

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08540
Telephone-609-924-4400

October 8, 1980

Memorandum

To: Harry Woolf
From: John Hunt *JH*
Subject: Status report on recommendations and conclusions
of the Trustee Review Committee

Attached you will find a complete list of the recommendations and conclusions of the Trustee Review Committee, with notations of action required or taken.

Listed below are additional comments on some of the recommendations and conclusions.

1. Recommendation Five states that "goals for faculty size should continue to be examined in the light of the Institute's financial circumstances."

The short-term goal for Faculty size recommended by the Review Committee requires one additional appointment in the School of Mathematics, the School of Natural Sciences and the School of Social Science, respectively. In the light of the Rosenbluth situation, two new appointments may eventually be necessary in the School of Natural Sciences in order to meet the goal established by the Review Committee.

The Institute's financial circumstances are now such that consideration should be given to making single appointments for the Schools of Mathematics, Natural Sciences and Social Science, with the understanding that an additional appointment to the School of Natural Sciences may also be required.

Present evidence regarding the time involved in making such appointments suggests that the matter should be cleared at the

/...

Memorandum to Harry Woolf
Status report on recommendations and
conclusions of the Trustee Review Committee

2

October 8, 1980

Board meeting of October 25 and then brought to the attention of the Faculty at the next Faculty meeting, so that action may begin.

With the endowment substantially up and the deficit decreasing, this would seem to be the time to move toward the achievement of the short-term goal of an active Faculty of 26 members called for in the Review Committee report. While there will clearly be additional expenses in the short run, an enlarged and renewed Faculty will in the long run help us strengthen our financial base. It is also useful from time to time to make the point with the Trustees that the endowment is a means to an end, the end being the Institute's academic and intellectual mission.

2. Recommendation Nine refers to the "solid, mutually advantageous working relationship" between the Institute and Princeton University, and concludes that "no more formal connection seems necessary or desirable at this time."

The benefits of this working relationship have now been extended to include access to the University Credit Union for Institute employees and shared use of the University police force for security purposes.

3. Recommendation Ten calls for an addition of \$10-20 million to the endowment, which was \$50 million when the report was prepared. The present Institute Development Program had as its initial goal an increase of \$15 million in the market value of the Institute's endowment by June 30, 1981. One aspect of the Development Program is the \$5 million Trustees Endowment Fund which the Trustees have agreed to give or help to secure as their particular contribution to the Institute's endowment drive. Contributions to this fund to date total \$1,309,271. We still do not have 100% participation by the Trustees in terms of personal giving.

The most logical way for the Trustees to fulfill this pledge is to make direct personal contributions to the Trustees Endowment

/...

Memorandum to Harry Woolf
Status report on the recommendations and
conclusions of the Trustee Review Committee

3

October 8, 1980

Fund (or to encourage others to do so) and to use their corporate connections to secure contributions from the corporate sector to the Institute's Fiftieth Anniversary Fund. During the fiftieth anniversary commemoration of the founding period of the Institute, we are seeking during 1980-83 fifty gifts of \$150,000 each in order to provide endowed stipend support for fifty visiting members annually. Gifts to the Fiftieth Anniversary Fund solicited by the Trustees are to be credited to the Trustees Endowment Fund.

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

October 1980

Excerpts from the recommendations and conclusions of the Trustee
Review Committee, as approved by the Board at its meeting
on October 15, 1976:

Recommendation One: "We believe that a faculty of twenty-five
to twenty-six professors is a reasonable
short-term goal, in the light of the present size and
retirement pattern. This includes eight professors
in the School of Mathematics, eight in the School of
Historical Studies, six in the School of Natural Sciences,
and three or four in the School of Social Science." (In
the Minutes of the Trustee meeting of April 24, 1976, it
is noted that "without making a formal motion, the sense
of the meeting was expressed that when the Board took
formal action on the report, the minimum size of the
Social Science faculty would be set at four professors.")

Action required
or taken:

The present situation is as follows:

School of Historical Studies	8
School of Mathematics	7
School of Natural Sciences	5
School of Social Science	3

In order to achieve the short-term goal recommended by the
Review Committee, one additional appointment should be sought
for the School of Mathematics, the School of Natural Sciences
and the School of Social Science, respectively.

Recommendation Two: "When a permanent appointment is available,
a school should have the option of postponing
that appointment and of appointing a distinguished scholar
for a period of two or three years at faculty salary and with
some faculty responsibilities. A sequence of such appoint-
ments should also be open to the schools as an alternative
to a permanent position."

Excerpts from the recommendations and conclusions
of the Trustee Review Committee....

2

Action required
or taken:

The School of Natural Sciences has made such an appointment while seeking a permanent replacement for Professor Tullio Regge.

Recommendation Three: "We recommend, for consideration by the faculties of the several schools, the appointment of young people for terms of three to five years and the invitation of groups of members who share an interest in a particular topic or topics during a given academic year."

Action required
or taken:

The School of Natural Sciences has recently made such appointments. All of the Schools are now inviting members who share an interest in a particular topic or topics; a recent example of collaborative work of this kind involves the joint project undertaken by Faculty and members of the Schools of Historical Studies and Social Science, and concerned with the interplay between social self-interpretation (or mutual perception) and action as a generating force in history.

Recommendation Four: "We recommend the appointment of visiting committees made up of one board member and four outside scholars in the field to evaluate the work of each of the schools not less frequently than every five years and to share their suggestions and impressions with the board and the faculty of the school."

Action required
or taken:

A visiting committee has now been formed for the School of Natural Sciences. Similar committees will now be formed each year until all Schools are covered, and each School will be visited not less frequently than every five years.

Recommendation Five: "Goals for faculty size should continue to be examined in the light of the Institute's financial circumstances. There should be reviews of the Institute's financial standing at least annually, and the results of these reviews should be shared with the faculty."

Excerpts from the recommendations and conclusions
of the Trustee Review Committee....

3

Action required
or taken:

The Institute's financial standing is reviewed by the Trustees as a whole twice a year, and written reports are made to the Faculty on an annual basis.

Recommendation Six:

"We recommend that the present number of members continue to be invited each year, as the limited savings that might be achieved by a reduction in membership would not justify the resulting loss to the world of scholarship."

Action required
or taken:

The number of members invited in the year of the Review Committee Report (1975-76) was 144. For succeeding years, the corresponding numbers were:

1976-77	151
1977-78	165
1978-79	170
1979-80	168
1980-81	157

Limitation on numbers is established by the Director in cooperation with the Schools. In order to limit use of Institute funds for support of members, a ceiling on the use of such funds has been established by each School.

Recommendation Seven:

"We recommend that there be no change in the qualifications that have in the past been considered desirable in the director or his role."

Recommendation Eight:

"The Review Committee recommends that the uniform mandatory retirement age of 70 should no longer be maintained for persons joining the Institute faculty after 1975-76. It favors the establishment of a system that would vary retirement age according to age at appointment."

Excerpts from the recommendations and conclusions
of the Trustee Review Committee....

4

Action required
or taken:

A uniform mandatory retirement age of 70
is still in force. Beginning in 1982, tenured
faculty will come under the provisions of the Retirement Act
which prohibits by law mandatory retirement before age 70.

Recommendation Nine:

"The Review Committee concludes that the
Institute and Princeton University have
developed a solid, mutually advantageous working relation-
ship and one that is likely to continue to benefit both
in the future. No more formal connection seems necessary
or desirable at this time."

Recommendation Ten:

"It is clear that additional resources are
required for the continued operation of the
Institute. An addition to the endowment fund of at least
\$10-20 million should be sought immediately, and we strongly
recommend that the board undertake a fund-raising campaign
to secure that amount as its initial goal."

Action required
or taken:

The Review Committee's analysis and projection
of the Institute's overall financial needs
used as a base point a market value of \$50 million for the
endowment at the time of the report. The present Institute
Development Program was formally approved by the Trustees
at the January 14, 1978, meeting of the Board and had as
its goal an increase of \$15 million in the market value
of the Institute's endowment by June 30, 1981.

The market value of the endowment as of June 30, 1976, was
\$55.5 million. The market value of the endowment as of
August 31, 1980, was \$91.5 million. Income from the endowment
for fiscal year 1976 was \$2.9 million; for fiscal year 1980,
it totaled \$4.7 million.

CROSS REFERENCE

FILE: REVIEW COMMITTEE - 1976

RE: REPORT

LETTER DATED:

SEE: LOCATED in Director's Office Supply Closet (black binders)

Index to material in Review Committee boxes:

Box #1: printouts on questionnaire -- 2/13/76, 2/18/76, and 3/19/76

indexes to printouts

files on former members in geographical areas

computer cards, box 1 of 2

index card files of quotations from members' comments

Box #2: originals of Review Committee minutes

originals of Review Committee report

File on Review Committee report:

suggestions for revision

drafts and working copies of report

Questionnaire Letters:

Members' address changes

Deaths

Requests for additional questionnaires

Letters -- first mailing

Letters -- second mailing

Search Committee material:

Search Committee memos

Search Committee applications

Review Committee Questionnaire for former members:

Tables of Questionnaire results

~~Tables from Questionnaires -- originals~~

Questionnaire -- selected comments

Report on Comment Sections (Jane Clinton's report)

Comments on additional fields

Questionnaire Tables and Statistics

Coding and Programming

Questionnaire Expenses and Consultants

Questionnaire Pretest

Questionnaire Mailing Data and Response rates

Blank Questionnaires

Results of the Review Committee questionnaire:

Report on results of questionnaire

Appendixes to report on results of questionnaire

Report on results of questionnaire -- originals

Appendixes to report on results of questionnaire -- originals

Tables from Questionnaire -- originals

Index to Material in Review Committee boxes -- page 2

Box #3: Review Committee Questionnaires:

Mathematics A-Z

Social Science A-Z

Historical Studies A-G

Box #4: Review Committee Questionnaires:

Historical Studies H-Z

Natural Sciences A-Z

Late returns of Review Committee questionnaire, all schools

Box #5: Report on the results of the Questionnaire -- 9 copies

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

October 1980

Excerpts from the recommendations and conclusions of the Trustee
Review Committee, as approved by the Board at its meeting
on October 15, 1976:

Recommendation One: "We believe that a faculty of twenty-five
to twenty-six professors is a reasonable
short-term goal, in the light of the present size and
retirement pattern. This includes eight professors
in the School of Mathematics, eight in the School of
Historical Studies, six in the School of Natural Sciences,
and three or four in the School of Social Science." (In
the Minutes of the Trustee meeting of April 24, 1976, it
is noted that "without making a formal motion, the sense
of the meeting was expressed that when the Board took
formal action on the report, the minimum size of the
Social Science faculty would be set at four professors.")

Action required
or taken:

The present situation is as follows:

School of Historical Studies	8
School of Mathematics	7
School of Natural Sciences	5
School of Social Science	3

In order to achieve the short-term goal recommended by the
Review Committee, one additional appointment should be sought
for the School of Mathematics, the School of Natural Sciences
and the School of Social Science, respectively.

Recommendation Two: "When a permanent appointment is available,
a school should have the option of postponing
that appointment and of appointing a distinguished scholar
for a period of two or three years at faculty salary and with
some faculty responsibilities. A sequence of such appoint-
ments should also be open to the schools as an alternative
to a permanent position."

Excerpts from the recommendations and conclusions
of the Trustee Review Committee....

2

Action required
or taken:

The School of Natural Sciences has made such an appointment while seeking a permanent replacement for Professor Tullio Regge.

Recommendation Three: "We recommend, for consideration by the faculties of the several schools, the appointment of young people for terms of three to five years and the invitation of groups of members who share an interest in a particular topic or topics during a given academic year."

Action required
or taken:

The School of Natural Sciences has recently made such appointments. All of the Schools are now inviting members who share an interest in a particular topic or topics; a recent example of collaborative work of this kind involves the joint project undertaken by Faculty and members of the Schools of Historical Studies and Social Science, and concerned with the interplay between social self-interpretation (or mutual perception) and action as a generating force in history.

Recommendation Four: "We recommend the appointment of visiting committees made up of one board member and four outside scholars in the field to evaluate the work of each of the schools not less frequently than every five years and to share their suggestions and impressions with the board and the faculty of the school."

Action required
or taken:

A visiting committee has now been formed for the School of Natural Sciences. Similar committees will now be formed each year until all Schools are covered, and each School will be visited not less frequently than every five years.

Recommendation Five: "Goals for faculty size should continue to be examined in the light of the Institute's financial circumstances. There should be reviews of the Institute's financial standing at least annually, and the results of these reviews should be shared with the faculty."

Excerpts from the recommendations and conclusions
of the Trustee Review Committee....

3

Action required
or taken:

The Institute's financial standing is reviewed by the Trustees as a whole twice a year, and written reports are made to the Faculty on an annual basis.

Recommendation Six:

"We recommend that the present number of members continue to be invited each year, as the limited savings that might be achieved by a reduction in membership would not justify the resulting loss to the world of scholarship."

Action required
or taken:

The number of members invited in the year of the Review Committee Report (1975-76) was 144. For succeeding years, the corresponding numbers were:

1976-77	151
1977-78	165
1978-79	170
1979-80	168
1980-81	157

Limitation on numbers is established by the Director in cooperation with the Schools. In order to limit use of Institute funds for support of members, a ceiling on the use of such funds has been established by each School.

Recommendation Seven:

"We recommend that there be no change in the qualifications that have in the past been considered desirable in the director or his role."

Recommendation Eight:

"The Review Committee recommends that the uniform mandatory retirement age of 70 should no longer be maintained for persons joining the Institute faculty after 1975-76. It favors the establishment of a system that would vary retirement age according to age at appointment."

insert as final para. on page 4:

Gifts, grants, contracts and pledges for the period
July 1, 1976 - June 30, 1980 totaled \$.
Of this amount, \$ represents addition to the
endowment fund.

Excerpts from the recommendations and conclusions
of the Trustee Review Committee....

4

Action required
or taken:

A uniform mandatory retirement age of 70 is still in force. Beginning in 1982, tenured faculty will come under the provisions of the Retirement Act which prohibits by law mandatory retirement before age 70.

Recommendation Nine:

"The Review Committee concludes that the Institute and Princeton University have developed a solid, mutually advantageous working relationship and one that is likely to continue to benefit both in the future. No more formal connection seems necessary or desirable at this time."

Recommendation Ten:

"It is clear that additional resources are required for the continued operation of the Institute. An addition to the endowment fund of at least \$10-20 million should be sought immediately, and we strongly recommend that the board undertake a fund-raising campaign to secure that amount as its initial goal."

Action required
or taken:

The Review Committee's analysis and projection of the Institute's overall financial needs used as a base point a market value of \$50 million for the endowment at the time of the report. The present Institute Development Program was formally approved by the Trustees at the January 14, 1978, meeting of the Board and had as its goal an increase of \$15 million in the market value of the Institute's endowment by June 30, 1981.

The market value of the endowment as of June 30, 1976, was \$55.5 million. The market value of the endowment as of August 31, 1980, was \$91.5 million. Income from the endowment for fiscal year 1976 was \$2.9 million; for fiscal year 1980, it totaled \$4.7 million.

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

TABLES FROM REVIEW COMMITTEE QUESTIONNAIRE

Extra Copy

Note on Tables from Review Committee Questionnaire:

The tables collected here show the major results of the Review Committee questionnaire, sent out and analyzed in 1975-76. Most of the tables are self-explanatory. Also included are a three-page "Summary of the characteristics of members who returned the questionnaire, by school" and the "Summary of Response Rate and Characteristics of Respondents."

Other counts and cross-tabulations were made in the course of analyzing the answers to the questionnaire, but they turned out to be of minor significance and are not reproduced here.

Barbara Gale
Executive Assistant to the
Review Committee

List of Tables

1. Response rate by schools
2. Members' schools by years of visits
3. Members' schools by years of first visits
4. Members' years of visits by position at most recent visit
5. Members' school by position at most recent visit
6. Number of visits to the Institute
Number of members with extended visits
Members' school by number of visits
7. Members' school by number of members with extended visits
Members' positions at most recent visit by extended visits
8. Members' fields
9. Members' school by members' field
10. List of field codes
11. Members' field by position at most recent visit
12. Members' school by age in 1976
13. Members' position at most recent visit by current age
14. Distribution of former members by country and world region
15. Regional distribution of former members within the United States
16. Membership in selected countries
Membership in selected states
17. Members' school by current address
18. Members' school by current position
19. Current academic or other position
Second current position

List of Tables (continued)

20. Members' current academic affiliation by school
Members' current nonacademic affiliation by school
21. Responses to questions in sections 2 and 3
22. Weighted averages for Question 2.1
23. Weighted averages for Question 3.1
Weighted averages for Question 3.2
24. Responses to questions in sections 2 and 3 --
Historical Studies
25. Responses to questions in sections 2 and 3 --
Mathematics
26. Responses to questions in sections 2 and 3 --
Natural Sciences
27. Responses to questions in sections 2 and 3 --
Social Science
28. Responses to questions in sections 2 and 3 --
postdoctoral fellows
29. Responses to questions in sections 2 and 3 --
junior faculty
30. Responses to questions in sections 2 and 3 --
professors
31. First step in Institute membership
Members' school by first step in membership
Members' position at most recent visit by first
step in membership
32. Members' school by academic affiliation before
most recent visit
Members' school by nonacademic affiliation before
most recent visit
33. Return to position after most recent visit
Members' school by return to position
Members' position at most recent visit by return
to position
34. Members' school by nature of change in position
after most recent visit

List of Tables (continued)

35. Members' position before most recent visit by nature
of change in position after visit
36. Members' position before most recent visit by
position after most recent visit
37. Members' school by position after most recent visit
38. Members' school by academic affiliation after most
recent visit
Members' school by nonacademic affiliation after
most recent visit
39. Members' school by position before original member-
ship -- all members
40. Members' school by position before original member-
ship -- repeating members only
41. Members' position at most recent visit by position
at original visit -- repeating members only
42. Change in position at later visit
43. Members' school by academic affiliation before
first visit -- repeating members only
Members' school by nonacademic affiliation before
first visit -- repeating members only
44. Plans for work at the Institute
Members' school by plans for work at the Institute
45. Members' school by adequacy of funding
Members' position at most recent visit by adequacy
of funding
Members' school by Institute funding only
Members' most recent position by Institute funding
only
46. Members' school by other sources of funding
Members' most recent position by other sources of
funding

Summary of the characteristics of members who returned
the questionnaire, by school

HISTORICAL STUDIES

There were 300 former members in Historical Studies who returned the committee's questionnaire, making up about 30 percent of the total sample. Some of these people were members of the Schools of Humanities and of Economics and Politics, which joined to form the School of Historical Studies in 1950. Of these members, 7 percent were postdoctoral fellows at the time of their most recent visits; 30 percent were junior faculty members; 54 percent were professors. The remaining 9 percent held other academic or nonacademic positions.

More responses from Historical Studies members came from abroad than in any of the other schools: nearly half of the respondents are now affiliated with institutions outside the United States. More than nine-tenths now hold teaching positions, about half in the United States and half in other countries. Three-quarters (the highest proportion among the schools) are now senior faculty members. Historical Studies members are the oldest group among the respondents: the average current age for the school was 64 years.

Members in the school are rarely appointed for periods longer than a year: less than 9 percent of the respondents listed such an extended visit. The school has the next highest proportion, after Mathematics, of repeating members among those in our sample: nearly a fifth visited the Institute more than once.

Among Historical Studies members, the most heavily represented fields in the Review Committee sample were classics (with a third of the school's members), Renaissance and modern history (with about a fifth), art history, intellectual history, and medieval history.

MATHEMATICS

Nearly half of the responses to the questionnaire came from former members in Mathematics -- 514, or 48 percent of the total. Of this group, 29 percent came to the Institute most recently as postdoctoral fellows; 46 percent as junior faculty members; 22 percent as senior faculty; and the rest, or 3 percent, from nonacademic or other academic positions.

Among the respondents to the questionnaire, Mathematics had the highest proportion (22 percent) of members who visited more than once. Slightly more than a quarter held at least one membership longer than a year.

Nearly three-quarters of the respondents from this school are now affiliated with institutions in the United States -- the next highest proportion, after Social Science. All but 5 percent now hold teaching positions, about a quarter of them outside the United States. About 70 percent are now senior faculty members and a fifth are assistant or associate professors. Mathematics members' average current age was about the same as that of Natural Science people: 47 years.

MATHEMATICS (continued)

Topology, analysis, and algebra are not only the most frequently listed fields among the respondents in this school but are three of the four fields listed by the most members overall.

NATURAL SCIENCES

All former Institute members in physics were classified in Natural Sciences, regardless of whether they were officially considered members in Mathematics or Natural Sciences at the time of their visits. (The two groups separated for organizational purposes in 1964 and the School of Natural Sciences was set up in 1966.) A small number of psychologists visiting in the 1950s, as part of a special program, were also classified as Natural Science members. Of the 196 former members in Natural Sciences who answered the questionnaire -- about 18 percent of the total response -- 43 percent were postdoctoral fellows at the time of their most recent visit; 27 percent were junior faculty members; 23 percent were senior faculty members, making Natural Sciences the youngest of the four schools by this informal measure. Of the remaining 8 percent, a larger proportion came to the Institute from research institutions than was the case in the other three schools.

Two-thirds of the members who returned the questionnaire are now affiliated with institutions in the United States. Slightly more than 80 percent -- the smallest percentage among the schools -- hold positions with educational institutions, about two-thirds of them in the United States. Of the members with nonteaching positions, most are presently affiliated with research institutions. Two-thirds (the smallest percentage among the schools) are now senior faculty members; 10 percent are junior faculty, and 10 percent are research scientists. The average current age for Natural Science respondents is about 47 years.

Members in this school are more commonly appointed for terms longer than a year than those in any of the other three schools. Just over a third of the Natural Science members were at the Institute for at least one such extended visit. About 15 percent visited the Institute more than once -- a slightly smaller proportion than in the Schools of Mathematics or Historical Studies.

Natural Science respondents in fields other than physics make up only about 5 percent of the total in that school. Theoretical physicists account for nearly three-quarters of the members in the school; about 11 percent are astrophysicists.

SOCIAL SCIENCE

Social Science began as a small program at the Institute in 1968 and was not set up as a school until 1973. Because of this, the number of former members from this school who returned the questionnaire is very small -- 49 members, or 4.6 percent of the total sample. With the exception of one repeating member, none of these people visited the Institute before 1965. Ten percent of the members who returned the questionnaire were postdoctoral fellows at the time of their most recent visits to the Institute; 33 percent were junior faculty members; and 55 percent were full professors. The rest came from other academic or nonacademic positions.

SOCIAL SCIENCE (continued)

Three-quarters of these former members are now affiliated with institutions in the United States. Nearly 95 percent hold teaching positions, almost three-quarters of them in the United States. More than two-thirds are senior faculty members; a fifth are junior faculty. In spite of their seniority, the average current age of former members in Social Science is the lowest among the members who responded to the questionnaire, 44 years. This relatively low average age is undoubtedly the result of the school's having been in existence for a shorter time than the other schools.

About a tenth of the members in Social Science visited the Institute more than once -- the lowest percentage among the schools. Twelve percent listed at least one visit of more than a year's duration, the second lowest proportion of extended visits, after Historical Studies.

Among the social science fields, sociology was most heavily represented, with nearly 30 percent of the Social Science members, followed by linguistics and psychology (25 percent) and anthropology (20 percent).

Summary of
Response rate and characteristics of respondents

Total response through 1/21/76 was 1063.

This date was chosen as the cut-off date for responses to be processed by the computer.

Total number of questionnaires mailed was approximately 2200.

Therefore this batch represents 48% of the total sent. (263 responses have been received since this date. These are not included among the responses in the following tables.)

28 former members are known to be dead or incapacitated.

101 questionnaires were undeliverable.

Assuming 2075 live, locatable former members, the sample (1063 responses) represents 51% of the possible total.

The percentage of members who responded in each School follows :

Historical Studies	300 responses	58% of possible response
Mathematics	514 responses	46% of possible response
Natural Sciences	196 responses	48% of possible response
Social Science	49 responses	58% of possible response

Breakdowns of 1063 responses

Response by geographical region:

U.S.	688 responses	64.7% of total response
non-U.S.	375 responses	35.3%

Response by School:

Historical Studies	300	28.2%
Mathematics	514	48.4%
Natural Sciences	196	18.4%
Social Science	49	4.6%
members with joint appointments in two Schools	4	.4%

Response by current age:

over 75	32	3.0%
66-75	145	13.6%
56-65	184	17.3%
46-55	266	25.0%
36-45	273	25.7%
26-35	162	15.2%
25 or under	1	.1%

Questionnaires response (continued)

Response by years at the Institute (Note that one member may be counted more than once, if he or she was at the Institute during more than one five-year period.)

1930-34	17	1.6% (of total response)
1935-39	43	4.0%
1940-44	37	3.5%
1945-49	86	8.1%
1950-54	127	11.9%
1955-59	185	17.4%
1960-64	203	19.1%
1965-69	264	24.8%
1970-74	369	34.7%
1975-76	39	3.7% (current or first-term members)

Response by year of first visit to the Institute (Note that each member will be listed only once in this table.)

1930-34	17	1.6%
1935-39	41	3.9%
1940-44	27	2.5%
1945-49	71	6.7% (cumulative percentage 14.7% before 1950)
1950-54	103	9.7%
1955-59	146	13.7%
1960-64	148	14.9%
1965-69	208	19.6% (cumulative percentage 71.6% before 1970)
1970-74	291	27.4%
1975-76	11	1.0% (28.4% first visited the Institute since 1969)

Response by current position (first position listed, if more than one was given):

postdoctoral	10	1.0% (of total who listed a position)
junior faculty	157	15.1%
professor	730	70.4%
researcher or curator	40	3.9%
administrator	40	3.9%
other academic position	48	4.6%
other nonacademic position	3	.3%
unemployed	9	.9%

Questionnaire response (continued)

Response by stage in career at most recent visit:

postdoctoral	265	25.4% (of those who listed a position)
junior faculty	387	37.1%
professor	344	33.0%
researcher or curator	17	1.6%
administrator	8	.8%
other academic position	19	1.8%
other nonacademic position	2	.2%

Response by stage in career at first visit (first visit and most recent visit
are identical for members who visited only once):

postdoctoral	316	30.4% (of those who listed a position)
junior faculty	412	39.6%
professor	263	25.3%
researcher or curator	18	1.7%
administrator	8	.8%
other academic position	22	2.1%
other nonacademic position	2	.2%

RESPONSE RATE BY SCHOOLS

The following table indicates the members to whom questionnaires were sent, in each school, who returned the questionnaire. These figures are approximate. The genuine response rate is probably higher than that shown here, since there are undoubtedly questionnaires that did not reach their destinations but were not returned to the Institute by the post office.

	HS	M	NS	SS	total
total questionnaires sent	546	1156	427	84	2213
bad addresses or deceased	26	44	16	--	86
total of live, locatable members	520	1112	411	84	2127
response -- first batch	300	514	196	49	1059*
late response	72	136	48	7	263
total response	372	650	244	56	1322*
rate of response -- first batch	57.7%	46.2%	47.7%	58.3%	49.8%
total response rate	71.5%	58.5%	59.4%	66.7%	62.2%

* The actual number of responses was 1063 and, in the second batch, 1326, including four former members with joint appointments in two of the four schools. They have been left out of this calculation. If one rounds the number of good addresses off to 2100, probably an optimistic estimate, the response rate for the first batch is 1063/21 or about 51% and the total response rate is 1326/21 or about 63%.

The percentages of each school represented in the total sample are about the same as those in the first batch of 1063 responses. Both are included here for purposes of comparison.

	HS	M	NS	SS	joint appointment
first batch	28.2%	48.4%	18.4%	4.6%	.4%
total	28.1%	49.0%	18.4%	4.2%	.3%

They also correspond fairly closely to the percentage of the total number of questionnaires sent to members of each school, as follows:

percentage of questionnaires sent	24.7%	52.2%	19.3%	3.8%
-----------------------------------	-------	-------	-------	------

Table 2

Members' schools by years of visits

This table gives both row and column percentages: the upper percentage is that of the school and the lower one is that of the membership in any given five-year period. For example, the 16 members in Mathematics who were at the Institute in 1930-34 represent 3.1% of the Mathematics members who returned the questionnaire and 94.1% of the respondents who visited during that five-year period. Note that one member may be counted more than once, if he or she was at the Institute during more than one five-year period.

	<u>1930-34</u>	<u>1935-39</u>	<u>1940-44</u>	<u>1945-49</u>	<u>1950-54</u>	<u>1955-59</u>	<u>1960-64</u>	<u>1965-69</u>	<u>1970-74</u>	<u>1975-76</u>
Historical Studies	0 0.0% 0.0%	14 4.7% 32.6%	15 5.0% 40.5%	17 5.7% 19.8%	32 10.7% 25.2%	44 14.7% 23.8%	55 18.3% 27.1%	91 30.3% 34.5%	106 35.3% 28.7%	12 4.0% 30.8%
Mathematics	16 3.1% 94.1%	23 4.5% 53.5%	18 3.5% 48.6%	50 9.7% 58.1%	61 11.9% 48.0%	101 19.6% 54.6%	114 22.2% 56.2%	123 23.9% 46.6%	151 29.4% 40.9%	11 2.1% 28.2%
Natural Sciences	1 .5% 5.9%	5 2.6% 11.6%	3 1.5% 8.1%	17 8.7% 19.8%	33 16.8% 26.0%	38 19.4% 20.5%	33 16.8% 16.3%	44 22.4% 16.7%	62 31.6% 16.8%	11 5.6% 28.2%
Social Science	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	1* 2.0% 1.2%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	4 8.2% 1.5%	48 98.0% 13.0%	2 4.1% 5.1%
Joint Appointments	0 0.0% 0.0%	1 25.0% 2.3%	1 25.0% 2.7%	1 25.0% 1.2%	1 25.0% .8%	2 50.0% 1.1%	1 25.0% .5%	2 50.0% .8%	2 50.0% .5%	3 75.0% 7.7%

* Since the School of Social Science did not exist in 1945-49, and since the program included a check to make sure that no social scientists were misclassified, this member must be someone who has visited more than once, as a member of some other school in 1945-49 (in this case, Natural Sciences) and most recently as a member in Social Science.

Table 3

Members' schools by years of first visits

This table gives both row and column percentages: the upper percentage is that of the school and the lower one is that of the members who first visited the Institute in any given five-year period. For example, the 14 members in Historical Studies who made their first visits to the Institute during 1935-39 represent 4.7% of the Historical Studies members who returned the questionnaire and 34.1% of the members who first visited during that five-year period. Note that each member is counted only once in this tabulation. A member who visited in 1940-44 and in 1950-54 appears under 1940-44, the earlier period.

	<u>1930-34</u>	<u>1935-39</u>	<u>1940-44</u>	<u>1945-49</u>	<u>1950-54</u>	<u>1955-59</u>	<u>1960-64</u>	<u>1965-69</u>	<u>1970-74</u>	<u>1975-76</u>
Historical Studies	0 0.0% 0.0%	14 4.7% 34.1%	11 3.7% 40.7%	12 4.0% 16.9%	26 8.7% 25.2%	38 12.7% 26.0%	40 13.3% 27.0%	70 23.3% 33.7%	85 28.3% 29.2%	4 1.3% 36.4%
Mathematics	16 3.1% 94.1%	21 4.1% 51.2%	14 2.7% 51.9%	40 7.8% 56.3%	48 9.3% 46.6%	75 14.6% 51.4%	82 16.0% 55.4%	97 18.9% 46.6%	117 22.8% 40.2%	4 .8% 36.4%
Natural Sciences	1 .5% 5.9%	5 2.6% 12.2%	2 1.0% 7.4%	17 8.7% 23.9%	29 14.8% 28.2%	32 16.3% 21.9%	26 13.3% 17.6%	36 18.4% 17.3%	45 23.0% 15.5%	3 1.5% 27.3%
Social Science	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	1* 2.0% 1.4%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	4 8.2% 1.9%	44 89.8% 15.1%	0 0.0% 0.0%
Joint Appointments	0 0.0% 0.0%	1 25.0% 2.4%	0 0.0% 0.0%	1 25.0% 1.4%	0 0.0% 0.0%	1 25.0% .7%	0 0.0% 0.0%	1 25.0% .5%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%

* Since the School of Social Science did not exist in 1945-49, and since the program included a check to make sure that no social scientists were misclassified, this member is likely someone who has visited more than once, as a member of some other school in 1945-49 and more recently as a member in Social Science.

Table 4

Members' years of visits by position at most recent visit

This table gives both row and column percentages: the upper percentage is that of the rank group and the lower one is that of the membership in any given five-year period. For example, the six members who visited most recently as postdoctoral fellows and who were at the Institute in 1930-34 represent 2.3% of the postdoctoral respondents and 40.0% of the members present during that five-year period. Note that one member may be counted more than once, if he or she was at the Institute during more than one five-year period. In addition, the position a member held at his or her most recent visit may not be the one held during all five-year periods. A member might have visited as a postdoctoral fellow and again, ten years later, as a professor; such a member would be counted on this table as a professor during both visits. Because most of the respondents hold academic positions, only postdoctoral fellows, junior faculty, and senior faculty appear on this table.

	<u>1930-34</u>	<u>1935-39</u>	<u>1940-44</u>	<u>1945-49</u>	<u>1950-54</u>	<u>1955-59</u>	<u>1960-64</u>	<u>1965-69</u>	<u>1970-74</u>	<u>1975-76</u>
postdoctoral	6	16	14	17	27	37	37	59	79	9
fellows	2.3%	6.0%	5.3%	6.4%	10.2%	14.0%	14.0%	22.3%	29.8%	3.4%
	40.0%	38.1%	40.0%	20.7%	22.1%	20.6%	18.3%	22.7%	21.5%	23.7%
junior	3	13	9	31	41	66	74	84	128	11
faculty	.8%	3.4%	2.3%	8.0%	10.6%	17.1%	19.1%	21.7%	33.1%	2.8%
	20.0%	31.0%	25.7%	37.8%	33.6%	36.7%	36.6%	32.3%	34.9%	28.9%
senior	6	13	12	30	49	69	84	104	143	18
faculty	1.7%	3.8%	3.5%	8.7%	14.2%	20.1%	24.4%	30.2%	41.6%	5.2%
	40.0%	31.0%	34.3%	36.6%	40.2%	38.3%	41.6%	40.0%	39.0%	47.4%

Table 5

Members' school by position at most recent visit

	<u>Post- doctoral</u>	<u>Junior Faculty</u>	<u>Professor</u>	<u>Researcher Curator</u>	<u>Administrator</u>	<u>Other Non Academic</u>	<u>Other Academic</u>
Historical Studies	20 6.8	87 29.7	159 54.3	8 2.7	5 1.7	0 0.0	14 4.8
Mathematics	158 31.2	233 46.0	113 22.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 0.2	2 0.4
Natural Science	82 42.9	51 26.7	43 22.5	8 4.2	3 1.6	1 0.5	3 1.6
Social Science	5 10.2	16 32.7	27 55.1	1 2.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
Joint Appointment	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 100.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0

Table 6

NUMBER OF VISITS TO THE INSTITUTE

Percentages given are of the total sample, as the response rate was 100%.

1 visit	861 members	81.0%
2 visits	145	13.6%
3 visits	40	3.8%
4 visits	10	.9%
5 visits	3	.3%
6 visits	2	.2%
9 visits or more	2	.2%

NUMBER OF MEMBERS WITH EXTENDED VISITS

An extended visit is defined here as one longer than one academic or calendar year. Percentages are of the total sample of 1063 members -- 100% response rate.

no extended visits	831 members	78.2%
1 extended visit	226	21.3%
2 extended visits	6	0.6%

MEMBERS' SCHOOL BY NUMBER OF VISITS

	<u>1 visit</u>	<u>2 visits</u>	<u>3 visits</u>	<u>4 visits</u>	<u>more than 4 visits</u>
Historical Studies	245 81.7%	34 11.3%	16 5.3%	3 1.0%	2 .6%
Mathematics	403 78.4%	85 16.5%	17 3.3%	5 1.0%	4 .8%
Natural Sciences	167 85.2%	22 11.2%	5 2.6%	2 1.0%	0 0.0%
Social Science	44 89.8%	4 8.2%	1 2.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%

Note that percentages given are of the school -- 81.7% of the Historical Studies members, for instance, came to the Institute only once. Two of the members with joint appointments have visited only one; one has visited three times; and one, six times. One member in Mathematics and one in Historical Studies visited nine times or more.

Table 7

MEMBERS' SCHOOL BY NUMBER OF MEMBERS WITH EXTENDED VISITS

Note that the percentages given are of the school -- 92.3% of the Historical Studies members held no memberships longer than one calendar year, for instance. Two of the four members with joint appointments had one extended visit and one had two.

	<u>no extended visits</u>	<u>one extended visit</u>	<u>two extended visits</u>
Historical Studies	277 92.3%	22 7.3%	1 .3%
Mathematics	382 74.3%	130 25.3%	2 .4%
Natural Sciences	128 65.3%	66 33.7%	2 1.0%
Social Science	43 87.8%	6 12.2%	0 0.0%

MEMBERS' POSITIONS AT MOST RECENT VISIT BY EXTENDED VISITS

Note that the percentages given are of the academic rank group. None of the administrators or people in nonacademic positions had extended memberships; they are not included in this table.

	<u>no extended visits</u>	<u>one extended visit</u>	<u>two extended visits</u>
postdoctoral fellows	150 56.6%	115 43.4%	0 0.0%
junior faculty	317 81.9%	69 17.8%	1 .3%
professors	305 88.7%	35 10.2%	4 1.2%
researchers/ curators	15 88.2%	2 11.8%	0 0.0%
other academic positions	18 94.7%	1 5.3%	0 0.0%

Table 8

MEMBERS' FIELDS

Note that general categories (Historical Studies, Physics, etc.) include members who did not list a more specific field. Please see the field code list on the following pages for a more specific listing of the fields included under each heading. Percentages are of the total sample, 1063 members.

Historical Studies	14	1.3%
History	3	.3%
Ancient History	60	5.6%
Classical Studies	47	4.4%
Medieval History	27	2.5%
Renaissance and Modern History	62	5.8%
Art History	44	4.1%
Intellectual History	32	3.0%
Non-U.S. or non-European History	4	.4%
Mathematics	88	8.3%
Logic	22	2.1%
Algebra	116	10.9%
Analysis	118	11.1%
Geometry/Topology	149	14.0%
Probability	9	.8%
Computer Science	6	.6%
Applied Mathematics	4	.4%
History of Mathematics	1	.1%
Biology	5	.5%
Psychology	5	.5%
Natural Sciences	3	.3%
Physics	27	2.5%
Theoretical Physics	90	8.5%
Particle Physics	37	3.5%
Astrophysics	24	2.3%
Plasma Physics	6	.6%
Social Science	8	.8%
Anthropology	10	.9%
Economics	9	.8%
Sociology	19	1.8%
Linguistics	14	1.3%

MEMBERS' FIELDS -- GENERAL AREAS

Historical Studies	27.6%
Mathematics	48.2%
Natural Sciences	18.6%
Social Science	5.6%

Table 9

MEMBERS' SCHOOL BY MEMBERS' FIELD

Note that while most members in any general area are in the obviously appropriate school, a few do not fit in neatly. Several sociologists, for instance, were members in Historical Studies, and at least one of the probability theorists was a member in Social Science. Where fields appear in more than one school, the number and percentage of the school will be noted. Percentages given are of the school -- thus 19.3% of the Historical Studies members listed their fields as ancient history.

	<u>Historical Studies</u>		<u>other schools</u>
Historical Studies (unspecified)	13	4.3%	1 with joint appoint.
History	3	1.0%	
Ancient History	58	19.3%	1 with jt. apptmt.
Classical Studies	47	15.7%	
Medieval History	27	9.0%	
Renaissance and Modern History	59	19.7%	3 in Social Science (6.1% of SS)
Art History	44	14.7%	
Intellectual History	31	10.3%	1 with jt. apptmt.
Non-Western History	4	1.3%	
	<u>Mathematics</u>		<u>other schools</u>
Mathematics (unspecified)	88	17.1%	
Logic	22	4.3%	
Algebra	116	22.6%	
Analysis	118	23.0%	
Geometry/Topology	148	28.8%	
Probability	8	1.6%	1 in SS (2.0%)
Computer Science	6	1.2%	
Applied Mathematics	1	.2%	2 in NS (1.0%) 1 in SS (2.0%)
History of Mathematics	1	.2%	
	<u>Natural Sciences</u>		<u>other schools</u>
Biology	5	2.6%	
Psychology	5	2.6%	
Natural Sciences (unspecified)	3	1.5%	
Physics	27	13.8%	
Theoretical Physics	89	45.4%	1 in M (.2%)
Particle Physics	37	18.9%	
Astrophysics	22	11.2%	2 in M (.4%)
Plasma Physics	6	3.1%	
	<u>Social Science</u>		<u>other schools</u>
Social Science (unspecified)	4	8.2%	3 in HS (1.0%) 1 in M (.2%)
Anthropology	10	20.4%	
Economics	4	8.2%	5 in HS (1.7%)
Sociology	14	28.6%	4 in HS (1.3%) 1 with jt. apptmt.
Linguistics	12	24.5%	1 in HS (.3%) 1 in M (.2%)

Table 10 -- List of Field Codes

Historical Studies -- fields

historical studies (unspecified)

history (unspecified)

ancient history

includes: Greek and Roman history and literature
classical philosophy
classical philology

classical studies

includes: classical archaeology
epigraphy
paleography

Medieval history

Renaissance and modern history

includes: early modern history

art history

includes: archaeology other than classical archaeology

intellectual history

includes: literary history and criticism
history of science
history of philosophy

Mathematics -- fields

mathematics (unspecified) or general mathematics

logic -- AMS categories 02-08

includes: logic
set theory
combinatorics

algebra -- AMS categories 10-25

includes: number theory
algebraic number theory
algebraic geometry
group theory
topological groups
Lie groups

analysis -- AMS categories 26-49

includes: real functions
functions of a complex variable
several complex variables
automorphic forms
partial differential equations
harmonic analysis
functional analysis
operator theory

geometry/topology -- AMS categories 50-59

includes: geometry
differential geometry
topology
algebraic topology
manifolds
global analysis
analysis on manifolds

probability/statistics -- AMS categories 60-62

includes: decision theory

computer science -- AMS categories 65-68

includes: numerical analysis
computer theory
Electronic Computer Project (ECP)
meteorology

applied mathematics -- AMS category 90, 93-94

includes: operations research
game theory

history of mathematics

Natural Sciences -- fields

biology/biophysics

psychology/neuropsychiatry

physics (unspecified) or general physics

theoretical physics

includes: nuclear physics
solid state physics
low temperature physics
mathematical physics
statistical physics
statistical mechanics
general relativity
celestial mechanics
atomic physics
quantum mechanics
quantum field theory
quantum electrodynamics
many-body problem
applied mathematics
applied physics
aerodynamics
fluid mechanics

particle physics

includes: particle theory
high energy physics
field theory
elementary particle physics

astrophysics

includes: astronomy

plasma physics

history of science

Social Science -- fields

social science (unspecified) or general social science

anthropology

includes: social anthropology
ethnohistory

economics/economic history

sociology/political science

includes: political sociology
historical sociology
comparative sociology
social history

linguistics/psychology

Table 11

Members' field by position at most recent visit (page 1 of 3)

This is a condensed table, combining specific fields into slightly more general areas (Ancient History and Classical Studies have become Classics, for instance) and listing fields only for postdoctoral fellows, junior faculty, and senior faculty, who make up 95.5% of the total. The table gives both row and column percentages, the upper percentage is of the rank group and the lower percentage is of the members in a particular field. The 6 postdoctoral members in classics, for instance, represents 2.3% of the postdoctoral fellows and 5.7% of the classicists who responded. The table appears in several parts.

	<u>general history</u>	<u>classics</u>	<u>medieval history</u>	<u>Ren. & mod. history</u>	<u>art history</u>	<u>intell. history</u>	<u>non-West. history</u>	<u>overall Historical Studies</u>
postdoctoral fellows	0 0.0% 0.0%	6 2.3% 5.7%	1 .4% 3.7%	6 2.3% 10.0%	2 .8% 4.8%	1 .4% 3.3%	2 .8% 50.0%	18 6.8%
junior faculty	8 2.1% 50.0%	30 7.8% 28.6%	6 1.6% 22.2%	11 2.8% 18.3%	17 4.4% 40.5%	9 2.3% 30.0%	1 .3% 25.0%	82 21.2%
senior faculty	7 2.0% 43.8%	60 17.4% 57.1%	18 5.2% 66.7%	38 11.0% 63.3%	16 4.7% 38.1%	18 5.2% 60.0%	1 .3% 25.0%	158 45.9%

Members' field by position at most recent visit (page 2 of 3)

	<u>general math.</u>	<u>logic</u>	<u>algebra</u>	<u>analysis</u>	<u>geom./ topol.</u>	<u>applied math.</u>	<u>overall Mathematics</u>
postdoctoral fellows	20 7.5% 23.8%	3 1.1% 13.6%	39 14.7% 33.9%	42 15.8% 35.6%	52 19.6% 35.1%	4 1.6% 20.0%	160 60.4%
junior faculty	30 7.8% 35.7%	11 2.8% 50.0%	57 14.7% 49.6%	51 13.2% 43.2%	71 18.3% 48.0%	10 2.6% 50.0%	230 59.4%
senior faculty	33 9.6% 39.3%	8 2.3% 36.4%	19 5.5% 16.5%	25 7.3% 21.2%	24 7.0% 16.2%	4 1.2% 20.0%	113 32.9%
	<u>biology/ psychol.</u>	<u>theoret. physics</u>	<u>particle physics</u>	<u>astro- physics</u>	<u>plasma physics</u>	<u>overall Natural Sciences</u>	
postdoctoral fellows	1 .4% 11.1%	43 16.3% 36.8%	25 9.4% 69.4%	9 3.4% 37.5%	3 1.1% 50.0%	81 30.6%	
junior faculty	1 .3% 11.1%	38 9.8% 32.5%	8 2.1% 22.2%	5 1.3% 20.8%	1 .3% 16.7%	53 13.7%	
senior faculty	5 1.5% 55.6%	24 6.9% 20.5%	3 .9% 8.3%	9 2.6% 37.5%	2 .6% 33.3%	43 12.5%	

Members' field by position at most recent visit (page 3 of 3)

	<u>general social science</u>	<u>anthropology</u>	<u>economics</u>	<u>sociology</u>	<u>linguistics/ psychology</u>	<u>overall Social Science</u>
postdoctoral fellows	1 .4% 14.3%	1 .4% 10.0%	2 .8% 22.2%	1 .4% 5.3%	1 .4% 7.1%	6 2.3%
junior faculty	1 .3% 14.3%	5 1.3% 50.0%	2 .5% 22.2%	8 2.1% 42.1%	6 1.6% 42.9%	22 5.7%
senior faculty	4 1.2% 57.1%	4 1.2% 40.0%	5 1.5% 55.6%	10 2.9% 52.6%	7 2.0% 50.0%	30 8.7%

Members' field by position at most recent visit -- general area

	Historical Studies	Mathematics	Natural Sciences	Social Science
Postdoctoral fellows	6.8%	60.4%	30.6%	2.3%
junior faculty	21.2%	59.4%	13.7%	5.7%
senior faculty	45.9%	32.9%	12.5%	8.7%

Table 12

Members' school by age in 1976

The four members with joint appointments have been left out of this table. Two are over 75; one is between 56 and 65; one is between 46 and 55. Ages were approximated by subtracting the year of birth from 1976. Percentages given are of the school.

	<u>over 75</u>	<u>66-75</u>	<u>56-65</u>	<u>46-55</u>	<u>36-45</u>	<u>35 or under</u>
Historical Studies	16 5.3%	85 28.3%	67 22.3%	80 26.7%	45 15.0%	7 2.3%
Mathematics	8 1.6%	42 8.2%	91 17.7%	115 22.4%	147 28.6%	111 21.6%
Natural Sciences	6 3.1%	16 8.2%	21 10.7%	58 29.6%	59 30.1%	36 18.4%
Social Science	0 0.0%	2 4.1%	4 8.2%	12 24.5%	22 44.9%	9 18.4%

Table 13

Members' position at most recent visit by current age

Percentages given are of the rank group -- 7.2% of the members who visited most recently as postdoctoral fellows, for instance, are now in the 66-75 age group. Other academic and other nonacademic positions have been omitted from this table, as they represent only 19 and 2 members, respectively.

	<u>over 75</u>	<u>66-75</u>	<u>56-65</u>	<u>46-55</u>	<u>36-45</u>	<u>35 or younger</u>
postdoctoral fellows	0 0.0%	19 7.2%	29 10.9%	45 17.0%	86 32.5%	86 32.5%
junior faculty	6 1.6%	31 8.0%	56 14.5%	96 24.8%	129 33.3%	69 17.8%
professors	17 4.9%	82 23.8%	83 24.1%	109 31.7%	49 14.2%	4 1.2%
researchers/curators	2 11.8%	2 11.8%	4 23.5%	2 11.8%	7 41.2%	0 0.0%
administrators	1 12.5%	4 50.0%	1 12.5%	2 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%

Table 14

DISTRIBUTION OF FORMER MEMBERS BY COUNTRY
AND WORLD REGION

United States and Canada	702	66.0%
British Isles	114	10.7%
France	43	4.0%
Germany	54	5.1%
Switzerland	24	2.3%
Italy	15	1.4%
Other Western European Countries (includes Greece)	42	4.0%
India/Japan	30	2.8%
Other Countries (includes Latin America, Africa, Eastern Europe, the Middle East)	39	3.7%

Note that of the total for the United States and Canada, 689, or 64.8% of the total, are in the United States, making the total for Canada 13 members, or 1.2% of the total.

Table 15

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF FORMER MEMBERS
 WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

<u>New England States</u> (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont)	101	14.7%
<u>Middle Atlantic States</u> (New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania)	198	28.7%
<u>East North Central States</u> (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin)	119	17.3%
<u>West North Central States</u> (Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota)	28	4.1%
<u>East South Central States</u> (Alabama, Mississippi, Kentucky, Tennessee)	7	1.0%
<u>West South Central States</u> (Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma)	28	4.1%
<u>South Atlantic States</u> (Delaware, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, District of Columbia, West Virginia)	70	10.2%
<u>Mountain West States</u> (Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming)	15	2.2%
<u>Pacific States</u> (California, Oregon, Washington, Alaska, Hawaii)	123	17.9%

NOTE: These are the regional classifications used by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. The total number of former members now affiliated with institutions in the United States is 689, or 64.8% of the sample. Percentages given are those of the members now in the United States.

Table 16

MEMBERSHIP IN SELECTED COUNTRIES

The following is a list of the numbers and percentages of members in non-U.S. countries with at least 1.0% of the total respondents. These are members current professional addresses, not their countries of citizenship or origin. Percentages given are those of the entire sample of 1063 members. The numbers and percentages come from an "unverified" run on the computer and may therefore contain random errors.

Canada	13 members	1.2% of total response
British Isles	114	10.8%
France	43	4.0%
West Germany	54	5.1%
Netherlands	11	1.0%
Switzerland	24	2.3%
Scandinavia	16	1.6%
Italy	15	1.4%
Japan	21	2.0%
Israel	11	1.0%

MEMBERSHIP IN SELECTED STATES

The following is a list of the numbers and percentages of members in selected states with large number of former members. Percentages given are those of the total sample, not simply of the U.S. members. These statistics are also from an "unverified" early computer run and may contain random errors.

New York	112	10.5%
California	102	9.6%
Massachusetts	64	6.0%
Illinois	60	5.6%
New Jersey	55	5.2%
Pennsylvania	32	3.0%
Connecticut	26	2.4%
Maryland	24	2.3%
Indiana	21	2.0%
Texas	20	1.9%

Table 17

Members' school by current address

Note that these addresses represent members' current affiliations and not their citizenship or country of origin. "Other Western European Countries" includes Greece. "Other Countries" includes Latin America, Africa, Eastern Europe, and the Middle East. Members holding visiting appointments were assigned to the region of their home institutions, and retired people were assigned to their current place of residence, when that could be determined. When members listed more than one current affiliation, the first listed (or the academic position, if one was nonacademic) was used. All members with joint appointments are now in the United States. Percentages are of each school.

	<u>U.S. & Canada</u>	<u>British Isles</u>	<u>France</u>	<u>Germany</u>	<u>Switzer- land</u>	<u>Italy</u>	<u>Other W. Eur. Countries</u>	<u>India & Japan</u>	<u>Other Countries</u>
Historical Studies	159 53.0%	61 20.3%	17 5.7%	22 7.3%	9 3.0%	8 2.7%	11 3.7%	3 1.0%	10 3.3%
Mathematics	375 73.0%	30 5.8%	19 3.7%	22 4.3%	8 1.6%	2 0.4%	21 4.1%	19 3.7%	18 3.5%
Natural Sciences	127 64.8%	16 8.2%	7 3.6%	9 4.6%	7 3.6%	5 2.6%	9 4.6%	7 3.6%	9 4.6%
Social Science	37 75.5%	7 14.3%	0 0.0%	1 2.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 2.0%	1 2.0%	2 4.1%

Table 18

Members' school by current position

Note that of the four joint members, three are professors and one an administrator. They have been left out of this table for simplicity's sake. Percentages given are of the School -- 74.1% of the Historical Studies members, for instance, are now professors. Only first-listed positions are included.

	<u>Post- doctoral</u>	<u>Junior Faculty</u>	<u>Professor</u>	<u>Researcher Curator</u>	<u>Administrator</u>	<u>Other Non Academic</u>	<u>Other Academic</u>	<u>Unemployed</u>
Historical Studies	1 0.3	22 7.5	217 74.1	11 3.8	15 5.1	2 0.7	22 7.5	3 1.0
Mathematics	6 1.2	106 21.2	350 69.9	9 1.8	10 2.0	1 0.2	16 3.2	3 0.6
Natural Science	3 1.6	19 10.0	126 66.3	19 10.0	13 6.8	0 0.0	8 4.2	2 1.1
Social Science	0 0.0	10 20.4	34 69.4	1 2.0	1 2.0	0 0.0	2 4.1	1 2.0

Table 19

CURRENT ACADEMIC OR OTHER POSITION

Note that this table shows the primary position, if more than one was given. Academic positions were given priority over nonacademic if two were listed. Percentages given are those of the 1037 former members who listed a position.

postdoctoral fellow	10	1.0%
junior faculty	157	15.1%
professor	730	70.4%
researcher-curator (includes writers, independent scholars)	40	3.9%
administrator	40	3.9%
other nonacademic (includes consultants, people in military or government service)	3	.3%
other academic (includes predoctoral or non-comparable non-U.S. positions)	48	4.6%
unemployed, unaffiliated	9	.9%

NOTE: 102 of these people are now retired. A small number are visiting professors.

SECOND CURRENT POSITION

Listed here only if the former member mentioned more than one affiliation; the questionnaire did not specifically ask for more than one. 935 people, or 88% of the total, listed only one position, so percentages given here are those of the 128, 12% of the sample, who listed second jobs.

postdoctoral fellow	1	.8%
junior faculty	1	.8%
professor	41	32.0%
researcher-curator	17	13.3%
administrator	62	48.4%
other nonacademic	1	.8%
other academic	5	3.9%
no second position	935	-----

Table 20

MEMBERS' CURRENT ACADEMIC AFFILIATION BY SCHOOL *

	<u>non-U.S. college or university</u>	<u>U.S. college or university</u>	<u>total in academic institutions</u>
Historical Studies	123 45.9%	145 54.1%	268
Mathematics	134 27.7%	349 72.3%	483
Natural Sciences	51 31.9%	109 68.1%	160
Social Science	12 26.1%	34 73.9%	46

MEMBERS' CURRENT NONACADEMIC AFFILIATION BY SCHOOL *

	<u>research</u>	<u>policy</u>	<u>cultural</u>	<u>research- devel.</u>	<u>govt.</u>	<u>unaffil.</u>	<u>total nonacademic</u>
Historical Studies	12 44.4%	1 3.7%	8 29.6%	0 0.0%	1 3.7%	5 18.5%	27
Mathematics	18 72.0%	1 4.0%	0 0.0%	2 8.0%	2 8.0%	2 8.0%	25
Natural Sciences	31 91.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 5.9%	0 0.0%	1 2.9%	34
Social Science	2 66.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	3

Note that these tables include only first-listed positions. Percentages given are of the members in the school in either academic or nonacademic institutions.

* The terms "academic" and "nonacademic" are not used with complete accuracy in referring to the institutions with which members are now or were previously affiliated; the use of the terms in these tables is a left-over of the coding process. What are called "academic" institutions in these tables are really teaching or educational institutions; "nonacademic" institutions are nonteaching institutions, a category that includes such clearly academic institutions as the Institute and I.H.E.S. The terms are used correctly in the text of the report.

Section 2: Intellectual environment of the Institute

Section 3: Long-range value of visit and of the Institute's work

Question 2.1 -- Indicate...the value of the following to your work at the Institute. (Percentages given are of those who answered this question -- at least 94.0% of the possible total for each item.)

	very important	important	unimportant
a. freedom from ordinary academic obligations	82.4%	15.1%	2.5%
b. peace and quiet	64.1%	29.6%	6.3%
c. intellectual interchange with other visiting members of your school	51.3%	39.6%	9.1%
d. intellectual interchange with visiting members of other schools	10.4%	29.6%	59.9%
e. intellectual interchange with faculty	44.8%	42.4%	12.9%
f. colloquia and lectures at the Institute	23.4%	51.1%	25.5%
g. proximity to Princeton University	37.5%	48.0%	14.5%
h. proximity to New York City and/or other major U.S. cities	10.0%	23.2%	66.8%

In addition, under "other" factors, 55 people, of 5.1% of the total, mentioned the Institute library facilities as either very important or important in their work. A further 27 people, or 2.6%, mentioned the Princeton University library facilities as either very important or important.

Weighted average -- in descending order of importance to members' work
 ("very important" counted as 3; "important" as 1; "unimportant" as 0)

1. freedom from ordinary academic obligations	2.62
2. peace and quiet	2.22
3. intellectual interchange with other visiting members of your school	1.94
4. intellectual interchange with faculty	1.77
5. proximity to Princeton University	1.60
6. colloquia and lectures at the Institute	1.21
7. intellectual interchange with visiting members of other schools	.61
8. proximity to New York City and/or other major U.S. cities	.53

Sections 2 and 3

Question 2.2 -- Was any member of the Institute faculty working in your specific field?

(Percentages given are of the 1035 former members who answered this question -- 97.4% of the total)

yes	603	58.3%
no	432	41.7%

Question 2.22 -- If not, did the lack of a professor working in your specific field impede or limit your work in any way?

(Percentages given of 458 responses -- 43.1% of total)

yes	48	10.5%
no	410	89.5%

Crosstabulation of Question 2.2 by Question 2.22*

	<u>Question 2.22</u> -- work impeded by lack of faculty member in field?	
<u>Question 2.2</u> faculty member in field?	yes	no
yes	5	28
no	43 (10.3%)	374 (89.7%)

NOTE: Percentages given of those with no faculty member in the field.

Question 2.3 -- Were there other visiting members working in your specific field?

(Percentages given of 1027 responses -- 96.6% of total)

yes	736	71.7%
no	291	28.3%

Question 2.31 -- If yes, was their presence directly helpful to you?

(Percentages given of 762 responses -- 71.7% of total)

yes	644	84.5%
no	118	15.5%

* This and similar crosstabulations are included to sift out those members who were asked to respond (in this case, those with no faculty member in the field) from those who should not properly have answered the question.

Sections 2 and 3

Crosstabulation of Question 2.3 by Question 2.31*

<u>Question 2.3</u> other members in field?	<u>Question 2.31</u> -- other members in field helpful?	
	yes	no
yes	635 (86.7%)	97 (13.3%)
no	7	18

NOTE: Percentages given of those with other visiting members in the field.

Question 2.4 -- Would it have been helpful to you -- in working on your particular topic -- to have a wider range of interests represented by the visiting members?

(Percentages given of 974 responses -- 91.6% of total)

yes	244	25.1%
no	730	74.9%

Question 2.5 -- On the whole, how did you feel about the degree of structure in the working situation at the Institute?

(Percentages given of 1016 responses -- 95.6% of total)

too structured	14	1.4%
just about right	958	94.3%
not structured enough	44	4.3%

Question 2.51 -- Would you have preferred any of the following? (Percentages given of 610 responses -- 57.4% of total)

a. more lectures or seminars given by the faculty	242	39.7%
b. more lectures or seminars given by the members	167	27.4%
c. more organized contact with Princeton University faculty and research students	195	32.0%
d. more lectures of general interest	242	39.7%

* Only members who answered yes to Question 2.3 were asked to answer Question 2.31.

Sections 2 and 3

Question 2.7 -- All things considered, did your visit to the Institute come up to your expectations?

(Percentages given of 1021 responses -- 96.0% of total)

yes	951	93.1%
no	70	6.9%

Question 3.1 -- How would you describe the role played by your visit to the Institute in the subsequent development of your own work?

(Percentages given of 1022 responses -- 96.1% of total)

crucial	245	24.0%
very important	470	46.0%
important	267	26.1%
unimportant	40	3.9%

Weighted average -- 2.84

("crucial" counted as 5; "very important" as 3; "important" as 1;
"unimportant" as 0)

Question 3.2 -- In your judgment, how would you describe the impact of the Institute in the intellectual development of your field in the last 10-15 years?

(Percentages given of 938 responses -- 88.2% of total)

crucial	160	17.1%
very important	347	37.0%
important	278	29.6%
unimportant	153	16.3%

Weighted average -- 2.26

("crucial" counted as 5; "very important" as 3; "important" as 1;
"unimportant" as 0)

Question 3.3 -- Are there additional fields of scholarship that you feel ought to be represented at the Institute?

(Percentages given of 775 responses -- 72.9% of total)

yes	227	29.3%
no	548	70.7%

Question 2.1 -- Weighted average rating for factors in the intellectual environment

This table is the inverse of the ones found on the first page of tables devoted to Sections 2 and 3 for each school and age group. It shows the order in which different groups of members valued each item on our list, from the group that gave it the highest rating to the group that gave it the lowest.

Freedom from ordinary academic obligations

1. Historical Studies	2.79
2. professors	2.77
3. Social Science	2.74
4. Mathematics	2.62
<u>overall average</u>	2.62
5. junior faculty	2.61
6. postdoctoral fellows	2.48
7. Natural Sciences	2.36

Peace and quiet

1. Historical Studies	2.50
2. professors	2.47
3. Social Science	2.23
4. <u>overall average</u>	2.22
5. Mathematics	2.17
junior faculty	2.17
6. postdoctoral fellows	1.99
7. Natural Sciences	1.92

Intellectual interchange -- own school

1. postdoctoral fellows	2.22
2. Mathematics	2.06
3. Natural Sciences	2.04
4. junior faculty	1.98
5. <u>overall average</u>	1.94
6. Social Science	1.75
7. professors	1.72
8. Historical Studies	1.69

Intellectual interchange -- other schools

1. Historical Studies	.77
2. Natural Sciences	.66
3. Social Science	.65
4. professors	.63
5. junior faculty	.62
6. <u>overall average</u>	.61
7. postdoctoral fellows	.51
8. Mathematics	.49

Intellectual interchange -- faculty

1. Historical Studies	1.91
2. Natural Sciences	1.80
postdoctoral fellows	1.80
3. junior faculty	1.78
4. <u>overall average</u>	1.77
5. professors	1.74
6. Mathematics	1.71
7. Social Science	1.40

Colloquia at the Institute

1. Mathematics	1.51
2. postdoctoral fellows	1.48
3. junior faculty	1.28
4. Natural Sciences	1.25
5. <u>overall average</u>	1.21
6. professors	1.01
7. Historical Studies	.75
8. Social Science	.62

Proximity to Princeton University

1. Historical Studies	1.85
2. junior faculty	1.63
professors	1.63
3. <u>overall average</u>	1.60
4. Mathematics	1.55
5. postdoctoral fellows	1.52
6. Natural Sciences	1.51
7. Social Sciences	1.07

Proximity to major U.S. cities

1. Historical Studies	.85
2. professors	.58
3. Social Science	.57
4. junior faculty	.57
5. <u>overall average</u>	.53
6. Mathematics	.41
7. postdoctoral fellows	.40
8. Natural Sciences	.37

Table 23
Question 3.1 -- Weighted average rating for the Institute's importance in
members' own work *

This table is the inverse of those found on the last page of tables devoted to Sections 2 and 3 for each school and age group. It shows the order in which different groups of members valued each item on our list, from the group that gave it the highest rating to the group that gave it the lowest.

1. Historical Studies	3.01
2. postdoctoral fellows	2.95
3. junior faculty	2.93
4. Mathematics	2.90
5. <u>overall average</u>	2.84
6. Social Science	2.81
7. professors	2.67
8. Natural Sciences	2.41

Question 3.2 -- Weighted average rating for the Institute's importance in the
development of members' fields

1. Mathematics	2.67
2. junior faculty	2.38
3. postdoctoral fellows	2.33
4. <u>overall average</u>	2.26
5. professors	2.11
6. Historical Studies	2.09
7. Natural Sciences	1.86
8. Social Science	.56

* Note that these average ratings are not comparable to those for various factors in the intellectual environment (Question 2.1), since the latter were based on a three-point scale; the ratings for Questions 3.1 and 3.2 are based on a five-point scale.

Section 2: Intellectual environment of the Institute

Section 3: Long-range value of visit and of the Institute's work

HISTORICAL STUDIES

(300 responses -- 28.2% of total)

Question 2.1 -- Indicate...the value of the following to your work at the Institute. (Percentages given are of those who answered the question -- at least 92.3% for each item.)

	very important	important	unimportant
a. freedom from ordinary academic obligations	90.7%	6.9%	2.4%
b. peace and quiet	76.9%	18.9%	4.2%
c. intellectual interchange with other visiting members of your school	41.7%	43.8%	14.6%
d. intellectual interchange with visiting members of other schools	12.8%	38.3%	48.9%
e. intellectual interchange with faculty	51.2%	37.3%	11.5%
f. colloquia and lectures at the Institute	10.8%	42.8%	46.4%
g. proximity to Princeton University	48.4%	39.4%	12.3%
h. proximity to New York City and/or other major U.S. cities	18.1%	30.5%	51.4%

Weighted average -- in descending order of importance to members' work
("very important" counted as 3; "important" as 1; "unimportant" as 0)

1. freedom from ordinary academic obligations	2.79
2. peace and quiet	2.50
3. intellectual interchange with faculty	1.91
4. proximity to Princeton University	1.85
5. intellectual interchange with other visiting members of your school	1.69
6. proximity to New York City and/or other major U.S. cities	.85
7. intellectual interchange with visiting members of other schools	.77
8. colloquia and lectures at the Institute	.75

Breakdowns by School -- Sections 2 and 3

HISTORICAL STUDIES (continued)

Question 2.2 -- Was any member of the Institute faculty working in your specific field?

(Percentages given are of the 97.7% of the Historical Studies respondents who answered this question -- 293 responses)

yes	176	60.1%
no	117	39.9%

Question 2.22 -- If not, did the lack of a professor working in your specific field impede or limit your work in any way?

(Percentages given are of the 130 Historical Studies members who responded -- 43.3% of the total.)

yes	5	3.8%
no	125	96.2%

Crosstabulation of Question 2.2 by Question 2.22

Question 2.22 -- work impeded by lack of faculty member in field?

Question 2.2
faculty member
in field?

	yes	no
yes	0	12
no	5 (4.3%)	111 (95.7%)

NOTE: Percentages given of those with no faculty member in the field.

Question 2.3 -- Were there other visiting members working in your specific field?

(Percentages are given of the 293 members who responded -- 97.7% of the total.)

yes	151	51.5%
no	142	48.5%

Question 2.31 -- If yes, was their presence directly helpful to you?

(Percentages given of the 163 responses -- 54.3% of total.)

yes	134	82.2%
no	29	17.8%

Breakdowns by School -- Sections 2 and 3

HISTORICAL STUDIES (continued)

Crosstabulation of Question 2.3 by Question 2.31

Question 2.31 -- other members in field helpful?

<u>Question 2.3</u> other members in field?	yes	no
yes	131 (87.3%)	19 (12.7%)
no	3	9

NOTE: Percentages given of those with other visiting members in the field.

Question 2.4 -- Would it have been helpful to you -- in working on your particular topic -- to have a wider range of interests represented by the visiting members?

(Percentages given of 277 responses -- 92.3% of total.)

yes	97	35.0%
no	180	65.0%

Question 2.5 -- On the whole, how did you feel about the degree of structure in the working situation at the Institute?

(Percentages given of 289 responses -- 96.3% of total)

too structured	5	1.7%
just about right	269	93.1%
not structured enough	15	5.2%

Question 2.51 -- Would you have preferred any of the following? (Percentages of 174 responses -- 58.0% of total)

a. more lectures or seminars given by the faculty	51	29.3%
b. more lectures or seminars given by the members	39	22.4%
c. more organized contact with Princeton University faculty and research students	86	49.4%
d. more lectures of general interest	28	16.1%

Breakdowns by School -- Sections 2 and 3

HISTORICAL STUDIES (continued)

Question 2.7 -- All things considered, did your visit to the Institute come up to your expectations?

(Percentages of 289 responses -- 96.3% of total)

yes	276	95.5%
no	13	4.5%

Question 3.1 -- How would you describe the role played by your visit to the Institute in the subsequent development of your own work?

(Percentages given of 289 responses -- 96.3% of total)

crucial	74	25.6%
very important	145	50.2%
important	66	22.8%
unimportant	4	1.4%

Weighted average -- 3.01

("crucial" counted as 5; "very important" as 3; "important" as 1;
"unimportant" as 0)

Question 3.2 -- In your judgment, how would you describe the impact of the Institute in the intellectual development of your field in the last 10-15 years?

(Percentages given of 255 responses -- 85.0% of total)

crucial	25	9.8%
very important	111	43.5%
important	75	29.4%
unimportant	44	17.3%

Weighted average -- 2.09

("crucial" counted as 5; "very important" as 3; "important" as 1;
"unimportant" as 0)

Question 3.3 -- Are there additional fields of scholarship that you feel ought to be represented at the Institute?

(Percentages given of 220 responses -- 73.3% of total)

yes	85	38.6%
no	135	61.4%

Breakdowns by School

Section 2: Intellectual environment of the Institute

Section 3: Long-range value of visit and of the Institute's work

MATHEMATICS

(514 responses -- 48.4% of total)

Question 2.1 -- Indicate...the value of the following to your work at the Institute. (Percentages given of those who answered the question -- at least 95.1% for each item)

	very important	important	unimportant
a. freedom from ordinary academic obligations	82.3%	14.9%	2.8%
b. peace and quiet	61.4%	33.2%	5.4%
c. intellectual interchange with other visiting members of your school	56.1%	37.9%	6.1%
d. intellectual interchange with visiting members of other schools	8.4%	23.9%	67.7%
e. intellectual interchange with faculty	41.4%	46.3%	12.2%
f. colloquia and lectures at the Institute	31.5%	56.7%	11.8%
g. proximity to Princeton University	34.9%	50.5%	14.6%
h. proximity to New York City and/or other major U.S. cities	6.7%	20.7%	72.6%

Weighted average -- in descending order of importance to members' work
 ("very important" counted as 3; "important" as 1; "unimportant" as 0)

1. freedom from ordinary academic obligations	2.62
2. peace and quiet	2.17
3. intellectual interchange with other visiting members of your school	2.06
4. intellectual interchange with faculty	1.71
5. proximity to Princeton University	1.55
6. colloquia and lectures at the Institute	1.51
7. intellectual interchange with visiting members of other schools	.49
8. proximity to New York City and/or other major U.S. cities	.41

Breakdowns by School -- Sections 2 and 3

MATHEMATICS (continued)

Question 2.2 -- Was any member of the Institute faculty working in your specific field?

(Percentages given of the 503 Mathematics respondents who answered this question -- 97.9% of the total)

yes	284	56.5%
no	219	43.5%

Question 2.22 -- If not, did the lack of a professor working in your specific field impede or limit your work in any way?

(Percentages given of 224 responses -- 43.6% of total)

yes	26	11.6%
no	198	88.4%

Crosstabulation of Question 2.2 by Question 2.22

	<u>Question 2.22</u> -- work impeded by lack of faculty member in field?	
<u>Question 2.2</u> faculty member in field?	yes	no
yes	3	10
no	23 (11.1%)	185 (88.9%)

NOTE: Percentages given of those with no faculty member in the field.

Question 2.3 -- Were there other visiting members working in your specific field?

(Percentages given of 493 responses -- 95.9% of total)

yes	390	79.1%
no	103	20.9%

Question 2.31 -- If yes, was their presence directly helpful to you?

(Percentages given of 398 responses -- 77.4% of total)

yes	337	84.7%
no	61	15.3%

MATHEMATICS (continued)

Crosstabulation of Question 2.3 by Question 2.31

Question 2.31 -- other members in field helpful?

<u>Question 2.3</u> other members in field?	yes	no
yes	333 (85.6%)	56 (14.4%)
no	3	3

NOTE: Percentages given of those with other visiting members in the field.

Question 2.4 -- Would it have been helpful to you -- in working on your particular topic -- to have a wider range of interests represented by the visiting members?

(Percentages given of 464 responses -- 90.3% of total)

yes	80	17.2%
no	384	82.8%

Question 2.5 -- On the whole, how did you feel about the degree of structure in the working situation at the Institute?

(Percentages given of 492 responses -- 95.7% of total)

too structured	4	0.8%
just about right	472	95.9%
not structured enough	16	3.3%

Question 2.51 -- Would you have preferred any of the following? (Percentages given of 284 responses -- 55.3% of total)

a. more lectures or seminars given by the faculty	131	46.1%
b. more lectures or seminars given by the members	83	29.2%
c. more organized contact with Princeton University faculty and research students	74	26.1%
d. more lectures of general interest	139	48.9%

Breakdowns by School -- Sections 2 and 3

MATHEMATICS (continued)

Question 2.7 -- All things considered, did your visit to the Institute come up to your expectations?

(Percentages given of 492 responses -- 95.7% of total)

yes	462	93.9%
no	30	6.1%

Question 3.1 -- How would you describe the role played by your visit to the Institute in the subsequent development of your own work?

(Percentages given of 497 responses -- 96.7% of total)

crucial	131	26.4%
very important	221	44.5%
important	124	24.9%
unimportant	21	4.2%

Weighted average -- 2.90

("crucial" counted as 5; "very important" as 3; "important" as 1;
"unimportant" as 0)

Question 3.2 -- In your judgment, how would you describe the impact of the Institute in the intellectual development of your field in the last 10-15 years?

(Percentages given of 459 responses -- 89.3% of total)

crucial	121	26.4%
very important	167	36.4%
important	121	26.4%
unimportant	50	10.9%

Weighted average -- 2.67

("crucial" counted as 5; "very important" as 3; "important" as 1;
"unimportant" as 0)

Question 3.3 -- Are there additional fields of scholarship that you feel ought to be represented at the Institute?

(Percentages given of 366 responses -- 71.2% of total)

yes	63	17.2%
no	303	82.8%

Table 26

Breakdowns by School

Section 2: Intellectual environment of the Institute

Section 3: Long-range value of visit and of the Institute's work

NATURAL SCIENCES

(196 responses -- 18.4% of total)

Question 2.1 -- Indicate...the value of the following to your work at the Institute. (Percentages given of those who answered the question -- at least 91.3% for each item)

	very important	important	unimportant
a. freedom from ordinary academic obligations	69.0%	28.9%	2.1%
b. peace and quiet	51.6%	36.8%	11.5%
c. intellectual interchange with other visiting members of your school	56.7%	34.2%	9.1%
d. intellectual interchange with visiting members of other schools	13.6%	25.0%	61.4%
e. intellectual interchange with faculty	46.4%	40.4%	13.1%
f. colloquia and lectures at the Institute	26.1%	50.0%	23.9%
g. proximity to Princeton University	32.1%	55.1%	12.8%
h. proximity to New York City and/or other major U.S. cities	6.1%	18.4%	75.4%

Weighted average -- in descending order of importance to members' work
 ("very important" counted as 3; "important" as 1; "unimportant" as 0)

1. freedom from ordinary academic obligations	2.36
2. intellectual interchange with other visiting members of your school	2.04
3. peace and quiet	1.92
4. intellectual interchange with faculty	1.80
5. proximity to Princeton University	1.51
6. colloquia and lectures at the Institute	1.25
7. intellectual interchange with visiting members of other schools	.66
8. proximity to New York City and/or other major U.S. cities	.37

Breakdowns by School -- Section 2 and 3

NATURAL SCIENCES (continued)

Question 2.2 -- Was any member of the Institute faculty working in your specific field?

(Percentages given of the 188 Natural Science respondents who answered this question -- 95.9% of the total)

yes	122	64.9%
no	66	35.1%

Question 2.22 -- If not, did the lack of a professor working in your specific field impede or limit your work in any way?

(Percentages given of 72 responses -- 36.7% of total)

yes	12	16.7%
no	60	83.3%

Crosstabulation of Question 2.2 by Question 2.22

Question 2.22 -- work impeded by lack of faculty member in field?

<u>Question 2.2</u> faculty member in field?	yes	no
yes	2	4
no	10 (15.6%)	54 (84.4%)

NOTE: Percentages given of those with no faculty member in the field.

Question 2.3 -- Were there other visiting members working in your specific field?

(Percentages given of 190 responses -- 96.9% of total)

yes	156	82.1%
no	34	17.9%

Question 2.31 -- If yes, was their presence directly helpful to you?

(Percentages given of 161 responses -- 82.1% of total)

yes	140	87.0%
no	21	13.0%

Breakdowns by School -- Sections 2 and 3

NATURAL SCIENCES (continued)

Crosstabulation of Question 2.3 by Question 2.31

Question 2.31 -- other members in field helpful?

<u>Question 2.3</u> other members in field?	yes	no
yes	138 (89.6%)	16 (10.4%)
no	1	5

NOTE: Percentages given of those with other visiting members in the field.

Question 2.4 -- Would it have been helpful to you -- in working on your particular topic -- to have a wider range of interests represented by the visiting members?

(Percentages given of 183 responses -- 93.4% of total)

yes	41	22.4%
no	142	77.6%

Question 2.5 -- On the whole, how did you feel about the degree of structure in the working situation at the Institute?

(Percentages given of 183 responses -- 93.4% of total)

too structured	5	2.7%
just about right	169	92.3%
not structured enough	9	4.9%

Question 2.51 -- Would you have preferred any of the following? (Percentages given of 125 responses -- 63.8% of total)

a. more lectures or seminars given by the faculty	51	40.8%
b. more lectures or seminars given by the members	35	28.0%
c. more organized contact with Princeton University faculty and research students	26	20.8%
d. more lectures of general interest	62	49.6%

NATURAL SCIENCES (continued)

Question 2.7 -- All things considered, did your visit to the Institute come up to your expectations?

(Percentages given of 189 responses -- 96.4% of total)

yes	168	88.9%
no	21	11.1%

Question 3.1 -- How would you describe the role played by your visit to the Institute in the subsequent development of your own work?

(Percentages given of 186 responses -- 94.9% of total)

crucial	28	15.1%
very important	81	43.5%
important	65	34.9%
unimportant	12	6.5%

Weighted average -- 2.41

("crucial" counted as 5; "very important" as 3; "important" as 1; "unimportant" as 0)

Question 3.2 -- In your judgment, how would you describe the impact of the Institute in the intellectual development of your field in the last 10-15 years?

(Percentages given of 180 responses -- 91.8% of total)

crucial	14	7.8%
very important	63	35.0%
important	76	42.2%
unimportant	27	15.0%

Weighted average -- 1.86

("crucial" counted as 5; "very important" as 3; "important" as 1; "unimportant" as 0)

Question 3.3 -- Are there additional fields of scholarship that you feel ought to be represented at the Institute?

(Percentages given of 145 responses -- 74.0% of total)

yes	50	34.5%
no	95	65.5%

Table 27

Breakdowns by School

Section 2: Intellectual environment of the Institute

Section 3: Long-range value of visit and of the Institute's work

SOCIAL SCIENCE

(49 responses -- 4.6% of total)

Question 2.1 -- Indicate...the value of the following to your work at the Institute. (Percentages given of those who answered the question -- at least 93.9% for each item)

	very important	important	unimportant
a. freedom from ordinary academic obligations	87.8%	10.2%	2.0%
b. peace and quiet	64.6%	29.2%	6.3%
c. intellectual interchange with other visiting members of your school	41.7%	50.0%	8.3%
d. intellectual interchange with visiting members of other schools	4.2%	52.1%	43.8%
e. intellectual interchange with faculty	34.0%	38.3%	27.7%
f. colloquia and lectures at the Institute	4.3%	48.9%	46.8%
g. proximity to Princeton University	19.6%	47.8%	32.6%
h. proximity to New York City and/or other major U.S. cities	10.6%	25.5%	63.8%

Weighted average -- in descending order of importance to members' work
 ("very important" counted as 3; "important" as 1; "unimportant" as 0)

1. freedom from ordinary academic obligations	2.74
2. peace and quiet	2.23
3. intellectual interchange with other visiting members of your school	1.75
4. intellectual interchange with faculty	1.40
5. proximity to Princeton University	1.07
6. intellectual interchange with visiting members of other schools	.65
7. colloquia and lectures at the Institute	.62
8. proximity to New York City and/or other major U.S. cities	.57

Breakdowns by School -- Sections 2 and 3

SOCIAL SCIENCE (continued)

Question 2.2 -- Was any member of the Institute faculty working in your specific field?

(Percentages given of the 48 Social Science respondents who answered this question -- 98.0% of the total)

yes	18	37.5%
no	30	62.5%

Question 2.22 -- If not, did the lack of a professor working in your specific field impede or limit your work in any way?

(Percentages given of 31 respondents -- 63.3% of total)

yes	5	16.1%
no	26	83.9%

Crosstabulation of Question 2.2 by Question 2.22

Question 2.22 -- work impeded by lack of faculty member in field?

Question 2.2
faculty member
in field?

	yes	no
yes	0	1
no	5 (17.2%)	24 (82.8%)

NOTE: Percentages given of those with no faculty member in the field.

Question 2.3 -- Were there other visiting members working in your specific field?

(Percentages given of 48 responses -- 98.0% of total)

yes	36	75.0%
no	12	25.0%

Question 2.31 -- If yes, was their presence directly helpful to you?

(Percentages given of 37 responses -- 75.5% of total)

yes	31	83.8%
no	6	16.2%

SOCIAL SCIENCE (continued)

Crosstabulation of Question 2.3 by Question 2.31

Question 2.31 -- other members in field helpful?

Question 2.3
other members
in field?

	yes	no
yes	31 (86.1%)	5 (13.9%)
no	0	1

NOTE: Percentages given of those with other visiting members in the field.

Question 2.4 -- Would it have been helpful to you -- in working on your particular topic -- to have a wider range of interests represented by the visiting members?

(Percentages given of 47 responses -- 95.9% of total)

yes	25	53.2%
no	22	46.8%

Question 2.5 -- On the whole, how did you feel about the degree of structure in the working situation at the Institute?

(Percentages given of 49 responses -- 100% of total)

too structured	0	.0%
just about right	45	91.8%
not structured enough	4	8.2%

Question 2.51 -- Would you have preferred any of the following? (Percentages given of 26 responses -- 53.1% of total)

a. more lectures or seminars given by the faculty	9	34.6%
b. more lectures or seminars given by the members	10	38.5%
c. more organized contact with Princeton University faculty and research students	9	34.6%
d. more lectures of general interest	13	50.0%

SOCIAL SCIENCE (continued)

Question 2.7 -- All things considered, did your visit to the Institute come up to your expectations?

(Percentages given of 48 responses -- 98.0% of total)

yes	42	87.5%
no	6	12.5%

Question 3.1 -- How would you describe the role played by your visit to the Institute in the subsequent development of your own work?

(Percentages given of 47 responses -- 95.9% of total)

crucial	11	23.4%
very important	22	46.8%
important	11	23.4%
unimportant	3	6.4%

Weighted average -- 2.81

("crucial" counted as 5; "very important" as 3; "important" as 1; "unimportant" as 0)

Question 3.2 -- In your judgment, how would you describe the impact of the Institute in the intellectual development of your field in the last 10-15 years?

(Percentages given of 41 responses -- 83.7% of total)

crucial	0	.0%
very important	6	14.6%
important	5	12.2%
unimportant	30	73.2%

Weighted average -- 0.56

("crucial" counted as 5; "very important" as 3; "important" as 1; "unimportant" as 0)

Question 3.3 -- Are there additional fields of scholarship that you feel ought to be represented at the Institute?

(Percentages given of 42 responses -- 85.7% of total)

yes	28	66.7%
no	14	33.3%

Breakdowns by Position at Most Recent Visit

Section 2: Intellectual environment of the Institute

Section 3: Long-range value of visit and of the Institute's work

POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS

(265 responses -- 25.4% of total)

Question 2.1 -- Indicate...the value of the following to your work at the Institute. (Percentages given of those who answered the question -- at least 95.0% for each item)

	very important	important	unimportant
a. freedom from ordinary academic obligations	75.8%	21.2%	3.1%
b. peace and quiet	55.2%	33.6%	11.2%
c. intellectual interchange with other visiting members of your school	64.0%	30.6%	5.4%
d. intellectual interchange with visiting members of other schools	8.9%	24.1%	66.9%
e. intellectual interchange with faculty	45.6%	43.3%	11.1%
f. colloquia and lectures at the Institute	31.2%	54.2%	14.6%
g. proximity to Princeton University	32.2%	55.6%	12.3%
h. proximity to New York City and/or other major U.S. cities	6.3%	21.0%	72.6%

Weighted average -- in descending order of importance to members' work
 ("very important" counted as 3; "important" as 1; "unimportant" as 0)

1. freedom from ordinary academic obligations	2.48
2. intellectual interchange with other visiting members of your school	2.22
3. peace and quiet	1.99
4. intellectual interchange with faculty	1.80
5. proximity to Princeton University	1.52
6. colloquia and lectures at the Institute	1.48
7. intellectual interchange with visiting members of other schools	.51
8. proximity to New York City and/or other major U.S. cities	.40

POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS (continued)

Question 2.2 -- Was any member of the Institute faculty working in your specific field?

(Percentages given of the 261 postdoctoral fellows who answered this question -- 98.5% of the total)

yes	160	61.3%
no	101	38.7%

Question 2.22 -- If not, did the lack of a professor working in your specific field impede or limit your work in any way?

(Percentages given of 103 responses -- 38.9% of total)

yes	20	19.4%
no	83	80.6%

Crosstabulation of Question 2.2 by Question 2.22

<u>Question 2.2</u> faculty member in field?	<u>Question 2.22</u> -- work impeded by lack of faculty member in field?	
	yes	no
yes	4	3
no	16 (16.8%)	79 (83.2%)

NOTE: Percentages given of those with no faculty member in the field.

Question 2.3 -- Were there other visiting members working in your specific field?

(Percentages given of 260 responses -- 98.0% of total)

yes	217	83.5%
no	43	16.5%

Question 2.31 -- If yes, was their presence directly helpful to you?

(Percentages given of 221 responses -- 83.4% of total)

yes	189	85.5%
no	32	14.5%

POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS (continued)

Crosstabulation of Question 2.3 by Question 2.31

<u>Question 2.3</u> other members in field?	<u>Question 2.31</u> -- other members in field helpful?	
	yes	no
yes	189 (87.1%)	28 (12.9%)
no	0	4

NOTE: Percentages given of those with other visiting members in the field.

Question 2.4 -- Would it have been helpful to you -- in working on your particular topic -- to have a wider range of interests represented by the visiting members?

(Percentages given of 243 responses -- 91.7% of total)

yes	45	18.5%
no	198	81.5%

Question 2.5 -- On the whole, how did you feel about the degree of structure in the working situation at the Institute?

(Percentages given of 257 responses -- 97.0% of total)

too structured	4	1.6%
just about right	239	93.0%
not structured enough	14	5.4%

Question 2.51 -- Would you have preferred any of the following? (Percentages given of 150 responses -- 56.6% of total)

a. more lectures or seminars given by the faculty	69	46.0%
b. more lectures or seminars given by the members	42	28.0%
c. more organized contact with Princeton University faculty and research students	39	26.0%
d. more lectures of general interest	72	48.0%

POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS (continued)

Question 2.7 -- All things considered, did your visit to the Institute come up to your expectations?

(Percentages given of 255 responses -- 96.2% of total)

yes	235	92.2%
no	20	7.8%

Question 3.1 -- How would you describe the role played by your visit to the Institute in the subsequent development of your own work?

(Percentages given of 256 responses -- 96.6% of total)

crucial	69	27.0%
very important	114	44.5%
important	67	26.2%
unimportant	6	2.3%

Weighted average -- 2.95

("crucial" counted as 5; "very important" as 3; "important" as 1;
"unimportant" as 0)

Question 3.2 -- In your judgment, how would you describe the impact of the Institute in the intellectual development of your field in the last 10-15 years?

(Percentages given of 230 responses -- 86.8% of total)

crucial	41	17.8%
very important	88	38.3%
important	68	29.6%
unimportant	33	14.3%

Weighted average -- 2.33

("crucial" counted as 5; "very important" as 3; "important" as 1;
"unimportant" as 0)

Question 3.3 -- Are there additional fields of scholarship that you feel ought to be represented at the Institute?

(Percentages given of 184 responses -- 69.4% of total)

yes	45	24.5%
no	139	75.5%

Table 29

Breakdowns by Position at Most Recent Visit

Section 2: Intellectual environment of the Institute

Section 3: Long-range value of visit and of the Institute's work

JUNIOR FACULTY

(387 responses -- 37.1% of total)

Question 2.1 -- Indicate...the value of the following to your work at the Institute. (Percentages given of those who answered the question -- at least 97.0% for each item)

	very important	important	unimportant
a. freedom from ordinary academic obligations	81.6%	15.8%	2.6%
b. peace and quiet	61.5%	32.7%	5.8%
c. intellectual interchange with other visiting members of your school	53.8%	36.9%	9.3%
d. intellectual interchange with visiting members of other schools	11.2	28.2%	60.6%
e. intellectual interchange with faculty	45.2%	42.0%	12.8%
f. colloquia and lectures at the Institute	25.7%	51.2%	23.1%
g. proximity to Princeton University	38.2%	48.2%	13.7%
h. proximity to New York City and/or other major U.S. cities	10.6%	24.9%	64.5%

Weighted average -- in descending order of importance to members' work
 ("very important" counted as 3; "important" as 1; "unimportant" as 0)

1. freedom from ordinary academic obligations	2.61
2. peace and quiet	2.17
3. intellectual interchange with other visiting members of your school	1.98
4. intellectual interchange with faculty	1.78
5. proximity to Princeton University	1.63
6. colloquia and lectures at the Institute	1.28
7. intellectual interchange with visiting members of other schools	.62
8. proximity to New York City and/or other major U.S. cities	.57

Breakdowns by Position -- Sections 2 and 3

JUNIOR FACULTY (continued)

Question 2.2 -- Was any member of the Institute faculty working in your specific field?

(Percentages given of the 384 junior faculty members who answered this question -- 99.2% of the total)

yes	222	57.8%
no	162	42.2%

Question 2.22 -- If not, did the lack of a professor working in your specific field impede or limit your work in any way?

(Percentages given of 169 responses -- 43.7% of total)

yes	14	8.3%
no	155	91.7%

Crosstabulation of Question 2.2 by Question 2.22

<u>Question 2.2</u> faculty member in field?	<u>Question 2.22</u> -- work impeded by lack of faculty member in field?	
	yes	no
yes	1	11
no	13 (8.4%)	142 (91.6%)

NOTE: Percentages given of those with no faculty member in the field.

Question 2.3 -- Were there other visiting members working in your specific field?

(Percentages given of 380 responses -- 98.2% of total)

yes	287	75.5%
no	93	24.5%

Question 2.31 -- If yes, was their presence directly helpful to you?

(Percentages given of 292 responses -- 75.5% of total)

yes	252	86.3%
no	40	13.7%

Breakdowns by Position -- Sections 2 and 3

JUNIOR FACULTY (continued)

Crosstabulation of Question 2.3 by Question 2.31

Question 2.31 -- other members in field helpful?

<u>Question 2.3</u> other members in field?	yes	no
yes	250 (87.4%)	36 (12.6%)
no	2	3

NOTE: Percentages given of those with other visiting members in the field.

Question 2.4 -- Would it have been helpful to you -- in working on your particular topic -- to have a wider range of interests represented by the visiting members?

(Percentages given of 360 responses -- 93.0% of total)

yes	87	24.2%
no	273	75.8%

Question 2.5 -- On the whole, how did you feel about the degree of structure in the working situation at the Institute?

(Percentages given of 374 responses -- 96.6% of total)

too structured	5	1.3%
just about right	353	94.4%
not structured enough	16	4.3%

Question 2.51 -- Would you have preferred any of the following? (Percentages given for 243 responses -- 63.0% of total)

a. more lectures or seminars given by the faculty	96	39.5%
b. more lectures or seminars given by the members	66	27.2%
c. more organized contact with Princeton University faculty and research students	76	31.3%
d. more lectures of general interest	99	40.7%

Breakdowns by Position -- Sections 2 and 3

JUNIOR FACULTY (continued)

Question 2.7 -- All things considered, did your visit to the Institute come up to your expectations?

(Percentages given of 380 responses -- 98.2% of total)

yes	352	92.6%
no	28	7.4%

Question 3.1 -- How would you describe the role played by your visit to the Institute in the subsequent development of your own work?

(Percentages given of 381 responses -- 98.5% of total)

crucial	99	26.0%
very important	179	47.0%
important	86	22.6%
unimportant	17	4.5%

Weighted average -- 2.93

("crucial" counted as 5; "very important" as 3; "important" as 1;
"unimportant" as 0)

Question 3.2 -- In your judgment, how would you describe the impact of the Institute in the intellectual development of your field in the last 10-15 years?

(Percentages given of 357 responses -- 92.3% of total)

crucial	69	19.3%
very important	132	37.0%
important	108	30.3%
unimportant	48	13.4%

Weighted average -- 2.38

("crucial" counted as 5; "very important" as 3; "important" as 1;
"unimportant" as 0)

Question 3.3 -- Are there additional fields of scholarship that you feel ought to be represented at the Institute?

(Percentages given of 286 responses -- 73.9% of total)

yes	76	26.6%
no	210	73.4%

Table 30

Breakdowns by Position at Most Recent Visit

Section 2: Intellectual environment of the Institute

Section 3: Long-range value of visit and of the Institute's work

PROFESSORS

(344 responses -- 33.0% of total)

Question 2.1 -- Indicate...the value of the following to your work at the Institute. (Percentages given of those who answered the question -- at least 94.5% for each item)

	very important	important	unimportant
a. freedom from ordinary academic obligations	89.5%	8.8%	1.8%
b. peace and quiet	75.2%	21.8%	3.0%
c. intellectual interchange with other visiting members of your school	41.4%	48.2%	10.4%
d. intellectual interchange with visiting members of other schools	8.9%	36.0%	55.1%
e. intellectual interchange with faculty	43.2%	43.8%	12.9%
f. colloquia and lectures at the Institute	16.5%	51.4%	32.1%
g. proximity to Princeton University	39.6%	44.2%	16.3%
h. proximity to New York City and/or other major U.S. cities	11.7%	22.5%	65.8%

Weighted average -- in descending order of importance to members' work ("very important" counted as 3; "important" as 1; "unimportant" as 0)

1. freedom from ordinary academic obligations	2.77
2. peace and quiet	2.47
3. intellectual interchange with faculty	1.74
4. intellectual interchange with other visiting members of your school	1.72
5. proximity to Princeton University	1.63
6. colloquia and lectures at the Institute	1.01
7. intellectual interchange with visiting members of other schools	.63
8. proximity to New York City and/or other major U.S. cities	.58

Breakdowns by Position -- Sections 2 and 3

PROFESSORS (continued)

Question 2.2 -- Was any member of the Institute faculty working in your specific field?

(Percentages given of the 340 professors who answered this question -- 98.8% of the total)

yes	190	55.9%
no	150	44.1%

Question 2.22 -- If not, did the lack of a professor working in your specific field impede or limit your work in any way?

(Percentages given of 162 responses -- 47.1% of total)

yes	11	6.8%
no	151	93.2%

Crosstabulation of Question 2.2 by Question 2.22

Question 2.22 -- work impeded by lack of faculty member in field?

Question 2.2
faculty member
in field?

	yes	no
yes	0	10
no	11 (7.4%)	137 (92.6%)

NOTE: Percentages given of those with no faculty member in the field.

Question 2.3 -- Were there other visiting members working in your specific field?

(Percentages given of 337 responses -- 98.0% of total)

yes	206	61.1%
no	131	38.9%

Question 2.31 -- If yes, was their presence directly helpful to you?

(Percentages given of 222 answers -- 64.5% of total)

yes	180	81.1%
no	42	18.9%

PROFESSORS (continued)

Crosstabulation of Question 2.3 by Question 2.31

Question 2.31 -- other members in field helpful?

<u>Question 2.3</u> other members in field?	yes	no
yes	174 (85.3%)	30 (14.7%)
no	4	10

NOTE: Percentages given of those with other visiting members in the field.

Question 2.4 -- Would it have been helpful to you -- in working on your particular topic -- to have a wider range of interests represented by the visiting members?

(Percentages given of 325 responses -- 94.5% of total)

yes	97	29.8%
no	228	70.2%

Question 2.5 -- On the whole, how did you feel about the degree of structure in the working situation at the Institute?

(Percentages given of 336 responses -- 97.7% of total)

too structured	4	1.2%
just about right	319	94.9%
not structured enough	13	3.9%

Question 2.51 -- Would you have preferred any of the following? (Percentages given of 186 responses -- 54.1% of total)

a. more lectures or seminars given by the faculty	64	34.4%
b. more lectures or seminars given by the members	53	28.5%
c. more organized contact with Princeton University faculty and research students	70	37.6%
d. more lectures of general interest	63	33.9%

Breakdowns by Position -- Sections 2 and 3

PROFESSORS (continued)

Question 2.7 -- All things considered, did your visit to the Institute come up to your expectations?

(Percentages given of 336 responses -- 97.7% of total)

yes	317	94.3%
no	19	5.7%

Question 3.1 -- How would you describe the role played by your visit to the Institute in the subsequent development of your own work?

(Percentages given of 336 responses -- 97.7% of total)

crucial	63	18.8%
very important	162	48.2%
important	95	28.3%
unimportant	16	4.8%

Weighted average -- 2.67

("crucial" counted as 5; "very important" as 3; "important" as 1;
"unimportant" as 0)

Question 3.2 -- In your judgment, how would you describe the impact of the Institute in the intellectual development of your field in the last 10-15 years?

(Percentages given of 307 responses -- 89.2% of total)

crucial	44	14.3%
very important	114	37.1%
important	86	28.0%
unimportant	63	20.5%

Weighted average -- 2.11

("crucial" counted as 5; "very important" as 3; "important" as 1;
"unimportant" as 0)

Question 3.3 -- Are there additional fields of scholarship that you feel ought to be represented at the Institute?

(Percentages given of 266 responses -- 77.3% of total)

yes	91	34.2%
no	175	65.8%

Table 31

FIRST STEP IN INSTITUTE MEMBERSHIP

Question 4.1 -- What was the first step in your discussions with the Institute about your most recent membership? (Percentages given are of 1034 responses -- 97.3% of the total)

a. invitation from a member of the Institute faculty	261	25.2%
b. informal discussion or correspondence with a member of the Institute faculty	277	26.8%
c. recommended by a senior colleague	214	20.7%
d. applied on own initiative	282	27.3%

MEMBERS' SCHOOL BY FIRST STEP IN MEMBERSHIP

	<u>invitation</u>	<u>informal discussion</u>	<u>recommended</u>	<u>own application</u>
Historical Studies	108 37.1%	109 37.5%	30 10.3%	44 15.1%
Mathematics	70 14.0%	119 23.8%	126 25.2%	186 37.1%
Natural Sciences	50 26.3%	41 21.6%	54 28.5%	45 23.7%
Social Science	32 65.3%	7 14.3%	4 8.2%	6 12.2%

MEMBERS' POSITION AT MOST RECENT VISIT
 BY FIRST STEP IN MEMBERSHIP

	<u>invitation</u>	<u>informal discussion</u>	<u>recommended</u>	<u>own application</u>
postdoctoral fellows	39 15.0%	41 15.8%	115 44.2%	65 25.0%
junior faculty	79 20.5%	100 25.9%	74 19.2%	133 34.4%
senior faculty	124 36.5%	120 35.3%	15 4.4%	81 23.8%
other academic position	3 17.6%	6 35.3%	5 29.4%	3 17.7%

MEMBERS' SCHOOL BY ACADEMIC AFFILIATION
 BEFORE MOST RECENT VISIT

	<u>non-U.S. college or university</u>	<u>U.S. college or university</u>	<u>total in academic institutions</u>
Historical Studies	122 46.9%	138 53.1%	260
Mathematics	135 28.8%	334 71.2%	469
Natural Sciences	52 33.3%	104 66.7%	156
Social Science	13 28.3%	33 71.7%	46

MEMBERS' SCHOOL BY NONACADEMIC AFFILIATION
 BEFORE MOST RECENT VISIT

	<u>research</u>	<u>policy</u>	<u>cultural</u>	<u>research- devel.</u>	<u>govt.</u>	<u>unaffil.</u>	<u>total nonacademic</u>
Historical Studies	17 58.6%	0 0.0%	7 24.1%	0 0.0%	2 6.9%	3 10.3%	29
Mathematics	21 72.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 10.3%	5 17.2%	29
Natural Sciences	28 82.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 8.8%	1 2.9%	2 5.9%	34
Social Science	1 33.3%	2 66.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3

Note that the percentages given above are those of the members in the school in either academic or nonacademic institutions.

RETURN TO POSITION AFTER MOST RECENT VISIT

Question 4.22 -- Did you return to [the position you held before your most recent membership] after your stay at the Institute?

(Percentages given of 1036 responses -- 97.5% of the total. Note that a "yes" answer means that the member did return to the position he or she held previously.)

yes	694 members	67.0%
no	342	33.0%

MEMBERS' SCHOOL BY RETURN TO POSITION

Members with joint appointments are not included on this table. Of the three who answered the question, 2 returned to their previous positions and 1 did not.

	<u>yes (returned)</u>	<u>no (did not return)</u>
Historical Studies	251 85.7%	42 14.3%
Mathematics	307 61.2%	195 38.8%
Natural Sciences	99 52.4%	90 47.6%
Social Science	35 71.4%	14 28.6%

Note that the percentages given are of the responding members in each school.

MEMBERS' POSITION AT MOST RECENT VISIT BY RETURN TO POSITION

	<u>yes (returned)</u>	<u>no (did not return)</u>
postdoctoral fellows	52 20.2%	206 79.8%
junior faculty	294 76.4%	91 23.6%
senior faculty	315 91.8%	28 8.2%
researcher or curator	11 64.7%	6 35.3%
other academic position	14 73.7%	5 26.3%
administrator	5 62.5%	3 37.5%

Table 34

MEMBERS' SCHOOL BY NATURE OF CHANGE IN POSITION
 AFTER MOST RECENT VISIT

This table is an accurate measure only of those members who said they did not return to the position they held before their most recent visits. Those who said they did return to the same position show up in the "indeterminate" column here, since we didn't want to assume they experienced no rise in rank. Altogether, 1032 responses were coded for this item. The percentages given below are those of each school's membership. No member's rank went down after the visit.

	<u>same institution higher position</u>	<u>different inst. higher position</u>	<u>different inst. same position</u>	<u>indeterminate</u>
Historical Studies	4 1.4%	15 5.1%	8 2.7%	265 90.7%
Mathematics	13 2.6%	122 24.4%	18 3.6%	347 69.4%
Natural Sciences	1 .5%	68 36.2%	7 3.7%	112 59.6%
Social Science	1 2.0%	3 6.1%	3 6.1%	42 85.7%

Table 25

MEMBERS' POSITION BEFORE MOST RECENT VISIT
 BY NATURE OF CHANGE IN POSITION AFTER VISIT

As in the case of the preceding table, this table is only useful for those members who did not return to their previous positions. Those who did return are classified here among the "indeterminate" responses. A total of 1028 responses were coded for this item. The percentages given below are those of the members in each academic rank or other position.

	<u>same institution higher position</u>	<u>different inst. higher position</u>	<u>different inst. same position</u>	<u>indeterminate</u>
postdoctoral fellows	8 3.1%	171 66.8%	4 1.6%	73 28.5%
junior faculty	9 2.3%	28 7.3%	10 2.6%	338 87.8%
senior faculty	2 .6%	3 .9%	20 5.9%	316 92.7%
researcher- curator	0 0.0%	3 17.6%	1 5.9%	13 76.5%
adminis- trator	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 12.5%	7 87.5%
other academic position	0 0.0%	2 10.5%	0 0.0%	17 89.5%
other non- academic position	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%

Table 36

Members' position before most recent visit by position after most recent visit

This table includes a total of only 317 members, or 29.8% of the total. These are for the most part members who did not return to the positions they held immediately before their most recent visits and who identified their next jobs. Both row and column percentages are given: the upper percentage is that of the members who held a position before their membership and the lower one is that of the members who held a position after their memberships. The 43 members who held postdoctoral fellowships (or were graduate students) both before and after their most recent visits represent 22.5% of the members who came to the Institute as postdocs and 97.7% of the members who were postdocs after they left the Institute. Members who came from other academic or nonacademic positions were very few and are not included here.

position after the most recent membership

position before the most recent membership	position after the most recent membership							
	<u>post- doctoral</u>	<u>junior faculty</u>	<u>senior faculty</u>	<u>researcher curator</u>	<u>administrator</u>	<u>other academic</u>	<u>other nonacademic</u>	<u>unemployed unaffiliated</u>
postdoctoral fellow	43 22.5% 97.7%	108 56.5% 75.5%	5 2.6% 7.5%	17 8.9% 60.7%	0 0.0% 0.0%	15 7.9% 65.2%	1 .5% 50.0%	2 1.0% 66.7%
junior faculty	0 0.0% 0.0%	32 41.6% 22.4%	27 35.1% 40.3%	7 9.1% 25.0%	4 5.2% 57.1%	5 6.5% 21.7%	1 1.3% 50.0%	1 1.3% 33.3%
senior faculty	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	30 93.8% 44.8%	0 0.0% 0.0%	2 6.2% 28.6%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%
researcher- curator	0 0.0% 0.0%	1 14.3% .7%	2 28.6% 3.0%	4 57.1% 14.3%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%
adminis- trator	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	2 66.7% 3.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	3 33.3% 14.3%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%

Table 37

Members' school by position after most recent visit

Note that this table includes a total of only 318 former members, 28.9% of the total. These are for the most part members who did not return to the positions they held immediately before their most recent visits and who told us what jobs they did go on to. Percentages given are of the school.

	<u>post- doctoral</u>	<u>junior faculty</u>	<u>senior faculty</u>	<u>researcher- curator</u>	<u>administrator</u>	<u>other academic</u>	<u>other non academic</u>	<u>unemployed</u>
Historical Studies	0 0.0%	7 17.1%	21 51.2%	7 17.1%	4 9.8%	1 2.4%	0 0.0%	1 2.4%
Mathematics	25 13.9%	98 54.4%	30 16.7%	8 4.4%	2 1.1%	14 7.8%	2 1.1%	1 .6%
Natural Sciences	19 22.4%	33 38.8%	11 12.9%	12 14.1%	1 1.2%	8 9.4%	0 0.0%	1 1.2%
Social Science	0 0.0%	5 45.5%	5 45.5%	1 9.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%

Table 38

MEMBERS' SCHOOL BY ACADEMIC AFFILIATION
 AFTER MOST RECENT VISIT

These statistics came from an unverified computer run and many contain some (infrequent) random errors. The statistics relating to members' nonacademic affiliations, below, are exact.

	<u>non-U.S. college or university</u>	<u>U.S. college or university</u>	<u>total in academic institutions</u>
Historical Studies	116 44.8%	143 55.2%	259
Mathematics	134 28.4%	338 71.6%	472
Natural Sciences	51 34.2%	98 65.8%	149
Social Science	14 29.2%	34 70.8%	48

MEMBERS' SCHOOL BY NONACADEMIC AFFILIATION
 AFTER MOST RECENT VISIT

	<u>research</u>	<u>cultural</u>	<u>research- devel.</u>	<u>govt.</u>	<u>unaffil.</u>	<u>total nonacademic</u>
Historical Studies	12 50.0%	9 37.5%	0 0.0%	2 8.3%	1 4.2%	24
Mathematics	15 62.5%	1 4.2%	1 4.2%	7 29.2%	0 0.0%	24
Natural Sciences	30 85.7%	0 0.0%	4 11.4%	1 2.9%	0 0.0%	35
Social Science	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1

Note that the percentages given above are those of the members in the school in either academic or nonacademic institutions.

Table 39

Members' school by position before original membership -- all members

This table includes 1041 members, 97.9% of the total, and represents a combination of first visits of repeating members with most recent visits (which are also first visits) for members who have visited only once, distributed according to members' school. Members with joint appointments are not included in the table; two had more than one visit, and both visited first as professors.

	<u>post- doctoral</u>	<u>junior faculty</u>	<u>professor</u>	<u>researcher curator</u>	<u>administrator</u>	<u>other academic position</u>	<u>other nonacademic position</u>
Historical Studies	24 8.2%	101 34.5%	140 47.8%	8 2.7%	5 1.7%	15 5.1%	0 0.0%
Mathematics	194 38.3%	246 48.6%	62 12.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 .6%	1 .2%
Natural Sciences	93 48.7%	48 25.1%	33 17.3%	9 4.7%	3 1.6%	4 2.1%	1 .5%
Social Science	5 10.2%	17 34.7%	26 53.1%	1 2.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%

Table 40

Members' school by position before original membership -- repeating members only

The table includes only the 200 members who visited the Institute more than once and who described the stages in their careers at which they first visited the Institute. They represent 18.8 percent of the members who answered the questionnaire and all but two of the members who visited more than once. Percentages given are those of the repeating members in the school. Members with joint appointments are not included in this table; two had more than one visit, and both visited first as professors.

	<u>post- doctoral</u>	<u>junior faculty</u>	<u>professor</u>	<u>researcher curator</u>	<u>other academic position</u>	<u>total repeating</u>
Historical Studies	6 10.7%	23 41.1%	23 41.1%	2 3.6%	2 3.6%	56
Mathematics	47 42.7%	52 47.3%	10 9.1%	0 0.0%	1 .9%	110
Natural Sciences	12 48.0%	6 24.0%	4 16.0%	2 8.0%	1 4.0%	25
Social Science	2 28.6%	2 28.6%	3 42.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7

Table 41

Members' position at most recent visit by position at original visit -- repeating members only

This table includes only the 200 former members (all but two of those who visited the Institute more than once) who identified the stage in their career at which they first visited the Institute. They represent 18.8% of the total sample. Both row and column percentages are included: the upper percentage is that of the members who held a position at their most recent visits; the lower one is the percentage of the members who originally visited in each job category. The 19 members who visited originally as postdoctoral fellows and most recently as junior faculty, for instance, represent 33.3% of those who came most recently as junior faculty and 28.4% of those who came originally as postdocs.

position before first Institute visit

position at most recent Institute visit	position before first Institute visit				
	<u>postdoctoral fellow</u>	<u>junior faculty</u>	<u>professor</u>	<u>researcher curator</u>	<u>other academic position</u>
postdoctoral fellow	16 100.0% 23.9%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%
junior faculty	19 33.3% 28.4%	37 64.9% 44.6%	0 0.0% 0.0%	1 1.8% 25.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%
professor	32 26.0% 47.8%	46 37.4% 55.4%	42 34.1% 100.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	3 2.4% 75.0%
researcher or curator	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	3 100.0% 75.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%
other academic position	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	1 100.0% 25.0%

Table 42

CHANGE IN POSITION AT LATER VISIT

The following table shows the number of members who returned to the Institute at a higher position than the one they first held and the percentages they represent of members first or most recently visiting with those titles. This information is based on the data for members most recent visits, their first visits, and the comparison of their positions at the times of the two visits.

<u>Members returning with a higher position</u>	<u>Members returning with the same position</u>
19 were first postdocs, then jr. faculty	16 postdoctoral fellows both times
32 were first postdocs, then professors	37 junior faculty both times
46 were first junior faculty, then prof.	42 professors both times
	3 researchers/curators both times
	1 other academic both times
97 repeating members with higher rank (9.1% of total sample)	99 repeating members with the same rank (9.3% of total sample)

Percentage of members who held each position at their first visit who returned with the same or higher titles:

	<u>total at first visit</u>	<u>returned -- higher rank</u>	<u>returned -- same rank</u>	<u>total returned</u>
postdoctoral fellows	316 100.0%	51 16.1%	16 5.1%	67 21.2%
junior faculty	412 100.0%	46 11.2%	37 9.0%	83 20.2%
senior faculty	263 100.0%	0 0.0%	42 16.0%	42 16.0%

Percentage of members who held each position at their latest visit who visited previously at the same or less advanced stages in their careers:

	<u>total at latest visit</u>	<u>visited earlier lower rank</u>	<u>visited earlier same rank</u>	<u>total visited earlier</u>
postdoctoral fellows	265 100.0%	0 0.0%	16 6.0%	16 6.0%
junior faculty	387 100.0%	19 4.9%	37 9.6%	56 14.5%
senior faculty	344 100.0%	78 22.7%	42 12.2%	120 34.9%

MEMBERS' SCHOOL BY ACADEMIC AFFILIATION
 BEFORE FIRST VISIT -- REPEATING MEMBERS ONLY

These tables includes 197 members who visited the Institute more than once;
 they represent 18.5% of the total response and 98.0% of the repeating members.

	<u>non-U.S. college or university</u>	<u>U.S. college or university</u>	<u>total in academic institutions</u>
Historical Studies	25 53.2%	22 46.8%	47
Mathematics	17 17.3%	81 82.7%	98
Natural Sciences	4 20.0%	16 80.0%	20
Social Science	1 14.3%	6 85.7%	7
joint appointment	--	2	2

MEMBERS' SCHOOL BY NONACADEMIC AFFILIATION
 BEFORE FIRST VISIT -- REPEATING MEMBERS ONLY

	<u>research</u>	<u>government</u>	<u>unaffiliated</u>	<u>total nonacademic</u>
Historical Studies	5 71.4%	0 0.0%	2 28.6%	7
Mathematics	6 54.5%	2 18.2%	3 27.3%	11
Natural Sciences	5 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5

The percentages given above are those of the members in the school in either
 academic or nonacademic institutions.

PLANS FOR WORK AT THE INSTITUTE

Question 4.3 -- Please indicate...the importance of the following in your plans for your work at the Institute. (Percentages given are of the members who rated each item -- at least 83.9% of the total in each case. Note that these statistics are from an "unverified" computer run and may therefore contain minimal random errors.)

	<u>very important</u>	<u>important</u>	<u>unimportant</u>
a. working on a specific, well-formulated problem	55.9%	27.9%	16.2%
b. broadening your competence and working in new fields	46.4%	33.9%	19.7%
c. defining and carrying through a specific project or problem in your field	53.6%	31.8%	14.6%
d. formulating problems for future work	47.2%	36.4%	16.4%
e. preparing for publication the results of research already completed	27.5%	29.1%	43.4%

MEMBERS' SCHOOL BY PLANS FOR WORK AT THE INSTITUTE

<u>Historical Studies</u>	<u>very important</u>	<u>important</u>	<u>unimportant</u>
a. work on specific problem	79.1%	14.1%	6.8%
b. working in new fields	27.6%	33.6%	38.8%
c. defining a project	68.5%	22.0%	9.5%
d. formulating future problems	33.6%	37.9%	28.5%
e. preparing results for publication	54.3%	24.1%	21.6%

Mathematics

a. work on specific problem	51.1%	32.9%	16.0%
b. working in new fields	51.6%	35.9%	12.5%
c. defining a project	47.6%	35.1%	17.3%
d. formulating future problems	53.0%	35.9%	11.1%
e. preparing results for publication	16.8%	31.3%	51.9%

Natural Sciences

a. work on specific problem	31.7%	37.1%	31.1%
b. working in new fields	59.3%	30.2%	10.5%
c. defining a project	47.3%	36.4%	16.4%
d. formulating future problems	49.2%	37.9%	13.0%
e. preparing results for publication	13.9%	29.7%	56.4%

MEMBERS' SCHOOL BY PLANS FOR WORK (continued)

<u>Social Science</u>	<u>very important</u>	<u>important</u>	<u>unimportant</u>
a. work on specific problem	60.4%	24.5%	15.1%
b. working in new fields	43.1%	29.4%	27.5%
c. defining a project	55.1%	34.7%	10.2%
d. formulating future problems	50.0%	30.8%	19.2%
e. preparing results for publication	38.5%	32.7%	28.8%

Table 45

MEMBERS' SCHOOL BY ADEQUACY OF FUNDING

(Percentages given are those of each school. Overall response rate was 92.7% of total)

	<u>more than adequate</u>	<u>adequate</u>	<u>less than adequate</u>
Historical Studies	12.2%	78.0%	9.8%
Mathematics	11.5%	81.2%	7.2%
Natural Sciences	11.6%	85.1%	3.3%
Social Science	14.9%	83.0%	2.1%

MEMBERS' POSITION AT MOST RECENT VISIT BY ADEQUACY OF FUNDING

(Percentages given of each academic rank group)

	<u>more than adequate</u>	<u>adequate</u>	<u>less than adequate</u>
postdoctoral fellows	12.4%	82.1%	5.6%
junior faculty	9.5%	81.5%	9.0%
senior faculty	13.5%	81.5%	5.0%

MEMBERS' SCHOOL BY INSTITUTE FUNDING ONLY

(Altogether, 1031 former members, or 97.0% of the total, answered this question. The percentages given below are those of the respondents in each school.)

	<u>Institute only</u>	<u>other sources</u>	<u>don't remember</u>
Historical Studies	45.1%	52.6%	2.4%
Mathematics	42.4%	54.8%	2.8%
Natural Sciences	61.5%	35.8%	2.7%
Social Science	59.2%	40.8%	---

MEMBERS' MOST RECENT POSITION BY INSTITUTE FUNDING ONLY

postdoctoral fellows	65.8%	32.3%	1.9%
junior faculty	44.4%	53.8%	1.8%
senior faculty	34.3%	62.4%	3.3%

Table 46

MEMBERS' SCHOOL BY OTHER SOURCES OF FUNDING

	<u>outside grant</u>	<u>member's own institution</u>	<u>personal resources</u>
Historical Studies	40.9%	48.9%	31.7%
Mathematics	64.5%	47.0%	13.5%
Natural Sciences	50.0%	42.9%	15.5%
Social Science	65.0%	50.0%	5.0%

MEMBERS' MOST RECENT POSITION BY OTHER SOURCES OF FUNDING

	<u>outside grant</u>	<u>member's own institution</u>	<u>personal resources</u>
postdoctoral fellows	74.5%	11.8%	19.6%
junior faculty	57.6%	48.0%	18.4%
senior faculty	46.3%	61.7%	19.6%

(Percentages above are those of the members in the school or academic rank group who answered the question. Over all, 55.8% of the total number of respondents did answer Question 5.21.)