

The 2012-13 Survey of  
Humanities Departments at  
Four-Year Institutions:  
**Linguistics**

Susan White, Raymond Chu, and Roman Czujko  
Statistical Research Center, American Institute of Physics

An excerpt from the full technical study conducted for the American Academy of Arts & Sciences.

**Recommended Citation:** Susan White, Raymond Chu, and Roman Czujko, *The 2012–13 Survey of Humanities Departments at Four-Year Institutions* (College Park, MD: Statistical Research Center, American Institute of Physics, 2014; sponsored by the American Academy of Arts & Sciences).

## Linguistics

In this section, we will provide an overview of HDS-1 Linguistics departments still awarding degrees in Linguistics at the time of HDS-2. We will start with the number of departments and faculty members. Next we will examine undergraduate and graduate education. We will then present data regarding tenure decisions, new hires, and faculty support for research. We also present information regarding online education and digital humanities.

**Table LN1: HDS-1 Departments and Faculty Members by Carnegie Classification and Highest Degree Offered, Fall 2012**

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No  $\delta$ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Number of Departments Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Faculty Members	Total Number of Faculty Members*
Primarily Undergraduate & Comprehensive	27 <i>See Appendix D.</i>	8.1 No $\delta$	220
Primarily Research	106 <i>See Appendix D.</i>	12.1 No $\delta$	1,280
Highest Degree Offered	Number of Departments Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Faculty Members	Total Number of Faculty Members
Bachelor’s	31 <i>See Appendix D.</i>	6.1 No $\delta$	190
Master’s	31 <i>See Appendix D.</i>	11.3 No $\delta$	350
Doctorate	71 <i>See Appendix D.</i>	13.5 No $\delta$	960
<b>All Remaining HDS-1 Departments</b>	<b>133</b> <i>See Appendix D.</i>	<b>11.3</b> No $\delta$	<b>1,500</b>

\* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

Table LN1 shows the number of Linguistics faculty members; the change in the average number of faculty members per department overall is not statistically significant.

Table LN2 presents faculty members by tenure status. Again, there have been no significant per-department changes in the distribution of faculty members across the types of appointments since the previous round of the study.

**Table LN2: Faculty Members at HDS-1 Departments\* by Tenure Status, Fall 2012**

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No  $\delta$ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments			
	Tenured	Tenure-Track	Neither Tenured nor Tenure-Track, Full-Time	Neither Tenured nor Tenure-Track, Part-Time
Primarily Undergraduate & Comprehensive	90 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	30 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	10 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	90 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>
Primarily Research	790 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	200 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	160 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	130 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>
Highest Degree Offered	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments			
	Tenured	Tenure-Track	Neither Tenured nor Tenure-Track, Full-Time*	Neither Tenured nor Tenure-Track, Part-Time
Bachelor’s	90 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	30 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	30 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	40 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>
Master’s	180 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	50 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	30 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	90 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>
Doctorate	610 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	150 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	110 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	90 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>
<b>All Remaining HDS-1 Departments</b>	<b>880</b> <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	<b>230</b> <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	<b>170</b> <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	<b>220</b> <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>

\* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

Table LN3 presents faculty members by employment status and gender. As with the tenure status, there have been no significant per-department changes in the average number of full-time and part-time faculty members per departments or in the average number of men and women per department.

**Table LN3: Faculty Members at HDS-1 Departments\* by Employment Status and Gender, Fall 2012**

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No  $\delta$ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments			
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Men	Women
Primarily Undergraduate & Comprehensive	130 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	90 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	70 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	150 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>
Primarily Research	1,130 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	150 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	630 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	650 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>
Highest Degree Offered	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments			
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Men	Women
Bachelor’s	150 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	40 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	90 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	100 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>
Master’s	260 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	90 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	150 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	200 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>
Doctorate	850 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	110 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	460 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	500 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>
<b>All Remaining HDS-1 Departments</b>	<b>1,260</b> <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	<b>240</b> <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	<b>700</b> <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	<b>800</b> <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>

\* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

Not every department housed in an institution classified as Primarily Research using the Carnegie classifications offers a doctorate, or even a master’s. Table LN4 details the highest degree offered by Linguistics departments housed at various institutions. Almost all of the doctoral programs are housed in Primarily Research institutions.

**Table LN4: Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments\* by Carnegie Classification and Highest Degree Offered, Fall 2012**

		Highest Degree Offered			All Remaining HDS-1 Departments
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctorate	
Carnegie Classification	Primarily Undergraduate & Comprehensive	13	11	3	27
	Primarily Research	18	20	68	106
All Remaining HDS-1 Departments		31	31	71	133

\* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

Table LN5 summarizes responses to the question of how many bachelor's degrees were awarded in Linguistics during the 2011-12 academic year. While they account for just over 75% of the number of departments, departments housed in Primarily Research institutions accounted for almost 90% of the bachelor's degrees awarded. The data also reveal a statistically significant increase in the average number of bachelor's awarded per department.

**Table LN5: Bachelor’s Degrees completed in Linguistics in HDS-1 Departments in the 2011-12 Academic Year**

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in *italics*; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No  $\delta$ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Number of Departments Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Bachelor’s Degrees Awarded	Total Number of Bachelor’s Degrees Awarded*
Primarily Undergraduate & Comprehensive	27	12.6 No $\delta$	340
Primarily Research	106	24.8 <i>Up 1.6 to 10.1</i>	2,630
Highest Degree Offered	Number of Departments Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Bachelor’s Degrees Awarded	Total Number of Bachelor’s Degrees Awarded*
Bachelor’s	31	14.5 <i>Up 0.8 to 8.6</i>	450
Master’s	31	22.3 <i>Up 0.7 to 16.8</i>	690
Doctorate	71	25.8 No $\delta$	1,830
<b>All Remaining HDS-1 Departments</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>22.3</b> <i>Up 2.5 to 9.8</i>	<b>2,970</b>

\* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

Table LN6 presents data on the number of juniors and seniors with a declared major in Linguistics. Overall, there is a significant increase in the per-department number of juniors and seniors with a declared major in Linguistics. This increase is seen in the Primarily Research institutions. When we examine the data broken out by the highest degree awarded, we find more variability in the number of juniors and seniors per department. This increased variability means that the changes in the per department averages are not significant.

If the number of students receiving bachelor’s degrees is to remain fairly constant, then one would expect the number of juniors and seniors with a declared major to be at least twice as large as the number of bachelor’s degree recipients. This was true in the first round of this study, and it continues to be the case in Linguistics this round. Given the number of juniors and seniors with a declared major in Linguistics, we might expect to see continuing increases in the number of bachelor’s degrees awarded in this discipline in the next few years.

**Table LN6: Number of Juniors and Seniors with Declared Major in Linguistics in HDS-1 Departments as of the Beginning of the Fall 2012 Term**

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No  $\delta$ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Number of Departments Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Juniors & Seniors with Declared Major	Total Number of Juniors & Seniors with Declared Major*
Primarily Undergraduate & Comprehensive	27	33.3 No $\delta$	900
Primarily Research	106	68.8 Up 3.9 to 30.1	7,290
Highest Degree Offered	Number of Departments Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Juniors & Seniors with Declared Major	Total Number of Juniors & Seniors with Declared Major*
Bachelor’s	31	37.3 No $\delta$	1,155
Master’s	31	82.3 No $\delta$	2,550
Doctorate	71	63.2 No $\delta$	4,485
<b>All Remaining HDS-1 Departments</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>61.6</b> Up 5.3 to 27.1	<b>8,190</b>

\* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

The average number of students in each department completing a minor in Linguistics mirrors that of the average number of juniors and seniors with a declared major in Linguistics showing a statistically significant increase. These data are detailed in Table LN7. During the 2011 – 2012 academic year, Linguistics departments awarded, on average, about 22 bachelor’s degrees per department and had about 11 students per department earn a minor in the field.

**Table LN7: Number of Students Completing a Minor in Linguistics in HDS-1 Departments during the 2011-12 Academic Year**

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No  $\delta$ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Number of Departments Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Students Completing a Minor	Total Number of Students Completing a Minor*
Primarily Undergraduate & Comprehensive	27	7.4 No $\delta$	200
Primarily Research	106	12.3 Up 0.0 to 6.4	1,300
Highest Degree Offered	Number of Departments Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Students Completing a Minor	Total Number of Students Completing a Minor*
Bachelor’s	31	4.7 No $\delta$	145
Master’s	31	19.7 No $\delta$	610
Doctorate	71	10.5 No $\delta$	745
<b>All Remaining HDS-1 Departments</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>11.3</b> Up 0.2 to 5.9	<b>1,500</b>

\* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

As shown in Table LN8, there were over 4,200 graduate students enrolled in programs in HDS-1 Linguistics departments during the Fall 2012 term. Most of these students were in departments that awarded a doctorate.



**Table LN8: Number of Graduate Students in Linguistics in HDS-1 Departments during Fall 2012 Term**

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No  $\delta$ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Average Number of Graduate Students (per department that offers graduate degree)	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Graduate Students (per department that offers graduate degree)	Total Number of Graduate Students*
Primarily Undergraduate & Comprehensive	45.0 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	45.0 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	630
Primarily Research	41.1 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	41.1 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	3,620
Highest Degree Offered	Average Number of Graduate Students	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Graduate Students	Total Number of Graduate Students*
Bachelor’s	0 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	0 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	0
Master’s	33.2 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	33.2 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	1,030
Doctorate	45.4 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	45.4 <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	3,220
<b>All Remaining HDS-1 Departments</b>	<b>41.7</b> <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	<b>41.7</b> <i>No <math>\delta</math></i>	<b>4,250</b>

\* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

Overall, almost 80% of the students enrolled in undergraduate introductory Linguistics courses are taught by a full-time faculty member, and 6% are taught by graduate students. These data are presented in Table LN9. The differences indicated by the asterisk (\*) in the table means that the proportion of students taught by that rank faculty member in that type of department differs significantly from the other comparable types of department (either by Carnegie Classification, by highest degree offered, or by form of control). A student in a department housed in a Primarily Undergraduate institution (by Carnegie Classification) is more likely to be taught by a full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty member than students in departments housed in Comprehensive or Primarily Research institutions.

It must again be noted that statistical significance depends on a number of factors, not solely the absolute difference between two values. While differences that are not marked as significant may seem to be the same size as, or even larger than, those marked as significant, they are not statistically significant. The most likely factors attributing to the lack of significance when the absolute difference seems “large enough” are a smaller sample size or a larger variation within that discipline.

**Table LN9: Instructor of Record for Undergraduate Introductory Courses in Linguistics in HDS-1 Departments, Fall 2012 Term**

	% of students taught by ...			
	Full-Time Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Part-Time Faculty Members	Graduate Students in the Department
By Carnegie Classification				
Primarily Undergraduate	54%*	25%	15%	6%*
Comprehensive	44%	23%	27%*	6%*
Primarily Research	42%	27%	13%	18%
By Highest Degree Offered				
Bachelor's	45%	29%*	24%*	2%*
Master's	38%*	32%*	21%*	8%*
Doctorate	45%	23%	10%	22%
By Form of Control				
Public	42%	26%	15%	17%
Private	45%	26%	19%*	10%*
<b>All Institutions</b>	43%*	26%*	16%	16%*

\* indicates that the proportion is significantly different from primarily research (for Carnegie Classification) or from Doctorate (for Highest Degree Offered) or from Public (for Form of Control) at the 5% level.

\* indicates that the proportion is significantly different from all other disciplines combined at the 5% level

We used regression analysis for these tests with a binary (0-1) variable for the level of interest. If the coefficient for the binary variable differed significantly from 0, then the interpretation from regression is that the discipline differs from all other levels combined.

Statistical significance depends on a number of factors, not solely the absolute difference between two values.

While differences that are not marked as significant may seem to be the same size as, or even larger than, those marked as significant, they are not statistically significant. The most likely factors attributing to the lack of significance when the absolute difference seems “large enough” are a smaller sample size or a larger variation within that discipline.

Table LN10 presents results for the instructor of record for all other (non-introductory) classes in Linguistics. Students in departments housed in Primarily Undergraduate institutions (Carnegie classification) are more likely to be taught by full-time faculty members than students in departments housed in Comprehensive or Primarily Research institutions. There is little difference by form of control.

Finally, Table LN11 summarizes the results for the instructor of record in graduate courses. There is very little difference for graduate courses. At private institutions, students are less likely to be taught by full-time faculty members and more likely to be taught by part-time faculty members.

**Table LN10: Instructor of Record for All Other Undergraduate (Non-Introductory) Courses in Linguistics in HDS-1 Departments, Fall 2012 Term**

	% of students taught by ...			
	Full-Time Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Part-Time Faculty Members	Graduate Students in the Department
By Carnegie Classification				
Primarily Undergraduate	74%*	14%	7%*	4%*
Comprehensive	68%	14%	14%*	4%*
Primarily Research	64%	17%	11%	9%
By Highest Degree Offered				
Bachelor's	68%	17%	13%*	3%*
Master's	63%	18%	16%*	3%*
Doctorate	64%	16%	9%	11%
By Form of Control				
Public	65%	16%	11%	8%
Private	66%	16%	12%	6%*
<b>All Institutions</b>	65%	16%	11%	8%*

\* indicates that the proportion is significantly different from primarily research (for Carnegie Classification) or from Doctorate (for Highest Degree Offered) or from Public (for Form of Control) at the 5% level.

\* indicates that the proportion is significantly different from all other disciplines combined at the 5% level

We used regression analysis for these tests with a binary (0-1) variable for the level of interest. If the coefficient for the binary variable differed significantly from 0, then the interpretation from regression is that the discipline differs from all other levels combined.

Statistical significance depends on a number of factors, not solely the absolute difference between two values.

While differences that are not marked as significant may seem to be the same size as, or even larger than, those marked as significant, they are not statistically significant. The most likely factors attributing to the lack of significance when the absolute difference seems "large enough" are a smaller sample size or a larger variation within that discipline.

**Table LN11: Instructor of Record for All Graduate Courses in Linguistics in HDS-1 Departments, Fall 2012 Term**

	% of students taught by ...			
	Full-Time Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Part-Time Faculty Members	Graduate Students in the Department
By Carnegie Classification				
Primarily Undergraduate	82%	13%	5%	0%
Comprehensive	86%	10%	4%	1%
Primarily Research	86%	10%	3%	1%
By Highest Degree Offered				
Bachelor's	82%	16%*	3%	0%
Master's	83%	14%*	3%	0%
Doctorate	86%	9%	4%	1%
By Form of Control				
Public	87%	9%	3%	1%
Private	80%*	13%	6%*	1%
<b>All Institutions</b>	86%	10%	4%	1%

\* indicates that the proportion is significantly different from primarily research (for Carnegie Classification) or from Doctorate (for Highest Degree Offered) or from Public (for Form of Control) at the 5% level.

We used regression analysis for these tests with a binary (0-1) variable for the level of interest. If the coefficient for the binary variable differed significantly from 0, then the interpretation from regression is that the discipline differs from all other levels combined.

Statistical significance depends on a number of factors, not solely the absolute difference between two values. While differences that are not marked as significant may seem to be the same size as, or even larger than, those marked as significant, they are not statistically significant. The most likely factors attributing to the lack of significance when the absolute difference seems "large enough" are a smaller sample size or a larger variation within that discipline.

Table LN12 presents the results for the assessment of undergraduate student learning in Linguistics departments. Learning outcomes assessment is an aggregate assessment which attempts to measure the effectiveness of a program or institution by examining the competence of a given cohort of students. We did not ask about the assessment of individual students; we asked respondents to tell us whether or not they assessed undergraduate student learning.

**Table LN12: Assessment of Overall Undergraduate Student Learning in Linguistics in HDS-1 Departments as of the Fall 2012 Term**

	All Institutions	Carnegie Classification			Form of Control	
		Primarily Undergraduate	Comprehensive	Primarily Research	Public	Private
No Departmental Assessment	40%	40%	27%	42%	33%	59%
Departmental Assessment for All Majors	44%	60%	45%	43%	51%	26%
Departmental Assessment for Majors in Honors Program Only	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	5%
Departmental Assessment for Some Other Group of Students	17%	0%	27%	16%	20%	10%

Note: The sum of the four rows in any column may exceed 100% because respondents could select multiple choices.

The “assessment” referenced is an aggregate assessment based on examining the results from a given cohort of students in an attempt to examine the effectiveness of a program.

For Linguistics, almost all of the departments view publications as either essential or very important in tenure decisions; 73% of all of the departments in the study view publications this way. Teaching appears to be less important in Linguistics departments than in all of the disciplines combined; the same is also true for service. The views of Linguistics departments on the importance of public humanities are also similar to that for all disciplines combined. Details for Linguistics departments are shown in Table LN13.

**Table LN13: Considerations in Tenure Decisions in Linguistics in HDS-1 Departments, Fall 2012**

	CC*	Essential	Very Important	Important	Marginally Important	Unimportant
Publications (research, scholarship, and creative work)	All	<b>85%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
	PUG & Comp	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%
	PRes	45%	45%	9%	0%	0%
Teaching	All	<b>50%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0%</b>
	PUG & Comp	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%
	PRes	42%	44%	11%	3%	0%
Service to the department or institution	All	<b>13%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>2%</b>
	PUG & Comp	13%	44%	37%	0%	5%
	PRes	12%	26%	47%	14%	1%
Public humanities (making the humanities and/or humanities scholarship accessible to the general public)	All	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>32%</b>
	PUG & Comp	0%	7%	19%	25%	49%
	PRes	3%	1%	14%	55%	27%

\*CC – Carnegie classification and PUG – Primarily Undergraduate, Comp – Comprehensive, & PRes – Primarily Research

**Table LN14: Faculty Tenure Decisions and New Hires in HDS-1 Departments**

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No  $\delta$ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

	<b>Number in Remaining HDS-1 Departments*</b>	<b>Relative to ...</b>
Tenured Faculty Members as of Fall 2012 (Fall 2007)	880	59% of total faculty members No $\delta$
Tenure-Track Faculty Members (not yet tenured) as of Fall 2012 (Fall 2007)	230	15% of total faculty members No $\delta$
Tenure-Track Faculty Members Granted Tenure per Year (Two-Year Average) 2010-11 & 2011-12 (2005-06 & 2006-07)	20 per year	9% of tenure-track, not yet tenured faculty members No $\delta$
Faculty Members Denied Tenure or Leaving Prior to Tenure Decision per Year (Two-Year Average) 2010-11 & 2011-12 (2005-06 & 2006-07)	5 per year	2% of tenure-track, not yet tenured faculty members No $\delta$
Tenured, Tenure-Track and Permanent Faculty Members Hired for 2012-13 (2007-08)	75	6% of full-time faculty members No $\delta$

\* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

As seen in Table LN14, there are no significant changes in the faculty tenure decisions and new hires in Linguistics departments.

Almost all Linguistics departments (or the institutions in which they are housed) provide support for research for full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members; this is comparable to all disciplines combined. A smaller proportion of full-time non-tenured or non-tenure-track faculty members in Linguistics departments receive research support than tenured and tenure-track faculty member; however this difference may not be statistically significant. Overall, the support available in Linguistics departments is comparable to that for all disciplines combined. The data are presented in Table LN15.

**Table LN15: Availability of Institutional or Departmental Support for Research in HDS-1 Departments, Fall 2012**

	<b>% of Institutions or Departments Providing Support</b>
For Full-time tenure or tenure-track faculty members	98%
For full-time non-tenured or non-tenure-track faculty members	70%
For part-time faculty members	26%

When looking at all disciplines, about 27% of departments offer a fully online course, and about one in ten (10%) offers a hybrid course. Linguistics departments appear to be less likely to offer either type of

The 2012-13 Survey of Humanities Departments

course. At the departments where these courses are offered, it appears that there are fewer fully online or hybrid courses offered than for all the disciplines combined. The details are shown in Table AH16.

**Table LN16: HDS-1 Linguistics Departments Offering Online Courses by Carnegie Classification and Form of Control, 2011-12 Academic Year**

	Departments Offering Fully Online Courses	Average Number of Fully Online Courses Offered	Departments Offering Hybrid Courses	Average Number of Hybrid Courses Offered
By Carnegie Classification				
Primarily Undergraduate & Comprehensive	30%	4.3	22%	1.0
Primarily Research	26%	1.6	7%	1.3
By Form of Control				
Public	31%	2.3	12%	1.2
Private	16%	1.7	5%	1.0
<b>All Institutions</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>1.1</b>

Even though they appear to be less likely to offer online courses, Linguistics departments overall appear to have a higher proportion of departments offering seminars focused on digital humanities and when asked about formal guides for evaluating digital publications. These results are summarized in Table LN17.

**Table LN17: Engagement with Digital Humanities by Carnegie Classification and Form of Control in HDS-1 Departments as of Fall 2012**

	Offered Seminar Focusing on Digital Methods for Research and Teaching	Have Formal Guidelines for Evaluating Digital Publications for Tenure and Promotion
By Carnegie Classification		
Primarily Undergraduate & Comprehensive	20%	13%
Primarily Research	24%	21%
By Form of Control		
Public	24%	23%
Private	20%	9%
<b>All Institutions</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>19%</b>