

UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE PHYSICAL EDUCATION FACULTY
SALARY SCHEDULES IN RELATION TO JOB RESPONSIBILITIES

by

ARCHIE CHARLES RINGGENBERG

B. S. Kansas State College, Pittsburg, 1962

9984

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirement for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Physical Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1972

Approved by:

T. M. Evans CBK
Major Professor

LD
2668
R4
1972
R55
copy 2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my appreciation to Professor Thomas M. Evans of the Physical Education Department for his time and professional advice in the development of this report.

My deepest appreciation goes to my wife, Verlene, for her encouragement and understanding during the accumulation of data, writing, and oral examination of this report, without which this paper could not have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Statement of the Purpose	1
Rationale of the Problem	2
Delimitations of the Problem	2
Limitations of the Problem	3
II. TREATMENT OF DATA	4
Selection of Questions	4
Coding Procedures	4
Statistical Methods	6
III. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	7
Survey Results	7
Response by Institutions	8
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	28
Conclusions of Correlations	28
Conclusions of Means	29
Conclusions of Salary Increases and Promotions	33
Implications of the Problem	33
BIBLIOGRAPHY	35
APPENDIX	36
ABSTRACT	50

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In our capitalistic society, individuals are concerned about financial incomes to support the material, physical, and emotional needs of himself and his family. Individuals seek work opportunities which provide income to meet the needs of the family. The type of work, pay, hours, and such become of interest to the family provider.

Statement of the Problem

The teaching profession has voiced concern that salaries are inadequate but responsibility and hours excessive. To scientifically gather information related to this opinion and validate this long heard statement, this report was undertaken.

The salary of teachers in higher education institutions in relation to professional qualifications, teaching hours, other hours, faculty rank held, and cost of living in a specific geographic location is considered essential in pursuit of support or denial of this statement. In addition, the methods used by institutions for granting salary increases, awarding such increases, and awarding professional promotions is essential. The physical education faculty was selected as the resource group to provide facts in support or denial of the claim of inadequate pay and excessive responsibilities.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this report is to collect and analyze general

information of physical education staff members concerning their faculty rank, degree, teaching credit hours, and clock hours as these factors pertain to salaries. Additional information collected includes bases for professional promotion, bases for salary increases, and methods of awarding such increases. All data was secured from physical education department personnel in colleges and universities having populations of 10,000 or more students.

Rationale of the Problem

Administrators of physical education have few facts to aid them in determining what salaries should be paid to their staff members. There is little concrete evidence to point out how professional promotions and awards are given. It is hoped that the materials gathered in this problem may aid an administrator in the decisions of salary bases, increases, and job promotions according to his particular location.

Delimitations of the Problem

One hundred eight colleges and universities were identified from The Blue Book of College Athletics, 1970-71 with students populations of over 10,000 populations. Both state supported and privately endowed institutions were included.

A three-part questionnaire was constructed designed to provide that specific information necessary to analyze the methods by which institutions determine basic salary schedules, salary increases, and faculty promotions.

Copies of the questionnaire as well as stamped, self addressed

envelopes were mailed to the Physical Education Department Chairman of each college and university included in the survey. A copy of the questionnaire plus the list of colleges and universities polled and their student populations is provided in the Appendix.

Limitations of the Problem

This study is limited by several factors. The number of questionnaires returned could have been substantially improved possibly by the use of a shorter questionnaire. A second limiting factor was the failure of department chairmen to provide information on both male and female staff members. Sections D and E of the questionnaire tended to be confusing to some persons answering the sections and should be explained differently if used in some future research.

CHAPTER II

TREATMENT OF DATA

Selection of Questions

Questions to be placed in the questionnaire were selected in anticipation of the factors which might influence the salaries physical education staffmembers receive. An interview with T. M. Evans, the chairman of Kansas State University Department of Physical Education, 1971, aided the author greatly in selecting questions concerning the bases for staff promotions and salary increases as well as the methods of awarding such increases.

Coding Procedures

The data in the following pages has been carefully coded to prevent lengthy explanations of each item in the body of this report. The codes were also used for the computer analysis of the results. Explanations of the coding procedures are as follows:

A. Each school is coded by three numbers, two numbers followed by a decimal point and a third number. A school designated by the first number one (1) indicates a school with 10,000 to 15,000 student population. A school designated by the first number two (2) indicates a school with a population of more than 15,000 students. The second number of the school code is an arbitrary number used only to differentiate between schools. The third number designates male or female staff. Male staff is

shown by decimal point one (.1); female staff, by decimal point two (.2).

B. The vertical and horizontal columns found on the correlation tabulations are referred to as A, B, C, etc. The letters' definitions are as follows:

- A. faculty rank
- B. highest degree held
- C. major field credit hours taught
- D. required credit hours taught
- E. total clock hours per week
- F. nine months salary
- G. adjusted salary (nine month's salary adjusted by the cost of living index based on high, middle, or low income bracket and geographical location¹).

C. Faculty ranks were designated the following numerical values because of computerized computations:

- 1 Professor
- 2 Associate Professor
- 3 Assistant Professor
- 4 Instructor
- 5 Assistant Instructor
- 6 Graduate Assistant

D. The highest degree held by physical educators was designated by the following numerical values:

¹See Appendix B.

- 1 Bachelor of Arts
- 2 Bachelor of Education
- 3 Bachelor of Science
- 4 Master of Science
- 5 Master of Arts
- 6 Master of Education
- 7 Doctor of Education
- 8 Doctor of Philosophy
- 9 Physical Therapist

E. The actual numerical value was used for the remaining columns C through G.

(Note that because of the way numerical values have been assigned, a negative high correlation between rank and salary, for example, still shows that the higher ranking staff member would receive higher pay.)

Statistical Methods

Using the above coding procedures, Pearson's Product Moment correlations were used on all the appropriate data. Arithmetic means were also computed. All statistical work was done by computer at the Kansas State University Computer Science Department.

CHAPTER III

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Survey Results

One hundred eight institutions received questionnaires. Sixteen institutions returned completed questionnaires. Seven institutions returned incomplete questionnaires and could not be used. Eighty institutions did not respond. Five institutions returned unanswered questionnaires with reasons why it was not completed.

Table 1 shows the survey results by response and percentage.

Table 1
Survey Results

Schools Contacted	<u>Number</u> 108	<u>Percent</u> 100%
Returned Completed	16	15%
Returned Incomplete	7	6%
Returned with Regrets	5	5%
Not Returned	80	74%

The poor response could have been reduced by a shorter questionnaire requiring only 30 minutes answering time. The sensitive information requested could have limited the number of responses itself. Sections of the questionnaire may have been confusing and should be clearly

explained in future research. The failure of department chairman to respond in student academic requirements limited the amount of data available.

Response by Institutions

The information received from the returned questionnaires was analyzed and recorded. Correlations of the six previously identified columns concerning rank, degree, etc. were computed using the Pearson Product Moment correlation formula. Means of the six columns were computed by institution and will be included with the correlations.

Significant correlations or means will be mentioned with the institution response. Response concerning bases for salary increases, methods of awarding salary increases, and bases for professional promotion will be discussed for each institution.

Institution identification, code data, and definitions may be referred to in previous pages of the report. The coded * identifies significant correlation of .05, and the coded ** identifies significant correlations of .01.

INSTITUTION 11.1

Correlations reveal that among the eighteen faculty members the higher the faculty rank, the higher the salary.

Mean figure indicate the average teaching load involves one hour of major course instruction and four hours of required course instruction.

The average faculty rank among the eighteen faculty members is Assistant Professor. The average degree held is the Master of Arts.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.17
B	-0.491*	-					4.89
C	-0.217	0.199	-				.72
D	-0.170	-0.351	-0.127	-			3.50
E	-0.593*	0.573*	0.040	-0.196	-		44.8
F	-0.932**	0.499*	0.188	0.121	0.555*	-	13,175
G	-0.932**	0.501*	0.188	0.115*	0.553*	0.999**	- 12,354
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

INSTITUTION 11.2

Correlations reveal that among the eleven faculty members the more total hours expended the higher the salary, and lower ranking teachers instruct more of the required physical education courses.

Mean figures indicate the average faculty member teaches only one hour of physical education major courses.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.55
B	-0.316	-					3.73
C	0.286	0.112	-				.36
D	0.776**	-0.316	-0.144	-			4.55
E	-0.278	0.259	0.417	-0.174	-		20.73
F	-0.249	0.154	0.078	0.124	0.842**	-	9,875
G	-0.270	0.167	0.070	0.107	0.840**	0.999**	- 9,249
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

Bases for salary increases are seniority for faculty ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4. All other faculty ranks salary increases are negotiated annually.

Methods of awarding salary increases are automatic increases for service in various amounts by rank and negotiated increases up to 6% in addition to the automatic raise.

Rank	Yearly Amount
1	\$500
2	400
3	350
4	200

Bases for professional promotion is attainment of higher degrees, research, and teaching efficiency.

INSTITUTION 12.1

Correlations reveal among the seven faculty members the salary is related directly to faculty rank.

Mean figures indicate the typical rank is Associate Professor, required courses taught amount to less than one hour, ten hours are taught in the major course classes, and the typical degree is a Doctor of Education. The mean figures indicate a very high faculty rank and high professional degree attainment. This institution was high quality individuals instructing the major physical education courses.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.00
B	-0.123	-					6.86
C	0.525	0.297	-				9.86
D	0.0	0.0	0.0	-			0.00
E	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-		40.0
F	-0.921**	-0.114	-0.755	0.0	0.0	-	13,257
G	-0.921**	-0.114	-0.755	0.0	0.0	-	14,185
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

INSTITUTION 12.2

No correlations of significance.

Mean figures indicate the four faculty members teach no required courses.

Bases for salary increases are merit as interpreted by the department head.

Methods of awarding salary increases are automatic 5% annual increases for all full time faculty members.

Bases for professional promotion is attainment of higher degrees research, teaching efficiency, or publications.

INSTITUTION 13.1

Correlations reveal among the twenty-one faculty members higher faculty rank results in higher salary.

Average degree is a Master of Science.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.52
B	-0.417	-					4.95
C	-0.307	0.644	-				2.95
D	0.115	-0.555**	-0.693**	-			5.10
E	0.650**	-0.608**	-0.635**	0.458*	-		18.5
F	-0.870**	0.438*	0.235	-0.007	-0.527*	-	10,100
G	-0.897**	0.655**	0.472*	-0.289	-0.688**	0.842**	11,498
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

INSTITUTION 13.2

No correlations of significance.

Only two teachers, both Associate Professors, one has a Master of Science degree, the other a Bachelor of Science degree.

Bases for salary increases is a merit rating system for faculty ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4. Other salaries are negotiated.

Salary increases are awarded in set amounts by rank.

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1	\$1,000
2	750
3	500
4	250

Bases for professional promotion is attainment of higher degrees, research, and teaching efficiency.

INSTITUTION 14.1

Correlations reveal among the thirty-seven faculty members rank is related to salary.

No significant mean data

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.65
B	-0.447**	-					5.41
C	-0.532**	0.305	-				4.87
D	0.466**	-0.187	-0.693**	-			5.08
E	-0.426**	0.008	0.470**	0.000	-		13.6
F	-0.951**	0.366*	0.513**	-0.496**	0.430**	-	10,941
G	-0.939**	0.352*	0.498**	-0.460**	0.427**	0.992**	- 11,119
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

Bases for salary increases is a Union controlled % increase.

Increases are awarded at 6.5% for all ranks annually.

Bases for professional promotion is high degree, or teaching efficiency for ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4. All other ranks depend on contributions to the institution for any increase.

INSTITUTION 15.1

Correlations of the fifteen faculty members reveal higher salaries result from higher rank achievement.

No significant mean data, as the institution balances the required course instruction time with major course instruction. The eighteen total class clock hours, if valid, are lower than the normal institution.

							<u>Correlation</u>	<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.80	
B	-0.385	-					5.40	
C	0.661**	-0.025	-				2.80	
D	-0.460	0.443	-0.523	-			3.53	
E	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-		18.0	
F	-0.885**	0.326	-0.674**	0.484	0.0	-	12,151	
G	-0.883**	0.322	-0.671**	0.486	0.0	0.999**	- 13,372	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	

Bases for salary increases for faculty ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4 is merit and an annual scheduled increase.

Salary increases are awarded from \$100 to \$700 per individual.

Professional promotions are awarded for degree attainment and teaching efficiency.

INSTITUTION 16.1

No significant data of correlations or means.

							<u>Correlation</u>	<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.52	
B	-0.443*	-					5.52	
C	0.0	0.0	-				0.00	
D	-0.302	0.337	0.0	-			19.0	
E	-0.458*	0.538*	0.0	0.559**	-		23.1	
F	-0.643**	0.198	0.0	0.007	0.078	-	13,372	
G	-0.648**	0.196	0.0	0.001	0.072	0.999**	- 13,133	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	

Salary increases are based on merit for ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4.
Other ranks based on evaluation and merit.

Salary increases are awarded by legislation.

Professional promotions are based on research, teaching efficiency, and service to institution.

INSTITUTION 17.1

Correlations reveal among the twenty three faculty members higher faculty ranks result in higher salary, the higher faculty rank results in teaching more major courses, the higher the rank the less required courses taught, and the more major courses any teacher instructs, the fewer required courses the instructor must teach.

Mean figures reveal a balanced teaching load carried by all teaching personnel.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.00
B	-0.664**	-					5.44
C	-0.774**	0.666**	-				4.74
D	0.764**	-0.449*	-0.853**	-			4.61
E	0.235	-0.362	0.008	-0.079	-		12.2
F	-0.717**	0.499*	0.428*	-0.582**	-0.269	-	13,403
G	-0.717**	0.499*	0.428*	-0.582**	-0.269	-	- 13,135
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

Bases for salary increases is a merit system controlled by the State College Board for all faculty ranks.

Method of awarding salary increases were not answered in the survey.

Bases for professional promotion is attainment of higher degrees, research for rank 1 and 2, and teaching efficiency for all faculty ranks.

INSTITUTION 21.1

Correlation data reveals among the sixteen faculty members the higher faculty rank teaches most major courses, the more major courses taught the higher the salary, and the more major courses taught the less the total hours per week. The more major courses taught the less time is spent teaching required courses, higher ranking teachers teach fewer required courses, and the more required hours taught the salary will be lower. Finally, the higher in rank the lower the number of total hours per week, higher the rank, the higher salary, and the more total hours per week the lower the salary.

Mean figures reveal no significant data.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.56
B	-0.539*	-					6.19
C	-0.947**	0.611*	-				5.25
D	0.848**	-0.643**	-0.934**	-			12.2
E	0.919**	-0.589*	-0.939**	0.919**	-		18.2
F	-0.809**	0.733**	0.847**	-0.818**	-0.793**	-	10,817
G	-0.821**	0.731**	0.860**	-0.824**	-0.806**	0.999**	- 12,554
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

INSTITUTION 21.2

Correlations reveal among the eight faculty members the higher in rank, the higher the salary, higher ranking teachers instruct more major courses, and teach fewer required courses.

The more major course hours instructed the fewer required courses were taught, and the salary was higher. Finally, the more required courses instructed the more total hours were required weekly.

Means figures demonstrated the average faculty rank is an Assistant Professor

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.13
B	-0.487	-					6.00
C	-0.931**	0.427	-				4.88
D	0.867**	-0.330	-0.854*	-			12.5
E	0.603	0.115	-0.487	0.809*	-		15.9
F	-0.763*	0.666	0.823*	-0.721*	-0.269	-	9,639
G	-0.765*	0.678	0.819*	-0.721*	-0.272	0.999**	11,060
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

Bases for salary increases are merit evaluations for faculty rank 1, 2, 3, and 4. Other ranks were not mentioned.

Methods of awarding salary increases varies in relation to existing funding. No breakdown figures are available.

Bases for professional promotion is degree attainment, research,

teaching efficiency, and professional attitude.

INSTITUTION 22.1

Correlation figures reveal among the twelve faculty members the higher the faculty rank, the higher the salary. Also, the more total hours expended per week the larger the salary.

Mean figure provided no significant data.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.83
B	-0.107	-					5.25
C	-0.196	0.173	-				6.68
D	0.381	-0.498	-0.403	-			3.17
E	-0.503	-0.186	0.447	-0.128	-		39.8
F	-0.786**	-0.290	0.327	-0.052	0.723**	-	11,119
G	-0.790**	-0.282	0.323	-0.057	0.720**	0.999**	12,052
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

INSTITUTION 22.2

Correlation figures reveal among the six faculty members the higher faculty rank instructors receive higher salaries.

Mean figures provided no significant data, as the average faculty rank is Assistant Professor, average degree attained is Master of Arts, and total clock hours amounts to thirty two hours per week.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.00
B	-0.136	-					5.17
C	-0.532	-0.285	-				6.67
D	0.479	-0.521	-0.584	-			2.83
E	-0.595	-0.561	0.554	0.075	-		32.8
F	-0.938*	0.231	0.365	-0.458	0.595	-	9,145
G	-0.935*	0.239	0.349	-0.451	0.588	0.999**	9.923
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

Bases for salary increase are teaching, research, service to department, and publications for rank 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Salary increases are awarded, but no set amount annually.

Bases for professional promotion are degree attainment, research, teaching efficiency and service to institution.

INSTITUTION 23.1

Correlations reveal that among the twenty-five faculty members the higher rank teachers receive higher salaries, and the more major courses instructed the fewer required courses are taught by one individual.

Mean figures provided no significant data, except this institution has the highest mean figure for total hours expended per week. Forty eight hours is more than any other institution answering the questionnaire.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.96
B	-0.173	-					5.00
C	-0.218	0.535**	-				8.24
D	0.316	-0.525**	-0.823**	-			2.88
E	0.075	0.505*	0.343	-0.061	-		48.8
F	-0.751**	0.059	0.173	-0.115	0.038	-	12,594
G	-0.744**	0.057	0.174	-0.115	0.041	0.999**	13,715
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

INSTITUTION 23.2

Correlations reveal that among the 10 faculty members higher rank results in higher salary, and the more required hours taught the fewer major courses would be instructed by one individual.

Mean figures provided no significant data.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.10
B	-0.066	-					4.70
C	0.167	0.464	-				7.30
D	-0.142	-0.479	-0.997**	-			4.80
E	-0.277	-0.417	0.237	-0.236	-		48.0
F	-0.857**	-0.052	-0.315	0.288	0.065	-	10,642
G	-0.850**	-0.040	-0.296	0.267	0.068	0.999**	11,654
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

Bases for salary increases is merit controlled, or equivalent to the annual cost of living increase.

Method of awarding salary increases is annually for ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4. Other faculty no higher than 8% annually.

Bases for professional promotion are degree attainment, research, teaching efficiency and service.

INSTITUTION 24.1

Correlations among the thirty four faculty members reveal higher rank results in: higher degrees, fewer required courses, more total hours, and higher salary. Higher degree individuals receive higher salaries and teach fewer required courses. The more required courses an individual teaches the fewer total hours spent per week, and the lower the salary.

Means figures reveal assistant professor is the average faculty rank.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						4.38
B	-0.894**	-					4.32
C	-0.101	0.128	-				8.84
D	0.958**	-0.907**	-0.060	-			3.35
E	-0.896**	0.741**	0.005	-0.880**	-		32.5
F	-0.976**	0.859**	0.001	-0.966**	0.932**	-	7,279
G	-0.976**	0.859**	0.017	-0.966**	0.931**	0.999**	- 7,977
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

INSTITUTION 24.2

Correlation figures reveal among the twelve faculty members the higher rank individuals receive the higher salary.

Mean data reveals teachers have less than two hours of required course instruction per individual.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.25
B	-0.293	-					4.33
C	-0.322	-0.025	-				8.75
D	0.546	-0.151	-0.550	-			1.83
E	-0.651*	0.042	0.286	-0.614*	-		38.0
F	-0.897**	0.333	0.189	-0.368	0.657*	-	11,375
G	-0.884**	0.344	0.195	-0.360	0.631*	0.998**	12,331
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

Bases for salary increases are seniority for faculty ranks 1 and 2, merit for ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4, and duties versus teaching load for 1, 2, 3, and 4 faculty ranks.

Methods for awarding salary increases were not conclusive.

Bases for professional promotion are degree attainment, research, teaching efficiency, and professionalism of the individual.

INSTITUTION 25.1

Correlations reveal among the twenty two faculty members faculty rank results in higher salary.

No significant mean data.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.14
B	-0.696**	-					4.77
C	0.415	-0.464*	-				3.50
D	-0.484*	0.555**	-0.238	-			5.50
E	-0.290	0.154	-0.213	-0.089	-		28.8
F	-0.827**	0.706**	-0.666**	0.498*	0.372	-	11,294
G	-0.830**	0.700**	-0.671**	0.494*	0.370	0.999**	12,039
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

INSTITUTION 25.2

Correlation among the 16 faculty members reveal rank relates to higher salary, higher the degree the fewer major courses are taught, the more major courses taught the less required courses are assigned, the more major courses taught the less the salary, and the more total hours expended the higher the salary.

No significant mean data.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.18
B	-0.585*	-					4.88
C	0.792**	-0.779**	-				8.50
D	-0.319	0.616*	-0.751**	-			7.44
E	-0.699**	0.357	-0.483	-0.148	-		27.8
F	-0.923**	0.644**	-0.781**	0.269	0.795**	-	10,245
G	-0.930**	0.645**	-0.784**	0.281	0.779**	0.999**	10,882
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

Bases for salary increases are merit for all faculty ranks.

Methods of awarding salary increases are:

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1	5%
2	3%
3	2%
4	2%

Bases for professional promotion are degree attainment and teaching efficiency for faculty ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4.

INSTITUTION 26.1

Correlations reveal among the fourteen faculty members the more total hours spent per week the more salary received by the individual.

Mean figures indicate the average degree is a Master of Education.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.00
B	-0.516	-					6.29
C	-0.407	0.214	-				3.29
D	0.524	-0.074	-0.672**	-			1.71
E	-0.632*	0.410	0.059	-0.096	-		23.9
F	-0.737**	0.543*	0.406	-0.373	0.829**	-	10,600
G	-0.738**	0.545*	0.406	-0.373	0.827**	-	10,643
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

Bases for salary increases for all faculty rank is merit evaluation.

Method of awarding salary increases for faculty ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4 are annual amounts of 9% per rank salary.

Bases for professional promotions are degree attainment and teaching efficiency.

INSTITUTION 27.1

Correlations reveal among the fourteen faculty members the higher faculty rank receives the higher salary, and the higher faculty rank teaches more major courses.

Mean figures indicate required courses are taught less than one hour a week per individual.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.14
B	-0.775**	-					6.79
C	0.806**	-0.659*	-				10.2
D	0.457	-0.508	0.292	-			0.29
E	0.251	-0.290	-0.191	0.075	-		22.2
F	-0.514	0.015	-0.330	-0.176	-0.023	-	18,057
G	-0.513	0.019	-0.330	-0.178	-0.024	0.999**	17,532
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

INSTITUTION 27.2

Correlation reveal among the eight faculty members the more major course hours of instruction the more total hours will be spent per

week.

Mean figures indicate required courses are taught less than one hour per week.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.63
B	-0.672	-					6.75
C	0.631	-0.587	-				12.0
D	0.0	0.0	0.0	-			0.00
E	0.452	-0.510	0.892**	0.0	-		22.3
F	-0.397	-0.048	-0.491	0.0	-0.205	-	14,875
G	-0.403	-0.035	-0.476	0.0	-0.184	0.999**	14,459
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

Bases for salary increases are faculty rank seniority. Other factors are research, publication, teaching efficiency, service, professionalism. Salaries are retained at the same rate three years at a time.

Method of awarding salary increases vary from \$500 to \$1,800, effective when the 3 year salary schedules are validated.

Bases for professional promotion are degree attainment, research, teaching efficiency, publication, institution and public service, and professionalism.

INSTITUTION 28.1

Significant correlations reveal higher faculty rank results in higher salary, higher degrees receive higher rank promotions, and

higher degree holders receive higher pay.

Mean figures of interest among the twelve faculty members show the average degree is Doctor of Education, average rank Associate Professor, and average teaching load in required courses is less than one hour per week.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.08
B	-0.698*	-					7.33
C	0.157	-0.045	-				7.33
D	-0.234	0.269	-0.674*	-			0.67
E	-0.363	0.157	0.518	-0.167	-		13.4
F	-0.949**	0.664*	-0.196	0.170	0.233	-	14,041
G	-0.948**	0.657*	-0.195	0.164	0.232	0.999**	13,677
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions Based on Correlations

Twenty two institutions replied with adequate information for correlations to be run. This resulted in a total of three hundred eight correlations which could provide significant data for positive statements of relationship of salary to rank, etc.

Fifty correlations were of high significance to establish positive proof relations of staff characteristics. Significant correlations are:

<u>Staff Characteristic</u>	<u>Number of Institution</u>	<u>Possible Number of Institution</u>
Higher Faculty Rank to Higher Salary	17	22
More Total Hrs. to Higher Salary	4	22
Higher Faculty Rank to Major Course Teaching	4	22
Higher Faculty Rank to Less Required Teaching	5	22
More Major Courses to Less Required Courses	6	22

Higher faculty rank results in higher salaries. Of interest, degrees did not correlate to higher salary in any significant correlation. Rank regardless of degree is the prime consideration of

salary an individual will receive.

Higher salaries are received by individual who contribute more total hours per week. It is worthy of note that several higher rank teachers recorded heavy total hour figures, but few teaching hours in major or required course instruction.

Higher ranking faculty members tend to teach major field courses as opposed to required courses and tend to teach few required courses. The lower ranking faculty teach the majority of the required courses. Fifteen correlation relate to the major course versus required courses instructed by higher faculty, the better paid faculty member, and the faculty member who teaches almost exclusively major courses. If similar research is conducted, interpretation of correlations could provide a complete report itself. A larger survey return would have provided too much correlation data to be handled in such a limited document.

Conclusions of Means

The coded tables provide a comparison by institution and category of the means figures of faculty rank, degree, teaching credit hours in major and required courses, total hours weekly, nine months salary, and adjusted salary.

In institutions under 10,000 population men are associate professors with a Master of Arts degree, teach 3 credit hours per semester in major course and 5 credit hours in required courses, spend 20 hours weekly other than teaching, receive a nine months salary of \$12,000+, and have a national adjusted income of \$12,800, CAT I MEN.