The Sixth Annual Report on the characteristics of newly appointed full-time faculty in California Community Colleges for the academic year 1972-73 provides relevant data from 94 public and 10 private community colleges. The size of the faculties in these institutions vary from 3 to 557 full-time faculty, both new and continuing, for a total of 14,343. Adding the part-time faculties, the total is around 20,000 faculty members for 876,000 students.

During the academic year, 827 new full-time faculty were hired, 440 of these being replacements. Comparisons with figures of the previous three years shows a steady drop in full-time faculty. Reasons for this drop are given: (1) a high retention rate of old faculty, (2) the larger number of part-time faculty and staff, (3) an increase in class size from 25-28 to 33-35, and (4) an increase in teaching, counseling, and housekeeping activities for full-time instructors.

The characteristics of the newly hired full-time faculty are reported as follows: (1) 58% males, 42% females; (2) 78% Caucasian, 8% black, 9% Chicano, 3% Asian, 1% Native American, 1% other; (3) majority ranged in age from 26-42 years; (4) 24% had non-teaching experience; (5) 3% new instructors had no prior teaching experience; (6) 1% had been Research Assistants; 3% had practice teaching, private teaching or tutoring; 9% had been Teaching Assistants; 17% had secondary school experience; 26% were experienced community college faculty; and 15.1% had 4-year college or university experience; (6) 9% had less than a BA degree and 17% had less than an MA; 7% had PhD's; (7) 13% were in Health Services field, 7% in English, 9% in Trade-Technical, 6% in Public Personnel Services; (8) new counselors employed was 5.5%. (DB)
94 public and 12 private colleges comprise the third tiered layer of higher education in California and they are loosely defined as community colleges.

They have been legally described as, "any institution of post-secondary education that awards degrees up to, but not including the bachelor's degree."

In November, 94 public and 10 private community colleges sent the last of the data needed to complete the Sixth Annual Report on the characteristics of newly appointed full-time faculty in California Community Colleges, for the academic year 1972-73. This study is contracted yearly by the California Junior College Association to The Field Service Center, School of Education, University of California, Berkeley.

The size of faculties in California Community Colleges ranges all the way from three for International Community College to five hundred and fifty-seven (557) at City College of San Francisco. These are full-time (FTE) faculty newly hired as well as continuing, and total 14,343. This includes librarians and counselors who are considered faculty at community colleges.

If one adds the part-time (hourly rate paid) faculty, the total figure jumps to around 20,000. These are needed to teach the 876,000 students who attended California community colleges last year. This easily makes community colleges in California the largest segment in higher education.

If one adds the part-time (hourly rate paid) faculty, the total figure jumps to around 20,000. These are needed to teach the 876,000 students who attended California community colleges last year. This easily makes community colleges in California the largest segment in higher education.

No longer are they the stepchild appendage to secondary education and referred to contemptuously as "high schools with ash trays."

Turning now to staffing patterns for the current academic year, eight hundred and twenty-seven (827) new full-time faculty were hired. Four hundred and forty (440) of these were replacements for faculty leaving the college for one reason or another.

Compared with the previous year figure of 1429 new faculty, one can see a steady three year drop in FTE faculty. This drop continued in spite of an 8% increase in students and the addition of one new college, Crafton Hills College, the second campus for the San Bernardino Community College District.

In speculating on reasons for this drop, it would appear reasonably safe to state that economic determinants are principally operating in this staffing pattern, and a little probing reveals four tentative conclusions.

1. With only 440 new faculty needed to replace those leaving the colleges, this means there is a 96.2% retention rate of old faculty, nearly the same as last year. It can be assumed that there is probably a sizable number of employed faculty who would like to be somewhere else, but since the job market is so tight, they will stay right there another academic year.

2. More part-time (hourly rate) faculty and staff are being hired than ever before. They are being used not only in the Extended Day programs but also as instructors in the regular day classes, counseling centers, library and offices.

3. Not all Deans of Instruction or College Presidents would agree fully with this, but it is suspected that again the economic squeeze is a major
factor in this trend to hire more part-time faculty. They are cheaper. The
going rate of pay is $8.00-$13.00 per hour, and faculty are paid only for
the class contact hour. As one old dean candidly put it, "I can hire five
instructors, each to teach one class for just about half of what it costs
us to hire one instructor to teach five classes on a full salary with all
of the fringe benefits."

This increased use of part-time faculty is confirmed by a review of the
job descriptions that are sent to placement offices by the colleges.

Some colleges are making a policy of hiring as much as half of their
faculty in the part-time category. One college president rationalized this
policy on the basis that it enables him to tap into the service area of the
college for resources of talent and experience that would be denied him if
he hired only full-time faculty.

Some of the candidates seeking full-time employment as an instructor
are quite bitter about increased part-time employment which is available
to them. One of them, for example, was able to get a full teaching load
of fifteen hours per week last year, but it was at three different colleges
in three different districts. His gross pay was close to $5,000 for nine
months and his transportation costs were excessively high. Compare that
with the average salary last year in California community colleges of
$14,868 for full-time, full-salary employment.

It used to be common for most of the extended day classes to be taught
by the regular full-time faculty, as "overteaching" for extra money. Now,
many college districts are prohibiting this practice as a measure of help
to unemployed teachers.

Roughly half of all of the candidates who succeeded in securing a
teaching position at the community college level through the Berkeley office
of the University of California, Office of Educational Career Services, were
placed in part-time positions. The office has encouraged candidates to take
part-time positions only if it enables them to "get a foot in the door" of
a particular college or to gain experience to more adequately compete for
a full-time position at a later date.

3. An increase in class size has also enabled colleges to hire less
new full-time faculty. Six years ago most colleges were proud of their
25-28 class size. Now 33-35 is a common sight over the protests of faculty
in academic senates. Larger class sizes have been used to compensate for
faculty pay increases. One college increased the class sizes and then cut
the pay of faculty by 20%. This was later lowered to 12%. The rational
in this instance was a lowered average daily attendance for full-time students
which meant less funds for faculty salaries.

4. Fourth and lastly, there is some evidence of increased teaching,
counseling and housekeeping activities for the full-time instructor. This
tends to cut down, again, on the need to hire additional part-time or full-
time staff. Work loads which in the past, were classified as teaching, are
being given as additional activities to be performed by instructors. This
is more common in the suburban and rural areas than in the urban areas where
teacher militancy is strongest.

It would appear that if the financial "crunch" continues at all levels
of education, these practices and trends can be expected to continue. Even
though State Proposition 1 (Bonding issue for community college construction)
 passed early in November, there is bound to be a time lag of a year or two
before new facilities will acquire additional staff.

Growth patterns in California Community Colleges must also be considered.
The era of about 5-6 new community colleges a year which characterized the
1950-1965 period in California is now over. The goal of one community college within 90 miles of almost every center of population in California has now been achieved.

Next academic year (1973-74), Los Medanos College will open in the Pittsburg-Antioch area of Northern California. This will be the third campus of the Contra Costa Community College District. This will not result in any new staff vacancies. All positions filled will be inter-district transfers. Cerro Coso College, the old northridge attendance center will be developed as a fully comprehensive community college by September 1973. This will then be the third campus of the Kern County Community College District at Bakersfield.

The next year should see Colleges of Indian Valley open in the Novato area. This will be operated on the cluster-college concept by the Marin Community College District as a second campus. An extended day program is already in operation under Dr. Ernest Berg, formerly president of Alameda College, but the question of financial support for the new college has not been entirely resolved.

It is possible that Evergreen College, the second campus of the San Jose Community College District will open in the period 1974-75. This also is projected as a cluster-college.

Beyond this, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education in Sacramento, has approved a total of thirty-eight (38) proposed expansion sites for the next 10-15 years. Many of these will be attendance sites rather than full-facility campuses. An example of this will be the downtown classes offered by City College of San Francisco.

Only one completely new district is being formed right now. This is the Mendocino Community College District at Ukiah. Their board is in the process of selecting a Superintendent-President. It will probably be several years before a campus is completed.

Development of community colleges in the private sector tends to stress specialized skills in the twelve (12) now in operation. Their staffing needs are negligible and their total faculty numbered only 104 last year.

Turning now to the characteristics of newly hired full-time faculty in the reporting 104 public and private community colleges of California, some interesting trends continue and new ones have been established.

This year the California Junior College Association added three new dimensions to the study...They are sex, age, and ethnic group. There was some apprehension that some colleges would balk at giving this kind of data, as being in violation of FERPA regulations. However, all 104 responded with data on all questions asked for the sixth straight year. * That is something of a record and an indication of the value that staff and faculty find in the statewide consolidated results. It was gratifying to note that the number of females hired is approaching parity with males. 58% of the new faculty were male and 42% female. That looks good in consolidated statewide terms. However, individual rural college reports, as well as a few suburban colleges still show a predominate male hiring preference. A counter trend is the increased employment of females in the rapidly expanding health services programs in our vocational-technical fields.

In the area of racial groupings of new faculty, the increased hiring of racial minorities is evident. 78% of the new faculty were Caucasian. 8% are black which is still below the percentage of blacks in California.

*The complete listing of data is available from Tom S. Fair, University of California, Berkeley.
Here again, inner-city colleges hired a higher percentage of blacks than did rural colleges. 9% of the new faculty classified themselves as Chicano. In the other categories, 3% were Asians, 1% Native American, and 1% listed "other" as their classification.

As to the age of new faculty, in general, the majority of faculty hired were between the ages of 26-42. Most of the few who were hired over 50 were retired vocational-technical people, especially nurses. The highest point in the curve is 28. All of this follows a long term tendency to hire young faculty with some experience (See Chart 1).

Recruitment of new faculty from outside of California advanced from 8% to 9%. This tends to be higher than reported by other states. In a tight job market, well qualified people who will be mobile may account for this slight rise. One theory advanced is that there are a sizable number of non-tenured assistant professors at small 4-year liberal arts colleges going broke financially who are being shown the door. They like to eat and if they can get a job at a community college, especially in California, they will probably do so.

Faculty Screening Committees, Deans and College Presidents should be sure that if they hire experienced 4-year college veterans that they are oriented to the kinds of unique programs at community colleges and the nature of the students who attend (See Table 1).

The highest level of experience held by new faculty members made a few predictable or explainable changes (See Table 1).

The number of new faculty coming to the colleges with non-teaching experience rose again this year to 24%. These people are teaching in the expanding vocational-technical and adult education programs, for the most part. This increase began in 1967 and has increased from 11% to 15% last year, and then again to 24% this year. There is strong indication that community college students are moving away from a preoccupation of academic subjects towards a curriculum that is exemplified more and more by the title, "College For Survival." Not a bad term at that! What it means is, students are turning away from the view that their comprehensive Community College is a stepping stone on the academic ladder of success in college transfer programs.

New instructors classified as "No prior teaching experience" dropped again this year to 3%. In 1967 this was 8.8% and has been dropping each year. That would seem to say that the opportunities for the person without teaching or professional experience are very limited. One cannot blame the hiring colleges for this situation. They want the most for their money and in a buyers market they will get the most experienced person they can within their budget limitations bracket which was $10,000-$14,000, this past placement year.

Several categories remained quite stable compared with data from the last five years of the study. Faculty whose experience was limited to being a Research Assistant remained at 1%. New instructors with community college practice, teaching internship or private teaching or tutoring remained at 3%. Also stable at 2% were those who had taught full-time as elementary teachers.

Former Teaching Assistants rose to 9%. This has been a gradual increase until this year when it jumped from 5.9% to 9%. The base year showed 4.1%. This could be interpreted to mean that there are better TAs these days (more selective and a greater emphasis on the quality of teaching at 4-year institutions); or, it could also mean that more doctoral candidates are being disenchanted with their programs and prospects for employment and are making a greater effort to be hired by community colleges.
Faculty who were experienced at secondary schools (at least 9 months, full-time), dropped again for the sixth year to 17%. That means that the golden broad path for faculty to move from junior high or senior high to the local community college has narrowed from 35.8% in 1967 to the 17% today. Community colleges in California truly have come of age and no longer are dependent on local high schools for faculty.

Experienced community college faculty doing musical chairs, moving from one community college to another, dropped again this year from 27% to 26%. This percentage had risen since 1969 to 30.1% in 1970, but since has dropped back to 26%. An explanation for this, again, may be the lack of opportunity to transfer from less desirable community colleges to more desirable community colleges.

Finally, when looking at experience as a factor in staffing, those new instructors with experience from 4-year colleges or universities dropped back to the 1967 level of 15.1%.

In collecting data as to the highest academic degree held by new faculty for the current academic year 1972-73, the colleges were asked to add a category of those with less than a BA degree, as well as those with less than an MA. It was felt that the greater emphasis on other-than-college transfer programs would see an influx of instructors from business and industry with less than a BA degree. California teaching certification requirements were designed to provide this kind of flexibility.

It was interesting, therefore, to see that 9% of the new faculty had less than a BA degree and 17% had less than an MA. Comparing this with the one figure of 22.3% for all new faculty with less than an MA in 1971, it can be seen that the new total of 26% is well above last year's. It would seem to indicate that the thrust of community colleges into Voc-Tech, Adult Education, General Education, and Community Service programs using local experienced technicians is fully integrated into the California Community College system.

In the area of preparation requiring an MA degree, new instructors with an MA awarded prior to 1972 remain about constant over the last six years. This year 55% of new faculty had an old MA as compared with 54.2% in 1967.

However, new faculty with an MA granted this year (1972) dropped to 12%. This is a significant drop over any of the last six years, from a high of 26% in 1969. This would seem to point to a reluctance to hire new MAs because, in most instances, they tend to lack experience in teaching or industry.

Although we should not have been surprised, looking at the last six years of this longitudinal study, it was noted that new faculty with a doctorate continued to rise, and now is 7%. This trend started in 1967 when the percentage was 3.1%. Again, the tight job market forces holders of the doctorate to look far and wide. In subject field areas, this degree appears to be most acceptable in Chemistry, Psychology, Philosophy, Sociology and English.

Examining the data collected to see which subject fields demanded and secured the highest percentage of new instructors, the resulting data was less dramatic (See Table II).

The expanding Health Services field accounted for the largest percentage of newly employed faculty for a 13%. This pre-eminent position is usually occupied by those employed to teach English. This latter field of English, General (IA-1B type) dropped to 7%.
The **Trade-Technical** new faculty (really in the same general category as the new Health Services faculty) accounted for 9% of the total.

In this general area must also be added the Public Personnel Services faculty. This is an inclusive category used to include such professionals as Police Science, Nutrition, Food Service people and others. They totaled 6%. Thus, there is a total 28% of the new faculty who were involved in teaching a skill, trade, profession or service.

Interest in the **fine arts**, of all kinds, remains high. Although 5% is not a large percentage, it represents the continuing interest of community college students in self-expression. Keeping in mind that the average age of full-time students last year in California was 22.2 and 24 on the national average, it is not surprising that arts and crafts hold a high interest with community college students.

It is surprising that the number of counselors employed each year holds close to the 1967 level of 5% at 5.5%. There was a bulge in 1968 and 1971 to 6.9 but returned to 5.5% this year. Many knowledgeable persons feel that effective counseling resulting in changed student decision is a weak point in the community college system. So why not larger and more effective counseling centers? Again, for California, it would appear that budgetary limitations are a prime determinant.

All of this leads us to ask where have gone the markets for History, Political Science, Economics, Anthropology, English, Foreign Languages, and Science teachers?

The wide latitude given students in higher education today in designing their programs makes it difficult for placement people to assist the academic trained person in securing employment.

Prepared by: Tom S. Phair, Consultant
California Junior College Association
Field Service Center, School of Education
Tolman Hall, University of California
Berkeley, California 94720
AGES OF NEVI FACULTY IN 94 PUBLIC AND 10 PRIVATE COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN CALIFORNIA

COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN CALIFORNIA
61% PUBLIC AND 39% PRIVATE
AGES OF NEW FACULTY IN
### TABLE I


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE II

**Principal Subject Field Teaching Areas to which New Faculty were assigned (expressed as a percentage of the total) in California Public and Private Community Colleges (1967-73)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>English &amp; Speech</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>P.E.</th>
<th>Natural Science</th>
<th>Social Science</th>
<th>Voc. Tech.</th>
<th>Counselling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes All Health Services*
### TABLE I

Academic Preparation, Experience Level, and Geographical Source of New Instructors in the Public and Private California Community Colleges (1967-1973)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Includes All Health Services**

### TABLE II

Principal Subject Field Teaching Areas to which new faculty were assigned (expressed as a percentage of the total) in the California Public and Private Community Colleges (1967-73)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>13.0*</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>