FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN CONTINUING EDUCATION:

A CASE STUDY

By

Donald E. Hanna

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1978

ABSTRACT

FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN CONTINUING EDUCATION:
A CASE STUDY

By

Donald E. Hanna

Purpose

The purposes of the study were:

1. To develop and analyze information concerning faculty participation in a variety of forms of continuing education
2. To increase knowledge about the types of audiences served by faculty members participating in continuing education
3. To examine the importance of reasons for faculty participation/nonparticipation in continuing education (as represented by the activities of off-campus credit instruction; conferences, institutes and workshops; and consulting services) and research

Methodology

Forty-eight faculty members, twelve from each of four colleges--Business, Education, Engineering, and Social Science--at Michigan State University, were randomly selected and interviewed.

A standardized schedule interview format was employed. The interview was organized around two instruments completed by each faculty member. The purpose of the first instrument was to determine the distribution of the faculty member's time across fourteen professional continuing education and noncontinuing education activities. The second instrument was designed so that faculty members could indicate the importance of selected reasons why they did or did not participate in four specific activities--off-campus credit instruction; conferences, institutes, and workshops; consulting and diagnostic services; and research.

A multiple regression F-test was used to discriminate between significant and nonsignificant variables correlating with the degree of participation in continuing education activities.

Results

Overall, affiliation with the College of Education, Academic Rank, Age, and Tenure Status were variables that most highly correlated at the .10 level with participation in continuing education activities. Older senior faculty were much more likely to be highly involved in continuing education than were younger faculty, as were those reporting more hours per week spent professionally.

Nontraditional students (in on-campus credit classes), defined as those twenty-six years of age and older, probably part-time and commuting to the campus,

as a ma

ming e

a facul

ger au

ss and

ofessi

pecial

ional

sses.

ssms

g edu

ntern

ervic

ere no

ndepe

nvers

ppre

esear

ty pa

ntern

ive o

ecia

clus

ies.

were a major audience of faculty members involved in continuing education activities. Professionals, both within the faculty member's field and outside of it, were also a major audience. Faculty members from the Colleges of Business and Education were heavily involved in serving these professionals. Faculty members from Education directed especially large percentages of their time toward nontraditional students in both on-campus and off-campus credit classes.

Based on the mean scores indicating importance of reasons for participating or not participating in continuing education (off-campus credit instruction, conferences, institutes, and workshops; and consulting and diagnostic services) and research, personal and professional reasons were more important for all activities than were tangible academic and financial rewards. Tangible institutional rewards (such as job security, promotion, and tenure) were important to faculty as reasons for participating in research, but they were not judged to be important reasons for participating in continuing education.

The most important reasons for not participating in continuing education were personal (lack of time, disruptive of schedule) and reflected the fact that for many faculty members, continuing education activities were of a lower priority than were noncontinuing education activities.

Conclusion

Major conclusions were:

1. Faculty members are highly involved in a variety of forms of continuing education.
2. Faculty members participating in continuing education serve a variety of audiences. Those receiving the largest allocation of faculty time are non-traditional students and professionals both within and outside the faculty member's field.
3. Older faculty members are most involved in continuing education, while younger faculty members are more involved in research.
4. Faculty members affiliated with the College of Education are more highly involved in continuing education than are faculty members affiliated with the Colleges of Business, Engineering, or Social Science.
5. Faculty members participate in continuing education more for intangible personal and professional reasons rather than for reasons related to academic or financial rewards or recognition. These latter reasons are rated more important as reasons for participating in research.

To my parents whose belief in the value of
education was constant and whose
sacrifices toward that end were
truly significant.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

More than anyone else connected with this study, I want to thank my mentor, advisor, and friend, Professor Russell J. Kleis. He, along with my committee of Drs. Richard L. Featherstone, Floyd G. Parker, and Lawrence W. Foster, provided sage counsel and guidance throughout my doctoral study.

I also wish to express my appreciation to Dr. George Van Dusen and the Student Affairs staff of the College of Engineering, whose support, humor, and friendship were always present; Dr. James Votruba, who provided encouragement and advice during the dissertation; Ms. Janet Favero, who assisted in the interview phase of the dissertation; and Ms. Linda Ross, who typed early drafts. To all of these persons I am grateful.

And finally to my wife, Karna, and children, Jason and Betsy; their smiles, love, and capacity for happiness have contributed immeasurably to the attainment of this goal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

APPENDICES

APPENDIX

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Introduction

During these past two centuries higher education in the United States has moved from a traditional position of isolation from the larger society and its problems to one of active participation and involvement. This active participation is nowhere better illustrated than in the applied research and lifelong teaching activities of the faculty of today's land-grant universities.

The purpose of this research has been: (1) to provide information regarding participation in a range of professional activities by selected faculty members of four colleges at Michigan State University, giving particular attention to the various forms of continuing education in which they participated and the audiences served and (2) to analyze reasons why faculty did or did not participate in certain selected continuing education activities.

Background

Continuing education within the modern university has only gradually and very recently emerged as a recognized and important activity of its faculty. Originally

universities in the western world were established as places where knowledge, primarily religious in nature, was passed from one generation to another. They were teaching institutions intended for the young. As the scientific revolution developed, the universities, with those in Germany providing leadership, added the generation of new knowledge as a second function of a university faculty. Their teaching focus, however, continued with the young. Borrowing from these early predecessors, the university in America emerged with the dual purposes of conducting scholarly research and disseminating knowledge to a traditionally young and elite population. Only in the past 150 years has this emphasis been enlarged to include significant faculty involvement in forms of teaching other than the traditional classroom, and in modes of research which have immediate implications for society. The acceptance of these activities by the faculty as a part of its legitimate responsibilities has been a slow and often painful process, both for those supporting the expansion of faculty involvement in them and for those philosophically or operationally opposing more extensive activity.

The literature of the past half century dealing with adult, lifelong, and continuing education, particularly that which emanates from those professionally concerned with development of the enterprise within the university, is full of references concerning its "marginality" and

"peripheral" status.[1] The frequency with which these references occur in the literature is significant evidence that continuing education has, even in the recent past, not been included within the central mission of most universities. Inadequate internal visibility, minimal financial support, low prestige and esteem, and reluctant faculty participation are all problems associated with its peripheral status.

Historically, faculty attitudes toward participation in certain more traditionally acknowledged forms of continuing education (conferences, correspondence instruction, off-campus teaching for example) have been lukewarm at best. And faculty members participating in other less traditionally recognized areas of continuing education (for example applied research, professional and popular writing, radio and television shows) frequently have not considered themselves to be involved in continuing education at all. Further, their involvement in these activities as forms of continuing education has rarely been documented and analyzed. As a result, several recent studies of faculty attitudes toward

---

[1]See Kenneth Benne, "Adult Education in the University," Journal of Higher Education 27 (November 1956): 413-18; Burton Clark, The Marginality of Adult Education: A Study of Institutional Insecurity (Berkley: University of California Press, 1956); Glenn Burch, Challenge to the University (Boston: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1961), pp. 12-19; Morton Gordon, "The Organization of Continuing Education in Universities and Colleges," NUEA Spectator 37 (September 1974): 20-27.

continuing education[1] have emphasized the importance of involving faculty more extensively in continuing education without first determining the extent to which faculty may already be involved.

Because of the fact that continuing education has been perceived to be a marginal activity of minimal consequence to the university, faculty at major universities have seldom been rewarded, either formally or informally, for their participation in lifelong and continuing education. Formally, participation in many activities has received little attention or consideration in the promotion and tenure decisions of academic departments. Informally, faculty prestige and esteem have not been generated through continuing education activities as they have through scholarly research. This minimal support for continuing education has certainly not encouraged faculty participation. Yet many faculty members participate in spite of the relative marginality of many of these activities in both the formal

---

[1]See Lee Porter, "Faculty Attitudes towards Selected Aspects of a Multi-dimensional University Continuing Education College" (Ph.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1969); Raymond M. Genick, "Faculty Concepts of Off-Campus Continuing Education Programs Offered through the Division of Urban Extension, Wayne State University" (Ph.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1972); Francis John Kane, "Perceptions of Department Chairmen from Selected Public Universities in the Southwestern United States as Related to the Degree of Participation of Their Departments in Continuing Education Programs" (Ed.D. dissertation, New Mexico State University, 1973).

departmental reward structure and the informal values of a research-oriented faculty.

Several recent university studies of major importance--University of Michigan,[1] University of California,[2] Michigan State University[3]--have emphasized the importance of documenting and increasing faculty participation in continuing and lifelong education, and of providing appropriate university rewards and recognition for faculty activity in this area. The Task Force on Lifelong Education at Michigan State University, in particular, suggested:

> (1) The University should expand its criteria for faculty hiring, embodying in that expansion components that will ensure the employment of a greater percentage of faculty familiar with, concerned about, and capable of lifelong educational activities.
> (2) Criteria for salary increases, promotions in academic rank, and the awarding of tenure should reflect the lifelong education efforts of faculty members proportionate to other accepted criteria.
> (3) The University should especially encourage the academic units to provide for travel opportunities and allowances, study sabbaticals, released time for program development, and other mechanisms to encourage faculty members to increase their expertise and involvement in lifelong educational activities.[4]

---

[1] Report of the Planning Committee on Extension and Adult Education, University of Michigan, 1970.

[2] Report of the President's Task Force on the Extended University, University of California, 1971.

[3] The Lifelong University: Report of the Task Force on Lifelong Education, Michigan State University, 1973.

[4] Ibid., p. 51.

Additional support and calls for greater university involvement have come from several recent national studies and reports. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, the Commission on Nontraditional Study, and the American Council on Education have been particularly interested in supporting the expansion of university involvement in continuing education, and have offered a number of specific suggestions related to increasing faculty participation.

This changing emphasis on and increased support for continuing education on the part of universities has been predicted by many thoughtful observers of higher education. Recent demographic shifts in the population signaling fewer traditional college-age people, an increasing rate and scope of technological change, and new roles and aspirations of women are just a few of the factors creating pressures for the university to become more involved in continuing education. These factors will significantly impact the scope and direction of future continuing education efforts within the university. Yet the success of these endeavors at any university is ultimately dependent upon the willingness of faculty to accept responsibility for and engage in activities which involve them in the affairs of the greater society.

Need for the Study

A number of investigators have analyzed faculty participation in and faculty attitudes toward continuing education.[1]

Each of these investigators employed a traditional conceptualization of continuing education. In general, faculty participation in continuing education was interpreted to mean participation in programs or courses formally sponsored by the continuing education or extension division of the university. While this approach has been understandable from an operational point of view, it has unnecessarily excluded many other activities that logically should be included within a definition of continuing education. This research has included those activities

---

[1]See Simpson O. Wilde, "A Study of the Evaluation of Extension Courses for Credit at Six State-Supported Institutions of Higher Education in North Carolina" (Ed.D. dissertation, North Carolina State University, 1965); Tunis H. Dekker, "Faculty Commitment to Adult Education" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1965); Porter, "Faculty Attitudes toward Selected Aspects of a Multidimensional University"; Larry Avon Hale, "Perceptions of University Academic Department Chairman as Related to the Degree of Participation of University Departments in Continuing Education" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1969); Genick, "Faculty Concepts of Off-Campus Continuing Education Programs Offered through the Division of Urban Extension, Wayne State University"; Kane, "Perceptions of Department Chairman from Selected Public Universities in Southwestern United States as Related to the Degree of Participation of Their Department in Continuing Education Programs."

within its definition of lifelong and continuing education, and has developed information concerning the degree of faculty participation in a broad spectrum of such activities.

This study has also been concerned with identifying the audiences served by faculty participation in these forms of continuing education. With the exception of reports of formal continuing education programs sponsored by Divisions of Continuing Education and Cooperative Extension, little information is available which identifies or describes the audiences served by such programs. One way of collecting this information would have been to survey the audience for every activity in which a faculty member participated. Another clearly more feasible alternative was to survey faculty members concerning the general characteristics of the audience(s) they served while participating in their respective continuing education activities. This research has followed the second approach and provided information about the audiences whom faculty members believed they were serving or directing their efforts toward while participating in specified activities.

Finally, while very little research exists on why faculty do or do not participate in continuing education, almost everyone concerned with university continuing education has an opinion. This research provides a systematic

view of how selected faculty from a single university report their own reasons for participation or nonparticipation. This information would appear to be of critical importance to those professionally concerned with understanding faculty participation in continuing education and how to develop and encourage it within the university.

This study, then, was designed to provide needed information on who participated in continuing education, the forms of continuing education in which they participated, the audiences served by this participation, and the reasons faculty members gave as to why they did or did not participate in a broad range of these activities.

A Problem of Definition

The definition of continuing education within a university has not been universally agreed upon by those professionally involved in it or responsible for it. It is often defined operationally to include all activities deliberately organized and specifically planned, usually by the agency or agencies responsible for continuing education, for adults who have completed at least the bachelor's degree. Yet this definition of continuing education often excludes activities solely on the basis of their sponsorship rather than their overall characteristics. What is clearly needed is a more comprehensive

and consistent definition as a basis for studying faculty participation in the full range of continuing education activities.

One alternative approach to defining continuing education is to use multiple parameters. Kleis defined continuing education in terms of six primary parameters--purposes, sponsors, learners, mentors, methods, and content, all within a cultural and temporal context.[1] For the purpose of this research, the following definition, distilled from the set proposed by Kleis, is employed:

Continuing education for a higher education institution is any planned and deliberate effort by its faculty and others affiliated with it to facilitate learning in relation to the problems and opportunities confronted within the lifespan of individuals who have assumed the roles of maturity. It is concerned with these problems and opportunities as they reside in the individual (as a person becoming), the institution (as a combination of individuals in formal covenant), or the community (as a complex system of individuals and institutions in less formal covenant.

As used in this study, the term "continuing education" applies to all such efforts of faculty at the university or college except those directed to the

---

[1]Russell J. Kleis, "Continuing Education Defined" (unpublished handout for Education 822B, Michigan State University, 1974).

traditional undergraduate and graduate student body, defined as predominantly full-time students resident on the campus or commuting to it, and below the age of twenty-six years. As such it is operationally composed of at least the following activities: off-campus credit instruction; conferences, institutes, and workshops; noncredit courses; noncredit seminars; consulting and diagnostic services; presenting general papers or talks; showings and recitals; presenting radio and television programs; and general reading and attending seminars as a learner. Additionally, faculty members serving older nontraditional students in on-campus credit situations were considered to be involved in a form of continuing education, albeit with potentially different considerations and motivations.

Sample Composition

The sample for this study consisted of a total of forty-eight faculty members evenly distributed among the Colleges of Business, Education, Engineering, and Social Science at Michigan State University.

Michigan State University was selected as the research base for this study partly because of its history of involvement in and commitment to continuing education. Also, as a major research-oriented land-grant institution, it shares many structural characteristics and philosophical foundations with other large public universities.

The four colleges comprising the population for this study represented professionally oriented colleges with identifiable clienteles external to the university. As such, each is involved in continuing education for the professions and is concerned with the application of specialized knowledge to problems of public concern and professional practice. All four colleges were chosen with attention to these similarities, all were expected to show faculty involvement in continuing education, and yet each was unique in the nature and extent of faculty involvement in continuing education.

Research Questions

This study represented an exploratory effort to analyze the range of faculty participation in continuing education activities, the audiences served by their participation in these activities, and the reasons why they did or did not participate in a broad selection of continuing education activities. The objectives of the study were met by focusing on a set of general questions related to faculty participation in continuing education followed by more specific predetermined research questions.

The general questions included:

1. What forms of continuing education have faculty participated in?
2. Who is it among the faculty that participated in continuing education? What special characteristics

o

p

1. W

i

e

4. W

ployed

mpreh

gnific

measu

impac

brief

a by

ition

1.

2.

of faculty, if any, separated those who participated highly from those minimally involved?

3. Who is it that has been served by a university's involvement, through its faculty, in continuing education?

4. What were the reasons faculty members gave for participating in different forms of continuing education? Why did they not participate in other forms?

Using the expanded definition of continuing education employed in this study, these questions were approached more comprehensively than in previous studies. These general questions were addressed by focusing on specific predetermined research questions, arranged according to (1) faculty participation in continuing education and (2) the reasons faculty members gave for participating or not participating in a broad range of forms of continuing education.

The research questions related to faculty participation in continuing education were:

1. For all forty-eight faculty members, what was the total mean percentage of time reported as allocated to each activity?

2. For all forty-eight faculty members, what was the total mean percentage of time reported as allocated to each audience?

3. For all forty-eight faculty members, classifying each activity as either continuing education or non-continuing education, what was the total mean percentage of time reported as allocated to continuing education activities?

4. Which of the variables of college affiliation, tenure, length of service to the university, academic rank, number of professional society memberships and reported workload expressed in hours per week, were significantly correlated with the percentage of time allocated to continuing education activities and audiences?

The research questions related to the reasons why faculty did or did not participate in continuing education included:

1. For all forty-eight faculty, did the reported importance of reasons for participating and for not participating in four selected activities of interest--off-campus credit instruction, conferences, institutes and workshops, consulting and diagnostic services, and research--differ?

2. For each of the four selected activities, what were reported as the most important reasons for participating and the most important reasons for not participating?

Significance of the Study

This study would seem to have been important for three reasons. First, the study included within its definition of continuing education many forms of faculty involvement not included by previous researchers. As a result, some important documentation and analysis of faculty activity in these forms of continuing education were achieved. Second, the study yielded some interesting and useful information with respect to faculty involvement in significant forms and vehicles of continuing education, including faculty beliefs about the audiences served in these activities. Third, it provided further understanding of why faculty do or do not participate in specific continuing education activities.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

This investigation has been limited to a case study of faculty members who have been in residence at Michigan State University during at least the past two years. The study is further limited in that only faculty members from certain preselected colleges were included within the population. Because of the bias resulting from these two facts, the results of this study cannot be generalized in a statistical sense to other colleges within Michigan State University, nor to other universities.

While the sample was composed only of Michigan State University faculty members, and the results therefore

cannot be directly generalized to any other university setting, the findings should be of general interest to individuals within a broad range of institutional settings because of the common problem all those concerned with university continuing education face; namely that of how best to encourage and facilitate faculty participation in continuing education.

Definitions

Faculty--The academic staff appointed and accepted by academic departments at Michigan State University. For the purpose of this study, only full-time faculty members with the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor were included.

Program--An organized set of activities designed to achieve specified goals or objectives.

Participation--To take leadership or actively engage in: in this case as an instructor, resource person, expert, consultant, planner, author, evaluator, or as a learner in continuing professional education.

Continuing Education--Continuing education for a higher education institution is any planned and deliberate effort by its faculty and others affiliated with it to facilitate learning in relation to the problems and opportunities confronted within the lifespan of individuals who have assumed the roles of maturity.

As

ias to

ige exc

tate ar

time s

and be

Cpe

ible at

ity defi

1. In

cr

2. Of

3. No

4. Co

5. No

6. C

7. P

8. S

9. P

10. (

Students

ar year

As used in this study the term "continuing education" applies to all such efforts of faculty at the university or college except those directed to the traditional undergraduate and graduate student body, defined as predominantly full-time students resident on the campus or commuting to it, and below the age of twenty-six years.

Operationally, this definition was interpreted to include at least the following activities, which are more fully defined in Chapter III, within its scope:

1. Instruction of nontraditional students in on-campus credit classes
2. Off-campus credit instruction
3. Noncredit courses
4. Conferences, Institutes, and Workshops
5. Noncredit seminars within the institution
6. Consulting, diagnostic services
7. Presenting papers or talks of general interest
8. Showings, recitals
9. Presenting television and radio programs
10. Continuing education efforts as a learner

Nontraditional Students--Predominantly part-time students returning to the campus who are at least twenty-six years old.

Summary and Overview of the Study

This chapter has been devoted to an introduction to the general topic of the study, faculty participation in continuing education. The development of continuing education in the university was briefly reviewed and its current importance as an activity of the faculty and concern of the university was discussed. The framework for the study was presented and the major questions to be answered were previewed and summarized.

A review of literature related to this study is presented in the following chapter. Chapter III includes a description of the population, data collection procedures and design of the study. A discussion and analysis of the resultant data are presented in Chapter IV. Finally, the summary of findings and conclusions of the study, as well as recommendations for further research, are discussed in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN CONTINUING EDUCATION: A BACKGROUND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The primary objectives of this exploratory study were to: (1) provide information regarding participation in a range of professional activities by faculty members in four colleges of Michigan State University, giving particular attention to the various forms of continuing education in which faculty members participated and the audiences served by their participation and (2) analyze reasons reported by faculty members as to why they did or did not participate in certain selected continuing education activities. This discussion is intended to provide prerequisite background for this research by focusing on literature related to:

1. Faculty involvement in continuing education
2. Faculty attitudes toward lifelong and continuing education
3. Factors related to faculty participation

Faculty Involvement in Continuing Education

Formal university involvement in continuing education did not become widespread in the United States until

the latter part of the 19th century. During this period the pressure for university involvement (from external sources primarily) usually culminated in the creation of university extension units modeled after the more established British pattern. However, individual faculty members at a few major universities had earlier begun to engage in instruction away from the campus on topics of popular interest even though few incentives existed, either formally or informally, to encourage such activity. Faculty at Yale, Rutgers, Columbia, Michigan State, and Kansas State were among the earliest to become involved in these activities. The most extensively used vehicle for involving the faculty was the university speaker's bureau. The focus was decidedly nonvocational with literature, history, philosophy, and "natural philosophy" among the more popular topics.[1]

From the beginning, opposition developed among the faculty within the university to extensive involvement in societal affairs. As a result, problems in motivating faculty to participate in many continuing education activities quickly developed.

A leading proponent of university extension at the turn of the century, Herbert Baxter Adams, identified five obstacles to successfully engaging the university in greater service to elements of society previously unserved:

---

[1]C. Hartley Grattan, In Quest of Knowledge (New York: Associated Press, 1955), pp. 185-88.

> 1) the exceedingly limited number of lecturers able to deal successfully with adults; 2) lack of money; 3) lack of time and energy on the part of university people who had to put campus duties first; 4) administration subordination of extension to campus activities; and 5) the competition of cheaper educational opportunities.[1]

Interestingly, Knox, writing over seventy-five years later, cites several of these same problems related to faculty involvement in continuing education.[2]

The development of continuing education activity within the university has been spasmodic and subject to periods of very slow growth since those early beginnings. The land-grant movement enlarged the American university system to include applied subjects such as agriculture and engineering, and opened the doors to children of workers, farmers and others previously excluded. As a result of major federal legislation--Hatch Act (1887), Smith-Lever Act (1914), Veteran's Readjustment Act or "GI" Bill (1944), Higher Education Act (1965), for example--the university through its faculty increasingly directed its attention to meeting the needs of a diverse set of publics, many previously unserved by the university and, in that sense, nontraditional.

---

[1]As quoted in Grattan, In Quest of Knowledge, p. 191.

[2]Alan Knox, "New Realities, The Administration of Continuing Higher Education," The NUEA Spectator, December 1975, pp. 6-9.

Despite this progress, continuing education remained, according to many, a "marginal" activity at the periphery of the institution. Those concerned with its development and acceptance as a legitimate activity of the faculty, while gaining significant support outside of the university, faced an uphill struggle within it. A. A. Liverwright, writing in the Handbook of Adult Education, analyzed problems and alternative directions for the future of higher continuing education. He concluded that the first and most pervasive problem is that adult and continuing education is still considered a peripheral and possibly expendable activity by the faculty and administration of the university.[1] This conclusion has been supported by writings of Benne,[2] Burch,[3] and Gordon,[4] among others.

Kane identified internal inertia as a major problem in the development of continuing education, and supported a program of continuing education for university faculty

---

[1]A. A. Liverwright, "Adult Education in Colleges and Universities," in Handbook of Adult Education in the United States, ed. Malcolm Knowles (Chicago: Adult Education Association of the United States, 1960), p. 214.

[2]Benne, "Adult Education in the University," pp. 413-20.

[3]Burch, Challenge to the University, pp. 26-29.

[4]Gordon, "The Organization of Continuing Education in Colleges and Universities," pp. 20-27.

as a first priority.[1] Kane also suggested that the "role conception in universities--largely an accumulation of faculty attitudes--remains as it has been for a hundred years."[2] Perhaps the best that could be said is that continuing education activities suffered through a period of, in Daniel P. Moynihan's phrase, benign neglect from the faculty of most universities.

Other more optimistic outlooks on the state of continuing education in the university have been advanced in recent years. Knox concluded that "after a century as a marginal concern of higher education institutions, the continuing education function has become widespread and visible. . . ."[3]

Pennfield argued that in studying adult and continuing education programs apart from their sponsoring institutions, one "risks perpetuating either a marginality complex derived from the covert acceptance of the sponsoring institution as the ideal standard, or a myth of uniqueness shored up by a ubiquitous faith in service. . . ."[4]

---

[1]Kane, "Perceptions of Department Chairman," p. 18.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Knox, "New Realities," p. 9.

[4]Kathleen R. Pennfield, "Public Service vs. Academic Values: University Extension in Conflict," Adult Education 25 (Winter 1975): 128.

Stern believed that universities are in many subtle and as yet unrecognized ways much more involved in continuing education activities than one look at the activities of the continuing education division would suggest:

> The rapidly changing nature of the disciplines has impelled a heavy emphasis by alert academics upon their own continuing education, even when they don't know they are so engaged. . . . When large numbers of professors go on leave to government or industrial assignments for six or eight years, are they not engaged in extension functions at important levels? . . . In this new way of life, then, continuing education at important levels frequently is undertaken by senior faculty, although they may not choose to think of their work in that sense. . . . Technology, with its extravagant cost factors, has created many additional research and educational service centers outside and independent of universities as well as many in universities. . . . They are not only research-oriented: much specialized continuing education goes on under their auspices. . . . The human service professions--medicine, social work, law, public health--have become complex in their requirements. Their needs for paraprofessional support have grown to the point that traditional course patterns and conference work cannot satisfy their training needs. . . . New versions of student-hood are being advanced and accepted, new bridges between faculty and student generations are being accepted in existing college and department patterns.[1]

Those factors identified by Stern have served to increase the involvement of faculty in continuing education activities, both for themselves and for their clients, within and outside of the university. Their expanding involvement in the total range of continuing education activities has been gradual and almost unnoticed by the

---

[1]Milton R. Stern, "Trends and Tangents," Journal of Higher Education 40 (February 1969): 157-59.

university as a whole. As a result, the university, through its faculty, is much more active in providing continuing education opportunities through a variety of mechanisms than has been popularly accepted. However, the total range of this involvement has been, to a large extent, unstudied and undocumented.

Surprisingly few studies have been concerned with identifying characteristics of faculty involved in continuing education and their attitudes and beliefs about it. Even fewer have asked faculty about their own participation in specific activities and the outcomes derived from it. As a result there is, unfortunately, a severely limited mass of empirical or descriptive research to serve as a foundation for this study.

Wilde studied the characteristics of faculty members involved in extension credit courses at six colleges in North Carolina and found that faculty members involved in these courses tended to be younger, with less education and lower faculty rank.[1]

Different conclusions were drawn by Dekker in a study of faculty involvement in conferences at Michigan State University, Purdue University, and Georgia Tech.[2]

---

[1]Simpson O. Wilde, "A Study of the Evaluation of Extension Courses."

[2]Tunis H. Dekker, "Faculty Commitment to Adult Education."

these

like

doct

esso

ad:

he
prof
prob
than
acti
prof
affo
grat

teac

the

am a

ente

ck,"2

dati

At these institutions highly involved faculty members were more likely than the faculty population as a whole to hold the doctorate, be tenured and hold the rank of associate professor or professor. As a supportive argument, Dekker stated:

> One can assume that faculty below the rank of full professor are necessarily more concerned with the problems of professional recognition and advancement than their senior colleagues. If adult educational activities do no contribute to the attainment of professional goals, lower ranking faculty can ill afford sufficient involvement to maintain an integrated orientation.[1]

Votruba, Kozoll, and Anderson, writing about faculty who teach extramurally at the University of Illinois, stated that the "typical faculty member engaged in this activity is an associate or full professor from a practitioner-oriented field such as agriculture, education or social work."[2] Others analyzing faculty involvement in continuing education were Genick[3] and Connolly.[4] The lack of agreement

---

[1]Ibid., p. 89.

[2]James Votruba, Charles Kozoll, T. Anderson, "A Profile of Extramural Faculty at the University of Illinois," Internal Report of the Office of Continuing Education and Public Service (University of Illinois, 1976), p. 1.

[3]Genick, "Faculty Concepts of Off-Campus Continuing Education."

[4]John J. Connolly, "A Study of Faculty Involvement in Community Service Programs" (Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1972).

shown in these studies concerning the characteristics of faculty who participated in various forms of continuing education can most probably be attributed to the different activities being investigated in each of these studies, the differing characteristics of the universities and colleges from which the samples were drawn, and the differing time frames in which the studies were undertaken, or a combination of all these or other factors. This study has offered still another view of faculty participation by focusing on the characteristics of faculty who are involved in the spectrum of continuing education activities as a part of their professional responsibilities within four selected colleges at Michigan State University.

Faculty Attitudes toward Continuing Education

Porter studied faculty attitudes toward five aspects (administration, students, purposes, programs, and instruction) of continuing education at Syracuse University. Overall, faculty attitudes were "favorable, but not so favorable as to indicate total endorsement."[1] In spite of this generally positive conception of University College, the continuing education college at Syracuse, Porter reported that many faculty members considered off-campus teaching to be less important than on-campus teaching. Overall, male

[1]Porter, "Faculty Attitudes," p. 91.

faculty were less favorable than females, and those involved in planning and research related to continuing education were more favorable than those not so involved. Those involved in noncredit aspects of continuing education expressed more favorable attitudes toward it than those involved in credit programs. And finally, instructors were more favorable than professors toward most aspects of continuing education. Porter concluded as a result of his study that higher adult education may have reached a point of wider acceptance from the faculty and a greater appreciation and acceptance of its importance.

Dekker studied faculty orientation to university conferences by examining the self-reported importance of reasons for their participation.[1] The objective was to test the hypothesis developed by Benne that faculty members in the professional schools (periphery of the university) would have an orientation which more closely integrated continuing education with the more traditional activities of research and on-campus teaching than would faculty in liberal arts (core of the university).[2] Although the hypothesis would seem to make some sense, no evidence was found to substantiate it. Dekker tested his hypothesis by developing

---

[1]Dekker, "Faculty Commitment."

[2]Benne, "Adult Education in the University," pp. 413-18.

a list of forty-six reasons why a faculty member might participate in continuing education. Faculty members were asked to rate how frequently each of these reasons was important to him/her in deciding to participate in continuing education (conferences). Half of the reasons indicated an integrated orientation to continuing education; the other half indicated a segmented orientation. Because Dekker's objective was to test the overall orientation of the faculty to continuing education rather than investigate the importance of individual reasons why faculty participated in it, raw scores indicating the frequency of importance of individual reasons for participation were not reported or available.

Dahle reported that faculty from the professional schools exhibited a very favorable attitude toward continuing education, but that faculty from the "hard sciences" had less favorable attitudes.[1] Faculty of lower academic rank were more favorably oriented to continuing education than were professors, a finding in agreement with that of Wilde and Porter, but directly countering that of Dekker that professors were more favorably oriented.

---

[1]Thomas L. Dahle, "Faculty Attitudes toward the Division of Continuing Education at the University of Oregon" (paper presented at the Adult Education Research Conference, Chicago, Illinois, 1969).

Hale studied the perceptions of department chairmen toward continuing education.[1] Chairmen of those departments whose faculties were independently rated as high participators in general held more favorable attitudes toward continuing education than chairmen of low-participating departments. In a similar study by Kane, results closely paralleled the findings of Hale.

Genick studied faculty attitudes toward continuing education at Wayne State University.[2] He concluded, as did Porter and Kane, that more favorable attitudes towards continuing education could best be achieved by active attempts to increase faculty awareness of the philosophy, objectives and programs of continuing education.

All of the studies reviewed are important contributions to our understanding of how faculty view continuing education. However, the purpose of most of these studies was to examine the "image" faculty have of continuing education as a concept functionally operationalized at their university, not to examine their attitudes toward their own participation in the activities of interest. Only Dekker's study was concerned with why faculty participate in continuing education. It is this concern that the present

---

[1]Hale, "Perceptions of Department Chairmen."

[2]Genick, "Faculty Concepts of Off-Campus Continuing Education."

study has addressed by focusing on the range of faculty activity in continuing education and the stated reasons of faculty members for engaging or not engaging in selected activities.

Factors Related to Faculty Participation in Continuing Education

Those interested in the development of continuing education in the university have speculated upon and discussed various reasons why faculty do or do not participate in it. There is no lack of interest in the topic. Yet no one has attempted to determine systematically, by asking faculty or by any other method of inquiry, what these reasons might be. The fact that the university, any university, cannot conduct a fully authentic program of continuing education without the involvement and support of its faculty reveals the importance of this information.

As a basis for examining this question, literature was reviewed and a pretest was conducted in order to determine potential reasons why faculty might or might not engage in continuing education activities. The pretest is discussed in Chapter III; the review of the literature is included in this section. The potential reasons are arbitrarily grouped for discussion purposes.

Tangible Academic or Financial Rewards

The belief that institutional rewards are an important reason for participating in some activities and not in

others is omnipresent in the literature on faculty participation. These rewards are usually and most powerfully operationalized for faculty through the salary, promotion, and tenure system of the university. They represent tangible incentives a university provides its faculty.

Ferguson found that job satisfaction accompanies high productivity only if past productivity has been rewarded.[1] This finding suggested to Dekker that institutional arrangements that provide recognition and reward (especially promotion and pay) are important factors affecting faculty orientation to continuing education.[2]

Gaff, in discussing the role of reward in motivating faculty to improve, observed that "when external motivation is used . . ., the carrot--not the stick--is the most common form of incentive."[3] Hodgkinson argues that one function of the reward system, as constituted in higher education,

---

[1]John B. Ferguson, "Job Satisfaction and Job Performance within a University Faculty" (Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1960).

[2]Dekker, "Faculty Commitment," p. 19.

[3]J. G. Gaff, Toward Faculty Renewal (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975), p. 7.

is to "decrease the level of threat . . . so that people will move into new tasks with a greater feeling of security and well-being."[1]

According to research by Ladd and Lipsett,[2] even though most faculty (75%) are more committed to teaching than to research, they corporately value research more than teaching when dispersing salary and promotion rewards. Since most continuing education activities involve some form of teaching, and yet are not given equal consideration even with on-campus teaching in the reward system, it is not surprising to find the reward system, as presently constituted, a disincentive for faculty participation in continuing education.

Votruba identified increased consideration (within the formal reward structure) of faculty activity in continuing education and outreach as a major vehicle for encouraging faculty participation and outlined a strategy by which this might be accomplished.[3] Medsker cited the

---

[1]Harold G. Hodgkinson, "Assessment and Reward Systems," in New Teaching-New Learning-Current Issues in Higher Education, ed. G. Kerry Smith (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971), pp. 48-49.

[2]Everett C. Ladd, Jr., and Seymour M. Lipset, The Divided Academy (New York: McGraw Hill, 1975), p. 349.

[3]James C. Votruba, "Faculty Reward for University Outreach: An Integrative Approach" (paper presented at the NUEA meeting, Tucson, Arizona, March 1977).

failure of departments to take into account participation in off-campus programs when they make decisions regarding tenure and promotion and emphasized the importance of special incentive and reward mechanisms to ensure participation.[1] A paradox exists, however, because faculty surveyed by Medsker indicated that the three most frequently mentioned very important influences on the decision to participate in an extended degree program were related to the unique nature of the program in which they participated rather than rewards per se.[2] Patton focused on incentives and obstacles to individual faculty and department participation in the University of California extended degree program and concluded that extended degree programs must emphasize financial perquisites and/or enhanced promotional opportunities to attract faculty.[3]

In a study of policies affecting faculty participation in continuing education and public service at the University of Illinois, Byrum found as Medsker had that tangible rewards such as salary, promotion and tenure were

---

[1]Leland Medsker et al., Extending Opportunities for a College Degree: Practices, Problems and Potentials (Berkeley: University of California, 1975), p. 175.

[2]Ibid.

[3]C. V. Patton, "Extended Education in an Elite Institution: Are There Enough Incentives to Encourage Faculty Participation?" Journal of Higher Education (July 1975): 427-44.

not perceived by faculty members to be effective in encouraging increased faculty participation.[1]

Knox[2] and Strother[3] appear among those who emphasize the importance of adequate rewards and incentives in the effort to attract the most able faculty members in continuing education.

Recognition

Young suggested that recognition may be as important in motivating faculty participation in instructional development as any material reward. "In addition to, (or even in place of) more tangible rewards (such as salary increases and academic promotion), formal praise and recognition (such as rewards or citations from colleagues . . .) may be an effective means of motivating faculty."[4]

---

[1]Linda Byrum, "Analysis of University of Illinois Policies which Affect Faculty Participation in Continuing Education and Public Service" (unpublished paper, University of Illinois, 1977).

[2]Knox, "New Realities," p. 7.

[3]George B. Strother, "The University's Role in Public Service and Extension," in Proceedings of National Conference on Public Service and Extension in Institutions of Higher Education (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia, 1974), pp. 11-18.

[4]Robert E. Young, "The Effect of Five Factors on University Faculty Member's Participation in Instructional Improvement" (Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1976), p. 35.

Gordon emphasized the importance of "the way of thinking that permeates a university" and the impact of this climate on faculty participation in continuing education.[1]

In a general study of faculty motivation, Tarvin found that nonmaterial rewards, or motivators such as recognition, were rated more important than material rewards for most behavior studied. However, Tarvin noted that failure to reward faculty performance in material form such as salary and/or promotion may negatively affect subsequent motivation.[2]

University, College, and Department Support

Lack of university and departmental support is often cited as a reason why faculty do not participate in certain activities. This is particularly true in continuing education. Conversely, increased support is often suggested as a way to increase faculty participation. Burris indicated the importance of department and college support for faculty engaged in continuing education activities but pointed out that no simple mechanism for increasing this

---

[1]Morton Gordon, "The Organization of Continuing Education in Colleges and Universities," p. 21.

[2]Lee Tarvin, "Faculty Motivation" (Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1972).

support exists. This same report suggested that increased recognition of the faculty effort and role in developing programs for nontraditional students is a requirement for success of new programs.[1]

Several of the faculty members interviewed by Medsker indicated that, although their involvement would have no impact on their promotion, they were motivated to participate because of the encouragement of the department chairman or dean.[2]

Ratchford stressed the importance of a strong institutional commitment to public service, derived from policy statements of the university but most importantly from the location and authority of the leadership within it and the adequacy of funding.[3]

Scheduling and Time

Lack of time of regular faculty and the difficulty of scheduling additional activities have long been cited as barriers to faculty participation in continuing education,

---

[1]Russell W. Burris, University Resource Support for Non-Traditional Study (Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa, 1973), p. 19.

[2]Medsker, Extending Opportunities for the College Degree, p. 179.

[3]C. Brice Ratchford, "Organizing to Accomplish the Public Service Objectives," in Proceedings of the National Conference on Public Service (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia, 1974), p. 80.

particularly in more formal programs. Writing in 1885, Herbert Baxter Adams identified the lack of time and energy on the part of the faculty, who must place a higher priority on on-campus duties, as one of five important obstacles to successfully engaging the university in greater service to society.[1]

Medsker interviewed faculty concerning their participation in off-campus degree programs and found "some faculty reluctance to offer instruction off-campus and/or at 'irregular' hours."[2] He also reported an over-extension of effort on the part of on-campus faculty involved in extended programs resulting in an inability of the faculty member to meet both extended degree and regular program responsibilities. "Even faculty in extended-campus programs participating as part of their regular instructional responsibilities . . . can find their workday lengthened by teaching off-campus and/or in the evenings or on weekends."[3]

McElhaney discovered a strong preference among faculty at Ohio State University for reduced workloads that would allow time for personal creativity and professional

---

[1]As quoted by Grattan, In Quest of Knowledge, p. 191.

[2]Medsker, Extending Opportunities for a College Degree, p. 175.

[3]Ibid., p. 176.

improvement.[1] Activities that are viewed as nonessential or "adjunct" are unlikely to be embraced unless they foster this sense of creativeness.

Votruba found that the time required to travel to and from class was a major detrimental factor on a faculty member's interest in teaching off-campus.[2]

Other Factors Associated with Participation in Continuing Education

Perhaps because of the low visibility of many continuing education activities, a lack of information and opportunity to participate is perceived by some faculty. The problem of better informing faculty regarding opportunity, mission and philosophy of continuing education was cited by Porter, Genick, and Kane.[3]

DeCrow identified a need for orientation and training to enable faculty to function more effectively with adult groups.[4]

---

[1]James H. McElhaney, "Attitudes of Selected Professors at the Ohio State University Regarding Their Workloads" (Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1959).

[2]Votruba, Kozoll, and Anderson, "A Profile of Extramural Faculty," p. 1.

[3]See Porter, "Faculty Attitudes"; Genick, "Faculty Concepts of Off-Campus Programs"; Kane, "Perceptions of Department Chairmen."

[4]Roger DeCrow, Administrative Practices in University Evening Colleges (CSLEA Reports; Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1962), pp. 36-45.

According to Medsker, the desire to "do something" for previously unserved students is a major reason faculty offer for participation in extended degree programs. Also mentioned by faculty members in Medsker's study as important motivating factors were previous positive experiences in continuing education programs, opportunity to innovate and experiment, and opportunity to interact with professionals in their field.[1]

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to provide prerequisite background to this study by focusing on and reviewing three areas: (1) the historical development of continuing education within the university; (2) studies of faculty involvement in and attitudes toward continuing education; and (3) suggested reasons for faculty participation or non-participation in continuing education. The central questions of this study are vitally related to these themes.

Part one emphasized the increased importance being placed on continuing education in the contemporary university, with particular stress on the pervasive nature of the continuing education activity of its faculty. Included within the second section was a review of past studies of faculty attitudes toward continuing education. Part three

---

[1]Medsker, Extending Opportunities for a College Degree.

examined the literature on potential reasons for faculty participation/nonparticipation in continuing education.

Continuing education has been perceived by many to be a marginal and peripheral activity of a university faculty. Low esteem and prestige have often been associated with participation in it. However, its importance to the university and to society has increased dramatically over the past century, as the university has moved from a traditional posture of isolation vis-a-vis the greater society to one of demands for more active involvement.

Additionally, a significant amount of faculty involvement in continuing education has occurred in activities outside the formal administrative structures and traditional definitions. This involvement has been to a large extent unrecognized and undocumented.

Faculty attitudes toward different types of formal continuing education programs, often the subject of past research studies, have ranged from "favorable," especially within the professional schools, to "not so favorable" within the sciences. However, most of these studies examined the image faculty members have of continuing education as a function at their universities rather than the attitudes and beliefs they have about their own participation.

A significant amount of interest exists in why faculty members do or do not participate in continuing

education. Surprisingly few researchers have asked this question of faculty members in a systematic manner, although opinions about why faculty participate in continuing education are widely held. Those researchers examining this topic in detail have discovered a wide variety of reasons for participation, many of which were used in this study, both in the development of the questionnaire and in discussions with faculty members.

Central to this study was a conceptualization of continuing education which defined faculty involvement in continuing education by specific activity rather than formal program sponsorship. The study has also represented an attempt to systematically examine faculty involvement in the spectrum of continuing education activities, rather than to limit the focus to one activity as in past studies. The study also has gone beyond past studies of faculty attitudes toward continuing education by focusing on the reasons faculty members give for their own participation or non-participation in continuing education.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The first objective of this study, as stated in Chapter I, was to provide information regarding participation in a range of professional activities by selected faculty members of four colleges at Michigan State University, giving particular attention to the various forms of continuing education in which they participated and the audiences served. The second objective was to analyze reasons given by faculty members as to why they did or did not participate in certain selected continuing education activities.

Research Mode

Early in the research, the investigator was confronted with alternative ways of designing the study and collecting the data. The research focus could have been narrowed, for example, to a specific activity, and simplified. A survey design with testable hypotheses could have been employed, a standardized questionnaire developed and mailed to a very large sample of faculty from several representative universities, and appropriate statistical analyses and tests on the resulting data could then have

been performed. The advantages of this approach would have been (1) employment of testable hypotheses, (2) conformity with assumptions required for statistical analysis, and (3) relative ease of administering the questionnaire and analyzing the responses. The resulting disadvantages would have been (1) limitation of the scope of the research questions and (2) absence of qualitative data and interpretation of responses through interaction with faculty members.

One of the basic building blocks of this research was an expanded interpretation of the domain of continuing education. An essential feature of this definition was the inclusion of a broad range of continuing education activities. Because this study represented an exploratory effort in the documentation of faculty participation in this broader spectrum of continuing education as well as an initial attempt to more fully understand why faculty do or do not participate in selected forms of continuing education, qualitative information was judged to be equally important with quantitative data.

The use of personal interviews offered several advantages over the use of a mailed questionnaire. First, the information being sought was of a sufficiently complex and detailed nature that a questionnaire would have been inappropriate and too time-consuming for most faculty members to complete. Second, faculty activity analysis is an inexact science, and the difficulty of classifying

many activities made the presence of an interviewer a distinct advantage in obtaining information that would be comparable among individual faculty members and faculty groups. Additionally the interview situation offered the researcher a unique opportunity to discuss the responses to particular questions in order to provide additional information of a qualitative nature, and finally, the interview technique and sample selection procedure insured a high degree of faculty participation, often a problem in questionnaire studies.

Along with the advantages of the in-person interview, however, were several disadvantages which should be mentioned. First, because of the amount of time required for each interview, the size of the sample was necessarily very small. This severely limited the possibility of analyzing the data statistically or drawing definitive conclusions generalizable to the larger population based on the sample results. Secondly, the risk of having few responses to particular sets of questions was great, especially when breaking the responses down by subgroups such as college, rank, and age. Both of these limitations suggested an adaptation of the case study approach rather than a statistical analysis.

Because of the requirement of obtaining essentially comparable data across faculty, a schedule standardized interview format was selected. The purpose of the

structured interview, outlined by Richardson, Dohrenwend, and Klein, is to: " . . . collect comparable and classifiable information from each participant so that differences between responses reflect actual differences or similarities between respondents and not differences due to the questions they were asked or to the meanings that they attributed to the questions."[1]

The structured interview, while imposing restrictions concerning the order and degree of departure from the schedule, permitted the respondent to amplify or qualify his responses, and allowed the researcher to ask follow-up questions where appropriate. The information thus obtained was both quantitative and qualitative, a feature considered essential for this research.

Sample Selection

Given the selection of the research mode, a case study approach using a structured interview format, it was considered essential that the sample of faculty members be drawn from an institution or group of institutions with characteristics widely shared with others in higher continuing education. Michigan State University, a major public university with a research orientation, a land grant tradition, and a long history of involvement in continuing

---

[1]Steven A. Richardson, Barbara S. Dohrenwend, and David Klein, Interviewing (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965), pp. 34-35.

education, characteristics similar to those of many of the larger universities in the country, was selected as the research "laboratory" for this study. To the extent that faculty members in all types of higher education institutions have common concerns and patterns of behavior, they are represented in this laboratory; beyond that, of course, they are not. Applicability of the results of the study is thus clearly limited.

Four colleges within Michigan State University were selected as the focus for this study. The College of Business, College of Education, College of Engineering, and the College of Social Science were selected, not at random, but because they are representative of colleges, as Benne conceptualized the university, at the periphery of the institution.[1] Each is a college with one or more identifiable clienteles outside the institution; each is involved in continuing education; and each is involved, through its faculty, in the application of specialized knowledge to problems of public concern and professional practice. All were chosen with attention to these similarities rather than differences and all were expected to show some faculty involvement in continuing education, yet vary in the specific activities engaged in, in degree of involvement, and reasons for participation/nonparticipation.

---

[1]Benne, "Adult Education in the University," pp. 413-18.

Twelve faculty members were selected randomly from each college, using a list of current faculty members provided by the Office of the Dean of each college. For each college, each faculty member was assigned a number and the sample for that college was generated using a random number's table. Faculty members declining or unable to participate in the study were replaced individually using this same procedure, thus assuring twelve randomly chosen faculty members per college. Each faculty member unable to participate in the study was asked to indicate his/her reason. The most common reason, given by five faculty members unable to participate, was lack of time. In addition four of the first chosen faculty members were on sabbatical or otherwise on leave from the campus and could not be contacted. Table 3.1 gives a breakdown of the number of faculty contacted by college in order to reach the sample goal of twelve members per college.

Instrumentation

Faculty Participation in Professional Activities

One objective of this research was to develop information concerning the continuing education activities faculty members participated in and the audiences served by their participation in those activities. The alternatives for collecting such data were succinctly presented by

Stecklein in an American Council on Education publication on Faculty Workload.

> "Efficiency expert" approach of having an observer accompany a faculty member as he performs his various duties.
>
> Annual report in which faculty report their teaching activity, publications, offices held in professional organizations, and other honors or public services rendered during the year.
>
> Diaries of activities and time spent for a specified period of time.
>
> Estimation of time spent, in terms of number of hours per week, per semester, or per quarter on various activities.
>
> Allocation of activity on a percentage basis to various activities.[1]

TABLE 3.1.--Number of faculty members in each college and number contacted in order to reach sample size of twelve faculty members per college

	College			
	Business	Education	Engineering	Social Science
Total number of faculty in each college	97	186	83	178
Number of faculty contacted	23	19	16	14
Number declining to participate	11	7	4	2
Number agreeing to participate	12	12	12	12

[1]John E. Stecklein, How To Measure Faculty Workload (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1961), p. 6.

The first approach was obviously inappropriate for this research and was probably mentioned somewhat tongue-in-cheek by the author cited. The diary was also considered unrealistic for the purposes of this research. It was decided to use percentage of time as a basis for reporting participation in activities. According to Stecklein,

> No one report technique can be said to be clearly superior to the other, although many people (including Stecklein) believe that it is easier for faculty members to allocate their time on a percentage basis than to itemize hours spent on various activities. . . . The emphasis should be on the faculty member's conception of his total time and how to divide his 100% time.[1]

Also suggested was the combination of percentage of time allocation with average hours of professional involvement per week, a technique employed by this study.

The Provost's Office at Michigan State University had for some time required colleges to collect information of the type mentioned above from faculty on an annual basis. However, the data collected were generated at the college level, the instruments employed were somewhat different across colleges, and information concerning the audiences served by faculty participation in a given activity was not requested. Additionally, this research was primarily concerned with faculty participation in continuing education, the audiences served by faculty

---

[1]Ibid., p. 17.

members participating in continuing education, and reasons for faculty participation/nonparticipation. For all of these reasons, the categories of activity normally used by MSU were modified and fourteen categories of faculty activity were specified. The Faculty Time Allocation form and the Percentage of Faculty Effort According to Audience forms, described later in this chapter, were developed to collect information on faculty activity and audiences served respectively. Additionally, two instruments were developed to collect information about why faculty did or did not participate in selected forms of continuing education. These will be described later in the chapter.

Categories of Faculty Activity

The categories of faculty activity were developed so that a faculty member would be able to assign all of his professional time to one or more activity categories. Each of the fourteen categories of activity was defined within the form in terms of component activities.

On-campus credit instruction included time spent in the instruction of credit seminars and classes, academic advising, new course development, class preparation, development of new class activities, advising graduate students, supervising teaching assistants, and thesis and dissertation advising.

Off-campus credit instruction included time spent in the instruction of credit seminars and classes, academic advising, new course development, class preparation, development of new class activities, all related to instruction at off-campus sites for students primarily enrolled in credit courses.

Noncredit courses included time spent preparing for and teaching in long-term noncredit instructional situations, whether on or off campus. Development of new instructional activities and advising of students within the classes were included.

Conferences, institutes, and workshops activity included all noncredit instructional activities of a short-term nature involving the faculty member in the role of presenter, planner, resource person, evaluator, etc. Included were both on-campus and off-campus activity and professional conference activity in which these roles were performed.

Noncredit seminars within the institution included all those noncredit seminars in which the role of instructor, resource person, expert, etc., was performed and which were conducted on campus.

Consulting, advising, and diagnostic services activity included all situations in which professional advice or assistance was given to individuals or groups, other than regular on-campus students and faculty

associates, and related to the resolution or clarification of problems. No distinction was made with respect to whether the activities were considered part of the regular responsibilities of the faculty member or were performed on an overload or a fee basis.

Presenting papers or talks of general interest included all situations in which faculty members provided overviews of a problem or issue related to their academic area. Excluded from this category were all such talks which were formally part of a conference, workshop, seminar, etc.

Showings and recitals were presentations intended for and open to the general public: recitals, exhibitions, open houses, etc.

Presenting radio and television programs included programs intended primarily for the general public, practitioners, and professionals. Excluded were presentations as parts of regular credit instruction.

Primary research, literature reviews, and experiments included activities designed to advance the state of knowledge in a given field. Excluded was time spent presenting results at conferences, meetings, etc., but included was all preparation time for such presentations.

Composing, writing, and works of art included creative activities of many types, such as writing a textbook or a novel, composing a musical piece, inventing a new machine, etc.

Faculty committee assignments and other administrative duties included all department, college and university committee work and other administrative activity. Excluded from this category were activities related to instruction such as supervision of graduate assistants, and activity related to research projects unless restricted solely to administration. Also excluded were offices and committee memberships in professional societies or other nonuniversity organizations.

Reading, attending seminars, and continuing education programs included all professional development activities designed primarily to increase competence, knowledge, and ability of the responding faculty member. Included was attendance at professional conferences when attending primarily as a learner rather than presenter, resource person, etc.

Professional society duties and responsibilities included all services performed in support of any professional society or organization to which a responding faculty member belonged, including service as an officer, on various committees and other general services. Excluded were formal presentations which occur at professional meetings.

Audiences Served

Faculty members participating in each of these activities were assumed to be serving a variety of

clientele groups or audiences. Seven types of audiences were identified for the purposes of this study. These were: (1) undergraduate students, (2) graduate students, (3) faculty colleagues, (4) professionals and practitioners in the faculty member's own field, (5) professionals and practitioners outside the faculty member's field, (6) general public, and (7) the individual faculty member (self). These audiences were defined in the following way:

Undergraduate students--students enrolled at the undergraduate level for credit and who may or may not be pursuing a degree program.

Graduate students--students enrolled at the graduate level for credit and who may or may not be pursuing a degree program.

Faculty colleagues--members of the faculty at Michigan State University or other similar universities.

Professionals and Practitioners in the faculty member's own field--individuals who are employed outside the university in a field of practice closely associated with the faculty member's own discipline.

Professionals and Practitioners outside the faculty member's own field--individuals who are employed outside the university in a field of practice not closely related to the faculty member's own discipline.

General Public--groups or individuals with diverse characteristics who are not readily identified by other categories of audiences.

Self--the individual faculty member as the primary beneficiary of his/her participation in an activity.

Additional sub-categories of traditional and non-traditional students were developed in order to identify a faculty member's involvement in serving nontraditional students as a part of regular on-campus instruction of undergraduate and graduate students. These sub-categories were defined in the following way:

Traditional students--predominantly full-time students resident on the campus or commuting to it, and below the age of twenty-six years.

Nontraditional students--predominantly part-time students returning to the campus who are at least twenty-six years old.

Faculty Activity Data Collection Forms

Viewed as complementary instruments, the Faculty Time Allocation form and the Percentage of Faculty Effort According to Audience form (see Appendix B) were designed to collect information according to both activities engaged in and audience served. The Faculty Time Allocation form was completed by the faculty member first,

using as a guide the categories of faculty activity previously described. Each faculty member was requested to allocate his/her time spent in professional activities during the past two academic years (1975-76, 1976-77) across the fourteen different categories of activity. The total amount of time the faculty member spent related to his profession or field was considered to be 100 percent.

Once the Faculty Time Allocation form was completed, the faculty member was requested to indicate the audience(s) served in any activities in which he/she had participated over the past two years. This was done by using the Percentage of Faculty Effort According to Audience form (Appendix B). The total time for any activity in which the faculty member had participated was considered to be 100 percent; this was to be distributed in percentages across the potential audience categories. By combining the responses to the Percentage of Faculty Effort form with those provided on the Faculty Time Allocation form, the percentage of each respondent's total time which was allocated to each activity and audience was calculated.

It should be emphasized that the percentage calculations represented both recollections and estimates of faculty members about how they actually had spent their

time in professional endeavors. There were several problems in this method of inquiry.

First, allocation of time spent in various activities assessed only the quantity of time a faculty member spent in given activities, not the quality. A faculty member's time is, as one professor in the study suggested, qualitative and should be measured and evaluated by output (i.e., product) as well as input (i.e., effort). Student rating systems and peer review of research articles represent attempts in the direction of measuring quality rather than quantity of effort. Such measures were not employed in this study.

Faculty members, like other human beings, have fallible memories. They also have normative values. Those faculty members within institutions of higher education similar to Michigan State University quite likely place a high value on research activity. The importance of this value may have affected their responses to the question of how much time they spent both in research and in continuing education. This attitude may in fact have been more prevalent among young faculty members because of their particular position, both within their department and their discipline, than for older faculty members.

And even though the areas of activity were fairly specific, the investigator necessarily relied upon the respondents to recall and assess the percentages of time

allocated to given activities. Often, presumably, these estimates were colored by such factors as whether or not the faculty members enjoyed particular activity, and whether the time consumed by one activity in relation to others over the past two years could be accurately remembered. Therefore, the results of these self-reports of professional activity were subjective and should be judged as such. However, the absence of other more accurate methods of assessing faculty time allocation short of accompanying the faculty member for a period of time, or asking him to tally his activity hour by hour, had to be recognized.

Reasons for Participation/ Nonparticipation

Four activities were selected for analysis concerning why faculty members did or did not participate in each. These activities were: (1) off-campus credit instruction; (2) conferences, institutes, and workshops; (3) consulting and diagnostic services; and (4) research. The first three activities represented a range of continuing education activity from the more formal and traditional to the informal and less traditional. They also represented three very important forms of knowledge dissemination in continuing education. The activity of research was selected to provide a basis for comparing reasons for participating or not participating in

continuing education activities with those given for a traditional and generally highly esteemed core activity of faculty members. This part of the instrument was designed to elicit responses from faculty members concerning the importance of selected reasons why they in general did or did not participate in the activities of specific interest enumerated above. The instrument consisted of a number of possible reasons for the faculty member's participation or nonparticipation in a given activity.

The reasons for participating in an activity were distilled from those proposed by Dekker in his 1965 research study described in Chapter II. Dekker had postulated forty-six reasons for faculty participation in conferences but did not examine or report how important each individual reason was to faculty. The reasons for participation from Dekker's work were analyzed and condensed and included within the proposal for the doctoral committee to evaluate. They were then evaluated by selected faculty members during pretest interviews for their clarity, absence of overlap, and comprehensiveness. Based upon suggestions made from both evaluations, a list of fourteen possible reasons for participation was developed. Space for additional reasons for participation, as well as comments concerning previous responses, was included. In order to conform with the requirements of the structured interview format as much as possible,

the items were randomly arranged and remained the same for each respondent. This format is presented in Appendix B.

A list of potential reasons for not participating in an activity was developed from the literature on continuing education as reviewed in Chapter II. This literature often refers to inadequacies related to pay, recognition, departmental rewards, scheduling, and lack of capability to work smoothly with adults as barriers to faculty participation. These reasons for not participating were also presented to the doctoral committee for consideration and modification and then evaluated for clarity, absence of overlap, and comprehensiveness by the faculty members included in the pretest interviews. A final form listing fourteen reasons, with space included for additional reasons and discussion, was developed based on the suggestions of both the committee and faculty members who participated in the pretest. This format is presented in Appendix B.

Pretesting the Instruments

Since the instruments used in this study represented a significant departure from forms previously used to collect information on faculty participation in continuing education, it was considered necessary to conduct a pretest of the instrument.

The pretest involved interviewing and administering a draft of the instruments to a sample of six faculty members with at least one from each of the colleges represented within the study. Three Professors, two Associate Professors, and one Assistant Professor were included within the pretest. During the interview the faculty members were asked to complete each of the draft instruments and evaluate their clarity, comprehensiveness, and ease of completion. They were also requested to evaluate the interview process and comment on the appropriateness of each of the proposed reasons for participating or not participating in continuing education.

These pretest interviews had several purposes. First they were designed to focus on the construct validity of the instruments related to faculty activity analysis. Each individual who indicated participation in a given activity by allocating a percentage of his/her time to it was asked to indicate specifically what kind of activities he/she was including. In this way, it could be determined whether the activity description in the instrument was being interpreted by faculty members as the investigator had intended. The same procedure was used to determine whether the definitions of audiences, as presented in the instrument, were being conveyed appropriately to faculty. From the information obtained, minor changes were made in several categories of faculty

activity. One new category was added and one additional audience was included.

A second objective of the pretest was to determine, for the purposes of asking faculty why they did or did not participate in continuing education activities, an appropriate operational definition of participation. From the responses and comments obtained in the pretest, 2 percent of a faculty member's time was selected as an appropriate minimum for defining participation in the activities of off-campus credit instruction; conferences, institutes, and workshops; consulting and diagnostic services; and research. In general, faculty who had participated at all in these activities during the past two years had allocated at least 2 percent of their time to them.

Using this criterion to determine participators in a given activity, faculty members allocating 2 percent or more of their time to a given activity were asked to indicate the importance of each selected reason in their decision to participate. Faculty members who had not participated, including a few who had allocated less than 2 percent of their time to a given activity, were asked to indicate the importance of each selected reason in their decision not to participate at all or more extensively in that activity. Each faculty member within the pretest was requested to evaluate the appropriateness of each of the potential reasons for participating or not

participating in an activity and was asked to name other potential reasons in each case. From the responses and suggestions made, the two forms were modified slightly. No statistical test for reliability of the instrument as a whole was performed because of the size of the pretest sample (dictated by the length of time each interview consumed and the small size of the sample) and the nature of the instrument.

Conducting the Interview

The choice of a standardized schedule interview format made a prescribed procedure for the interview and administration of the accompanying instrument mandatory. That procedure was:

A. General Introduction
   1. Explanation of the purpose of the study
   2. Outline of the general questions to be asked
   3. Explanation of the interview format
B. Presentation of the Categories of Faculty Activity
C. Administration of the Faculty Time Allocation form
D. Explanation and Administration of the Percentage of Faculty Effort According to Audience form
E. For each of four activities--off-campus credit instruction; conferences, institutes, and workshops; consulting and diagnostic services; and research--faculty members allocating 2 percent

or more of their time were requested to indicate how important each potential reason listed on the form was in their decision to participate in that activity. For each of these activities in which none of their time was allocated, faculty members were asked to indicate how important each potential reason listed on the form was in their decision not to participate in that activity. Faculty members allocating between zero and 2 percent of their time to an activity were asked to indicate how important each of the listed reasons was in their decision not to participate more extensively.

For each activity only one set of reasons, the set for participation or the set for nonparticipation, was given to the faculty member. This was done in order to avoid an artificial situation where a faculty member might be asked to rate reasons for participating even though he had not participated. In short, those who participated were asked why; those who did not (or participated minimally) were asked why not (or why not more).

In all cases faculty were asked to indicate other reasons that might have been important to them in their decision to participate or not participate in a given activity.

This study employed two interviewers. The investigator for the study conducted thirty of the interviews

while the second interviewer, another doctoral student in continuing education, conducted eighteen. Because of the structured interview approach, the procedures and format used in each interview were designed to be as nearly identical as possible. The use of a second interviewer also may have minimized any unintended bias on the part of the investigator.

Treatment and Analysis of the Data

As was indicated in Chapter I, the study was designed to meet the following objectives:

1. To provide information on the total range of professional activities of a selected group of forty-eight faculty members, giving particular attention to the various forms of continuing education in which they participated and the audiences which they served
2. To analyze and compare the rated importance of reasons why faculty did or did not participate in certain selected continuing education activities and in research

Analysis of the data collected on faculty activity was designed to achieve the first objective by focusing on the following research questions:

1. For all forty-eight faculty members, what was the total mean percentage of time allocated to each activity?
2. For all forty-eight faculty members, classifying each activity as either a continuing education activity or a noncontinuing education activity, what was the total mean percentage of time allocated to continuing education activities?
3. For all forty-eight faculty members, what was the total mean percentage of time allocated to each audience?
4. Which of the variables of college affiliation, tenure, length of service to the university, academic rank, number of professional society memberships and reported workload expressed in hours per week, were significantly correlated with the percentage of time allocated to continuing education activities and audiences?

Several procedures for analyzing data related to these research questions were employed. Descriptive information, including the mean percentage of time allocated to each faculty activity and audience served, was displayed and discussed in Chapter IV, first for the sample as a whole and then for each individual college. Mean percentages of time allocated by faculty members of

different academic ranks to continuing education and non-continuing education activities were compared and discussed.

A step-wise multiple regression procedure was used to analyze the extent to which the variables of college affiliation, age, academic rank, number of professional society memberships held, length of service to MSU, and total hours per week spent professionally were correlated with percentage of time faculty members allocated to continuing education and audiences served.

This analytical procedure was selected for several reasons. First, it provided clear and concise information about characteristics of faculty members and their correlation with participation in each activity. Second, the procedure provided a basis for selecting those characteristic(s), taken singly or in combination, which "best" explain faculty participation in each activity. This feature is particularly important in cases where independent variables are highly correlated with each other, as they are in this study.[1]

In the multiple regression procedure, the computer selects first the best single variable, determined by its simple correlation, enters the variable in the regression equation, and performs an F test for significance. A

---

[1]Further discussion of the step-wise multiple regression procedure can be found in Draper and Smith, Applied Regression Analysis, pp. 171-95.

second variable is then entered into the regression equation on the basis of how much the second variable adds to the explanation of participation, measured by R^2. Because addition of a related variable can change the importance of previously entered variables, a new F-score is calculated for each variable as new variables are entered.[1] The summary table, which includes all faculty characteristics entered into the regression equation, provides information concerning the significance of each characteristic of faculty members in combination with all other characteristics.

A significance level of $\alpha = .10$ was used to determine significant F-scores. Use of the .10 level is common where findings are not generalized to the population, as was the case for this study. In addition the possibility of committing a Type I error is greatly reduced.

The second objective of this study was to analyze and compare the rated importance of reasons given by faculty members for their participation or nonparticipation in four selected activities of interest--off-campus credit instruction; conferences, institutes, and workshops; consulting and diagnostic service; and research. Faculty

---

[1]This is a principal advantage of the stepwise multiple regression procedure in that each variable previously entered into the regression equation is reconsidered upon the entry of an additional variable.

members were asked to rate the importance in general of reasons why they did or did not participate. Based on pretest results, participation in an activity was defined as consuming 2 percent or more of a faculty member's total time. In all cases faculty were asked to comment on their ratings and to suggest other factors which were important in their decision.

The research questions of immediate interest were:

1. For all forty-eight faculty, did the rated importance of reasons for participating and for not participating in four selected activities of interest--off-campus credit instruction; conferences, institutes, and workshops; consulting and diagnostic services; and research--differ?

2. For each of the four selected activities what were rated as the most important reasons for participating and the most important reasons for not participating?

The mean scores indicating the importance of each reason for each activity were reported for all faculty. For the purpose of comparison, the mean scores of reasons for participating or not participating in each activity were also rank-ordered according to their rated importance.

Summary

A brief description of the sample selected for this study was presented in this chapter. Also included were discussions of the research design and methodology for collecting the data, development of the instruments required for data collection, and a description of the procedures for analyzing the data. Results of the analysis are presented and discussed in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

REPORT AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This chapter is devoted to a presentation, discussion, and analysis of the data collected to achieve the objectives of the study. The format for the chapter consists of: (1) a restatement of the objectives of the study, (2) a brief review of the procedures for collecting the data, and (3) a presentation, analysis, and discussion of the data.

As outlined in Chapter I, the objectives of this study were to: (1) provide information on participation by faculty members in four colleges of Michigan State University in a range of professional activities, giving particular attention to the various forms of continuing education in which faculty members participated and the audiences which, as identified by faculty, were served by their participation; and (2) analyze reasons reported by faculty members as to why they did or did not participate in certain selected activities.

A survey instrument was designed and used in a structured interview format in order to collect information

of th

struc

inst

of the type required to meet these objectives. During the structured interview and administration of the accompanying instrument, faculty members were asked:

1. To complete a personal data form which requested their age, academic rank, tenure status, highest academic degree held, and total estimated hours spent professionally in all activities
2. To allocate by percentages, into fourteen categories, all of their time spent professionally over the two academic years, 1975-76 and 1976-77
3. For each activity participated in, to allocate their time by percentage according to the audience(s) served
4. To rate for four specific types of activities--off-campus credit instruction; conferences, institutes, and workshops; consulting and diagnostic services; and research--the importance on a scale of one (no importance) to five (high importance) of reasons why they did or did not participate in each of these activities. Participation was defined operationally as consuming at least 2 percent of the faculty member's total professional time.

Characteristics of Faculty Members within the Sample

Forty-eight faculty members within four colleges--twelve randomly selected from each of the Colleges of

Business, Education, Engineering, and Social Science--were interviewed as a part of this study. The study was essentially a case study; therefore, the results are not generalizable to the larger population of faculty members at Michigan State University or at other colleges and universities. However, to the extent that the characteristics of these faculty members and the context in which they operate are shared with other faculty members, the results of this study offer valuable information about faculty participation in continuing education.

The purpose of this section is to describe the sample selected for this case study.

Academic Rank, Tenure Status, and Academic Degrees

Twenty-three (48%) of the faculty members included within the sample were full professors. All of these faculty members had been awarded tenure, and all but three held the doctoral degree.

Sixteen faculty members (33%) were Associate Professors. All of these faculty members held the doctoral degree, and all except one had been awarded tenure.

Nine faculty members (19% of the sample) were Assistant Professors. Of these faculty members, only one had been awarded tenure; seven of the other eight were on tenure stream appointments and subject to departmental review for promotion and tenure. The other faculty member

held a temporary appointment. Five of these faculty members had received the doctoral degree.

Tables 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 present this information for the sample as a whole. Table 4.4 provides this information for each college.

Representation within Each of the Colleges

Though the sample selection process did not involve stratification within colleges, the distribution of faculty members in the sample quite closely resembled the population as a whole. As expected, because of the small number of faculty members selected per college, there were differences among the colleges in the degree to which the twelve-member samples were representative of their respective populations. All but four departments within the four colleges were represented by at least one faculty member. Table 4.5 identifies the departments and the number of faculty members from each who were interviewed.

Based on the factors of rank and tenure, the sample from the College of Social Science was least representative of its faculty in that the lower academic ranks and nontenured faculty were proportionally over-represented. In the Colleges of Business and Education, nontenured faculty were under-represented. Overall, the forty-eight faculty members were closely proportional in representation of

TABLE 4.1.--Number of faculty respondents by academic degree and academic rank

Academic Rank	Highest Academic Degree Received		Total
	Master's	Doctor's	
Professor	3	20	23
Associate Professor	0	16	16
Assistant Professor	4	5	9
Total	7	41	48

TABLE 4.2.--Number of faculty respondents by tenure status and academic rank

Academic Rank	Tenure Status		Total
	Tenured	Not Tenured	
Professor	23	0	23
Associate Professor	15	1	16
Assistant Professor	1	8	9
Total	39	9	48

TABLE 4.3.--Number of faculty respondents by tenure status and highest academic degree

Highest Degree Received	Tenure Status		Total
	Tenured	Not Tenured	
Masters	4	3	7
Doctoral	35	6	41
Total	39	9	48

TABLE 4.4.--Distribution of faculty respondents by academic degree, academic rank, and tenure status in each selected college

	College			
	Business	Education	Engineering	Social Science
Highest Degree Received				
Master's	1	0	3	3
Doctoral	11	12	9	9
Academic Rank				
Professor	5	9	6	3
Associate Professor	5	3	3	4
Assistant Professor	2	0	3	5
Tenure Status				
Tenured	11	12	9	7
Not Tenured	1	0	3	5

TABLE 4.5.--Distribution of faculty respondents by academic departments and schools of the four colleges in the study

College	Department/School	Number of Respondents	
Business	Accounting and Financial Administration	3	
	Business Law, Insurance, and Office Administration	1	
	Economics	4	
	Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Management	1	
	Management	2	
	Marketing and Transportation Administration	1	
			12
Education	Administration and Higher Education	2	
	Counseling, Personnel Services, and Educational Psychology	3	
	Elementary and Special Education	1	
	Health, Physical Education, and Recreation	1	
	Secondary Education and Curriculum	4	
	Teacher Education	1	
			12
Engineering	Chemical Engineering	1	
	Civil Engineering	2	
	Computer Science	1	
	Electrical Engineering and Systems Science	3	
	Engineering Instructional Services	1	
	Mechanical Engineering	0	
	Metallurgy, Mechanics and Materials Science	4	
			12
Social Science	Anthropology	0	
	Criminal Justice	1	
	Geography	2	
	Labor and Industrial Relations	0	
	Political Science	1	
	Psychology	4	
	Sociology	0	
	Social Science	1	
	Social Work	2	
	Urban Planning and Landscape Architecture	1	
			12

TABLE 4.6.--A comparison between the sample of faculty members selected (S) and the population (P) by academic rank and tenure status

	College									
	Business		Education		Engineering		Social Science		All Colleges	
	S	P	S	P	S	P	S	P	S	P
Academic Rank										
Professor	42%	53%	75%	60%	50%	39%	25%	41%	48%	52%
Associate Professor	42%	25%	25%	25%	25%	27%	33%	22%	33%	25%
Assistant Professor	18%	22%	0%	15%	25%	34%	42%	29%	19%	25%
Tenure Status										
Tenured	92%	74%	100%	85%	75%	74%	58%	73%	81%	77%
Nontenured	8%	26%	0%	15%	25%	26%	42%	27%	19%	23%

academic rank and tenure status of all faculty members in the four selected colleges.

Other Characteristics of the Sample

Other characteristics of the sample which were of interest were age, hours per week spent in professional activities, years of service to Michigan State University, and number of professional society memberships. These data for the sample and by college are provided in Table 4.7.

In general, the youngest faculty members were drawn from the College of Social Science, the oldest from the College of Education. Social Science faculty members reported a higher average number of professionally spent hours per week than did the three other colleges within the sample. They also reported a shorter length of association with Michigan State University. Faculty members from the College of Education held more, and those from Business held fewer, memberships in professional societies than did faculty members from other colleges.

Many of the characteristics of faculty members reported in this section are highly related. Certainly academic rank, tenure status, age, and years of service with the university are all interrelated characteristics of faculty members in any university. Simple "r" correlations, which illustrate the degree to which these

TABLE 4.7.--Selected characteristics descriptive of faculty members within the sample by college

Characteristic	College				
	Business	Engineering	Education	Social Science	All
Mean Age (in yrs.)	42.2	45.0	47.9	37.6	43.4
Mean Hours per Week Spent in Professional Activity	53.9	58.5	55.1	66.7	58.5
Mean Years of Service to MSU	13.3	16.3	13.4	6.8	12.5
Mean Number of Professional Society Memberships	3.6	4.9	5.9	4.6	4.75

characteristics were related within this sample, are provided in Table 4.8.

The purpose of the analysis which follows is to determine which of these characteristics or combination of characteristics correlated with the degree of involvement of faculty members in continuing education activities.

Faculty Participation in Continuing Education

Participation in continuing education was measured in terms of percentages of professional time allocated to activities defined by the investigator as continuing education activities. Faculty members were requested to review major categories of activities (Appendix B) and, if they deemed it appropriate, suggest additions or modifications in their makeup. Forty-four of the faculty members interviewed expressed approval of the categories as presented and allocated their time accordingly. Two faculty members preferred to distinguish between research undertaken as the result of a paid contract and research undertaken in order to "satisfy intellectual curiosity." One faculty member suggested that consulting for a fee is an inappropriate activity for a faculty member to engage in, being in conflict philosophically with his view of the role of the university and those who serve within it, and removed it from consideration. He was recorded as not participating in that activity. Another

TABLE 4.8.--Intercorrelation between selected characteristics of faculty members

	Characteristics					
	Age	Academic Rank	Tenure Status	Length of Service to MSU	Number of Professional Society Memberships	Hours of Work Per Week
Age	1.00					
Academic Rank	.53	1.00				
Tenure Status	.27	.65	1.00			
Length of Service to MSU	.79	.56	.39	1.00		
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.28	.25	.32	.20	1.00	
Hours of Work Per Week	-.27	-.21	-.28	-.32	.15	1.00

faculty member held classes off-campus for regularly enrolled on-campus students as a part of field supervision and created a category to encompass that activity. His time spent on that activity was recorded as on-campus instruction.

Several faculty members commented that categories of activity were often interrelated and that their participation in one activity indirectly could be allocated to another category. They were requested, in all such cases, to allocate their time as equitably as possible among the two or more activity categories. Even though the purpose of the study was not to measure faculty output, one faculty member suggested (and this author concurs) that participation is qualitative as well as quantitative. Another faculty member commented that his allocation of time was subjective and may have reflected his preferences for how his time should have been allocated rather than how it actually was. Still another faculty member, expressing his distaste for serving on departmental and college committees, thought he may have allocated more time to that category than he actually spent because the negative memory of his participation was so strong.

In general, faculty members were familiar with the time allocation procedure used in the study and were able to distribute their time across the fourteen activities with only those minor problems described above.

Allocation of Professional Time to Continuing Education and Other Professional Activities

The data describe how faculty members in the four colleges--Business, Education, Engineering, and Social Science--and the sample as a whole allocated their professional time to the categories of activity displayed in Table 4.1. Professional activities were organized by the investigator into two sectors, continuing education and noncontinuing education activities. In keeping with the definition of continuing education adopted for the study, time reported to have been spent in off-campus instruction, noncredit courses, conferences, institutes and workshops, noncredit seminars, consulting and diagnostic services, presenting papers or talks of general interest, presenting television and radio programs, continuing education as a learner, and instruction of nontraditional undergraduate and graduate students in on-campus credit classes was allocated to continuing education. Similarly, time reported to have been spent in research, writing, composing, faculty committee assignments, professional society duties, administration, and instruction of traditional undergraduate and graduate students was allocated to the noncontinuing education sector.

The mean percentage of time allocated by all faculty members to off-campus credit instruction was 3.57 percent, with faculty members affiliated with the

TABLE 4.9.--Percentage distribution of time allocated to continuing education and non-continuing education activities by faculty members in four colleges

Activity	College				
	Business	Education	Engineering	Social Science	All
Continuing Education:					
Off-campus credit instruction	1.75%	9.03%	.83%	2.67%	3.57%
Noncredit courses	.17	.17	0	.5	.16
Conferences, Institutes, workshop	3.0	5.42	1.77	4.17	3.58
Noncredit seminars	.33	.3	.34	.03	.25
Consulting, diagnostic services	6.2	9.5	4.44	7.58	6.98
Presenting papers	1.17	1.05	.88	.17	.76
Showings, recitals	0	0	.37	.08	.12
Presenting television and radio programs	1.13	.13	.17	.42	.45
Continuing Education as a Learner	2.58	6.1	4.5	4.39	4.40
On-campus instruction of nontraditional students:					
(Undergraduate)	3.06	.8	3.28	1.79	2.28
(Graduate)	4.54	29.18	2.43	7.79	10.99
Sub-Total Continuing Education	23.93%	61.68%	19.01%	29.59%	33.55%

TABLE 4.9.--Continued

Activity	College				
	Business	Education	Engineering	Social Science	All
Noncontinuing Education:					
On-campus Instruction of traditional students:					
(Undergraduate)	32.5	6.63	39.97	13.38	23.12
(Graduate)	14.48	8.41	7.35	17.66	11.95
Research, writing, composing	21.5	11.55	23.4	26.13	20.67
Faculty committee assignments, Professional society duties, Administrative work	7.59	11.77	10.3	13.24	10.73
Sub-Total Noncontinuing Education	76.07%	38.36%	81.02%	70.41%	66.49%
Total All Professional Activities	100.00%	100.04%	100.03%	100.00%	100.02%

College of Education allocating the highest percentage (9.03%) and faculty members affiliated with the College of Engineering allocating the lowest percentage (.83%).

The mean percentage of time allocated by all faculty members to conferences, institutes, and workshops was 3.58 percent with faculty members affiliated with the College of Education allocating the highest percentage (5.4%) and faculty members affiliated with the College of Engineering allocating the lowest percentage (1.77%).

Other continuing education activities (noncredit courses and seminars, presenting papers, showings, recitals, television, and radio) were not participated in widely by faculty members, each consuming less than 1 percent of the faculty members' time.

The mean percentage of time allocated by all faculty members to on-campus instruction of nontraditional undergraduate students was 2.28%. Faculty members affiliated with the College of Engineering allocated the highest percentage (3.28%) while those affiliated with the College of Education reported the lowest (.8%).

The mean percentage of time allocated by all faculty members to on-campus instruction of nontraditional graduate students was 10.99 percent. Faculty members affiliated with the College of Education allocated, by a substantial margin, the highest percentage (29.18%)

while faculty members affiliated with the College of Engineering reported the lowest percentage (2.45%).

The mean percentage of time allocated by all faculty members to consulting and diagnostic services was 6.98 percent, with faculty members affiliated with the College of Education allocating the highest percentage (9.5%) and faculty members from the College of Engineering reporting the lowest percentage (4.44%).

The mean percentage of time allocated by all faculty members to continuing education as a learner was 4.4 percent. Faculty members affiliated with the College of Education allocated the highest percentage (6.1%) and those affiliated with the College of Business reported the lowest (2.58%).

The mean percentage of time allocated by faculty members to continuing education as a set of activities was 33.5 percent. Faculty members affiliated with the College of Education allocated the highest percentage (61.68%) and those affiliated with the College of Engineering reported the lowest percentage (19.01%).

For the sample as a whole, the percentage of time allocated to various continuing education activities (33.5%) exceeded the percentages allocated to on-campus undergraduate instruction (25%), on-campus graduate instruction (23%), and research (21%). Consuming approximately one-third of the average faculty member's

professional time, continuing education activity was both significant and pervasive. It was not an activity of little consequence to the university.

A comparison was made between percentages of time allocated to continuing education and noncontinuing education between professors, associate professors, and assistant professors (see Table 4.10). Professors allocated a larger percentage of their time to continuing education (40.15%) than did either associate professors (27.17%) or assistant professors (28.61%). Both associate professors and assistant professors allocated larger percentages of their time to research (25.95% and 20.75% respectively) than did professors (17.5%).

Correlation between Faculty Characteristics and Faculty Participation in Continuing Education

A major objective of this study,beyond examining the percentages of time allocated by faculty members to continuing education, was to identify faculty characteristics which might be significantly correlated with the degree of participation. The purpose of this section is to determine which, if any, of these characteristics were related to faculty participation in each continuing education activity, for continuing education as a set of activities, and for research.

The continuing education activities included within this analysis and identified earlier in this

TABLE 4.10.--A comparison of the percentage distribution of faculty time to continuing education and noncontinuing education activities between professors, associate professors, and assistant professors

Activity	Rank			
	Professors n = 23	Associate Professors n = 16	Assistant Professors n = 9	All
Continuing Education:				
Off-campus credit instruction	5.41%	2.81%	.22%	3.57%
Noncredit courses	.09	.23	.26	.16
Conferences, Institutes, workshop	3.61	3.95	2.89	3.58
Noncredit seminars	.26	.16	.39	.25
Consulting, diagnostic services	7.96	5.46	7.33	6.98
Presenting papers	.85	.48	1.00	.76
Showings, recitals	.13	.09	.11	.12
Presenting television and radio programs	.42	.25	1.0	.45
Continuing Education as a Learner	5.41	3.66	3.11	4.40
On-campus instruction of nontraditional students:				
(Undergraduate)	2.21	1.85	3.18	2.27
(Graduate)	13.64	8.35	8.85	10.99
Sub-Total Continuing Education	39.99%	27.29%	28.34%	33.53%
Noncontinuing Education:				
On-campus Instruction of traditional students:				
(Undergraduate)	20.50	20.86	33.67	23.12
(Graduate)	10.95	14.52	9.49	11.97
Research, writing, composing	17.30	25.44	20.72	20.66
Faculty committee assignments, Professional society duties, Administrative work	11.28	11.88	7.27	10.73
Sub-Total Noncontinuing Education	60.03%	72.70%	71.65%	66.48%
Total All Professional Activities	100.02%	99.99%	99.89%	100.01%

chapter were: instruction of nontraditional undergraduate and graduate students; off-campus credit instruction; non-credit courses; conferences, institutes, and workshops; noncredit seminars within the institution; consulting and diagnostic services; presenting papers or talks of general interest; showings and recitals; and continuing education as a learner. Faculty characteristics included in the analysis were age of the faculty member, college affiliation, academic rank, tenure status, length of service to Michigan State University, number of memberships in professional societies, and hours per week spent professionally.

A step-wise multiple regression statistical procedure was used to determine whether each of these characteristics of faculty members significantly correlated with participation in each specified continuing education activity. In this procedure, a simple correlation analysis was performed, providing the individual correlation between a given independent variable (characteristic) and the percentage of time allocated by faculty members to an activity or set of activities. In the multiple regression procedure, the computer selected the characteristic that was most highly correlated with faculty participation in each activity and performed an F test for significance. A second characteristic was then selected by the computer program based upon the extent to which it, in combination with the first characteristic, was correlated with faculty

participation in the activity. This procedure was repeated for all independent variables. The end result was,for each activity or group of activities considered, information concerning the significance of each characteristic, in relation to all other characteristics entered in the test, in explaining the degree of faculty participation. The results of that analysis are presented and discussed in this section, first for each specific continuing education activity, then for the general set of continuing education activities, and finally for the activity of research.

It should be noted that the variable of College Affiliation is a nonlinear variable in that coding of the four colleges represented no hierarchy. As a result only n-1 or three colleges could be included in the regression equation. The College of Engineering, whose faculty members participated least in continuing education activities, was arbitrarily excluded from the analysis by the investigator in each analysis. This was done in order to control elimination of one of the colleges rather than allow the computer program to arbitrarily exclude a college, perhaps a different one in each case.

Instruction of nontraditional undergraduate students. Three characteristics were shown to be correlated at the .10 level of significance with on-campus instruction of nontraditional undergraduate students.

Affiliation with the College of Education was negatively correlated with participation in this activity; faculty members from this college apparently were not significantly engaged in on-campus instruction of nontraditional undergraduate students.

In the four colleges, taken together, tenure status was positively correlated with on-campus instruction of undergraduate nontraditional students with faculty members having tenure being more likely to participate than those who did not. Academic rank was negatively correlated with participation, suggesting that lower ranking but tenured faculty members, primarily Associate Professors, were more highly involved in this activity than were either senior faculty members or nontenured ones.

TABLE 4.11--Correlation between selected characteristics of faculty members and their participation in on-campus instruction of nontraditional undergraduate students[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
College of Education	.25	-.25	2.96*
Tenure Status	.31	.12	2.75*
Academic Rank	.35	-.09	2.37*
Length of Service to MSU	.39	.13	.23
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.40	-.06	.39
Age	.40	.04	.14
College of Business	.41	.13	.16
College of Social Science	.41	-.06	.11

*Significant at $\alpha = .10$

[a]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to on-campus instruction of undergraduate nontraditional students was 2.3 percent.

Instruction of nontraditional graduate students. Four characteristics were shown to be correlated at the .10 level of significance with on-campus instruction of nontraditional graduate students. The one most highly and positively correlated was affiliation with the College of Education. Faculty members from this College allocated a significantly greater amount of time to this activity than did faculty members of other colleges.

Age, tenure status, and length of service to MSU were also positively correlated with participation in the instruction of nontraditional graduate students in on-campus courses. Older faculty members and those with longer association with the university, often the same persons, were in general more involved than their younger and newer colleagues in instruction of nontraditional graduate students. (See Table 4.12.)

Off-campus credit instruction. Twenty-one of the forty-eight faculty members, 44 percent of the sample, participated in teaching off-campus credit courses. All twelve faculty members interviewed from the College of Education allocated significant portions of their time to this activity. It was, therefore, not surprising to find that affiliation with the College of Education was the characteristic most highly correlated with participation in this activity. (See Table 4.13.)

TABLE 4.12.--Correlation between selected characteristics of faculty members and their participation in on-campus instruction of nontraditional graduate students[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
College of Education	.59	.59	14.3*
Tenure Status	.65	.11	3.1*
Age	.69	.29	8.6*
Length of Service to MSU	.74	.05	5.1*
College of Business	.74	-.18	.7
College of Social Science	.74	-.11	.4
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.75	.17	.5
Hours Working per Week	.75	-.10	.4
Academic Rank	.75	.08	.01

*Significant at $\alpha = .10$

[a]Mean percentage of total time allocated by the sample as a whole to on-campus instruction of graduate nontraditional students was 11 percent.

TABLE 4.13.--Correlation between selected characteristics of faculty members and their participation in off-campus credit instruction[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
College of Education	.63	.63	3.0*
Academic Rank	.65	.39	2.8*
College of Social Science	.66	-.13	2.4*
Tenure Status	.67	.18	.2
College of Business	.67	-.18	.4
Hours of Work per Week	.68	-.06	.1
Age	.68	.26	.2
Length of Service to MSU	.68	.09	.1
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.68	.16	.1

*Significant at $\alpha = -.10$

[a]Mean percentage of total time allocated by the sample as a whole to off-campus credit instruction was 3.58 percent.

Participation was also positively correlated with academic rank with senior faculty more involved than lower ranking faculty. It was negatively correlated with affiliation with the College of Social Science, where only four faculty members participated.

Noncredit classes. Faculty members participated only minimally (.16%) as teachers in noncredit classes. Of the faculty characteristics selected for analysis, only one, tenure status, significantly correlated with such participation (see Table 4.14). Tenured faculty were likely to be more highly involved than were non-tenured faculty. This may reflect the low priority that participation in this activity is believed to have in tenure decisions. No other characteristics appeared to be significantly related to teaching of noncredit classes.

Conferences, workshops, institutes. Affiliation with the College of Education was most highly correlated with contributions as speakers, leaders or resource persons in conferences, workshops, and institutes. Other characteristics did not correlate significantly with such participation. However, of other characteristics, tenure status was identified as being of second importance; the correlation though low was negative. Since faculty members often are invited to participate in conferences (both on-campus and at other locations) based upon their

TABLE 4.14.--Correlation between selected characteristics of faculty members and their teaching in noncredit classes[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
College of Social Science	.20	.20	2.3
Tenure Status	.25	.06	3.7*
Academic Rank	.34	-.14	2.0
College of Education	.35	-.03	.1
Length of Service to MSU	.36	-.18	.5
Age	.37	-.13	.4
Number of Memberships in Professional Societies	.37	-.01	.2
Hours of Work per Week	.37	.06	.1

*Significant at $\alpha = .10$

[a]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to teaching noncredit courses was .16 percent.

TABLE 4.15.--Correlation between selected characteristics of faculty members and their participation as teachers in conferences, institutes and workshops[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
College of Education	.34	.34	4.8*
Tenure Status	.40	-.12	2.3
College of Social Science	.43	.08	1.5
College of Business	.46	-.09	1.2
Academic Rank	.47	.06	1.0
Length of Service to MSU	.48	-.15	.7
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.48	.07	.5
Hours of Work per Week	.49	-.02	.4
Age	.50	.01	.1

*Significant at $\alpha = .10$

[a]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to conferences, institutes, and workshops was 3.6 percent.

established reputations, it would seem reasonable to expect that participating faculty members, most of whom are tenured, would be more likely to be highly involved. Yet nontenured faculty members were at least as highly involved in this activity as were tenured faculty. (See Table 4.15.)

Noncredit seminars within the institution. Faculty members participated only minimally in noncredit seminars within the institution (.25%). Hours per week spent professionally was correlated (negatively) at the .10 level of significance with such participation. The meaning of this finding is not readily apparent. (See Table 4.16.)

Consulting and diagnostic services. Affiliation with the College of Education was correlated with the percentage of time allocated by faculty members to consulting and diagnostic services, as was the number of hours per week spent in professional activities. It would seem that faculty members who consulted believed they worked a longer work week than faculty members who did not. (See Table 4.17.)

Presenting papers or talks of general interest. Although the F-score was not significant at the .10 level for any of the independent variables, Social Science College affiliation was the characteristic most significantly correlating (negatively) with participation in this activity. Faculty members from this college were

TABLE 4.16.--Correlation between characteristics of faculty members and their participation in noncredit seminars within the institution[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
Hours of Work per Week	.21	.21	3.3*
College of Social Science	.28	.09	.3
College of Business	.29	-.10	.4
College of Education	.30	-.01	.2
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.30	.0	.2
Age	.30	.0	.1
Academic Rank	.31	.04	.2
Tenure Status	.31	.0	.1
Length of Service to MSU	.31	.02	.1

*Significant at $\alpha = .10$

[a]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to noncredit seminars within the institution was .25 percent.

TABLE 4.17.--Correlation between selected characteristics of faculty members and their participation in consulting and diagnostic services within the institution[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
College of Education	.21	.21	4.9*
Tenure Status	.32	-.18	2.3
Academic Rank	.37	.07	.5
Hours of Work per Week	.41	.18	3.4*
College of Business	.46	-.01	1.9
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.47	-.09	1.2
Length of Service to MSU	.49	.03	.3
College of Social Science	.49	.01	.3
Age	.50	.12	.1

*Significant at $\alpha = .10$

[a]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to consulting and diagnostic services was 7 percent.

not inclined toward presenting talks of interest to a wider audience on nonresearch related topics. The number of hours spent professionally per week also negatively correlated with participation in this activity; apparently, this is one of the activities that is sacrificed by professors who believe they are working long hours. (See Table 4.18.)

Showings and recitals. None of the faculty members within colleges included within this analysis (Business, Education, Social Science) participated in showings or recitals to any great degree. Only faculty members affiliated with the College of Engineering, which held open houses to publicize its facilities and educate the public on matters related to technology, were involved in this activity. A negative correlation, statistically significant in two cases, was found between affiliation with the other three colleges included and the degree of faculty participation in this activity. (See Table 4.19.)

Presenting radio or television programs. As a whole, faculty members were not widely engaged in presenting radio or television programs (.45% of their total professional time). However, six characteristics were significantly related to participation in this activity. The number of hours spent professionally per week correlated (negatively) with participation in this activity. Faculty members who reported working longer hours were

TABLE 4.18.--Correlation between selected characteristics of faculty members and their participation in presenting papers or talks of general interest[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
College of Social Science	.27	-.27	.2
Hours of Work per Week	.32	-.26	.9
Age	.34	.21	1.4
Academic Rank	.36	.04	1.5
Tenure Status	.40	-.19	.7
College of Business	.40	.17	.3
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.41	.09	.2
College of Education	.41	.09	.04

No significance at $\alpha = .10$

[a]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to presenting papers or talks of general interest was a very minor .76 percent.

TABLE 4.19.--Correlation between selected characteristics of faculty members and their participation in showings and recitals[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
Length of Service to MSU	.24	.24	1.0
College of Education	.31	-.18	3.1*
College of Business	.39	-.17	4.6*
College of Social Science	.44	-.06	1.8
Age	.44	.12	.1
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.45	-.01	.2
Hours of Work per Week	.45	.01	.4
Tenure Status	.45	-.02	.2
Academic Rank	.45	.03	.1

*Significant at $\alpha = .10$

[a]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to showings and recitals was .12 percent.

not as likely to be involved as those who reported working a relatively shorter work week. Academic rank was significantly correlated (negatively) with participation, suggesting higher involvement of lower ranking faculty, while age was significantly correlated (positively) with participation. In view of the high inter-correlation of these two variables (+.53) this result was somewhat surprising. In reviewing the data, however, it was found that these results were explained by relatively heavy involvement by two older assistant professors. This accounted for most of the very limited participation for the sample as a whole. (See Table 4.20.)

Continuing education as a learner. Only hours per week spent professionally significantly correlated (positively) with the degree of participation in continuing education as a learner. Apparently, as with consulting, a relationship exists between participation in this activity and the overall amount of professional involvement measured in hours. Age was, in isolation from other variables, positively correlated (.2) with involvement. This finding conforms with an observation offered by one faculty member that "the older one becomes, the more one should participate to keep up with new developments in the discipline." (See Table 4.21.)

TABLE 4.20.--Correlation between selected characteristics of faculty members and their participation in presenting television or radio programs[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
College of Business	.29	.29	3.7*
Hours of Work per Week	.38	-.29	4.9*
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.44	.13	2.3*
College of Social Science	.50	-.01	2.4*
Academic Rank	.53	-.11	3.6*
Age	.58	.18	3.3*
Tenure Status	.59	.10	1.0
Length of Service to MSU	.60	.12	.4
College of Education	.60	-.15	.2

*Significant at $\alpha = .10$

[a]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to television or radio programs was .45 percent.

TABLE 4.21.--Correlation between selected characteristics of faculty members and their participation in ccntinuing education as a learner[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
Age	.20	.20	1.4*
Hours of Work per Week	.32	.19	3.8*
College of Education	.37	.19	.5
Tenure	.39	-.14	1.4
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.39	.10	.7
College of Business	.41	-.17	.5
Length of Service to MSU	.41	.11	.1

*Significant at $\alpha = .10$

[a]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to continuing education as a learner was 4.4 percent.

All continuing education activities. For continuing education activities as a group, affiliation with the College of Education was the characteristic which most highly correlated (positively) with participation. This was the case even when the instruction of nontraditional students in on-campus credit courses was excluded from the analysis. Faculty members from the College of Education were in general highly involved in a broad range of continuing education activities.

Age and hours per week spent professionally were also significantly correlated with participation in continuing education. Apparently, faculty members who participated highly in continuing education were older and worked somewhat longer hours. (See Table 4.22.)

Correlation between Faculty Characteristics and Faculty Participation in Research

Faculty participation in research was selected for analysis using the step-wise multiple regression procedure in order to provide a basis for comparing continuing education participation patterns with those of a traditional and highly esteemed activity. For the purpose of analysis, research included: primary research, literature reviews, experiments, creative writing, and composing.

Age was the characteristic most significantly correlating (negatively) with faculty participation in

TABLE 4.22.--Correlation between selected characteristics of faculty members and their participation in continuing education[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
College of Education	.52	.52	13.3*
Hours of Work per Week	.55	.07	2.5*
Age	.59	.30	2.3*
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.61	.10	.6
College of Social Science	.62	-.05	1.5
College of Business	.64	-.13	1.7
Tenure Status	.64	.04	.5
Academic Rank	.65	.28	.6
Length of Service to MSU	.65	.09	.2

*Significant at $\alpha = .10$

[a]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to all continuing education activities was 33.5 percent.

TABLE 4.23.--Correlation between selected characteristics of faculty members and their participation in research[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
Age	.57	-.57	9.2*
College of Education	.62	-.38	9.8*
Academic Rank	.67	-.15	4.4*
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.71	.03	4.4*
Hours of Work per Week	.71	.17	.7
Length of Service to MSU	.72	-.40	.9
College of Social Science	.72	.19	.9
College of Business	.72	.09	.4
Tenure	.72	.03	.1

*Significant at $\alpha = .10$

[a]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to research was 20.67 percent.

research. Younger faculty members were more likely to be highly involved in research activities than were older faculty members.

Affiliation with the College of Education was also correlated (negatively) with the degree of involvement in research. This finding was probably in part a result of the service orientation of this college.

Two other characteristics showed significant correlation with participation in research. Academic rank, like age, was significantly correlated (negatively) with faculty members of lower ranks being most highly involved in research. The final characteristics significantly correlating (positively) with the degree of participation in research was the number of professional society memberships held. A strong reason for participating in professional societies could be to ensure a forum for presenting and obtaining research ideas and results. (See Table 4.23.)

Overall results of tests for significant correlation between selected characteristics of faculty members and their participation in each continuing education and research activity are shown in Table 4.24.

Allocation of Professional Time to Continuing Education and Noncontinuing Education Audiences

For each activity in which they participated, faculty members were asked to allocate the time spent according to the audiences served. These audiences were:

TABLE 4.24.--A summary of characteristics of faculty members correlating with participation in selected activities

Activity	Characteristics								
	College of Business	College of Education	College of Social Science	Academic Rank	Tenure Status	Age	Length of Service to MSU	Number of Professional Society Memberships	Hours of Work Per Week
Continuing Education:									
Instruction of Undergraduate Nontraditional Students		-		+	+				
Instruction of Graduate Nontraditional Students		+			+	+	+		
Off-Campus Credit Instruction		+	-	+					
Noncredit Courses					+				
Conferences, Workshops, Institutes		+							
Noncredit Seminars within the Institution									+
Consulting Diagnostic Services		+							+
Presenting Papers or Talks of General Interest									
Showings/Recitals	-	-							
Presenting Television or Radio Programs	+		-	-		+		+	-
Continuing Education as a Learner									+
ALL Continuing Education Activities		+				+			+
Research		-		-		-		+	

+ = Positive Correlation, significant at the .10 level

- = Negative Correlation, significant at the .10 level

1. Undergraduate students, including both traditional and nontraditional students
2. Graduate students, including both traditional and nontraditional students
3. Faculty colleagues
4. Professionals in the faculty member's discipline or field
5. Professionals outside the faculty member's discipline or field
6. The general public and
7. The individual faculty member

In cases such as research or committee work where the audience may not have been known, faculty members were asked to identify the intended audience or clientele. Faculty members allocated their time according to audience so that the total percentage of time allocated to all audiences, for each activity participated in, totaled 100 percent. These data were later combined with the percentage of time allocated to each activity to produce more precise information on the percentage of time allocated to each audience in each activity.

Several faculty members found it difficult to estimate the number of nontraditional students enrolled in their on-campus classes, though they were definitely aware of their presence. They were requested to allocate time on the basis of their best estimates. Three

faculty members within the College of Education suggested that the nontraditional student, as defined in this study, was really the traditional student within their college. For purposes of consistency, however, the definition as initially developed for this study was used uniformly in each college. Faculty members within the College of Education also had difficulty distinguishing between professionals within the field and those in other fields. Teachers, administrators, counselors and similar professional workers in both public and private schools, in educational associations, or county, state and federal departments of education, were generally considered to be within the faculty member's own field; those not so employed were considered not to be. Many faculty members expressed reservations about whether their participation in faculty committees served any audience. Those expressing this sentiment were asked to allocate their time according to the types of concerns addressed by the committees on which they served (e.g., serving on the undergraduate curriculum committee was recorded as serving undergraduates). In general, faculty members had little difficulty identifying major audiences for their specified activities.

Summary data, for all faculty members and for those within each of the four colleges, showing percentages of time allocated to continuing education and noncontinuing education audiences are presented in Table 4.25.

TABLE 4.25.--Mean percentages of time allocated to continuing education and noncontinuing education audiences by faculty members in four colleges

Audience	College				
	Business	Education	Engineering	Social Science	All
Continuing Education:					
Undergraduate students	4.02%	2.38%	4.15%	2.50%	3.26%
Graduate students	4.66	31.28	3.03	8.99	11.99
Faculty colleagues	2.64	2.63	2.33	3.4	2.75
Professionals outside higher education within the faculty member's own field	4.68	14.98	3.5	6.24	7.35
Professionals in other fields	3.68	4.61	1.3	2.63	3.06
General Public	2.04	1.52	1.3	2.83	1.91
Self	2.16	4.25	3.4	2.97	3.2
Sub-Total Continuing Education	23.88	61.65	19.01	29.56	33.52
Noncontinuing Education:					
Undergraduate students	34.61	8.5	44.20	16.04	25.84
Graduate students	17.65	11.83	12.96	23.85	16.57
Faculty colleagues	16.56	10.82	12.58	23.47	15.85
Professionals outside higher education within the faculty member's own field	4.38	3.88	7.32	4.59	5.04
Professionals in other fields	1.54	1.63	1.93	.89	1.49
General Public	1.46	1.53	1.32	.89	1.31
Self	.03	.25	.97	.65	.47
Sub-Total Noncontinuing Education	76.23	38.44	81.28	70.38	66.57
Total--All Audiences	100.11	100.0	100.29	99.34	100.09

Correlation between Faculty Characteristics and Audiences Served by Faculty Members Participating in Continuing Education

The purpose of the following section is to determine which characteristics of faculty members correlated with the extent to which faculty members participating in continuing education served various audiences.

A step-wise multiple regression statistical procedure was used to analyze the extent to which each of these characteristics was significantly correlated with the percentage of time allocated by faculty members' participation in continuing education to each audience. In this procedure, a simple correlation analysis was performed, providing the individual correlation between a given independent variable (characteristic) and the extent to which a given audience was served by faculty participation in continuing education. In the multiple regression procedure, the computer selected the characteristic that was most highly correlated with service to each audience and performed an F test for significance. A second characteristic was then selected by the computer based upon the extent to which it, in combination with the first characteristic, was correlated with service to the audience. This procedure was repeated for all independent variables. The end result was, for each audience considered, information concerning the significance of each characteristic, in relation to all other

characteristics entered in the test, in explaining the extent to which a given audience was served by faculty members participating in continuing education. The results of that analysis are presented and discussed in this section.

Undergraduate students. Undergraduate students were not generally the intended audience for faculty members participating in continuing education. None of the characteristics of faculty members correlated at the .10 level of significance with service to this audience. (See Table 4.26.)

Graduate students. The largest portion of the graduate student audience served by faculty members participating in continuing education was comprised of the nontraditional student participating in on-campus or off-campus credit courses. Affiliation with the College of Education was the only characteristic significantly correlated with service to graduate students by faculty members participating in continuing education. This result was at least partially due to the large off-campus graduate credit program sponsored by the College of Education. (See Table 4.27.)

Faculty colleagues. Only one characteristic, age, was significantly correlated (negatively) with service to other faculty colleagues by faculty members participating in continuing education. Younger faculty

TABLE 4.26.--Correlation between selected faculty characteristics and service to undergraduate students by faculty members participating in continuing education[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.14	-.14	.7
College of Education	.20	.10	1.2
Tenure Status	.23	.12	.9
Academic Rank	.25	.01	.3
Hours of Work per Week	.26	.04	.3
College of Business	.26	-.01	.2
Length of Service to MSU	.27	-.01	.2
Age	.27	-.02	.2

No significance at $\alpha = .10$

[a]While participating in continuing education activities, faculty members directed 3.26 percent of their total time to undergraduate students; they directed an additional 25.84 percent of their total time to this audience while engaged in noncontinuing education activities.

TABLE 4.27.--Correlation between selected faculty characteristics and service to graduate students by faculty members participating in continuing education[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
College of Education	.69	.69	18.4*
Academic Rank	.71	.38	.7
College of Social Science	.72	-.14	1.0
Length of Service to MSU	.72	.06	.9
Age	.73	.25	1.1
Tenure Status	.73	-.26	.3
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.73	.19	.2
Hours of Work per Week	.73	-.09	.2
College of Business	.73	-.24	.04

*Significant at $\alpha = .10$

[a]While participating in continuing education activities, faculty members directed 11.99 percent of their total time to graduate students; they directed an additional 16.57 percent to this audience while engaged in noncontinuing education activities.

members directed more of their efforts in continuing education toward faculty colleagues than did their older counterparts. (See Table 4.28.)

Professionals within the respondent's discipline or field. Only one characteristic, affiliation with the College of Education, was correlated with service to professionals in the respondent's discipline or field by faculty members participating in continuing education. Although the correlation was not statistically significant at the designated level, older faculty members were more involved in serving this audience than were younger faculty members. (See Table 4.29.)

General public. Three characteristics, tenure status, age, and number of professional society memberships were positively correlated with service to the general public by faculty members participating in continuing education. Apparently, the extent to which a faculty member serves the general public is highly related to his/her security and status. Older faculty members with tenure were more involved in serving this audience than were younger faculty members (Table 4.30).

Professionals outside the respondent's discipline or field. Four variables, academic rank of the faculty member, affiliation with the Colleges of Education or Business, and the number of hours spent professionally

TABLE 4.28.--Correlation between selected faculty characteristics and service to faculty colleagues by faculty members participating in continuing education[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
Age	.26	-.26	3.1*
Length of Service to MSU	.32	-.10	1.5
College of Social Science	.34	.18	.8
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.35	-.05	.02
College of Business	.35	.01	.05
College of Education	.35	-.13	.04
Academic Rank	.35	-.11	.04
Tenure Status	.35	.03	.03

*Significant at $\alpha = .10$

[a]While participating in continuing education activities, faculty members directed 2.75 percent of their total time to their faculty colleagues; they directed an additional 15.85 percent of their total time to this audience while participating in noncontinuing education activities.

TABLE 4.29.--Correlation between selected faculty characteristics and service to professionals within the respondent's discipline or field by faculty members participating in continuing education[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
College of Education	.51	.51	9.7*
Age	.53	.24	.2
Hours of Work per Week	.54	-.01	.2
College of Social Science	.55	-.09	.6
College of Business	.56	-.16	.8
Tenure Status	.56	-.07	.7
Academic Rank	.56	.24	.3
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.57	.21	.4
Length of Service to MSU	.57	.10	.02

*Significant at $\alpha = .10$

[a]While participating in continuing education, faculty members directed 7.35 percent of their total time to professionals within the respondent's discipline or field; they directed an additional 5.04 percent of their total time to this audience while engaged in noncontinuing education activities.

significantly and positively correlated with service to professionals in other disciplines by faculty members participating in continuing education. Faculty members with the Colleges of Education and Business spent a significant portion of their time with individuals whom they considered to be in different disciplines, often in consulting roles. Professors tended to allocate more of their time to this audience than did Associate or Assistant Professors, as did those faculty members who worked longer hours.

The number of professional society memberships held was negatively correlated with service to this audience. The meaning of this finding is not readily apparent. (See Table 4.31.)

The individual faculty member. Three characteristics, age, the number of hours per week spent professionally, and affiliation with the College of Education, were significantly correlated (positively) with the degree to which faculty members themselves were the intended audience of their continuing education efforts. Faculty members identified themselves as the intended audience primarily when engaged in their own personal and professional continuing education.

One characteristic, number of professional society memberships, was negatively correlated. This is

TABLE 4.30.--Correlation between selected faculty characteristics and service to the general public by faculty members participating in continuing education[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
Tenure Status	.31	.31	4.1*
Age	.38	.12	3.5*
Length of Service to MSU	.43	-.08	2.3*
College of Business	.45	.04	1.4
College of Social Science	.47	.18	1.2
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.50	.08	2.5*
Hours of Work per Week	.53	-.04	2.0*
Academic Rank	.54	-.14	.2
College of Education	.54	-.09	.1

*Significant at $\alpha = .10$

[a]While participating in continuing education activities, faculty members directed 1.91 percent of their total time to the general public; they directed an additional 1.31 percent of their total time to this audience while engaged in noncontinuing education activities.

TABLE 4.31.--Correlation between selected faculty characteristics and service to professionals outside the respondent's discipline or field by faculty members participating in continuing education[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
Academic Rank	.30	.30	4.57*
College of Education	.35	.27	4.49*
College of Business	.40	.12	3.02*
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.44	-.08	2.92*
Hours of Work per Week	.49	.02	2.69*
Age	.51	.23	.72
College of Business	.52	-.12	.6
Tenure Status	.52	-.17	.1
Length of Service to MSU	.53	.17	.02

*Significant at $\alpha = .10$

[a]While participating in continuing education, faculty members directed 3.06 percent of their total professional time to professionals in other fields; they directed an additional 3.2 percent to this audience while engaged in noncontinuing education.

a very surprising finding, for it is generally assumed that a major function of professional society affiliation is keeping oneself abreast of his field, i.e. continuing professional education. (See Table 4.32.)

TABLE 4.32.--Correlation between selected faculty characteristics and the individual faculty member as an audience[a]

Variable	Multiple Correlation (r)	Simple Correlation	F-score
Age	.25	.25	4.6*
Hours of Work per Week	.39	.21	5.0*
Number of Professional Society Memberships	.43	-.04	2.6*
College of Education	.46	.12	2.1*
Length of Service to MSU	.47	.08	1.1
Tenure Status	.48	-.01	.1
College of Business	.49	-.12	.2
College of Social Science	.49	-.04	.2
Academic Rank	.49	.16	.1

*Significant at $\alpha = .10$

[a]Faculty members participating in continuing education directed 3.2 percent of their total professional time to themselves as an audience.

Reasons for Faculty Participation/Nonparticipation in Continuing Education

Four specific activities--off-campus instruction; conferences, institutes, and workshops; consulting and diagnostic services; and research--were selected for analysis concerning why faculty members did or did not participate in each. The first three activities were selected to be representative of a range of continuing education activity from the more formal and traditional

TABLE 4.33.--A summary of characteristics of faculty members and their correlation with continuing education service to seven audiences

Audience	Characteristics								
	College of Business	College of Education	College of Social Science	Academic Rank	Tenure Status	Age	Length of Service to MSU	Number of Professional Society Memberships	Hours of Work Per Week
Undergraduate Students									
Graduate Students		+							
Faculty Colleagues						-			
Professionals in the Faculty Members Field		+							
Professionals in Other Fields	+	+		+				-	+
General Public					+	+	-	+	-
Self		+				+		-	+

+ = Positive Correlation, at the .10 level of significance

- = Negative Correlation, at the .10 level of significance

to the informal and less traditional. Each also represented three very important forms of knowledge dissemination in continuing education. Research was included in the analysis in order to provide a comparison between the rated importance of reasons for participation/nonparticipation in continuing education and that of a traditional and generally highly esteemed core activity of faculty members.

For each activity, participation was defined as consuming 2 percent or more of the faculty member's time. A faculty member participating in a given activity was asked to rate the importance of each of fourteen potential reasons why he/she, in general, chose to participate in that activity and to add and rate other reasons which may have been salient. A faculty member not participating in an activity was asked to rate the importance of potential reasons why he/she chose not to participate in the activity and, as in the first case, to add and rate any other important reasons.

Analysis of Reasons for Faculty Participation

For each of the four activities--off-campus credit instruction; conferences, institutes, and workshops; consulting/diagnostic services; and research--the total number of faculty members, by college and as a group, who participated in each activity is indicated in Table 4.34.

TABLE 4.34.--Number and percentage of faculty in four colleges participating in four selected activities

College	Activity							
	Off-Campus Credit		Conferences Institutes Workshops		Consulting		Research	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Business	4	33	9	75	11	92	11	92
Education	12	100	11	92	11	92	11	92
Engineering	1	8	5	42	10	83	10	83
Social Science	4	33	9	75	10	83	11	92
Total	21	44	34	71	42	88	43	90

The percentage of faculty members who participated significantly in each of these four activities ranged from 44 percent in off-campus credit instruction to almost 90 percent in consulting and research. The percentage of College of Business faculty members participating in consulting and research was high (92% in each) while the percentage participating in conferences (75%) and off-campus credit instruction (33%) was much lower. The percentage of College of Education faculty members who participated in each activity was high, ranging from 100 percent in off-campus credit instruction to 92 percent in each of the other three activities (conferences, consulting, and research). The percentage of College of Engineering faculty members who participated in consulting and in

research was high (83% in each), but low for off-campus credit instruction (8%) and conferences (33%). The percentage of College of Social Science faculty members participating in research (92%) and consulting (83%) was high. The percentage participating in conferences was 75 percent and in off-campus credit instruction 33 percent.

Overall, the percentage of faculty members in each college who participated in consulting and in research was high. The percentage of faculty members in each college who participated in conferences was high except for the College of Engineering. The percentage of faculty members in each college who participated in off-campus credit instruction was high only for the College of Education.

The data in Table 4.35 reveal the mean faculty ratings of importance for each reason for participation in each of three continuing education activities and in research. The mean score for each reason indicates its degree of importance (1 = no importance, 5 = high importance). Also shown next to the mean score is the rank ordered importance of each reason (1 = most important, 14 = least important).

For the purpose of display and further analysis, reasons for participation listed in Table 4.35 were aggregated into four categories:

1. Intangible personal and professional outcomes
2. Tangible academic or financial rewards

TABLE 4.35.--Mean ratings of importance of reasons for faculty participation in selected continuing education activities and research

Reasons for Participating	Activities							
	Continuing Education						Research	
	Off-campus Credit Instruction n=21		Conferences Institutes Workshops n=34		Consulting n=42		Research n=43	
	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank
Participation personally rewarding	3.95	2	4.0	1	4.05	1	4.51	1
Desire to be of service and share knowledge with public	4.14	1	3.85	2	3.88	2	2.61	6
Develop increased awareness of problems in society	3.29	4	3.38	3.5	3.48	4	3.21	7
Obtain problems for research and study	2.52	9	3.09	6	3.6	3	4.14	2
Opportunity to experiment with new subject matter/modes of teaching	3.67	3	3.03	7	2.85	8	2.77	10
Expected Activity of the profession	2.62	7	3.35	5	2.91	5.5	3.93	4
Expected Activity of a person in my situation	2.62	7	3.38	3.5	2.81	9	3.98	3
Recognition from non-academic professionals in the discipline	2.72	7	2.97	8	2.91	5.5	2.64	13
Increase in pay	3.24	5	1.97	11	2.88	7	2.81	9
Recognition from persons with general interest in the profession or discipline	2.33	10	2.88	9	2.71	10	2.76	11
Recognition from faculty colleagues	1.95	11	2.77	10	2.21	11	3.72	5
Increased prospects of job security	1.43	12	1.74	13	1.69	12	2.93	8
Increased likelihood of consideration for promotion	1.38	13	1.77	12	1.48	13	2.7	12
Increased likelihood of consideration for tenure	1.1	14	1.53	14	1.29	14	2.26	14

1 = High importance; 5 = Low importance

3. Professional or positional expectation
4. Peer or public recognition

Intangible personal and professional outcomes. Five of the most important reasons faculty indicated for participation in both continuing education and in research were intangible personal and professional outcomes. In order of their rated importance as reasons for participation in continuing education activities, reasons related to intangible personal and professional outcomes were:

1. The belief that participation was personally rewarding
2. The desire to be of service and share knowledge with the public
3. Interest in obtaining problems for research and study
4. Developing increased awareness of problems in society
5. The opportunity to experiment with new subject matter or modes of teaching

Ratings of importance and the rank ordered importance for each of these reasons were highly similar between each of the continuing education activities. A few minor differences were noted. Concerning these, faculty members did not believe that obtaining problems

for research and study was as important a reason for participating in off-campus credit instruction as it was for conferences, institutes and workshops, or consulting. Conversely, and as might be expected, the opportunity to experiment with new subject matter/modes of teaching was a more important reason for participating in off-campus credit instruction than it was for conferences or consulting.

When the rated importance of these reasons for participating in continuing education was compared with the rated importance of reasons for participating in research, the desire to be of service and share knowledge with the public was of less importance as a reason for participating in research than in continuing education, as was the development of increased awareness of problems in society. Faculty members also believed that participation was personally rewarding and rated this as an extremely important reason for participation in all continuing education activities.

The mean ratings of importance for reasons and categories of reasons, along with related rank orders, are presented in Table 4.36.

Tangible academic or financial rewards. In general, tangible academic or financial rewards were rated as of very low importance as reasons for participation in continuing

TABLE 4.36.--Mean faculty ratings of importance of intangible personal and professional outcomes as reasons for participating in continuing education and research

Reasons for Participating	Activity							
	Continuing Education						Research	
	Off-Campus Credit n=21		Conferences Institutes Workshops n=34		Consulting n=42		Research n=43	
	Mean Rating*	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank
Participation personally rewarding	3.95	2	4.0	1	4.05	1	4.51	1
Desire to be of service and share knowledge with public	4.14	1	3.85	2	3.88	2	3.61	6
Obtain Problems for Research and Study	2.52	9	3.09	6	3.59	3	4.14	2
Develop Increased Awareness of Society	3.29	4	3.38	3.5	3.48	4	3.21	3
Opportunity to Experiment with New Subject Matter/ Modes of Teaching	3.67	3	3.03	7	2.85	8	2.77	10

*1 = no importance; 5 = high importance

education activities, but were rated as of greater importance as reasons for participation in research. In order of their rated importance as reasons for participation in continuing education activities, tangible academic or financial rewards for participating in continuing education activities shown in Table 4.37 were:

1. Increased pay
2. Increased prospects of job security
3. Increased likelihood of consideration for promotion
4. Increased likelihood of consideration for tenure

Of these reasons, only increased pay was cited as a somewhat important reason for participation in continuing education, especially in off-campus credit instruction.

Increased consideration for promotion and tenure were not generally rated as being of importance as reasons for participation in continuing education. However, it would be logical to expect that promotion and/or tenure would cease to be meaningful incentives once they were achieved by the faculty member. Since thirty-nine of the forty-eight faculty members within the sample were already tenured and almost half were professors, their responses probably greatly lowered the rated importance of these reasons for participating for the sample as a whole. In fact, a comment of more than one tenured faculty member who rated the importance of tenure as an insignificant

TABLE 4.37.--Mean faculty ratings of importance of tangible academic or financial rewards as reasons for participating in continuing education and research

Reasons for Participating	Activity							
	Continuing Education						Research	
	Off-Campus Credit n=21		Conferences Institutes Workshops n=34		Consulting Diagnostic n=42		Research n=43	
	Rank	Rating*	Rank	Rating	Rank	Rating	Rank	Rating
Increase in Pay	5	3.24	11	1.97	7	2.88	9	2.81
Increased Prospects of Job Security	12	1.43	13	1.74	12	1.69	8	2.93
Increased Likelihood of Consideration for Promotion	13	1.38	12	1.77	13	1.48	12	2.7
Increased Likelihood of Consideration for Tenure	14	1.1	14	1.53	14	1.29	14	2.26

*1 = no importance; 5 = high importance

reason for current participation was that "this doesn't mean it wasn't extremely important to me before I had it."

The composition of the sample with respect to academic rank and tenure status suggested a comparison of reasons related to faculty rewards between professors, who already have tenure and full academic rank, associate professors, who generally have tenure but must be concerned about promotion, and assistant professors, for whom both promotion and tenure may represent tangible and potentially significant incentives. One would expect, to the extent that rewards are significant reasons for faculty members participating in continuing education, that they would be more important to assistant and associate professors than to professors. However, this expectation was not confirmed for continuing education activities. With the exception of increased pay for consulting, which was of greater importance to assistant and associate professors than to professors, no major differences between the importance of these reasons for participation in continuing education were observed among the different ranks (see Table 4.38).

While few differences were noted between the importance of reward related reasons given for participation in continuing education activities, major differences were found between the responses of professors, associate professors, and assistant professors with

TABLE 4.38.--The mean ratings of importance of tangible academic or financial rewards for participation in continuing education and research by professors, associate professors, and assistant professors

Activity	Increased Prospects of Job Security			Increased Likelihood of Consideration for Promotion			Increased Likelihood of Consideration for Tenure			Increase in Pay		
	Rank			Rank			Rank			Rank		
	Asst. Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Prof.	Asst. Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Prof.	Asst. Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Prof.	Asst. Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Prof.
	n=1	n=7	n=13	n=1	n=7	n=13	n-1	n=7	n=13	n=1	n=7	n=13
Off-Campus Credit Instruction	1.0 (10.5)*	1.7 (13)	1.3 (12)	1.0 (10.5)	1.9 (12)	1.2 (13)	1.0 (10.5)	1.3 (14)	1.0 (14)	3.0 (7)	3.1 (3.5)	3.3 (5)
	n=6	n=9	n=19	n=6	n=9	n=19	n=6	n=9	n=19	n=6	n=9	n=19
Conferences, Institutes, Workshops	2.3 (12)	2.0 (14)	1.4 (12)	2.5 (10.5)	2.7 (10.5)	1.1 (13.5)	2.0 (14)	2.1 (13)	1.1 (13.5)	2.2 (13)	2.7 (4.5)	1.6 (11)
	n=9	n=14	n=19	n=9	n=14	n=19	n=9	n=14	n=19	n=9	n=14	n=19
Consulting and Diagnostic Services	1.9 (11)	1.6 (13.5)	1.7 (12)	1.4 (13)	1.7 (12)	1.3 (13)	1.2 (14)	1.6 (13.5)	1.10 (14)	2.0 (10)	3.9 (1)	2.5 (10)
	n=8	n=15	n=20	n=8	n=15	n=20	n=8	n=15	n=20	n=8	n=15	n=20
Research	3.1 (8.5)	3.8 (7)	2.2 (12)	3.1 (8.5)	4.3 (5)	1.4 (13.5)	3.3 (7)	3.0 (11)	1.4 (13.5)	2.8 (11)	3.6 (8)	2.3 (11)

*Rank-ordered importance of each reason for each activity indicated in parentheses.

1 = no importance; 5 = high importance

respect to their reasons for participating in research. For assistant and associate professors job security, consideration for promotion and consideration for tenure were all significantly more important reasons for participating in research than each was for professors. This was true for both the mean score, indicating each reason's importance, and its rank, indicating its importance in relation to all other reasons for participation in a particular activity. And for assistant and associate professors, reward related reasons were of much greater importance in their decision to participate in research than they were in their decision to participate in continuing education. This finding illustrates the importance of faculty rewards and would seem to support the arguments of Knox,[1] Votruba,[2] and others that increased consideration of faculty participation in continuing education in the departmental reward structure would be a highly successful mechanism for encouraging more faculty involvement. At present, however, faculty members in a position to be promoted or be granted tenure did not appear to believe that their prospects were enhanced by their participation in continuing education.

---

[1]Knox, New Realities, p. 8.

[2]Votruba, Faculty Rewards, pp. 6-10.

TABLE 4.39.--Mean faculty ratings of importance of professional or positional expectation as reasons for participation in continuing education and research

Reasons for Participating	Activity							
	Continuing Education						Research	
	Off-Campus Credit n=21		Conferences Institutes Workshops n=34		Consulting Diagnostic n=42		Research n=43	
	Mean Rating*	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank
Expected Activity of the Profession	2.62	7	3.35	5	2.91	5.5	3.93	4
Expected Activity of a Faculty Member in a Similar Situation	2.62	7	3.38	3.5	2.81	9	3.98	3

*1 = no importance; 5 = high importance

Professional or positional expectations. In general faculty members believed that they participated in each of the three continuing education activities of interest at least in part because their participation was expected, either by their profession or because of their particular position within their department/college. This belief was a particularly strong reason for participating in conferences, institutes and workshops as it was for research. (See Table 4.39.)

Reasons related to professional or positional expectations were rated as of greater importance by faculty members participating in research than they were by faculty members participating in each of the continuing education activities.

Peer or public recognition. Of varying importance to faculty members as reasons for participation in continuing education were those related to peer or public recognition (see Table 4.40). In order of their rated importance, these were:

1. Recognition from nonacademic professionals in the discipline
2. Recognition from persons with general interest in the profession or discipline
3. Recognition from faculty colleagues

TABLE 4.40.--Mean faculty ratings of importance of peer or public recognition as reasons for participation in continuing education and research

Reasons for Participating	Activity							
	Continuing Education						Research	
	Off-Campus Credit n=21		Conferences Institutes Workshops n=34		Consulting Diagnostic Services n=42		Research n=43	
	Mean Rating*	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank
Recognition from Non-academic Professionals in the Discipline	2.62	7	2.97	8	2.91	5.5	2.64	13
Recognition from Persons with General Interest in the Profession or Discipline	2.33	10	2.88	9	2.71	10	2.76	11
Recognition from Faculty Colleagues	1.95	11	2.77	10	2.21	11	3.72	5

*1 = no importance; 5 = high importance

Of these reasons, recognition from nonacademic professionals was rated as the most important reason for participating in each of the continuing education activities, followed by recognition by the general public. Of least importance was recognition from other faculty. This suggests a belief that faculty members are not disposed to recognize their colleague's endeavors off the campus in the same way that they recognize research and teaching efforts on the campus. At the same time, it appears that the contact with and recognition from nonfaculty professionals offers an alternative though probably less valued way for faculty to be rewarded for their off-campus effort.

Other Reasons for Participating

As a supplement to information collected through use of the instrument, faculty were asked to identify other important reasons for their participation in each activity. The reasons identified were specific and generally referred to only one activity. As a result, it seemed appropriate to discuss these in the context of each specific activity.

Off-campus credit instruction--Several faculty members mentioned that they participated in off-campus instruction because their participation was essential to off-campus degree programs offered by their department. In a sense this comprises a professional expectation.

In addition, the College of Education offered graduate credit classes overseas. For at least two faculty members the opportunity to teach in these classes was a significant reason for their participation. Travel related to these courses was mentioned as an especially attractive feature for their participation, contrasted with a generally negative attitude toward domestic travel.

The College of Business offers an MBA program away from the campus modeled on an executive development concept. One faculty member participating in this program did so because it represented a way of keeping current with and maintaining contact with practicing executives and their problems.

Conferences, institutes, and workshops--For three individuals engaged in off-campus versions of this activity the opportunity to travel represented a significant reason for their participation. Travel in general, however, was regarded negatively by most faculty members; thus, even though three faculty members mentioned it as a reason for their participation, it was not of major positive importance to most faculty.

One faculty member stated that one reason he participated in conferences was to enlarge the role of the department, college and university in societal affairs. In relation to this view, he mentioned the natural inclination of academic disciplines to focus inward rather than

outward; participation in conferences, institutes and workshops represented for him an opportunity to direct his attention outward. Additionally, for several faculty members, the opportunity to exchange information of importance with professional peers was of significant importance as a reason for participating in continuing education. Related to this, several faculty members mentioned their participation in the context of getting to know faculty members from other institutions.

Consulting and diagnostic services--Again, the opportunity to travel was mentioned by one faculty member as a reason for his consulting activities.

Several faculty members reported that they participated in consulting because they believed it directly improved the quality of their on-campus teaching in a variety of ways. According to these faculty members, participation in consulting provided the opportunity to bring "real-life" problems into the classroom, thereby increasing their credibility. Two faculty members mentioned their participation in the context of improving opportunity for students to be involved in practical problems, obtaining additional materials for students and providing them with technical and financial assistance. Additionally several faculty members believed that not to participate in consulting would severely limit their own personal continuing education efforts.

Research--Most of the additional reasons faculty offered for their participation in research were philosophical in nature. Several faculty members stated that they participated in research because they enjoyed the excitement of discovery. Another important reason for participation was related to what one faculty member termed "a scientific obligation to society." The importance of "adding to existing knowledge" was offered by another faculty member for his participation. And finally, the importance of being current and maintaining research interests as a complement to teaching was cited as a reason for participation.

Conclusions and recommendations for further research on reasons for faculty participation are presented in Chapter V. A presentation of the data concerning why faculty did not participate in continuing education and research follows.

Reasons for Faculty Nonparticipation

For each of the four activities--off-campus credit instruction; conferences, institutes, and workshops; consulting and diagnostic services; and research--the generally small number of faculty members (by college and as a group) who did not participate in each activity is indicated in Table 4.41.

TABLE 4.41.--Number and percentage of faculty members who did not participate in four selected activities

College	Activity							
	Off-Campus Credit Instruction		Conferences Institutes Workshops		Consulting		Research	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Business	8	67	3	25	1	8	1	8
Education	0	0	1	8	1	8	1	8
Engineering	11	92	7	58	2	17	2	17
Social Science	8	67	3	25	2	17	1	8
Total	27	56	14	29	6	12	5	10

Overall only five faculty members (10%) allocated less than 2 percent of their time to research and only six faculty members (12%) did not participate in consulting. Noninvolvement in off-campus credit instruction was more widespread with twenty-seven faculty members (56%) who did not participate. These twenty-seven individuals were, however, from only three colleges--Business, Engineering and Social Science. The College of Education had no faculty members within the sample who had not participated in off-campus credit courses. The number of faculty members who did not participate in conferences, institutes and workshops was small (8% for Education and 25% for both Engineering and Social Science) for all but the College of Engineering (58%).

Table 4.42 displays the mean faculty ratings of importance for each reason for not participating in continuing education activities and in research. The mean score for each reason indicates its degree of importance (1 = no importance, 5 = high importance). Also shown is the rank of each reason (1 = highest importance, 14 = lowest importance).

For the purposes of display and further analysis, reasons for nonparticipation listed in Table 4.42 were aggregated into five categories:

1. Inadequate time
2. Inadequate training/preparation
3. Inadequate tangible or academic rewards
4. Lack of information and opportunity
5. Inadequate recognition and status

Inadequate time. Three of the most important reasons for not participating in each of the continuing education activities were time related (see Table 4.43).

In order of their rated importance time-related reasons for not participating in continuing education activities were:

1. Increased demand on personal and family time
2. Lack of professional time
3. Disruptive of regular schedule

TABLE 4.42.--Mean ratings of importance of reasons for faculty nonparticipation in selected continuing education activities and research

Reasons for Not Participating	Activity							
	Continuing Education						Research	
	Off-Campus Credit Instruction n=27		Conferences Institutes Workshops n=14		Consulting n=6		Research n=5	
	Mean Rating*	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank
Increased demand on personal and family time	3.44	1	2.86	3	4.17	1	3.8	1
Lack of professional time	3.37	2	3.0	1.5	4.0	2	3.0	2
Disruptive of regular schedule	2.67	4	2.79	4	3.67	3	1.8	7
Lack of opportunity to participate in activity	3.19	3	2.57	5	3.33	4	2.2	4.5
Inadequate department and college encouragement and support	2.59	5	3.0	1.5	2.5	5.5	2.2	4.5
Lack of information about activity	2.15	7	2.07	7	2.5	5.5	1.0	11.5
Inadequate pay for participation	2.26	6	2.21	6	2.0	9	2.6	3
Inadequate recognition for participation from faculty colleagues	2.04	8	2.0	7	2.5	5.5	1.0	11.5
Lack of consideration in the promotion decisions of the department/college	1.89	9	1.93	9	2.16	7	1.0	11.5
Inadequate recognition for participation from persons with general interest in the discipline	1.78	10	1.71	10.5	1.83	11	1.4	8
Lack of required (or assumed to be required) training/experience	1.42	13	1.71	10.5	2.0	9	2.0	6
Lack of consideration in the tenure decisions of the department/college	1.59	11	1.5	12.5	1.33	13.5	1.0	11.5
Inadequate preparation/ training in working with adults	1.48	12	1.5	12.5	1.33	13.5	1.0	11.5
Inadequate recognition for participation from nonacademic professionals in the field	1.33	14	1.36	14	1.33	14	1.0	11.5

*5 = High importance; 1 = Low importance

TABLE 4.43.--Mean faculty ratings of importance of time related reasons for not participating in continuing education and research

Reasons for Not Participating	Activity							
	Continuing Education						Research	
	Off-Campus Credit Instruction n=27		Conferences Institutes Workshops n=14		Consulting Diagnostic Services n=6		Research n=5	
	Mean Rating*	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank
Increased Demand on Personal and Family Time	3.44	1	2.86	3	4.17	1	3.18	1
Lack of Professional Time	3.37	2	3.0	1.5	4.0	2	3.0	2
Disruptive of Regular Schedule	2.67	4	2.79	4	3.67	3	1.8	7

*1 = no importance; 5 = high importance

In the case of each continuing education activity, faculty members believed that increasing their participation would interfere with other demands on their time or would be disruptive of their normal pattern of professional activity. The five faculty members not participating or participating minimally in research also cited inadequate time as a major reason for not participating in that activity.

However, faculty members who cited time-related reasons for not participating in a given activity were probably also reflecting the low priority accorded that activity in relation to other activities, both professional and personal. One professor made this observation about why he didn't participate in consulting.

> Lack of time? No. Certainly if I really wanted to consult on a more regular basis I could at the expense of some other role that I perform. Basically it comes down to the fact that I would rather do other things with my time.

For every faculty member, limited time forces a choice of which activities to participate in. Research was of such a low priority for five faculty members that they did not participate (and inadequate time was rated as by far the most important reason for their nonparticipation). Consulting was not participated in by six faculty members and again inadequate time was rated as of substantially higher importance as a reason for not participating than were other reasons. Off-campus credit

instruction and conferences, institutes and workshops were not participated in by twenty-seven and fourteen faculty members respectively, and while inadequate time was rated as the most important reason for not participating in these activities, other reasons also assumed greater importance.

Inadequate preparation and training. Of very little importance as a reason for not participating in continuing education activities was the belief by faculty members that they had been inadequately prepared, either in their subject matter or in the methodology of teaching or working with adults (see Table 4.44).

Lack of opportunity, information, and support. Faculty members believed that they did not receive adequate information about opportunities to participate in continuing education activities. Lack of support from the department and college was also rated as a relatively important reason for faculty nonparticipation in continuing education. In order of their rated importance, reasons related to opportunity, information and support for nonparticipation in continuing education, shown in Table 4.45, were:

1. Lack of opportunity to participate in the activity

TABLE 4.44.--Mean faculty ratings of importance of inadequate preparation/training as reasons for not participating in continuing education and research

Reasons for Not Participating	Activity							
	Continuing Education						Research	
	Off-Campus Credit Instruction n=27		Conferences Institutes Workshops n=14		Consulting Diagnostic Services n=6		Research n=5	
	Mean Rating*	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank
Lack of Required (or assumed to be required) Training/Experience	1.42	13	1.71	10.5	2.0	9	2.0	6
Inadequate Preparation/ Training in Working with Adults	1.48	12	1.5	12.5	1.33	13.5	1.0	11.5

*1 = low importance; 5 = high importance

TABLE 4.45.--Mean faculty ratings of importance of lack of information, opportunity and support as reasons for not participating in continuing education and research

Reasons for Not Participating	Activity							
	Continuing Education						Research	
	Off-Campus Credit Instruction n=27		Conferences Institutes Workshops n=14		Consulting Diagnostic Services n=6		Research n=5	
	Mean Rating*	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank
Lack of Opportunity to Participate in Activity	3.19	3	2.57	5	3.33	4	2.2	4.5
Inadequate Departmental/College Encouragement and Support	2.59	5	3.0	1.5	2.5	5.5	2.2	4.5
Lack of Information About the Activity	2.15	7	2.07	7	2.5	5.5	1.0	11.5

*1 = low importance; 5 = high importance

2. Inadequate departmental/college encouragement and support
3. Lack of information about activity

Lack of opportunity and information about the activity were frequently mentioned as reasons for not participating in off-campus credit instruction. A frequent response of faculty members was, "well, no one really asked me to teach off-campus; I suppose if someone had asked, then other reasons might have assumed greater importance." It is also interesting that while these reasons were rated as important reasons for not participating in continuing education, they were not important as reasons for not participating in research.

Inadequate departmental and college support was judged particularly important as a reason for not participating in conferences. Several faculty members cited the unavailability of travel and support funds for participation in off-campus conferences where expenses were not covered by the conference budget. The absence of support for participation in these activities from the department chairman was also mentioned by one faculty member.

Inadequate tangible academic and financial rewards. Lack of tangible academic and financial rewards were rated as only moderately important as a reason why faculty members did not participate in continuing education

(Table 4.46). In order of their rated importance reasons related to tangible academic and financial rewards for nonparticipation were:

1. Inadequate pay for participation
2. Lack of consideration in the promotion decisions of the department/college
3. Lack of consideration in the tenure decisions of the department/college

A large percentage of faculty members in the sample had tenure (80%) and were full professors (53%). For these faculty members, prospects of tenure or promotion probably did not affect their decision to participate or not to participate. Even so, several faculty members interviewed stated that, prior to being granted tenure and/or being promoted, these were important considerations affecting their professional behavior. It is also interesting to note that of five faculty members who did not participate in research, none stated that this was as a result of lack of consideration in either the promotion or tenure decisions of their department.

Inadequate recognition. Inadequate recognition was not a highly important reason why faculty members did not participate in continuing education activities. In order of their rated importance, reasons related to recognition were:

TABLE 4.46.--Mean faculty ratings of importance of lack of tangible academic and financial rewards as reasons for not participating in continuing education and research

Reasons for Not Participating	Activity							
	Continuing Education						Research	
	Off-Campus Credit Instruction n=27		Conferences Institutes Workshops n=14		Consulting Diagnostic Services n=6		Research n=5	
	Mean Rating*	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank
Inadequate Pay for Participation	2.26	6	2.21	6	2.0	9	2.6	3
Lack of Consideration in the Promotion Decisions of the Department/College	1.89	9	1.93	9	2.16	7	1.0	11.5
Lack of Consideration in the Tenure Decisions of Department/College	1.59	11	1.5	12.5	1.33	13.5	1.0	11.5

*1 = low importance; 5 = high importance

1. Inadequate recognition for participation from faculty colleagues
2. Inadequate recognition for participation from persons with general interest in the discipline
3. Inadequate recognition for participation from nonacademic professionals within the discipline or field

Inadequate recognition from faculty colleagues was rated as a more important reason for not participating in continuing education than it was as a reason for not participating in research. Apparently participation in continuing education is believed not to be recognized by faculty members in the same way as is participation in research.

Inadequate recognition from faculty colleagues was also rated as a more important reason for not participating in continuing education than was inadequate recognition from either other professionals or the general public.

Other Reasons for Not Participating

Faculty were also asked to indicate other reasons for not participating in each activity. The reasons for not participating were related to specific activities and will be discussed in that context.

TABLE 4.47.--Mean faculty ratings of importance of inadequate recognition as a reason for not participating in continuing education and research

Reasons for Not Participating	Activity							
	Continuing Education						Research	
	Off-Campus Credit Instruction n=27		Conferences Institutes Workshops n=14		Consulting Diagnostic Services n=6		Research n=5	
	Mean Rating*	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank	Mean Rating	Rank
Inadequate Recognition for Participation from Faculty Colleagues	2.04	8	2.0	8	2.0	9	1.0	11.5
Inadequate Recognition for Participation from Persons with General Interest in the Discipline	1.78	10	1.71	10.5	1.83	11	1.4	8
Inadequate Recognition for Participation from Nonacademic Professionals within the Field	1.33	14	1.36	14	1.33	13.5	1.0	11.5

*1 = low importance; 5 = high importance

Off-campus credit instruction--A reason for not participating in this activity, that was significant for at least three faculty members, was the belief that few off-campus courses were offered in the faculty member's field. Two faculty members in engineering felt that there would be little demand for courses off-campus in their areas of specialty. One faculty member in social science mentioned that his department had turned down a request for a Masters Degree to be offered off-campus. Another faculty member did not participate because he perceived off-campus credit courses to be in general "a low priority of his college and MSU." Still another faculty member mentioned that he was not interested in teaching off-campus because it did not fit with his personal priorities, which revolved around undergraduate teaching and research. One faculty member commented that off-campus credit instruction occurred primarily in the late afternoon and evening and thus conflicted with his recreational periods. As a result, he did not participate.

In general, specific reasons mentioned were indirectly related to a lack of opportunity to participate, the low priority associated with off-campus credit instruction, or the conflict with other potential activities, professional and personal, which their participation would generate.

Conferences, Institutes, Workshops--One faculty member cited the lack of demand for his participation as an additional reason for not participating in more conferences, institutes, and workshops. Another cited the distance one must travel to many conferences, especially of a professional nature, as a barrier to increasing participation.

Consulting and diagnostic services--Contrary to what most faculty members participating in consulting reported, one faculty member suggested that consulting reduced the teaching effort and effectiveness of those who did it. Another faculty member suggested, as previously reported, that consulting on a paid basis was inconsistent with his view of the proper role of a university faculty member.

Research--Only two additional reasons were given by faculty members for not participating in research. Poor equipment inadequate for research was given as a reason by one faculty member. Lack of specific research interests and problems were offered by another. Overall, comments by faculty members indicated that there were few good reasons for not participating in some kind of research. The fact that only five faculty members did not participate at least minimally support this view.

Data related to why faculty did or did not participate in continuing education activities and research

were presented in this section of Chapter IV. Conclusions related to the research findings and recommendations for further research are found in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Purpose of the Study

Continuing education has historically not been a high priority activity of the faculty of most major research-oriented colleges and universities. It often has been, according to many involved with its development, a peripheral and potentially expendable activity. Yet most institutions, public and private, acknowledge responsibility for providing higher education for the nontraditional student and for those citizens beyond the campus perimeter. Indeed, public land-grant universities are charged with this mission.

Faculty members engaged in continuing education have often encountered problems associated with their participation. Informally, faculty prestige and esteem have not been generated through participation in continuing education as they have been through scholarly research. Formally, faculty members participating in continuing education activities have seldom been

credited in the promotion and tenure process for their involvement. As a result of these and other factors, faculty attitudes toward participation in certain forms of continuing education have not been entirely positive.

In spite of these problems, university involvement in continuing education has increased dramatically over the past thirty years. Faculty members have often participated in its various forms without recognizing their activities as continuing education. Employed within this study was a comprehensive definition of continuing education which included within its scope both traditionally recognized continuing education activities (such as off-campus credit instruction) and those activities often overlooked as continuing education (for example, teaching nontraditional students as a part of regular on-campus instruction, participating in radio and television programs, and engaging in a variety of other educative services for adult learners).

The purposes of this study were: (1) to provide information on the total range of professional activities of a selected group of forty-eight faculty members, giving particular attention to the various forms of continuing education in which they participated and the audiences which they served; and (2) to

analyze reasons why these faculty members did or did not participate in certain selected continuing education activities.

Research Design and Methodology

This exploratory research was a case study of a limited sample of faculty members at one university. The major advantage of such an approach was that it made possible through intensive interviews the collection of complex and detailed information, both qualitative and quantitative, on professional activities of faculty members. However, this approach also limited statistical generalizability of the results to other settings within higher education.

Michigan State University, a large public research, teaching and service-oriented land-grant university, was chosen as the setting for this study because its characteristics are widely shared with many other major universities. Although generalizations are risky, to the extent that environmental and other conditions at Michigan State University are also present at other universities, the results of this study are applicable to a wide variety of institutions.

Twelve faculty members were randomly selected and interviewed from each of four colleges--Business, Education, Engineering, and Social Science--at Michigan State University. A schedule standardized interview

format was employed. The interview was organized around two instruments completed by each faculty member. The purpose of the first instrument was to determine the distribution of the faculty member's time across fourteen or more professional activities and across seven or more audiences served. The second instrument was designed so that faculty members could indicate the importance of selected reasons why they did or did not participate in four categories of activities--off-campus credit instruction; conferences, institutes, and workshops; consulting and diagnostic services; and research. The structured interview format permitted the collection of qualitative information while ensuring maximum comparability of responses to particular questions.

Several procedures for analyzing the data were employed. A step-wise multiple regression procedure was used to analyze the extent to which the factors of college affiliation, age, academic rank, number of professional society memberships held, length of service to MSU, and total hours per week spent professionally were correlated with percentage of time faculty members allocated to participation in continuing education and the audiences served. Characteristics of faculty members who were high participators in continuing education were compared with those of faculty members who were low participators. Percentages of time allocated to aggregated sets of

activities (undergraduate instruction, graduate instruction, research, and continuing education) were compared between the four colleges within the study. And finally, the mean rated importance of reasons for participating or not participating in four selected categories of professional activities--off-campus credit instruction; conferences, institutes, and workshops; consulting and diagnostic services; and research--was reported and discussed.

Summary of Findings

This section highlights in summary form the findings of the study presented in Chapter IV. Conclusions drawn from these data and recommendations for further related research are presented in later sections of this chapter.

Faculty Participation in Continuing Education

The forty-eight faculty members interviewed for this study allocated, as a group, 33.5 percent of their total professional time to continuing education activities. Faculty members affiliated with the College of Education allocated the greatest percentage of their total professional time to continuing education (61.7%*). College of Social Science faculty members allocated

---

*Includes percentages of time allocated to non-traditional students.

29.6 percent* and College of Engineering faculty members allocated 19 percent* of their professional time to continuing education.

The continuing education activities most highly participated in by the forty-eight faculty members as a whole were on-campus instruction of nontraditional graduate students (11%), consulting and diagnostic services (7%), continuing education as a learner (4.4%), conferences, institutes, and workshops (3.6%), off-campus credit instruction (3.6%), and on-campus instruction of nontraditional undergraduate students (2.3%). In each of these activities, except for instruction of nontraditional undergraduate students, faculty members from the College of Education allocated greater percentages of their time than did faculty members affiliated with Engineering, Business, or Social Science. In all cases except continuing education as a learner and on-campus instruction of undergraduate nontraditional students, faculty members affiliated with the College of Engineering allocated the least percentage of time to each of the continuing education activities. Professors allocated a greater percentage of their time to continuing education (40%) than did Associate Professors (27.3%) or Assistant Professors (28.3%).

---

*Includes percentages of time allocated to nontraditional students.

A multiple regression correlation procedure was employed to test which, if any, characteristics of faculty were correlated at the .10 level of significance with participation in each continuing education activity, in research, and in the group of continuing education activities taken as a whole.

Participation in on-campus instruction of undergraduate nontraditional students[1] was positively correlated with both academic rank and tenure status, but was negatively correlated with affiliation with the College of Education. It appeared that other characteristics did not significantly correlate with participation in on-campus instruction of undergraduate nontraditional students.

Participation in on-campus instruction of graduate nontraditional students[2] was positively correlated with tenure status, age, length of service, and affiliation with the College of Education. It appeared that other characteristics did not significantly correlate with participation in on-campus instruction of graduate nontraditional students.

---

[1]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to on-campus instruction of undergraduate nontraditional students was 2.3 percent.

[2]Mean percentage of total time allocated by the sample as a whole to on-campus instruction of graduate nontraditional students was 11 percent, the largest percentage allocated to any continuing education activity.

Participation in off-campus credit instruction[1] was positively correlated with academic rank and affiliation with the College of Education. It appeared that other characteristics did not significantly correlate with participation in off-campus credit instruction.

Participation in teaching noncredit courses[2] was positively correlated only with the tenure status of the faculty member.

Participation in conferences, institutes, and workshops[3] was positively correlated only with affiliation with the College of Education.

Participation in noncredit seminars within the institution[4] was positively correlated only with hours per week spent professionally.

---

[1]Mean percentage of total time allocated by the sample as a whole to off-campus credit instruction was 3.58 percent.

[2]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to teaching noncredit courses was an insignificant .16 percent.

[3]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to conferences, institutes, and workshops was 3.6 percent.

[4]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to noncredit seminars within the institution was .25 percent.

Participation in consulting and diagnostic services[1] was positively correlated only with affiliation with the College of Education and with the number of hours per week spent professionally.

It appeared that no characteristics of faculty members were correlated at the .10 level of significance with participation in presenting papers or talks of general interest.[2]

Participation in showings and recitals[3] was negatively correlated with affiliation with both the College of Business and the College of Education. Only faculty members from the College of Engineering reported more than minimal involvement in this activity.

Participation in television or radio programs[4] was positively correlated with age, number of professional society memberships and affiliation with the College of

---

[1]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to consulting and diagnostic services was 7 percent, the second largest allocation of time to any continuing education activity.

[2]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to presenting papers or talks of general interest was .76 percent.

[3]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to showings and recitals was a relatively insignificant .12 percent.

[4]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to television or radio programs was .45 percent.

Business. Participation was negatively correlated with the number of hours per week spent professionally, academic rank, and affiliation with the College of Social Science. It appeared that other characteristics did not significantly correlate with participation in television or radio programs.

Participation in continuing education as a learner,[1] one of the activities most consistently participated in, was positively correlated only with the number of hours of work per week.

Participation in continuing education as a set of activities was positively correlated at the .10 level of significance with age, hours per week spent professionally and affiliation with the College of Education. It appeared that other characteristics did not correlate with overall participation in continuing education.

Faculty Participation in Other Professional Activities

Data concerning faculty participation in non-continuing education activities were also collected and reported.

Faculty members from the Colleges of Business and Engineering allocated the highest percentages of time

---

[1]Mean percentage of time allocated by the sample as a whole to continuing education as a learner was 4.4 percent.

(47% and 46.3% respectively) to instruction of on-campus traditional students, while faculty members within the College of Social Science allocated 31 percent, and faculty members within the College of Education allocated only 15 percent of their time to this activity.

Faculty members from the Colleges of Business (21.5%), Engineering (23.4%), and Social Science (26.1%) allocated relatively equal percentages of time to research, while faculty members in the College of Education reported that 11.5 percent of their time was spent in research.

Participation in research was negatively correlated at the .10 level of significance with age, academic rank, and affiliation with the College of Education. Participation was positively correlated with the number of professional society memberships held. It appeared that other characteristics did not significantly correlate with participation in research.

Audiences Served by Faculty Participation in Continuing Education

Seven potential audiences for faculty members participating in continuing education were identified and defined. Two audiences, undergraduate students and graduate students in on-campus credit classes, were further divided into traditional and nontraditional students. Other audiences identified were faculty

colleagues, professionals outside the university in the respondent's field or one closely associated with it, professionals outside the university in fields unrelated to the respondent's, the general public, and the individual respondent. Four of these audiences--undergraduate and graduate traditional students, faculty colleagues, and the individual faculty member--were largely internal to the university environment. Other audiences--undergraduate and graduate nontraditional students, professionals, and the general public--were, to varying degrees, external to the university.

Faculty members reported that of their total professional time, 9 percent was allocated to serving nontraditional graduate students (in continuing education activities), most prominently in on-campus instruction. An additional 7.4 percent of the faculty members' total professional time was allocated to serving professionals in the faculty members' field or discipline. Other audiences served by faculty members participating in continuing education were professionals in fields other than the faculty members' (3.06%), nontraditional undergraduate students (3.3%), the responding faculty member (3.2%),[1] and faculty colleagues within higher education (2.75%).

---

[1]Usually as a result of participating in his/her own continuing education.

A multiple regression correlation procedure was employed to test which, if any, characteristics of faculty members were correlated at the .10 level of significance with the extent to which each audience was served by faculty members participating in continuing education.

Service to undergraduate students, of which nontraditional students were the major audience for continuing education, was not correlated with any characteristics of faculty members selected for the study.

Service to graduate students, of which nontraditional students were the major audience for continuing education, was correlated only with affiliation with the College of Education. It appeared that no other characteristics were significantly correlated with service to graduate students.

Service to faculty colleagues was not correlated with any of the characteristics of faculty members examined in this study.

Service to professionals in the faculty member's discipline or field was positively correlated only with affiliation with the College of Education.

Service to professionals other than those within the faculty members' discipline or field was positively correlated with affiliation with the College of Business and Education, academic rank, the number of professional

society memberships and hours per week spent professionally. It appeared that no other characteristics were significantly correlated with service to this audience.

Service to the general public was positively correlated with tenure status, age and number of professional society memberships. Service to this audience negatively correlated with hours per week of professional involvement. It appeared that no other characteristics were significantly correlated with service to the general public.

Three characteristics of faculty members within the study were positively related with the extent to which the faculty member engaged in continuing education as a part of his/her own learning effort. These characteristics were hours per week spent professionally, age, and affiliation with the College of Education. One characteristic, hours per week spent professionally, was negatively correlated.

Reasons for Faculty Participation/Nonparticipation in Selected Continuing Education Activities and Research

Faculty members participating in each of four activities--off-campus credit instruction; conferences, institutes and workshops; consulting and diagnostic services; and research-rated the importance of reasons

for their participation. Faculty members not participating in those activities rated the importance of reasons for their nonparticipation.

The most important reasons for faculty participation in continuing education were related to intangible personal and professional outcomes derived from their participation.[1] These reasons for participation were also important for faculty members participating in research.

Except for increased pay, among the least important reasons for participation in continuing education activities were tangible academic or financial rewards.[2] These reasons for participation were rated of greater importance for faculty members participating in research. In this connection they were especially important for lower ranking faculty members.

---

[1]In order of their rated importance as reasons for participating in continuing education, reasons related to intangible personal and professional outcomes were: (1) Participation personally rewarding, (2) Desire to be of service and share knowledge with the public, (3) Develop increased awareness of problems in society, (4) Obtain problems for research and study, and (5) Opportunity to experiment with new subject matter/modes of teaching.

[2]In order of their rated importance as reasons for participating in continuing education, reasons related to tangible academic or financial rewards were: (1) Increased pay, (2) Increased prospects of job security, (3) Increased likelihood of consideration for promotion, and (4) Increased likelihood of consideration for tenure.

Professional or positional expectations[1] were rated of greater importance to faculty members as reasons for participating in research than they were as reasons for participating in continuing education.

Reasons related to peer or public recognition[2] were of varying importance as reasons for participating in continuing education and research. Of these reasons, recognition from both nonacademic professionals and the general public was of greater importance as a reason for participating in continuing education than for research, while recognition from faculty colleagues was rated of more importance as a reason for participating in research.

The most important reasons for not participating in continuing education were time related.[3] These reasons were also the most important for not participating in research.

---

[1]In order of their rated importance, reasons related to professional or positional expectations were: (1) Expected activity of the profession and (2) Expected activity of a faculty member in my situation.

[2]In order of their rated importance as reasons for participating in continuing education, reasons related to peer or public recognition were: (1) Recognition from nonacademic professionals in the discipline, (2) Recognition from persons with general interest in the discipline or field, and (3) Recognition from faculty colleagues.

[3]In order of their rated importance as reasons for not participating in continuing education, reasons related to time were: (1) Increased demand on personal and family time, (2) Lack of professional time, and (3) Disruptive of regular schedule.

The reasons rated least important for not participating in continuing education (and in research) were related to inadequate preparation and training.[1]

Reasons related to lack of opportunity, information, and support were moderately important for faculty members not participating in each of the continuing activities,[2] but were of much less importance to faculty members not participating in research.

Of reasons related to tangible academic and financial rewards, only inadequate pay was rated as even moderately important as a reason for not participating in continuing education. Inadequate pay was also a highly rated reason for faculty members not participating in research. Lack of consideration in the promotion and/or tenure decisions of the department was not an important

---

[1] In order of their rated importance as reasons for not participating in continuing education, reasons related to preparation and training were: (1) Lack of required (or assumed to be required) training/experience and (2) Inadequate preparation/training in working with adults.

[2] In order of their rated importance as reasons for not participating in continuing education, reasons related to opportunity, information, and support were: (1) Lack of opportunity to participate in activity, (2) Inadequate department/college encouragement and support, (3) Lack of information about the activity.

reason by faculty members not participating in either continuing education activities or research.[1]

Reasons related to inadequate recognition for participation were rated not highly important by faculty members not participating in continuing education.[2] Of these reasons, inadequate recognition for participation from faculty colleagues was the most important reason for faculty members not participating in continuing education. None of these reasons was rated important by faculty members not participating in research.

Conclusions

This study was essentially a detailed case study of forty-eight faculty members within four colleges at Michigan State University. Conclusions drawn from the findings are, therefore, statistically limited to this case study. Even so, the conclusions may be tentatively

---

[1] In order of their rated importance as reasons for not participating in continuing education, reasons related to tangible academic and financial rewards were: (1) Inadequate pay, (2) Lack of consideration in the promotion decisions of the department/college, (3) Lack of consideration in the tenure decisions of the department/college.

[2] In order of their rated importance as reasons for not participating in continuing education, reasons related to inadequate recognition were: (1) Inadequate recognition for participation from faculty colleagues, (2) Inadequate recognition for participation from persons with general interest in the discipline, (3) Inadequate recognition for participation from nonacademic professionals within the field.

applied to a wide variety of higher education settings found to be similar to Michigan State University.

Faculty Involvement in Continuing Education

In general, faculty members within the sample were significantly involved in a variety of continuing education activities. These activities ranged from the more traditional activities such as teaching in off-campus credit courses to nontraditional and less widely engaged in forms of continuing education such as television, radio, and showings.

Only four colleges within Michigan State University were selected for study by the investigator. Two of the criteria used for selection were: (1) that an external professional clientele could be identified for each College and (2) that the College be included within the periphery of the university as defined by Benne.[1] Colleges meeting these criteria could be expected to be more highly involved in continuing education than those who do not. Even with that high expectation, however, the degree of involvement by faculty members in this study was surprising. It demonstrates that continuing education within the university is not a minor activity of faculty as some have suggested. In fact, continuing education is

---

[1]Benne, "Adult Education in the University," pp. 413-18.

comprised of a set of activities which, based on the results of this study, are extensively engaged in by faculty members representing a variety of professional fields.

A traditional assumption in continuing education has been that because universities are only marginally committed to continuing education, they are only minimally involved in it. Perhaps the major conclusion of this study is that a reexamination of this assumption is required. Faculty members interviewed as a part of this study were involved in continuing education in many subtle and unrecognized, as well as very obvious, ways both within and outside the commonly identified forms of extension work and the formal structure designed to administer it. With one-third of the professional time of faculty members being spent in continuing education, continuing education represented a commitment of time equal to or exceeding commitment of time to each of three other major functions of a university, viz, research, undergraduate teaching, and graduate teaching.

Faculty members who were most highly involved in continuing education were likely to be affiliated with the College of Education. Of the eleven continuing education activities examined in this study, affiliation with the College significantly correlated with the degree of faculty participation in five. The extent of this

involvement was surprising even though participation was expected to be substantial due to the reliance of teachers and other professional educators upon the college for continuing professional education.

Faculty members in other colleges were also highly involved in continuing education although not on a scale comparable to that of the College of Education faculty. Faculty members within the College of Engineering, for example, participated in continuing education less than did faculty members of other colleges. Even so, about one-fifth of the time of Engineering faculty members was allocated to continuing education activities, representing a sizable commitment on the part of the College and illustrating the substantial involvement of faculty members in these activities.

If a recent trend toward professional licensure continues, it is likely that universities and their faculties will be called upon (and in a sense forced) to provide additional continuing professional education beyond that currently provided. It may be, therefore, that faculty activity in continuing education (at least in the professional schools) will increase from its already high level.

Faculty members who were most highly involved in continuing education were as a group older than those who participated minimally. Because age is also related

to academic rank, tenure status, and length of service to the university, it is probable that all of these factors combine to influence a faculty member's decision to participate in various forms of continuing education. Older tenured faculty members are no longer subject to the same kind of formal review and evaluation which influence the professional careers of younger faculty. They can, therefore, afford the luxury of choice regarding which types of professional activities they engage in. Further, senior faculty members have often established regional and national reputations which create considerable opportunity and demand for their services in continuing education. Especially in activities such as consulting, conferences, and television, those who have achieved prominence could be expected to be high participators.

Junior faculty have a much different set of conditions influencing the way in which their professional time is spent. Whether "publish or perish" is doctrine or myth, younger faculty members participated in research to a much greater degree than did older faculty members. Almost all junior faculty members indicated their belief that performance in research was the most important factor affecting chances for promotion and tenure. Several faculty members suggested that good research would compensate for poor performance in other areas. It was not surprising, therefore, to find junior faculty members at

the Assistant and Associate Professor levels to be more involved in research and less involved in continuing education than were senior faculty. Of considerable interest, however, was the degree to which junior faculty were involved in continuing education and the forms in which this involvement was manifested. Assistant and Associate Professors allocated approximately 28 percent of their time to continuing education activity; this percentage included 10 percent which was allocated to instruction of nontraditional students in on-campus classes. This is a substantial percentage of involvement and actually surpassed the percentage of time they spent in research.

The results of this study also provide indirect confirmation of the importance of normative beliefs about the promotion and tenure process in influencing how faculty spend their time as well as the importance of research within that process. Both research and continuing education are activities which are expected but not required of faculty members while teaching is generally assigned. Several faculty members believed that their participation in research was likely to be rewarded through the promotion and tenure process, at least partly because the product of research, publication, is visible and easily evaluated. Faculty members were much less sure of the value of participation in continuing education within the promotion and tenure process. One Assistant Professor

highly involved in continuing education indicated that his participation might negatively affect his chances for promotion. Clearly if junior faculty are to be encouraged to participate in continuing education, greater weight needs to be given to participation in the promotion and tenure process; or if such weight is given that fact needs to be communicated more effectively to faculty members, especially those of lower ranks.

The findings of this research serve to confirm statements of Stern,[1] Knox,[2] and others that continuing education has moved closer to being a mainstream activity of the faculty in higher education. Certainly if degree of involvement is an appropriate measure of commitment to a concept, the faculty members within this sample were highly committed to continuing education in general and to specific activities in particular. Stated another way, the findings do not confirm or support the assumption that continuing education is a minor activity of a university, although participation in it may continue to be marginally supported within the reward structure.

---

[1]Stern, "Trends and Tangents," pp. 157-59.

[2]Knox, "New Realities," p. 8.

Audiences Served by Faculty Participation in Continuing Education

Continuing education (as such or under related terms such as public service, university outreach extension) is comprised of a set of activities designed to serve clienteles primarily external to the traditional student body of the university. This research, in addition to examining the degree of faculty participation in continuing education, was also concerned with identifying the extent to which such various audiences were served.

Nontraditional students in on-campus instruction were a major audience of faculty members participating in continuing education. This audience was large for faculty members from the College of Education in part because of the College's program of late afternoon and evening classes as well as the emphasis on credit for teacher certification and upgrading. However, it was also quite substantial for faculty members from other colleges who indicated that a minimum of 7.2 percent (Engineering) of their time was directed toward this audience through their participation in continuing education. This illustrates the importance of one rapidly growing and frequently neglected way in which the university serves the continuing education needs of its constituency, i.e., through the regular on-campus credit program offered at hours and under conditions convenient to the nontraditional student.

Other major audiences reported by faculty members participating in continuing education included professionals, both within the faculty member's own field or closely related to it. Since each college included within the study was oriented to an external professional clientele these results were not surprising. The findings do, however, illustrate the importance of professionals outside the university in influencing the types of activities engaged in by faculty. As professionals increasingly become subject to recurrent certification requirements, the percentage of faculty time directed to this audience may also expand.

Only a small percentage of time was devoted to serving the general public through continuing education activities. Most faculty members who allocated little or none of their time to this audience felt there would be little interest in the technicalities of their areas of expertise among the general public. It should be noted, however, that if the general public were defined to include professionals outside the university, faculty members participating in continuing education would spend about one-eighth of their time directly in service to this aggregate audience, a substantial commitment.

In summary, the university serves a diverse set of audiences through the continuing education activities of its faculty. Faculty members affiliated with

professionally oriented colleges such as those represented by this sample were primarily concerned with continuing professional education.

Reasons for Faculty Participation/Nonparticipation

The rated importance of reasons why faculty members did or did not participate in four selected activities--off-campus credit instruction; conferences, institutes, and workshops; consulting and diagnostic services; and research--was reported and analyzed. The degree of importance for each reason was determined by asking faculty members to rate how important each particular reason was to them in their decision to participate (not participate) in each activity.

Faculty members participating in continuing education activities rated intangible personal and professional reasons for participation in continuing education as of greater importance than those which benefited the faculty member materially (tangible academic or financial rewards) or in terms of status (recognition from faculty, professionals or the general public). While one would not expect faculty members to deemphasize their personal or professional reasons for participation in any activity, it is interesting to note that reasons related to promotion, tenure, increased job security, and recognition received much higher ratings as reasons for participating

in research than they did as reasons for participation in continuing education. This indicates that faculty members believed that they enhanced their prospects for these outcomes substantially by participating in research but very little by participating in any of the three forms of continuing education. For younger faculty members most subject to the pressure of the promotion and tenure process, this belief was manifested through higher than average participation in research and lower participation in continuing education.

Perhaps of even greater importance, however, faculty members chose to participate in continuing education for a variety of personal and professional reasons. This suggests that, even though participation in continuing education was not believed to be formally recognized or rewarded in the same manner as research, faculty members believed it in their best personal and professional interest to participate.

The most important reasons for not participating in continuing education were related to inadequate time or scheduling problems. It would seem, however, that time is a reflection of personal and professional priorities, and a faculty member's decision not to participate in continuing education (or research) is a result of the way his/her time is prioritized. Interestingly, time was the only reason rated even moderately important

by faculty members not participating in research, indicating perhaps that faculty believed that there were few good reasons other than personal choice for not participating in research.

Tangible academic or financial rewards were not rated as important reasons for not participating in continuing education. Apparently faculty members participated in many forms of continuing education in spite of, rather than because of, pay or consideration in the promotion/tenure process.

Recommendations for Further Research

The purpose of this research was to provide information on faculty participation in continuing education. Several areas for further research related to this objective were suggested by the results of this study.

First, an interinstitutional study would, if similar definitions and methodology were used, widen the applicability of the results of this research. Further, a replication of this type of study in a different kind of institution (a liberal arts college or a community college, for example) might show different patterns of involvement in continuing education.

A comparison of faculty patterns of involvement found in dissimilar types of colleges (and departments) within a major university would also build upon this

research. In this type of comparison, colleges could be studied in detail and placed into groups based on certain theoretical constructs. Their patterns of faculty involvement in continuing education could then be compared based on these constructs. Among those constructs suggested by this study which may affect the forms and degree of involvement of faculty members in continuing education are the colleges' orientation to different sectors of employment (public versus private), the degree to which each is concerned with technology and its advancement, the extent to which a college is oriented to application of knowledge versus knowledge generation. All of these characteristics and others may affect involvement of faculty members in continuing education, the specific forms this involvement takes, the audiences served, and the reasons for faculty participation or non-participation.

Finally, a study employing an experimental design which could control for various incentives or disincentives potentially influencing participation in continuing education would add valuable knowledge concerning why faculty participate in continuing education. This controlled state of affairs is difficult to achieve in an academic setting. As a result, some researchers have developed a simulated set of conditions which approximate those which would exist in a controlled environment and

have asked faculty members to respond based on simulated or assumed conditions. This approach might provide valuable insights into the factors which influence the degree of faculty participation in and/or commitment to continuing education.

Implications for Professional Practice

A comprehensive definition of continuing education was employed in this study. This definition was intended to include a broad range of activities through which the university and its faculty respond to the educational needs of nontraditional adult learners.

Faculty members in this study were highly involved in these various continuing education activities. Time commitment ranged from almost 20 percent of total professional time for faculty members affiliated with the College of Engineering to 60 percent of total professional time for faculty members affiliated with the College of Education. This finding did not support a recurring theme of the literature in higher continuing education that continuing education was engaged in only minimally by most faculty. Based on the results of this study, faculty members at Michigan State University are involved in a broad range of continuing education activities which represent a sizable time commitment on their part.

A major question in recent years for those professionally involved or responsible for university

continuing education has been how to increase faculty involvement. The results of this study indicate present substantial involvement and suggest a need for a shift in emphasis away from increasing overall faculty involvement to documenting and rewarding ongoing involvement as well as ensuring its quality.

Even though faculty members in this study were highly involved in various forms of continuing education, their participation has not enjoyed the same kind of academic legitimacy as has research. Faculty attitudes toward continuing education have not been entirely favorable, and participation in it has often not been rewarded as participation in research has been, either formally through promotion and tenure or informally through increased professional recognition and status. Faculty members in this study who participated in research cited these rewards as important or moderately important reasons for their participation in research but not for their participation in continuing education. Faculty members who participate in continuing education as a part of their academic responsibilities should be rewarded in the same manner as they or their colleagues are for participation in research and on-campus instruction.

The most immediate and powerful application of reward occurs within the academic department. Reward and encouragement distributed from outside the

department cannot fully compensate for their absence within. Those interested in shaping the development of continuing education should examine mechanisms through which academic departments would have greater incentive to document and evaluate their faculty members' efforts in continuing education, as is currently done with research and on-campus instruction.

And finally, because the historical development and focus of each university and college has been unique, patterns of participation in continuing education found at one university cannot be presumed to apply for all. It would thus seem important for each university interested in increasing or improving its own faculty's pattern of involvement in continuing education to begin by documenting and analyzing its probably already substantial level of participation. This study could be used in this effort as a general model for conceptualizing the scope of continuing education within a major university.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE CORRESPONDENCE WITH DEANS OF BUSINESS, EDUCATION, ENGINEERING, LIFELONG EDUCATION AND FACULTY MEMBERS SELECTED FOR THE STUDY

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE CORRESPONDENCE WITH DEANS OF BUSINESS, EDUCATION, ENGINEERING, LIFELONG EDUCATION AND FACULTY MEMBERS SELECTED FOR THE STUDY

March 22, 1977

Dean
Campus

Dear Dean :

Thank you for taking the time to meet with me today concerning my dissertation research.

As you know, the objectives of my study are to (1) Develop information concerning faculty participation in nontraditional activities at Michigan State University and (2) Analyze self-expressed reasons why they do or do not participate in specific activities. I plan to interview a total of approximately fifty faculty members evenly divided between the Colleges of Business, Social Science, Education and Engineering. The interviews will be conducted Spring Term.

I greatly appreciated your interest and your comments and suggestions concerning the study. The results should be available by the end of the year and I would be happy to share them with you.

Cordially,

Donald E. Hanna
Ph.D. Candidate,
Administration and Higher
Education

March 31, 1977

Professor
Campus

Dear Professor :

I am conducting a study of MSU faculty participation in a variety of nontraditional activities. The purpose of the study is to find out the types of nontraditional activity engaged in by faculty and their reasons for participating or not participating in these activities.

As a part of this study, a limited number of faculty (approximately forty-eight total) will be interviewed. You are one of twelve faculty members selected to be interviewed from the College of Social Science. The interview should take no more than one hour and can be arranged at your convenience. Because of the small number of individuals to be interviewed, your participation is extremely important.

This study is being conducted under the direction of Professor Russell J. Kleis of the College of Education, and when completed, will fulfill the dissertation requirement for the Ph.D. degree. All information collected for this study will be treated as absolutely confidential. Your name will not appear nor be associated with the study in any way.

I will be calling you in a few days as a follow-up to this letter. Hopefully at that time we can arrange an interview time convenient for you. As I've already mentioned, the interview should take one hour or less to complete. However, if you choose not to participate, kindly complete and return the enclosed post card.

Your cooperation and participation in this study are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Donald E. Hanna
Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Administration
and Higher Education

Enc.

APPENDIX B

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

APPENDIX B

PERSONAL DATA SURVEY

AGE _____

COLLEGE OF AFFILIATION

COLLEGE OF _____

EDUCATION (Circle highest degree obtained)

1. Bachelor's Degree
2. Master's Degree
3. Ph.D. Degree

ACADEMIC RANK

1. Assistant Professor
2. Associate Professor
3. Professor
4. Other (Please specify _____)

TENURE STATUS

1. Tenured
2. Tenure stream appointment/not tenured
3. Temporary appointment

AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS OF PROFESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT PER WEEK

_____

LENGTH OF SERVICE TO MSU

_____

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY ACTIVITY

# of Memberships _____ # of Committee Memberships _____

# of Committee Leadership Roles _____

Offices Held the Past Three Years _____, _____

_____, _____

DESCRIPTION OF CATEGORIES OF FACULTY ACTIVITIES

1. On-campus credit instruction includes time spent in the instruction of credit seminars and classes, academic advising, new course development, class preparation, development of new class activities, advising graduate students, supervising teaching assistants, and thesis and dissertation advising.

2. Off-campus credit instruction includes time spent in the instruction of credit seminars and classes, academic advising, new course development, class preparation, development of new class activities, etc., all related to instruction at off-campus sites for students primarily enrolled in an off-campus situation.

3. Noncredit courses includes time spent preparing for and teaching in long-term noncredit instructional situations, whether on or off-campus. Development of new instructional activities and advising of students within the classes should be included.

4. Conferences, institutes, and workshops activity includes all noncredit instructional activities of a short-term nature involving the faculty member in the role of presenter, planner, resource person, evaluator, etc. Include both on-campus activity and professional conference activity in which these roles were performed.

5. Noncredit seminars within the institution includes all seminars in which the role of instructor, resource person, expert, etc. was performed. (Note: must not be for credit)

6. Consulting, advising and diagnostic services activities include all situations in which professional advice or assistance is given to individual or groups, other than regular on-campus students and faculty associates, and related to the resolution or clarification of a problem. No distinction is made with respect to whether the activities are considered part of the regular responsibilities of the faculty member or are performed on an overload or fee basis.

7. Presenting papers or talks unrelated to research includes all situations in which faculty provide overviews of a problem or issue related to their academic area. Exclude all such talks which were formally part of a conference, workshop, seminar, etc.

8. Showings and recitals are presentations intended for and open to the general public; recitals, exhibitions, open houses, etc.

9. Presenting radio and television programs includes programs intended primarily for the general public, practitioners and professionals. Exclude presentations part of regular credit instruction.

10. Primary research, literature reviews, experiments include activities designed to advance the state of knowledge in a given field. Exclude time spent presenting results at conferences, meetings, etc., but include all preparation time for such presentations.

11. Composing, writing and works of art include creative activities of many types, such as writing a textbook, a novel, composing a musical piece, inventing a new machine, etc.

12. Reading, attending seminars and continuing education programs include all professional development activities designed primarily to increase competence, knowledge and ability. Include attendance at professional conferences in attending primarily as a learner rather than presenter, resource person, etc.

13. Faculty committee assignments and other administrative duties include all department, college and university committee activity and other administrative activity. Exclude activities related to instruction such as supervision of graduate assistants, and activity related to research projects unless solely restricted to administration.

14. Professional society duties and responsibility includes all service performed in support of any professional society or organization to which one belongs, including service as an officer, on various committees and other general services. Exclude formal presentations which occur at professional meetings.

FACULTY TIME ALLOCATION

ACTIVITY	PERCENTAGE OF TIME/PROFESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT
1. On-campus credit instruction	
2. Off-campus credit instruction	
3. Noncredit courses	
4. Conferences, institutes, workshops	
5. Noncredit seminars within institution	
6. Consulting, diagnostic services, advising	
7. Presenting papers unrelated to research	
8. Showings, recitals	
9. Presenting television and radio programs	
10. Primary research, literature reviews, experiments	
11. Composing, writing, works of art	
12. Faculty committee assignments, administrative duties	
13. Attending seminars and continuing education as a learner	
14. Professional society duties and responsibility	

PERCENTAGE OF FACULTY EFFORT ACCORDING TO AUDIENCE

Activity \ Audience	Undergraduate Students		Graduate Students		Faculty Colleagues and Academicians	Nonacademic Professionals and Practitioners within field	Professionals and Practitioners in other fields	General Public	Self	Total
1. On-campus credit instruction		Traditional		Traditional						
		Nontraditional		Nontraditional						
2. Off-campus credit instruction										
3. Noncredit courses										
4. Conferences Institutes Workshops										
5. Noncredit seminars within institution										
6. Consulting, Diagnostic services, Advising										
7. Presenting papers unrelated to research										
8. Showings, Recitals										
9. Presenting television and radio programs										
10. Primary research, Literature reviews Experiments										
11. Composing, Writing, Works of art										
12. Faculty committee assignments and other administrative duties										
13. Attending seminars, conferences, and other activities as a learner										
14. Professional Society Duties and Responsibility										

REASONS FOR PARTICIPATION

ACTIVITY_____

Given the situation as it has existed in your department and college the past two years, rate each of these factors listed below with respect to how important it was in influencing your decision to participate in this activity.

Rating Scale	Of No Importance 1	2	Moderately Important 3	4	Extremely Important 5
Desire to be of service and share knowledge with public	1	2	3	4	5
Increased prospects of job security	1	2	3	4	5
Expected activity of the profession	1	2	3	4	5
Increase in pay	1	2	3	4	5
Obtain problems for research and study	1	2	3	4	5
Develop increased awareness of problems in society	1	2	3	4	5
Opportunity to experiment with new subject matter/modes of teaching	1	2	3	4	5
Increased likelihood of consideration for promotion	1	2	3	4	5
Participation personally rewarding	1	2	3	4	5
Expected activity of person in my situation	1	2	3	4	5
Recognition from faculty colleagues	1	2	3	4	5

Rating Scale	Of No Importance 1	2	Moderately Important 3	4	Extremely Important 5
Increased likelihood of consideration for tenure	1	2	3	4	5
Recognition from non-academic professionals in the discipline	1	2	3	4	5
Recognition from persons with general interest in the profession or discipline	1	2	3	4	5
Other_____	1	2	3	4	5

REASONS FOR NOT PARTICIPATING

ACTIVITY_____

Given the situation as it has existed in your department and college the past two years, rate each of these factors listed below with respect to how important it was in influencing your decision not to participate in this activity.

Rating Scale	Of No Importance 1	2	Moderately Important 3	4	Extremely Important 5
Inadequate pay for participation	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of information about activity	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of recognition for participation from faculty colleagues	1	2	3	4	5
Inadequate preparation/ training in working with adults	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of consideration in the tenure decisions of the department/college	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of recognition for participation from persons with general interest in the discipline	1	2	3	4	5
Increased demand on personal and family time	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of adequate departmental and college encouragement and support	1	2	3	4	5

RATING SCALE

	Of No Importance 1	2	Moderately Important 3	4	Extremely Important 5
Disruptive of "regular" schedule	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of opportunity to participate in activity	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of consideration in the promotion decisions of the department	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of recognition for participation from nonacademic professionals in the discipline	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of time	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of required (or assumed to be required) training/ experience	1	2	3	4	5
Other_____	1	2	3	4	5

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Balyeat, Ralph E. Factors Affecting the Acquisition and Retention of College Faculty. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia, 1968.

Bornheimer, Deane G.; Burns, Gerald P.; and Dumke, Glenn S. The Faculty in Higher Education. Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1973.

Brubacher, John S., and Rudy, Willis. Higher Education in Transition. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.

Burch, Glenn. Challenge to the University. Boston: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1961.

Burris, Russell W. University Resource Support for Non-Traditional Study. Iowa City, Iowa: The University of Iowa Division of Extension and University Services, 1973.

Carey, James T. Forms and Focus in University Adult Education. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1961.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Less Time--More Options: Education Beyond the High School. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

_____. The More Effective Use of Resources: An Imperative for Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Caplow, Theodore, and McGee, Reece J. The Academic Marketplace. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1958.

Clark, Burton. The Marginality of Adult Education: A Study of Institutional Insecurity. Berkley: University of California Press, 1956.

Draper, N. R., and Smith, H. Applied Regression Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Dyer, John P. Ivory Towers in the Marketplace. New York: Bobbs Merrill Company, 1956.

Etzioni, Amitai. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: Free Press, 1961.

Eurich, Alvin C., ed. The Shape of the Future in Higher Education. New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1968.

Fishbein, Martin, and Ajzen. Beliefs, Attitudes, Intention and Behavior. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1975.

Gaff, J. G. Toward Faculty Renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Grattan, C. Hartley. In Quest of Knowledge. New York: Associated Press, 1955.

Hodgkinson, Harold G. "Assessment and Reward Systems." In New Teaching-New Learning--Current Issues in Higher Education, 1971. Edited by G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Houle, Cyril O. Major Trends in Higher Adult Education: Notes and Essays on Education for Adults. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1959.

Ingham, Roy J., ed. Institutional Backgrounds of Adult Education. Boston: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1966.

Knowles, Malcolm S. The Modern Practice of Adult Education. New York: Association Press, 1970.

_____. The Adult Education Movement in the United States. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Ladd, Everett C., and Lipset, Seymour M. The Divided Academy. New York: McGraw Hill, 1975.

Lewis, Lionel S. Scaling the Ivory Tower. Washington, D.C.: The John Hopkins University Press, 1975.

Liverwright, A. A. "Adult Education in Colleges and Universities." In Handbook of Adult Education in the United States. Edited by Malcolm Knowles. Chicago: Adult Education Association of the United States, 1960.

McMahon, Ernest E. An End to Confusion: Notes and Essays on Education for Adults. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1965.

Medsker, Leland; Edelstein, Stewart; et al. Extending Opportunities for a College Degree: Practices, Problems, and Potential. Berkley: University of California, 1975.

Morton, John R. University Extension in the United States. Birmingham, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1953.

Ortega y Gasset, Jose. Mission of the University. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944.

Peterson, Renee, and Peterson, William. University Adult Education. New York: Harper Brothers, 1960.

Postman, Lee; Bruner, Jerome S.; and McGinnes, Elliott. "Personal Values as Selective Factors in Perception." In Readings for Introductory Psychology. Edited by Richard C. Teevan and Robert C. Birney. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1965.

Ratchford, C. Brice. "Organizing to Accomplish Public Service Objectives." In Proceedings of National Conference on Public Service and Extension in Institutions of Higher Education. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia, 1974.

Report of the Planning Committee on Extension and Adult Education. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1970.

Report of the President's Task Force on the Extended University. University of California, 1971.

Richardson, Stephen A.; Dohrenwend, B.; and Klein, David. Interviewing. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965.

Stecklein, John E. How To Measure Faculty Workload. Washington, D.C.: The American Council on Education, 1961.

Strother, George B. "The Universities' Role in Public Service and Extension." In Proceedings of National Conference on Public Service and Extension in Institutions of Higher Education. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia, 1974.

Stecklein, John E. "Methods of Analyzing, Expressing and Reporting Faculty Load Data." In Faculty Work Load. Edited by Kevin Bunnell. Washington, D.C.: The American Council on Education, 1960.

Task Force on Lifelong Education. The Lifelong University. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1973.

Whipple, James B., and Chertow, Doris S., eds. The University and Community Service: Perspectives for the Seventies. Syracuse: Syracuse University Publications in Continuing Education, 1970.

Articles and Journals

Benne, Kenneth. "Adult Education in the University." Journal of Higher Education 27 (November 1956): 413-18.

Bess, James L. "Patterns of Satisfaction of Organizational Prerequisites and Personal Needs in University Academic Departments." Sociology of Education 46 (Winter 1973): 99-114.

Byrum, Linda M. "Analysis of University of Illinois Policies Which Affect Faculty Participation in Continuing Education and Public Service." Paper submitted for class in Adult, Higher and Continuing Education 486, University of Illinois (Spring 1977).

Dahle, Thomas L. "Faculty Attitudes toward the Division of Continuing Education at the University of Oregon." Paper presented at the National Seminar on Adult Education Research, Chicago, Illinois, 1969.

Day, H. P. "University Public Service: Which Public, Which Service?" Adult Leadership 24 (November 1975): 85.

Gordon, Morton. "The Organization of Continuing Education in Universities and Colleges." NUEA Spectator 37 (September 1974).

Knox, Alan B. "New Realities: The Administration of Continuing Higher Education." NUEA Spectator 39 (December 1975).

Mannon, James. "Value Commitment in a Normative Organization." Journal of Educational Research 65 (October 1972): 14-16.

Michigan State University Board of Trustees. Policy Statements Concerning Lifelong Education at Michigan State University, June 20, 1975.

Patton, Carl V. "Extended Education in an Elite Institution; Are There Sufficient Incentives to Encourage Faculty Participation?" Journal of Higher Education 46 (July 1975): 427-44.

Pennfield, Kathleen. "Public Service versus Academic Values: University Extension in Conflict." Adult Education 25 (Winter 1975): 107-24.

Stern, Milton R. "Trends and Tangents." Journal of Higher Education 40 (February 1969): 157-59.

Votruba, James; Kozoll, Charles; and Anderson, Thomas. "A Profile of Extramural Faculty at the University of Illinois." Internal study of Continuing Education and Public Service, University of Illinois, 1975.

Dissertations

Abbett, William. "An Analysis of Actual and Preferred Patterns of Faculty Activity in the College of Engineering at Michigan State University." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1974.

Connolly, John J. "A Study of Faculty Involvement in Community Service Programs." Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1972.

Dekker, Tunis H. "Faculty Commitment to University Adult Education." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1965.

Ferguson, John B. "Job Satisfaction and Job Performance within a University Faculty." Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1960.

Genick, Raymond M. "Faculty Concepts of Off-Campus Continuing Education Programs Offered Through the Division of Urban Extension, Wayne State University." Ph.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1972.

Hale, Larry Avon. "Perceptions of University Academic Department Chairmen as Related to the Degree of Participation of University Departments in Continuing Education." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1969.

Kane, Francis John. "Perceptions of Department Chairmen from Selected Public Universities in Southwestern United States as Related to the Degree of Participation of Their Departments in Continuing Education Programs." Ed.D. dissertation, New Mexico State University, 1973.

McElhaney, James H. "Attitudes of Selected Professors at the Ohio State University Regarding Their Workloads." Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1959.

Porter, Lee. "Faculty Attitudes Towards Selected Aspects of a Multidimensional University Continuing Education College." Ph.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1969.

Stewart, Michael O. "Correlates of Faculty Reward." Ph.D. dissertation, Kansas State University, 1972.

Tarvin, Robert E. "Faculty Motivation." Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1972.

Wilde, Simpson Ownbey. "A Study of the Evaluation of Extension Courses Offered for Credit at Six State-supported Institutions of Higher Education in North Carolina." Ed.D. dissertation, North Carolina University, 1965.

Young, Robert E. "The Effect of Five Factors on University Faculty Members' Participation in Instructional Improvement." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1976.