

## Quantitative Analysis of the FSC's NYU 2031 Survey, April 2012

All the results in this report are statistically significant at the  $p < .0005$  level unless otherwise noted.

### I. How many and who responded to the survey?

The survey was sent to 3933 faculty members. 1146 responded, for an overall 29% return rate. This varied widely by school. The lowest response rate was for the School of Law (11%), and the highest was for Wagner (61%). The School of Medicine, with the largest group of faculty (1368), had a return rate of 16%. In the Faculty of Arts and Science (1071, including Courant Institute), the second largest grouping of faculty, the response rate was 40%.

Response rates were higher for those with more extreme opinions. Excluding those who were neither supportive nor opposed, schools with more opposed faculty had higher response rates ( $r = +0.60$ ,  $p = .03$ ).

### II. Opposition to the NYU 2031 plan

The plan was opposed by a majority of the faculty: 64% vs. 25% (a 5:2 ratio), with 12% of the faculty neither opposed nor supportive. 71% of those who were not neutral were opposed. On a 7-point scale (from 1 = strongly oppose to 7 = strongly support), the average was 2.9, a bit more opposed than “slightly opposed.” 40% of respondents strongly oppose the plan, and this was the most frequent response.

A majority of respondents (56% vs. 31%, or almost 2:1) disagreed with a statement taken from the [NYU 2031 website](#), which claimed that “NYU 2031 will meet the needs of NYU’s faculty and students & its research and academic programs.” 13% of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed. On a 7-point scale (from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree), the mean was 3.3, between “slightly disagree” and “neither.” 28% of respondents strongly disagreed, and this was the most frequent response.

Respondents expressed no “confidence in the university’s ability to successfully carry out NYU 2031”: 59% vs. 29% (a 2:1 ratio), with 11% of the faculty being neutral. On the 7-point scale, the mean was 3.1, a bit more negative than “slightly disagree” with expressing confidence. 34% of respondents strongly disagreed with expressing confidence, and this was the most frequent response.<sup>1</sup>

### III. Where did people get their information, and how did this correlate with opinions?

Tell us about the information you have received about NYU 2031, on which you base your opinions.									
Answer Options	strongly disagree	disagree	slightly disagree	neither	slightly agree	agree	strongly agree	Rating Average	Response Count
I do not have enough information to form an opinion.	<b>30%</b>	28%	9%	8%	9%	11%	6%	2.92	1079
I rely on conversations with colleagues/other friends.	6%	10%	4%	15%	27%	<b>30%</b>	8%	4.67	1093
I rely on newspapers.	5%	8%	4%	11%	27%	<b>37%</b>	7%	4.87	1091

<sup>1</sup> There was some concern that this last question on confidence might be ambiguous, with those opposed versus supporting NYU 2031 interpreting “successfully carry out” differently. There was no evidence for this. Opposition to the plan (Q1) correlated +0.85 with lack of confidence (Q2b), consistent with a strong linear relationship.

Answer Options	strongly disagree	disagree	slightly disagree	neither	slightly agree	agree	strongly agree	Rating Average	Response Count
I rely on NYU press releases and publicity.	8%	11%	7%	13%	25%	<b>30%</b>	7%	4.51	1100
I rely on Community Board 2 publications and/or meetings.	15%	16%	7%	<b>22%</b>	14%	19%	7%	3.87	1067
I rely on tenants' associations in Washington Square Village or Silver Towers.	19%	16%	6%	<b>23%</b>	13%	17%	6%	3.70	1070
I rely on other sources of information (specify below).	15%	10%	1%	<b>44%</b>	6%	15%	9%	3.94	804

Support for the plan was associated with not having enough information to form an opinion ( $r = +0.38$ ), and was unrelated to relying on NYU press releases ( $r = +.04$ ). The more respondents relied particularly on tenants' associations ( $r = -0.47$ ) and on Community Board 2 ( $r = -0.43$ ), but also on friends and colleagues ( $r = -0.22$ ) and on newspapers ( $r = -0.14$ ), the lower their support for the plan.<sup>2</sup>

Having no confidence in the university's ability to carry out NYU 2031 showed a pattern similar to support for the plan. Having more confidence was associated with not having enough information ( $r = +0.36$ ). Confidence was positively related to relying on NYU press releases ( $r = +0.07$ ,  $p < .03$ ). The more respondents relied on tenants' associations ( $r = -0.41$ ) and on Community Board 2 ( $r = -0.37$ ), but also on friends and colleagues ( $r = -0.22$ ) and on newspapers ( $r = -0.14$ ), the less confidence they had.

#### **IV. What benefits or damage did people expect from NYU 2031?**

How much do you think implementation of NYU 2031 will benefit or damage each of the following, over the next 20 years?										
Answer Options	damage very much	damage	slightly damage	neither	slightly benefit	benefit	benefit very much	unable to comment	Rating Average	Response Count
faculty salaries and benefits	18%	<b>26%</b>	11%	<b>26%</b>	4%	5%	2%	9%	2.93	1127
faculty recruitment	<b>28%</b>	19%	8%	12%	10%	12%	6%	5%	3.17	1122
faculty retention	<b>29%</b>	21%	11%	13%	7%	9%	5%	5%	2.95	1106
the appeal of NYU housing for faculty	<b>37%</b>	17%	9%	9%	6%	12%	6%	5%	2.89	1118
keeping tuition increases low	<b>32%</b>	23%	13%	16%	2%	3%	2%	9%	2.43	1125
the quality of students who attend NYU	14%	15%	8%	<b>32%</b>	8%	9%	6%	8%	3.60	1113
NYU's financial stability	<b>29%</b>	21%	11%	15%	4%	6%	4%	11%	2.77	1114

<sup>2</sup> Respondents who relied on one source of information also relied on others, so the sources were mutually supportive rather than mutually exclusive. Reliance on tenants' associations and on Community Board 2 were very closely related ( $r = +0.69$ ), but reliance on all other information sources was positively correlated ( $+0.40 > rs > +0.13$ ).

On a scale running from “damage very much” (= 1) to “neither” (= 4) to “benefit very much” (= 7), NYU 2031 was seen as damaging all of the outcomes listed. It was seen as most damaging to “keeping tuition increases low” (2.43) and “NYU’s financial stability (2.77); slightly damaging to “the appeal of NYU housing for faculty” (2.89), “faculty salaries and benefits” (2.93), “faculty retention” (2.95), and “faculty recruitment” (3.17); and least damaging to “the quality of students” (3.60).<sup>3</sup>

These items correlate very highly with each other ( $r_s > +0.60$ ). For example, seeing NYU 2031 as damaging faculty salaries and benefits goes along with seeing it as damaging NYU’s financial stability. Both support for NYU 2031, and confidence in the university to carry out the plan successfully, correlated positively with all these damage-benefit items ( $r_s > +0.64$ ). So those who oppose the plan see all these things as being damaged by it.

How did these damage-benefit averages compare for those opposing versus those supporting NYU 2031 (omitting respondents who said “neither”)? The difference was greatest for “faculty recruitment” (5.66 for supporters vs. 2.06 for those opposed), followed by “appeal of NYU housing” (5.31 vs. 1.75), and “faculty retention” (5.32 vs. 1.90). Differences were smaller for “NYU’s financial stability” (4.80 vs. 1.90), “quality of students” (5.55 vs. 2.74), “faculty salaries and benefits” (4.57 vs. 2.24), and “keeping tuition increases low” (3.87 vs. 1.81). Each pair of averages differs significantly from each other, and all of these averages differ from the scale’s neutral point (4.00), with one exception. Those supporting the plan thought it would not affect tuition.

## **V. How would reductions in NYU 2031 affect attitudes?**

69% of respondents said that reductions in NYU 2031 would change their opinions. These people were less supportive of NYU 2031 (2.38) and had less confidence in the university (2.70) than those who said reductions would not change their opinions (3.96 and 3.99 respectively).

The most favored change was to omit the buildings in the courtyard in Washington Square Village, which averaged 2.28 (on an opinion-change scale from 1 = much more positive to 7 = much more negative). Moving most of superblock construction elsewhere averaged 2.52, and did not differ much from omitting the hotel (2.57). Scaling back the Zipper building (2.76) produced less positive change than omitting the hotel ( $p = .002$ ), and omitting construction on the Morton Williams site (3.10) produced the least positive change.<sup>4</sup>

## **VI. Will construction be done in a way that minimizes stress on the cultural and physical environment?**

Almost 60% do not believe a statement taken from the [NYU 2031 website](#), claiming that the construction phase of NYU 2031 will be sensitive to the potential for placing undue stress on NYU’s cultural and physical environments. The average rating was 3.13, “slightly disagree.” And the most common rating was 1.00, “strongly disagree.”

---

<sup>3</sup> All of these values are significantly lower than the neutral “neither” point on the scale (4.00). The ordering of issues is similar in terms of the percent of respondents with an opinion who see NYU 2031 as damaging tuition (75%), NYU’s financial stability (67%), appeal of faculty housing (65%), faculty retention (64%), faculty salaries and benefits (60%), faculty recruitment (58%), and quality of students (41%).

<sup>4</sup> Question 6 asked people to assess effects of specific reductions, but only if they’d said “yes” on Question 5 (that reductions in NYU 2031 would change their opinions). But about **160 people who said “no” on Q5 also responded to Q6**. Dropping these people shifts the Rating Average in a positive direction (toward the left) on items 6a through 6e. All Rating Average changes were positive, and the averages remained statistically different from the neutral point of 4.00, “stay the same.”

Not surprisingly, this item correlated positively with the first three items in the survey, indicating that opposition to the plan, rejecting the claim that NYU 2031 would meet faculty and student needs, and lack of confidence in the university, are all associated with rejecting this claim that stress will be minimized ( $r > +0.44$ ). Omitting respondents who neither support nor oppose NYU 2031, those who support it agree very slightly with this claim (4.50), whereas those who oppose it simply disagree (2.46).

### VII. Does place of residence affect opposition to NYU 2031?

Yes. The farther one lives from the superblocs, the more one supports the plan. Those who live in Washington Square Village and Silver Towers “oppose” the plan on (Question 1 average = 1.83); those who live in the neighborhood of the super blocks or in Greenwich Village only “slightly oppose” the plan (2.78); and those who live “elsewhere” hardly oppose or support the plan (3.86).

Of all the demographic variables, this is easily the best predictor of support for NYU 2031 ( $r = +0.47$ ). Not living in NYU housing also predicts support ( $r = +0.40$ ), and of course these two variables correlate very highly ( $r = +0.94$ ).

### VIII. Which other demographic variables are related to opposition to NYU 2031?

We undertook a multiple regression analysis to determine which demographic variables are related to opposition to NYU 2031. When a) distance living from the superblocs, b) living in NYU housing or not, c) time as an NYU faculty member, d) whether or not children live with you, e) children’s age groups, and rank at NYU are entered simultaneously as predictors of opposition to NYU 2031, only one variable is significantly related ( $\beta = 0.25, p = .03$ ): distance from the superblocs. As noted above, there is more support for NYU 2031 among respondents who live farther from the superblocs.

### IX. Are there differences in support for NYU 2031 among the schools of NYU, and why?

Yes, there are. Excluding the schools with fewer than 10 respondents, the schools’ average support fall in the following order, from most opposed to (1) to most supportive of (7) NYU 2031: Gallatin (1.88), Tisch, Arts & Science, Social Work, Stern, Steinhardt, Wagner, Dentistry, SCPS, Law, Libraries, Medicine, and Nursing (4.95). Almost the same order appears in a tally of the percent of respondents supporting NYU 2031.

School	Support NYU 2031
Tisch School of the Arts	5%
Gallatin School of Individual Study	7%
Arts & Science	15%
Silver School of Social Work	25%
Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service	26%
Steinhardt School	29%
Leonard N. Stern School of Business	30%
College of Dentistry	39%
School of Continuing and Professional Studies (SCPS)	52%
School of Law	53%
Division of Libraries	57%
School of Medicine	68%
College of Nursing	<b>71%</b>

Most of these differences are not reliable (statistically significant) because of the large number of comparisons and varying school sizes. But Tisch, Gallatin, Arts & Science, Steinhardt, and Stern are more opposed ( $p < .05$ ) than Medicine or Nursing. Tisch, Gallatin, and Arts & Science are more opposed than Dentistry or SCPS. And Tisch and Arts & Science are more opposed than Steinhardt.<sup>5</sup>

What might account for these differences among schools? Schools differ in many ways, but the only relevant one we measured is how far their faculty lives from the superblocks. On average, over 20% of the variation in these differences is accounted for by living distance from the superblocks.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> We used Tamhane's T2 post hoc comparisons for groups of different sizes and variances.

<sup>6</sup> We analyzed differences in support between schools as a function of how far the faculty lives from the superblocks. This was a 3-point scale constructed from Question 11, with 1 = in the superblocks (11a and 11b), 2 = near the superblocks (11e and 11f), and 3 = not in the Village. "Over 20%" is the average  $R^2$  for differences in support, in the pooled samples from pairs of schools that were reliably different, accounted for by faculty distance from the superblocks. We then entered a binary code for the pair of schools into these equations, and found that the  $\Delta R^2$  averaged 10%.