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Background and Objectives
**Background & Objectives**

- Founded in 1920, the American Society of Radiologic Technologists (ASRT) is the largest radiologic science organization in the world, with a worldwide membership of approximately 90,000. The mission of the ASRT is to provide members with educational opportunities, promote radiologic technology as a career, and monitor state and federal legislation that affects the profession.

- In both 1992 and 1997 the ASRT commissioned a wage and salary survey of radiologic technologist professionals. In January of 2001 the ASRT once again commissioned a wage and salary survey of radiologic technologist professionals, this time to be conducted by Savitz Research Solutions.

- The primary objectives of the 2001 ASRT Wage and Salary Survey were to provide the most accurate possible demographic profile of the population of radiologic technologists and to track changes in that profile from 1997 to 2001 in the:
  - Employment of radiologic technologists
  - Wages and salary of radiologic technologists
  - Demographics of radiologic technologists

- An earlier report provided detailed results of the 2001 study. This report focuses on comparisons of the 2001 results with the results from the 1997 Wage and Salary Survey. Due to adjustments for technical differences in the way the two surveys were conducted and analyzed, the 2001 means and percentages reported here differ slightly from the corresponding figures in the earlier report. (See the note at the bottom of p. 6 for a more detailed explanation.)
Methodology
In 1992 the American Society of Radiologic Technologists (ASRT) commissioned a wage and salary study to measure income, benefits, satisfaction, and other demographics of radiologic technologists at the national level.

In 1997 the ASRT once again commissioned a wage and salary survey, this time with the additional purpose of establishing a base line measurement that would allow the ASRT to track demographic changes for radiologic technologists over time. Much of the material and structure of the 1997 study was based upon the format of the 1992 study. In 2001, the ASRT commissioned Savitz Research Solutions to conduct its wage and salary survey. Much of the material and methodology used for the current study was based on the material and methodology used for the 1997 study (as outlined in the report *Radiologic Technologist Wage and Salary Survey 1997*).

This *Comparative Analysis* is a comparison of data collected for the 1997 Wage and Salary Survey with data collected for the 2001 survey. The *Radiologic Technologist Wage and Salary Survey 2001* reports “weighted means” that equally represent ARRT registrants from across the United States. The 1997 survey reported “unweighted means” (simple averages of responses from approximately equal numbers of RTs in each state) that overrepresent ARRT registrants from less populated states. To compare the 2001 weighted means to the 1997 unweighted means would be like comparing apples to oranges. To obtain a more accurate indication of changes from the 1997 survey to the 2001 survey, the 2001 means were recomputed or "unweighted" to compare them to the 1997 unweighted means. This *Comparative Analysis* is the result of this unweighted comparison.
Changes from 1997 include slight modifications to the questionnaire (including 3 additional satisfaction questions) as well as supplemental sampling of 10 pre-selected municipalities.

Overall, there was a slight drop in participation in 2001 from the level of participation experienced in 1997.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sent</th>
<th>Total Returned</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1997</td>
<td>23,176</td>
<td>11,722</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2001</td>
<td>29,914</td>
<td>12,525</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following pages detail the methodology used for the 2001 Wage & Salary Survey.
Methodology

During the Spring of 2001, a total of 29,914 mail surveys were sent to technologists drawn from the registrant database of the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists.

The majority of the mail surveys were sent to 27,619 radiologic technologists living in the 50 states. A supplemental mail survey was sent to 2,295 radiologic technologists living in 10 pre-selected state municipalities.

As in 1997, the sample sent included Radiography, Radiation Therapy, Nuclear Medicine, Diagnostic Medical Sonography, Cardiovascular Interventional Technology, Computed Tomography, Magnetic Resonance Imaging, Mammography, and Quality Management. A total of 12,525 usable surveys were returned, yielding the following response rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Total Sent</th>
<th>Total Returned</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base: Total Respondents</td>
<td>29,914</td>
<td>12,525</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiography</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>3,356</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation Therapy</td>
<td>5,693</td>
<td>2,193</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Medicine</td>
<td>2,392</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Medical Sonography</td>
<td>2,582</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiovascular Interventional Technology</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computed Tomography</td>
<td>2,633</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetic Resonance Imaging</td>
<td>2,588</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammography</td>
<td>2,669</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Management</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Specialty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Specify Specialty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology

Just as in 1997, the main sample was designed to include a maximum of 150 respondents in Radiography (per state), 150 respondents in Radiation Therapy (per state) and 50 in the remaining specialties (per state) for a maximum total of 550 respondents per state.

The supplemental sample of municipalities was designed to include a maximum of 75 respondents in Radiography (per city), 75 respondents in Radiation Therapy (per city) and 25 in the remaining specialties (per city) for a maximum total of 275 respondents per municipality.

In many cases, the actual number of registered radiologists practicing a particular specialty in a given state was less than the maximum allowed. In these cases, all of the registered radiologists practicing that particular specialty in that state were included in the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speciality</th>
<th>Maximum Per State</th>
<th>Average Per State</th>
<th>Actual Per State</th>
<th>Maximum Per Muni.</th>
<th>Average Per Muni.</th>
<th>Actual Per Muni.</th>
<th>Total Sent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base: Total Respondents</strong></td>
<td>650</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>27,619</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>29,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiography</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation Therapy</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5,375</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>5,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiovascular Interventional Technology</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>2,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computed Tomography</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2,386</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>2,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetic Resonance Imaging</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>2,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammography</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2,419</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Medicine</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Management</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonography</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2,435</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2,582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mail questionnaire sent to respondents included the following areas of investigation:

- Employment Status
  - Active Employment, Reason for Inactive Employment
- Employment Setting
  - Setting, Hospital Size
- Specialty
  - Credentials, Primary Practice
- Current Position
  - Current Position, Years in Radiologic Science/Current Position, Hours/Shift Worked
- Career Satisfaction
  - Career Satisfaction, Work Place Rating, Choose Same Career Path
- Wages & Salary
  - Pay Basis, Hourly Rate, Annual Salary, Pay Raise Interval, Pay Raise Increase, Overtime, On Call Status/Pay, Salary Satisfaction, Employer Provided Benefits
- Associations
  - Union Representation, ASRT Membership, Years ASRT Member, Other Memberships
- Demographics
  - State, Municipality, Age, Gender, Marital Status, Education
The following analysis compares 2001 respondents with the 1997 respondents. In some cases, 1997 data was either not available or was not comparable to the 2001 data. In these cases, notation is included to indicate why the 2001 data was not compared to the 1997 data.

Various sub-groups were also compared. The various sub-groups include:

♦ Primary Practice
  “Primary Practice” respondents indicated that most of their time is/was spent in one of 12 disciplines. The disciplines surveyed are:
  » Radiography
  » Radiation Therapy
  » Nuclear Medicine
  » Diagnostic Medical Sonography
  » Mammography
  » Cardiovascular Interventional Tech.
  » Computed Tomography
  » Magnetic Resonance Imaging
  » Quality Management
  » Vascular Technology
  » Medical Dosimetry
  » All Other Disciplines

♦ Municipality
  “Municipality” respondents indicated that their workplace location is in one of 11 pre-selected municipalities. The municipalities surveyed are:
  » Atlanta, GA (in Region IV)
  » Miami, FL (in Region IV)
  » Boston, MA (in Region I)
  » New York, NY (in Region II)
  » Chicago, IL (in Region V)
  » St. Louis, MO (in Region VII)
  » Dallas, TX (in Region VI)
  » Seattle, WA (in Region X)
  » Denver, CO (in Region VIII)
  » Washington, D.C. (in Region III)
  » Los Angeles, CA (in Region IX)
  (D.C. was not in supplement sample in mail-out)
Various sub-groups were also compared. The various sub-groups include: (cont)

- **Regions**

  “**Region**” respondents indicated that their workplace is in one of the 50 states or the District of Columbia. The states and D.C. were divided into the following 10 regions:

  - Region I
    - Connecticut
    - Maine
    - Massachusetts
    - New Hampshire
    - Rhode Island
    - Vermont
  - Region II
    - New York
    - New Jersey
  - Region III
    - Pennsylvania
    - Delaware
    - District of Columbia
    - Maryland
    - Virginia
    - West Virginia
  - Region IV
    - Alabama
    - Florida
    - Georgia
    - Kentucky
    - Mississippi
    - North Carolina
    - South Carolina
    - Tennessee
  - Region V
    - Illinois
    - Indiana
    - Michigan
    - Minnesota
    - Ohio
  - Region VI
    - Arkansas
    - Louisiana
    - New Mexico
    - Oklahoma
    - Texas
  - Region VII
    - Iowa
    - Kansas
    - Missouri
    - Nebraska
  - Region VIII
    - Colorado
    - Montana
    - North Dakota
    - South Dakota
    - Utah
    - Wyoming
  - Region IX
    - Arizona
    - California
    - Nevada
  - Region X
    - Alaska
    - Hawaii
    - Idaho
    - Oregon
    - Washington
Executive Summary
Introduction

♦ Founded in 1920, the American Society of Radiologic Technologists (ASRT) is the largest radiologic science organization in the world with a worldwide membership of approximately 90,000. Its mission is to provide members with educational opportunities, promote radiologic technology as a career and monitor legislation.

♦ The ASRT has been conducting a tracking study (1992, 1997 & 2001) with the objective of keeping abreast of changes over time in the:

◊ Employment, Wage and Salary & Demographics of radiologic technologists

♦ A total of 29,914 questionnaires from a national random sample of the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists were sent in the Spring of 2001 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Total Sent</th>
<th>Total Returned</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base: Total Respondents</td>
<td>29,914</td>
<td>12,525</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiography</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>3,356</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation Therapy</td>
<td>5,693</td>
<td>2,193</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Medicine</td>
<td>2,392</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Medical Sonography</td>
<td>2,582</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiovascular Interventional Technology</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computed Tomography</td>
<td>2,633</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetic Resonance Imaging</td>
<td>2,588</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammography</td>
<td>2,669</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Management</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Specialty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Specify Specialty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

Employment Status

♦ As in 1997, 97% of the 2001 respondents are presently employed in the radiologic sciences.

♦ Of the 3% of the 2001 respondents that stated they are not presently employed in the radiologic sciences, “leaving the field”, “taking care of kids” and “retired” are the most common specific reasons why they are not presently employed.

Employment Setting

♦ Currently, almost half of the respondents (48%) work in a non-profit hospital. This is identical to the 1997 respondents.

♦ When looking at all hospitals, the average number of beds today is 327.

◊ The average number of beds in the for-profit hospitals increased from 249 beds in 1997 to 315 beds in 2001, a 27% increase.

◊ The average number of beds in the non-profit hospitals increased 19% from 1997.
In 2001, there were 22,624 credentials held by the 12,442 respondents, almost half of these credentials are in “Radiography”.

“Radiation Therapy”, “Computed Tomography”, “MRI” and “Cardiovascular Interventional Technology” had a higher percentage of respondents in 2001 stating they were credentialed in these specialties than in 1997.

When looking at credentials of individuals, 89% of the 2001 respondents are credentialed in “Radiography”. The specialties with the next highest percentage of credentialed respondents are “Mammography” and “Radiation Therapy” with almost a quarter of the respondents being credentialed in these specialties.

The respondents were asked in which discipline they spend the majority of their time. Twenty-nine percent of the 2001 respondents stated “Radiography”. This was very similar to the 1997 results. The discipline with the biggest increase since 1997 is “Radiation Therapy” with 19% of the 2001 respondents stating this specialty while only 9% of the 1997 respondents stated “Radiation Therapy” as their primary practice.
Executive Summary

Specialty (cont)

♦ The majority of respondents are credentialed in their primary practice.

◊ There was a significant increase in the percentage of Technologists from 1997 to 2001 who stated they were credentialed in their primary practice. Those credentialed in “MRI” as their primary practice increased from 65% to 92%, “Computed Tomography” increased from 56% to 87%, and “Cardiovascular Interventional Technology” increased from 44% to 82%.
Current Position

♦ As in 1997, the majority of the respondents (61%) stated their job title as “Staff”.

◊ The percentage of Technologists who have the title of “Senior/Lead” increased from 11% in 1997 to 18% in 2001.

◊ Technologists holding the title “Program Director” have decreased from 8% four years ago to 1% in 2001.

♦ The average length of practicing in the radiologic sciences decreased slightly from 16.08 years in 1997 to 15.83 years in 2001.

♦ Again, when looking at the average length in the respondent’s current position, the 2001 respondents’ average tenure is slightly shorter. The average length in 1997 was almost 9 years whereas the average length of current position for the 2001 respondents is just over 8 years.
Current Position (cont)

- The percentage of Technologists who work part time compared to full time changed little from 1997. Around 87% of the respondents work full time.

- When looking at all Technologists, full and part time, 78% work 40 or more hours in a given week.

- The shifts that Technologist work remained virtually unchanged from the 1997 study, with 92% working the day shift, 6% working the evening shift, and 2% working the night shift.
Wages & Salary

HOURLY WAGES

♦ The majority of the 2001 respondents (84%) are paid on an hourly basis. This is almost identical to the 85% of 1997 respondents who were paid on an hourly basis.

♦ The average hourly wage of part time and full time technologists is $20.60.

◊ The 2001 full time technologists’ average hourly pay rate is $20.74, whereas the part timers average hourly pay rate is $19.87.

◊ The 2001 full time technologists’ average pay rate increased about 22% from the 1997 average of $17.02.

♦ When comparing 1997 hourly wage by specialty with the 2001 hourly wage by specialty, Medical Dosimetry had the largest increase of 26%. Their average hourly wage went from $22.23 in 1997 to $28.09 in 2001. Radiation Therapy, Nuclear Medicine, Cardiovascular Interventional Technology, MRI, and Diagnostic Medical Sonography all had over a 20% percent increase in average hourly wage over the past 4 years.
HOURLY WAGES

Unlike 1997 results, where the New York/New Jersey area respondents received the highest hourly wage, now the Arizona/California/Nevada area joins the NY/NJ area in receiving the highest hourly wages. The Arkansas/Louisiana/New Mexico/Oklahoma/Texas area respondents experienced the largest hourly wage increase from 1997.

To understand the issue of urban wage rate, an oversampling of selected municipalities took place. The largest difference between the wage rate of a region compared to an oversampled municipality’s wage rate in that region was Boston and its region. Boston’s hourly wage is about 19% higher than that of non-Boston Technologists in Region I (the Connecticut/Maine/Massachusetts/New Hampshire/Rhode Island/Vermont area).
Wages & Salary (cont)

ANNUAL SALARY

♦ Sixteen percent of the respondents stated they were paid on an annual salary basis, which is almost identical to the 15% of 1997 respondents who were paid on an annual salary basis.

♦ Among respondents paid on a salary level, the 2001 respondents’ average annual salary is $52,231.
   ◊ The full time technologists’ average annual salary is $52,842, an increase of about 22% from the 1997 average annual salary of $43,470.
   ◊ The part time technologists’ average annual salary is $34,547.

♦ Like the hourly wage respondents, all of the average salaries by specialty increased from 1997. The largest increases (all approximately 27%) were shown in the Nuclear Medicine, Mammography, and Quality Management specialties.
The New York/New Jersey respondents had the highest average annual salary. The largest increase in average annual salary was found in the Alabama/Florida/Georgia/Kentucky/Mississippi/North Carolina/South Carolina/Tennessee area (Region IV), with an increase of 29% from the 1997 study.

The largest difference in average annual salaries between a municipality and the rest of the region was the Miami Technologists’ average annual salary. Their average annual salary was 29% higher than the non-Miami Technologists in Region IV.
Wages & Salary (cont)

SALARY SATISFACTION

♦ The Technologists were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with their current salary. 42% stated they were either “Very satisfied” or “Somewhat satisfied” with their current salary. This is an increase over the 1997 study, where only 33% of the Technologists were either “Very satisfied” or “Somewhat satisfied” with their current salary.

RAISES

♦ A higher percentage of 2001 respondents received a raise in the past 12 months compared to the 1997 respondents, 88% versus 77%.

♦ The average raise increased from 4% in 1997 to 5.32% in 2001.
Executive Summary

Wages & Salary (cont)

EMPLOYER PROVIDING BENEFITS

♦ There was very little change in the percentage of employers providing funding for benefits (life insurance, health insurance, dental insurance, liability insurance, retirement, tuition assistance, disability protection, uniform supply and professional meetings).

◊ There was a 5% increase in employers that provide no funding for “Continuing Education”.

25
Associations

♦ The percentage of respondents who are ASRT members has increased significantly since 1997. Sixty percent of the 2001 respondents are current members of the ASRT, while only 47% of the respondents in 1997 were current ASRT members.

♦ Of the respondents who are current ASRT members, the average length of membership is 7.45 years.

◊ This is slightly up from an average of 7.00 years in 1997.

Note: An interesting finding was discovered in the data regarding ASRT membership. With an increase in the percentage of respondents being an ASRT member from 1997 to 2001, the length of tenure as an ASRT member would be expected to decrease. Instead, the length of tenure actually increased. The lower response rate in 2001 could signal that non-ASRT members did not complete the survey at the same rate as 1997. A reason for this could be that a cover letter, notifying the respondents of an upcoming survey, was sent to all Technologists who were to receive the questionnaire in 1997, while in 2001 notification of the survey was only placed in an ASRT newsletter and was not sent to all possible respondents.
Conclusions

♦ Most aspects of the Technologist’s job, workplace and salary have changed little from 1997. “Employment Setting”, “Current Position”, “Years in Radiologic Sciences”, “Hours Worked”, “Shift Worked, Pay Basis”, “Overtime Pay” and “Paid for Being on Call” essentially stayed the same.

♦ A swing towards a higher percentage of Technologists’ being credentialed in the discipline that is their primary practice appears to be taking place. From 1997 to 2001 the greatest increases in the percentage of Technologists who are credentialed in the primary practice were for “MRI”, “Computed Tomography”, and “Cardiovascular Interventional Technology”, with all having over a 40% increase since 1997.

♦ Technologists are more satisfied with their career than their workplace and career choice. When looking at the percentage of 2001 respondents who gave a positive rating of each area, about 80% of the respondents gave a positive rating to their career, 70% gave a positive rating of their workplace and 54% gave a positive rating to their career choice.

♦ While both 2001 Full-Time Hourly Wages and Full-Time Salaries increased almost 22% from 1997, employers providing funding for benefits have remained the same. It does look like the form of funding appears to be shifting from 100% Funding of benefits to a Fixed Percentage Amount of Funding.
Employment Status - Detailed Findings
Employment Status

The vast majority of those interviewed in either year are actively employed in radiologic science.

Base: Respondents Answering (n=varied)
Q1. Are you presently employed in the radiologic sciences?
Employment Status

The most common reasons for no longer being employed in the field are that members retire, decide to take time to stay at home to care for their children or simply leave the field.

Reasons For Inactive Employment Status

- Position in Diff. Field: 16%
- Take Care of Kids Full Time: 16%
- Retired: 16%
- Find Better Radiology Position: 7%
- Position Downsized: 6%
- Go Back to School: 6%
- Relocated - Looking Radiology: 5%
- Laid Off - Looking Radiology: 4%
- Relocated - Looking Diff. Field: 1%
- Other: 22%

Base: Respondents Answering Year 2001 (n=402)

Q2. If not, why has your employment status changed?

Note: Year 1997 Data Not Available.
Employment Setting - Detailed Findings
The hospital setting remained virtually unchanged between the two test periods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Setting</th>
<th>Year 1997</th>
<th>Year 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospital (Not-for-Profit)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinic/Physician’s Office</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital (For-Profit)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaging Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient Imaging Facility</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Unit</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt./V.A. Hospital</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Respondents Answering Year 1997 (n=11,200); Year 2001 (n=12,188)

Q3. In which employment setting do/did you practice most of your time?
Employment Setting

The size of hospitals in which Technologists worked grew (according to bed size) substantially over the past four years. For-Profit hospitals grew about 27% while the number of beds in Not-for-Profit hospitals grew about 19%.

Base: Respondents Answering (n=varied) Note: Some Year 1997 Data Not Available.

Q3a. If your primary practice is/was in a hospital, what is/was the size (in # of beds) of the hospital?
Specialty - Detailed Findings
In looking at the total number of credentials mentioned, it appears that there has been a slight decline in Radiography, Mammography, Nuclear Medicine and Diagnostic Medical Sonography while the percentage of credentials in Radiation Therapy, Computed Tomography, Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Cardiovascular Interventional Technology have grown slightly.

Base: Total Credentials Mentioned Year 1997 (n=18,322); Year 2001 (n=22,624)
Q5A. In which of the following disciplines or specialties are/were you credentialed?
Specialty

About 90% of the respondents have a credential in Radiography. These data were not provided in the 1997 report, so a comparison can not be made.

Credentials Held by Respondents

- **Radiography**: 89%
- **Mammography**: 22%
- **Radiation Therapy**: 21%
- **Comp. Tomo.**: 15%
- **MRI**: 10%
- **CV Int. Tech.**: 8%
- **Nuclear Medicine**: 5%
- **Diag. Med. Son.**: 5%
- **Medical Dos.**: 2%
- **Vascular Tech.**: 2%
- **All Other**: 3%

**Base**: Respondents Answering Year 2001 (n=12,442)

Q5A. In which of the following disciplines or specialties are/were you credentialed?

Note: Year 1997 Data Not Available.
In focusing on the disciplines being practiced, there was a substantial increase in Radiation Therapy in the 2001 sample compared to 1997. This finding may not be representative, however, since it could have been influenced by the stratified sampling process. It can only be confirmed in the next wave.

**Table: Primary Practice by Year Surveyed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Year 1997</th>
<th>Year 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radiography</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation Therapy</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammography</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computed Tomogr.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV Int. Tech.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Medicine</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diag. Med. Sonogr.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Dosimetry</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base:** Respondents Answering Year 1997 (n=10,150); Year 2001 (n=11,443)

Q5B. Please indicate in which discipline you practice(d) most of your time.
As far as the ARRT membership is concerned, most members are credentialed in their primary practice. There has been a significant increase in the percentage of members who primarily practice and are also credentialed in MRI, Computed Tomography, and Cardiovascular Interventional Technology.

**Credentialed in Primary Practice by Year Surveyed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Year 1997</th>
<th>Year 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radiography</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rad. Therapy</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammography</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Medicine</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. Tomogr.</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diag. Med. Sonogr.</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV Int. Tech.</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Dosim.</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Mgmt.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vascular Tech.</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Year 1997</th>
<th>Year 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graphy</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rad. Therapy</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammography</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Medicine</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. Tomogr.</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diag. Med. Sonogr.</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV Int. Tech.</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Dosim.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Mgmt.</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vascular Tech.</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base:** Respondents Answering (n=varied)
Q5A. In which of the following disciplines or specialties are/were you credentialed?
Q5B. Please indicate in which discipline you practice(d) most of your time.
Current Position - Detailed Findings
Current Position

There appears to be an increase in the percentage of Technologists holding Senior/Lead positions and a substantial decrease in the percent holding Program Director positions.

Base: Respondents Answering Year 1997 (n=7,799); Year 2001 (n=12,283)
Q6. Which of the following titles best describes your current job position (or previous job position if no longer employed in radiologic sciences)?
The average number of years in either their field or their current position has decreased slightly in the past four years.

Base: Respondents Answering (n=varied)

Q4. How long have/had you practiced in the radiologic sciences?
Q7. How long have/had you practiced in this current position?

Note: Approximations Used for Year 1997.
In comparing the mix of part-time to full-time, the ratio has hardly changed in the last four years. While “part-timers” seem to work close to the same number of hours now as four years ago, full-time workers are working about 3 to 4 more hours per week on average.
Current Position

Thirty-four percent (34%) of all respondents spend more than 40 hours working in an average work week. Fourteen percent average more than 48 hours in their average work week.

**Hours Worked Per Week**

*Mean = 39.97 Hours*

- **Part Time (NET)**
  - 8 hours or less: 13%
  - 9 to 16 hours: 1%
  - 17 to 24 hours: 2%
  - 25 to 31 hours: 6%
  - 32 to 39 hours: 4%
  - Full-Time (NET): 87%

- **Full-Time (NET)**
  - 39 hours: 9%
  - 40 hours: 44%
  - 41 to 48 hours: 20%
  - Over 48 hours: 14%

**Base:** Respondents Answering Year 2001 (n=11,975)

Q11. Approximately, how many hours on average do you work in a week?

Note: Year 1997 Data Not Available.
The distribution of shifts worked has remained unchanged over the years.

Q12. On what shift do you practice more than half the time?

Base: Respondents Answering Year 1997 (n=11,350); Year 2001 (n=12,007)

Shift Work On by Year Surveyed

Day Shift
- Year 1997: 91%
- Year 2001: 92%

Evening Shift
- Year 1997: 7%
- Year 2001: 6%

Night Shift
- Year 1997: 2%
- Year 2001: 2%
Career Satisfaction - Detailed Findings
About 80% of the Technologists are at least “Somewhat Satisfied” with their career. Only 2% of those interviewed stated they are “Very Dissatisfied” with their career.

Base: Respondents Answering Year 2001 (n=12,003)
Q8. Please rate your overall satisfaction with your current career. Indicate your satisfaction with the career path you have chosen using the five point scale below.

Note: Asked only in Year 2001.
Career Satisfaction

Satisfaction ratings dropped somewhat when focusing on the work place. The switch primarily went from positive to less positive/neutral. About 70% rated their work place as at least “Good” and only 2% rated it “Very Poor”.

Q9. Please rate your current work place below.

Work Place Rating
Mean = 3.85

Base: Respondents Answering Year 2001 (n=12,040)

Note: Asked only in Year 2001.
Respondents were generally less satisfied with their career choice than they were with their career or work place. A little more than half of the respondents said they “Probably” or “Definitely” would choose the same career while almost a quarter said they “Probably” or “Definitely” would not.

Base: Respondents Answering Year 2001 (n=12,040) Note: Asked only in Year 2001.
Q10. If you could go back in time and had the chance to do it all over again, how likely would you be to choose your same career in radiologic sciences?
Note: All 1997 wage and salary information was based on “Work Full-Time” respondents (minimum workweek of 32 hours) as reported on page 3 of the *Radiologic Technologist Wage and Salary Survey 1997*. 

Wages & Salary - Detailed Findings
The majority of Technologists are still paid on a hourly basis.

**Pay Basis**
By Year Surveyed

**Base:** Respondents Answering Work Full-Time Year 1997 (n=9,454); Year 2001 (n=11,996)

Q13. On what basis are you paid and what is your hourly rate or annual gross salary?

- **Wages & Salary**
- The majority of Technologists are still paid on a hourly basis.
The average hourly pay rate hovers around $20 with less than a dollar difference between part-time and full-time employees. It appears that full-time hourly wages increased a little more than 20% over the last four years.

Base: Respondents Answering (n=varied)

Q13. On what basis are you paid and what is your hourly rate or annual gross salary?

Note: Some Year 1997 Data Not Available.
Wages & Salary

The highest hourly wage increases over the years were experienced by Medical Dosimetrists, Radiation Therapists, Nuclear Medicine Technologists, Cardiovascular Interventional Technologists, MRI Technologists and Diagnostic Medical Sonography Technologists.

Average Hourly Wages by Specialty by Year Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>1997 n</th>
<th>2001 n</th>
<th>% Inc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MedicalDosim.</td>
<td>(n/a)</td>
<td>(8,462)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiology</td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>(125)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Medicine</td>
<td>(631)</td>
<td>(1,413)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Radiology</td>
<td>(588)</td>
<td>(440)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI</td>
<td>(663)</td>
<td>(438)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Mgmt.</td>
<td>(721)</td>
<td>(756)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV Int. Tech.</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vascular Tech.</td>
<td>(649)</td>
<td>(727)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. Tomography</td>
<td>(79)</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammography</td>
<td>(796)</td>
<td>(804)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiography</td>
<td>(780)</td>
<td>(775)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>(2,317)</td>
<td>(2,147)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Respondents Answering Work Full-Time (n=varied)

Q13. On what basis are you paid and what is your hourly rate or annual gross salary?

Note: Some Year 1997 Data Not Available.
Wages & Salary

Using the Region reference table on page 12, the Arizona/California/Nevada area (Region IX) and the New York/New Jersey area (Region II) are paid the most on an hourly rate. The Arkansas/Louisiana/New Mexico/Oklahoma/Texas area (Region VI) and the Illinois/Indiana/Michigan/Minnesota/Ohio/Wisconsin area (Region V) experienced the highest hourly wage increases.

**Average Hourly Wages by Region by Year Surveyed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>% Inc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$20.72</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>$19.35</td>
<td>$23.73</td>
<td>22.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>$20.41</td>
<td>$23.39</td>
<td>14.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>$18.58</td>
<td>$22.29</td>
<td>19.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>$18.39</td>
<td>$22.25</td>
<td>20.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>$16.66</td>
<td>$20.85</td>
<td>25.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>$15.95</td>
<td>$20.15</td>
<td>26.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>$15.55</td>
<td>$19.88</td>
<td>21.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>$16.30</td>
<td>$19.80</td>
<td>17.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>$16.89</td>
<td>$19.16</td>
<td>20.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>$15.84</td>
<td>$18.92</td>
<td>21.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Respondents Answering Work Full-Time (n=varied)

Q13. On what basis are you paid and what is your hourly rate or annual gross salary?
Wages & Salary

In 2001, oversampling of selected municipalities took place to get a better read at urban wage rates (while D.C was not oversampled, it had enough returns for analysis purposes). New York Technologists were paid the highest followed closely by Boston. Atlanta and St. Louis were the two lowest paying municipalities. D.C. has the largest difference in hourly wage rates with the non-D.C. Technologists in Region III (the Pennsylvania/Delaware/D.C./Maryland/Virginia/West Virginia area).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Region n=</th>
<th>Mun. n=</th>
<th>% Diff</th>
<th>Average Hourly Wages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.Y., Reg. II</td>
<td>$27.05</td>
<td>(315)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>15.65%</td>
<td>$23.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Reg. I</td>
<td>$26.37</td>
<td>(799)</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>18.52%</td>
<td>$22.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A., Reg. IX</td>
<td>$25.97</td>
<td>(499)</td>
<td>(73)</td>
<td>9.44%</td>
<td>$22.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, Reg. X</td>
<td>$25.11</td>
<td>(683)</td>
<td>(98)</td>
<td>12.65%</td>
<td>$23.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C., Reg. III</td>
<td>$24.21</td>
<td>(695)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>22.27%</td>
<td>$21.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Reg. V</td>
<td>$23.90</td>
<td>(1,170)</td>
<td>(104)</td>
<td>14.63%</td>
<td>$20.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Reg. IV</td>
<td>$22.40</td>
<td>(1,273)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>16.60%</td>
<td>$19.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, Reg. VIII</td>
<td>$22.06</td>
<td>(830)</td>
<td>(125)</td>
<td>9.03%</td>
<td>$20.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, Reg. VI</td>
<td>$21.97</td>
<td>(749)</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
<td>$19.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Reg. IV</td>
<td>$20.65</td>
<td>(91)</td>
<td>(91)</td>
<td>-0.47%</td>
<td>$19.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, Reg. VII</td>
<td>$19.07</td>
<td>(742)</td>
<td>(122)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Asked only in Year 2001.

Q13. On what basis are you paid and what is your hourly rate or annual gross salary?
Wages & Salary

The annual salary of full-time salary employees increased at a similar rate as hourly employees. The annual full-time salary employees compensation increased about 22% in the past four years.

![Average Annual Salary](chart)

**Base:** Respondents Answering (n= varied)  
**Q13.** On what basis are you paid and what is your hourly rate or annual gross salary?

Note: Some Year 1997 Data Not Available.
Wages & Salary

All specialties showed a greater than 11% increase in annual salaries from 1997. Nuclear Medicine, Mammography and Quality Management 2001 annual salaries increase over 25% from 1997 salaries.

Average Annual Salary by Specialty by Year Surveyed

Year 1997 = n/a $51,780 $48,707 $43,979 $47,899 $42,745 $45,293 $45,703 $42,833 $40,338 $39,850 $35,333 $48,916
Year 2001 = $52,842 $62,442 $57,713 $55,992 $54,872 $54,255 $53,080 $50,927 $50,167 $47,040 $46,159 $44,899 $61,906
% Inc. = n/a 20.59% 18.49% 27.32% 14.56% 26.93% 17.19% 11.43% 17.12% 16.61% 15.83% 27.07% 26.56%

Base: Respondents Answering Work Full-Time (n=varied)

Q13. On what basis are you paid and what is your hourly rate or annual gross salary?

Note: Some Year 1997 Data Not Available.
Wages & Salary

While the Arizona/California/Nevada area (Region IX) and the New York/New Jersey area (Region II) remain at the top end in terms of salary, the New England region, consisting of Connecticut/Maine/Massachusetts/New Hampshire/Rhode Island/Vermont (Region I) moved up in rank as compared to its hourly standing. The largest increase in salary were experienced by the Alabama/Florida/Georgia/Kentucky/Mississippi/North Carolina/South Carolina/Tennessee area (Region IV) and the Iowa/Kansas/Missouri/Nebraska area (Region VII).

Average Annual Salary by Region by Year Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>% Inc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Regions</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$52,840</td>
<td>21.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region II</td>
<td>$48,295</td>
<td>$58,794</td>
<td>21.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region I</td>
<td>$48,630</td>
<td>$57,405</td>
<td>18.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region IX</td>
<td>$47,515</td>
<td>$56,892</td>
<td>19.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region X</td>
<td>$47,174</td>
<td>$54,889</td>
<td>16.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region IV</td>
<td>$41,067</td>
<td>$52,788</td>
<td>28.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region V</td>
<td>$45,582</td>
<td>$51,557</td>
<td>13.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region VI</td>
<td>$41,383</td>
<td>$50,775</td>
<td>22.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region VII</td>
<td>$42,887</td>
<td>$50,346</td>
<td>17.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region VIII</td>
<td>$39,289</td>
<td>$49,460</td>
<td>25.89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Inc. = n/a 21.74% 18.04% 19.73% 16.35% 28.54% 13.11% 22.70% 17.39% 25.89% 18.61%

Base: Respondents Answering Work Full-Time (n=varied)

Q13. On what basis are you paid and what is your hourly rate or annual gross salary?

Note: Some Year 1997 Data Not Available.
Wages & Salary

Miami, Florida has the highest average annual salary and also has the greatest difference compared to its region as a whole. Los Angeles salaries are about 6% less when compared to Region IX (the Arizona/California/Nevada area) as a whole.

Average Annual Salary by Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Municipality Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Reg. IV</td>
<td>$68,009</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, Reg. X</td>
<td>$62,885</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y., Reg. II</td>
<td>$61,809</td>
<td>(56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Reg. I</td>
<td>$60,706</td>
<td>(32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, Reg. VI</td>
<td>$55,787</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A., Reg. IX</td>
<td>$53,428</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, Reg. VII</td>
<td>$53,080</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, Reg. VIII</td>
<td>$52,065</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Reg. IV</td>
<td>$51,856</td>
<td>(37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Reg. V</td>
<td>$51,046</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C., Reg. III</td>
<td>$50,106</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Annual Salary by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Municipality Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reg. IV</td>
<td>(300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. X</td>
<td>(126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. II</td>
<td>(119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. I</td>
<td>(150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. VI</td>
<td>(180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. IX</td>
<td>(103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. VII</td>
<td>(169)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. VIII</td>
<td>(102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. IV</td>
<td>(300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. V</td>
<td>(206)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. III</td>
<td>(157)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Diff. = 28.83% 14.57% 5.13% 5.75% 9.87% -6.09% 7.32% 7.62% -1.77% -0.99% -0.48%

**Base:** Respondents Answering Year 2001 Work Full-Time (n=varied)

Q13. On what basis are you paid and what is your hourly rate or annual gross salary?

Note: Asked only in Year 2001.
About three-quarters of the respondents experience raises on an annual basis. About 10% get a raise less often than once per year. Raise intervals have not changed drastically over the past four years.

**Time Between Raises**

By Year Surveyed

Base: Respondents Answering Year 1997 (n=11,264); Year 2001 (n=11,973)

Q14. What is the expected time interval between salary increases at your workplace?
**Wages & Salary**

Currently, more respondents received a raise in the previous twelve months than four years ago.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Surveyed</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Recall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1997</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2001</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base:** Respondents Answering Year 1997 (n=11,230); Year 2001 (n=12,008)

Q15. Did you receive a raise in your salary/wages in the last 12 months?
The average wage raise experienced four years ago was 4% while in the current wave, the average raise was 5.32%.

**Percent Salary/Wage Increase**

**By Year Surveyed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base:** Respondents Answering (n=varied)

Q16. Taking into account all sources of your last raise (including bonuses and dividends), by what percentage did your salary/wage increase (e.g., 4.5%)?
Wages & Salary

Overtime pay has not changed greatly since 1997. As in 1997, respondent are significantly more likely to get paid “Time and a Half” when working over 40 hours in a week or over 80 hours in a pay period than when working over 8 hours in a day.

Base: Respondents Answering (n=varied)

Q17. If you are paid overtime, please use the scale below to indicate at which rate you are paid for overtime in each situation.
Wages & Salary

Once again, getting paid overtime for Saturday, Sunday and holiday work has changed very little when comparing 1997 responses with 2001 responses. Respondents are much more likely to be paid “Double Time” when working on holidays as opposed to working on the weekend.

Paid Overtime
By Year Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1997</th>
<th>Year 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturdays</td>
<td>Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holidays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular Pay</th>
<th>Time &amp; a Half</th>
<th>Double Time</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1997</td>
<td>Year 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturdays</td>
<td>Sundays</td>
<td>Holidays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Respondents Answering (n=varied)

Q17. If you are paid overtime, please use the scale below to indicate at which rate you are paid for overtime in each situation.
The percentage of respondents who are paid to be “On Call” has not changed in the past four years.

**Base:** Respondents Answering (n=varied)

Q18a. Are you paid for being on call?
Wages & Salary

The vast majority of those who are paid for being “On Call” are paid on a per hour rate rather than a per call/patient rate.

Note: Year 1997 Data Not Available.

Base: Respondents Answering Year 2001 (n=5,514)
Q18a. Are you paid for being on call?
Q18b. If yes, please indicate amount paid for each situation.
The average hourly rate for being paid to be “On Call” is $8.41 while the average “Per Call/Patient” rate is $58.47.
Salary satisfaction has increased substantially in the past four years. Those giving positive (Top 2 Box on 5 point scale) ratings increased from 33% to 42%.

Salary Satisfaction by Year Surveyed
Top 2 Box Score and Mean Rating
(Scale: 5=Very Satisfied; 1=Not At All Satisfied)

- Year 1997: Mean = 3.00, 33% (n=10,285)
- Year 2001: Mean = 3.14, 42% (n=12,002)

Base: Respondents Answering (n=varied)
Q20. Please rate your level of satisfaction with your current salary.
Overall, the total percentage of employers providing funding for insurance (either 100% Funding or a Fixed Amount of Funding) does not appear to have changed dramatically from the 1997 respondents to the 2001 respondents. However, there does appear to be a small shift from 100% Funding to a Fixed Amount of Funding.
Once again, the total percentage of employers providing funding for insurance (either 100% Funding or a Fixed Amount of Funding) does not appear to have changed dramatically in the past four years. Once again, 100% Funding decreased slightly while Fixed Amount of Funding increased slightly.

**Employer Provided Miscellaneous Benefits**

**By Year Surveyed**

- **Year 1997 Retirement/Pension Program**
  - No Funding: 13%
  - Fixed %/Dollar: 5%
  - 100% Funding: 11%
  - Unsure: 71%

- **Year 2001 Retirement/Pension Program**
  - No Funding: 11%
  - Fixed %/Dollar: 5%
  - 100% Funding: 10%
  - Unsure: 74%

- **Year 1997 Tuition Assistance**
  - No Funding: 14%
  - Fixed %/Dollar: 12%
  - 100% Funding: 10%
  - Unsure: 48%

- **Year 2001 Tuition Assistance**
  - No Funding: 24%
  - Fixed %/Dollar: 26%
  - 100% Funding: 24%
  - Unsure: 51%

- **Year 1997 Disability Protection**
  - No Funding: 20%
  - Fixed %/Dollar: 11%
  - 100% Funding: 10%
  - Unsure: 42%

- **Year 2001 Disability Protection**
  - No Funding: 28%
  - Fixed %/Dollar: 26%
  - 100% Funding: 28%
  - Unsure: 45%

**Base:** Respondents Answering (n=varied)

Q23. Please indicate how much funding your employer provides toward each of the benefits listed below.
The vast majority of employers in both 1997 and 2001 do not provide funding for “Uniforms” or “Professional Association Dues”. The total percentage of employers providing some form of funding for “Professional Association Dues” did increase slightly from four years ago. Almost half of all employers in 2001 provided no funding for “Continuing Education”, a 5% increase from 1997.

Base: Respondents Answering (n=varied)
Q23. Please indicate how much funding your employer provides toward each of the benefits listed below.
Once again, the total percentage of employers providing funding for professional meetings (either 100% Funding or a Fixed Amount of Funding) does not appear to have changed much in the past four years.

Base: Respondents Answering (n=varied)
Q23. Please indicate how much funding your employer provides toward each of the benefits listed below.
Associations - Detailed Findings
The percentage of respondents who are represented by a union has remained virtually unchanged in the past four years.

**Base:** Respondents Answering (n=varied)

**Q19.** Are you represented by a collective bargaining agent or union?

**Union Representation**
 **By Year Surveyed**

- **Year 1997**
  - 6%
  - n= (11,143)

- **Year 2001**
  - 7%
  - n= (11,933)
**Associations**

ASRT membership has increased dramatically in the past four years.

---

**Member of ASRT**

**By Year Surveyed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n= (11,279) (12,060)

---

**Base:** Respondents Answering (n=varied)

Q21. Are you a current member of the ASRT (American Society of Radiologic Technologists)?
 Associations

Among members, the number of years as an ASRT member increased slightly from 7 years in 1997 to 7.45 years in 2001.

Base: Respondents Answering (n=varied)
Q21. Are you a current member of the ASRT (American Society of Radiologic Technologists)?
Q21a. If yes, how long have you been a member?
The number of professional radiologic associations that 2001 respondents are members of is virtually the same as it was for 1997 respondents.

**Professional Associations**

**By Year Surveyed**

- **Year 1997**: 1.57
- **Year 2001**: 1.58

**Base**: Respondents Answering (n=varied)

**Q22.** How many state, regional, or other national professional radiologic associations are you currently a member of?

**Note**: Approximation Used for Year 1997.
Demographics - Detailed Findings
### Demographics

The highest percentage of 2001 Radiography Technologists reside in Region I, Region VIII and Region X while the highest percentage of 2001 Radiation Therapists reside in Region II, Region IV and Region V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY PRACTICE</th>
<th>Region I</th>
<th>Region II</th>
<th>Region III</th>
<th>Region IV</th>
<th>Region V</th>
<th>Region VI</th>
<th>Region VII</th>
<th>Region VIII</th>
<th>Region IX</th>
<th>Region X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001 ASRT Wage &amp; Salary Survey</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Region I</td>
<td>Region II</td>
<td>Region III</td>
<td>Region IV</td>
<td>Region V</td>
<td>Region VI</td>
<td>Region VII</td>
<td>Region VIII</td>
<td>Region IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base: Total Respondents</td>
<td>(11,443)</td>
<td>(1,219)</td>
<td>(505)</td>
<td>(998)</td>
<td>(1,769)</td>
<td>(1,028)</td>
<td>(1,061)</td>
<td>(1,127)</td>
<td>(676)</td>
<td>(954)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiography</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation Therapy</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammmography</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computed Tomography</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetic Resonance Imaging</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiovascular Interventional Tech.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Medicine</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Medical Sonography</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Dosimetry</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Management</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vascular Technology</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest percentage of 2001 Radiography Technologists reside in Region I, Region VIII and Region X while the highest percentage of 2001 Radiation Therapists reside in Region II, Region IV and Region V.
The average age for all 2001 respondents is 41 years. Region X has the oldest average age for Technologists (43 years) while Region IV has the youngest average age for Technologists (40 years).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Region I</th>
<th>Region II</th>
<th>Region III</th>
<th>Region IV</th>
<th>Region V</th>
<th>Region VI</th>
<th>Region VII</th>
<th>Region VIII</th>
<th>Region IX</th>
<th>Region X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 30</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 35</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 40</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 45</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 50</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 55</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 or older</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>41.18</td>
<td>42.07</td>
<td>41.42</td>
<td>40.62</td>
<td>39.64</td>
<td>40.67</td>
<td>40.94</td>
<td>40.86</td>
<td>41.34</td>
<td>43.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dash = Zero (0) Respondents. 0% = Less than 0.5% Respondents.
Mammography and Diagnostic Medical Sonography have the highest percentage of female Technologists; Nuclear Medicine and Cardiovascular Interventional Technology have the highest percentage of male Technologists. Male Technologists appear to out-earn their female colleagues. The biggest wage differences (both hourly and salary) occur in Medical Dosimetry, Nuclear Medicine, Radiography and Diagnostic Medical Sonography. Quality Management is the only discipline where female Technologists earn more.

### WAGE & SALARY

<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>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2001 ASRT Wage &amp; Salary Survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong>: Total Respondents</td>
<td>(8,420)</td>
<td>(2,137)</td>
<td>(1,404)</td>
<td>(437)</td>
<td>(435)</td>
<td>(773)</td>
<td>(723)</td>
<td>(801)</td>
<td>(754)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>(124)</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hourly Wage by Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$20.41</td>
<td>$17.43</td>
<td>$23.77</td>
<td>$21.91</td>
<td>$22.01</td>
<td>$18.85</td>
<td>$21.15</td>
<td>$20.08</td>
<td>$21.85</td>
<td>$21.83</td>
<td>$20.52</td>
<td>$27.32</td>
<td>$20.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong>: Total Respondents</td>
<td>(1,772)</td>
<td>(415)</td>
<td>(436)</td>
<td>(94)</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>(89)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(93)</td>
<td>(136)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(101)</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary Wage by Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$56,017</td>
<td>$49,900</td>
<td>$59,754</td>
<td>$51,156</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$45,153</td>
<td>$48,621</td>
<td>$55,991</td>
<td>$51,354</td>
<td>$49,500</td>
<td>$64,878</td>
<td>$64,837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$51,165</td>
<td>$43,991</td>
<td>$56,865</td>
<td>$51,577</td>
<td>$44,750</td>
<td>$55,508</td>
<td>$46,323</td>
<td>$51,222</td>
<td>$55,471</td>
<td>$51,000</td>
<td>$60,561</td>
<td>$58,872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dash = Zero (0) Respondents. 0% = Less than 0.5% Respondents.
The vast majority of 2001 respondents are female and married. Region I has the highest percentage of female respondents while Region X has the highest percentage of male respondents. Regions VII and VIII have the highest percentage of married respondents while Region IX has the highest percentage of single respondents.
The most common degree held among 2001 respondents is an Associate degree. Region IX has the highest percentage of respondents with an Associate’s degree while Region X has the highest percentage of respondents with a Bachelor’s degree.
Questionnaire
ASRT WAGE & SALARY SURVEY 2001

PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS IN TERMS OF YOUR JOB IN RADIOLOGIC SCIENCES ONLY.
DO NOT INCLUDE OTHER JOBS YOU MAY HAVE.

1. Are you presently employed in the radiologic sciences?
   - ☐ Yes (Skip to Question 3)
   - ☐ No (PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS 2 THRU 7 ONLY AND RETURN THE SURVEY.)

2. If not, why has your employment status changed? (SELECT ONLY ONE)
   - ☐ Position was eliminated due to downsizing
   - ☐ Was laid off; looking for another position in the radiologic sciences
   - ☐ Left to find a more lucrative position within the radiologic sciences
   - ☐ Left to find a position in a different field
   - ☐ Relocated to another area and am looking for a position within the radiologic sciences
   - ☐ Relocated and am looking for a position in a different field
   - ☐ Left to go back to school
   - ☐ Left to take care of children full-time
   - ☐ Retired
   - ☐ Other (Please Specify) ________________________________

3. In which employment setting do you practice most of your time? (SELECT ONE ONLY)
   - ☐ Education
   - ☐ Corporate
   - ☐ Industrial
   - ☐ Clinic or Physician’s Office
   - ☐ Imaging Center
   - ☐ Hospital (Not-for-profit)
   - ☐ Hospital (For-profit)
   - ☐ Mobile Unit
   - ☐ Outpatient Imaging Facility
   - ☐ Government/V.A. Hospital
   - ☐ Temporary Service
   - ☐ Locum Tenens (Temporary Staffing)
   - ☐ Armed Forces
   - ☐ Other (Please Specify) ________________________________

3a. If your primary practice is in a hospital, what is the size (in # of beds) of the hospital? (SELECT ONE ONLY)
   - ☐ Less than 50 beds
   - ☐ 50-99 beds
   - ☐ 100-199 beds
   - ☐ 200-299 beds
   - ☐ 300-399 beds
   - ☐ 400-499 beds
   - ☐ 500 or more beds

4. How long have you practiced in the radiologic sciences? (Do not include number of years for preparatory education)
   ________________________________ years
   (Round to nearest full year)

5. In which of the following disciplines or specialties are/were you credentialed?
   (PLEASE ANSWER BOTH SA AND SB)

5a. I am/was credentialed in:
   (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY)
   - ☐ Radiography
   - ☐ Radiation Therapy
   - ☐ Nuclear Medicine
   - ☐ Diagnostic Medical Sonography
   - ☐ Mammography
   - ☐ Cardiac Stress Test Technology
   - ☐ Computed Tomography
   - ☐ Magnetic Resonance Imaging
   - ☐ Quality Management
   - ☐ Vascular Technology
   - ☐ Diagnostic Cardiac Sonography
   - ☐ Medical Dosimetry
   - ☐ Other (Please Specify) ________________________________

5b. Most of my time is/was spent in:
   (SELECT ONE ONLY)
   - ☐ Radiography
   - ☐ Radiation Therapy
   - ☐ Nuclear Medicine
   - ☐ Diagnostic Medical Sonography
   - ☐ Mammography
   - ☐ Cardiac Stress Test Technology
   - ☐ Computed Tomography
   - ☐ Magnetic Resonance Imaging
   - ☐ Quality Management
   - ☐ Vascular Technology
   - ☐ Diagnostic Cardiac Sonography
   - ☐ Medical Dosimetry
   - ☐ Other (Please Specify) ________________________________

6. Which of the following titles best describes your current job position or previous job position if no longer employed in radiologic sciences? (SELECT ONE ONLY)
   - ☐ Staff
   - ☐ Supervisor/Manager
   - ☐ Senior/Lead
   - ☐ Administrator
   - ☐ Clinical Instructor
   - ☐ Assistant Chief
   - ☐ Didactic Instructor
   - ☐ Chief
   - ☐ Clinical Coordinator
   - ☐ Corporate Representative
   - ☐ Program Director
   - ☐ Other (Please Specify) ________________________________

7. How long have you practiced in this current position? (Needs to be consecutive) ________________________________ years
   (Round to nearest full year)

(IF YOU ANSWERED NO TO QUESTION 1, PLEASE STOP HERE.)

8. Please rate your overall satisfaction with your current career. Indicate your satisfaction with the career path you have chosen using the five point scale below. (SELECT ONE ONLY)
   - ☐ Very Dissatisfied
   - ☐ Somewhat Dissatisfied
   - ☐ Neutral
   - ☐ Somewhat Satisfied
   - ☐ Very Satisfied

9. Please rate your current work place below. (SELECT ONE ONLY)
   - ☐ Very Poor
   - ☐ Poor
   - ☐ Fair
   - ☐ Good
   - ☐ Very Good

10. If you could go back in time and had the chance to do it all over again, how likely would you be to choose your same career in radiologic sciences? (SELECT ONE ONLY)
    - ☐ Definitely Would Not
    - ☐ Probably Would Not
    - ☐ Might or Might Not
    - ☐ Probably Would
    - ☐ Definitely Would
11. Approximately, how many hours on average do you work in a week? ___ hours
   (Round to nearest full hour)

12. On what shift do you practice more than half the time? (SELECT ONE ONLY)
   Q. Day Shift   Q. Evening Shift   Q. Night Shift

13. On what basis are you paid and what is your hourly rate or annual gross salary?
   (Do not include bonuses or other benefits) (SELECT ONE ONLY)
   Q. Hourly: $ ___ (Hourly rate)   or   Q. Salaried: $ ___ (Annual Gross Salary)

14. What is the expected time interval between salary increases at your workplace?
   (SELECT ONE ONLY)
   Q. 3 months   Q. 1 year   Q. Random Intervals
   Q. 6 months   Q. More than 1 year   Q. Unsure

15. Did you receive a raise in your salary/wages in the last 12 months?
   Q. Yes   Q. No (Skip to Question 17)   Q. Don't Recall (Skip to Question 17)

16. Taking into account all sources of your last raise (including bonuses and dividends), by what percentage did your salary/wage increase e.g. 4.5%? ___

17. If you are paid overtime, please use the scale below to indicate at which rate you are paid overtime in each situation.

   Regular Pay   Time & a half   Double-time   Unsure
   A. Over 8 hours in one day   Q.   Q.   Q.   Q.
   B. Over 40 hours in one week   Q.   Q.   Q.   Q.
   C. Over 80 hours in one pay period   Q.   Q.   Q.   Q.
   D. Saturdays (part of 40 hr. work-week)   Q.   Q.   Q.   Q.
   E. Sundays (part of 40 hr. work-week)   Q.   Q.   Q.   Q.
   F. Holidays (part of 40 hr. work-week)   Q.   Q.   Q.   Q.

18a. Are you paid for being on call?
   Q. Yes   Q. No (Skip to Question 19)

18b. If yes, please indicate amount paid for each situation (WRITE "NA" IF NOT APPLICABLE): Per hour $ ____ (Hourly rate) Per call/patient $ __________

19. Are you represented by a collective bargaining agents or union?
   Q. Yes   Q. No

20. Please rate your level of satisfaction with your current salary.
   Q. Not At All Satisfied   Q. Very Satisfied

21. Are you a current member of the ASRT (American Society of Radiologic Technologists)?
   Q. Yes   Q. No (Skip to Question 22)

21a. If yes, how long have you been a member? ___ years (Round to nearest full year)

22. How many state, regional, or other national professional radiologic associations are you currently a member of? (Excluding credentialing agencies, i.e., ARRT, ___)

23. Please indicate how much funding your employer provides toward each of the benefits listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Provides no funding</th>
<th>Provides a fixed % or dollar amount</th>
<th>Provides 100%</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Life Insurance</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Health Insurance</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Dental Insurance</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Liability Insurance</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Retirement/Pension Program</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Tuition Assistance</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Disability Protection</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Professional Association Dues</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. CE Courses/Materials</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Uniform Supply/Reimbursement</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Professional Meetings</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Registration Fees</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Travel Expenses</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Meal Expenses</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Lodging Expenses</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Q.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEMOGRAPHICS

Workplace Location: 2-Letter State Abbreviation: ___________ ZIP Code: ___________

Please indicate if your workplace location is in one of the following municipalities:
   Q. Atlanta, GA   Q. Dallas, TX   Q. Chicago, IL
   Q. Boston, MA   Q. Los Angeles, CA   Q. St. Louis, MO
   Q. Seattle, WA   Q. Miami, FL   Q. Seattle, WA
   Q. Washington, DC   Q. New York, NY   Q. None of these

Year of Birth: _______ Gender: Q. Male   Q. Female

Marital Status: Q. Married   Q. Single

Highest level of education completed: (SELECT ONE ONLY)
   Q. High school or equivalent   Q. Associate degree   Q. Master's degree
   Q. Certificate   Q. Baccalaureate degree   Q. Doctoral degree
   Q. Advanced certificate(s)

Thank you for your help. Please return the survey in the postage paid envelope by February 5th.