THE AMBIGUOUS ROLE OF THE NURSE EDUCATOR: BACCALAUREATE FACULTY WORKLOAD AND ITS IMPACT ON RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

by

Mary Ann Romer Anderson

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
The University of Utah
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

College of Nursing

The University of Utah

June 1984

THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH GRADUATE SCHOOL

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

Mary Ann Romer Anderson

This thesis has been read by each member of the following supervisory committee and by majority vote has been found to be satisfactory.

Hassell, R.N., M.S.

THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH GRADUATE SCHOOL

FINAL READING APPROVAL

To the Graduate Council of The University of Utah:

I have read the thesis of Mary Ann Romer Anderson in its final form and have found that (1) its format, citations, and bibliographic style are consistent and acceptable; (2) its illustrative materials including figures, tables, and charts are in place; and (3) the final manuscript is satisfactory to the Supervisory Committee and is ready for submission to the Graduate School.

Member, Supervisory Committee

Approved for the Major Department

Linda K. Amos, Ed.D., F.A.A.N.
Chairman, Dean

Approved for the Graduate Council

James L. Clayton
Dean of The Graduate School

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of baccalaureate faculty workload on the opportunity and ability of nursing faculty to undertake scholarly research. Inherent in this study were the perceptions of baccalaureate nursing faculty concerning the concepts of role conflict and role ambiguity and their effects on the pursuit and production of professional research. The study was conducted by mailing an 18 item questionnaire to 116 baccalaureate faculty members in three colleges of nursing situated in state university medical centers in the Rocky Mountain Region of the United States. There was a 58% return rate from the questionnaires.

The data were analyzed statistically using chi-square, Kruskal-Wallis Anova, Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranked, and Mann-Whitney U tests as well as frequencies to determine what impact the workload might have on the production of nursing research. The results of the study indicate three important findings. First, and most significant, is that the faculty surveyed reported that they generally do not fulfill well the three requirements of teaching, research, and community service traditionally expected in the university setting. Second, role conflict and role ambiguity were validated statistically as contributors to the low level of

research produced. The third prominent finding was that the faculty members in this study met the description of typical baccalaureate faculty members referred to in the literature.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere appreciation is expressed to the Supervisory Committee: Dr. Manny Gunne, Committee Chairman; Dr. Kimbal Wheatley; and Janice Hassell, RN, MS for their valuable mentoring and guidance.

Gratitude for the pleasant sharing of knowledge and talents go to Merle Romer, Ken Richins, and Dr. Marlene Egger.

Loving appreciation goes to Emily M. Anderson without whom there would not be any purpose at all.

Mary Ann Anderson

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Problem

The majority of nursing baccalaureate faculty are master's educated and presumably ill-prepared to pursue sophisticated scholarly research. Yet these same nursing faculty are supposedly expected to fulfill the three traditional functions of the academic profession (teaching, service and research) while also providing significant clinical instruction and supervision. In the practical constraints of time and energy alone, the opportunity to perform all these tasks becomes problematic with the consequence that research and/or the other faculty functions are likely to suffer.

In addition to being predominantly master's prepared and reputedly having a heavy workload which precludes pursuing scholarly research, many baccalaureate nursing faculty presumably also face an incongruous time and task allocation which may contribute to role ambiguity. These faculty are required to fulfill a significant number of student contact hours in classroom, laboratory, and clinical settings. They are required to put in appropriate

amounts of related time in preparation for instruction and evaluation of students. Supposedly, these activities alone fill a major portion of the work week. Many baccalaureate faculty believe they were hired essentially to perform these particular instructional tasks. They are additionally, then, asked to assist, to some extent, the institution, the community, and the profession in some service capacity each week. Furthermore, like other academic disciplines in the university, nursing faculty are expected to pursue publishable scholarly research.

A potential for role conflict arises when assigned and related tasks consume a majority of the available career time while unassigned research and publication expectations are the criteria rewarded through promotion and pay. When the time expended for one set of tasks is so large but little recognized while that available for another set is so limited yet highly valued, how does one adequately fulfill each? And how is each properly perceived in its role relation to the other? It is this lack of congruence in expectations and rewards which encumbers the faculty member's performance and, therefore, may not allow for the adequate pursuit and production of scholarly research, especially with an inadequate preparatory background.

Most faculty in higher education today are generally presumed to have the three-fold responsibility pattern of teaching, service, and research which commonly defines

their professional role. The seeds of this characteristic triad of academic activities in American institutions can be traced to the period following the Civil War when teaching was essentially the only function of the faculty and the American higher educational enterprise began to acquire some equilibrium (Freedman, 1979). The inception of land-grant colleges in the 1860s further stabilized the collegiate system of higher education in America but with it came the responsibilities beyond teaching (i.e., scholarly research and service to society).

Although teaching is often the most recognized responsibility for faculty, it ranks far behind research as the function most rewarded and highly regarded in achieving professorial success (Hohenstein, 1980). Lagging even further behind the research function is the service responsibility. Service is a recognized obligation, but few faculty find the institutional reward system favorable enough to warrant a strong personal commitment to on and off campus service activities. According to Hohenstein,

> . . . public service is a uniquely American graft onto the tradition of higher education. The research function developed and was almost deified . . . The teaching function, of course, has existed from the very beginning. It should be no surprise, then, that a relative newcomer must struggle for a role in so complex a social institution as the university (1980).

During the land-grant college era when much of higher education was crystallizing, nursing was struggling just to establish the basic role of the instructor in hospital schools of nursing which were not even associated with

colleges or universities at the time. When nursing did begin to move into the academic environment more fully, it did not, consequently, bring with it a very scholarly tradition. Teaching was the primary function for nursing faculty. Research, therefore, as a component of nursing responsibilities, certainly was not a serious concern when the first three schools of nursing in the United States were established a little over 100 years ago (Christy, 1980). The significant problems encountered by nursing educators were still concerned with teaching as the schools developed and multiplied over the next 50 years, increasing from 432 in 1900 to well over 2,000 schools in 1926 (Committee on the Grading of Nursing Schools, 1928). Today there are 288 Diploma, 753 Associate Degree, and 414 Baccalaureate schools of nursing nationally (NLN, 1982).

A major concern in that early era was that, in the majority of hospital schools, there were, literally, no instructors; students were thrust into hospital wards to learn by watching and imitating other students. At the turn of the century, the nurse known as the Training School Superintendent taught what little nursing instruction there was while physicians "guest-lectured" here and there on various aspects of medical care (Christy, 1980). A half century later, in the aftermath of World War II, college attendance had become an integral part of the American way of life for a substantial segment of the population, including large numbers of young women involved in the formal

study of nursing.

At that time in the history of American higher education, faculty positions in most disciplines were plentiful, and due to the growing emphasis on funded research and the availability of federal monies, the number of research-oriented professors in the university system increased concomitantly (Freedman, 1979). This particular faculty function, research, became firmly ensconced among the professors' regular work expectations and was beginning to assume primacy.

However, postwar educational changes for nurses differed considerably from that which occurred in the mainstream university setting. In the mid-twentieth century, most nursing education was carried on in three-year hospital schools of nursing. Nursing education had not yet established a university base. Close scrutiny of the anticipated impact of nursing education was summarized in the 1948 report by Ester Lucile Brown in her volume Nursing in the Future. Ms. Brown offered some pertinent recommendations. Her primary focus was that ". . . effort be directed toward building basic schools of nursing in universities and colleges . . . that are sound in organizational and financial structure, adequate in facilities and faculty, and well distributed to serve the needs of the entire country." At that time, the feasibility of a combined general and professional university course, shortened to four years, was proposed. Still, the necessity of continuing hospital

schools of nursing far into the future was also acknowledged. By 1963 diploma schools of nursing were finally on a significant decline, while college-based associate degree programs, which had begun earnestly in the 1950s, and baccalaureate nursing programs were increasing in number (Jamieson, Sewall, & Suhrie, 1976). The history of higher education reveals that during this period other disciplines were advancing in their multiple pursuits and enjoying a period of scholarly growth and expansion by their faculty members while nursing was just beginning to establish a teaching tradition and a foothold in the university arena. Nursing began seriously to fix its position in higher education in 1959 (Jamieson et al., 1976).

A number of salient events contributed to research assuming a priority among many university faculty. The awarding of federal research grants to the major universities in the post-World War II era served to strengthen the value of the research function among university faculty. Research in a university setting became basic to this form of higher education. Second, it is the major tool by which new knowledge is generated and through which an individual researcher (most often found on the resource-richer university campuses) can best keep apprised of the trends in a particular area of interest. Third, research grants contribute to the economic well-being of this type of institution (Andreoli, 1979). This model of

government-supported research in the university system helped make the doctorate the requisite credential for the college professor and has elevated the importance of research and publication as the hallmarks of professional success--as well as the avenue to promotion and advancement (Andreoli, 1979). This professional requirement to carry on scholarly research put pressure on the fledging field of nursing higher education and its faculty to emulate that generally accepted university pattern. However, because of nursing's late entry into university and college based education programs, a large deficit in research had to be made up by the college of nursing faculty.

A defensible explanation for the minimal research performance in colleges of nursing at this time, of course, is the lack of doctoral degrees and their concomitant preparation as an entry level for assistant professors in nursing higher education. The doctorate, signifying that the faculty member has some refined scholarly skills and acquired certain methodological competencies in research, has by this time been established as the expected entry level for most other disciplines. That has not been true typically of nursing. In 1976, the American Nurses' Association reported that only 3.5 percent of all nurses employed full-time in nursing education and 9.5 percent of those in collegiate programs held doctorate degrees (American Nurses' Association, 1976). The National League of Nursing reported in January, 1982, that there were 1,657

doctorate, 14,085 master's and 3,751 baccalaureate prepared full-time faculty in RN programs nationally, and 189 doctorate, 2,673 master's, and 2,089 baccalaureate prepared faculty members working part-time. This would indicate that the master's degree has been recognized and essentially accepted as the appropriate level for faculty preparation in nursing since the 1960s. The majority of nursing faculty still hold the master's as their highest degree while the criteria for professorial promotion and tenure now seem to clearly include the strong expectation for research and publication characteristic of the doctorate.

Colleges of nursing, faced with the increasing pressures to resemble the established academic disciplines and come into their own professional identity as well, have reached the developmental point where it is necessary to delineate quite clearly what are the expected faculty functions and defined areas of stewardship. This personal and professional definition is essential not only for the organization of work and the advancement of the profession of nursing, but more practically for the role identity of the nurse educator. In light of the American Nurses' Association 1985 proposal, which places nursing education very firmly in the university system, and the inherent demands that decision makes (particularly on baccalaureate nursing faculty), there is a need for refinement and specificity of the professional role expectations of the

nursing educator. Scholarly research has become an essential foundation for this academic concept of a multi-faceted professional role in all other disciplines and appears now as a strong expectation for nursing educators as well.

The focus of this research project was to gather some descriptive data concerning the baccalaureate faculty's workload and its impact on nursing research productivity. Some basic factors considered were the history of nursing education and the subsequent lack of socialization to the university milieu--of which research is a predominate aspect; the paucity of doctorally-prepared nurse educators; and the university expectation for nursing faculty to perform well in the roles of teaching, research, and service while still meeting the demands of the clinical component of nursing education. It is theorized that the uncertainty surrounding the tri-fold expectations in colleges of nursing place these faculty in a situation of role ambiguity and potential role conflict which could render their overall performance unsatisfactory, at least in terms of the research component. This discrepant behavior possibility is attributed to the factors previously identified: history and socialization, educational preparation, and the role demands which may be compounded by large clinical responsibilities.

The underlying concern is the allegation that nursing faculty have not produced research to the degree of faculty

in other disciplines. The increasing demands of service and research as well as teaching are continuously complicated by the concomitant concerns over meeting peer and student expectations for a satisfactory level of clinical competence. Therefore, a hypothesis of this research project is that role ambiguity and role conflict attributable in some degree to demanding workloads among baccalaureate nursing faculty are basic problems inhibiting the pursuit and production of scholarly research.

Purpose

The purpose of this investigation is to determine the impact of faculty workloads on the opportunity and ability of nursing faculty to undertake scholarly research. The perceived effects of role ambiguity and role conflict on the pursuit and production of scholarly research will be examined as possible contributing factors. The overall null hypothesis for this study is that baccalaureate faculty do not produce significant research.

Four principal questions intrinsic to the research concern of baccalaureate faculty workload and its impact on research activities will be investigated. 1) What is the impact of workload for baccalaureate nursing faculty on their research production? 2) What aspects of the faculty's workload specifically and significantly affect research production? 3) Do multiple work expectations

contribute to the development of role ambiguity for baccalaureate nursing faculty? 4) Does the uncertainty regarding responsibilities and rewards lead to the potential for role conflict? This research project will inspect each question in relationship to the problem as described.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

On the baccalaureate faculty level, the importance of the research responsibility is often lost to the heavy clinical assignments (Bauder, 1982). However, clinical instructors in addition to teaching are still expected to fulfill the tri-fold mission of service, research, and teaching. For the nursing faculty these traditional academic activities are supposedly fulfilled through committee memberships, college assignments, student advisement, community service, and professional pressures for postgraduate work along with relevantly viable research (Solomons, Jordison, Powell, 1980).

In spite of the high value placed on research in the academic setting generally, the literature indicates that in most colleges of nursing the predominate value is on excellence in teaching (Conway & Glass, 1978; Fawcett, 1979; Saylor, Genthe, & Otis, 1979). It is apparent that nursing has characteristics which set it apart from older, more established disciplines in the university complex. For example, as an emerging profession, nursing has evolved through clinically organized programs with a heavy emphasis on practical experience. Modern nursing has its origins in

the hospital system which stressed obedience to superiors and placed emphasis on skill rather than theory. Vestiges of these philosophies are still found in schools of nursing today (Henry, 1981). There are other differences which have been identified currently as attributable causes for the limited amount of nursing research, however. One major difference is expressed by Dean Conway and assistant professor Glass (1978) of the University Wisconsin, Milwaukee, who stated that the neophyte faculty member faces at least two major problems: "She must define her own role and she must determine how that role fits into the organization." It is true that a contract with the school or college may specify certain work expectations, and the courses one is assigned to teach may help to define others. However, these are far from complete guidelines to the entire scope of the faculty role.

One significant area of role conflict in nursing education is between clinical competence and scholarly research which do not appear to be compatibly pursued. The conflict is likely to materialize when the authorities who grant promotion and tenure do not equate clinical practice with scholarly achievement. Therefore, the faculty member who devotes much assigned time and expertise to clinical practice will find it a disadvantage when being considered a candidate for promotion or tenure. While clinical practice may not compare to the acknowledged scholarly activity of researching and writing a book, it is, nonetheless, an

essential and time-consuming component of the job within an applied discipline such as nursing. This value incongruency is undoubtedly one of the most important sources of role conflict for the new faculty member who finds a denial of recognition for the very expertise (clinical) which served, largely in the faculty member's mind, as the basis for appointment in the first place.

Another potential role ambiguity element is meeting the requirements of the contract letter which specifies that the faculty member is expected not only to teach and engage in research but also to contribute to the community through various means of service. Yet, the assigned course load and student contact hours seem to predetermine the major time and task demands of the job. Thus confusion emerges when young faculty members must forego their own perceptions of the faculty role in deference to the perspectives of certain of their peers. This confusion often manifests itself when senior members confront new faculty members with encouragements to serve on committees or specialized projects with such comments as "You should do that!" and "It will look good in your folder" (Conway and Glass, 1978). This subtle pressure for internal service is essential to the functioning of the university (Hohenstein, 1980), yet it, too, adds to the role conflict seen in baccalaureate faculty.

Furthermore, while these position demands are generally accepted by the neophyte faculty member, the criterion of

scholarly research, for someone with only a master's degree preparation or less, is seen as an unrealistic expectation leading to more role ambiguity (Henry, 1981). Nurses with master's preparation are educationally sound practitioners of nursing; often they are not skilled researchers. They are, however, likely to initiate some research studies although they are presumably less skilled in scientific or scholarly investigation techniques than their doctorally prepared colleagues.

Higher education institutions in our democratic society traditionally have held primary responsibility for the discovery, restructure, and transmission of the knowledge relevant to all the disciplines and learned professions (Schlotfeldt, 1977). Presumably, the goal of all university faculty is to function well in these areas of teaching, research, and service. Teaching and service are long established missions of higher education faculty, but the emphasis on research, according to available literature, possibly began in 1892 when the faculty at the University of Chicago were told that promotion would depend on scholarly research, rather than on teaching (Andreoli, 1979). In the same decade, the faculty at the University of Pennsylvania were cautioned against favoring teaching at the expense of research (Andreoli, 1979). This trend of holding research higher in esteem than teaching or service has continued in the university so that today it is often viewed as the most prestigious of the three faculty responsibilities (Henry,

1981).

"It is because of the professional expectation that collegiate faculty will contribute to the expansion of knowledge as well as its transmission, that there is the expectation of all faculty members to be involved in research" (Solomons et al., 1980). However, as Fawcett (1979) and others have observed, research has not been " . . . an integral part of the nurse faculty member's normative workload." She notes that the major reasons given for limited research productivity are lack of academic preparation, appropriate socialization, and time.

In their article "Socialization for Survival in the Academic World," Conway and Glass (1978) stated that the socialization process in colleges of nursing "almost assures the nonsuccess of the neophyte faculty member" because of an absence of what is referred to as "the spirit of inquiry" which characterizes research pursuits. However, Fawcett (1979) states that the faculty member who wants to do research, assuming there is academic preparation and proper socialization, does find the time to fulfill that aspect of faculty commitment. Still, many baccalaureate nursing faculty members state that time does not allow them to meet the research responsibility of their employment position (Conway & Glass, 1978).

The argument of limited time and inadequate socialization would also be pertinent to the question of community service as well as for teaching and research as

faculty promotion and tenure requirements. Yet, according to Solomons et al. (1980), there is not a normative expectation for nurse educators in this area, nor does it make itself a priority on the work schedule according to the general findings of current literature. It should be pointed out that published literature on the subject of nursing faculty workload is rather limited and inconclusive.

Fawcett (1979) explains that many nurse faculty members spend most of their time in the clinical laboratory guiding the learning activities of their students or consulting with clinicians. Other immediate responsibilities of the nurse educator include managing the students, performing the public relations necessary at the clinical sites, preparing lectures for classes, conducting discussions, and planning clinical assignments (Conway & Glass, 1978). "Committee and ad hoc task force activities usurp what little physical and intellectual energy may remain," according to Conway and Glass (1978). The very dynamics of clinical and classroom instruction force teaching to become the priority task and the one facet of the faculty member's job which is adequately accomplished because of its structural constraints and the obvious consequences if it is not!

The question then becomes, are the teaching obligations more readily met because of the formal assignment schedules of clinical and classroom responsibilities and the tangible tasks associated with them (i.e., class preparation, project assignments, examinations, and other evaluations)? If

research was also somehow assigned and tangible in terms of time and expectations of performance, perhaps it would become a more operational obligation of the faculty's workload. In light of these uncertain circumstances, Conway and Glass (1978) propose that the need for the new faculty members to define their own roles is a major problem in socialization. A possible solution to this dilemma is to define clearly the role obligations and expectations including, of course, opportunities for academic freedom as an integral part of the process.

An example of how challenging it can be to determine one's own role set is clearly described in Stuebbe's 1980 article on student/faculty perspectives. In pursuing her study, she discovered that clinical nursing faculty valued their teaching talents and instructor-student relationship as their most significant skills. Yet, the students ranked the instructor's ability to perform clinically as the faculty's most important characteristic. These discrepant perspectives indicate that inherent in the nursing faculty role are some realistic concerns about role conflict and ambiguity based on the value orientation and time distribution for teaching, research, service, and clinical responsibilities.

Williamson (1972) helps to clarify one of the basic concepts of role conflict and ambiguity by noting that however well suited a college of nursing is to the higher education model, in many ways it will not conform to the

basic principles of its professional system. She agreed that colleges of nursing are generally congruent with the overall university in the external policies and procedures, but it is the internal organization which does not clearly interface with the expectations of higher education. Williamson (1972) attributes this disharmony to nursing's long association with the hospital structure.

According to Batey (1969), when a nurse prepares to become a faculty member, the views of appropriate professional behavior and its rewards are likely to be those learned in the hospital setting, and odds are favorable that the nurse will continue to operate according to the standards learned as a hospital nurse. Palmer, too, observed that,

> Few nurse faculty members have grown up in nursing schools rich in traditions of learning, scholarship, and practice. Initially, large numbers of nurse faculty members came from hospital systems, training and work. These nurses brought into the college and university the hospital systems and models of training, work and life styles, and the images of the role models in those settings (1971).

Williamson (1972) expresses the idea that the hospital system reflects an institutional value system which rewards conformity to policies and procedures. Status and position are officially delegated through the authority mechanisms of the organizational system, a system bounded by the walls of that institution. Higher education, on the other hand, reflects a professional value system which rewards expertise in a given discipline focused beyond the university setting. In any professional value system, status and position are

acknowledged by the particular professional group orientation.

Role conflict and ambiguity have been viewed with more interest in recent years with the expansion of role theory; role theory has been used to describe and explain the stresses associated with membership in an organization (Sell, Brief, & Schuler, 1981). Role conflict is commonly defined as an incongruity of the expectations associated with a role. It has been elaborately conceptualized in the literature (McGrath & Perrault, 1976; Sabin & Allen, 1968). Generally, role ambiguity has been defined as the degree to which clear information is lacking regarding (1) the expectations associated with a role (2) methods of fulfilling known role expectations, and/or (3) the consequences of role performance (Graen, 1976; Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, & Snoek, 1964). The salience of examining and interpreting the research on role conflict and ambiguity concerns their relationships with attitudes, behaviors, and other factors (Sell et al., 1981).

There is evidence that individuals with high levels of role ambiguity also respond to their situation with anxiety, and certain negative perceptions of themselves (Brief & Aldag, 1976). It has also been found that because individuals are ambiguous about the behavior required of them by supervisors, they may actually be working at the wrong things (from the organization's point of view) and are probably unaware that they are doing so (Sell et al.,

1981).

The methods of coping with role conflict and ambiguity that have been studied demonstrate a variety of mechanisms that allow for the survival of the person experiencing role stress, yet there were not any approaches which could effectively be considered as invariably productive. Schuler (1979) hypothesized that some individuals cope with conflict by maintaining the status quo. Simmons (1968) found empirical support for that general hypothesis but considered it a disadvantageous way to handle role conflict and ambiguity. Beehe and Newman's (1978) research indicates that the focal person withdraws from interaction and communication with the role senders when there is significant ambiguity. Again, this appears to be dysfunctional. Burk and Belcourt (1974) isolate successful and unsuccessful patterns for coping with specific types of role conflict. Schuler's (1979) research suggests that direct intervention into role episodes of high role conflict and ambiguity are necessary in order to break dysfunctional patterns which become established in organizations between role senders and the focal person. Results suggest that the simple act of coping (vs. noncoping) is more strongly related to satisfaction than any one particular type of coping strategy employed. No other research which has directly investigated coping mechanisms was identified although Anderson's (1976) results do suggest that coping mechanisms differ across levels of perceived stress.

Morris, Steers, and Koch (1979) identified role conflict as being significantly related to participation in decision making, supervisory span of control, span of subordination (i.e., the number of supervisors a subordinate reports to), and formalization. They determined that the key to reducing both role conflict and role ambiguity may lie in providing employees a larger voice in decisions affecting their jobs. This suggestion could be applied to the role of nursing faculty by allowing them to participate in the clear determination of their own work and reward priorities as faculty members.

The concern over the effects of role conflict and ambiguity is significant enough to suggest a consideration of these concepts in terms of faculty workload and its impact on nursing research. According to the literature, research (in many nurse education settings) is not seen as the most valued activity, yet it is one of the three prominent requirements for promotion and tenure. This secondary ranking for research by nurse educators is verified by the findings of four empirical research studies on the workloads of nursing faculty. Two additional studies compared nursing to other fields on the university campus and a third which compared only science and engineering faculty did, nonetheless, have some data pertinent to nursing.

In 1959, Potter analyzed the work of 196 clinical teaching faculty from 38 NLN accredited collegiate schools

of nursing over a week-long period. There were obvious variables in performance according to her study. Potter discerned that the work week hours ranged from 26.3 to 87.8 hours, with an average of 46.8. Only 8% reported fewer than 38 hours and 10% reported more than 60 hours worked a week. She also found that the classroom and clinical assignments of those studied accounted for 74% of the faculty activities. An overall response showed that a meager average of 1.8% of the faculty time was spent on research, with only 25% of the sample reporting that they did any research and writing at all. There were no instructors with doctorate degrees among her 196 respondents in this 1959 research project.

In 1974 at the University of Iowa, a retrospective estimate by all faculty on the average amount of time spent each week for various activities was undertaken. Because the faculty did not feel comfortable about statistics based upon recall and memory, an attempt to verify the information was performed through classifying the on-going nursing faculty work activities into four categories: teaching, scholarly productivity and research, service, and professional growth. Each teaching faculty member was asked to keep a log for the same 7-day period, including weekends. Acknowledging that there never is a "typical" week, a 7-day segment in the middle of the semester was selected. A second weekly log, obtained a month later, tended to establish reliability and validity and verify the accuracy

of the research tool.

The findings of this study showed that the work week of university faculty in composite was 57.4 hours and for nursing faculty in particular the average was 52.6 hours. The number of hours computed included not only instruction but also the time spent in preparation, evaluation, counseling, and advising. The nursing faculty spent 36.5 hours in student-oriented roles; 7.4 hours in community service; and 8.7 hours (16%) in research weekly (Solomons et al., 1980).

Based on the 1974 University of Iowa research process, Solomons et al. (1980) replicated that study for the nursing faculty in 1979. Responses to that study were obtained from 62% of the faculty, and the results showed that teaching was the major activity of the faculty consuming 37.3 hours of the 53.5 average hour work week. The category of professional growth averaged 8 hours a week, and service 4.8. The least amount of time was spent on scholarly productivity, 3.4 (6%) hours a week. When compared by rank, professors were the only faculty members who did <u>any</u> research. The Solomons et al. study and that previously done at the University of Iowa were both completed in the 1970s, yet they show a variability in terms of the amount of time spent by faculty on nursing research. For the 1974 study the time commitment to research was 16% while in the 1979 project it was 6%.

Similarly, in 1979, the University of Wisconsin-

Milwaukee devised an activity-based point system for assessing faculty workloads. By using the philosophy of the school of nursing, the university guidelines, and the established commitments of the faculty members to teaching, research, and service, the committee established units based on clock hours required for weekly activities. The units represented portions of work categories per semester but excluded research (Saylor et al., 1979). Interestingly, two years after the guidelines had been used, the workload for individual faculty members had become more equitable, but the guidelines did not allocate time for research; an impact on research production was not reported (Saylor et al., 1979).

This absence of research as a true component of the standardized faculty format of performance is an obvious one in these studies. The exclusion of research in the 1959 Potter study could be attributed to the total absence of doctorally prepared faculty members and the time of its historical occurrence as the 1950s were the initial dates of nursing's move into the university setting. The more recent Saylor study did not indicate the educational preparation of the faculty polled, yet, in this study there seems to be only a slight motivation to perform nursing research. Is this a result of inadequate research socialization, role conflict and ambiguity, or can it be attributed to the task-oriented ethic of hospital schools of nursing? The article did not identify a reason for the lack of research performance in this faculty group.

A second study comparing nursing faculty to those in other disciplines was undertaken at the University of San Francisco by Counelis in 1974. The results of this study were predominately numerical and encompassed most of the colleges on the campus. However, for purposes of this literature review, reference will be made to only two of the colleges, nursing and education. The reason for comparing just these two areas comes from the report itself which states, "The number of contact hours in the laboratory sciences or internship programs in education and nursing are higher in absolute numbers than the course credit for the course." The concept of work demands on the faculty outside of the classroom has a strong similarity in these two areas. Some of the more significant data are found in Table 1.

From this research it was determined that the nursing faculty taught approximately six more students per course than the educational faculty, yet their student-teacher ratio was less, and they had a smaller ratio of courses per faculty. These data would indicate that nursing faculty carry comparable class and student workloads with that of education faculty. However, there were no data comparing the amount of time spent in service and research for either faculty group (Counelis, 1974).

In 1978-79, another empirical project assessed the workload of faculty at universities in the fields of science and engineering. This research showed that faculty members

Table 1

Comparison of Nursing and Education Workloads: University of San Francisco

	Nursing	Education	Total University
Number of Faculty	32	38	533
Number of Courses	43	83	1,269
Number of Students	799	1,061	25,118
Course Units Taught	190	202	3,276
Faculty Contact Hrs/wk	476	482	4,145
Courses/Faculty	1.3	2.1	2.4
Students/Faculty	25	27.2	48.1
Course Units/Faculty	5.9	5.2	6.3
Students/Course	18.6	12.8	19.2

Adapted from Counelis, 1974

devoted 48 hours per week to their professional activities and 16 of those hours (33%) each week were spent on research (NSF, 1981). University faculty time in research varied significantly by field and environmental life. For example, physical scientists averaged about 20 hours per week for research. All faculty members devoted about twice as much time in preparing for class, grading papers, and similar activities as they spent with students in classroom and laboratories. The full-time science and engineering faculty spent an average of almost 16 hours per week in research over the course of the entire year (NSF, 1981).

The disciplinary differences in research emphasis are evident from the literature available (i.e., nursing faculty in some instances do not allocate research a very high rating in the workload framework, and other science

fields feature it in the workload scheme as a point of emphasis). The literature indicates that there is a deficit in nursing faculty performance in the area of research. Solomons et al. (1980) state that faculty development in research will continue to be a major goal in nursing, and that "nursing will continue to be viewed as the poor relation of the health science family" until that area of academic weakness is corrected.

Based on these apparently confounding role elements, the aim of this research project is to examine the theoretical precepts of role ambiguity by delineating the professional tasks, attitudes, and preparation of the nurse educator and the proportion of time devoted to these various academic responsibilities (i.e., faculty workload) to determine how these may affect the research function. This concern for the performance of research is based on its undeniably high priority in the general university system.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Because of the emerging goal for the profession of nursing to firmly establish a scholarly foundation in the university setting, research has become a significant role expectation among baccalaureate nursing faculty responsibilities. Therefore, this survey study was undertaken to determine the impact of baccalaureate faculty workload on the production of research by nursing educators.

Sample and Setting

The sample of this research project is the baccalaureate faculty in three colleges of nursing located in the Rocky Mountain region of the United States. These educational facilities include all levels of graduate programs and are situated within major medical centers. Both full-time and part-time faculty were included in the study.

Limitations

The limitations of this project include those which are inherent in the use of a questionnaire. They are a lower return rate, a possibility of question misinterpretation,

and potential superficiality of answers. There is also the usual concern over the validity and accuracy of self-reports. However, the use of a questionnaire in this study was the most feasible data collection technique due to financial and time constraints.

Definitions

Role. The descriptive behaviors associated with a position.

Role ambiguity. A situation in which the descriptive behaviors are vague, unclear, and/or uncertain.

Role conflict. A situation in which the descriptive behaviors are difficult or impossible to meet.

Workload. The responsibilities which accompany the position of baccalureate nursing faculty. Formally they are categorized as teaching (including clinical), research, and service.

Research. The scholarly exploration of a scientific body of knowledge, its tenets and phenomena. For the purpose of this study, research is the composite of systematic investigation and publishable writing.

Teaching. The didactic and clinical instruction of students in their area of professional endeavor. Teaching includes clinical training and supervision, classroom instruction, preparation time, evaluation, and advisement.

Service. The sharing of knowledge and skills with appropriate segments of the collegiate organization and

the professional and public communities.

Professional enhancement. The activities necessary to the professional growth and development of an individual. It is often seen as self-study, workshops, formal classes, and/or professional interchange.

Data Collection

After receiving approval from the deans of the three colleges to be surveyed, the data were collected by means of a questionnaire focusing on workload, professional responsibilities, and attitudes. The questionnaires were mailed to a nursing administrative representative at each institution who later distributed them to the appropriate faculty members. The questionnaires were color-coded by institution and returned by mail in a self-addressed, stamped envelope to the investigator.

Instrument

The instrument was a two-part questionnaire consisting of eight demographic questions and 10 professional information questions. The questionnaire was designed to elicit responses to the issues under study in this research project. A small group of associate degree nursing faculty was given the questionnaire as a pilot set and reported no problems concerning readability or use of the tool.

The professional information section of the tool included three major areas: (1) listing the number of hours

spent in an average work week, and the number of hours spent in an ideal work week, (2) listing the number and type of publications, research currently in progress, and the number of presentations made at professional conferences, and (3) describing the reward systems extant in the respondents' institutions as well as their own perceptions of any constraining forces possibly preventing them from achieving institutional rewards.

Design

In this study on baccalaureate faculty workload, several correlational items were examined. Correlations were run on each demographic question with the variables of teaching, research, community service, committee work, and professional enhancement. To see if the three schools were statistically similar, Kruskal-Wallis ANOVAs were run comparing each. Frequencies, Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-rank, and the Mann-Whitney U test were done on the ideal allocation of time in a work week as compared to the actual allocation of time for a week. The frequency tests allowed for a reasonable manner of organizing a large amount of raw data. The Mann-Whitney and Wilcoxon tests allowed for the ranking of data for the identification of factors concerning the two populations. The workload categories include teaching (classroom instruction, clinical instruction, and its requisite travel time, grading and evaluation, counseling and advising, and finally preparation

time), community service, research, (scholarly investigations and writing for publication), professional enhancement, and committee work. The final point of consideration was the rank ordering by the respondents of the reward systems and any constraining forces of their respective colleges of nursing.

The responses were categorized as behaviors which are rewarded, institutional rewards, conflicting responsibilities, and constraining personal circumstances. Ranking was done on the responses as a unit, and then were done comparing full-time with part-time, and master's or lower status with doctorally-prepared faculty members.

When cross classifying information as in this project, it is appropriate to utilize the chi-square distribution. Its purpose is to make inferences about the population and was used to test each item by school as well as each demographic item and the variables. When computing the chi-square, and the observed frequency is far from the expected frequency, the corresponding number in the sum is large; when the two are close the number is small. Large values of chi-square distribution mean that, on the whole, the observed frequencies are close to the expected ones. The overall calculation of the chi-square is to give a measure of the distance between the observed frequencies and the expected frequencies. The expected frequencies are those that would be present if there were no relationships between the two variables. The chi-square statistic is

applied to contingency tables to test the independence of different populations. In this instance the chi-squares would help indicate the similarities or lack of similarities among the three schools and their workload and demographic data.

Unlike the other tests, the Mann-Whitney U employs the actual ranks of the various observations directly as a device for testing the hypothesis about the identity of two population distributions. It is an effective and relatively powerful alternative to the usual t-test for equality means. The rationale for the Mann-Whitney test can be based directly on the concept of randomization. That is, probability statements actually refer directly to all possible randomizations of the same sample of N subjects among the various treatments.

The same general argument for the Mann-Whitney test may be extended to the situation where more than two independent groups are being compared. The appropriate test for this type of problem is the Kruskal-Wallis. It has very close ties to the Mann-Whitney and can properly be regarded as a generalized version of the Mann-Whitney method. The Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance by ranks was used to test each item by school to determine the similarities or differences in the three institutions.

The Spearman rank correlation coefficient is a simplistic way of comparing rank orders of data for agreement. In this test, the point of view can be taken

that if the rank orders agree, the ranks of individuals correlate positively with each other, whereas, disagreement should be reflected by a negative correlation. A zero correlation represents an intermediate condition; there is no particular connection between the rank of the variables. It was used in this instance to test the positive or negative relationships between the different aspects of the workload.

Null hypothesis is another consideration of the statistics of this paper. A reasonable null hypothesis is that there are no actual relationships between variables and that any such observed relationship is only a function of chance or sampling error. The need for a null hypothesis lies in the concept that statistical hypothesis testing is basically a process of rejection. The researcher does not know when an error in statistical decision making has been committed. The acceptance or rejection of a null hypothesis could only be definitively ascertained by collecting information from the entire population, in which case there would be no need for statistical inference. Throughout this study, the significance level of Alpha = .05 was used. The use of .05 means there was a 5:100 risk of making an error for the null hypothesis.

Applying these various statistical techniques to the survey data collected was determined to be an appropriate means of attempting to answer the general questions of

the impact of workload on the pursuit and productivity of research.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DATA ANALYSIS

In this study, baccalaureate faculty from three colleges of nursing in the Rocky Mountain region of the United States within major university medical centers were surveyed concerning their actual and ideal workload situations, record of publications, current research and conference presentations, and reward systems with subsequent constraining forces found in their settings. These schools were chosen because of their apparent similarities and with the assumption that research would be valued in each setting. A hundred and sixteen questionnaires were mailed to administrative respresentatives at each college. Of these, 67 were mailed back for a return rate of 57.76%. All were deemed usable. The return rate was considered satisfactory for a questionnaire survey. From school #1, there were 45 baccalaureate faculty members identified; however, due to a clerical error only 22 of those received the questionnaire with 19 returning it, for a return rate of 86%. School #2 distributed 34 questionnaires, and returned 20 for a return rate of 58%. School #3 distributed 65 questionnaires and returned 28 of them for a 43% return rate.

In order to determine how data on workload and research activity gathered in this study may correlate, a number of analyses were run. The first was a simple frequency distribution. When calculating the frequencies on the demographic information from the participating faculty members, as shown in Table 2, an informative depiction of the baccalureate faculty members at the three colleges emerged. To determine similarities or lack of similarities between the schools surveyed the Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance was run on the pooled schools and the responses of the demographic data. None of the tests were statistically significant at the Alpha = .05 level. This finding suggests a strong similarity among the schools. The chi-square tests indicated that the schools did not vary on a statistically significant level, except on the item of professional enhancement. Essentially, the three schools had the same kinds of faculty spending similar amounts of time fulfilling the requirements of their professional workloads. The professional enhancement category had a p value of .03, and was statistically significant only for school #1. A possible explanation for this difference was that only this school reported having doctoral students on the faculty and these students reported their school attendance as professional enhancement. This personal perception of professional enhancement could have increased significantly the hours reported in that category for school #1.

This lack of demonstrable difference, except for the

Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of Schools Pooled

Group	N	mean	median	mode	SD
		Educational background			
2. BS	5				
3. MS	44	3.25	3.148	3.0	.704
4. Ph.D.	15				
5. Ed.D.	2				
6. Other	1				
		Title of present position			
1. TA/TF	2				
2. Instructor	20				
3. Assistant Professor	33	2.94	1.132	3.0	1.043
4. Associate Professor	8				
5. Full Professor	0				
6. Other	4				
		Employment status			
1. Full-time	53	1.209	1.132	1.0	.410
2. Part-time	14				
		Years teaching			
1. 0-5	26				
2. 6-10	18				
3. 11-15	8	2.403	1.917	1.0	1.567
4. 16-20	2				
5. 20+	11				
6. Intermittent	2				
		Age bracket			
1. 20-29	4				
2. 30-35	17				
3. 36-40	13	3.642	3.462	2.0	1.621
4. 41-45	13				
5. 46-50	5				
6. 50+	15				

Table 2 Continued

Group	N	mean	median	mode	SD
		Sex			
1. Female	66				
2. Male	1	1.015	1.008	1.0	.122
		Personal situation			
1. Single	14				
2. Married	41	2.152	1.963	2.0	1.011
3. Separated	0				
4. Divorced	9				
5. Widow	2				
		Numbers of children			
0.0	49				
1.1	14	.328	.184	.0	.587
2.2	2				
		Professional Organization Membership			
0.	10				
1.	24	1.612	1.472	1.0	1.128
2.	21				
3.	6				
4.	6				
		Membership in professional organization by name			
ANA	41				
WICHEN	9	--	--	--	--
NLN	12				
Clinical speciality	35				
Sigma Theta Tau	7				
Other	5				

Note: ANA = American Nurses' Association
WICHEN = Western Interstate Conference on Higher Education for Nurses
NLN = National League for Nursing
Numbers of central tendency refer to numeration under heading of Group and not actual value of responses.

category of professional enhancement, presents an identifiable composite picture of the average baccalaureate nursing faculty member at these three institutions. Characteristically, this faculty member is a married female without children; there was only one male respondent in the survey. The typical faculty member is a full-time assistant professor with a master's degree. She is between the ages of 30-40 and has been teaching for 6-10 years. She belongs to 1.6 professional organizations, the American Nurses' Association being the most common with clinical specialty organizations next in frequency.

This representative person is unpublished in terms of articles, chapters, and books. Reportedly, she is currently working on a research project and has presented 1.1 scholarly papers at a district, state or national conference during her career. In terms of her teaching responsibilities, this representative faculty member spends 3.9 hours in the classroom teaching per week and 16.14 hours providing clinical instruction. She also puts into her teaching responsibilities 5.5 preparation hours, 3.03 hours on grading and evaluation, and 1.6 hours counseling and advising. She devotes 2.9 hours to research each week and 2.06 hours to writing for publication. The responsibilities of community service are limited to 1.63 hours a week, with committee work taking 3.08 hours weekly. Professional enhancement has an overall mean of 3.27 hours per week.

The Mann-Whitney U and Wilcoxon rank summary tests

were used to compare the ideal work week with the average actual work week. Some significant correlations among these data were found. These tests were employed with the schools pooled because of their similarities; the results are displayed in Tables 3 and 4. The Mann-Whitney U indicated that the variable of research ideal (the time one wished to devote to research pursuits) had three significant comparisons: employment status, years of teaching, and educational level. Each of these items compared on a significant level of p (two-tailed) = .05 or less. This finding indicates that the amount of time baccalaureate faculty members want to spend on research relates to their employment status, as well as to their educational level and the number of years they have been teaching. This analysis suggests that those who possessed doctorate degrees and had been teaching for at least 6 years while being employed full-time tended to prefer more time for research.

Other significant data were apparent when comparing research average with educational level. Each of these items was significant at the p = .03 or below. This finding also intimates that the amount of time baccalaureate faculty members spend on research relates to their employment duration and educational level. Briefly, the indications are that the more years faculty have spent in teaching and the higher their degrees, the more time they spend on research activities. The same is true of publications and education. The higher the education, the more time is spent weekly

Table 3

Mann-Whitney U Test of Ideal and Average Work Week with Education, Years of Teaching, Employment Status and Publications

Variables	P
Research ideal with full-time, part-time	.0398
Research ideal with year of teaching	.0230
Research ideal with education	.0005
Research average with years of teaching	.0379
Research average with education	.0200
Publications with education	.0270

Table 4

Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-Ranks Test of Ideal Work Week with Average Work Week

Variables	P
Teaching	.000
Research	.000
Community service	.017
Committee work	.016

writing for publication. It seems appropriate to note that the less experienced doctoral faculty member wishes for more time to pursue research, and that same educational level person with more experience does indeed devote more time to research activities.

When comparing the average work week results with the ideal work week results, as found in Table 5, one

Table 5

Comparison of Average and Ideal Work Week Means in Hours

Category	Average	Ideal
Classroom instruction	3.9	3.68
Clinical instruction	16.14	13.64
Preparation time	5.531	5.49
Grading and evaluation	4.25	3.406
Counseling and advising	3.03	2.688
Research	2.935	5.714
Writing for publication	2.016	3.871
Community service	1.625	2.238
Professional enhancement	3.27	3.213
Committee work	3.078	2.349

participant in the study reported a preference for 101 hour ideal work week; another participant planned a 93 hour work week as ideal. Both of these very high figures were calculated with the Wilcoxon test; it is reported in Table 4. The advantage of using the Wilcoxen test on this information is the rank ordering which does not allow such unexpected responses to alter the meaning of the other participants' apparently more rational responses. The comparison of the teaching ideal data with the teaching average data was $p = .000$. The same results were found when comparing research ideal with research average. Both of these results indicate that baccalureate instructors are unable to allocate what they consider to be ideal amounts of time to their teaching or research responsibilities. There is considerable difference between the average and ideal in both categories.

Other points of interest from the Wilcoxon analysis had to do with the community service ideal and the community service average. The $p = .017$ score provides the same conclusion, (i.e., the ideal and average performance are not congruous). Ideal committee work when compared with average committee work had a $p = .016$ which again offers the same general conclusion. Professional enhancement, both ideal and average, was tested with the Wilcoxon and found to be insignificant which indicates the one area without major differences. The faculty reportedly are spending approximately the same number of hours each week on

professional enhancement as they would allocate in an ideal work week.

The Spearman correlation coefficient, Table 6, was carried out on the 24-paired variables in the ideal and average work week question to determine if there is agreement in the rank orders of the data. With this test, it is assumed that if rank orders agree, the ranks are positively correlated to each other, whereas disagreement should be reflected by a negative correlation. Five factors correlated on a significant level.

Research average correlated negatively on a significant

Table 6

Spearman Correlation Coefficients of Ideal Work Week with Average Work Week

Correlation	N	r	Sig
Research average with Teaching average	61	-.298	.012
Research Average with Community service ideal	58	-.2278	.043
Publication with Professional enhancement average	63	.2331	.033
Publication with Committee work average	64	.3563	.002

Note: r= Spearman's correlation coefficient
Sig= Significance value

level with teaching average and community service ideal. The interpretation of these results is that as the average number of hours devoted to research goes up or increases in the workload, the other two factors diminish. Writing for publication correlated positively with two items: professional enhancement and committee work. The interpretation is that as a faculty member does more writing and publishing, there is also more time spent on professional enhancement and doing committee work.

Chi-squares were run correlating the schools with the participants' replies on the questions concerning publications, current research in progress, and scholarly presentations. Again, none of the tests were statistically significant. This finding would indicate that the three universitites were very similar not only on faculty demographics, but also on their publication and research ativities, including presentations of scholarly papers.

Some of the chi-square statistics were incongruent with the expectations of this study. Reference is made to the lack of significance between the education of the respondent and the amount of research carried out. Also, the years of teaching and the age of the person did not relate significantly with the amount of research in which the faculty member was currently involved. It was expected that having more years of teaching and doctoral preparation would increase the amount of research participation. However, such did not occur for the sample studied according to the

chi-square test, but was significant when tested with the Mann-Whitney U. This difference could be attributed to the rank ordering of the Mann-Whitney U test.

An additional expectation was that the more profesionally active a faculty member was, as measured by membership in professional organizations, the more emphasis there would be on research. However, this was not the case either, even when considering membership in Sigma Theta Tau, a professional research organization. The only factors which correlated significantly on the chi-square statistic were the employment status and the type of research done, specifically funded research. Seventy-five percent of full-time faculty were involved in funded research, whereas, only 17% of the part-time respondents were involved in research, and that in the nonfunded category.

It should be noted that personal life style did not seem to have an effect on the amount of research these faculty members were currently pursuing. Neither was there a correlation between marital status or presence of children and the amount of research currently being done. Nonetheless, family responsibility was listed as one of the major constraints to research by the respondents. The statistics do not render an explanation for these incongruities except that in the ranks computed in the "constraints to research" question, the results were not statistically significant. This circumstance may suggest that family responsibility is not a critical issue, but one

that is present. However, family responsibility was nevertheless the most frequently listed constraint to research production.

The analysis of questions six through nine on the professional information section dealing with most rewarded behaviors, types of rewards given, and constraints to achieving the rewards revealed a unique problem. The actual statistics were computing ranks for each item categorized. The categories were behaviors which are rewarded, institutional rewards, conflicting responsibilities, and constraining personal circumstances. There was concern in this study that a large number of respondents (25 of 67) may have reversed the ranking instructions by using 1 as the highest and 5 as the lowest instead of 5 as the highest and 1 as the lowest as the instructions indicated. This does conceivably heavily influence the results of this part of the study.

Appendix A, page 83 displays average ranks for the total study group. Research was the most rewarded behavior. Promotion was the highest ranked reward, and clinical activities presented the greatest conflict with research. Family constraints reportedly were the strongest personal obstacle to carrying out research. Two other personal constraints, pursuing advanced degrees and nonprofessional expectations, were virtually tied with family commitments for the highest average hindrances to research pursuits.

Appendix A, pages 84 and 85 contrast the average

rankings for respondents with a master's degree or less with those who have doctorate degrees. The master's and less educated faculty resembled the overall group, but the 17 doctorate faculty members reported a greater variety of highly rewarded behaviors, kinds of rewards, and conflicting responsibilities. However, there was too much missing information on this group to permit a meaningful analysis of the personal constraint item, question nine.

Appendix A, pages 86 and 87 stratify responses by full-time and less than full-time employment. Full-time people rank research much higher than other behaviors (where $\underline{R}$ = average rank/$\underline{R}$ = 3.784). Full-time faculty perceive promotion and tenure as the chief rewards, whereas, part-time faculty members would add committee work ($\underline{R}$ = 3.214). Both groups cite teaching, clinical responsibility, and college service as major conflicts with the pursuit of research. Finally, both groups ranked pursuit of advanced degrees, family commitments, and nonprofessional expectations high as personal constraints, although substantially more emphasis in the part-time group is on pursuing degrees ($\underline{R}$ = 4.300 vs. $\underline{R}$ = 3.095).

Appendix A page 88 offers further information on the faculty members' rankings by displaying the percentages of the respondents who ranked a given item as a 5 or the highest rank. The percentage of people who did not assign a rank of 5 for a given question is shown as missing. These appendices display data which are multinominally distributed.

Therefore, they may be tested using Pearson's chi-square test. The priority given research was more clearly delineated in Appendix A, page 88 than it was in Appendix A, page 83. Of those responding, 65.7% ranked research as the single most rewarded behavior when considering rewards given for the priority behavior. Tenure was less often ranked highest, and reduced teaching schedule and promotion were the most frequently ranked highest. Of those surveyed, 34.33% ranked clinical activities highest in conflicting with research, which serves to clarify the near-tie in Appendix A, page 83. This approach to viewing the data specifies that clincical activities are the most predominate conflict listed, whereas viewing the data only as average rank of response left a conclusion unclear. Personal constraints displayed the same results as in Appendix A, page 83, with 46.27% of those responding, failing to rank any personal constraint as 5. This could be interpreted as 46.27% of the respondents did not feel they had a dominate (5) constraint or it could be a misreading of the instructions.

Appendix A, pages 89 and 90 are analogous to AppendiX A, pages 84 and 85 in comparing faculty with a master's degree or less with those who have doctoral degrees. Again, master's responses resembled the total group, but doctoral faculty responses ranked service over research 29.41% of the time. The doctorally prepared faculty ranked research as the highest reward behavior 47% of the time.

Promotion and reduced teaching loads received frequent

5's as rewards in both groups, with tenure slightly less recognized as the highest rank. More than 23% of both groups agreed that clinical activities were the highest conflicting responsibility. Pursuit of degrees is more often the highest personal constraint of master's faculty at 20%, with doctorate faculty responding at 17.65%. These answers were followed in both groups by family commitment. However, the distribution of responses of all four questions is not statistically significant for master's as compared to doctorate which indicates that although there are differences of interest when looking at the statistics, the information was not statistically significant in the two groups.

Comparing full-time to part-time faculty in Appendix A, pages 91 and 92 showed that nearly 2/3 of those participating identified research as the highest ranked rewarded behavior with clinical activities second in the part-time group (21.43%) and service second in the full-time group (18.8%). Full-time faculty perceive promotion and reduced teaching as primary rewards, whereas, prestigious committees are an additional incentive for part-time people. Both groups perceived the highest ranked conflict to be clinical responsibilities (30-40%). Pursuit of degrees was cited highest by 50% of the part-time replies, whereas, full-time respondents cited family constraints most frequently, but only 18.87% of the time.

A graphic representation of additional data can be found

in subsequent tables. Table 7 contains the professional information frequencies of the ideal work week data, and Table 8 has the same information on the average work week question. The summary of data concerning faculty publication is found in Tables 9, 10, and 11, and the presentation of papers information is in Tables 12 and 13.

Table 7

Professional Information Frequencies of Ideal Work Week Data

Hours	N	mean	median	mode	SD
		Classroom instruction			
0	4				
1	3	3.683	3.450	2.0	2.256
2	15				
3	10				
4	12				
5	8				
6	6				
8	2				
9	1				
10	2				
		Clinical instruction			
0	1				
3	2	13.641	14.500	10.0	4.984
5	2				
6	1				
8	3				
9	1				
10	10				
12	8				
13	1				
14	3				
15	3				
16	10				
17	2				
18	8				

Table 7 Continued

Hours	N	mean	median	mode	SD
19	2				
20	5				
22	1				
24	1				
		Preparation time			
0	1				
2	17	5.492	4.556	2.0	4.366
3	5				
4	8				
5	9				
6	2				
7	2				
8	10				
9	1				
10	6				
15	1				
30	1				
		Grading and evaluating			
0	2				
1	10	3.406	2.370	2.0	3.206
2	23				
3	6				
4	8				
5	2				
6	2				
8	1				
9	1				
15	1				
20	1				
		Counseling and advising			
0	2				
1	8	2.688	2.210	2.0	1.726
2	31				
3	8				
4	6				
5	6				
6	1				
7	1				
10	1				

Table 7 Continued

Hours	N	mean	median	mode	SD
		Research			
0	7				
1	1	5.714	4.80	8.0	4.492
2	7				
3	4				
4	11				
5	5				
6	5				
7	1				
8	14				
10	4				
16	1				
19	1				
20	2				
		Writing for publication			
0	6				
1	6	3.871	3.250	2.0	2.883
2	16				
3	4				
4	9				
5	5				
6	2				
7	1				
8	10				
10	3				
		Community service			
0	9				
1	11	2.238	1.979	20	1.729
2	24				
3	6				
4	7				
5	4				
8	2				
		Professional enhancement			
0	6				
1	4	3.213	2.60	2.0	2.138
2	20				
3	5				

Table 7 Continued

Hours	N	mean	median	mode	SD
4	9				
5	11				
6	1				
8	5				
		Committee work			
0	8				
1	10	2.349	2.087	2.0	1.715
2	23				
3	8				
4	8				
5	4				
8	2				

Table 8

Professional Information Frequencies of Average Work Week Data

Hours	N	mean	median	mode	SD
		Classroom instruction			
0	6				
1	5	3.906	3.750	4.0	2.921
2	9				
3	9				
4	12				
5	10				
6	6				
7	3				
8	1				
9	2				
19	1				
		Clinical instruction			
2	1				
3	1	16.141	16.50	20.00	4.553
8	1				
10	5				
11	2				
12	5				
13	2				
14	3				
15	2				
16	10				
17	1				
18	11				
19	1				
20	13				
21	1				
22	2				
23	2				
24	2				
		Preparation time			
0	1				
1	1	5.531	4.265	4.0	3.695
2	9				
3	8				
4	17				

Table 8 Continued

Hours	N	mean	median	mode	SD
5	6				
6	4				
7	1				
8	3				
9	1				
10	9				
11	1				
12	1				
16	1				
20	1				
		Grading and evaluating			
0	1				
1	8	3.031	3.50	2.0	2.911
2	12				
3	11				
4	7				
5	8				
6	6				
8	5				
9	2				
10	3				
15	1				
		Counseling and advising			
0	2				
1	13	1.625	2.421	2.0	2.031
2	19				
3	6				
4	10				
5	10				
6	3				
10	2				
		Research			
0	27				
1	7	2.935	1.071	.00	4.450
2	8				
3	2				
4	4				
5	2				
6	3				
7	1				

Table 8 Continued

Hours	N	mean	median	mode	SD
8	1				
10	3				
13	1				
15	1				
16	1				
20	1				
		Writing for publication			
0	32				
1	10	2.061	.484	.00	3.581
2	6				
4	6				
5	2				
6	2				
7	1				
9	1				
10	1				
13	1				
20	1				
		Community service			
0	24				
1	12	1.625	1.167	.00	1.795
2	13				
3	3				
4	6				
5	4				
6	1				
7	1				
		Professional enhancement			
0	13				
1	11	3.270	2.077	.00	3.580
2	13				
3	5				
4	7				
5	3				
8	3				
9	3				
10	2				
12	1				
13	1				
15	1				

Table 8 Continued

Hours	N	mean	median	mode	SD
		Committee work			
0	10				
1	9	3.078	2.700	2.00	2.346
2	12				
3	5				
4	11				
5	5				
6	8				
7	2				
8	1				
10	1				

Table 9

Publication of Articles by Faculty

Number Published	N	mean	median	mode	SD
		Single author			
0	41	.851	.317	.00	1.663
1	14				
2	5				
3	4				
4	1				
8	1				
9	1				
		First author			
0	51	.507	.157	.00	1.341
1	9				
2	3				
3	2				
4	1				
9	1				
		Second author			
0	46	.493	.228	.00	.959
1	15				
2	3				
3	1				
4	1				
5	1				

Table 10

Publication of Chapters by Faculty

Number Published	N	mean	median	mode	SD
		Single author			
0	46	.493	.228	.00	.959
1	15				
2	3				
3	1				
4	1				
5	1				
		First author			
0	62	.104	.040	.00	.394
1	3				
2	2				
		Second author			
0	58	.224	.078	.00	.735
1	6				
2	2				
5	1				

Table 11

Publication of Books by Faculty

Number Published	N	mean	median	mode	SD
		Single author			
0	65	.030	.015	.00	.171
1	2				
		First author			
0	66	.015	.008	.00	.122
1	1				
		Second author			
0	61	.090	.049	.00	.288
1	6				

Table 12

Papers Presented by Faculty at District, State or National Level

Number of papers	N	mean	median	mode	SD
1. 0	21	1.134	.917	1.0	1.205
2. 1-3	30				
3. 4-7	9				
4. 8-11	2				
5. 12-15	3				
6. Other	2				

Table 13

Frequencies of Ideal and Average Work Week

by Hours Per Week

Mean	median	mode	SD	mean	median	mode	SD
	Teaching Ideal				Teaching Average		
28.984	28.10	21.00	10.284	33.016	32.75	35.00	8.7
	Research Ideal				Research Average		
9.613	8.50	10.00	6.085	4.919	2.30	.00	6.30

Tables 13 and 14 contain the frequencies of the ideal and average work week by hours per week. These tables contain the basic information from which the statistical tests were performed.

This survey research demonstrated that the three schools involved in the project were statistically similar. The faculty at all three institutions reportedly work a weighted mean of 44.4 hours a week with schools #1 and #2 being remarkable similar at 47.8 and 47.7 hours a week, as indicated on Table 15. However, school #3 had an average work week of 43.2 hours. It is interesting to note that part-time faculty at school #1 work more hours each week than the full-time faculty. This is attributable to the professional enhancement component of the questionnaire as school #1 is the only school reporting doctoral students as faculty members. Those faculty members reported their class involvement as students in the professional enhancement category. This altered the total work hours considerably which accounts for the high figure in part-time faculty work hours for school #1.

The final question on the survey was "Is there any other aspect of this issue you consider important that has not been touched on in this questionnaire?" Of the 67 respondents, 27 or 40% provided a reply to that question. It is a reasonable conclusion that those who took the time to write their reply felt that what they were recording was of value. Twenty-four responses were considered either

Table 14

Total Hours and N for Ideal and Average Work Week by Hours per Week

Hours	N	Hours	N
Teaching Ideal		Teaching Average	
14	2	18	1
16	2	21	1
19	4	22	3
21	6	23	2
22	2	24	4
23	1	25	3
24	1	26	4
25	4	27	3
26	4	28	3
27	2	29	3
28	5	30	1
29	3	31	1
30	3	33	2
31	4	34	3
32	4	35	5
33	3	36	3
35	5	37	1
36	1	38	2
38	1	39	1
40	1	40	2
41	1	41	1
50	1	42	3
57	1	44	2
81	1	46	1
		47	2
		48	1
		65	1

Table 14 Continued

Hours	N	Hours	N
Research Ideal		Research average	
0	4	0	19
2	1	1	4
3	2	2	10
4	6	3	1
6	6	4	7
7	3	5	2
8	6	6	2
10	11	7	1
11	2	8	2
12	2	9	2
13	1	10	3
14	1	12	2
15	1	14	1
16	6	15	2
18	2	16	1
20	2	20	1
22	1	25	1
24	1	28	1
28	1		

Table 15

Hours Worked Weekly by School

	school #1	school #2	school #3
		Average	
total	47.778	47.667	43.208
full-time	47.25	50.667	44.286
part-time	48.833	32.667	35.667
		Ideal	
total	43.529	44.053	49.391
full-time	46.182	46.067	50.7
part-time	38.667	36.5	40.667

constructive suggestions or negative comments. The other three replies were explanatory in nature. There were no comments that could be construed as positive concerning the issues under discussion. Some of the comments made were:

> "It is difficult for a part-time faculty member to pursue anything new if that person has a large clinical group for whom she is responsible."
>
> "The clinical time . . . adds a minimum of 18-20 hours (including travel) to the schedule. Research and publishing become impossible under those circumstances."
>
> "Workloads should vary from quarter to quarter to allow those faculty who are interested and willing to do writing and research to do so."

These three comments indicate role conflict by their expressions of inability to meet two expectations of their jobs, teaching (clinical) and research. One respondent indicated that it is impossible, another suggested a manner of allowing the opportunity for research writing indicating

that it cannot be done in her current situation. Clinical instruction is a very tangible aspect of baccalaureate faculty workload and according to these faculty members precludes writing and research.

A doctorally prepared respondent made a pertinent comment concerning family constraints and the production of research. It follows:

> "I think that currently there is a new breed of Ph.D's who are trying to balance a professional life with that of having a young family. While it is articulated that writing and research are part of the job, unfortunately, in reality, time is not programmed into job responsibilities for such activities."

Role conflict and ambiguity occur when messages for work priority come from administration in an unclear manner. This problem was alluded to by some of the respondents as well.

> "Administration always seems threatened. Do not work with teaching ranks. Clinical schedule and heavy time commitment with BS students precludes research and publication time."

> "I am not a disgruntled faculty member. Overall I enjoy my position. However, isn't it time that schools of nursing back up their statements of publish, write grants, etc. with time within the position for faculty to do so?"

> "One of the main problems on our faculty is one of attitude. Administration has a noncaring attitude toward most faculty and promote negative competition between faculty peers . . . There are no standards for workload assignments."

> "There is a lack of affirmation and validation for faculty pursuing Ph.D's. These people are put into low prestige teaching positions and little consideration is given to their career goals when scheduling and workloads are distributed."

A final comment of those written tends to crystallize

the picture of role ambiguity. It refers to the responsibility of baccalaureate education, and points out that it is simply not conducive to the concepts of writing and research.

> ". . . undergraduate teaching is fun, but requires energy and involvement on the baccalaureate level. Unfortunately, this level of teaching does not offer a lot of opportunities to work daily in areas which involve research, theory development, and sophisticated levels of professional development."

These comments are an overview of the responses made on the questionnaires. They actually touch on all aspects of this research project. The predominate responsibility of teaching is clearly addressed by these voluntary remarks. There is also reference to the number of master's prepared faculty on the baccalaureate faculty, and some comments indicating a lack of support for pursuing the doctorate degree. The idea of ambiguous and conflicting job roles seems to exist as witnessed by the comments regarding teaching role as compared to that of writing and research. There were several comments that seem to support the presence of this problem. At least it can accurately be said that these problems were present for those who wrote a response to question 10 on this survey tool.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The basic objective of this study was to determine if baccalaureate faculty members fulfill the university expectations of significant research, community service, and assigned teaching responsibilities. A point of concern was the presumed heavy teaching load that baccalaureate instructors are reputed to have, as well as the paucity of doctorally educated faculty who may be inadequately prepared to carry out sophisticated research. Another issue of research interest was the possible role conflict and ambiguity which seems to be a part of the baccalaureate faculty work experience. In brief, baccalaureate instructors with large teaching asignments, but without the research-based doctorate degree, are nevertheless, apparently expected to fulfill the professional responsibilities of research and service along with their teaching commitments.

The major focus of this survey was on the research component of those responsibilities since it is probably the one factor which will establish nursing's credibility in the university setting. Scholarly research is seen as the hallmark of academia, and, as indicated in the literature review, is an area found lacking among nursing academics.

Except for the category of professional enhancement as

described in Chapter IV, the three schools surveyed did not differ statistically from each other in any area. They had similar faculties, workloads, and research and writing credits. These people spend 30.234 hours in an average work week fulfilling their teaching responsibilities, which represents 68% of their average total work week. They spend 5 hours a week doing research and writing for publication and commit 4.7 hours toward community service and college committee work. These activities formed an overall work week of 44.4 hours. The weekly average number of hours reported as worked was low when compared to the weekly averages found in the literature. The significance of this fact is uncertain; a number of speculative interpretations are possible.

Of the 67 respondents, 44 had masters degrees; 17 doctorate degrees; 5 bachelor degrees; and 1 nonspecific other degree (Table 2). These data do have a bearing on the study because of the concept that master's prepared faculty members are excellent practitioners, but many do not have sophisticated research skills. Although 26 of the 67 respondents were not currently doing any research, 36 were involved in a research project, with one participating in two projects, and three faculty members were working on three projects. The mean was .712 and the mode was zero. The mode of zero indicated that the most popular response of the faculty was zero research, or they did not have any research currently in progress; the mean of .712 indicated that on the

average 71% of the faculty had one research project on which they were currently working; or each faculty member had .712 research projects in progress.

In spite of the survey indicating that a majority of the faculty members (61%) were involved in a research project, little was being published. The mode for publishing articles, chapters, and books was zero. The mean in each case was .5 or below except for the single authors of articles which was .851. These numbers are not statistically significant. The results indicated that most of those queried did not publish their research works.

When comparing responses to the questions concerning the ideal teaching/research time in a week and average teaching/research time in week, there were some discrepencies which tended to suggest job dissatisfaction. This point was further verified by personal comments made by some of those participating in the study. Job dissatisfaction is one of the consequences of role conflict and ambiguity. Again, a basic premise of this study was that there are heavy time and task demands made on baccalaureate faculty members, which lend themselves to role ambiguity. Generally, role ambiguity has been defined as the degree to which clear information is lacking regarding (1) the expectations associated with a role (2) methods of fulfilling known role expectations, and/or (3) the consequences of the role performance (Graen, 1976). It would seem that faculty members do understand their role expectations, but are not clear on the methods of fulfilling

these known role expectations, specifically that expectation of research production.

Further verification of role conflict occurred as when given the opportunity to plan their ideal work week, the faculty altered their current work week in several significant areas. They gave themselves 3.766 hours less a week of teaching and 4.7 more hours to do research. That group reaction to the current employment situation was, interestingly enough, a very simple maneuver to alter the hours and thereby allow themselves what they felt were the requisite number of hours to perform research activities. There were differences in other categories as well. Ideal community service was increased .61 hours, whereas college service was decreased .73 hours a week. The difference between ideal and average community service and college service was only 30-40 minutes a week, but both items tested with the Wilcoxon technique and were found to be statistically significant (Table 4). An important consideration in the role conflict framework is that the behavior seen as the most rewarded, which was research, was one which was not done successfully by most of the participants. The greatest constraint to research production was listed as clinical activities. This was a significant part of the baccalaureate faculty member's job, requiring 16 hours of the work week. This finding seems to indicate the most rewarded behavior is not displayed because of another major job responsibility which is clinical instruction.

The Spearman correlation coefficients on teaching and research average indicated that the more one teaches, the less one does research. This is an informative result of the survey because of the expectations of the population under examination. The Spearman results also indicated a negative correlation with research average and community service; or the more research that was done, the less community service was rendered. This test also indicated that the more a faculty member published, the more hours per week were spent in professional enhancement activities, and on committee work.

The faculty at the three colleges ranked research as the most rewarded behavior at their schools and also indicated that clinical activities conflicted most with research efforts. The survey results showed that the faculty had a mean of 30.234 hours of teaching related responsibilities a week and still had the stated charge of producing viable research. Two other items listed on the rank order tests as being major deterrents to the production of significant research were the constraining factors of pursuing advanced degrees and family commitments. Again, the possibility of role conflict presents itself. In a situation where the majority of persons are master's prepared, the concern over continued educational pursuits is generally present. In this group of faculty, the majority of them were married which again indicated that there was a family setting with which the faculty did have to deal. The survey did not allow

suggestions for solutions to the problems which were presented. But those two predominate constraining factors to the production of research were reported by a majority of those questioned.

Again it is significant to recognize that a majority of those teaching on the baccalaureate level are master's prepared. In this study it was 44 master's as compared to 17 doctorally educated. This comparison relates directly to the test results of the Mann-Whitney U which in essence said that the most research is done by the doctorally-prepared faculty persons who have spent more years teaching. The same was true of the publication category; the higher the education the more publication was done. These facts, even for this limited survey group, should have an impact on consideration given to baccalaureate faculty workload in that doctorate preparation may be the appropriate educational preparation for baccalaureate level instruction if research and publishing are to continue to be faculty expectations.

Those surveyed in this study were essentially master's prepared faculty who reported being involved in one research project or less, yet they list research as the most rewarded behavior at all three institutions. These people were obligated to 30 hours of teaching tasks a week, with 16 hours of that in the clinical area. Yet they list clinical activities as the predominate constraint to producing research. Some of these faculty members reported pursuing advanced degrees and family commitments as the major personal

constraints to the production of research, and the majority of them are subject to concern in both categories. These points indicate that the majority of faculty report they have to deal with multiple job conflicts.

The picture portrayed of the baccalaureate faculty surveyed in this study, as the results relate to research production, indicate a need to consider the workload expectations in terms of the concerns mentioned and statistically validated as the faculty are not performing successfully in this area.

Conclusion

The results of this study suggest three important findings and conclusions. Specifically they are (1) the baccalaureate faculty at these three institutions resemble the profile described in the literature at this time, (2) they report being unable to meet well the traditional trifold role responsibilities of university faculty, and (3) they also exhibit certain characteristics conducive to both role ambiguity and conflict.

The first finding is that faculty members in this study met the description of baccalaureate faculty members referred to in the literature. They do expend most of their time in teaching and related tasks. The majority of them are without doctorate degrees, but they do report a desire to pursue more research and writing although they have little involvement in these activities and even less productivity in publishing any

scholarly research.

This finding has particular significance in reference to the most recent study on baccalaureate workloads which was in 1979. Since this same category of faculty in 1984 are functioning essentially the same as those surveyed in 1979, a likely conclusion is that, in 5 years, there has not been little if any change in performance for these baccalaureate faculty members.

Directly related to the second finding is the presence of role conflict and ambiguity which cannot be ignored. As a group, the respondents reportedly preferred less teaching responsibility and more time to pursue their research and writing for publication endeavors. There were personal comments on the questionnaire indicating there was conflict between teaching responsibilities and the research publishing expectations. Generally, the faculty surveyed would have liked to have had different distributions of their role responsibilities. They indicated that their clinical activities were the greatest constraint to the fulfillment of their expectation for research. Research was stated to be the most rewarded behavior of these faculty members. Yet, their teaching assignments comprised a very powerful 30 hours which, when combined with their service and professional enhancement activities, would seem to preclude much time for significant research and/or writing.

Perhaps the most significant finding was that baccalaureate faculty members at the three institutions

surveyed reported that they generally do not fulfill all three requirements for performance in a university setting. They did fulfill their teaching requirements, which compose 68% of their work week commitments, but the amount of research in which they were involved was limited. Much less is ever published. The community service time to which they were committed was minimal.

It is reasonable to conclude that there is a need for change in the baccalaureate faculty workload. One conclusion is that the faculty need to find within their 44.4 hour work week the time to do research or increase the length of their work week to include the necessary time to do the expected research. Another possible but seemingly unrealistic conclusion is the deletion of research as a baccalaureate faculty expectation. This is based upon the facts of this study which state that research is not being done successfully and that situation has not changed over the past five years.

If none of the above conclusions are dealt with, an additional concern would be over the tenure of these faculty members. Without significant research and its publication, or the achievement of a doctorate degree, how many faculty members will achieve tenure status? A reasonable conclusion would be a limited number.

In an effort to clarify these data, some consideration of the research questions presented in Chapter II seems necessary.

(1) What is the impact of workload for nursing baccalaureate faculty on their research production? Specifically, this impact seems to come in terms of time allotment for specific expectations. These faculty members work an average week of 44.4 hours, and spend 30 hours or 68% of their time on teaching tasks alone. Again, a reasonable conclusion seems to be to increase the work hours or alter the responsibilities of the faculty.

(2) What aspects of the faculty's workload specifically and significantly affect research production? Baccalaureate faculty in this study were predominately master's prepared, this seems to have a significant affect on the production of research because of the positive relationship between doctorate education and research production. In this study the data indicated that the higher the degree and the more years in the collegiate setting, the more research was produced and published. The heavy teaching assignment with the component of clinical instruction was another predominate aspect of baccalaureate faculty performance.

(3) Do multiple work expectations contribute to the development of role ambiguity for baccalaureate nursing faculty? These faculty members do have multiple work responsibilities. They do seem to be aware of them in that they indicated involvement in each area. However, as a group they were not successful in completing their expected behaviors. Their research involvement was limited and little of it was published. Their participation in community and

collegiate service was also limited. The teaching done by these participants consumed a significant amount of their work week although it was not evaluated for effectiveness. The personal comments made by some of the respondents did indicate that they could not fulfill successfully all of the expectations of their employment situation.

(4) Does the uncertainty regarding responsibilities and rewards lead to the potential for role conflict? According to the responses of this group of faculty, the most rewarded behavior on their faculty was research, however, the major conflict to research production was clinical activities. This group is not producing significant amounts of research and are obligated to a mean of 16 hours of clinical work each week. The research did not statistically validate role conflict, but there were other indications of its presence. These people are not performing strongly in the most rewarded area. Another aspect of this possible role conflict comes in reviewing the personal comments made by the participants which indicated a concern over meeting teaching responsibilities and research expectations. Role conflict was indicated to be existent in the faculties studied.

Recommendations for Further Study

Baccalaureate faculty workload and its impact on nursing research needs to receive on-going evaluation as a part of nursing colleges' strivings to perform on a level equal with

the other, more well-established colleges on the university campus. In an effort to accomplish this elevated or altered format of performance, additional study needs to be done concerning faculty workload.

An expansion of this project would render additional information as to the actual definition of the problem on a broader scale. With refinement of the tool and careful selection of schools, there could be a representative picture of baccalaureate faculty workloads in a national sense which could be meaningful. Additional questions which could be asked are: Do you feel adequately prepared to do meaningful research? If you had the time to do research, would you? It would also be interesting to know if faculty members had tenure.

Then it would seem essential to survey the deans of the colleges of nursing involved in order to glean their perceptions of the problems. These people could be put into a laboratory setting with a representative group of faculty members and participate in group dynamics where some sincere effort at resolution would be made by both groups.

Since the survey results suggested role conflict and ambiguity as significant aspects of the workload question, there would be reason to pursue that area in more detail. Perhaps a close look at job satisfaction and faculty turnover would bring to the forefront some tangible and useful concepts and concerns. One could speculate that faculty members with such role conflict might have a significant

depression level which could be determined by means of testing.

Whichever approach is used, further study should be done as this research provided further evidence of the existence of a problem with baccalaureate faculty workload and the meeting of expectations on a university level. Hopefully, another study could be focused on the goal of resolution of the problem.

APPENDIX A

RAW DATA

Average Rank of Responses to

Questions 6-9

No stratisfying (N=67)

For the remaining questions, please rank the choices from 1 to 5 with five being the highest and most significant selection.

6. What is the rank order of the following behaviors for which faculty in your college of nursing are rewarded:

classroom teaching	2.846
research publications	3.785
clinical activities	2.538
service	2.766
committee work	3.000

7. What is the rank order for the following means by which faculty at your institution are rewarded:

salary increases	2.742
promotion in rank	3.323
tenure awards	3.082
prestige committees	2.883
reduced teaching schedule	2.883

8. Rank order the following responsibilities which may conflict with your ability to pursue research and publications:

none	2.217
classroom teaching	3.291
clinical activities	3.446
college service	3.091
professional service	2.520

9. Rank order any personal circumstances which may create constraints on your ability to fulfill your several professional obligations:

none	2.533
single parent	2.200
pursuing degrees	3.484
family commitments	3.488
nonprofessional expectations	3.43

Master's degree and lower (N=50)

6. What is the rank order of the following behaviors for which faculty in your college of nursing are rewarded:

classroom teaching	2.860
research/publications	3.940
clinical activities	2.520
service	2.633
committee work	2.960

7. What is the rank order for the following means by which faculty at your institution are rewarded:

salary increases	2.833
promotion in rank	3.354
tenure awards	3.085
prestige committees	2.848
reduced teaching schedule	2.761

8. Rank order the following responsibilities which may conflict with your ability to pursue research and publications:

none	1.947
classroom teaching	3.405
clinical activities	3.595
college service	3.100
professional service	2.439

9. Rank order any personal circumstances which may create constraints on your ability to fulfill your several professional obligations:

none	2.462
single parent	2.000
pursuing degrees	3.462
family commitments	3.576
nonprofessional expectations	3.407

Doctorate degrees (N=17)

6. What is the rank order of the following behaviors for which faculty in your college of nursing are rewarded:

classroom teaching	2.800
research/publications	3.267
clinical activities	2.600
service	3.200
committee work	3.133

7. What is the rank order for the following means by which faculty at your institution are rewarded:

salary increases	2.429
promotion in rank	3.214
tenure awards	3.071
prestige committees	3.000
reduced teaching schedule	3.286

8. Rank order the following responsibilities which may conflict with your ability to pursue research and publications:

none	3.500
classroom teaching	2.923
clinical activities	3.000
college service	3.067
professional service	2.889

9. Rank order any personal circumstances which may create constraints on your ability to fulfill your serveral professional obligations:

none	3.000
single parent	5.000
pursuing degrees	3.600
family commitments	3.125
nonprofessional expectations	3.600

Full-time employment (N=53)

6. What is the rank order of the following behaviors for which faculty in your college of nursing are rewarded:

classroom teaching	2.843
research/publications	3.784
clinical activities	2.451
service	2.740
committee work	2.941

7. What is the rank order for the following means by which faculty at your institution are rewarded:

salary increases	2.771
promotion in rank	3.354
tenure awards	3.064
prestige committees	2.891
reduced teaching schedule	2.804

8. Rank order the following responsibilities which may conflict with your ability to pursue research and publications:

none	2.375
classroom teaching	3.250
clinical activities	3.419
college service	3.045
professional service	2.474

9. Rank order any personal circumstances which may create constraints on your ability to fulfill your several professional obligations:

none	2.800
single parent	2.364
pursuing degrees	3.095
family commitments	3.516
nonprofessional expectations	3.636

Part-time employment (N=14)

6. What is the rank order of the following behaviors for which faculty in your college of nursing are rewarded:

classroom teaching	2.857
research/publications	3.786
clinincal activities	2.857
service	2.857
committee work	3.214

7. What is the rank order for the following means by which faculty at your institution are rewarded:

salary increases	2.857
promotion in rank	3.214
tenure awards	3.143
prestige committees	2.857
reduced teaching schedule	3.143

8. Rank order the following responsibilities which may conflict with your ability to pursue research and publications:

none	1.857
classroom teaching	3.455
clinical activities	3.538
college service	3.273
professional service	2.667

9. Rank order any personal circumstances which may create constraints on your ability to fulfill your several professional obligations:

none	2.000
single parent	1.750
pursuing degrees	4.300
family commitments	3.400
nonprofessional expectations	3.000

Average Rank of Responses

Questions 6-9:

Percent Ranking Five

No stratisfying (N=67)

6. What is the rank order of the following behaviors for which faculty in your college of nursing are rewarded:

missing 2.98%	classroom teaching	1.49%
	research/publications	65.67%
	clinical activities	10.45%
	service	16.42%
	committee work	2.98%

7. What is the rank order for the following means by which faculty at your institution are rewarded:

	salary increases	13.43%
8.96%	promotion in rank	25.37%
	tenure awards	16.42%
	prestige committees	10.45%
	reduced teaching schedule	25.37%

8. Rank order the following responsibilities which may conflict with your ability to pursue research and publications:

	none	7.46%
37.31%	classroom teaching	17.91%
	clinical activities	34.33%
	college service	2.98%
	professional service	0.00%

9. Rank order any personal circumstances which may create constraints on your ability to fulfill your several professional obligations:

	none	4.48%
46.27%	single parent	2.98%
	pursuing degrees	19.40%
	family commitments	17.91%
	nonprofessional expectations	8.96%

Master's degree and lower (N=50)

6. What is the rank order of the following behaviors for which faculty in your college of nursing are rewarded:

missing		
0%	classroom teaching	2%
	research/publications	72%
	clinical activities	12%
	service	12%
	committee work	2%

7. What is the rank order for the following means by which faculty at your institution are rewarded:

	salary increases	16%
6%	promotion in rank	26%
	tenure awards	16%
	prestige committees	12%
	reduced teaching schedule	24%

8. Rank order the following responsibilities which may conflict with your ability to pursue research and publications:

	none	6%
34%	classroom teaching	18%
	clinical activities	38%
	college service	4%
	professional service	0%

9. Rank order any personal circumstances which may create constraints on your ability to fulfill your several professional obligations:

	none	4%
44%	single parent	2%
	pursuing degrees	20%
	family commitments	20%
	nonprofessional expectations	10%

Doctorate degrees (N=17)

6. What is the rank order of the following behaviors for which faculty in your college of nursing are rewarded:

missing 11.76%	classroom teaching	0%
	research/publications	47.00%
	clinical activities	5.88%
	service	29.41%
	committee work	5.88%

7. What is the rank order for the following means by which faculty at your institution are rewarded:

	salary increases	5.88%
17.65%	promotion in rank	23.53%
	tenure awards	17.65%
	prestige committees	5.88%
	reduced teaching schedule	29.41%

8. Rank order the following responsibilities which may conflict with your ability to pursue research and publications:

	none	11.76%
47.06%	classroom teaching	17.65%
	clinical activities	23.53%
	college service	0.00%
	professional service	0.00%

9. Rank order any personal circumstances which may create constraints on your ability to fulfill your several professional obligations:

	none	5.88%
52.94%	single parent	5.88%
	pursuing degrees	17.65%
	family commitments	11.76%
	nonprofessional expectations	5.88%

Full-time employment (N=53)

6. What is the rank order of the following behaviors for which faculty in your college of nursing are rewarded:

missing 5.66%	classroom teaching	0.00%
	research/publications	66.04%
	clinical activities	7.55%
	service	18.87%
	committee work	1.89%

7. What is the rank order for the following means by which faculty at your institution are rewarded:

	salary increases	13.21%
11.32%	promotion in rank	26.42%
	tenure awards	16.98%
	prestige committees	7.55%
	reduced teaching schedule	24.53%

8. Rank order the following responsibilities which may conflict with your ability to pursue research and publications:

	none	7.55%
39.62%	classroom teaching	18.87%
	clinical activities	32.08%
	college service	1.89%
	professional service	0.00%

9. Rank order any personal circumstances which may create constraints on your ability to fulfill your several professional obligations:

	none	5.66%
49.06%	single parent	3.77%
	pursuing degrees	11.32%
	family commitments	18.87%
	nonprofessional expectations	11.32%

Part-time employment (N=14)

6. What is the rank order of the following behaviors for which faculty in your college of nursing are rewarded:

missing	classroom teaching	7.14%
0.00%	research/publications	64.29%
	clinical activities	21.43%
	service	7.14%
	committee work	7.14%

7. What is the rank order for the following means by which faculty at your institution are rewarded:

	salary increases	14.29%
0.00%	promotion in rank	21.43
	tenure awards	14.29%
	prestige committees	21.43%
	reduced teaching schedule	28.57%

8. Rank order the following responsibilities which may conflict with your ability to pursue research and publications:

	none	7.14%
28.57%	classroom teaching	14.29%
	clinical activities	42.86%
	college service	7.14%
	professional service	0.00%

9. Rank order any personal circumstances which may create constraints on your ability to fulfill your several professional obligations:

	none	0.00%
35.71%	single parent	0.00%
	pursuing degrees	50.00%
	family commitments	14.29%
	nonprofessional expectations	0.00%

Multinominal Chi-Squares on Replies to Questions 6, 7, 8, and 9 According According to Employment Status

Employment Status	class	res	clin	ser	comm
		number 6			
full-time	0	35	4	10	1
part-time	1	9	3	1	1
		=7.0754	p=.13196	3 or 30%	1
		number 7			
full-time	7	14	9	4	13
part-time	2	3	2	3	4
		=1.9864	p=.73826		
		number 8			
full-time	4	10	17	1	
part-time	1	2	6	1	
		=1.1995	p=.75312	1 or 12.3%	1
		number 9			
full-time	3	2	6	10	6
part-time	0	0	7	2	0
		=9.8803	p=.04249	2 or 20%	1

Multinominal Chi-Squares on Replies to Questions 6, 7, 8 and 9 According to Education

Education	class	res	clin	ser	comm
		number 6			
Masters	1	36	6	6	1
PH.D.	0	8	1	5	1
		=5.1184	p=.27536	3 or 30%	1
		number 7			
Masters	8	13	8	6	12
PH.D.	1	4	3	1	5
		=1.5314	p=.82107		
		number 8			
Masters	3	9	19	2	
PH.D.	2	3	4	0	
		=1.8833	p=.59699	1 or 12.5%	1
		number 9			
Masters	2	1	10	10	5
PH.D.	1	1	3	2	1
		=1.4341	p=.83825	2 or 20%	1

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO FACULTY; PROFESSIONAL INFORMATION SHEET; DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SHEET

1109 North 125 West
Sunset, Utah 84015
Phone: 801-825-6863

Dear Faculty Member:

The matter of workload, particularly for baccalaureate faculty, continues to be an issue of far-ranging significance to the faculty, administration, and the nursing profession in general. Are the faculty too overburdened with instructional responsibilities to be productive in research and publications? Is there a genuine problem with a reasonable solution? Before any sensible solutions or adjustments can be attempted, a better understanding of the particular problem is eminently essential. Is it workload or other variables (preparation, socialization, experience, etc.) which have a major impact on the production of research and publication? As a nurse and sometime faculty member, as well as a graduate student in nursing administration, I have undertaken a study of baccalaureate faculty workload and its ramifications for research and professional advancement.

The purpose of this particular study is to investigate some potential constraints of workloads on the ultimate pursuit and production of research and publications as well as some measurement of the attitudes and demographics which may affect the teaching, research, and service responsibilities of nursing baccalaureate faculty.

My study sample will be drawn from the baccalaureate faculty of the WICHEN region, of which your college of nursing is a part. You are requested to complete this questionnaire voluntarily as your participation in this study. Completion and return of this questionnaire serves as your informed consent to participate. All responses will be kept completely anonymous. The data collected will remain confidential and reported essentially in the aggregate. Copies of the results will be provided to you and interested participants.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Anderson, R.N.,
M.S. Candidate

Enclosures:
1. Demographic Information Questionnaire
2. Professional Information Questionnaire
3. Return Envelope

The purpose of this study is to explore some probable constraints of instructional workloads on the ultimate pursuit and production of research and publications among baccalaureate nursing faculty. The study is also designed to determine some measure of the attitudes and demographics which may affect the teaching, research and service responsibilities of your job.

Please complete this questionnaire with your nearest estimate of accuracy by following the instructions provided; then return the completed form in the attached envelope. Remember you need not sign the form.

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please complete the following questionnaire according to your personal situation:

1. What is your educational background?

   AD BS MS Ph.D. Ed.D

   Other Specify _____

2. What is the title of your present position?

   TA/TF Inst Asst Prof Assoc Prof Full Prof

   Other Specify _____

3. What is your employment status?

   Full-time Part-time 3/4 1/2 1/4

   Other Specify _____

4. How many years have you been teaching?

   0-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 over 20

   Inter-mittent Describe _____

5. What is your age bracket?

   20-29 30-35 36-40 41-45 46-50

   over 50 Specify _____

6. What is your sex?

   Female Male

71 What is your personal situation?

single married separated divorced children

8. What Professional Nursing Organizations do you particpate in actively?

None ANA WICHEN NLN Clinical Speciality

Professional Information

1. How many hours per week should you ideally allocate to each of the following:

Classroom instruction	_____	Clinical instruction including travel	_____
Preparation time	_____	Grading & evaluating	_____
Counseling & advising	_____	Community service	_____
Research	_____	Writing/publication	_____
Professional enhancement	_____	Committee work	_____

2. How many hours per week do you currently average in each of the following:

Classroom instruction	_____	Clinical instruction including travel	_____
Preparation time	_____	Grading & evaluating	_____
Counseling & advising	_____	Community service	_____
Research	_____	Writing/publication	_____
Professional enhancement	_____	Committee work	_____

3. How many journal articles, chapters, or books have you published?

ARTICLES: single author	____	first author	____	second or other author	____
CHAPTERS: single author	____	first author	____	second or other author	____
BOOKS: single author	____	first author	____	second or other author	____

4. What type of research do you currently have in progress?

None ___ Master's Thesis ___ Doctoral Dissertation ___
Funded ___ Independent Research ___ Other ___

5. How many papers have you presented at a district, state, or national conference?

None _____ 1-3 _____ 4-7 _____
8-11 _____ 12-15 _____ Other _____

For the remaining questions, please rank the choices from 1 to 5 with five being the highest and most significant selection:

6. What is the rank order of the following behaviors for which faculty in your college of nursing are rewarded:

classroom teaching _____ research/publications _____
clinical activities _____ service _____
committee work _____

7. What is the rank order for the following means by which faculty at your institution are rewarded:

salary increases _____ promotion in rank _____
tenure awards _____ prestige committees _____
reduced teaching schedule _____

8. Rank order the following responsibilities which may conflict with your ability to pursue research and publications:

none _____ classroom teaching _____
clinical activities _____ college service _____
professional service _____

9. Rank order any personal circumstances which may create constraints on your ability to fulfill your several professional obligations:

none _____ single parent _____
pursuing degrees _____ family commitments _____
nonprofessional expectations _____

10. Is there any other aspect of this issue you consider important that has not been touched on in this questionnaire? You may use extra paper, if necessary, to respond.

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO DEAN

1109 North 125 West
Sunset, Utah 84150
Phone: 801-825-6863

Dear Dean:

The matter of workload, particularly for baccalaureate faculty, continues to be an issue of far-ranging significance to all administrators and other members of nursing colleges and the profession. However, before any sensible solutions or adjustments can be attempted, a better understanding of the problem is eminently essential. Is it workload or other variables (preparation, socialization, experience, etc.) which have a major impact on the production of research and publication? As a nurse and sometime faculty member, as well as a graduate student in nursing administration, I have undertaken a study of baccalaureate faculty workload and its ramifications for research and professional advancement.

The purpose of this particular study is to investigate some potential constraints of workloads on the ultimate pursuit and production of research and publications as well as some measurement of the attitudes and demographics which may affect the teaching, research, and service responsibilities of baccalaureate faculty.

My study sample will be drawn from the baccalaureate faculty of the WICHEN region. Copies of the survey materials are enclosed for your review and consideration to include, possibly, your institution in the study. I am requesting your permission to involve your baccalaureate faculty, both full and part-time, as one of three institutional groups to be surveyed in this study. The data collected will be kept confidential and reported essentially in the aggregate and copies of the results will be provided you and interested participants.

I have found it helpful in the past to identify an institutional contact person with whom I could work directly to facilitate data collection and clarification. Therefore, I would like to request your cooperation and will call you soon to determine your level of particpation and to finalize other research related arrangements.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Anderson, R.N., M.S.
Candidate

REFERENCES

American Nurses' Association. (1977). Facts about nursing 76-77. Kansas City, Mo.: The Association, p. 12.

Anderson, C. R. (1976). Coping behaviors as intervening mechanisms in the inverted-U stress performance relationship. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 30-34.

Andreoli, K. G. (1979, November). Faculty productivity. Journal of Nursing Administration, 9, 11, 47-9.

Batey, M. V. (1969). The two normative worlds of the university nursing faculty. Nursing Forum, 8, 1, 5-17.

Bauder, L. (1982). Balancing organizational demands with human needs: The ironic emphasis in schools of nursing. Western Journal of Nursing Research, 4, 2, 153-165.

Bedeian, A. G., and Armenakis, A. A. (1981). A path-analytic study of the consequences of role conflict and ambiguity. Academy of Management Journal, 24, 2, 417-24.

Beehe, T. A., and Newman, J. E. (1978). Job stress, employee health, and organizational effectiveness: A facet analysis, model, and literature review. Personnel Psychology, 31, 665-699.

Brief, A. P., and Aldag, R. J. (1976). Correlates of role indices. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 468-472.

Brown, E. L. (1948). Nursing for the future. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, p. 11.

Burk, R. J., and Belcourt, M. L. (1974). Managerial role stress and coping responses. Journal of Business Administration, 5, 2, 55-68.

Christy, T. E. (1980, August). Clinical practice as a function of nursing education: An historical analysis. Nursing Outlook, 28, 8, 493-7.

Committee on the Grading of Nursing Schools (1928). Nurses, patients, and pocketbooks: Report of a Study of the Economics of Nursing. New York: The Committee, p. 35.

Conway, M. E., and Glass, L. K. (1978 July). Socialization for survival in the academic world. Nursing Outlook, 26, 7, 424-8.

Counelis, J. S. (1974, May). Academic productivity: Institutional level theory. The Association for Institutional Research Form, Washington, D.C.

Creswell, J. W., and Bean, J. P. (1981). Research output, socialization, and the Bigland model. Research in Higher Education, 15, 1, 69-91.

Fawcett, J. (1979, April). Integrating research into the faculty workload. Nursing Outlook, 27, 4, 259-62.

Freedman, M. (1979). Academic culture and faculty development. Montaigne Press, Inc., Berkeley, California.

Graen, G. (1976). Role-making process within complex organizations. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial organizational psychology, 100-106, Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Henry, J. K. (1981, April). Nursing and tenure. Nursing Outlook, 29, 4, 240-244.

Hohenstein, W. V. (1980, Spring). Service: The neglected person of the academic trinity. National Forum, 60, 2, 18-19.

Jamieson, E. M., Sewall, M. F., and Suhrie, E. B. (1976). Trends in nursing history. W. B. Saunders Company: Philadelphia.

Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., and Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity. New York: Wiley.

McGrath, R. H., and Perrault, W. D. (1976). Organizational role conflict: Its antecedents and consequences. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 17, 19-44.

Morris, J. H., Steers, R. M., and Koch, J. L. (1979). Influence of organizational structure on role conflict and ambiguity for three occupational groupings. Academy of Management Journal, 22, 1, 58-71.

National Science Foundation. (1981, December). Activities of science and engineering faculty in universities and 4-year colleges, 1978/79. Surveys of Science Resources Series, NSF, 81-323.

NLN. (1983). State-Approved Schools of Nursing-RN, p. 113.

Palmer, I. S. (1971). The responsibility of the university faculty in nursing. Nursing Forum, 10, 1, 123-124.

Potter, R. M. (1959). Faculty workload in the clinical fields in nursing degree programs. Nursing Research, 8, 2, 160-168.

RN Population and Overview. (1980, November). National Sample of RN's, U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services.

Sabin, T. R., and Allen, V. L. (1968). Role theory. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology (42-96), 1, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Saylor, A. A., Kaylor, L. E., Genthe, D., and Otis, E. (1978). Guidelines for faculty workloads. American Journal of Nursing, 902-4.

Schlotfeldt, R. M. (1977, Jan-Feb). Nursing research: Reflection of values. Nursing Research, 26, 1, 4-8.

Schuler, R. S. (1979). A role perception transactional process model for organizational communication-outcome relationships. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 23, 268-291.

Sell, M. V., Brief, A. P., and Schuler, R. S. (1981). Role conflict role ambiguity: Integration of the literature and directions for future research. Human Relations, 34, 1, 43-71.

Simmons, R. G. (1968). The role conflict of the first line supervisor: An experimental study. American Journal of Sociology, 73, 482-495.

Solomons, H. C., Jordison, N. S., and Powell, S. R. (1980, March). How faculty members spend their time. Nursing Outlook, 28, 3, 160-65.

Stuebbe, B. (1980, September). Student and faculty perspectives on the role of nursing instructor. Journal of Nursing Education, 19, 7.

Williamson, J. A. (1972). The conflict producing role of the professionally socialized nurse-faculty member. Nursing Forum, 11, 4, 357-66.