does not teach a class. If you are faculty you should be teaching.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Faculty don’t necessarily view service to the institution as something that should be done. It’s “I have to be on at least one university committee before I can go for tenure or I have to be on a college committee before I can go for tenure because I need to have that checkmark on my vita.”</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Faculty members are generally content experts with no training in how to teach. So they think of classroom instruction as “I show up, I deliver the work, you figure out how to learn it.”</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Faculty would rather sit around griping about the institution than get involved and try to change things.</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Faculty are not committed to the students. They don’t want to help. They don’t care about the students. All they care about is their research.</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Faculty spend a lot of time on service commitments both inside and outside the university, ranging from institutional projects such as accreditation and faculty governance to leadership positions in national organizations. (+3)

Factor 1 respondents commented that faculty service flows from a desire to be a “good citizen.” They stressed that service and involvement in their field not only enables their programs to attract good student candidates, but also results from a responsibility to set a good example for students in their programs. “If I weren’t involved, they might not be involved,” said one respondent.

Factor 1 respondents also linked the desire to perform service to the importance of faculty involvement in institutional governance. They commented that tenure-track faculty realize that involvement in governance is important and that if faculty are involved in governance, they consequently will be more involved in service. Factor 1 responded negatively to statement 24, a statement that calls into question faculty desire to engage with and improve their institutions:

24. Faculty would rather sit around griping about the institution than get involved and try to change things. (-4)

One respondent commented that while there are “plenty who gripe,” many other faculty “get involved.” Another noted that the perception of griping stems more from faculty over-involvement than under-involvement: “They fight every battle rather than choosing fights.” A third respondent did not think the realities of faculty life backed up the statement. “I do not see when faculty actually can sit around, let alone have time to gripe,” she said.
Similarly, a negative response to statement 23 corroborates the good citizenship concept of service by disagreeing with the suggestion that faculty service comes merely from a sense of self-preservation:

23. Faculty don’t necessarily view service to the institution as something that should be done. It’s “I have to be on at least one university committee before I can go for tenure or I have to be on a college committee before I can go for tenure because I need to have that checkmark on my vita.” (-3)

Although respondents recognized that service is often seen as the least recognized facet of faculty life when compared to teaching and research, they did not think that the lack of importance accorded to service in the reappointment, tenure, and promotion process meant that service was not being performed. As one respondent summed up the relationship, “I think the amount [of time] that faculty spend on service is often underestimated because it is undervalued.”

**Centrality of faculty to the institution.** In addition to recognizing the value of faculty service, the Factor 1 viewpoint also sees faculty as the cornerstone of institutions of higher education. Statement 28 ranked at the positive end of the factor array:

28. Faculty are at the heart of the institution. Without them you don’t have a university. (+4)

In interviews, Factor 1 respondents commented on this statement both in terms of the functional structure of universities and in terms of the educational mission. Some respondents noted that although students are the focus of the institution, faculty are
equally necessary given that the core function of the university is “the development and transmission of knowledge.

Try running a university without your faculty and see how far you get. You'd have a hotel (if residential) and not a whole lot else. We teach, create the knowledge, and create the impact. All those who work on a campus have an integral role to play. The faculty are the heart of it.

Other respondents commented on the relatively permanent nature of tenured faculty; although students and administrators change every few years, tenured faculty remain with the institution as “keepers of the flame.” In this view faculty are of key importance to the institution because they “understand the norms and expectations” and “safeguard the academic mission and life of higher education.”

In addition to positively ranking a statement that highlights the centrality and importance of faculty to the institution and to higher education in general, the Factor 1 viewpoint reacts negatively to statement 12. This statement questions faculty presence and involvement on campus:

12. Many faculty are “ghost faculty” who rarely set foot on campus and have little interest in students. (-3)

Although respondents noted that there may be one or two faculty on a campus who meet this description, they felt that such individuals were rare:

Everyone has a story about a “ghost” to tell. Are “many” faculty like this? No. Can we all name one? Probably. That “ghost” might just be working from home
bringing in million dollar grants and (for faculty) paying the travel money for your conferences and (for students) paying to keep your tuition lower.

The Factor 1 viewpoint firmly believes that faculty not only sit at the heart of the institution, but they are actively present on campus fulfilling its educational mission.

**Interrelation of research and teaching.** In addition to believing that “teaching and research functions are [at] the heart” of the institution, the Factor 1 viewpoint also recognizes teaching and research as driving the mission of higher education. The high rankings of statements 2 and 4 show that Factor 1 respondents do not see conflict between these activities:

2. Faculty research contributes to knowledge, which in turn contributes to the students’ education. It enriches the classroom experience. So you need to have the researchers, or you don’t have the content for the teachers to teach. (+4)

4. Some of your absolute best researchers are also some of your best teachers and it’s not just by happenstance. It’s because they are really committed to being instructors first and foremost, and they know that to be a good instructor they have got to be a good writer and researcher and contribute to their field. (+3)

These statements describe teaching and research as interrelated functions and suggest that one cannot exist without the other. One respondent’s comment portrays the combination of these two aspects of faculty life as defining elements of faculty life:

The core of what universities do is produce and convey knowledge. Faculty produce knowledge thorough their research and convey it in the classroom. A
trained monkey can follow a rote curriculum. It takes a scholar to teach well at a real University.

This “integrated life” view of teaching and research portrays faculty as active professionals both in the classroom and in moving their fields forward through their scholarship.

At the opposite end of the factor array from statements 2 and 4 is another statement regarding teaching and research. The negative placement of statement 17 seems to suggest teaching and research do not need to go hand and hand.

17. No one should be on a university campus and have a faculty appointment who does not teach a class. If you are faculty you should be teaching. (-3)

One respondent described this statement as “sheer silliness that would bite a university in the buttocks if implemented.” Given the Factor 1 viewpoint’s emphasis on integrated teaching and research, this negative response to statement 17 seems contradictory. Respondents’ comments, however, reveal that they define teaching in a broader sense. “Teaching doesn’t necessarily involve a formal class—faculty are teaching all the time,” said one. Another respondent said that publishing is a form of teaching; “It’s passing information along to 1500 versus the 15 in our classrooms.” This generalized definition of teaching reconciles a university having research only faculty with an institution’s teaching mission; it is “okay to have a place for research only” as long as “there are people there who can teach.”
Factor 1 respondents also had negative reactions to statements that suggested that faculty are not committed to good teaching. Statement 9 was ranked at the negative pole of the factor array.

9. Faculty members are generally content experts with no training in how to teach. So they think of classroom instruction as “I show up, I deliver the work, you figure out how to learn it.” (-4)

Respondents felt that while it was true that graduate training in many disciplines may involve cursory to no training in teaching skills or pedagogy, this did not correlate with faculty abdicating responsibility for their students’ learning. One person commented, “I believe that there is too little training in teaching, but the faculty are still trying.” Factor 1 respondents also had strong negative responses to statement 34:

34. Faculty are not committed to the students. They don’t want to help. They don’t care about the students. All they care about is their research. (-4)

Respondents called this statement “offensive,” and argued that among the faculty they know teaching is “very valued.” One respondent’s comment seemed particularly impassioned about statement 34.

Who pissed in this person's Cheerios the day they wrote this statement? Why on earth would an individual spend 4 years as an undergraduate, 2 years getting a master’s, 4-5 getting a Ph.D., then a lifetime working for far less than one could get in business and industry if he or she didn't care about students? It doesn't make sense. Helping students is what all of us do. At research institutions we have heavier research loads. Some institutions require less research. We all help
students like it is our job—wait, it is our job. Can you find one person on every campus who is bad at it? Yes. Name a career where you can’t find one horrible excuse for a (doctor, attorney, athlete, etc.). Faculty do a pretty good job on balance, some might say we work pretty hard at it.

Other Factor 1 respondents commented that while there are “tired faculty,” there are none “who just don’t care.” Another summed up the Factor 1 perspective that “some faculty are less committed to students, but it is a range” with the vast majority interested not only in their research but also in how that scholarship can be used to serve the teaching mission of higher education.

Faculty independence. The fourth theme that emerges in the Factor 1 viewpoint is that of independence. Respondents ranked statement 32 at the positive end of the factor array:

32. Faculty have the freedom to make independent decisions. At the end of the day, they are the “captains of their own scholarly schooners—if it sails on gloriously or crashes into the shoals, it’s largely to their own credit or blame.” (+3)

Comments about this statement reflected the view that tenure-track faculty are “autonomous” and that the ability to have control over one’s professional destiny is what draws many people into faculty roles. “We have incredible flexibility and freedom,” said one respondent. However, respondents also noted a downside to this autonomy: “if things go wrong, it’s usually our fault.”
Factor 2: The Conflicted Life of the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly

Unlike the four discrete themes that emerge in Factor 1, the five themes that emerge in Factor 2 are interrelated and overlapping. The overarching perspective that emerges in Factor 2 is “the conflicted life of the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly.” This view sees both faculty and faculty life as containing both good and bad elements—faculty range in levels of commitment to their work but also struggle with mixed messages about what work their institution values. Five themes emerge under this view: (a) faculty commitment; (b) invisibility; (c) rewards; (d) lack of involvement in service; and (e) institutional priorities. There is no meaning behind the ordering of the themes in this section. The statements that placed at the positive and negative poles of the Factor 2 factor array are listed in Table 3.

**Faculty commitment.** A recurring theme in Factor 2 is that both faculty and faculty life are varied: some parts good, some parts frustrating, and some parts just plain bad. This view is supported by the placement of statement 8 at the positive end of the array.

8. Regarding faculty, there’s a mix of the good, the bad, and the ugly across campus. From dedicated, highly motivated, very student-oriented faculty to those that simply do minimally what you expect them to do. (+3)

The Factor 2 point of view emphasizes that not all faculty are the same or have the same experiences. “In any large, diverse, complex university one is going to find faculty who are very good and those who are no longer good at what they do,” said one respondent. “You cannot really talk about ‘faculty’ as if it is a monolithic entity,” said another.
Table 3

*Descending Array of Factor Scores and Statements for Factor 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Faculty view research as far more important than teaching because what they hear is that if they don’t do research they’re not going to get tenure.</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Entry level faculty are encouraged to do the minimum they have to do service-wise to demonstrate they’re a player and they’re doing their fair share. But no one ever got tenure on the basis of service.</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>No one really wants to be a bad teacher.</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Faculty research contributes to knowledge, which in turn contributes to the students’ education. It enriches the classroom experience. So you need to have the researchers, or you don’t have the content for the teachers to teach.</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Regarding faculty, there’s a mix of the good, the bad, and the ugly across campus. From dedicated, highly motivated, very student-oriented faculty to those that simply do minimally what you expect them to do.</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Time spent on research and writing is “invisible” because it often does not involve interaction with other people and it takes time outside of the office.</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Administrators don’t get the benefits of faculty research and expertise on campus in large part because they don’t involve faculty on relevant campus committees.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Faculty are equally concerned about and engaged in teaching undergraduate and graduate students.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Faculty are included on university committees as a placeholder or figurehead to say that there is faculty representation on the committee. But no one expects them to really do any work because they must have other important things to do.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Many faculty are “ghost faculty” who rarely set foot on campus and have little interest in students.</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Faculty are not committed to the students. They don’t want to help. They don’t care about the students. All they care about is their research.</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>“Service” is sometimes used as an excuse to get out of teaching and research.</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
respondent. “There are enormous varieties among the faculty–some good and some bad.” Another respondent simply summed up the situation as, “that’s life.”

Statement 13 produced similar respondent commentary that talked about the presence of both good and bad faculty on campus. This statement is a basic comment on the intentions of everyone standing in front of a classroom.

13. No one really wants to be a bad teacher. (+4)

Factor 2 respondents placed this at the positive end of the factor array but made caveats about that placement. One person said that he agreed with it but was “skeptical.” Another noted that “no one goes into faculty with that intention [of being a bad teacher],” but that they are not always successful at being a good teacher. “There are a lot of bad teachers, but they don’t want to be that way,” said another person. One respondent also commented that although he thought it was not a common occurrence, he could think of an example of someone who did not meet this statement’s sentiment. He described this faculty member’s perspective as one hoping that “if they teach classes badly enough, and students don’t like them, they won’t have to teach.”

Despite the caveats placed on statement 13, the placement of statement 34 at the negative end of the factor array reinforces the sentiment that faculty are indeed invested in their teaching. This statement asserts that faculty are more committed to their research than to student success.

34. Faculty are not committed to the students. They don’t want to help. They don’t care about the students. All they care about is their research. (-4)
Respondents had many strong comments about this statement, ranging from outrage to commentary on how academic personalities and the realities of classroom set-ups can create this impression. One respondent commented that statement 34 is “stated as malicious rather than ignorant or disillusioned by faculty.” Other respondents felt that this misunderstanding comes from a lack of understanding between different types of people. Based on personality inventories such as Holland codes, “faculty are different from the majority of students,” one said. Another person commented that “many faculty are introverts—they want to help but don’t know how.” Classroom structure was seen to compound these personality differences and emphasize perceived faculty shortcomings. “Faculty like small classes where they can interact with students,” one person said. However, another noted that such class sizes are rare and that “when you have 300-400 students in a lecture hall it gives the impression that faculty do not care about students.” Another respondent noted that even when faculty have large numbers of students it does not mean that they are not interested in the students individually. “It’s rare to hear a story about a faculty member who when they are approached individually says ‘no, I don’t have time,’” he said.

Despite a resoundingly negative response to statement 34, the Factor 2 point of view still seems to acknowledge that the statement might have basis in truth in rare instances. “The squeaky wheel gets a lot of play—those people exist,” one person said. However, the broadness and negativity of the statement gave it its place at the negative end of the array.
This statement just seemed too strong for me to agree at any level with it. It seems so inclusive of all faculty. I know that there are faculty who are not committed to students, but I am happy to report that they don't constitute the majority by any means at least at my institution.

This comment reinforces the theme of the good, the bad, and the ugly in the Factor 2 point of view about faculty. Although respondents could find an example of negative behavior on their campuses, or at least assumed they would be able do so, they disagreed with a statement that tried to lump all faculty together in this regard. “This monolithic approach won't do,” one respondent said. “Some faculty may not be committed, may not want to help, may not care. But others do.”

**Invisibility.** Just as faculty performance and engagement can vary, elements of faculty life can also be good or bad. One of the frustrations that emerges in this factor is a feeling that the work faculty do is not always seen or acknowledged. Statements 18 and 12 both address issues of faculty work being “invisible”:

18. Time spent on research and writing is “invisible” because it often does not involve interaction with other people and it takes time outside of the office. (+3)

12. Many faculty are “ghost faculty” who rarely set foot on campus and have little interest in students. (-4)

Factor 2 respondents see faculty “invisibility” as an issue of faculty personalities and the nature of faculty work. “Faculty are not evil, they’re introverts,” one person said. “Closing the door is easier than extroverted activities. Service requires extroversion.”
Another commented “what does an institution value? . . . that work is not done in this office.”

These comments demonstrate a level of frustration with the nature of faculty work not being fully understood by those outside of faculty positions. Although statement 12 can be read as an indictment of levels of faculty engagement with students and the institution, comments from Factor 2 respondents suggest they view it as more reflective of misunderstanding. Multiple respondents stated that “the creative process must be done alone” and that not being in their office with the door open at all times does not mean that they are not “available” to students. A few noted that with electronic communication and social networking sites faculty are both expected and able to be in contact with students outside of office hours. In statements 12 and 18, “the assumption is that being off-campus means someone is not interested, not working,” an assessment that the Factor 2 view finds both incorrect and frustrating to faculty.

**Rewards.** One area where the Factor 2 point of view sees conflict in faculty life is faculty responsibilities and the rewards associated with different types of activities. Statement 6 addresses how faculty prioritize teaching and research based on their importance in the reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) process:

6. Faculty view research as far more important than teaching because what they hear is that if they don’t do research they’re not going to get tenure. (+4)

Comments from Factor 2 respondents called this prioritization “logical” because the RTP committees “rarely discuss teaching or service.” Although institutions may publicly state that teaching is a top mission for their university, the Factor 2 point of view sees conflict
between what is stated and what is valued in the reward system. One respondent commented that “if someone is a terrible teacher, the review committee will bring up student evaluations, but it is usually not discussed.” Another stated that he did not think faculty valued research more than teaching “in their hearts and minds,” but that faculty “have to do things in a traditional way to get tenure.”

Whereas one respondent said that the “current system is a faculty-centric model” that does not “look out for the interests of students,” Factor 2’s positive response to statement 2 suggests that the Factor 2 point of view may see more value behind the emphasis on research than just meeting a performance goal or faculty’s individual interests:

2. Faculty research contributes to knowledge, which in turn contributes to the students’ education. It enriches the classroom experience. So you need to have the researchers, or you don’t have the content for the teachers to teach. (+3)

This statement elicited comments that reflect a view that although Factor 2 respondents may feel that research is over-valued in faculty evaluations, it is essential to academia and is not separate from teaching responsibilities. One person commented that this is true “particularly at the doctoral level.”

Another statement that relates to the faculty reward system also ranked at the positive end of the factor array. Statement 7 says that the RTP process sets up a system that rewards research and teaching to the point of overshadowing service expectations.
7. Entry level faculty are encouraged to do the minimum they have to do service-wise to demonstrate they’re a player and they’re doing their fair share. But no one ever got tenure on the basis of service. (+4)

Factor 2 respondents interpreted this statement as a reflection of what work their institutions value and methods faculty employ to ensure their longevity and success in their positions. “Senior faculty lead the way with service,” said one respondent. Another respondent noted that “what counts as service can vary across colleges.” One respondent was less placid in interpreting this statement and saw it as a result of research-oriented faculty wielding greater power than faculty who are more teaching or service focused. “They think the institution is all about them and all rewards should go to research,” he said. Finally, one respondent agreed with this statement because he himself encourages the behavior. “As a department chair, how do I protect pre-tenure faculty,” he asked. His answer is to promote a focus on teaching and research, but research most of all.

**Lack of involvement in service.** In addition to fitting under the theme of faculty rewards, statement 7 also leads into the theme of the lack of faculty involvement in service. Although statement 7 suggests that lack of involvement stems from the relative importance of teaching and research in the tenure and promotion process, other statements suggest that there are other reasons behind faculty being uninvolved. Statement 22 says that faculty are not involved in service because administrators do not invite them to be on committees.
22. Administrators don’t get the benefits of faculty research and expertise on campus in large part because they don’t involve faculty on relevant campus committees. (-3)

Factor 2 respondents placed this statement at the negative end of the factor array but had varying reasons why. One respondent commented that “administrators try to get faculty involved, but it is hard to get faculty to do it.” Other respondents took the opposite perspective and noted that there are committees on campus that would fit well with their own areas of scholarship and interest, but administrators drawing up the committees do not want them to be involved. “They don’t want the expertise,” one respondent said. Another commented that “one cannot be a prophet in his or her own land,” attributing this situation to administrators who only value experts from outside their own institutions.

The Factor 2 point of view also responds negatively to statements 31 and 35. Statement 31 suggests that even when faculty are included on committees there is little expectation for them to do actual work.

31. Faculty are included on university committees as a placeholder or figurehead to say that there is faculty representation on the committee. But no one expects them to really do any work because they must have other important things to do. (-3)

Comments made about this statement suggest that respondents felt that faculty are indeed expected to do work and that the figurehead role falls to another campus group.

In my experience if you are on a committee you are expected to do the work. Faculty are not figureheads on committees. Students sometimes are.
Factor 2 also disagreed with statement 35. This statement suggests that faculty use service to avoid doing other work.

35. “Service” is sometimes used as an excuse to get out of teaching and research. (-4)

Respondents’ comments suggest that they have varied reasons for disagreeing with this statement. One person reasoned that this statement is untrue because faculty need service in addition to teaching and research for RTP. Another respondent felt that there are some faculty who are “very service oriented” and may focus more on service than teaching and research. However, in this situation service is not an “excuse,” but rather an example of “people tend[ing] to gravitate towards what they do well.” Finally, one respondent felt that service is never used as an excuse because faculty simply are not engaged in service. “All faculty need to be doing more of it,” he said.

**Institutional priorities.** The “Rewards” theme talked about the competing responsibilities faculty have to teaching, research, and service and the effect that has on how faculty prepare for RTP. Respondents commented that the reason this is a problem for faculty as they navigate their academic career is that their institutions lack a clear focus about the type of institution they want to be and what type of work they value. The Factor 2 perspective does not, however, see these conflicts of institutional identity and focus as limited to teaching, research, and service.

Statement 25, which placed at the negative end of the factor array, also addresses conflicts in institutional priorities.
25. Faculty are equally concerned about and engaged in teaching undergraduate and graduate students. (-3)

One respondent remarked that this statement is true “in the abstract,” but the reality is that faculty are assigned to different programs and the level of work with graduates and undergraduates varies according to the nature of a given field or program. Respondents provided the example of their own field, college student personnel, as just such an example; CSP is a graduate only field so CSP faculty generally have little contact with undergraduate students.

Another respondent struggled with this statement and described the relationship on his campus as a “tug-of-war.” Some respondents noted that this struggle to balance the two can occur for both the institution and for the faculty members. Institution-wise, the balance between undergraduates and graduates can be affected by the mission of the institution (research versus teaching) and by funding. One respondent noted that at his institution the tuition dollars raised by the large number of undergraduates fund the graduate programs.

The conflict between undergraduate and graduate education was also mentioned as being a product of faculty preference. “There are a number of faculty who would just as soon not have one or the other,” one person said. “They see undergraduates as a burden or vice-versa—there are too many resources invested in graduate students but graduate students can take care of themselves.” Most respondents, however, thought that faculty preferred working with upper division or graduate students than younger students. “Working with undergraduates is a rough gig,” said one person.
Consensus Statements

Although there are differences in viewpoints between Factors 1 and 2, there are still points of agreement. Consensus statements are statements that both factors rank in a similar way. In this study consensus statements appear throughout the spectrum of agreement to disagreement. The PQMethod software produced a list of 15 statements that do not distinguish between Factors 1 and 2 at the $p < .01$ level. These statements are presented in Table 4.

Many of these statements fall into a neutral range in the factor array, meaning that neither factor had a strong reaction to the statement. However, there are two statements that place at the positive end of the spectrum and two that place at the negative end of the spectrum. Those at the positive end are statements 2 and 13. Both of these statements reflect a positive view of faculty teaching. Statement 2 describes the positive effect that faculty research has on classroom instruction. Statement 13 asserts that “no one wants to be a bad teacher.”

At the other end of the spectrum are statements 12 and 34. Both of these statements describe faculty as unengaged with the institution and uninterested in their teaching or their students. Factors 1 and 2 both disagree with these statements and place them at the negative end of their factor arrays.
Table 4

*Consensus Statements for Factors 1 and 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor Array</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Course prep, course prep, course prep…that’s a huge amount of faculty time that’s really invisible.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Faculty research contributes to knowledge, which in turn contributes to the students’ education. It enriches the classroom experience. So you need to have the researchers, or you don’t have the content for the teachers to teach.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The more you involve faculty in the decision-making structure, the more involved in the institution they become and the better institution you’re going to have.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Faculty use the pressure to publish as an excuse to get out of other university work. It is a polite way for faculty to get out of commitments.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Many faculty are “ghost faculty” who rarely set foot on campus and have little interest in students.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>No one really wants to be a bad teacher.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Most faculty were focused on academics as undergraduates. They were not involved in the extracurricular. So, they may want to be engaged at the University, but don’t know how to do it because of lack of familiarity.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Young faculty have the drive to change things in the University, but at that level they don’t have enough power to make change in the institution. Older faculty have the power but not the desire.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Administrators don’t get the benefits of faculty research and expertise on campus in large part because they don’t involve faculty on relevant campus committees.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>It can be difficult for faculty to balance bringing their research into the classroom because if they refer too much to their studies and interests in their teaching the students see it as self-promotion and write the course off as “it’s all about him.”</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>It is hard for faculty because the institution says it wants both teaching and scholarship to be strong. But at the same time the institution really rewards them on scholarship while demanding most of their time for teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 4 (continued)

Consensus Statements for Factors 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor Array</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Faculty are included on university committees as a placeholder or figurehead to say that there is faculty representation on the committee. But no one expects them to really do any work because they must have other important things to do.</td>
<td>-1 -3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Rather than taking responsibility for poor teaching performance, faculty make excuses for negative student evaluations by calling the evaluations a personality contest and saying the “students don’t like me.”</td>
<td>-1 -2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Faculty are not committed to the students. They don’t want to help. They don’t care about the students. All they care about is their research.</td>
<td>-4 -4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Trying to get faculty to do anything is like trying to herd cats. They are very stubborn and reluctant to change.</td>
<td>0 -1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Considerations

A Two Factor Versus a Three Factor Solution

According to Brown (1980), Q methodology is “a mixture of scientific judgment plus more purely statistical aspects.” He wrote that factor rotation can be “reduced to mere instrumentation,” however it is up to the researcher’s judgment “whether or not to accept the factor solution that has been routinely provided” (pp. 258-259). One area where this interplay between statistics and researcher judgment comes into play is in deciding which factors are of interest to the study. In this study, the question emerged as to whether or not a two factor or three factor solution was most appropriate for the Q sort data.
For the purposes of discussing an alternative three factor structure for this Q study, alternative factor names are used in this section. Factor 1 remains consistent in each factor solution and is called Factor A. Factor 2, however, is examined as two separate factors: Factor B and Factor C. The factor arrays for Factors A, B, and C are presented in Appendix D.

In the post-sort interviews conducted in conjunction with the Q sorts, it seemed that there were multiple thoughts coming together in Factor 2. Although everyone was like-minded that faculty generally mean well but range in quality of effort from the good to the ugly, one perspective seemed to reflect frustrations that administrators may feel in working with faculty and the other seemed to reflect frustrations of faculty themselves. Based on this intuition, the initial results of this study had three factors: Factors A, B, and C.

There were problems with Factor B and Factor C, however. The greatest problem was that they were highly correlated at $r = .57$. Removing the participants with the highest loadings on the opposite factors in order to reduce the correlation left Factor B with three defining sorts and the cross-product of the two highest factor loadings no longer satisfied Humphrey’s Rule as described in Chapter 3 (Brown, 1980). Consequently a two factor solution in which Factor B and Factor C are encompassed by “Factor 2” seemed to be the stronger and clearer choice.

Although Factor B and Factor C were not chosen as the final results of this study, it is still valuable to note some subtle distinctions between the two. Factor B positively ranked statements that assert that faculty involvement creates a better institution and
which tout the value of research (statements 3, 4, and 27). Factor B also responded strongly to statements that reflect a feeling that faculty are not as fully involved as their administrations would like them to be (negative placement of statements 22 and 31). Factor B also differed from Factors A and C by agreeing the faculty are disengaged from the non-academic side of the university (statement 11) and disagreeing with the idea that faculty spend a lot of time on service commitments (statement 15). Factor C, on the other hand, is hallmarked by statements that reflect a sense of faculty carrying a research burden (positive placement of statements 6 and 18; negative placement of statement 10) and faculty angst at wanting to be a better teacher (positive placement of statements 9 and 13). Despite slight differences in emphasizing some statements over others, however, Factors B and C share a core perspective that addresses the conflicts inherent in faculty responsibilities and an acknowledgement that faculty have varying levels of success in meeting those challenges.

**Respondent Number Fourteen**

There is a precedent in Q studies of looking at the perspectives of individual respondents if that person is thought to possess a unique, important, or unusually informed point of view. Stephenson (1964) is an example of a study that includes a factor that is defined solely by one sort. In this study of views about Cuba, Stephenson included a sort performed as a theoretical representation of how a well-known expert on the topic would view the topic. No other individuals significantly loaded with the theoretical sort, but the single-person factor was still examined because of it represented a unique viewpoint. The decision to examine a factor that would not meet traditional criteria for being statistically
significant reflects the emphasis Q methodology places on seeking factors that are theoretically important rather than simply mathematically present (Brown, 1980).

In this study there was also a unique individual of interest, not because of his status as an expert in the field of views on faculty, but rather because he was the only individual who did not load significantly on either Factor 1 or Factor 2 (see Table 1). In psychological studies there is a precedent for studying individuals who do not correlate with established factors. These persons are “unambiguous residuals” and can be seen as having a “statistically certified uniqueness” from the other participants in the study (Barron, 1955, p. 668). However, “Respondent Fourteen” is of interest not just because of his lack of factor loading; he was also one of the four original interviews from which statements for the Q sample were drawn. As a full professor who has been a CSP faculty member for more than 21 years, this individual possesses a strong, defined perspective on higher education that appears to differ from his CSP colleagues in a few areas.

To provide a clearer picture of how Respondent Fourteen differs from the two factors, it is useful to look at where his individual factor array differs from the other two. In order to do this, I summed the absolute values of the differences between Respondent Fourteen’s sort and the factor arrays for the other two factors. For example, Respondent Fourteen rated statement 12 as +4 whereas Factors 1 and 2 rated that as -3 and -4, respectively. The sum of the absolute value of the differences between the placements of this statement is 15. For the purposes of illustrating some key differences between Respondent Fourteen and Factors 1 and 2, Table 5 shows the top five statements with the greatest difference between Respondent Fourteen and Factors 1 and 2.
Table 5

*Top Five Differences in Statement Rankings for Respondent Fourteen Versus Factors 1 and 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Many faculty are “ghost faculty” who rarely set foot on campus and have little interest in students.</td>
<td>Respondent Fourteen 4  F1 -3  F2 -4  Difference 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Time spent on research and writing is “invisible” because it often does not involve interaction with other people and it takes time outside of the office.</td>
<td>F1 -4  F2 1  Difference 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The more you involve faculty in the decision-making structure, the more involved in the institution they become and the better institution you’re going to have.</td>
<td>F1 -3  F2 2  Difference 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Course prep, course prep, course prep . . . that’s a huge amount of faculty time that’s really invisible.</td>
<td>F1 -2  F2 2  Difference 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Faculty wield a great deal of power in the university, from deciding admissions and determining who gets tenure, to shaping the future direction of the institution.</td>
<td>F1 -4  F2 -1  Difference 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statement where Respondent Fourteen showed the greatest difference from Factors 1 and 2 is also one for which he takes credit: statement 12. “I’m responsible for that one,” he said. Although both Factors 1 and 2 ranked this statement about ghost faculty at the negative end of the factor array, Respondent Fourteen ranked it at +4. He noted a lack of interest in students as evidenced by faculty not putting in sufficient office hours or closing the doors to their offices when they are around. He also commented that
the number of faculty who could be characterized as “ghosts” has increased during his time as a faculty member and that in recent years “young faculty don’t see a long-term relationship with the university.” This lack of commitment to students and the institution results in faculty who are unwilling to be on campus more than they have to be, let alone to serve on committees or focus on improving teaching. “It is like pulling teeth to get anything done—other than writing,” he said.

Respondent Fourteen strongly disagreed with statement 18, placing it at the -4 position. Both Factors 1 and 2 responded positively to this statement about research and writing time being invisible, with Factor 1 placing it at +1 and Factor 2 at +3. Respondent Fourteen’s comments about this statement were two-fold. First, he noted that research can indeed be done in one’s office and involve interacting with students and other people. Second, he noted that the results of successful, finished research are “very visible on one’s résumé or vita.”

Statement 3 asserts that having faculty involved in the decision-making processes of a university makes the faculty more engaged and the institution better. Respondent Fourteen disagreed with this, placing statement +3 at -3. Factors 1 and 2 placed it on the positive side of the factor array, at +2 and +1, respectively. Respondent Fourteen commented that statement 3 “ought to be true, but the more power faculty have the more self-interest they have.” He said that faculty “say the right things, but don’t go the extra mile,” and “overwhelmingly care about themselves.” This comment is in stark contrast to a comment from a Factor 1 respondent who asserted that faculty are needed in the university decision-making process to “safeguard the academic mission and life of higher
education” and to represent the long term interests of the institution in the face of short-
term administrators who do not stay long enough in their positions to see the impact of the
changes they make. Instead, Respondent Fourteen concluded that he “wouldn’t want
faculty in charge of this place. They’re too selfish and self-centered.”

Both Factors 1 and 2 placed statement +1 at +2, but Respondent Fourteen placed it
at -2. Regarding the sentiment that course prep is a “huge amount of faculty time that’s
really invisible,” Respondent Fourteen saw this as a statement by faculty who “want to
give an impression of how overworked they are.” However, he doubted whether this is
actually the case for most faculty and commented that he did not think most faculty do
enough teaching and work with students to agree with this sentiment. “Universities now
have to hire advisors to do work with students that faculty should be doing,” he said.

Finally, Respondent Fourteen also differed from Factors 1 and 2 about statement
16, which discusses faculty wielding power within their institutions. While Respondent
Fourteen responded negatively to the statement and placed it at -4, Factors 1 and 2 were
more neutral about it, placing it at +1 and -1, respectively. Respondent Fourteen
commented that statement 16 reflects “naïve thinking” and that at his own institution “it is
clear that [faculty] have no power at all, even in deciding who is admitted to our
programs.” However, similarly to his comments regarding statement 3 in which he noted
that he did not think that faculty involvement necessarily leads to a better institution, he
also noted that faculty controlling the direction of the university “would be nice,
theoretically . . . but maybe not.”
In looking at the statements where Respondent Fourteen differenced from Factors 1 and 2, it appears that he takes a more critical view of full-time, tenure-track, non-CSP faculty than the other participants in the study. However, it should also be noted that there are many statements that Respondent Fourteen placed in a similar fashion to the other two factors. For example, Respondent Fourteen agreed with Factors 1 and 2 that “No one wants to be a bad teacher” (statement 13) and placed it at +4. Similarly, he placed statement 34, which suggests that faculty only care about their research and not students, at -3. Factors 1 and 2 placed statement 34 at -4. Perhaps his view is best summed up through his placement of statement 8 (“Regarding faculty there is a mix of the good, the bad, and the ugly . . .”) at the +4 spot. In looking at the range of faculty, Respondent Fourteen focuses on a different “bad” and “ugly” than the other factors.

The Researcher’s Factor Loadings

According to Creswell (2009), one of the techniques used to enhance validity in qualitative studies is identifying any bias the researcher brings to the study. In Q methodology one not only provides quantitative data such as factor loadings but also interpretations of the emergent factors. Consequently I believe that it is important for me as a researcher to bring to the forefront my own point of view about full-time, tenure-track faculty outside of CSP programs.

My interest in doing this study came from the dissonance I found between the subtle dialog about faculty I heard when taking classes in a CSP program and my own experiences with people who are faculty members. My father retired from a long career as a full-time, tenure-track faculty member in biological sciences. My aunt is a full-time,
tenure-track faculty member in modern languages. I grew up in a college town so many of my friends had at least one parent on the faculty at the local university. All of these people were dedicated academics with workaholic characteristics. They talked to me about their classes and students, their research, and their frustrations with the university. I developed tremendous respect for the amount of effort they put into their jobs and was surprised upon starting my doctoral program to discover that people in courses and conferences on student affairs did not share my views about faculty and faculty roles.

In an effort to clarify my views on faculty in this context of this study, I completed the Q sort and calculated my factor loading for both Factor 1 and Factor 2. I loaded significantly on each factor. My Factor 1 loading was 0.60 and my Factor 2 loading was 0.48. These loadings make me a mixed case, meaning that my point of view encompasses facets of both Factor 1 and Factor 2.

In general, I would classify my viewpoint as pro-faculty. The three statements I ranked at +4 were statements 8, 13, and 28. My placement of statement 8, which refers to faculty as “the good, the bad, and the ugly,” is my acknowledgement that although we talk about faculty as whole, in reality they are all different and have unique experiences. Statement 13 says that “No one really wants to be bad teacher.” My placement of this statement reflects my belief that all faculty mean well, value teaching, and want to be successful in what they do. For me, statement 18 is a basic fact: “Faculty are at the heart of the institution. Without them you don’t have a university.” However, my agreement with this statement is based not just on the fact that you need teachers and researchers for
a university to function, but also in the belief that faculty are an almost spiritual center to institutions of higher education.

The statements I placed at -4 also reflect these beliefs that faculty work hard and value research, teaching, and students. I disagreed with statement 12 because I believe that most faculty have workaholic tendencies, even if their work does not take place in their office. I disagreed with statement 34 for similar reasons. I have never witnessed anything to make me believe that faculty do not value student learning or that they are involved in their research to the exclusion of interest in their other job responsibilities. I believe that there is more than one way to “care about the students,” and that all faculty want to pass on their knowledge to others. Finally, I disagreed with statement 21 because I believe that although faculty are indeed torn between “multiple and at times competing demands,” they do still try to improve their instruction. Again, how this is done can vary from faculty member to faculty member, and from tinkering with a PowerPoint slide to trying to build an active learning classroom. Ultimately I believe that all faculty want their students to learn and want to be a successful contributor to their disciplines, whether or not we visibly witness that work taking place in their offices on campus.

Summary

Twenty-eight full-time, tenure-track CSP faculty completed Q sorts of their perspectives about full-time, tenure-track, non-CSP faculty. Centroid factor analysis and varimax rotation of these sorts produced two factors identified by their overarching themes as Professional Contributions and The Conflicted Life of the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly. The Professional Contributions factor focused on issues of faculty as individual
contributors to their field and to their institutions. The Conflicted Life factor focused on the competing pressures faculty experience and that not all faculty do a good job of meeting all of their job demands. Points of consensus between the two factors were identified and will be discussed further in Chapter 5. Finally, other considerations were discussed, including (a) the possibility of Factor 2 containing two different trains of thought, (b) the perspective of a non-loading participant, and (c) the researcher’s factor loading. Chapter 5 provides further discussion of these results.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

This chapter reviews the information covered in the preceding four chapters and discusses implications of the factors described in Chapter 4. The research questions for this study asked about the perspectives that full-time, tenure-track CSP faculty hold about full-time, tenure-track, non-CSP faculty. The results of a Q method investigation of these perspectives are presented, followed by recommendations for future research and implications for practitioners.

Summary of the Study

Context

One of the challenges that American colleges and universities face in improving efficiency and student learning on their campuses is a lack of collaboration across different functional units. Student affairs and academic affairs units both focus on enhancing the educational mission of the institution, but collaborative efforts between the two areas are often infrequent and sometimes ineffectual (Keeling, 2004). Many issues create a divide between student affairs and academic affairs and prevent effective collaboration. Such issues include: separate roles on campus, a history of isolation, different discipline-based languages, communication problems, unclear institutional missions, and insufficient impetus to change (Cook, Eaker, et al., 2007).

Other noted reasons for the lack of collaborative efforts between student affairs and academic affairs have to do with each side not understanding the other and a clashing of cultures (Cook, Eaker et al., 2007). College student personnel professional preparation
programs have a unique opportunity to promote cross-divisional understanding in this scenario. CSP programs share a mission of educating future student affairs administrators in the historical and practice-based foundations of student affairs while also preparing students to meet the professional standards of the field (CAS, 2006). These standards include asking students and practicing professionals to understand faculty roles and campus cultures (Joint Task Force on Professional Competencies and Standards, 2010).

CSP faculty, with ties to both student affairs and academic affairs, have a unique opportunity to understand both sides of this issue and to help bridge the apparent divide between the functional areas through the process of socializing students to their professional roles (Weidman et al., 2001). In their teaching roles, CSP faculty determine the official messages about other faculty that are communicated in the classroom through reading, projects, and general curriculum choices. However, CSP faculty may also communicate a hidden curriculum that includes other assumptions and messages about faculty. Understanding what perspectives CSP faculty hold about non-CSP faculty and faculty roles may help unveil the messages that CSP students are learning and hopefully help illuminate the perceived differences in culture that mark the student affairs/academic affairs divide.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this Q methodology study was to explore perspectives that full-time, tenure-track College Student Personnel professional preparation program faculty hold about full-time, tenure-track faculty outside of College Student Personnel
professional preparation programs. Specifically, this study examined what factors emerged when CSP faculty at Carnegie Classification Research Universities/High Research Activity institutions were asked to agree and disagree with positive, negative, and neutral statements about areas of faculty life including teaching, research, and service.

**Research Questions**

Three research questions guided this study:

*Research Question One:* What factors emerge from participants’ responses to a Q sort concerning their perceptions about full-time, tenure track, non-CSP faculty at their institution?

*Research Question Two:* How do these factors differ?

*Research Question Three:* Are there common sentiments across factors?

**Methods**

This study approached the topic of CSP faculty perceptions about full-time, tenure-track, non-CSP faculty through the use of Q methodology. This research framework was chosen because Q methodology provides a means of systematically studying people’s self-referent, subjective opinions (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The data collection method used is a Q sort in which participants model their opinions about a topic, in this case views about faculty, via rank ordering a set of stimuli into a forced distribution grid.

There were two samples for this study. The first was the statement sample comprised of 36 statements about faculty and faculty roles that were drawn from
interviews with CSP faculty and from pertinent literature. There were an equal number of positive, negative, and neutral statements representing issues of teaching, research, scholarship, and combined/other. The second sample was the person sample, or P set. Full-time, tenure-track, CSP faculty at Carnegie Classification RU/H institutions were recruited for participation via email and a national CSP faculty listserv. Twenty eight faculty participated in this study.

Data collection took place in two phases: in-person sorts at participants’ home institutions and online sorts. In both phases, participants sorted the 36 statements about faculty into a Q sort grid. The sorting process asked them to reflect on the statements and to rank them according to those with which they most agreed to those with which they most disagreed. Post-sort interviews were conducted during the in-person sorts and open-ended questions were asked after the online sorts. Both the in-person interviews and the online open-ended questions asked participants to clarify why they placed statements at the extreme ends of the Q sort. Participants also completed a questionnaire of demographic information which asked about characteristics such as gender, rank, and years as a CSP faculty member.

The 28 Q sorts were analyzed using PQMethod software (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2001). Centroid factor analysis with varimax factor rotation produced a solution with two factors correlated at \( r = 0.38 \). Relationships between the factors and demographic variables of gender, rank, time as a CSP faculty member, and in-person versus online sorts were tested using Fisher’s Exact Test. No relationships were statistically significant at the \( p < .05 \) level.
Major Findings

Analysis of the Q sorts produced two factors representing different views about faculty: (a) one that focuses on the contributions faculty bring to their institutions and academic fields and (b) one that sees faculty and faculty life as ranging from good to bad. Ten participants significantly loaded on Factor 1 and seven significantly loaded on Factor 2. Ten participants were confounded cases who loaded significantly on both factors. One participant did not load on either factor.

The point of view represented by Factor 1 contained four themes under an overarching theme of “Professional Contributions:” (a) faculty contributions to service; (b) centrality of faculty to the institution; (c) interrelation of research and teaching; and (d) faculty independence. The Factor 2 view sees faculty existence as “the Conflicted Life of the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly.” Five themes emerged under this view: (a) faculty commitment; (b) invisibility; (c) rewards; (d) lack of involvement in service; and (e) institutional priorities. These two factors had points of disagreement and consensus, which are discussed later in this chapter.

Two other topics emerged from the analysis. The first topic is that Factor 2 may contain two distinct but convergent ideas: frustrations that faculty feel in their faculty roles and frustrations that people have working with faculty. Although people who loaded on Factor 2 sorted the statements in a similar manner, comments from interviews with the respondents suggest that people may have had differing reasons for why they agreed and disagreed with some of the statements in the sort.
The second topic that emerged was the non-loading sort of Respondent Fourteen. Respondent Fourteen’s sort presented a view that was more critical of faculty than those presented by Factors 1 and 2. Although Respondent Fourteen’s sort was not defined as a separate factor for this study, it was important to include a mention of his sort as a reminder of the limitations of this study. Although Factors 1 and 2 represent the views of the majority of the participants in this study, they do not represent the full range of perspectives that full-time, tenure-track CSP faculty hold about full-time, tenure-track, non-CSP faculty.

**Results of the Research Questions**

**Research Question One**

Factor 1: “Professional Contributions.” The Factor 1 perspective focuses on the professional contributions that faculty make to their institutions and their academic fields. This view sees faculty as being at the heart of their institutions, not only because faculty are needed to teach students, but also because faculty involvement in institutional governance improves the university. The Factor 1 view also sees faculty as highly engaged in service, both within their institutions and in their academic fields.

This view holds faculty research in high regard, but does not see those activities as being in conflict with teaching responsibilities. Indeed, the Factor 1 point of view sees research as enhancing teaching and as a necessary part of an institution’s academic mission. This view thinks that having a balance of faculty who specialize in either teaching or research can benefit a university. In regards to teaching, the Factor 1 perspective sees faculty as dedicated to student learning and wanting to improve
classroom instruction, even if some individual faculty members are more successful at this than others.

Overall, the Factor 1 perspective is staunchly positive about faculty. It celebrates faculty independence and passion. This view sees faculty roles almost as a noble calling—as the keepers of the flame of higher learning, faculty are at the heart of universities and at the forefront of creating knowledge.

Factor 2: “The Conflicted Life of the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly.” The Factor 2 perspective sees faculty as trying to do their best in university settings that often send conflicting messages about what the institutions value. This view sees faculty priorities as being driven not by faculty passions and independent interests, but rather by the requirements they need to meet to keep their jobs and progress in their faculty positions. If work is not going to be valued by a tenure review committee, that work takes a backseat to endeavors that advance careers within the institution. Faculty service to the institution is seen as a common victim to these pressures. A conflict then arises if the institution says it values both teaching and faculty involvement in service, but only research is truly valued when it comes to tenure and promotion.

Despite conflicting messages about institutional value and rewards, the Factor 2 point of view still values teaching and research endeavors. This view sees research providing the knowledge to be conveyed in the classroom. It recognizes that all faculty want to be good teachers and want their students to learn. However, the Factor 2 view sees conflict between undergraduate and graduate teaching; both individual faculty members and institutional priorities often favor one type of student over another.
Another struggle that emerges in the Factor 2 perspective is the invisibility of faculty work. Research, writing, and prepping for classes take a large amount of faculty time, but this view feels that this time is invisible to other people. This work may require faculty to work at home, at odd hours, or with their office door closed, which may lead to the impression that faculty are not at work or uninterested in students. However, this impression is seen as a false one that is symptomatic of a misunderstanding of faculty work styles and the pressures placed on faculty time.

Overall, the Factor 2 perspective acknowledges that both faculty and faculty life has elements of being good, bad, and ugly. An academic life can be difficult and, although most faculty do their best to conduct good research, engage and educate students, and serve their institutions, not all faculty live up to the challenge.

Research Question Two

On the most basic level, Factors 1 and 2 differ in tone. Although Factor 1 respondents note positive faculty contributions and hold them up as stalwart defenders of academia, Factor 2 respondents think that not all faculty live up to this ideal. This difference can be illustrated through each factor’s response to statement 9. This statement had the greatest difference in location between the two factor arrays:

9. Faculty members are generally content experts with no training in how to teach. So they think of classroom instruction as “I show up, I deliver the work, you figure out how to learn it.” (-4, +2)

Respondents in both factors disagreed with parts of this statement, but differed as to which part of the statement influenced where the statement placed in their respective
factor arrays. Factor 1 respondents agreed that not all faculty are trained teachers, but strongly disagreed with the idea that faculty do not take responsibility for their teaching and place the onus of education on the student. This belief in faculty engagement in teaching earned statement 9 a place at the far negative end of the Factor 1 factor array. Factor 2 respondents, however, were more ambivalent about this statement. Although they disliked the strong wording of this point of view on classroom instruction, they generally agreed that faculty are not necessarily trained teachers, thus earning this statement a place on the positive side of the factor array.

Beyond a general sense of positive versus skeptical perspectives, another key difference between the two factors is how they respond to statements about faculty involvement in service. Factor 1 respondents strongly agreed with statements that talked both about the importance of faculty service to their institutions and academic fields and that faculty spend a lot of time in this capacity. Factor 1 also strongly disagreed with statements that suggest that faculty only see service as a checkmark on their vitas and that faculty would rather sit around and gripe about the institution than get involved. Factor 2 respondents, on the other hand, were primarily neutral about these statements. They felt faculty tend to be less involved in service than they would like or, perhaps, should be. Factor 2 respondents agreed with statements that gave reasons why there is lack of faculty involvement. For example, they agreed with statements that said that service does not count for much in the tenure and promotion process and that administrators do not seek out faculty involvement on pertinent committees. However, Factor 2 respondents
did feel that when faculty are doing institutional service they do put time and effort into those endeavors.

Another difference between Factors 1 and 2 is a disagreement over the locus of control in faculty life. Factor 1 responded positively to statements that imply that faculty play an important role in their institutions and have control over their own professional destinies. They believe that faculty are at the heart of the institution, that faculty involvement improves the institution, and that faculty should be rewarded for doing things about which they are passionate. The Factor 1 view is that faculty are the “captains of their own scholarly schooners,” and that fostering independent thought and scholarship makes for strong institutions and well educated students.

The story that emerges in the Factor 2 perspective is very different. They are neutral about statements that place faculty at the center of the institution and somewhat negative about the idea of faculty being captains of their own destinies. Instead, Factor 2 focuses on a lack of faculty control. Faculty are pulled in multiple directions from competing institutional demands. Their work priorities are determined not by their passions, but rather by tenure and promotion committees. Unlike Factor 1, which sees faculty as successful, independent contributors, Factor 2 respondents view most faculty work as invisible and done as an effort to march to the beat of someone else’s drum. As one Factor 2 respondent commented, “parameters are set for us . . . the idea of the entrepreneurial professor doesn’t ring true.”
Research Question Three

Commonalities between Factors 1 and 2 are demonstrated by consensus statements, those statements that both factors ranked in a similar manner. There were 15 statements that did not distinguish between Factors 1 and 2 at the $p < .05$ level. These ranged from statements that both factors ranked at the extreme positive and negative ends of the factor array to statements that placed in neutral to slightly positive or negative positions.

At the extreme ends of the spectrum, Factors 1 and 2 both agreed with statements that reflect positive views of faculty teaching and disagreed with negative views of faculty engagement in the institution. Both factors agree that research enhances teaching, that all faculty want to be good teachers, and that preparing for courses takes a lot of time that is invisible to other people. Both factors disagreed with statements that suggest that faculty are on committees as figureheads and that most faculty are “ghost faculty” who have little interest in students and are only interested in their own research.

In addition to the statements ranked at the highly positive and negative ends of the factor arrays, there were also a number of statements that both factors ranked similarly, but in a more neutral fashion. These statements ran the gamut from a statement about faculty using the pressure to publish as an excuse to get out of other work to a statement comparing efforts to work with faculty to the process of herding cats.

Placements in the neutral range can be an indication of questions that were difficult for participants to sort. Participants were given the instruction that if they were not sure where to place a statement or if they had mixed feelings about a statement, to
place it in a neutral column. Statement 20, which appears in the 0 position in both Factors 1 and 2, states that young faculty have the drive to make changes in the institution but no power to do so, while older faculty have the power but not desire to make change. Several participants on both factors commented that they placed this statement in the neutral area because they agreed with parts of the statement and not others.

Overall, despite the differences between Factors 1 and 2, there are points where the two points of view converge. These points of consensus present a primarily positive view of faculty: agreeing with statements that place value on faculty activities and desire to teach well and disagreeing with statements that suggest that faculty selfishly care about their research to the disregard of students.

Conclusions

The study revealed two different views about faculty. Whereas one viewpoint sees productive individuals who serve as stalwart defenders of the academic flame, the other viewpoint sees a diverse group of people who mean well but have varying levels of success dealing with mixed institutional priorities. Issues such as the importance of research and the desire to teach well cut across the two perspectives, while issues of faculty service work and the locus of control over faculty life drew dividing lines between them. This study expands the existing literature around CSP programs by examining views held by CSP faculty. Previous research had looked at CSP demographics, publishing histories, and the experiences of African-American CSP faculty, but none had examined their views about their faculty colleagues.
The results of this study also align with existing literature about faculty culture and identity. Specifically, the Factor 1 perspective appears to reflect the belief in an overarching faculty culture as outlined in Kuh and Whitt’s *The Invisible Tapestry* (1988). As described in Chapter 2, literature around faculty culture has historically shown that the academic profession shares a worldview that values “the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge,” “faculty autonomy,” and collegiality as demonstrated through “opportunities for social interaction and . . . faculty governance” (p. 76). These values have direct linkages to Factor 1 themes: (a) interrelation of research and teaching, (b) faculty independence, and (c) faculty contributions to service. The Factor 1 perspective demonstrates a belief that faculty are united through their professional obligations and desires to uphold these values of academia.

In *The Invisible Tapestry* (Kuh & Whitt, 1988), the belief in an overarching faculty identity is pitted against a belief in separate, disciplined based affiliations. At first glance, the Factor 2 perspective did not seem antithetical to the idea of a generalized set of cross-discipline faculty values. However, there was one statement in the sample that did, by happenstance, address the presence of discipline based subcultures:

5. Teaching emphasis varies based on the amount of research focus in a given department. In particular, faculty in hard sciences place less of a focus on teaching than faculty in education, humanities, or social sciences. (-2, 2)

The Factor 1 perspective disagrees with the statement but the Factor 2 perspective agrees that teaching and research focus can vary by disciplines and department. In this light, the Factor 2 perspective perhaps illustrates a belief that the commonalities among faculty are
not necessarily based on the shared values of a faculty culture, but rather are based on shared experiences. Kuh and Whitt suggested that these commonalities of experiences, a “shared picture of what a faculty member is and does” can then “obscure the underlying differences” in values between faculty groups (p. 77). Using this framework, Factor 1 represents a view of a pan-faculty identity based on values and beliefs about ideal faculty roles whereas Factor 2 represents an acknowledgement of shared experiences. These experiences and struggles affect all faculty because of their functional roles in the institution, but do not necessarily imply that all faculty have the same values and beliefs about higher education.

When reading this study, it is important to remember that Q methodology does not presume to capture all possible viewpoints, merely those that are present in a particular group of participants. As the discussion of Respondent 14 demonstrates, there are indeed other points of view about full-time, tenure-track, non-CSP faculty that exist beyond those presented in Factors 1 and 2. Another interesting aspect to this study is that, despite the feeling in Factor 2 that faculty have varying levels of success at meeting the demands of their jobs, Factors 1 and 2 both have a view of faculty that is primarily positive and sympathetic. Both agree that faculty care about students and put a lot of time into their work, even if they disagree as to whether or not that time and effort is visible and acknowledged. Factor 2 respondents talk about frustrations, but underlying those frustrations is the belief that faculty try hard and mean well.

In contrast to these factors, however, the original interviews from which the statements were taken presented a more critical view of faculty. It was a struggle in
putting the concourse together to come up with enough positive statements to achieve a balance between positive, negative, and neutral viewpoints. Some negative statements from the interviews and literature were changed in direction to make them more positive for the statement sample. Why then, if the concourse seemed so negative, are the factors that emerge from the study positive?

One simple answer may be social desirability and sorters not wanting to sound negative about their faculty colleagues. Some participants surprised this researcher with what statements they placed at the positive end of the spectrum. They seemed not to match comments they have made about faculty in the past or outside of the Q sorting process. For example, someone who had previously made comments about other faculty not being willing to put effort into their teaching somehow now felt that no one wants to be a bad teacher.

The difference in modes of data collection between the initial interviews and the Q sorts also may have played a role. Studies have shown that quantitative and qualitative methods can produce different results. For example, in a study about chilly classroom climates for women, Allan and Madden (2006) found that the results of a survey showed little evidence of negative classroom experiences for women whereas focus groups revealed many examples of chilly classroom climates. The process of talking about experiences helped the women to remember instances of chilly climates that were forgotten or considered unimportant when they were completing the survey. Similarly, the initial interviews that produced the concourse for this study asked participants to reflect and expound upon their own experiences and beliefs while the Q sort process had
them rank statements made by someone else. It is possible that the differences between these methods contributed to a negative concourse and positive factors.

Another factor that may have contributed to a positive outlook about faculty is the political climate at the time of data collection. The in-person sorts were conducted in Ohio during February through April 2011. On March 31, 2011, Ohio Governor John Kasich signed into law the Senate Bill 5 (SB 5) that limited collective bargaining for public employees, including faculty unions (StateImpact, n.d.). Ohio voters supported repealing the law in the following November elections; however, the months leading up to the original signing of the bill through the elections saw both protests in favor of faculty rights and accusations of overpaid, underperforming academics. During post-sort interviews many of the participants in this study said that while they were not in favor of faculty unions, they disliked the attempt by the state government to limit faculty rights. In hindsight, it would have been useful to have asked these participants to reflect on whether their sorts might have come out differently had they completed them prior to the emergence of SB 5.

The difference between a negative concourse and positive factors could also be an indication of a disconnect between what is said about faculty in everyday discourse or the classroom and what people think about faculty when they take time to reflect about the topic. For example, one participant in this study had a moment of pause after reading a statement that says that faculty were focused on academics, not extracurricular activities, as undergraduates and therefore they are unfamiliar with how to become engaged at the university. She commented, “Wow—I’ve definitely said that in class, but I’m not sure I
really believe it.” Such dissonance upon reflection hints that the messages that CSP students hear about faculty may not accurately reflect the story their faculty would really want to tell.

Given the socialization process that occurs during graduate education, each CSP faculty member potentially acts as a multiplier of views about faculty in student affairs. Casual comments and curricular decisions by one faculty member have the power to influence how many students will view their faculty colleagues and academic affairs upon entering the workforce. Therefore it is important if CSP faculty and student affairs professionals truly wish to reach across the student affairs/academic affairs divide and to facilitate collaboration, that they begin to take a critical lens to their own views about faculty and whether or not those same messages are the ones they pass on to new student affairs professionals.

**Recommendations for Future Study**

This study was an initial exploration of the perspectives CSP faculty hold and it was limited to their perspectives about a narrow part of academic affairs: full-time, tenure-track, non-CSP faculty. The process of conducting this study has raised several questions beyond the original research questions: (a) why were the perspectives that emerged from the factors positive while the initial interviews were generally negative, (b) does the Factor 2 perspective encompass both frustrations with being a faculty member and frustrations in working with faculty, and (c) how do locus of control issues factor into perspectives about faculty? Each of these questions could generate separate studies of their own.
Future research about this topic also could widen the focus to include CSP faculty views about other areas of the university, such as non-tenure-track faculty, adjunct faculty, academic administrators, and student affairs. Examining institutions other than RU/H institutions could also yield different perspectives. Also, since faculty who are not in full-time, tenure-track lines teach in CSP programs, including perspectives from other types of faculty would be important to gaining a better sense of the messages being conveyed to graduate students via CSP professional preparation programs.

Different methods other than Q sorts could also be employed to explore the issue of perceptions about faculty. Intensive interviews with people who represent Factor 1, Factor 2, or other points of view would further illuminate the nature of these perspectives and how they differ and overlap. Quantitative surveys could be used to assess the prevalence of these factors across CSP faculty and other campus stakeholders.

Beyond finding out what views CSP faculty say they hold, it is also important to investigate what messages they actually convey in the classroom and the views students hold when they finish a CSP program. Surveying students at the start of their CSP program and again at graduation could provide an interesting look at the effects of CSP programs on students’ views about faculty or academic affairs. It could also be informative to ask CSP students what views they think their CSP faculty hold; disconnects between students’ perceptions of what their CSP faculty think and CSP faculty member’s perceptions of their own beliefs could point to problems in preparing students to positively approach collaboration across the student affairs/academic affairs divide.
Recommendations for Practitioners

Each CSP faculty member has the opportunity to shape the dialogue about faculty and to promote positive collaborative efforts between student affairs and academic affairs. Both the results of this study and the Q sort statements could be used to facilitate conversations in classroom settings. Questions that could be used in this environment include asking about what views the students have about faculty based on their undergraduate experiences, what views they think their professors and internship or practicum supervisors have about faculty, and what challenges they expect to face in working with faculty upon graduation. This activity could be particularly effective in courses about faculty and faculty roles.

As a field, student affairs has both the CAS Standards and Professional Competencies Areas for Student Affairs Practitioners guiding the values and attitudes of the profession. This study and the questions it raises could serve as a call to action asking CSP faculty and student affairs professionals to critically evaluate the dialog around faculty that is perpetuated in student affairs functional areas, student affairs conferences, and in professional preparation programs. The Professional Competencies ask for student affairs professionals to be able to understand campus cultures, to be able to partner with faculty, and to be able to work with people of differing perspectives (Joint Taskforce on Professional Competencies and Standards, 2010). With these as the stated goals of the profession, student affairs administrators have the opportunity and obligation to serve as leaders for positive interactions with all campus constituents and as agents for collaborative change in our institutions. Such efforts should extend beyond the confines
of professional preparation and into the realm of professional development; through conferences, publications and on campus committees, CSP faculty and student affairs professionals can work together to foster understanding of faculty roles and to practice and promote mindful, open communication and collaboration.

**Summary**

In sum, this study sought to contribute to the literature about CSP faculty, professional preparation programs, and beliefs about faculty and faculty roles through an investigation of the perceptions that full-time, tenure-track CSP faculty hold about full-time, tenure-track, non-CSP faculty. A Q methodology approach to examining this issue produced two primary perspectives about faculty: one which focuses on the professional contributions of faculty and one which focused on the challenges and mixed successes faculty face. These two perspectives differed from one another on issues such as the level of success that faculty have in doing their jobs and the degree of control faculty have over their work lives. The two factors agreed that faculty want to perform well in both teaching and research and that they care about their students. The presence of a third, more critical point of view is suggested through the sort of an individual who did not load on either Factor 1 or Factor 2. Other perspectives may exist but were not captured through the sample of faculty who participated in this study.

The results of this study reflect existing literature about faculty culture and academic discipline specific values, but also raised questions about why the factors that emerged were positive while much of the dialogue about faculty seems to have a negative tone. Further research into the difference between the dialogue about faculty versus
actual beliefs about faculty is recommended. This research could also be expanded to investigations of: (a) student affairs faculty, student, and practitioner views about other campus groups; (b) interactions between campus groups; and (c) how professional preparation programs prepare students for collaboration with faculty. Student affairs faculty and practitioners should be called on to carefully consider what messages about faculty are presented in the professional preparation classroom and to work to further understanding and positive collaboration between functional divisions on university campuses.
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In-Person Q Sort

Kent State University
Institutional Review Board

Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Study Title: College Student Personnel Preparation Program Faculty Views About Full-Time, Tenure-Track Faculty: A Q-Methodology Study

Principal Investigator: Linnea Carlson Stafford

You are being invited to participate in a research study. This consent form will provide you with information on the research project, what you will need to do, and the associated risks and benefits of the research. Your participation is voluntary. Please read this form carefully. It is important that you ask questions and fully understand the research in order to make an informed decision. You will receive a copy of this document to take with you.

Purpose:
College Student Personnel preparation program faculty (CSP), because work history and research agendas, bridge the sometimes contentious divide between student affairs and academic affairs. If a goal of the academy is greater cooperation and understanding between academic and student affairs, it is therefore important to understand what perspectives are held by those who are familiar with and navigate both areas and who socialize other people to do the same. Consequently, this Q-Methodology study explores perspectives held by full-time, tenure-track CSP faculty about full-time, tenure-track professors outside of CSP programs.

Procedures
In this study you will be asked to do three things: 1) complete a Q sort of statements about faculty, 2) complete a demographics and background questionnaire, and 3) verbally answer a few questions reflecting on the Q sort process and the demographics questionnaire. You may be contacted by the researcher for clarification of your responses if questions arise during data analysis. This process should take approximately one hour.

Audio and Video Recording and Photography
The portion of the data collection during which you are asked to reflect on the Q-sorting process may be audio taped. These tapes may be referenced during data analysis to clarify answers that were provided during the data collection process.
**Benefits**
This research will not benefit you directly. However, your participation in this study will help us to better understand CSP faculty and their points of view.

**Risks and Discomforts**
There are no anticipated risks beyond those encountered in everyday life.

**Privacy and Confidentiality**
Your study related information will be kept confidential within the limits of the law. Any identifying information will be kept in a secure location and only the researchers will have access to the data. Individual research participants will not be identified in any publication or presentation of research results; only aggregate data will be used.

**Voluntary Participation**
Taking part in this research study is entirely up to you. You may choose not to participate or you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You will be informed of any new, relevant information that may affect your health, welfare, or willingness to continue your study participation.

**Contact Information**
If you have any questions or concerns about this research, you may contact Linnea Carlson Stafford at (330) 672-8565 or Dr. Mark Kretovics at (330) 672-0642. This project has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or complaints about the research, you may call the IRB at 330.672.2704.

**Consent Statement and Signature**
I have read this consent form and have had the opportunity to have my questions answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I understand that a copy of this consent will be provided to me for future reference.

___________________________________  _____________________
Participant Signature     Date
AUDIOTAPE CONSENT FORM

Linnea Carlson Stafford
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

I agree to participate in an audio-taped interview about College Student Personnel (CSP) preparation program faculty views about full-time, tenure-track faculty as part of this project and for the purposes of data analysis. I agree that Linnea Carlson Stafford may audio-tape this interview. The date, time and place of the interview will be mutually agreed upon.

__________________________________________________________________________
Signature Date

I have been told that I have the right to listen to the recording of the interview before it is used. I have decided that I:

____want to listen to the recording  ____do not want to listen to the recording

Sign now below if you do not want to listen to the recording. If you want to listen to the recording, you will be asked to sign after listening to them.

Linnea Carlson Stafford may / may not (circle one) use the audio-tapes made of me. The original tapes or copies may be used for:

____this research project ____publication ____presentation at professional meetings

__________________________________________________________________________
Signature Date

Address:
Data Collection Form

Name: ___________________________________   Date:__________________

Rank the statements about full-time, tenure track faculty at your campus according to those that you most agree with (+4) to those that you most disagree with (-4). Fill the numbers next to each statement into the column that best represents your feelings about that statement. There should be one number per white box in the grid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+3</th>
<th>+4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview Questions

1. Why did you choose the statements for the +4/Most Agree column?

2. Why did you choose the statements for the -4/Most Disagree column?

3. Were there any statements that were hard for you to sort? Why were they difficult?

4. Are there any statements or sentiments you would have added?

5. Where did you place # 25: Faculty are equally concerned about and engaged in teaching undergraduate and graduate students? Why?

6. What research or scholarship have you done on faculty?
Demographics Questionnaire

College Student Personnel (CSP) Preparation Program
Faculty: Who Are You and Where Do You Come From?

Your History in CSP and the Academy

1. How many years have you been a full-time faculty member in a CSP program?
   __ 5 years or less
   __ 6 to 10 years
   __ 11 to 20 years
   __ 21 years or more

2. How many years have you been a full-time faculty member in CSP at your current institution?
   __ 5 years or less
   __ 6 to 10 years
   __ 11 to 20 years
   __ 21 years or more

3. What is your current faculty rank?
   __ Professor
   __ Associate Professor
   __ Assistant Professor
   __ Other: ___________________

4. What CSP topics do you teach most regularly in your program? (list up to 5)

   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________

5. Were you an administrator in higher education before becoming a full-time faculty member?
   __ Yes – For approximately how many years? __________
   __ No
6. If yes, what positions did you hold at as an administrator in higher education? (Please list only up to the last five positions you held)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

7. What is the highest degree you have earned?
   __ Ph.D.
   __ Ed.D.
   __ Ed.S.
   __ M.Ed.
   __ M.A.
   __ Other: _________________________

8. In what field did you receive this degree?
   __ Higher Education
   __ Higher Education Administration/College Student Personnel
   __ Counseling
   __ Other: _________________________

9. On the whole, would you say that you personally identify more with Student Affairs or Academic Affairs on your campus?
   __ Student Affairs
   __ Academic Affairs
   __ Identify with both equally
   __ Identify with neither Student Affairs nor Academic Affairs

10. What is your gender?
    __ Male
    __ Female
    __ Other
    __ Prefer not to answer
11. Which of the following best matches your racial or ethnic identity? (Select all that apply)
   __ African-American
   __ Asian
   __ Hispanic
   __ Native American or Native Alaskan
   __ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
   __ White/Caucasian
   __ Other
   __ Prefer not to answer

**YOUR PROGRAM AND INSTITUTION**

12. Would you describe your university as more research focused or more teaching focused?
   __ Research focused
   __ Teaching focused
   __ Equally research and teaching focused

13. Would you describe your CSP program as more research focused or more teaching focused?
   __ Research focused
   __ Teaching focused
   __ Equally research and teaching focused

14. What degrees does your CSP program offer?
   __ M.Ed.
   __ M.A.
   __ M.S.
   __ Ed.S.
   __ Ph.D.
   __ Ed.D.
   __ Other: _______________

15. From very cooperative to not at all cooperative, how would you classify the relationship between academic affairs and student affairs at your current institution?
   __ Very Cooperative
   __ Somewhat Cooperative
   __ Not Very Cooperative
   __ Not At All Cooperative
16. Thinking in terms of your current role as a CSP faculty member, please briefly describe what interactions you have with the student affairs division at your university.

17. Thinking in terms of your current role as a CSP faculty member, please briefly describe what interactions you have with non-CSP faculty at your university.
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Online Q Sort

Online Study Recruitment Script

Hello! My name is Linnea Stafford and I am a doctoral student at Kent State University. For my dissertation I am conducting a Q methodology study of points of view that full-time, tenure-track College Student Personnel (CSP) preparation program faculty hold about other full-time, tenure-track faculty. CSP faculty sit in a unique position in colleges and universities, with an opportunity to bridge the sometimes contentious divide between student affairs and academic affairs. If a goal of the academy is greater cooperation and understanding between academic and student affairs, it is therefore important to understand what perspectives are held by those who are familiar with and navigate both areas and who socialize other people to do the same.

If you are a full-time, tenure-track faculty member teaching in a CSP program, I welcome you to participate in my study. This research will not benefit you directly. However, your participation in this study will help us to better understand CSP faculty and their points of view.

This process should take approximately 30 to 45 minutes to complete. If you are willing to participate, all you need to do is click on this link:
http://qsortonline.com/qsort/L.Stafford2/

If you participate there are three steps in the process:

1) Read a set of 36 statements about faculty and faculty life. At this point you will sort them into three piles: agree, disagree, and neutral/mixed feelings.

2) Place the 36 statements into a distribution grid, ranging from those statements with which you most agree to those with which you most disagree.

3) Answer a few questions about your Q-sort and a complete a demographics questionnaire.

Your study related information will be kept confidential within the limits of the law. Individual research participants will not be identified in any publication or presentation of research results; only aggregate data will be used. There are no anticipated risks beyond those encountered in everyday life. Taking part in this research study is entirely up to you. You may choose not to participate or you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

If you have any questions or concerns about this research, you may contact Linnea Carlson Stafford at lcarlson@kent.edu or (330) 672-8565 or Dr. Mark Kretovics at mkretov1@kent.edu or (330) 672-0642.

This project has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or complaints about the research, you may call the IRB at 330.672.2704.

Thank you very much for your time!

Linnea Carlson Stafford
Kent State University
Work: (330) 672-8565
lcarlson@kent.edu
Welcome to “College Student Personnel Preparation Program Faculty Views About Full-Time, Tenure-Track Faculty: A Q-Methodology Study,” a web-based survey. Before taking part in this study, please read the consent form below and click on the "Continue" button at the bottom of the page if you understand the statements and freely consent to participate in the study.

Purpose: College Student Personnel preparation program faculty (CSP), because of work history and research agendas, bridge the sometimes contentious divide between student affairs and academic affairs. If a goal of the Academy is greater cooperation and understanding between academic and student affairs, it is therefore important to understand what perspectives are held by those who are familiar with and navigate both areas and who socialize other people to do the same. Consequently, this Q-Methodology study explores perspectives held by full-time, tenure-track CSP faculty about full-time, tenure-track professors outside of CSP programs.

Procedures: In this study you will be asked to do two things: 1) complete a Q sort of statements about faculty, and 2) complete a questionnaire about your background and your reaction to completing the Q-sort. You may be contacted by the researcher for clarification of your responses if questions arise during data analysis. This process should take approximately between one half hour and 45 minutes.

Benefits: This research will not benefit you directly. However, your participation in this study will help us to better understand CSP faculty and their points of view.

Risks and Discomforts: There are no anticipated risks beyond those encountered in everyday life.

Privacy and Confidentiality: Your study related information will be kept confidential within the limits of the law. Any identifying information will be kept in a secure location and only the researchers will have access to the data. Individual research participants will not be identified in any publication or presentation of research results; only aggregate data will be used. Participants should be aware, however, that the survey is not being run from a "secure" https server of the kind typically used to handle credit card transactions, so there is a small possibility that responses could be viewed by unauthorized third parties (e.g., computer hackers).

Voluntary Participation: Taking part in this research study is entirely up to you. You may choose not to participate or you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You will be informed of
any new, relevant information that may affect your health, welfare, or willingness to continue your study participation.

Contact Information: If you have any questions or concerns about this research, you may contact Linnea Carlson Stafford at (330) 672-8565 or Dr. Mark Kretovics at (330) 672-0642. This project has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board (IRB). If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or complaints about the research, you may call the IRB at (330) 672-2704.

If you are 18 years of age or older, understand the statements above, and freely consent to participate in the study, click on the "Continue" button to begin the Q-sort.

Step 1:

Although we know that all faculty are different and have unique experiences, people both inside and outside of the Academy often talk about faculty in a general sense.

We are asking you to respond to a series of statements that people have made about faculty as a group. These statements were taken from interviews with College Student Personnel (CSP) Preparation Program faculty, articles in The Chronicle of Higher Education, and other literature about faculty.

For this study, when you read the word “faculty,” please think about full-time, tenure-track, non-CSP faculty at your own institution.

Read the following 36 statements carefully and split them up into three piles: a pile for statements with which you tend to disagree, a pile for statements with which you tend to agree, and a pile for statements about which you are neutral or have mixed feelings.

You can either drag the statements into one of the three piles or press 1, 2, or 3 on your keyboard. Please note: If you drag the text boxes to the piles, please release when the text box changes color. Make sure you use the corresponding numbers (1, 2, or 3) depending on the number of the pile on which you want to place the text box. Changes can be made later.

If you want to read this instruction a second time, press the help-button at the bottom left corner.
Step 2:

In this step you will place each one of the statements you have read in a grid ranging from those with which you most agree with to those with which you most disagree.

Take the statements from the "AGREE"-pile and read them again. You can scroll through the statements by using the scroll bar. Next, select the three statements with which you most agree and place them on the right side of the score sheet below the "+4". Now read the statements in the "DISAGREE"-pile again. Just like before, select the three statements with which you most disagree and place them on the left side of the score sheet below the "-4".

Next, select the statements with which you second most agree/disagree and place them under "+3"/"-3". Follow this procedure for all statements in the "AGREE"- and "DISAGREE"-piles.

Finally, read the "NEUTRAL"-statements again and arrange them in the remaining open boxes of the score sheet.

Note:
- The Agree and Disagree categories are fluid. If you have enough statements in either of these groups that they need to be placed in the Neutral column that is perfectly fine.
- The order of statements within the columns does not matter.
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## Factor Q-Sort Values for Each Statement in a Two Factor Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor Array</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Course prep, course prep, course prep . . . that’s a huge amount of faculty time that’s really invisible.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Faculty research contributes to knowledge, which in turn contributes to the students’ education. It enriches the classroom experience. So you need to have the researchers, or you don’t have the content for the teachers to teach.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The more you involve faculty in the decision-making structure, the more involved in the institution they become and the better institution you’re going to have.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Some of your absolute best researchers are also some of your best teachers and it’s not just by happenstance. It’s because they are really committed to being instructors first and foremost, and they know that to be a good instructor they have got to be a good writer and researcher and contribute to their field.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teaching emphasis varies based on the amount of research focus in a given department. In particular, faculty in hard sciences place less of a focus on teaching than faculty in education, humanities, or social sciences.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Faculty view research as far more important than teaching because what they hear is that if they don’t do research they’re not going to get tenure.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Entry level faculty are encouraged to do the minimum they have to do service-wise to demonstrate they’re a player and they’re doing their fair share. But no one ever got tenure on the basis of service.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Regarding faculty, there’s a mix of the good, the bad, and the ugly across campus. From dedicated, highly motivated, very student-oriented faculty to those that simply do minimally what you expect them to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Faculty members are generally content experts with no training in how to teach. So they think of classroom instruction as “I show up, I deliver the work, you figure out how to learn it.”</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Faculty use the pressure to publish as an excuse to get out of other university work. It is a polite way for faculty to get out of commitments.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Faculty are often disengaged with the non-academic side of the university and may feel that they are not even supposed to be engaged in those areas. This contributes to the “ivory tower” myth and allows faculty to sort of skirt out of being involved in the institution.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many faculty are “ghost faculty” who rarely set foot on campus and have little interest in students. 

No one really wants to be a bad teacher.

Faculty focused on research make the university more prestigious which in turn makes students’ degrees more valuable.

Faculty spend a lot of time on service commitments both inside and outside the university, ranging from institutional projects such as accreditation and faculty governance to leadership positions in national organizations.

Faculty wield a great deal of power in the university, from deciding admissions and determining who gets tenure, to shaping the future direction of the institution.

No one should be on a university campus and have a faculty appointment who does not teach a class. If you are faculty you should be teaching.

Time spent on research and writing is “invisible” because it often does not involve interaction with other people and it takes time outside of the office.

Most faculty were focused on academics as undergraduates. They were not involved in the extracurricular. So, they may want to be engaged at the University, but don’t know how to do it because of lack of familiarity.

Young faculty have the drive to change things in the University, but at that level they don’t have enough power to make change in the institution. Older faculty have the power but not the desire.

Faculty, working to meet multiple and at times competing demands, rarely focus on either improving instruction or demonstrating gains in student learning.

Administrators don’t get the benefits of faculty research and expertise on campus in large part because they don’t involve faculty on relevant campus committees.

Faculty don’t necessarily view service to the institution as something that should be done. It’s “I have to be on at least one university committee before I can go for tenure or I have to be on a college committee before I can go for tenure because I need to have that checkmark on my vita.”

Faculty would rather sit around griping about the institution than get involved and try to change things.

Faculty are equally concerned about and engaged in teaching undergraduate and graduate students.

As long as they don’t shirk their basic teaching and departmental duties, faculty are considered virtuous professors when they teach and do research on what they love. Professors are, and should be, encouraged and rewarded for passion for their work.
| 27 | Faculty involvement in service in their field increases the visibility of the institution and makes their programs stronger and able to attract better candidates. |
| 28 | Faculty are at the heart of the institution. Without them you don’t have a university |
| 29 | It can be difficult for faculty to balance bringing their research into the classroom because if they refer too much to their studies and interests in their teaching the students see it as self-promotion and write the course off as “it’s all about him.” |
| 30 | It is hard for faculty because the institution says it wants both teaching and scholarship to be strong. But at the same time the institution really rewards them on scholarship while demanding most of their time for teaching. |
| 31 | Faculty are included on university committees as a placeholder or figurehead to say that there is faculty representation on the committee. But no one expects them to really do any work because they must have other important things to do. |
| 32 | Faculty have the freedom to make independent decisions. At the end of the day, they are the “captains of their own scholarly schooners—if it sails on gloriously or crashes into the shoals, it’s largely to their own credit or blame.” |
| 33 | Rather than taking responsibility for poor teaching performance, faculty make excuses for negative student evaluations by calling the evaluations a personality contest and saying the “students don’t like me.” |
| 34 | Faculty are not committed to the students. They don’t want to help. They don’t care about the students. All they care about is their research. |
| 35 | “Service” is sometimes used as an excuse to get out of teaching and research. |
| 36 | Trying to get faculty to do anything is like trying to herd cats. They are very stubborn and reluctant to change. |
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Factor Q-Sort Values for Each Statement in a Three Factor Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor Array</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Course prep, course prep, course prep…that’s a huge amount of faculty time that’s really invisible.</td>
<td>2 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Faculty research contributes to knowledge, which in turn contributes to the students’ education. It enriches the classroom experience. So you need to have the researchers, or you don’t have the content for the teachers to teach.</td>
<td>4 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The more you involve faculty in the decision-making structure, the more involved in the institution they become and the better institution you’re going to have.</td>
<td>3 4 -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Some of your absolute best researchers are also some of your best teachers and it’s not just by happenstance. It’s because they are really committed to being instructors first and foremost, and they know that to be a good instructor they have got to be a good writer and researcher and contribute to their field.</td>
<td>3 4 -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teaching emphasis varies based on the amount of research focus in a given department. In particular, faculty in hard sciences place less of a focus on teaching than faculty in education, humanities, or social sciences.</td>
<td>-2 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Faculty view research as far more important than teaching because what they hear is that if they don’t do research they’re not going to get tenure.</td>
<td>0 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Entry level faculty are encouraged to do the minimum they have to do service-wise to demonstrate they’re a player and they’re doing their fair share. But no one ever got tenure on the basis of service.</td>
<td>1 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Regarding faculty, there’s a mix of the good, the bad, and the ugly across campus. From dedicated, highly motivated, very student-oriented faculty to those that simply do minimally what you expect them to do.</td>
<td>1 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Faculty members are generally content experts with no training in how to teach. So they think of classroom instruction as “I show up, I deliver the work, you figure out how to learn it.”</td>
<td>-4 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Score 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Faculty use the pressure to publish as an excuse to get out of other university work. It is a polite way for faculty to get out of commitments.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Faculty are often disengaged with the non-academic side of the university and may feel that they are not even supposed to be engaged in those areas. This contributes to the “ivory tower” myth and allows faculty to sort of skirt out of being involved in the institution.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Many faculty are “ghost faculty” who rarely set foot on campus and have little interest in students.</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>No one really wants to be a bad teacher.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Faculty focused on research make the university more prestigious which in turn makes students’ degrees more valuable.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Faculty spend a lot of time on service commitments both inside and outside the university, ranging from institutional projects such as accreditation and faculty governance to leadership positions in national organizations.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Faculty wield a great deal of power in the university, from deciding admissions and determining who gets tenure, to shaping the future direction of the institution.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>No one should be on a university campus and have a faculty appointment who does not teach a class. If you are faculty you should be teaching.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Time spent on research and writing is “invisible” because it often does not involve interaction with other people and it takes time outside of the office.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Most faculty were focused on academics as undergraduates. They were not involved in the extracurricular. So, they may want to be engaged at the University, but don’t know how to do it because of lack of familiarity.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Young faculty have the drive to change things in the University, but at that level they don’t have enough power to make change in the institution. Older faculty have the power but not the desire.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Faculty, working to meet multiple and at times competing demands, rarely focus on either improving instruction or demonstrating gains in student learning.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Administrators don’t get the benefits of faculty research and expertise on campus in large part because they don’t involve faculty on relevant campus committees.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty don’t necessarily view service to the institution as something that should be done. It’s “I have to be on at least one university committee before I can go for tenure or I have to be on a college committee before I can go for tenure because I need to have that checkmark on my vita.”

Faculty would rather sit around griping about the institution than get involved and try to change things.

Faculty are equally concerned about and engaged in teaching undergraduate and graduate students.

As long as they don’t shirk their basic teaching and departmental duties, faculty are considered virtuous professors when they teach and do research on what they love. Professors are, and should be, encouraged and rewarded for passion for their work.

Faculty involvement in service in their field increases the visibility of the institution and makes their programs stronger and able to attract better candidates.

Faculty are at the heart of the institution. Without them you don’t have a university

It can be difficult for faculty to balance bringing their research into the classroom because if they refer too much to their studies and interests in their teaching the students see it as self-promotion and write the course off as “it’s all about him.”

It is hard for faculty because the institution says it wants both teaching and scholarship to be strong. But at the same time the institution really rewards them on scholarship while demanding most of their time for teaching.

Faculty are included on university committees as a placeholder or figurehead to say that there is faculty representation on the committee. But no one expects them to really do any work because they must have other important things to do.

Faculty have the freedom to make independent decisions. At the end of the day, they are the “captains of their own scholarly schooners—if it sails on gloriously or crashes into the shoals, it’s largely to their own credit or blame.”

Rather than taking responsibility for poor teaching performance, faculty make excuses for negative student evaluations by calling the evaluations a personality contest and saying the “students don’t like me.”

Faculty are not committed to the students. They don’t want to help. They don’t care about the students. All they care about is their research.
“Service” is sometimes used as an excuse to get out of teaching and research.

Trying to get faculty to do anything is like trying to herd cats. They are very stubborn and reluctant to change.
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