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**Abstract**

The objective of this paper is to provide a multi-faceted analysis of the perceptions and workplace context for junior (assistant) professors in the highly decentralized Canadian “system”. Drawing on recent studies conducted by the authors on Canadian university tenure processes and faculty remuneration in order to provide a context, the paper will focus on the perceptions of assistant professor respondents to the Canadian component of the Changing Academic Professions (CAP) survey, compared with their more senior (associate and full professor) peers. Our analysis suggests that junior faculty perceive the academic workplace as reasonably positive and supportive. In addition to relatively high levels of satisfaction, institutional support, and remuneration, the findings suggest that there are minimal substantive differences in levels of work and work patterns between junior and more senior faculty, a finding that is at odds with the general literature and common sentiment. The differences that do emerge appear to be more modest and nuanced than is popularly characterized.

**Introduction**

In 2007-08 Canadian universities employed 39,855 full-time faculty. Approximately 68% of all full-time faculty were in tenure-stream appointments, with 19,137 (48%) holding tenure, and 7803 (20%) in pre-tenure appointments (Canadian Association of Universities Teachers, 2010). Thirty-two percent of all full-time faculty (12,915) held appointments that were not tenure-stream, and this fact, combined with the growth of sessional, part-time and other contractual teaching appointments at Canadian universities (Rajagopal, 2002), has led many observers to conclude that there has been an increasing fragmentation and differentiation of academic work between employee groups (Muzzin, 2009), and that the academic workplace is changing in response to the existence of new categories of employment, increasing student/faculty ratios, decreasing government support, and new investments combined with increasing expectations in research (Jones, 2007). Academic work is clearly changing, but while there is considerable agreement on the marginalization of sessional/contract university teachers, relatively little is known about the experiences and perceptions of full-time, tenure-stream faculty, especially the perceptions of early career faculty who may be struggling to obtain tenure in this changing environment.

Our objective in this paper is to provide a brief review of key contextual features of the academic workplace in Canadian universities, relate these features to the shifting global contexts and conditions of academic work, and then, drawing on a national survey of Canadian university faculty collected for the Changing Academic Profession (CAP) project, compare the perceptions reported by early career faculty with their more senior peers. This analysis situates the Canadian case within a broader international context in order to test assumptions in the literature that junior and senior faculty members are experiencing changes in university governance and support in radically different ways.

The major findings are twofold: Canadian full-time tenure stream faculty members, regardless of rank, are operating under reasonable, if not favourable, working conditions; and despite rhetoric and evidence indicating a divergence in responsibilities and pressures between junior and senior ranking faculty in the broader international literature, the limited differences reported in the CAP survey between junior and senior faculty in Canada appear to counter the predominant narrative.

**The International Context of Academic Work**

 One of the major catalysts for this paper is the need to gain a better understanding of how 21st century conditions and pressures are influencing the experiences of Canadian academics within the academic workplace and how academics are in turn conceptualizing the state of the profession. While this study is grounded in the Canadian context, the authors recognize that national systems are embedded in particular historical traditions with highly contextualized developmental trajectories.

 There are three major global trends that help to situate this study’s analysis of junior faculty in the Canadian jurisdiction: the increasing differentiation of national post-secondary systems and institutions, and, as a result, their academic workforces; the introduction of staff management techniques and system-wide accountability frameworks; and lastly, the current and impending demographic shifts in the academic labour forces of many Western jurisdictions. The intersection of these common realities and their manifestation in universities and their national systems are of great significance to the context of early career academics, as they represent the significant structural and environmental conditions that currently determine the conditions under which new faculty members are entering the academy and subsisting within the academic profession.

Issues of system-wide and institutional differentiation have been engaged by higher education scholars for close to 40 years, primarily stemming from the seminal works of Clark (1983, 1987, 1997) and Trow (1972) and their analyses of post-war massification processes and the subsequent impacts on Western higher education systems. While the majority of OECD countries achieved massification over the latter parts of the 20th century, the recent forces of globalization and regionalization are “encouraging a much finer and more flexible differentiation of institutions which may well lead to greater volatily and fuzziness within and across systems” (Enders and Musselin, 2008, p. 131). Primarily in response to changing economic conditions, national governments are increasingly managing and dividing institutions according to more specialized functions (Finklestein, 2010, p. 141).

The impact of this new set of differentiation processes is the dichotomization of ‘have’ and ‘have not’ institutions, with corresponding hierarchies of academic professionals being established within and between the various layers of national systems and international regimes. In America, Canada, the UK and Australia, the most glaring manifestation of this differentiation is the fragmentation of a historically homogenous academic workforce into full-time and contingent labour groups, operating under radically divergent employment frameworks and conditions (Court, 1998; Finklestein, 2003, 2010; Ehrenberg *et al.,* 2005; Robinson, 2005; Hugo, 2005a, b, c). As Finklestein contends, “the notion of academics as a ‘cohesive group’ united by a common pre-service socialization experience will become increasing limited in its application to a shrinking core” (Finklestein 2010, p. 153).

 The second major global trend impacting the academic profession is the well-documented rise of managerialism and regimes of accountability within and across national post-secondary systems (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; Olssen and Peters, 2005). This trend is associated with increased top-down prioritization of teaching and research loads, including the steering and control of previously autonomous professional agendas, increased pressure for quasi-entrepreneurial activities in relation to academics acquiring their own research funding, and shifting conceptions of ‘relevance’ in regard to the relationship between post-secondary education and society (Enders and Musselin, 2008). The cumulative impact of these changes on the academic profession is the conceptualization of post-secondary teachers and researchers less as career scholars and more as ‘managed professionals’ or ‘academic workers’ (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997, Finklestein, 2003; Enders and Musselin, 2008). The impact of these shifts on academic workloads varies by country, but general hypotheses indicate that individuals are working harder and more than ever before, and are subject to increased expectations regarding publication and teaching performance (Finklestein, 2010), resulting in an organizational “narrative of constraint” (O’Mera, Terosky, and Neumann 2008, p. 16).

 The final contextual piece impacting many OECD countries with mature higher education systems are the demographic shifts occurring within the academic workforce in terms of both gender and age. Regarding the former, there is evidence that many mature systems are witnessing a significant shift in the gender make-up of their academic labour force, both in cumulative numbers and according to rank, though increases in female representation at more senior positions are taking place at much slower rates (Enders and Musselin, 2008). In terms of age, Enders and Musselin (2008) estimate that between 40% and 60% of the overall professoriate are older than 55 years of age, and between 2008 and 2018, an average of 4% to 6% of the professoriate will retire each year (pg. 130). The implications of this for the academic workforce in many national systems are an increased turnover rate that can be met in one of two ways; either the replacement of retiring tenured and permanent faculty with new tenure-stream and permanent positions or the retrenchment of permanent positions in favor of a temporary and ‘more flexible’ workforce. The implication for the continued feminization of the workforce is that with a decrease in permanent positions, gains may continue to be limited in both size and scope.

Taking these trends as a whole, it appears that the academic workplaces is changing and the conditions of employment and the nature of the academy are moving the profession away from the relatively stable conditions of the mid-to-late 20th century. The current study begins an investigation into the Canadian context, interpreting findings from the Changing Academic Profession (CAP) survey and drawing upon broader research into the conditions of employment for full-time faculty across Canadian universities.

**The Canadian Context for Academic Work**

Canada has a highly decentralized university “system”. Under Canada’s constitution, education is the responsibility of the provinces; there is no national ministry of education or higher education, and no national higher education policy or legislation. Universities are relatively autonomous institutions operating under provincial regulation and legislation. Universities are created as private, not-for-profit corporations, though most are considered public in that they receive provincial government operating grants. As such, there are considerable variations in funding mechanisms and governance structures by province (Shanahan and Jones, 2007).

Professors are employees of universities, and these autonomous corporations, operating under provincial labour laws, can determine the terms of appointment, remuneration, and other conditions of employment. Most Canadian university faculty are unionized, in fact, Dobbie and Robinson (2008) have argued that higher education may be the most unionized sector in Canada. Most full-time university faculty are members of institution-specific labour unions that negotiate collective agreements with university management, and these agreements cover employment issues related to salaries and benefits, but they also frequently cover key academic working conditions, including defining academic freedom as a condition of employment. At many universities, other categories of university teachers, such as sessional/contractual teachers and graduate students who teach undergraduate courses are also unionized, but they are often represented by separate unions from those representing full-time faculty.

Two recent studies contribute to our understanding of academic work in Canada, especially the conditions of employment of early career faculty. Based on the assumption that the tenure process both defines academic work and establishes the criteria for the assessment of academic work, Gravestock, Greenleaf and Jones (2009) conducted a detailed analysis of tenure and promotion policies at 44 Canadian universities. Of the 44 institutions included in their study, 33 had unions representing full-time faculty, and the tenure and promotion policies were wholly or partially enshrined within the collective agreement. At the remaining institutions there was some form of binding agreement between the faculty association and the university that covered key conditions of employment that was similar to a collective agreement, including addressing tenure and promotion procedures. In other words, tenure and promotion policies at all of these universities emerged from negotiations between faculty and management.

Many elements of the tenure and promotion processes are common across institutions. New junior tenure-stream faculty are initially appointed on a probationary, pre-tenure contract. The most common arrangement involves an initial contract of between two or three years in length, followed by some form of probationary review, and, if the candidate is successful, the individual receives a second contract that continues until the tenure review. The length of the pre-tenure probationary period varies by institution, but generally ranges from between 3 and 7 years.

All universities define academic work in terms of teaching and research, though some institutions also include service as a component of academic work. At all universities included in the study, the criteria for tenure focused on the assessment of teaching and research, and while some institutions indicated that service was important, it was also clear that tenure could not be obtained on the basis of service activities alone.

While tenure criteria clearly focused on teaching and research, Gravestock, Greenleaf & Jones (2009) noted significant differences in how institutions describe the standards of research and teaching, including major differences in the language and terminology used to describe the criteria for assessment. There may be common themes, but tenure is institutionally defined. They also found major differences in tenure review processes, including the number of committees that review the tenure dossier, the role of academic administrators, and impact of a negative tenure decision; in some cases a negative tenure decision would lead to a terminal contract, while in others the unsuccessful candidate could reapply under certain conditions.

The second study focuses on faculty remuneration in Canadian universities. Jones and Weinrib (2010) analyzed Statistics Canada data on 2007/2008 faculty salaries from 52 universities. The study was part of an international comparative project following on Rumbly, Pacheco and Altbach’s (2008) analysis of faculty member salaries that had noted that Canada had among the highest salaries for both junior and senior faculty members across 15 countries. Jones and Weinrib found that early-career faculty continue to be well remunerated; the average salary for an assistant professor was $6928 per month (or an annual salary of $83,136 or approximately £52,900).

The study also notes significant differences in salary levels by gender, institutional type, and province. On average, across ranks, female faculty earn approximately 89% of their male counterparts, though there is evidence that this gender gap has been narrowing over time. Generally speaking, salaries at institutions categorized as medical/doctoral are higher than those at universities with a primarily undergraduate mandate. The average salaries of assistant professors varied by province (between an average annual salary of $70,188 in Newfoundland and Labrador and an average salary of $87,660 in Alberta).

These two studies contribute to our understanding of academic work in Canada and the context in which early-career faculty are working. Academic work in Canada is largely defined at the institutional level, but universities have generally defined the academic work of tenure-stream faculty in terms of teaching, research, and, to a lesser extent, service. Tenure policies, which define academic work and describe the process by which this work is assessed in order to determine whether an individual will obtain a permanent appointment, are negotiated between representatives of the faculty and university management. Junior faculty are reasonably remunerated, at least in comparison to their peers in many other jurisdictions, and Canadian faculty obtain a range of benefits, including sabbaticals (as an entitlement), pensions, and extended health care.

**The Changing Academic Profession (CAP) Survey in Canada: Methodology**

 The 2007 Changing Academic Profession Survey, covering 18 countries, was a follow-up to the 1992 Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, which involved 14 countries (Altbach, 1996). As Canada was not involved in the initial 1992 survey, this marks the first time that a comprehensive national effort has been made to accumulate data on faculty perceptions of the academic profession in the Canadian jurisdiction. A detailed description of the research design and methods for the international CAP surveys can be found in earlier publications (Locke and Teichler, 2007).

 The Canadian study was designed to obtain responses from a representative sample of faculty at Canadian universities. A two-stage cluster sample was created at the level of institutions and at the level of individuals. At the institutional level, the target population of universities was sorted by type of institution (Medical/Doctoral, Comprehensive, and Primarily Undergraduate). A random sample of institutions was created from this list. The institutional sample consisted of 18 institutions: 4 Medical/Doctoral, 6 Comprehensive, and 8 Primarily Undergraduate. At least one institution from each of Canada’s 10 provinces was represented in the sample. For each of the 18 universities in the sample, full-time faculty with the titles of Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor were included in the individual-level cluster samples. Only full-time university faculty were surveyed.

At the end of October 2007, 6693 potential participants were sent a bilingual email invitation message with an embedded link to a web-based survey. The survey was closed in mid-December, 2007. Another phase of the survey was initiated in April 2008 to capture more responses, and the survey was finally closed in May 2008 having obtained 1152 valid returns for a response rate of 17.21%. Details on the survey sampling framework and response rates are provided in Table 1.

**Insert Table 1**

The characteristics of the respondent population closely resemble the characteristics of the whole population of full-time faculty at Canadian universities in terms of institutional type, rank, and a number of demographic characteristics. Women are slightly over-represented (40.9 % of respondents compared with 32.7 % of full-time faculty).

This paper focuses on the reported perceptions of early-career tenure-stream faculty compared with the responses from their more senior peers. Our analysis of data focused on the cross-tabulation of questionnaire responses in order to analyze differences in response between early-career and more senior career faculty. We define early-career faculty as individuals holding the rank of assistant professor, and we compare their responses with those from faculty at the more senior ranks of associate professor and professor.

**Perceptions of Early Career Faculty**

This study began with the assumption that there would be substantive differences in responses between early career faculty and more senior faculty. Perhaps the most important finding of the subsequent analysis is that there were in fact very few differences. The general conclusion that can be drawn from the Canadian CAP data is that assistant professors generally report that they operate under similar working conditions to their more senior colleagues, and possess a relatively high level of satisfaction with the majority of their professional responsibilities and functions.

In terms of academic work, the CAP survey dealt with issues relating to work situations and activities, specifically targeting the amount of work time spent on various activities and the disposition of faculty members to different aspects of the profession. The authors were very interested to examine how the work patterns of early career faculty compared with their more senior colleagues, as a common trope often portrays early faculty operating under more strenuous working conditions in terms of raw hours of work, particularly in the realm of teaching and research activities. The findings from the CAP survey appear to contradict this popular conception. In response to the survey question examining work hours per week across various professional activities while classes are in session, assistant-level faculty reported spending an average of 22.4 hours/week on teaching-related activities, 16.3 hours on research-related activities, 4 hours/week on service-related activities and 5.7 hours/week on administrative duties, for a total of 48.4 hours of work per week. At the more senior levels, these numbers were only slightly adjusted: 18.9 hours/week on teaching, 15.7 on research, 3.8 on service and 9.1 on administration, for a total of 47.5 hours of work per week.

The question examining faculty work patterns while classes are not in session presents a similar relation between junior and senior faculty time allotment; Assistant-level faculty reported spending an average of 6.1 hours in teaching, 30.4 hours in research, 3.7 hours in service and 4.9 hours in administration (for a total of 45.1 hours of work per week), compared to 5.4 in teaching, 26.7 in research, 4 in service and 8 in administration (for a total of 44.1 hours per week) for more senior faculty. This data indicates that, on average, there are only minor differences in the overall hours of academic work reported by early career and more senior ranks, with minor variances occurring in two particular areas; assistant professors report spending slightly more time on teaching activities, and senior faculty report spending more time on administrative duties.

**Insert Table 2 & 3**

The survey also examined whether there was a significant difference in desired balance between research and teaching activities across faculty ranks. This question is significant because of the possibility that generational differences and seniority levels may alter faculty preferences and behaviour patterns, having been socialized into the academic profession under relatively different social and economic conditions. However, as with the reported levels of academic work per week, the differences in the reported preferences by faculty rank were not statistically significant. For assistant professors, preferences were reported as follows: 4% prefer teaching, 30% lean towards teaching, 53% lean towards research and 13% prefer research. For senior faculty, 7% prefer teaching, 25% lean towards teaching, 54% lean towards research, and 14% prefer research.

One area of work where the data does indicate a relatively significant difference between junior and more senior faculty members is in regards to the portion of teaching responsibilities that are devoted to undergraduate teaching. Assistant professors reported spending 71% of their time teaching undergraduates, 18.7% on Masters, 5.5% on Doctoral, and 1.6% teaching in professional programs. Comparatively, senior colleagues report spending 61% of their teaching time at the undergraduate level, 23% at the Masters level, 10.9% at the Doctoral level, and 2.1 in professional programs. One might assume that these findings simply reflect developmental differences within academic work, and that responsibility for graduate teaching increase as individual’s transition from early to mid-career.

Another difference in work activities emerged in response to questions related to outside employment. Only 24% of assistant professors reported that they had taken on other employment (such as paid consulting) over the two years previous to the survey date, while 31% of more senior faculty reported engaging in these activities.

The CAP data also suggests that junior faculty are more likely to consider, and act on, major career changes than their more senior colleagues. Asked whether they had considered a variety of career changes in the five years previous to completing the survey, 34% of assistant professors considered a change to another HEI in Canada, 24% considered HEIs outside of Canada and 24% considered moving to a non-HEI/research institution position. This is compared to senior faculty responses, where only 27% had considered a move to another HEI in Canada, 18% had considered a HEI outside of Canada and 20% had considered a move to a non-HEI/research institution position.

**Satisfaction and Influence**

In order to understand the relationship between academic rank and the level of job satisfaction of Canadian academics, we cross-tabulated rank with responses to a series of relevant questions in the CAP survey. Faculty at all ranks indicated a high level of job satisfaction, though more senior faculty indicated higher levels of satisfaction than early career faculty (see also Weinrib *et al*., in press). Approximately 70% of full professors strongly disagreed with the statement “if I could do it over again I would not become an academic,” compared with 54% of associate professors and 49% of assistant professors. Responding to the statement, “my job is a source of considerable personal strain”, 20% of assistant professors and 21% of associate professors ‘strongly agreed’, while this number fell to 14% for full professors. Generally speaking, a larger share of full professors reported higher levels of job satisfaction and a more positive view of the academic profession than individuals appointed to the lower ranks, though it is interesting to note that the levels of stress reported by pre-tenure faculty are the same as the levels of stress reported by post-tenure associate professors.

**Insert Table 4**

These findings are interesting, but not unexpected. The study provides support for previous findings in the literature that lower ranking professors operate under more stressful working conditions, primarily due to being embedded in ongoing professional legitimation processes (Sorcinelli, 1992; Castle and Schutz, 2002). For those who have already attained the highest rank in Canadian universities, those at the full professor rank, it is not unreasonable to expect that the absence of promotional pressures and the attainment of the highest position in departmental hierarchies would lower overall stress levels and usher in a more favorable opinion of personal and professional circumstances. Linking this finding with the earlier note about there being limited variation in faculty work patterns, both while classes are and are not in session, we can tentatively conclude that qualitative conditions, in combination with lower levels of professional security and remuneration, most likely result in the differences in satisfaction.

In terms of other notable observations, cross-examining rank with respondent perceptions of individual influence at the department, school/faculty and institutional level, revealed some of the survey’s clearest relationships. While most faculty members believe that they are very or somewhat influential at the department level, regardless of rank, this perceived influence decreases at the faculty/school level, and then decreases again in reference to decisions at the institutional level. Full professors reported higher levels of influence at each level compared with both associate and assistant professors. Interestingly, the majority of assistant professors reported that they have at least some influence over decisions at the department level, suggesting that while there are clear hierarchies associated with perceived influence by rank, the decision making arrangements at the local level provide junior faculty with a voice (see Metcalfe *et al*., in press).

**Insert Table 5**

**Conclusions:**

Our overall conclusion is that while we expected to find significant differences in a range of working conditions and experiences, based on broad changes in the global economic and political environment, the CAP data indicates only modest differences in the perceptions of academic work reported by early-career faculty compared with their more senior peers. The two groups report similar hours of work, similar interest in relation to balance of activity, and only minor differences in how they spend their time. Junior faculty are reasonably remunerated, and most are represented by faculty unions that have negotiated tenure and promotion policies as part of the collective bargaining process. Faculty across all ranks report a high level of job satisfaction, though on average more senior faculty report higher levels of satisfaction than their junior colleagues. Generally speaking, the findings suggest that full-time early career faculty in tenure-stream positions are doing well.

Recognizing that these findings indicate a relatively stable and healthy professional environment for both junior and senior faculty in Canadian universities, there are some caveats that bear further examination through subsequent study. Most significantly, there is evidence that the global shift towards more contingent labor is occurring in Canada, and that as a result, a more stratified labour force with significantly different employment conditions is appearing (Rajogopal, 2002). Unlike institutions in some other jurisdictions, Canadian universities appear to be maintaining a strong tenure-stream category of academic professionals, but the cost of maintaining this full-time cohort comes at the expense of an expanding number of part-time and non-permanent contract workers who have very different working conditions. The implications of these broad changes in the balance of academic professionals in these quite different employment categories requires further study.

These changes also raise interesting questions related to gender and academic career patterns. There is a long history of gender inequity within the Canadian professoriate, and while there are indications that the gap is narrowing, women continue to be the minority in all academic ranks. For example, according to the 2010 Canadian Association of University Teachers Almanac, as of 2007, 20% of full professors in Canadian universities were female, compared to a 35% representation at the associate professor level, and 43% at the assistant professor level (CAUT, 2010, 5). Given that the majority of part-time/contract faculty are women, will the growing dependence on casual academic labour lead to further gender imbalances within the academy? Will career patterns change with growing numbers of experienced casual workers competing for well-remunerated, tenure-stream positions?

As we have indicated, there are a range of contextual features that may have played a role in protecting junior faculty in Canada from some of the systemic difficulties reported in some other jurisdictions. The decentralized nature of the Canadian system means that academic work (and working conditions) are largely defined at the institutional level, and the existence of strong labour unions have played an important role in protecting the interests of their members. On the other hand, more qualitative research is required in order to further explore the experiences of early career faculty as they navigate the rapidly changing environment of the 21st century university.
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Table 1.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 1: Canadian CAP Survey Sampling Framework |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Gross Sample\* |  | Net Sample |  | Returned Sample |
|  | Institutions |  | Institutions |  | Institutions |  |
|  |   |  | Faculty |  |  | Faculty |  |  | Faculty |
| **University Type** | (#) | (%) | (#) | (%) | (#) | (%) | (#) | (%) | (#) | (%) | (#) | (%) |
| Medical Doctoral | 15 | 31.9 | 18840 | 59.7 | 4 | 22.2 | 2245 | 33.5 | 4 | 22.2 | 442 | 38.4 |
| Comprehensive | 11 | 23.4 | 7806 | 24.7 | 6 | 33.3 | 3109 | 46.5 | 6 | 33.3 | 501 | 43.5 |
| Undergraduate | 21 | 44.7 | 4908 | 15.6 | 8 | 44.4 | 1339 | 20.0 | 8 | 44.4 | 209 | 18.1 |
|  | 47 | 100.0 | 31554 | 100.0 | 18 | 100.0 | 6693 | 100.0 | 18 | 100.0 | 1152 | 100.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \*Source: CAUT Almanac, 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 2 Hours per Week that Junior and Senior Faculty Reporting Working During Teaching Terms

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **In Session (hrs)** | Junior | Senior |
| Teaching-related | 22.4 | 18.9 |
| Research-related | 16.3 | 15.7 |
| Service-related | 4 | 3.8 |
| Administrative duties | 5.7 | 9.1 |
| **Total** | **48.4** | **47.5** |

Table 3 Hours per Week that Junior and Senior Faculty Reported Working During Non-Teaching Terms

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Out of Session (hrs)** | Junior | Senior |
| Teaching-related | 6.1 | 5.4 |
| Research-related | 30.4 | 26.7 |
| Service-related | 3.7 | 4 |
| Administrative duties | 4.9 | 8 |
| **Total** | **45.1** | **44.1** |

Table 4 Responses to Faculty Satisfaction Questions

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **If I had to do it over again, I would not… (%)** | Strongly agree/Agree | Neutral | Disagree/Strongly Disagree |
| Senior | 8 | 7 | 85 |
| Junior | 13 | 15 | 72 |
| **This is a poor time for a young person to begin a career…(%)** | SA/A | N | D/SD |
| Senior | 35 | 18 | 46 |
| Junior | 36 | 21 | 43 |
| **My job is a source of considerable personal strain (%)** | SA/A | N | D/SD |
| Senior | 35 | 27 | 38 |
| Junior | 46 | 29 | 25 |
| **Overall satisfaction (%)** | Very high/High | Average | Low/Very Low |
| Senior | 73 | 21 | 7 |
| Junior | 80 | 13 | 7 |

Table 5 Faculty Perceptions of Influence at Department/Faculty/Institution Levels by Rank

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department Level (%)** | Very Influential | Somewhat Influential | A little Influential | Not at All Influential |
| Full Professor | 31.0 | 43.0 | 18.0 | 6.0 |
| Associate Professor | 21.1 | 39.6 | 27.4 | 10.4 |
| Assistant Professor | 10.8 | 42.0 | 33.2 | 9.8 |
| **Faculty/School Level (%)** |  |  |  |  |
| Full Professor | 11.5 | 35.4 | 30.6 | 18.5 |
| Associate Professor | 6.3 | 23.2 | 39 | 28.3 |
| Assistant Professor | 1.8 | 12.2 | 37.8 | 41.6 |
| **Institution Level (%)** |  |  |  |  |
| Full professor | 3.7 | 21.4 | 35.1 | 37.4 |
| Associate Professor | 2.1 | 8.4 | 29.6 | 56.6 |
| Assistant Professor | 0.4 | 2.5 | 16.8 | 69.1 |