

A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES OF PURCHASING DIRECTORS
OF THE STATE CENTRAL PURCHASING AGENCIES
AND THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVER-
SITIES IN THE UNITED STATES REGARDING
USE OF A STATE CENTRAL AGENCY BY THE
LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

By

FRED LEE MCBRIDE

Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1960

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1962

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1970

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
FEB 15 1971

A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES OF PURCHASING DIRECTORS
OF THE STATE CENTRAL PURCHASING AGENCIES
AND THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVER-
SITIES IN THE UNITED STATES REGARDING
USE OF A STATE CENTRAL AGENCY BY THE
LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

Thesis Approved:

Richard E. Jones

Thesis Adviser

Kenneth H. Clark

Fred Black

D. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

770372

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to convey a very genuine expression of my appreciation for the encouragement and guidance extended to me by Dr. Richard Jungers, Committee Chairman; Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, Member from the College of Education; and Professor Fred Black, Member from the College of Business. Each was constructively critical at the initial stages of development of the proposal which aided me greatly in the implementation and completion of the study. Each allowed me the freedom to carry out the study on my own, yet never failed to be available when their advice or assistance was needed.

Also, without the cooperation of the Directors of Purchasing of both the State Central Purchasing Agencies or their counterparts and the Land-Grant Institutions, this study could not have been achieved. To them goes my sincere thanks.

Finally, and with deep appreciation, my warmest "Thank You" to my wife, Dee, who not only spent many hours helping to record and tabulate data and edit and type all the material, but who created and maintained an environment of encouragement which was of immeasurable value.

Again, to each of these people goes my genuine appreciation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF PROCEDURAL METHODOLOGY	1
The Problem and Outline of Method of Acquiring	
Data	4
Significance of the Study	5
Method of Analysis	9
Definition of Terms	10
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
III. FINDINGS	19
State Questions	19
Institution Questions	29
IV. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	41
Summary	41
Recommendations	43
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	46
Books	46
Reports	46
Theses	47
APPENDIX A - THE STATE QUESTIONNAIRE AND ACTUAL RESPONSES	48
APPENDIX B - THE INSTITUTION QUESTIONNAIRE AND ACTUAL RESPONSES	75
APPENDIX C - THE INVESTIGATOR'S CLASSIFICATION OF UNDIRECTED RESPONSES TO THE STATE QUESTIONNAIRE	117
APPENDIX D - THE INVESTIGATOR'S CLASSIFICATION OF UNDIRECTED RESPONSES TO THE INSTITUTION QUESTIONNAIRE	124

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 1	19
II. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 1a	20
III. A Tabulation of Responses to Question 2	21
IV. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Question 2, Part A	22
V. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Question 2, Part B	22
VI. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 3	23
VII. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 4	24
VIII. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 5	25
IX. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 6	26
X. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 7	27
XI. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 8	28
XII. A Tabulation of Responses to Question 1	29
XIII. A Tabulation of Responses to Question 2	29
XIV. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 2	30
XV. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 3, Part 1	31

Table	Page
XVI. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 3, Part 2	31
XVII. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 4, Part 1	32
XVIII. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 4, Part 1	33
XIX. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 4, Part 2	33
XX. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 5	34
XXI. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 6	35
XXII. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 7	36
XXIII. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 8	37
XXIV. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 9	38
XXV. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 10	39
XXVI. A Tabulation and Statistical Analysis of Responses to Question 11	39

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF PROCEDURAL METHODOLOGY

Purchasing goods and services for higher education institutions is an enormous business. The staff of the Committee on Government and Higher Education in their report contained in The Campus and the State¹, indicated expenditures of state purchasing for higher education in the United States to be over one and one-quarter billion dollars annually. Ritterskamp, Abbott, and Ahrens² also estimate that of the six or seven billion dollars now being spent annually for the current operation of our institutions of higher learning in the United States, "As much as one billion dollars may be going for the purchase of supplies and equipment."

John D. Millett, President of Miami University at Oxford, Ohio, says in the Foreword of Purchasing for Educational Institutions:³

Judicious strengthening of the purchasing department brings a greater financial yield than most investments of institutional funds. A competent faculty must also have competent purchasing and storage assistance if the educational objective of an institution is to be realized. It

¹Moos, Malcomb and Francis E. Rourke, The Campus and the State, Johns Hopkins Press (Baltimore, 1959), p. 105.

²Ritterskamp, James J., Jr., Forrest L. Abbott, and Bert C. Ahrens, Purchasing for Educational Institutions, Teachers College, Columbia University (New York, 1961), Foreword.

³Ibid.

is shortsighted economy indeed which pays the faculty member what he deserves and then fails to provide him with the supplies and equipment he needs at the time when he needs them.

The Purchasing Director is the custodian of this type of expenditure. He or his authorized representative acts as the agent for the educational institution in dealing with parties supplying or aspiring to supply goods or services to the institution. His department should be composed of professional and expert specialists for procuring* these goods and services required by other departments or individuals in achieving the overall goal of the institution. The needs may be as simple as dusting rags or used tennis balls, or as complex as a computer or mass spectrophotometer.

In order to best serve the institution's needs, management must be constantly alert to best policies and methods for achieving the goal of the institution. Related specifically to the important task of procurement of the essential commodities and services necessary to the achievement of the institution's goal, one method of accomplishing the purchasing functions goal is to critically research its operation and the operations of others to determine what practices can and do work best in moving towards that goal. One important area of concern to this function is that of centralized purchasing. This was one of the major areas of concern of the Council of State Governments⁴; Moos,

* Procurement is used to describe a comprehensive program of planned purchasing rather than the simple act of buying or purchasing a particular requirement of a using department.

⁴The Council of State Governments, Purchasing by the State (Chicago, 1956), pp. 1-43.

Malcomb and Rourke⁵; Ritterskamp, Abbott, and Ahrens⁶; and Abbott⁷, all of which are discussed in the Review of Literature Chapter of this study. However, if one is to critically evaluate what exists, he must first identify and isolate exactly what does exist. That is what this study attempts to accomplish relative to state centralized purchasing by land-grant institutions. Therefore, the procedure involved in this study is:

1. To gather data from the State Central Purchasing Agency Directors and the Land-Grant Institution Purchasing Directors in the fifty United States regarding their attitudes towards use of a centralized state purchasing agency by land-grant institutions within each state.

2. To make a statistical analysis using the Chi Square Method as explained by Wert, Neidt, and Ahmann⁸.

3. To assimilate the information into a meaningful composite of attitudes of the State Central Purchasing Agency Directors and the Land-Grant Institution Purchasing Directors relative to use of the centralized state agencies by the land-grant institutions.

4. To draw conclusions relative to the use of the centralized state agencies by the land-grant institutions.

⁵Moos, Malcomb and Francis E. Rourke, The Campus and the State, Johns Hopkins Press (Baltimore, 1959), pp. 103-114.

⁶Ritterskamp, James J., Jr., Forrest L. Abbott, and Bert C. Ahrens, Purchasing for Educational Institutions, Teachers College, Columbia University (New York, 1961), pp. 4-14.

⁷Abbott, Frank L., "Purchasing Practices and Policies," Proceedings, Twenty-Sixth Annual Convention of National Association of Educational Buyers (Garden City, New York, 1947), pp. 21-28.

⁸Wert, James, Charles Neidt, and J. Stanley Ahmann, Statistical Methods in Educational and Psychological Research, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. (New York, 1954).

5. To make recommendations based upon the data received and the conclusions drawn from this study in order to improve the purchasing function in the aforementioned area.

The Problem and Outline of Method of Acquiring Data

Though the concept of centralized purchasing for higher education institutions is not new, it was accepted on many college and university campuses forty or more years ago reports Ritterskamp, Abbott, and Ahrens⁹. The problem of concern in this study is to develop a composite of the attitudes of the directors of purchasing of both the state centralized purchasing agencies and the land-grant institutions in the United States relative to the use of state centralized purchasing agencies by the land-grant institutions and to make recommendations based upon this composite of attitudes to improve purchasing in the aforementioned area.

The method used was of the written questionnaire type. The questionnaire mailed to the states contained eight questions and the questionnaire mailed to the institutions contained eleven questions. A copy of the appropriate questionnaire and a letter explaining the purpose, samples of which are contained in the Appendix, were mailed to the Director of Purchasing of each state, except Oklahoma*, and each

⁹ Ritterskamp, James J., Jr., Forrest L. Abbott, and Bert C. Ahrens, Purchasing for Educational Institutions, Teachers College, Columbia University (New York, 1961), Foreword.

* At the time of this study the investigator was employed by the Board of Regents for Oklahoma State University and the A & M Colleges as Assistant Purchasing Agent. Since there had been some controversy over the use of the central agency by higher education institutions in the state, it was deemed advisable not to include Oklahoma and its land-grant institutions in the study.

land-grant institution, except the two in the state of Oklahoma, which are Langston University and Oklahoma State University. If after three weeks no response had been received, a follow-up memo and another copy of the questionnaire were mailed. If then after three more weeks no response had been received, another memo with a hand-written note was mailed which explained the need for the information and which requested the cooperation of the purchasing directors. Responses were received from 41 of the 49 states and 53 of the 63 institutions included in the study. These figures represent a return of 84 percent from each group.

Significance of the Study

A review of the literature reveals that over a decade has passed since any critical analyses of educational procurement have been undertaken. With the tremendous growth of higher education during this period, the problems involved in procurement have increased in magnitude and complexity.

One of the major areas of concern in educational purchasing is that of centralization of the purchasing functions. One of the important problems of institutional organization concerns the degree to which functions will be centralized. Regarding centralization of educational purchasing at the state level, Russell¹⁰ says, "Experience indicates that if all purchases are routed through a central state office, little if any savings are likely to result on most of the commodities used by colleges and universities." He goes on to say that

¹⁰Russell, John D., The Finance of Higher Education, The University of Chicago Press (Chicago, 1954), p. 299.

the central purchasing office seems to have an unfortunate propensity to fall into hands of politicians whose party loyalty is generally stronger than their aptitudes as purchasing agents. He states further that the institutions suffer undue delays because of the distance factor between the central purchasing agency office and the institution, that the central agency is more concerned with contract price and less concerned with other costs which must be met by an institution before the article becomes usable to the institution, that all too often arbitrary substitutions by the central agency imposes undue hardships on the educational institution, and other negative aspects of central purchasing at the state level.

Ritterskamp, Abbott, and Ahrens¹¹ say:

In practice it has been sometimes found that combining the needs of a college or university with those of a non-educational function has resulted in an increase rather than a decrease in costs. Furthermore, administrative inefficiency can seriously restrict the educational output of the institution. Those responsible for purchasing and for the business activities of state supported colleges and universities should press for adoption of a plan which offers opportunity for every penny of savings that might accrue from standardization and quantity purchasing, yet at the time avoids the dangers of indiscriminate and sweeping overcentralization.

Yet, Donald H. Webster, Director of Bureau of Governmental Research and Services, University of Washington, suggests in the Preface of Campbell's Centralized Purchasing for Washington Cities¹², that some

¹¹Ritterskamp, James J., Jr., Frank L. Abbott, and Bert C. Ahrens, Purchasing for Educational Institutions, Teachers College, Columbia University (New York, 1961), pp. 11-12.

¹²Campbell, Ernest Howard, Centralized Purchasing for Washington Cities, University of Washington in Cooperation with the Association of Washington Cities (Seattle, 1948).

advantages of a centralized purchasing office might be from economies which flow from large wholesale orders, standardization of equipment and supplies, centralized stores, and others. Campbell goes on to say that some of the advantages of centralized purchasing are lower costs of commodities, reduction of overhead cost of buying through reduction in personnel, reduction of the volume of paper work, standardization of specifications, simplification of vendors' problems through solicitation of business from one purchasing office, and other noteworthy advantages. He cautions that the establishment of such an agency does not necessarily guarantee the realization of all of the above-mentioned advantages of centralized purchasing, but such centering of responsibility should facilitate many improvements in purchasing practices and procedures and affect economies.

Also, Thomas¹³ says, "Increasingly there has made itself felt, however, in both commercial and governmental practice, a tendency to concentrate responsibility for all purchasing in a single unit of the organization. The advantages and economies which it has been sought to secure by this development are fairly obvious." He goes on to list the advantages of centralization of the purchasing function and includes such points as:

1. The standardization of grades and varieties of articles purchased, resulting in the elimination of unduly expensive grades, a reduction in stocks to be carried, and in purchases in bulk rather than in small quantities.

¹³Thomas, Arthur G., Principles of Government Purchasing, New York, London, D. Appleton and Company (1919).

2. Concentration of buying power, resulting in lower prices and in contracts and flexible purchasing agreements which each plant could not secure separately, and furnishing an incentive to dealers to give the best possible service in deliveries and to make all necessary adjustments in order to retain business.

3. The development of expertness and specialization in the purchasing force, resulting in low prices, better selection of purchases, etc.

4. A reduction in the total number of persons employed in purchasing and related work.

5. A corresponding specialization and reduction in the inspection forces, if they too be centralized, as is commonly the case where purchasing is centralized.

There is a concern in many states to further centralize purchasing of commodities for all state agencies including institutions of higher education under one state purchasing authority. An example is the recommendation to that effect made by the Oklahoma Governors Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the State Government¹⁴. Further, the investigator's contacts with the various states indicated that many states require by statute that institutions of higher learning purchase through the state central purchasing agency. Also, the Ohio State Legislatures Committee on Government Efficiency and Economy¹⁵ says that

¹⁴Oklahoma Governors Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the State Government, Oklahoma and Higher Education: Some Comparative Tables and Comments, The Committee (Oklahoma City, 1952).

¹⁵College Management, CCM Professional Magazines, Inc., Greenwich, Connecticut (April, 1969), p. 15.

\$400,000.00 could be saved by centralizing purchasing of food and supplies for all 32 food serving institutions in the state.

Hence, there are different opinions relative to centralization of the purchasing function. Therefore, it is felt that a study involving the opinions of those persons most directly involved in purchasing for the land-grant institutions and the states will be of great benefit in the establishment and promotion of purchasing policy more concretely founded.

For this reason the investigator proposed a study of this important management aspect of higher education in the United States and feels that the time, effort, and expense are justifiable.

Method of Analysis

The initial effort in the analysis of the responses to the questionnaires received from the respondents was to record each response. On questions one through three, and eight to the states, and one through five and eight through eleven to the institutions, the answers were recorded objectively according to the category of response selected by the respondent. However, with the remainder the investigator subjectively placed the response in the appropriate category according to the response received and as shown in the actual analysis section of the dissertation.

A statistical analysis of each state question and of each institution question was made. Next, where possible, related state and institution questions were juxtaposed and statistically analyzed and an evaluation of the results was made by the investigator. Where a statistical analysis was not practical or possible the investigator

attempted to draw some subjective conclusions from the assimilated data.

The statistical tool used was the Chi Square approach as discussed by Wert, Neidt, and Ahmann¹⁶. The formula is:

$$\chi^2 = \sum \left[\frac{(\text{Actual Frequency} - \text{Expected Frequency})^2}{\text{Expected Frequency}} \right]$$

An adaptation of Chi Square proposed by Yates¹⁷ was used where any cell of expected frequencies contained less than five responses.

Essentially, this proposal consists of adding one half case to the smallest frequency and adjusting all other frequencies so that the row and column totals remain the same.

No data was considered acceptable unless significant at the five percent level or better.

Definition of Terms

In order to clarify some terms in this study which might be confusing, the following definitions are provided:

Annual Contract. Used synonymously with state contract. A mutual agreement between the State Central Purchasing Agency and a vendor relative to the purchase of goods and services for a period of one year.

Bid. A legal offer to supply goods and/or services.

Central Supply. A term used to refer to a centralized warehouse or storage place for items common to several agencies or departments.

Competitive Bid. A legal offer to supply goods and/or services in which potential vendors are vying with others to make the lowest and best offer.

¹⁷Yates, Frank, "Contingency Tables Involving Small Numbers and the χ^2 Test," Supplement to the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Vol. 1 (1934), pp. 217-235.

Contract Buying. The act of purchasing on the basis of a previously negotiated agreement. Usually refers to procurement through a State Contract.

Contract Purchases. Items obtained through use of contract buying.

Fair-trade Items. Merchandise on which the manufacturer sets the price at which all authorized distributors must sell.

Institution. Land-grant college or university which was established by the Morrill Act of 1862.

MRO Items. Represents maintenance, repair, and operating supplies. Supplies such as screws, pipe fittings, paint, and other items necessary for the continuous operation of the physical plant.

Para-purchasing Items. Goods obtainable on a lease-purchase agreement.

Procurement. Used synonymously with purchasing.

Purchasing. Used synonymously with procurement or supply management to mean the entire function of obtaining goods or services for a state or institution; includes direction of the initial request for goods and services, negotiations with suppliers, supervision of receipt and payment of goods and services, and other related activities such as inventory control, etc.

Purchasing Director. An individual legally authorized to represent a state or land-grant institution in dealing with vendors supplying or aspiring to supply goods and/or services to a state or land-grant institution.

Quotation. A legal agreement expressing the willingness to provide goods and/or services for a stated cost and under specific terms and conditions. Sometimes used synonymously with bid.

Scheduled Purchases. Items procured from a contract previously negotiated for the purpose of obtaining items as needed without the necessity for establishing a contract and reordering periodically.

Sole Source Items. Goods and/or services obtainable from a single vendor only.

State Central Purchasing Agency. The state level governmental unit responsible for procurement of goods and services for state agencies. It is also referred to in many questionnaire responses in this theses as Central Supply, or State.

State Contract. A legal and mutual purchasing agreement between the State Central Purchasing Agency and a vendor from which any state agency may purchase under the established terms and conditions.

Vendor. An individual or business firm supplying goods and/or services to the State Central Purchasing Agency or land-grant institutions.

Warehouse Stock. Items of common and re-occurring need by the various departments within an institution which are stored at a relatively constant inventory level at a central stocking point and which are readily available when needed.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A review of the literature in the area of purchasing for educational institutions seems to indicate that there have been two major and recent studies conducted which have been concerned with state colleges and universities. One of these was a study in which a questionnaire was sent to the purchasing officials for the forty-eight states and Puerto Rico regarding such aspects of purchasing as, the organizational location, personnel selection and salaries, internal operations, and related functions. This study was conducted by the Council of State Governments¹ which serves as the secretariat of the National Association of State Purchasing Officials which is composed of all state and territorial purchasing officials, their assistants and deputies. It was directed towards developing an up to date composite of purchasing at the state level, or at what is often called state central purchasing.

The Council in 1947 wrote to all state purchasing officials requesting (1) information with respect to major provisions of laws establishing the state purchasing agency, (2) a description of the duties and responsibilities of the agency, and (3) a brief description of the

¹The Council of State Governments, Purchasing by the State (Chicago, 1956), p. ii of Foreword.

organization and operation of the central purchasing agency. Based upon information furnished by the states, a report was prepared and published in May, 1947, entitled Purchasing by States². In March, 1955, the report was updated and published under the same title. It is summarized in narrative form and includes additional information such as the location of the agency organizationally, personnel selection and salaries, internal operations, and related functions. It was not concerned with purchasing for or by educational institutions nor was it directed specifically towards land-grant institutions.

The other, and possibly the more significant of these two major endeavors, was conducted by The Committee on Government and Higher Education and is reported by Moos and Rourke³. The fifteen member Committee was composed of such noted educators and governmental leaders as Milton Eisenhower, James B. Conant, R. Sargent Shriver and others. The method used in obtaining data was primarily by direct interviews in which the research staff traveled throughout the country making on the spot studies in thirty-nine states with hundreds of college and state officials. It also involved correspondence and special meetings with government officials and educators in every state. The central theme was the impact of government involvement in the administration of state colleges and universities. Of significant importance to the area of purchasing for the land-grant institutions was the Committee's⁴ findings in the area of central purchasing which states:

²The Council of State Governments, Purchasing by States (Chicago, 1947), p. ii of Foreword.

³Moos, Malcomb and Francis E. Rourke, The Campus and the State, Johns Hopkins Press (Baltimore, 1959).

⁴The Council of State Governments, Purchasing by States (Chicago, 1947), pp. 36 and 37.

Despite the reasonable purposes for which centralized state purchasing has been set up, the methods employed by some state purchasing agencies have impaired the efficient operation of colleges and universities. In some cases the impairment has been so extensive that the main objective of the purchasing system, maximum economy consistent with the responsibility of the institution, is actually not achieved. Excessive delays (sometimes months), arbitrary substitution of items of equipment in the orders, and in some cases what appears to be deliberate obstruction of academic purchases, are the most common complaints where purchasing practices hamper the college. The Committee has been pleased to note the number of state purchasing agents who view their assignment as one of service. It is also gratifying to have reports that some states are by regulations or statute assuring that orders for scientific equipment are not given the same sort of screening as is given to routine purchase of supplies. Educators must acknowledge a difference in nature between those procedural requirements which are annoying or waste time and energy without, in fact, achieving the intended savings, and those which actually impede the educational program. This is a line too fine to be drawn accurately for all local situations in the framework of one definition, and so the Committee has based its recommendations on broad general principles. In so doing, it has kept uppermost the realization that its recommendations must be balanced, reasonable, and consistent with the requirements of both state and higher education. It believes that the following recommendations will have applicability through the country:

Colleges and universities should be encouraged, where savings will result, to make voluntary use of state purchasing services, but they should be exempted from compulsory state purchasing. The Committee agrees with purchasing officials that commodities used throughout the state government may often be purchased more economically by means of centralized, scheduled buying. It believes on the other hand, that certain purchases can best be made by the institutions themselves, both in terms of savings and the effectiveness of the educational program. Educators frequently complain that delays experienced through central purchasing are harmful to their educational and research programs. It is especially important that institutions should be given full discretion in the selection of scientific equipment, and teaching and research materials. The Committee would favor the voluntary use of state purchasing procedures where the institutional administrators believe this will prove economical and otherwise helpful.

Purchases made by institutions should be in conformity with modern purchasing procedures, including open and competitive bidding for large items and bulk purchasing. In this connection, the Committee would look with favor on uniform

legislation setting standards to be observed by agencies receiving their funds from the state. Even in the absence of such uniform legislation, the state universities and colleges should expect to make their practices conform with those which are established and approved by statute or regulation.

In an earlier study (1947), Abbott⁵ reported on a questionnaire sent to officials of institutions of higher education regarding centralization of the purchasing function. It was similar to this study in that it was based upon responses by purchasing officials to centralization. However, it was directed towards all higher education institutions rather than specifically to land-grant institutions. Also, it is 22 years old and is much outdated considering the vast changes in higher education immediately after the ending of World War II. Reck⁶ reported on the effectiveness of the policies established by the Federal Supply Service. However, it was concerned with centralized purchasing at the federal level rather than at the state level. He concluded, "It seems to be clear that the actual savings, although they cannot be established quantitatively, must have heavily outweighed the \$16,600,000.00 of operating expenses incurred by the Federal Supply Service in the fiscal year 1952."

Also, another relatively recent study of central purchasing was made, but not relative to educational institution procurement, by Katherine Luech of the Bureau of Economic and Business Research, for

⁵Abbott, F. L., "Purchasing Practices and Policies," Proceedings, Twenty-Sixth Annual Convention of National Association of Educational Buyers (1947), pp. 21-28.

⁶Reck, Dickson, Government Purchasing and Competition, Berkeley, University of California Press (1954), pp. 192-208.

the University of Utah⁷ regarding the in-state purchasing laws in the fifty states. The five question questionnaire was to determine practices, policies, and statutes which were to be used to establish a reference from which to formulate standards of operation for its own central agency.

Thomas⁸ made a personal study of the purchasing systems of thirty or more large corporations, including General Electric, Western Electric, International Harvester, Westinghouse, and others, plus several important cities, to determine the extent of centralization of the purchasing functions. The cities included New York, Chicago, Baltimore, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, Des Moines, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, and St. Louis.

There have been a number of other minor studies vaguely, yet somewhat, related to this study. It appears from reviewing Dissertation Abstracts⁹, for 1957 through the most recent volume, and Masters Theses in Education, by Silvey¹⁰, that most of this work has been done by aspirants for the Masters Degree in either business administration or secondary education. Those which are most closely related to this study are listed in the bibliography. These studies are essentially concerned with purchasing certain categories of needs or with the

⁷University of Utah, Bureau of Economic and Business Research, In-State Purchasing Preference Practices, Katherine L. Luech, Bureau of Economic and Business Research (Salt Lake City, 1961).

⁸Thomas, Arthur G., Principles of Government Purchasing, D. Appleton and Company (New York, 1919).

⁹Dissertation Abstracts, University Microfilms Inc. (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1957-1968).

¹⁰Masters Theses in Education, H. M. Silvey, Editor; Research Publications (Cedar Falls, Iowa, 1956-1966).

purchasing routine within a particular college or school district.

Therefore, specific findings are not reported here.

The publications, American School and University (New York: American School Publishing Corp.), College and University Business (Chicago: The Modern Hospital Publishing Co.), and Buying for Higher Education (National Association of Educational Buyers) are three major sources of small articles and reports on research within individual institutions or areas.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

Responses to the questionnaires have been tabulated and are contained in the Appendix. In the following, a statistical summarization of the responses to each question is presented and discussed and conclusions relative to each are presented.

State Questions

Question 1. Is the institution's existing relationship with central purchasing best for the state?

TABLE I

A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 1

Response	Actual	Expected
Yes	25	16.5
No	<u>8</u>	<u>16.5</u>
TOTAL	33	33

$\chi^2 = 8.758^*$

*Significant at the one percent level.

Therefore, it may be shown that there is significant agreement that the existing relationship between the institution and central

purchasing is that which is best for the state.

Question 1a. Is the institution's existing relationship with central purchasing best for the institution?

TABLE II

A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 1a

Response	Actual	Expected
Yes	25	16
No	<u>7</u>	<u>16</u>
TOTAL	32	32

$$\chi^2 = 10.125^*$$

* Significant at the one percent level.

Therefore, it may be shown that there is significant agreement that the existing relationship between the institution and central purchasing is that which is best for the institution.

In summary, there is significant agreement among the directors of state level central purchasing agencies that the existing relationship between the institutions and central purchasing agencies is that which is best for both the states and the institutions.

Question 2. If not, which of the following arrangements does best serve the needs of (a) the state? (b) the institution?

TABLE III

A TABULATION OF RESPONSES
TO QUESTION 2

Responses	Part A	Part B
1. Compulsory in all cases.	6	3
2. Compulsory in some, optional in some, not available in some.	1	1
3. Compulsory in some, not available in others.	1	0
4. Compulsory in some, optional in some.	4	5
5. Compulsory in some, optional in all others.	0	0
6. Optional in all cases.	1	2
7. Not available in any case.	0	0
8. Not available in some, optional in some.	0	0
9. Other	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
TOTAL	15	13

Relative to Part A, since the response frequencies are small, arrangements one through five are combined into a new category (A) Compulsory, and arrangements six through nine into a new category (B) Optional or Not Available. Since the frequency of Part B is less than five, the Yates proposal is applied.

TABLE IV
A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
QUESTION 2, PART A

Response	Actual Data		Adjusted Data	
	Actual	Expected	Actual	Expected
(A)	12	8.33	11.5	8.33
(B)	<u>3</u>	<u>6.67</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>6.67</u>
TOTAL	15	15	15	15

$\chi^2 = 2.5229^*$

* Not significant at the five percent level.

Therefore, it cannot be shown that there is significant agreement that either a "compulsory" or an "optional or non-availability" arrangement is best for the states.

With reference to Part B, if the same statistical application is made, the following is the result:

TABLE V
A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
QUESTION 2, PART B

Response	Actual Data		Adjusted Data	
	Actual	Expected	Actual	Expected
(A)	9	7.2	8.5	7.2
(B)	<u>4</u>	<u>5.8</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>5.8</u>
TOTAL	13	13	13	13

$\chi^2 = .525^*$

* Not Significant at the five percent level.

Therefore, it cannot be shown that there is significant agreement that either a "compulsory" or an "optional or non-availability" arrangement is best for the institution.

Summarizing both Parts A and B of Question 1, there is no agreement upon the best relationship for either the states or the institutions, by those central purchasing agency directors who do not feel the existing relationship is that which is best for the states and institutions purchasing agencies.

Question 3. If not available, should central purchasing agency be made available to the institution?

TABLE VI

A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 3

Response	Actual Data		Adjusted Data	
	Number of Responses	Expected Number of Responses	Number of Responses	Expected Number of Responses
(A) Yes	9	5	8.5	5
(B) No	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>5</u>
TOTAL	10	10	10	10

$X^2 = 4.900^*$

* Significant at the five percent level.

Since the frequency of (B) is less than five, the Yates proposal is applied.

Therefore, it may be shown that there is significant agreement by the central purchasing agency directors that, if not already available to the institution, its services should be made available.

Question 4. What do you feel to be the major contribution of central purchasing to the institutions?

TABLE VII

A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 4

Response	Actual	Expected
A. Advantages of volume buying.	18	11.5
B. Increased efficiency of added services provided by central purchasing.	10	11.5
C. Saves money for the institutions obtaining lower prices than can the institutions.	11	11.5
D. Advantages of state contracts.	<u>7</u>	<u>11.5</u>
TOTAL	46	46
$\chi^2 = 5.6522^*$		

*Not significant at the five percent level.

Therefore, it cannot be shown that there is any significant agreement as to which of the four categories listed is the greater contribution. However, four categories did emerge from a possible 46 individual responses. If Chi Square could be computed on this basis with a possible 46 categories with an expected frequency one and with 42 categories with an actual frequency of zero, it would become significant at 548. This, of course, is not statistically acceptable. However, it is most interesting to note that there appears to exist some degree of homogeneity within those responses received so that 4 categories can be formed.

Question 5. What do you feel to be the major weakness of central purchasing in its relation with the institutions?

TABLE VIII

A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 5

Response	Actual	Expected
A. None	9	7.25
B. Lack of effective communications.	8	7.25
C. Miscellaneous	7	7.25
D. Increased time consumption.	<u>5</u>	<u>7.25</u>
TOTAL	29	29
$X^2 - 1.459*$		

*Not significant at the five percent level.

Therefore, it cannot be shown that there is any significant agreement as to which of the four categories listed is the greater weakness. However, four categories did emerge from a possible 29 individual responses. If Chi Square could be computed on this basis and extended by interpellation, assuming a possible 29 categories, each with an expected frequency of one and with 25 categories with an actual frequency of zero, it would become significant at 190. This, of course, is not statistically acceptable. However, it is most interesting to note that there appears to exist some degree of homogeneity within those responses received so that four categories can be formed.

Question 6. In what categories can central purchasing obtain better prices and/or services than can the institutions?

TABLE IX

A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 6

Response	Actual	Expected
A. Office supplies, equipment and furniture.	16	8
B. All.	13	8
C. Janitor supplies.	8	8
D. Food.	7	8
E. Lab and hospital supplies.	5	8
F. Gasoline and petroleum products.	5	8
G. Tires, tubes, and batteries.	5	8
H. Paper and printing.	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>
TOTAL	64	64
$\chi^2 = 15.750^*$		

* Significant at the five percent level.

Therefore, it can be shown that there is a significant agreement among the central purchasing agency directors relative to those categories in which they can assist the institutions in obtaining lower prices and/or better services.

Question 7. In what categories is central purchasing unable to assist the institutions in obtaining better prices and/or services?

TABLE X

A TABULATION^{**} AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 7

Response	Actual	Expected
A. Sole-source and locally purchased items and service, and service contracts.	14	8.6
B. Food.	8	8.6
C. Education or teaching supplies.	8	8.6
D. Miscellaneous items.	8	8.6
E. Scientific and laboratory supplies and equipment.	<u>5</u>	<u>8.6</u>
TOTAL	43	43
$X^2 = 5.0233^*$		

*Not significant at the five percent level.

Therefore, it cannot be shown that there is any significant agreement as to which of the five categories listed is that in which central purchasing is most unable to assist the institution. However, five categories did emerge from a possible 43 individual responses. If Chi Square were computed and interpellated on this basis, it would become significant at 370. Of course, this is not statistically acceptable, but it is most interesting to note that there is some degree of homogeneity of responses.

^{**}(A) includes combined categories of sole-source, locally purchased items and service, and service contracts; none is eliminated; (D) is formed by combining all items not included in the other categories.

Question 8. How much is your agency's cost of operation increased, if any, by the institution's use of your services?

TABLE XI

A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ^{**} ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 8

Response	Actual Data		Adjusted Data	
	Actual	Expected	Actual	Expected
Not Increased	24	12	23.5	12
Increased	<u>0</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>12</u>
TOTAL	24	24	24	24

$$\chi^2 = 10.5416^*$$

* Significant at the five percent level.

Therefore, it can be shown that there is significant agreement among the central purchasing agency directors that the agency's costs of operation are not increased significantly by the use of their services by the institutions.

** Since the categories of responses "None," "Do not know," and "Very nominal," each equal 12, the actual frequency is the same as the expected frequency. Therefore, Chi Square equals zero. However, by eliminating "Do not know," combining "None" and "Very nominal" into a new category titled "Not increased significantly" and by creating a new category, "Increased significantly," two categories "Increased" and "Not increased" can be compared in the above table. The Yates proposal is used since category "Increased" equals zero.

Institution Questions

Question 1. Does a state central purchasing agency exist in your state?

TABLE XII

A TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 1

Response	Number of Responses	Percent of Total
Yes	49	89
No	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>
TOTAL	55	100

Hence, it may be stated that a central purchasing agency exists in most states, In this instance, over 89 percent indicate that such does exist in their state.

Question 2. What is the institution's relationship with central purchasing?

TABLE XIII

A TABULATION * OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 2

Response	Number of Responses	Percent of Total
A. Compulsory in at least some instances.	33	66

* In the above table, (A) includes categories one through five, each of which indicates compulsory in at least one form; (B) includes item six only, which indicates optional in all cases; (C) includes categories seven through nine which indicates not available in at least some cases or other relationships not included in the preceding.

Table XIII (Continued)

B. Optional in all cases.	12	24
C. Not available or some other arrangement.	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>
TOTAL	50	100

The institution's relationship with central purchasing is essentially compulsory in at least some form. Of those replying, 66 percent indicate compulsory usage in some form while only 24 percent indicate optional usage is permitted. Only 10 percent indicate that a central agency is not available.

If (A) is broken down into two more specific categories, (A) Compulsory in all, and (B) Compulsory in some, the following is obtained:

TABLE XIV

A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 2

Response	Number of Responses	Percent of Total
A. Compulsory in all cases.	4	12
B. Compulsory in some cases.	<u>29</u>	<u>88</u>
TOTAL	33	100

There is agreement among those whose relationship with central purchasing is compulsory, in at least some form, that most are not compulsory in all cases, but in some cases only. In this instance 88 percent indicate compulsory usage of a central agency in some cases, while only 12 percent indicate compulsory usage in all cases.

Question 3, Part 1. Is your institution's relationship with central purchasing that which best serves the needs of the institution?

TABLE XV

A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 3, PART 1

Response	Actual	Expected
Yes	32	26
No	<u>20</u>	<u>26</u>
TOTAL	52	52
$\chi^2 = 2.7692^*$		
* Not significant at the five percent level.		

Therefore, it can not be shown that there is significant agreement among the institutions that their relationship with central purchasing is that which is best for the institutions.

Question 3, Part 2. Is your institution's relationship with central purchasing that which best serves the needs of the state?

TABLE XVI

A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 3, PART 2

Response	Actual	Expected
Yes	36	25
No	<u>14</u>	<u>25</u>
TOTAL	50	50
$\chi^2 = 9.6800^*$		
* Significant at the one percent level.		

Therefore, it can be shown that there is significant agreement among the institutions that their relationship with central purchasing is that which is best for the states.

In summary, it may be concluded that there is no agreement among the institutions that their relationship with central purchasing is best for the institutions, but they do agree it is best for the states.

Question 4, Part 1. If the existing relationship with central purchasing is not, which arrangement is best for the institution?

If those categories with responses of less than five are eliminated and only categories five and six are included, the following results are obtained:

TABLE XVII

A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 4, PART 1

Response	Actual	Expected
A. Compulsory in some, optional in all others.	5	8.5
B. Optional in all cases.	<u>12</u>	<u>8.5</u>
TOTAL	17	17

$$X^2 = 2.8824^*$$

* Not significant at the five percent level.

Therefore, among the institutions who feel their relationship with central purchasing is not best for the institution, there is no significant agreement on whether compulsory or optional usage is best.

If categories two, three, and five are combined into one group, (A) Compulsory, and categories six and eight into another group (B) Optional or Not Available, the following results are obtained:

TABLE XVIII
A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 4, PART 1

Response	Actual	Expected
A. Compulsory in at least some cases.	7	12
B. Optional or not available.	<u>13</u>	<u>8</u>
TOTAL	20	20
$\chi^2 = 5.2083$		
* Significant at the five percent level.		

Hence, in this instance it can be shown that there is significant agreement that an optional or non-availability arrangement is best for the institution.

Question 4, Part 2. If the existing relationship with central purchasing is not, which arrangement is best for the state?

TABLE XIX
A TABULATION^{**} AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 4, PART 2

Response	Actual	Expected
A. Compulsory in at least some cases.	6	8.33
B. Optional or not available.	<u>9</u>	<u>6.67</u>
TOTAL	15	15
$\chi^2 = 1.4956^*$		
* Not significant at the five percent level.		

** The same arrangement as in Table XVIII is used.

Therefore, it cannot be shown that there is significant agreement as to whether compulsory or optional usage of central purchasing is best for the state.

In summary, it may be stated that, among those institution purchasing directors who feel that the existing relation with central purchasing is not that which is best for the institution or the state, there is significant agreement that optional in contrast to compulsory usage of central purchasing is best for the institution. However, there is no significant agreement to what arrangement is best for the state.

Question 5. If not already available, should a state central purchasing agency be made available to your institution?

TABLE XX

A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 5

Response	Actual	Expected
Yes	12	12
No	<u>12</u>	<u>12</u>
TOTAL	24	24
$\chi^2 = 0^*$		

*Not significant at the five percent level.

Since the expected and actual frequencies are equal, it cannot be shown that a central purchasing agency at the state level should be made available to the institutions.

Question 6. What are the major contributions of central purchasing to your institution?

TABLE XXI

A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
 RESPONSES** TO QUESTION 6

Response	Actual	Expected
A. Increased efficiency of added services provided by central purchasing.	16	11.4
B. Advantages of state contracts.	15	11.4
C. Saves money for the institutions by obtaining lower prices than can the institutions.	11	11.4
D. Advantages of volume buying.	9	11.4
E. None.	<u>6</u>	<u>11.4</u>
TOTAL	57	57

$$\chi^2 = 6.0701^*$$

* Not significant at the five percent level.

Therefore, it cannot be shown that the frequencies in the foregoing problem are significantly different from those which would result if only chance factors were operating. However, five categories emerge from a possible 57 individual responses. If Chi Square were computed on this basis, it would then become significant. In this respect, it may be stated that there is no agreement by the institutions as to which of the five contributions of the central agency indicated are more significant, but they do agree that there are five areas of contributions instead of 57 possible individual contributions.

** Response F and G, each equal to one, are eliminated.

Question 7. What are the major weaknesses of central purchasing relative to the institution?

TABLE XXII

A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 7

Response	Actual	Expected
A. Added delays.	26	11.25
B. Too cumbersome and restrictive.	15	11.25
C. Poorer service and delivery from vendor.	11	11.25
D. Unable to obtain exactly what the institutions really need.	9	11.25
E. Not qualified technically to obtain unique needs of educational institutions.	9	11.25
F. None.	9	11.25
G. Miscellaneous.	6	11.25
H. Loss of institutional autonomy.	<u>5</u>	<u>11.25</u>
TOTAL	90	90

$$\chi^2 = 27.8667^*$$

* Significant at the one percent level.

Therefore, it may be shown that there is significant agreement among the institutions relative to the major weaknesses of central purchasing with respect to its relation to the institutions.

Question 8. In what categories can central purchasing obtain better prices or services for the institution?

TABLE XXIII
A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 8

Response	Actual	Expected
A. Vehicles.	27	12.31
B. Gasoline and petroleum products.	20	12.31
C. Furniture and appliances.	19	12.31
D. Insurance.	14	12.31
E. Tires, batteries and other auto supplies.	13	12.31
F. Office supplies and equipment.	12	12.31
G. Miscellaneous.	10	12.31
H. Items common to all state agencies.	9	12.31
I. Paper, printing and photo supplies.	8	12.31
J. None.	8	12.31
K. Food.	7	12.31
L. Lab and medical supplies.	7	12.31
M. Physical maintenance supplies.	<u>6</u>	<u>12.31</u>
TOTAL	160	160

$$\chi^2 = 38.8446^*$$

*Significant at the one percent level.

Therefore, it may be shown that there is significant agreement among the institutions with regard to those categories in which central purchasing can obtain lower prices or better service for the institutions than can the institutions alone.

Question 9. In what categories is central purchasing unable to assist the institutions in obtaining better prices or service?

TABLE XXIV

A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 9

Response	Actual	Expected
A. Scientific supplies and equipment.	32	11.7
B. Maintenance supplies and equipment.	15	11.7
C. Furniture.	10	11.7
D. Office supplies and equipment.	9	11.7
E. All.	8	11.7
F. Agriculture supplies and animals.	7	11.7
G. None.	6	11.7
H. Paper and paper products.	5	11.7
I. Miscellaneous ^{**}	<u>25</u>	<u>11.7</u>
TOTAL	117	117

$\chi^2 = 61.6599^*$

* Significant at the one percent level.

Therefore, it may be shown that there is significant agreement among the institutions relative to those categories in which central purchasing is unable to secure lower prices or better service for the institutions than can the institutions acting alone.

** Since the frequency for each was less than five, the last ten items are combined into "Miscellaneous" (I = 25) category.

Question 10. Is your institution's cost of operation increased, decreased, or unchanged, when central purchasing services are used?

TABLE XXV

A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 10

Response	Actual	Expected
Increased	18	15
Unchanged	15	15
Decreased	<u>12</u>	<u>15</u>
TOTAL	45	45
$\chi^2 = 1.2000^*$		
* Not significant at the five percent level.		

Therefore, it cannot be shown that there is significant agreement among the institutions relative to the effect upon the institution's cost of processing bids, purchase orders, and other documents when central purchasing's services are used.

Question 11. When central purchasing services are used, how is the time required by your institution to obtain goods or services affected?

TABLE XXVI

A TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 11

Response	Actual	Expected
Increased	36	23
Not increased**	<u>10</u>	<u>23</u>

** Formed by combining categories Decreased and Unchanged.

Table XXVI (Continued)

TOTAL	46	46
$\chi^2 = 14.6956^*$		

* Significant at the one percent level.

Therefore, it may be shown that there is agreement among the institutions that the time required to obtain goods and services is significantly increased when central purchasing is used.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Based upon the foregoing findings, the following statements of summarization may be made:

1. A central purchasing agency exists in 89 percent of the states and in 66 percent of those states its use by the institutions is compulsory in some form, optional in 24 percent, and not available to 10 percent of them.

2. The states feel that the existing relationship with the institutions is best for the states and institutions while the institutions feel it is best for the states but not for them.

3. Among those states which feel the existing relationship with the institutions is not best for either, there is no agreement upon what relationship is the best. However, the institutions agree that an optional usage or non-availability arrangement is best for them, but do not agree upon what is best for the state.

4. Where no central agency is available to the institution, the states agree that it should be made available. However, the institutions are not in agreement.

5. The states view their major contributions to the institutions as being the advantages of volume buying, increased efficiency of added services they provide, the ability to obtain lower prices, and

advantages of state contracts. The institutions see the state's contributions to them as being the increased efficiency of added services of the states, their ability to obtain lower prices, the advantages of volume buying, and none at all.

6. The states express their major weaknesses relative to the institutions as none, lack of communication, miscellaneous, and increased time consumption. The institutions see the weaknesses to be added delays, the cumbersome and restrictive nature of the central agency, poorer service and delivery from vendors, the inability to obtain exactly what is needed, lack of qualifications by the state to do educational purchasing, none, and miscellaneous weaknesses.

7. The states feel they can obtain better prices and service than can the institutions in the areas of office furniture, equipment, and supplies; all; janitor supplies; food; laboratory and hospital supplies; gasoline and other petroleum products; tires, tubes, and batteries; and paper and printing products. The institutions say the areas are vehicles; gasoline and petroleum products; furniture and appliances; insurance; tires, batteries, and other auto supplies; office furniture and equipment; miscellaneous; items common to all state agencies; paper, printing, and photo supplies; none; food; laboratory and medical supplies; and maintenance supplies.

8. The states indicate they cannot obtain better prices and service than can the institutions in the areas of food; sole source and locally purchased items and services; educational or teaching supplies; scientific and laboratory supplies and equipment, and miscellaneous items. The institutions report the areas to be scientific supplies and equipment; all; agriculture supplies and animals; none;

paper and paper products; and miscellaneous items.

9. There is no agreement by the institutions, but the states claim their costs of operation are not increased appreciably by the institution's usage of their services. However, there is agreement among the institutions that the amount of time involved when central purchasing services are used is significantly increased when compared to their not using those services.

Recommendations

Several discrepancies are seen to exist between the attitudes of the central agencies and the institutions relative to the questions in this study.

Hence, the investigator's first recommendation is for each land-grant institution and the central purchasing agency in a state to make a maximum effort to establish a clear channel of communication between each other in order for each to understand itself and the other so that they might work in concert. Interestingly, communications was one of the problems found by the Committee on Government and Higher Education¹ relative to government involvement in higher education.

The second recommendation is for each institution and central agency within a state to initiate a self-study program to periodically review if, and if so, how effectively, each is achieving its purpose, to analyze its goal, and to determine how all can work best together, if they should at all, in a manner best for both the institution and

¹Committee on Government and Higher Education, The Efficiency of Freedom, Report, Johns Hopkins Press, (Baltimore, 1959), p. 42.

the state.

The third recommendation is a compilation of these reviews which could be made available to all the state central purchasing agencies and land-grant institutions in order that each might profit.

Also, the findings of this study suggest need for further study. The investigator would recommend studies to:

1. Resolve the discrepancies between the fact that the states say a central agency should be available to the institutions while the institutions say it should not.

2. Determine for each institution and central agency in exactly which areas the central agency can and cannot be of assistance to the institution.

3. Determine the exact cost to each institution and central agency resulting from the institution's usage of the central agency and compare it with any savings to determine whether or not it is economically feasible.

4. Determine how the major complaint by the institutions, increased time required to obtain goods and services when the central agencies are used, can be reduced.

5. Resolve the question of how the institutions can say usage of a central agency is best for the state but not for them though they are part of the state system.

6. Determine, since some institutions' cost of operation is increased and some is decreased when the central agency is used, why all cannot enjoy a cost decrease.

7. Determine, since some institutions indicate the time required for them to process "paper work" is reduced when they use the central

agency while others indicate it is increased, why all cannot enjoy a decrease in this factor.

If the recommendations resulting from this study are followed, a contribution to this important business function of the land-grant institutions and states will have been made.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Hayes, F. Albert. Evaluating Purchasing Performance. New York: American Management Association, 1964.
- Heinritz, Stuart F. Purchasing. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1947.
- Hodges, Henry Green. Procurement, The Modern Science of Purchasing. New York: Harper, 1961.
- Huegy, H. W. and R. V. Mitchell. Stock Control Methods. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1942.
- Lewis, Howard Thompson. Procurement: Principles and Cases. Chicago: R. D. Irwin, 1948.
- Matherly, Alva Marian. Kentucky State Purchasing. Lexington: University of Kentucky, 1948.
- Moos, Malcomb and Francis E. Rourke. The Campus and the State. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1959.
- National Association of Educational Buyers. Purchasing for Educational Institutions. Columbia University, 1961.
- Nicholson, Joseph W. County Purchasing. New York: The National Association of Purchasing Agents, 1940.
- Reck, Dickson. Government Purchasing and Competition. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1954.
- Thomas, Arthur G. Principles of Government Purchasing. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1919.

Reports

- Campbell, Ernest Howard. Centralized Purchasing for Washington Cities. University of Washington in Cooperation with the Association of Washington Cities: Seattle, 1948.
- Committee on Government and Higher Education. The Efficiency of Freedom Report. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1959.

Oklahoma Governors Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the State Government. Oklahoma and Higher Education: Some Comparative Tables and Comments. Oklahoma City: The Committee, 1952.

Utah University, Bureau of Economic and Business Research. In-State Purchasing Preference Practices. Salt Lake City: Katherine L. Luech, Bureau of Economics and Business Research, 1961.

Theses

From Masters Theses in Education. H. M. Silvey, Editor. Cedar Falls, Iowa: Research Publications, 1956-1966.

Aronson, Harry. A Survey of Equipment Identification and Inventory Control System of Selected Public Schools, p. 34.

Binger, George R. Purchasing Procedures of the Nine Largest Public Schools in Nebraska, p. 239.

Clarke, George E. School Supply Administration, p. 231.

Deane, Paul D. A Punch Card Procedure for Control and Accounting of Supplies in Public School Systems, p. 389.

Hultz, Lawrence D. A Study of the Practices and Procedures Used by County Superintendents of Schools Relative to the Purchasing of Standard School Supplies, p. 25.

Scott, Victor A. Cooperative Purchasing of School Supplies in Texas Public Schools, p. 421.

Truax, James N. Implications for Cooperative Purchasing by Northern San Diego County School Districts, p. 42.

Dissertation Abstracts. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, Inc., 1956-1966.

Brock, D. E. Survey Instruments for Evaluation of the Economic Efficiency of Public School Purchasing, No. 4473.

Clemons, D. E. Administrative Control Criteria for Purchasing Instructional Materials. Vol. 25, No. 3345.

APPENDIX A

THE STATE QUESTIONNAIRE AND ACTUAL RESPONSES

Dear Sir:

I need your help.

In an attempt to improve the important task of purchasing for state institutions, I am trying to determine the best relationship between land-grant institutions and a centralized state purchasing agency.

Will you please complete the attached brief questionnaire and at your earliest convenience return it in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope?

Thank you sincerely for your assistance in researching this area of purchasing.

Respectfully,

Fred L. McBride
2210 West 10th
Stillwater, Oklahoma

**A Survey of the Attitudes of Directors of State
Central Purchasing Agencies Towards its Use by
Land Grant Universities**

1. Do you feel that the arrangement regarding the use of the state central purchasing agency by the land grant university in your state is that which best serves the needs of the state? Yes ___ No ___
The University? Yes ___ No ___
2. If not, which of the following arrangements, with reference to the land grant university do you feel best serves the needs of the state? _____. The University? _____
 1. Compulsory in all cases
 2. Compulsory in some, optional in some, not available in some
 3. Compulsory in some, not available in others
 4. Compulsory in some, optional in some
 5. Compulsory in some, optional in all others
 6. Optional in all cases
 7. Not available in any case
 8. Not available in some, optional in some
 9. Other, please explain _____
3. If use of the state central purchasing agency is not available to the land-grant university, do you feel it should be made available? Yes ___ No ___ (Please leave blank if such use is already available.)
4. What do you feel to be the major contribution to the land-grant university afforded by use of the state central purchasing agency? (If such use does not exist, please indicate the major contribution if such did exist.) _____

5. What do you feel to be the major weakness, if any, of the state central purchasing agency relative to procurement of goods and services for the land-grant university? _____

6. In what general categories (e.g. vehicles, foods, laboratory supplies, insurance, furniture, etc.), if any, do you feel that use of state central purchasing agency does or could result in lower prices or better service for the land-grant university than it could obtain by non-use of such agency? _____

7. In what general categories of needs, if any, do you feel use of state central purchasing agency by the land-grant institution in your state results in no significantly better (or essentially the same) prices and service than could be obtained by its not using such agency? _____

8. If the land-grant university in your state uses your Agencies service, how much is your agencies cost of operation increased, if any? _____

STATE QUESTIONS #1

Do you feel that the arrangement regarding the use of the state central purchasing agency by the land-grant university in your state is that which best serves the needs of the state?

Yes _____ No _____ The University? Yes _____
No _____

Name of State	Best Serves State's Needs	Best Serves University's Needs
Alabama	Yes	Yes
Alaska	Yes	Yes
Arizona	Yes	Yes
Arkansas	No	Yes
California		
Colorado	Yes	Yes
Connecticut	Yes	Yes
Delaware	No	No
Florida		
Georgia		
Hawaii	Yes	Yes
Idaho	Does not apply in Idaho.	
Illinois		
Indiana		
Iowa	No C.P.A. exists.	
Kansas	Yes	Yes

Kentucky	Yes	Yes
Louisiana		
Maine	Yes	Yes
Maryland		
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes
Michigan	No	No
Minnesota	Unable to comment.	Institution has never used Central Purchasing.
Mississippi	Yes	Yes
Missouri		
Montana	Yes	Yes
Nebraska	Yes	Yes
Nevada		
New Hampshire	No	No
New Jersey	Yes	Yes
New Mexico	Yes	Yes
New York		
North Carolina	Yes	Yes
North Dakota	No	No
Ohio	Unanswered	Unanswered
Oregon	Yes	Yes
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes
Rhode Island		
South Carolina		
South Dakota	Yes	Yes
Tennessee	Yes	Yes
Texas	Yes	Yes

Utah	Yes	Unanswered
Vermont	No	No
Virginia	Yes	Yes
Washington	No	No
West Virginia	Yes	Yes
Wisconsin	Yes	Yes
Wyoming	No. C.P.A. exists.	

STATE QUESTION #2

If not, which of the following arrangements,
with reference to the land-grant university do
you feel best serves the needs of the state?

_____ The university? _____

Name of State	Best Serves State's Needs	Best Serves University's Needs
Alabama	Unanswered	Unanswered
Alaska	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Arizona	Unanswered	Unanswered
Arkansas	4	4
California		
Colorado	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Connecticut	Unanswered	Unanswered
Delaware	6	6
Florida		
Georgia		
Hawaii	Unanswered	Unanswered
Idaho	Does not apply in Idaho.	
Illinois		
Indiana		
Iowa	No. C.P.A. exists.	
Kansas	1	1
Kentucky	4	4

Louisiana		
Maine	Unanswered	Unanswered
Maryland		
Massachusetts	Unanswered	Unanswered
Michigan	1	1
Minnesota	Unable to comment.	Institution has never used C.P.A.
Mississippi	Unanswered	Unanswered
Missouri		
Montana	4	4
Nebraska	2	2
Nevada		
New Hampshire	4	4
New Jersey	1	1
New Mexico	Unanswered	Unanswered
New York		
North Carolina	Unanswered	Unanswered
North Dakota	1 and 9	1 and 9, at least to participate in term contracts.
Ohio	Unanswered	Unanswered
Oregon	9	9
Pennsylvania	Unanswered	Unanswered
Rhode Island		
South Carolina		
South Dakota	Unanswered	Unanswered
Tennessee	Unanswered	Unanswered
Texas	Unanswered	Unanswered
Utah	Unanswered	Unanswered

Vermont	1	1
Virginia	Unanswered	Unanswered
Washington	1	Unanswered
West Virginia	Unanswered	Unanswered
Wisconsin	Unanswered	Unanswered
Wyoming	No. C.P.A. exists.	

STATE QUESTIONS #3

If use of the state central purchasing agency is not available to the land-grant university, do you feel it should be made available? Yes _____
 No _____ (Please leave blank if such use is already available.)

Name of State	Should Be Made Available	Should Not Be Made Available
Alabama	Unanswered	Unanswered
Alaska	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Arizona	Unanswered	Unanswered
Arkansas	Unanswered	Unanswered
California		
Colorado	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Connecticut	Unanswered	Unanswered
Delaware	Unanswered	Unanswered
Florida		
Georgia		
Hawaii	Unanswered	Unanswered
Idaho	Does not apply in Idaho.	
Illinois		
Indiana		
Iowa	No C.P.A. exists.	
Kansas	Yes	
Kentucky	Unanswered	Unanswered

Louisiana		
Maine		No
Maryland		
Massachusetts	Unanswered	Unanswered
Michigan	Unanswered	Unanswered
Minnesota	Unable to comment.	Institution has never used Central Purchasing.
Mississippi	Unanswered	Unanswered
Missouri		
Montana	Unanswered	Unanswered
Nebraska	Unanswered	Unanswered
Nevada		
New Hampshire	Unanswered	Unanswered
New Jersey		Use of Central Purchasing is presently available, but not used by the University.
New Mexico	Yes	
New York		
North Carolina	Unanswered	Unanswered
North Dakota	Yes	
Ohio	Yes	
Oregon	Unanswered	Unanswered
Pennsylvania	Unanswered	Unanswered
Rhode Island		
South Carolina		
South Dakota	Unanswered	Unanswered
Tennessee		
Texas	Unanswered	Unanswered

Utah	Yes	
Vermont	Yes	
Virginia	Yes	
Washington	Unanswered	Unanswered
West Virginia	Yes	
Wisconsin	Unanswered	Unanswered
Wyoming	No. C.P.A. exists.	

STATE QUESTION #4

What do you feel to be the major contribution to the land-grant university afforded by use of the state central purchasing agency? (If such does not exist, please indicate the major contribution if such did exist.)

Name of State	Major Contribution
Alabama	University receives benefit of larger volume purchasing.
Alaska	Central Supply's contract award manual.
Arizona	Low prices due to combining common use requirements.
Arkansas	Low prices due to purchasing power.
California	
Colorado	Economy of purchasing through combining requirements of all state agencies.
Connecticut	Service.
Delaware	Bulk purchasing of gasoline and fuel oil.
Florida	
Georgia	
Hawaii	Savings by consolidating University's requirements with others on items common to all.
Idaho	Does not apply in Idaho.
Illinois	
Indiana	Do not operate through Central Purchasing.

Iowa	No C.P.A. exists.
Kansas	Save money while keeping control in University's administration's hands.
Kentucky	Lower prices through volume purchasing, additional services offered-inspection, standards and specifications, interior designing.
Louisiana	
Maine	Contracts on gas, oil, tires, tubes, etc.
Maryland	
Massachusetts	Better prices, service and delivery.
Michigan	Purchasing on specifications and not on personal wishes.
Minnesota	Institution has never used Central Purchasing.
Mississippi	Gives University a basis for cost comparison.
Missouri	
Montana	Advantage of more prospective bidders; better prices.
Nebraska	Advantage of large volumes tend to give us better contact with the vendors.
Nevada	
New Hampshire	Contracts.
New Jersey	Lower prices on practically all categories (except books) would result.
New Mexico	Purchasing by volume.
New York	
North Carolina	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objective and impartial approach to purchasing (freedom from pressure of campus personnel and hierarchy.) 2. Staff specialization. 3. Strong bargaining power due to volume purchasing.

North Dakota	Would eliminate senseless duplication of function and create greater volume for Central Purchasing.
Ohio	Savings due to larger volume prices.
Oregon	Efficiency through specialization, standards, and volume.
Pennsylvania	Lower prices due to our experience and volume of business transacted.
Rhode Island	
South Carolina	
South Dakota	Better prices due to pooled purchases; advantages of annual contracts.
Tennessee	Buying power of Central Purchasing by purchasing in large quantities and through use of annual contracts.
Texas	Quantity buying advantage.
Utah	Volume buying and use of state contract prices.
Vermont	Savings.
Virginia	Substantial savings on items other than MRO and teaching supplies.
Washington	Setting standards and specifications for all state agencies; savings on contracted volume buying.
West Virginia	Better prices, more complete coverage of supplies.
Wisconsin	Standards/value analysis program; volume contract purchasing; uniform procurement procedures.
Wyoming	No. C.P.A. exists.

STATE QUESTION #5

What do you feel to be the major weakness, if any, of the state central purchasing agency relative to procurement of goods and services for the land-grant University?

Name of State	Major Weakness
Alabama	Communication, (University is removed from Central Purchasing and problems are not readily communicated.)
Alaska	None. The University of Alaska operates its own purchasing function which operates under the identical authority as the State's Division of Supply.
Arizona	None.
Arkansas	We have no control of purchases from University cash funds.
California	
Colorado	None.
Connecticut	None.
Delaware	Poor quality of personnel and lack of experience and professionalism; inability to buy <u>value</u> .
Florida	
Georgia	
Hawaii	No capabilities for purchase of specialty items peculiar to education equipment needs of the University.
Idaho	Does not apply in Idaho.
Illinois	

Indiana	University does not operate through Central Purchasing.
Iowa	No. C.P.A. exists.
Kansas	Lack of communications; misunderstanding.
Kentucky	Lead time involved from submission of requisition until award of contract and delivery of goods.
Louisiana	
Maine	None.
Maryland	
Massachusetts	None.
Michigan	Unanswered.
Minnesota	Institution has never used Central Purchasing. Unanswered.
Mississippi	Purchasing Agent's ability to determine if he can acquire with best economy and efficiency through Central Agency or on bids by quantity purchased.
Missouri	
Montana	Lack of good communications.
Nebraska	The schools are able to obtain better prices on typewriters, desks, etc. for instructional purposes.
Nevada	
New Hampshire	None.
New Jersey	Longer lead time would be required if the Central Agency were used.
New Mexico	Communications.
New York	
North Carolina	Imperfections in communications and mutual understanding of problems.
North Dakota	Unanswered.
Ohio	Unanswered.

Oregon	Communications.
Pennsylvania	Unanswered.
Rhode Island	
South Carolina	
South Dakota	In order to work at all, the University must have a strong purchasing coordinator and good communications and understanding with the central authority.
Tennessee	Time element; takes longer to process, receive bids, etc.
Texas	Unanswered.
Utah	Unanswered.
Vermont	None.
Virginia	Failure to obtain proper lead time from college.
Washington	None.
West Virginia	None.
Wisconsin	Poor response time.
Wyoming	No C.P.A. exists.

STATE QUESTION #6

In what general categories (e.g., vehicles, foods, laboratory supplies, insurance, furniture, etc.), if any, do you feel that use of state central purchasing agency does or could result in lower prices or better service for the land-grant university than it could obtain by non-use of such agency?

Name of State	Categories
Alabama	Vehicles, laboratory supplies, furniture, gasoline, tires and tubes, light bulbs, batteries and office supplies.
Alaska	Not applicable.
Arizona	Vehicles, food, office supplies and equipment, business machines and maintenance supplies.
Arkansas	Vehicles, tires, tubes, insurance, furniture and fixtures, office machines and equipment.
California	
Colorado	All items used by University.
Connecticut	All (Price is secondary, service and quality are first).
Delaware	Poor quality of personnel and lack of professionalism; inability to buy value.
Florida	
Georgia	
Hawaii	All items common to the University and other state agencies.
Idaho	Does not apply in Idaho.

Illinois	
Indiana	Do not operate through Central Purchasing.
Iowa	No C.P.A. exists.
Kansas	In almost all categories.
Kentucky	Vehicles, food and furniture.
Louisiana	
Maine	Tires, tubes, gasoline, motor oil, and possibly light bulbs.
Maryland	
Massachusetts	All.
Michigan	All.
Minnesota	Unanswered. Institution has never used Central Purchasing.
Mississippi	Purchasing Agent's ability to determine if he can acquire with best economy and efficiency through Central Agency or on bids by quantity purchased.
Missouri	
Montana	Food, furniture, rough paper items, plumbing and electrical supplies, vehicles, janitor supplies, etc.
Nebraska	Vehicles, paper products (because of our total volume).
Nevada	
New Hampshire	All where competition is available; "sole source" items not advantageous.
New Jersey	Practically all categories except books. Because of increased quantities, lower prices would result, benefitting not only the University but all other state colleges. Service (defined as the time to make delivery after receipt of order) would be the same as presently obtained but the Central Agency would probably require more time to process requisitions.
New Mexico	All volume-purchase items without doubt.

New York	
North Carolina	Usually in all.
North Dakota	All.
Ohio	Computer supplies, paper products, hardware, glass, canned goods, vehicles, tires, batteries, electric bulbs, radio tubes, photo film and supplies, magnetic tape, furniture, drugs and pharmaceuticals, office machines, fertilizers, detergents and germicides, janitor equipment and supplies, and hospital supplies.
Oregon	All except contracts for professional services.
Pennsylvania	Unanswered.
Rhode Island	
South Carolina	
South Dakota	All but food service.
Tennessee	Vehicles, paper products, and some foods.
Texas	Vehicles, lab supplies and equipment, furniture, printing, building maintenance supplies, and office supplies.
Utah	All categories.
Vermont	All.
Virginia	All except MRO insurance and non-competitive items.
Washington	All commodity items.
West Virginia	All, especially foods and furniture.
Wisconsin	Scheduled or contract purchasing results in lower price and better service on items common to two or more state agencies.
Wyoming	No C.P.A. exists.

STATE QUESTION #7

In what general categories of needs, if any, do you feel use of state central purchasing agency by the land-grant institution in your state results in no significantly better (or essentially the same) prices and service than could be obtained by its not using such agency?

Name of State	Categories
Alabama	Food, insurance, hardware items, any item with educational discount.
Alaska	Not applicable.
Arizona	Textbooks, teaching tools, and institutional materials.
Arkansas	Commodities that can be purchased from the local area, (e.g., food, janitor supplies, and most services).
California	
Colorado	Special feeds, products used in experimental areas.
Connecticut	University and state should not be in competition. They should, together, take advantage of volume buying, central warehousing, and other centralized services.
Delaware	Furniture, MRO supplies.
Florida	
Georgia	
Hawaii	Education equipment, teaching aids, science equipment, items peculiar to University's needs.
Idaho	Does not apply in Idaho.

Illinois	
Indiana	Do not operate through Central Purchasing.
Iowa	No C.P.A. exists.
Kansas	Books, service contracts on controls, livestock for breeding, and professional services.
Kentucky	Commodities not included on purchasing schedules, science equipment and meat and perishable foods.
Louisiana	
Maine	Lab supplies, possibly foods.
Maryland	
Massachusetts	Unanswered.
Michigan	Office equipment.
Minnesota	Unanswered. Institution has never used Central Purchasing.
Mississippi	Food.
Missouri	
Montana	Chemicals and lab supplies, music and art supplies.
Nebraska	Institution does good job in purchasing their needs. They use our contracts when it is to their advantage-on the other hand, they do quite well by themselves.
Nevada	
New Hampshire	"Sole source" items.
New Jersey	Use of Central Agency would result in lower prices in practically all areas except text books.
New Mexico	Small purchases.
New York	

North Carolina	Single source items, manufacturer controlled resale price items, small purchases (building materials, and across the counter purchases of electrical and plumbing supplies).
North Dakota	Books and periodicals, and fair-trade items.
Ohio	Fresh fruits and vegetables, meat, and contractual services.
Oregon	Contracts for service.
Pennsylvania	Perishable and "sole source" items.
Rhode Island	
South Carolina	
South Dakota	Only loss to the University is a few days in processing; emergency purchases handled direct.
Tennessee	Office equipment and machines.
Texas	Unanswered.
Utah	None.
Vermont	None.
Virginia	MRO and other items listed under six.
Washington	None (Volume buying is the key; also, Central Purchasing relieves the University from local pressure, e.g., from faculty and business people).
West Virginia	Sole source (We buy on a direct basis).
Wisconsin	Unique or para-purchasing (No competition exists), commodities.
Wyoming	No C.P.A. exists.

STATE QUESTION #8

If the land grant university in your state uses your agency's service, how much is your agency's cost of operation increased, if any?

Name of State	Amount
Alabama	None (University uses Central Purchasing at its option).
Alaska	Very nominal cost for preparation of CA award manual.
Arizona	Do not know.
Arkansas	Don't know (Cost is postage, handling cost, and increased personnel).
California	
Colorado	Very little.
Connecticut	Not a dime (Contracts must be established anyway, for all the agencies).
Delaware	None (It's optional).
Florida	
Georgia	
Hawaii	Not significantly.
Idaho	Does not apply in Idaho.
Illinois	
Indiana	Don't operate through Central Purchasing.
Iowa	No C.P.A. exists.
Kansas	None.

Kentucky	Very slightly.
Louisiana	
Maine	None (With such little use).
Maryland	
Massachusetts	None.
Michigan	None.
Minnesota	Institution has never used Central Purchasing.
Mississippi	Don't know.
Missouri	
Montana	No definite amount available.
Nebraska	None.
Nevada	
New Hampshire	None.
New Jersey	University not presently using Central Agency. While the additional work load could not be absorbed without additions to present Central Agency buying staff, the increase would be less than the number of people presently employed by the University purchasing office. Much of their work is duplication of work being done in the Central Agency office.
New Mexico	One-half of one percent of dollar volume.
New York	
North Carolina	Don't know.
North Dakota	Ten-twenty percent.
Ohio	Unanswered.
Oregon	Higher Education constitutes 60 percent of the total purchases of Central Purchasing with a resulting 50 percent increase in C.P. cost. If the University did this, the increase would equal 150 percent.
Pennsylvania	Breakdown not available.

Rhode Island	
South Carolina	
South Dakota	Very little; use of annual contracts allow procurement by the University.
Tennessee	Do not know.
Texas	Very little.
Utah	None.
Vermont	" ? "
Virginia	Unknown since they have always been a part of our operation.
Washington	Minimal (One buyer and assistant, perhaps).
West Virginia	None
Wisconsin	Very minimal.
Wyoming	No C.P.A. exists.

APPENDIX B
THE INSTITUTION QUESTIONNAIRE AND
ACTUAL RESPONSES

Dear Sir:

I need your help.

In an attempt to improve the important task of purchasing for state institutions, I am trying to determine the best relationship between land-grant institutions and a centralized state purchasing agency.

Will you please complete the attached brief questionnaire and at your earliest convenience return it in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope?

Thank you sincerely for your assistance in researching this area of purchasing.

Respectfully,

Fred L. McBride
2210 West 10th
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Name of Institution _____

Your Name _____

A Survey of Attitudes of Land Grant University
Purchasing Directors Towards Use of State Central
Purchasing Agencies by Land-Grant Universities

1. Does a state centralized purchasing agency exist in your state? Yes _____ No _____
2. If so, is its use by your institution
 1. Compulsory in all cases
 2. Compulsory in some, optional in some, not available in some
 3. Compulsory in some, optional in some
 4. Compulsory in some, not available in others
 5. Compulsory in some, optional in all others
 6. Optional in all cases
 7. Not available in any case
 8. Not available in some, optional in some
 9. Other, please explain _____
3. Do you feel that the arrangement you have indicated above is that which best serves the needs of your institution? Yes _____ No _____. Your State? Yes _____ No _____
4. If not, which of the above arrangements do you feel would best serve the needs of your institution? (Indicate item number) _____. Your State? _____
5. If use of a state central purchasing agency is not available to your institution, do you feel it should be made available? Yes _____ No _____
6. What do you feel to be the major contribution to your institution by the State Central Purchasing Agency? (If no such agency exists, please indicate the major contribution if such did exist.) _____

7. What do you feel is the major weakness, if any, of a state central purchasing agency relative to your institution? _____

8. In what general categories (e.g. vehicles, foods, laboratory supplies, insurance, furniture, etc.) of needs, if any, do you feel use of State Central Purchasing does or could result in significantly lower prices or better service than could be obtained by non-use of such agency? _____

9. In what general categories of needs, if any, do you feel use of state central purchasing agency results in no significantly better (or essentially the same) prices and service that could be obtained by non-use of such agency? _____

10. Is your institution's cost of processing bids, purchase orders, and other documents related to acquisition of goods or services through use of state central purchasing agency as compared to non-use, Increased _____, Decreased _____, Unchanged _____?
11. If, or when, state central purchasing agency is used by your institution, is the time required to obtain goods or services significantly increased _____, decreased _____, or unchanged _____?

INSTITUTION QUESTION #1

Does a state centralized purchasing agency exist
in your state?

Name of Institution	Yes	No
Auburn		No
Alabama A and M		No
University of Alaska		
University of Arizona	Yes	
University of Arkansas	Yes	
Arkansas A, M, and Normal		
University of California (Davis)	Yes	
Colorado State University	Yes	
University of Connecticut	Yes	
University of Delaware	Yes	
University of Florida	Yes	
Florida A and M University		No
University of Georgia	Yes	
Ft. Valley State	Yes	
University of Hawaii	Yes	
University of Idaho	Yes	
University of Illinois	Yes	
Purdue University (Indiana)		No

Iowa State	The subject comes up in about every 4th year in our Legislature. This is the year again.	No
Kansas State University	Yes	
University of Kentucky	Yes	
Kentucky State College	Yes	
Louisiana State University	Yes	
Southern University		
University of Maine	Yes	
University of Maryland	Yes	
Maryland State	Yes	
University of Massachusetts	Yes	
Michigan State University	Yes	
University of Minnesota	Yes	
Mississippi State University	Yes	
Alcorn A and M		No
University of Missouri		
Lincoln University	Yes	
Montana State	Yes	
University of Nebraska	Yes	
University of Nevada	Yes	
University of New Hampshire	Yes	
The State University (New Jersey)		
New Mexico State University	Yes	
Cornell University (New York)	Yes	
North Carolina State University	Yes	
Agricultural and Technical College	Yes	
North Dakota State University	Yes	

Ohio State	Yes
Oregon State University	Yes
Pennsylvania State University	
University of Rhode Island	Yes
Clemson University (South Carolina)	Yes
South Carolina State College	Yes
South Dakota State University	Yes
University of Tennessee	Yes
Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State College	
Texas A and M University	Yes
Prairie View A and M College	Yes
Utah State University	Yes
University of Vermont	
Virginia Polytech Institute	Yes
Virginia State College	Yes
Washington State University	Yes
West Virginia University	Yes
University of Wisconsin	Yes
University of Wyoming	Yes

INSTITUTION QUESTION #2

If so, is its use by your institution:

1. Compulsory in all cases.
2. Compulsory in some, optional in some, not available in some.
3. Compulsory in some, optional in some.
4. Compulsory in some, not available in others.
5. Compulsory in some, optional in all others.
6. Optional in all cases.
7. Not available in any case.
8. Not available in some, optional in some.
9. Other, please explain _____

Name of Institution	Use
Auburn	Unanswered.
Alabama A and M	Unanswered.
University of Alaska	
University of Arizona	3
University of Arkansas	2
Arkansas A, M, and Normal	
University of California (Davis)	6
Colorado State University	2
University of Connecticut	3
University of Delaware	6
University of Florida	2
Florida A and M University	Unanswered.
University of Georgia	2
Ft. Valley State	3

University of Hawaii	1 (Where state has a central contract.)
University of Idaho	6 and 9 (We use state contracts when it is to our advantage.)
University of Illinois	Unanswered.
Purdue University	6
Iowa State	Unanswered.
Kansas State University	3
University of Kentucky	9
Kentucky State	3
Louisiana State University	2
Southern University	
University of Maine	6
University of Maryland	5
Maryland State	4
University of Massachusetts	3 (We have fiscal autonomy on 80-90 percent.)
Michigan State University	6
University of Minnesota	None (6 contemplated.)
Mississippi State University	6
Alcorn A and M	Unanswered.
University of Missouri	
Lincoln University	3
Montana State	3
University of Nebraska	5
University of Nevada	5 (The Nevada Leg. in 1967 passed a law giving the Univ. of Nevada Systems autonomy in nearly all purchases. The

University of Nevada (Continued)

exceptions being:
 items of equipment &
 supplies warehoused
 by the Central Agency,
 & items which that
 agency has on Open-
 End Contract, i.e.,
 vehicles, fuel oil,
 gasoline, gas credit
 cards, tires, tubes,
 batteries, light
 bulbs, & various jan-
 itorial supplies. The
 last two items are
 warehoused by the
 State.)

University of New Hampshire	6
The State University (New Jersey)	
New Mexico State University	6
Cornell University (New York)	6
North Carolina State University	2
Agricultural and Technical College	1
North Dakota State University	2
Ohio State	7
Oregon State University	3
Pennsylvania State University	
University of Rhode Island	1 (Handle federal grants.)
Clemson University (South Carolina)	2
South Carolina State College	2
South Dakota State University	3
University of Tennessee	8
Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State College	
Texas A and M University	2
Prairie View A and M College	3

Utah State University	9 (Regular budgets optional in all cases. New buildings & equipment only.)
University of Vermont	
Virginia Polytech Institute	3
Virginia State College	3
Washington State University	2
West Virginia University	1
University of Wisconsin	2
University of Wyoming	6

INSTITUTION QUESTION #3

Do you feel that the arrangement you have indicated above is that which best serves the needs of your institution? Yes _____ No _____
 Your state? Yes _____ No _____

Name of Institution	Best Serves Needs of Your: Institution	State
Auburn	Yes	Yes
Alabama A & M	Yes	Yes
University of Alaska		
University of Arizona	Yes	Yes
University of Arkansas	No	No
A, M, & Normal, Arkansas		
University of California	Yes	Yes
Colorado State University	No	No
University of Connecticut	No	No
University of Delaware	Yes	Yes
University of Florida	No	No
Florida A & M	Unanswered	
University of Georgia	No	Yes
Ft. Valley State	No	Yes
University of Hawaii	Yes	Yes
University of Idaho	Yes	Yes
University of Illinois	Yes	Unanswered

Purdue University (Indiana)	Yes	Yes
Iowa State	Unanswered	
Kansas State University	Yes	Yes
University of Kentucky	No	No
Kentucky State	Yes	Yes
Louisiana State University	No	No
Southern University		
University of Maine	Yes	Yes
University of Maryland	No	No
Maryland State College	Yes	Yes
University of Massachusetts	Yes	Yes
Michigan State University	Yes	Yes
University of Minnesota	Yes	Yes
Mississippi State University	Yes	Yes
Alcorn A & M	Unanswered	
University of Missouri		
Lincoln University	Yes	Yes
Montana State	No	No
University of Nebraska	No	No
University of Nevada	Yes	Yes
University of New Hampshire	Yes	Yes
The State University (New Jersey)		
New Mexico State University	Yes	Yes
Cornell University (New York)	Yes	Yes

North Carolina State University	Yes	Yes
Ag. & Tech. College	Yes	Yes
North Dakota State University	No	No
Ohio State	No	No
Oregon State University	Yes	Yes
Pennsylvania State Univer- sity		
University of Rhode Island	No	Unanswered
Clemson University	Yes	Yes
South Carolina State College	Yes	Yes
South Dakota State University	No	No
University of Tennessee	Yes	Yes
Tenn. Ag. & Ind. State College		
Texas A & M University	No	No
Prairie View A & M College	No	No
Utah State College	Yes	Yes
University of Vermont		
Virginia Polytech Institute	No	No
Virginia State College	Yes	Yes
Washington State College	Yes	Yes
W. Virginia University	No	Yes
University of Wisconsin	No	Yes
University of Wyoming	Yes	Yes

INSTITUTION QUESTION #4

If not, which of the above arrangements do you feel would best serve the needs of your institution? _____ Your state _____

Name of Institution	Best Serves Institutions Needs	Best Serves States Needs
Auburn	Unanswered	Unanswered
Alabama A & M	Unanswered	Unanswered
University of Alaska		
University of Arizona	Unanswered	Unanswered
University of Arkansas	8	8
A, M, & Normal		
University of California (Davis)	Unanswered	Unanswered
Colorado State University	6	6
University of Connecticut	6	6
University of Delaware	Unanswered	Unanswered
University of Florida	6	6
Florida A & M	Unanswered	Unanswered
University of Georgia	6	Unanswered
Ft. Valley State	5 or 6	Unanswered
University of Hawaii	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
University of Idaho	Unanswered	Unanswered
University of Illinois	Unanswered	Unanswered

Purdue University (Indiana)	Unanswered	Unanswered
Iowa State	Unanswered	Unanswered
Kansas State University	Unanswered	Unanswered
University of Kentucky	5	5
Kentucky State	Unanswered	Unanswered
Louisiana State University	6	6
Southern University		
University of Maine	Unanswered	Unanswered
University of Maryland	6	6
Maryland State College	Unanswered	Unanswered
University of Massachusetts	Unanswered	Unanswered
Michigan State University	Unanswered	Unanswered
University of Minnesota	Unanswered	Unanswered
Mississippi State University	Unanswered	Unanswered
Alcorn A&M	Unanswered	Unanswered
University of Missouri		
Lincoln University	Unanswered	Unanswered
Montana State	5	5
University of Nebraska	6	6
University of Nevada	Unanswered	Unanswered
University of New Hampshire	Unanswered	Unanswered
The State University (New Jersey)		
New Mexico State University	Unanswered	Unanswered
Cornell University (New York)	Unanswered	Unanswered
North Carolina State University	Unanswered	Unanswered
Ag. & Tech. College	Unanswered	Unanswered

North Dakota State University	6	3
Ohio State	5	5
Oregon State University	Unanswered	Unanswered
Pennsylvania State University		
University of Rhode Island	2	Unanswered
Clemson University	Unanswered	Unanswered
South Carolina State University	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
South Dakota State University	5	5
University of Tennessee	Unanswered	Unanswered
Tenn. Ag. & Ind. State College		
Texas A & M University	6	6
Prairie View A & M College	6	Unanswered
Utah State University	Unanswered	Unanswered
University of Vermont		
Virginia Polytech Institute	6	Unanswered
Virginia State College	Unanswered	Unanswered
Washington State University	Unanswered	Unanswered
West Virginia University	3	Unanswered
University of Wisconsin	6	2
University of Wyoming	Unanswered	Unanswered

INSTITUTION QUESTION #5

If use of a state central purchasing agency is not available to your institution, do you feel it should be made available? Yes _____
 No _____

Name of Institution	Should It Be Made Available?
Auburn	No
Alabama A & M	No
University of Alaska	
University of Arizona	Unanswered
University of Arkansas	Not Applicable
A, M, & Normal	
University of California (Davis)	Unanswered
Colorado State University	No
University of Connecticut	Unanswered
University of Delaware	Unanswered
University of Florida	No
Florida A & M	Unanswered
University of Georgia	Unanswered
Ft. Valley State	Yes
University of Hawaii	Not Applicable
University of Idaho	No
University of Illinois	No

Purdue University (Indiana)	No
Iowa State	No
Kansas State University	Unanswered
University of Kentucky	Unanswered
Kentucky State	Unanswered
Louisiana State University	No
Southern University	
University of Maine	Not Applicable
University of Maryland	Unanswered
Maryland State	Unanswered
University of Massachusetts	Unanswered
Michigan State University	Yes (but only 6)
University of Minnesota	Yes (but optional)
Mississippi State University	Unanswered
Alcorn A & M	No
University of Missouri	
Lincoln University	Unanswered
Montana State	Unanswered
University of Nebraska	Unanswered
University of Nevada	Unanswered
University of New Hampshire	Yes
The State University (New Jersey)	
New Mexico State University	Yes
Cornell University (New York)	Yes
North Carolina State University	Unanswered
Ag. & Technical College	Yes

North Dakota State University	Unanswered
Ohio State	Yes
Oregon State University	Unanswered
Pennsylvania State University	
University of Rhode Island	Yes
Clemson University	Unanswered
South Carolina State College	Unanswered
South Dakota State University	Unanswered
University of Tennessee	No
Tennessee Ag. & Industrial State College	
Texas A & M University	Unanswered
Prairie View A & M College	Yes
Utah State University	Yes
University of Vermont	
Virginia Polytech Institute	Unanswered
Virginia State College	Unanswered
Washington State University	Unanswered
West Virginia University	Yes
University of Wisconsin	Unanswered
University of Wyoming	No

INSTITUTION QUESTION #6

What do you feel to be the major contribution to your institution by the state central purchasing agency? (If no such agency exists, please indicate the major contribution if such did exist.)

Name of Institution	Major Contribution
Auburn	Unanswered
Alabama A & M	None
University of Alaska	
University of Arizona	Obtaining open-end contracts on items common to all agencies (providing quality is not sacrificed).
University of Arkansas	Central purchase of motor vehicles.
A, M, & Normal	
University of California (Davis)	Increased purchasing power; exchange of information.
Colorado State University	Unanswered
University of Connecticut	Large volume contracts (fuel, oil, vehicles, seeds and fertilizer).
University of Delaware	Purchasing of bulk items e.g., gasoline, fuel and vehicles.
University of Florida	Establishment of complete test facilities for product evaluation.
Florida A & M	Unanswered

University of Georgia	Defense of purchase against pressure groups.
Ft. Valley State	It has a greater number of vendors for a commodity and relieves us of obtaining bids.
University of Hawaii	Furnish low price and standard delivery on standardized items.
University of Idaho	State contracts saves money.
University of Illinois	Major guide-trends, market information, new techniques.
Purdue University (Indiana)	None
Iowa State	Hardly any.
Kansas State University	The advantage of large quantity buying, use of competitive bids, and buyers are specialized.
University of Kentucky	Major price contracts in certain areas.
Kentucky State	Better prices in most cases.
Louisiana State University	A limited number of worthwhile statewide contracts.
Southern University	
University of Maine	None
University of Maryland	Purchase of items as gas etc., which includes our specifications.
Maryland State College	It's the most economical procurement for major building projects.
University of Massachusetts	Contracts
Michigan State University	Contracts on light bulbs, gas, and fuel oil, tires, and batteries.
University of Minnesota	Volume buying on standard products.
Mississippi State University	Volume discounts.

Alcorn A & M	Unanswered
University of Missouri	
Lincoln University	Unanswered
Montana State	It can handle large acquisitions and "hot potato" items, e.g., cars and trucks.
University of Nebraska	Volume purchasing (e.g., vehicles)
University of Nevada	Immediate availability of commonly used items e.g., desks, chairs, bond paper, carbon papers, pencils and pens, etc., sacked sugar, and flour.
University of New Hampshire	Saves bidding (e.g., on paper, tires, and insurance).
The State University (New Jersey)	
New Mexico State University	State contracts.
Cornell University	Better prices on some commodities.
North Carolina State University	Many contracts are made that include our routine needs.
Ag. & Tech. College	Lower pricing.
North Dakota State University	Reduces our work load in securing bids, quotations, etc.
Ohio State	Not applicable
Oregon State University	Lower prices through quantity buying by combining requirements of all state agencies.
Pennsylvania State University	
University of Rhode Island	None
Clemson University	Better prices and state wide basis for purchasing.
South Carolina State College	Financial savings.

South Dakota State University	Quantity price on standard merchandise (office supplies and furniture, hardware, gasoline, tires, etc.).
University of Tennessee	Exists, but we operate independently of state agency.
Tennessee Ag. & Industrial State College	
Texas A & M University	Contracts on wide variety of MRO supplies.
Prairie View A & M College	Generally lower prices, specification standardization, inspection and analysis of goods with respect to standards and quality, stronger legal recourse with respect to poor vendor performance.
Utah State University	State contracts.
University of Vermont	
Virginia Polytech Institute	Volume contracts common to all, though too limited and restricted.
Virginia State College	Various contracts established for expediting the purchase items used by all state agencies at a better price.
Washington State University	Saves time since state makes many contracts and we order direct.
West Virginia University	State contracts.
University of Wisconsin	None
University of Wyoming	Quantity purchasing of non-technical items common to all (e.g., IBM cards).

INSTITUTION QUESTION #7

What do you feel is the major weakness, if any, of a state central purchasing agency relative to your institution?

Name of Institution	Major Weakness
Auburn	Delay in processing orders.
Alabama A & M	Local business firms do not have advantage of selling to the college.
University of Alaska	
University of Arizona	Too much paper work, not enough say-so as to quality, and not using <u>our</u> experience and say-so.
University of Arkansas	Compulsory centralized purchase of items under a term contract when our institution can purchase the same items under bid procedures at significantly lesser prices.
A, M, & Normal	
University of California (Davis)	None
Colorado State University	Distance factor and unawareness of special needs of the particular institution.
University of Connecticut	Time
University of Delaware	Unnecessary controls.
University of Florida	Delay in processing without commensurate savings in prices.

Florida A & M	Educational supplies and items needed for teaching could not be purchased as needed.
University of Georgia	Duplication of clerical effort.
Ft. Valley State	Too long a waiting period.
University of Hawaii	Time delay if desired change to meet University needs arises.
University of Idaho	Not qualified to handle University purchasing.
University of Illinois	Bureaucratic delays, lack of knowledge of Universities needs (especially research), costly communications for records sake, politics not in the best interest of the University.
Purdue University	Delay and red tape.
Iowa State University	Added delays.
Kansas State University	Time required to process orders.
University of Kentucky	Too much emphasis upon contracts and too little on service.
Kentucky State College	Time of delivery.
Louisiana State University	Delay caused by additional red tape in processing.
Southern University	
University of Maine	Over centralization, no direct contact with user and his needs and time delay.
University of Maryland	Too damn slow and lack of understanding of academic problems.
Maryland State College	Lack of speed.
University of Massachusetts	Slow and too much red tape and paper work.

Michigan State University	Too many contracts are on <u>cheapest</u> and not always <u>best</u> , e.g., dorm and office furniture.
University of Minnesota	Do not know how to buy for universities.
Mississippi State University	None
Alcorn A & M	Unanswered
University of Missouri	
Lincoln University	Delay and purchases not meeting specifications.
Montana State University	Too cumbersome and slow and unable to function efficiently to purchase creatively.
University of Nebraska	Too slow and lack of knowledge of use of the product.
University of Nevada	Continuous shortage of warehouse stock causing us to expensively buy small quantities until warehouse is again stocked.
University of New Hampshire	None
The State University (New Jersey)	
New Mexico State University	Delayed purchases.
Cornell University (New York)	Poorer delivery, sales representation, and service.
North Carolina State University	The agency contract prices which usually include transportation costs to anywhere in the state of North Carolina are sometimes higher than we would have to pay for the same or comparable items here in Raleigh.
Ag. & Tech. College	Unanswered
North Dakota State University	Loss of personal contact with representatives of companies, slower delivery, and we're required to purchase items we

North Dakota State University (continued)	feel are not satisfactory for our needs.
Ohio State University	Not applicable
Oregon State University	The time element in research areas where equipment and materials are needed immediately.
Pennsylvania State University	
University of Rhode Island	Slow, too much politics, items not received as needed, and difficult to cancel order when vendor is delinquent.
Clemson University	None
South Carolina State College	Slow delivery
South Dakota State University	Technical knowledge of products not known, higher cost and poor service from companies.
University of Tennessee	Time consuming, too far removed from requisitioner, and too complex and unwieldy.
Tennessee Ag. & Industrial State College	
Texas A & M University	Lack of product and resource knowledge on technical items. Quotations and purchase order delays on standard items.
Prairie View A & M College	Requisition processing quite time consuming, preference for particular brand or model of commodity not necessarily honored, dollar limitation on optional purchases too restrictive, order adjustments and invoice (payment) processings quite technical and time consuming.
Utah State University	Communications
University of Vermont	
Virginia Polytech Institute	Lack of institutional autonomy to determine what meets <u>its</u> needs best.

Virginia State College	Competitive purchasing of items which in some cases are not equal to that originally specified.
Washington State University	Delay in distribution of new contracts.
West Virginia University	Time loss, quality control is poor, unreliable vendors, loss of manufacturers discounts to teaching hospitals, etc.
University of Wisconsin	Prevents free hand in soliciting quotes which we are large enough and better prepared to do.
University of Wyoming	Delay in bidding and lack knowledge of specifications.

INSTITUTION QUESTION #8

In what general categories (e.g., vehicles, foods, laboratory supplies, insurance, furniture, etc.) of needs, if any, do you feel use of state central purchasing does or could result in significantly lower prices or better service than could be obtained by non-use of such agency?

Name of Institution	General Categories
Auburn	We may use any price the state has if the supplier will sell to us.
Alabama A & M	Vehicles
University of Alaska	
University of Arizona	Tires, batteries, paper, office supplies, and furniture (if including quality). Stick to items common to all agencies for contracts.
University of Arkansas	Vehicles, stationers supplies, tires, light bulbs, vehicle batteries.
A, M, & Normal	
University of California (Davis)	Vehicles, auto supplies, lamps, and computer tape.
Colorado State University	None
University of Connecticut	Large volume contracts (e.g., fuel oil, vehicles, seeds, and fertilizer.
University of Delaware	Bulk items such as vehicles, gas and fuel.

University of Florida	Vehicles are the exception to #7. It does create problems in that we cannot trade-in vehicles on state contract.
Florida A & M	Vehicles and insurance.
University of Georgia	Vehicles, food, insurance, major non-science equipment.
Ft. Valley State	Vehicles, canned food, insurance, office furniture, gasoline and oil fuels, farm equipment.
University of Hawaii	Vehicles, insurance, food, standard furniture, office equipment, POL and lumber.
University of Idaho	Fuel and heating oil, tab cards, gas and lube, tires, batteries, paper, etc.
University of Illinois	None (University gets better prices often.)
Purdue University (Indiana)	None
Iowa State	Vehicles (<u>possibly</u>)
Kansas State University	All if properly administered.
University of Kentucky	Vehicles, office furniture, and GSA prices on others.
Kentucky State College	Unanswered
Louisiana State University	Medical supplies, vehicles, and auto tires.
Southern University	
University of Maine	Only where institutions' needs are minimal and states' are voluminous.
University of Maryland	Vehicles, insurance, fuel oil and gasoline.
Maryland State College	Major building projects.
University of Massachusetts	Vehicles and food.

Michigan State University	None. We can do much better.
University of Minnesota	Unanswered
Mississippi State University	Vehicles, office machines, and tires.
Alcorn A & M	Unanswered
University of Missouri	
Lincoln University	Vehicles and paper supplies.
Montana State	Vehicles, printing, and fuels.
University of Nebraska	Vehicles
University of Nevada	Office furniture and supplies and all others such as vehicles bid on open-end contracts which institutions could accomplish the same.
University of New Hampshire	Insurance, tires, and paper.
The State University (New Jersey)	
New Mexico State University	None
Cornell University (New York)	Vehicles, laboratory supplies, gas, fuel oil, furniture, fans, and household appliances.
North Carolina State University	Vehicles
Ag. & Tech. College	All
North Dakota State University	Furniture, insurance, and petroleum products.
Ohio State	Vehicles, furniture, gasoline, fuel oil, light bulbs, and all general name brand items.
Oregon State University	All the above (vehicles, foods, laboratory supplies, insurance, furniture, etc.).
Pennsylvania State University	
University of Rhode Island	Insurance
Clemson University	Vehicles, furniture.

South Carolina State College	Vehicles, supplies.
South Dakota State University	Standard merchandise, such as office supplies and furniture, hardware, gas, tires, etc.
University of Tennessee	None
Tennessee Ag. & Ind. State College	
Texas A & M University	Standard office furniture and others where volume affects price by combining requisitions of all agencies.
Prairie View A & M College	All of the categories listed plus office supplies and animal feed.
Utah State University	Gas, oil, and insurance.
University of Vermont	
Virginia Polytech Institute	Paper, furniture, office supplies, and contract areas, such as household appliances, fuel oil, etc.
Virginia State College	All
Washington State University	Vehicles, pipe and fittings, insurance, food, tires, batteries, air conditioners, drugs, surgical supplies, glass, forms, IBM cards and photo supplies.
West Virginia University	Vehicles, paper, office furniture and insurance.
University of Wisconsin	None
University of Wyoming	None (perhaps insurance)

INSTITUTION QUESTION #9

In what general categories of needs, if any, do you feel use of state central purchasing agency results in no significantly better (or essentially the same) prices and service that could be obtained by non-use of such agency?

Name of Institution	General Categories
Auburn	Unanswered
Alabama A & M	Food and laboratory supplies.
University of Alaska	
University of Arizona	Automobiles and <u>some</u> paper (e.g., photographic).
University of Arkansas	Office machines, foods, laboratory supplies, furniture.
A, M, & Normal	
University of California (Davis)	Food and paper goods.
Colorado State University	All categories.
University of Connecticut	Laboratory supplies and equipment, furniture and food.
University of Delaware	All others. (All items except bulk items such as vehicles, gas, and fuel.)
University of Florida	Paper, light bulbs, furniture, science supplies, laboratory furniture and equipment, and food.
Florida A & M	Unanswered

University of Georgia	Almost all others. (Almost all except vehicles, food, insurance, major non-science equipment.)
Ft. Valley State College	Building supplies, farm animals and feed, sanitary supplies, household furniture and furnishings.
University of Hawaii	Education equipment, laboratory supplies and equipment, and service.
University of Idaho	Nearly all categories.
University of Illinois	None
Purdue University (Indiana)	Practically all.
Iowa State University	Most commodities.
Kansas State University	Items available from only one source (e.g., special scientific component parts available from one source only) and \$200.00 orders or less.
University of Kentucky	Food, laboratory supplies, dental and hospital supplies and insurance.
Kentucky State College	Unanswered
Louisiana State University	Office supplies and furniture, foods, operating and maintenance supplies, fertilizers, incandescent and fluorescent lamps, gasoline, janitorial supplies, office machines.
Southern University	
University of Maine	Dormitory furniture and science supplies and equipment.
University of Maryland	Food, furniture, laboratory supplies and equipment, and science apparatus.
Maryland State College	General procurement.
University of Massachusetts	All, except for small institutions, central purchasing is best.

Michigan State University	Vehicles, laboratory equipment and supplies, food and furniture.
University of Minnesota	Unanswered
Mississippi State University	Food, books, paper, etc. Varies with agency.
Alcorn A & M	Unanswered
University of Missouri	
Lincoln University	Laboratory supplies, furniture, and insurance.
Montana State University	MRO items, science supplies and instruments, and furniture.
University of Nebraska	All others. (All except vehicles)
University of Nevada	Administrative charge (3%) plus increase in paper work and slow action.
University of New Hampshire	None, except insurance, tires, and paper.
The State University (New Jersey)	
New Mexico State University	All
Cornell University (New York)	Chemicals, electronic equipment, science equipment, paper and paper products, office supplies, business machines, and MRO supplies.
North Carolina State University	Office and maintenance supplies and technical and science equipment.
Ag. & Tech. College	None
North Dakota State University	Vehicles, food, and laboratory supplies.
Ohio State	Food, laboratory supplies, medical supplies, office supplies.
Oregon State University	Specialized equipment, especially in research areas.

Pennsylvania State Univ.	
University of Rhode Island	All
Clemson University	None
S. Carolina State College	Foods
S. Dakota State University	Laboratory supplies and equipment, technical equipment, cattle, feed, seed, athletic supplies, and medical equipment.
University of Tennessee	No information since we don't use Central Purchasing.
Tennessee Ag. & Ind. State College	
Texas A & M College	Technical equipment, especially science research.
Prairie View A & M College	Office machines.
Utah State University	Tires, paints, lumber, and photo supplies.
University of Vermont	
Virginia Polytech Institute	Optical equipment (must use Central Purchasing) industrial equipment and refrigeration equipment.
Virginia State College	None
Washington State Univ.	Farm equipment, science equipment, hardware supplies, cutlery, and office machines.
West Virginia University	Food, laboratory supplies and equipment and any or all selected items.
University of Wisconsin	None, but only because we're large and not because the state is incompetent.
University of Wyoming	All categories not common to all state departments.

INSTITUTION QUESTION #10

Is your institution's cost of processing bids, purchase orders, and other documents related to acquisition of goods or services through use of state central purchasing agency as compared to non-use, increased _____, decreased _____, unchanged _____?

Name of Institution	Increased (I)	Decreased (D)	Unchanged
Auburn	Unanswered		
Alabama A & M	"Not used"		
University of Alaska			
University of Arizona	I		
University of Arkansas A, M, & Normal			U
University of California (Davis)			U
Colorado State University	I		
University of Connecticut			U
University of Delaware			U
University of Florida	I		
Florida A & M	Unanswered		
University of Georgia	I		
Ft. Valley State	I		
University of Hawaii	"Unknown"		
University of Idaho			U

University of Illinois	I	Estimated on comparison of general information.	
Purdue University (Indiana)		Unanswered	
Iowa State		Unanswered	
Kansas State University			U
University of Kentucky	I		
Kentucky State College			U
Louisiana State Univ.	I		
Southern University			
University of Maine			U
University of Maryland			U
Maryland State Univ.		"Not applicable"	
University of Massachusetts			D
Michigan State University			U
University of Minnesota		Unanswered	
Mississippi State Univ.			D
Alcorn A & M		Unanswered	
University of Missouri			
Lincoln University			D
Montana State	I		
University of Nebraska	I	(invoices and checks)	
University of Nevada			D
Univ. of New Hampshire	I		
The State University (New Jersey)			
New Mexico State Univ.	I		
Cornell University (New York)	I		

N. Carolina State Univ.		D	
Ag. & Tech. College	Unanswered		
N. Dakota State Univ.		D	
Ohio State	"Not applicable"		
Oregon State University		D	
Pennsylvania State Univ.			
Univ. of Rhode Island	I		
Clemson University			U
S. Carolina State Univ.			U
S. Dakota State University	I	(service decreased)	
Univ. of Tennessee	Unanswered	(Since we don't use state purchasing, unable to answer)	
Tenn. Ag. & Ind. State College			
Texas A & M University		D (slightly)	
Prairie View A & M College		D	
Utah State University			U
University of Vermont			
Virginia Polytech Institute	I		
Virginia State College		D	
Washington State Univ.		D	
West Virginia University			U
Univ. of Wisconsin	I		
University of Wyoming	I		

INSTITUTION QUESTION #11

If, or when, state central purchasing agency is used by your institution, is the time required to obtain goods or services significantly increased _____, decreased _____, unchanged _____?

Name of Institution	Increased (I)	Decreased (D)	Unchanged (U)
Auburn	Unanswered		
Alabama A & M	"Not used"		
University of Alaska			
University of Arizona	I		
University of Arkansas A, M, & Normal		D (in some)	U (in some)
University of California (Davis)			U
Colorado State Univ.	I		
Univ. of Connecticut	I		
Univ. of Delaware			U
University of Florida	I		
Florida A & M			
University of Georgia	I		
Ft. Valley State	I		
University of Hawaii			U
University of Idaho			U
University of Illinois	I		

Purdue University (Indiana)	Unanswered	
Iowa State	I	
Kansas State University	I	
Univ. of Kentucky	I	
Kentucky State College		D
Louisiana State Univ.	I	
Southern University		
University of Maine		U
	We use only State contracts on auto supplies and gas and oil for vehicles. Also, insurance. (separate state agency, not purchasing)	
University of Maryland	I	
Maryland State Univ.	I	
Univ. of Massachusetts	I	
Michigan State University		U
University of Minnesota	Unanswered	
Mississippi State Univ.		D
Alcorn A & M	Unanswered	
University of Missouri		
Lincoln University	I	
Montana State	I	
Univ. of Nebraska	I	
University of Nevada	I	
Univ. of New Hampshire	I	
The State University		
New Mexico State Univ.	I	
Cornell University (New York)	I	

N. Carolina State University	I	
Ag. & Tech. College		U
N. Dakota State University	I	
Ohio State		"Not applicable"
Oregon State University	I	
Pennsylvania State Univ.		
Univ. of Rhode Island	I	
Clemson University		U
S. Carolina State College		U
S. Dakota State University	I	(service decreased)
Univ. of Tennessee	I	(We actually never go through State Purchasing so cannot answer; If we used it, it would have to increase time required to process, etc.)
Tenn. Ag. & Ind. State College		
Texas A & M University	I	
Prairie View A & M College	I	
Utah State University	I	
University of Vermont		
Virginia Polytech Institute	I	
Virginia State College	I	
Washington State Univ.	I	
West Virginia University	I	
University of Wisconsin	I	(When the price exceeds \$3,000, our own inquiries must follow state regulations, which slows the procurement process. Purchasing from state secured law bidders on certain items does not slow up the procurement time.)
University of Wyoming	I	

APPENDIX C

THE INVESTIGATOR'S CLASSIFICATION OF
UNDIRECTED RESPONSES TO THE
STATE QUESTIONNAIRE

STATE QUESTION #4

Rank	Number of Responses	Response
1	18	Quantity buying advantage, better prices due to pooled purchases, buying power of Central Purchasing by purchasing in large quantity, University receives benefit of larger volume purchasing, low prices due to combining common use requirements, low prices due to purchasing power, bulk purchasing of gasoline and fuel oil, savings by consolidating University requirements with others on items common to all, lower prices through volume purchasing, advantage of large volumes tend to give us better contact with the vendors, purchasing by volume, would create greater volume for Central Purchasing, strong bargaining power due to volume purchasing, efficiency through volume, efficiency due to our volume of business transacted, savings on volume buying, economy of purchasing through combining requirements of all state agencies, volume buying and use of state contract prices, consolidation of purchases for greater volume.
2	10	Efficiency due to our experience, efficiency through specialization (and standards), staff specialization, additional services offered (inspection, standards and specifications, interior designing), service, service and delivery, more complete coverage of supplies, advantage of more prospective bidders, would eliminate senseless duplication of function, gives the University a basis for cost comparison, purchasing on specifications and not on personal wishes, objective and impartial approach to purchasing (freedom from pressures of campus personnel and hierarchy).
3	7	Savings, substantial savings on items other than MRO and teaching supplies, better prices, save money while keeping control in University administrations' hands, better prices (service and delivery), better prices, lower prices on

practically all categories (except books) would result, lower prices.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 7 | Central Supply's contract award manual contracts on gas, oil, tires, tubes, etc., contracts, advantages of annual contracts, savings on contracted buying, buying power through use of annual contracts, contract buying, volume buying and use of state contract prices. |
| 4 | 4 | Setting standards and specifications for all state agencies, standards/value analysis program, uniform procurement procedures, efficiency through (specialization and standards, increased standardization). |

STATE QUESTION #5

Rank	Number of Responses	Responses
1	8	Communication (4), lack of communication, misunderstanding, lack of good communication, imperfections in communication and mutual understanding of problems.
2	9	None (9)
3	11	Unanswered (9), does not apply, university does not go through central purchasing.
4	7	We have no control of purchases from university's cash funds, no capability for purchase of specialty items peculiar to the educational equipment needs of the university, purchasing agent's inability to determine if he can acquire with best economy and efficiency through central agency or on bids by quantity purchased, the schools are able to obtain better prices on typewriters, desks, etc., for instructional purposes, poor quality of personnel and lack of experience and professionalism, inability to buy value, purchase of scientific equipment.
5	5	Time loss, longer lead time would be required if the central agency were used, time element (takes longer to process, receive bids, etc.), failure to obtain proper lead time from the college, poor response time.

STATE QUESTION #6

Rank	Number of Responses	Responses
1	16	Furniture and fixtures (6), office supplies and equipment (5), business machines (2), computer supplies, magnetic tape, all, especially foods and furniture.
2	13	All (5), all, especially foods and furniture, all except contracts for professional services, all except MRO insurance and non-competitive items, all except foods, all items common to the University and other state agencies, all except books, all volume purchase items, all items used by the University, almost all commodities and equipment, all categories.
3	8	Detergents and germicides, light bulbs (2), maintenance supplies, janitor supplies and equipment (2), plumbing and electrical supplies, hardware.
4	7	Food (4), canned goods, some foods, all, especially foods and furniture.
5	5	Laboratory supplies (2), hospital supplies, glass, drugs and pharmaceuticals.
5	5	Gasoline (3), bulk fuel oil, motor oil.
5	5	Tires and tubes (4), batteries.
6	4	Rough paper items, paper products (3).
7	1	Fertilizers
7	1	Insurance
7	1	Printing
7	1	Scheduled or contract purchases.
7	1	Vehicles

STATE QUESTION #7

Rank	Number of Responses	Responses
1	8	Food (2), meat (2) and perishables (3), fresh fruits and vegetables.
1	8	Sole source items (4), non-competitive items, fair-trade items, manufacturer controlled price items, para-purchasing items.
1	8	Educational items, teaching tools, instructional material, music and art supplies, textbook (2), books, periodicals.
2	5	Science equipment, chemicals, laboratory supplies, special feeds products used in experiment areas, possibly scientific equipment.
3	3	Locally purchased items, small purchases (2).
3	3	Most services and service contracts (3).
4	2	Office equipment, office machines.
3	3	None (3)
5	1	Insurance
5	1	Hardware
5	1	Janitor Supplies
5	1	Furniture
5	1	MRO Supplies
5	1	Livestock

STATE QUESTION #8

Rank	Number of Responses	Responses
1	12	None (11), not a dime.
1	12	Do not know (6), no definite amount available, breakdown not available, "?", unknown, Institution has never used Central Purchasing, would depend on volume.
1	12	Very nominal, not significantly, very slight, less than it would cost the University to perform the same function, very little (3), minimal, very minimal (2), if the University performed same function cost would be 3 times as much, $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1% of our dollar volume.
3	8	Unanswered (7), does not apply.

APPENDIX D

THE INVESTIGATOR'S CLASSIFICATION OF
UNDIRECTED RESPONSES TO THE
INSTITUTION QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTITUTION QUESTION #6

Rank	Number of Responses	Response
1	16	Exchange of information, establishment of complete test facilities for product evaluation, defense of purchases against pressure groups, major guide trends, market information, new techniques, it can handle large acquisitions and "hot-potato" items (such as vehicles), purchase of bulk items, reduces our work load in securing bids, quotes, etc., saves bidding, buyers are specialized, specification standardization, inspection and analysis of goods with respect to standards and quality, stronger legal recourse with respect to poor vendor performance, state-wide basis for purchasing.
2	15	Contracts on items common to all agencies, large volume contracts (3), saves money through state contracts, major price contracts in certain areas, contracts on light bulbs, gas and fuel oil, tires and batteries, contracts (3), contracts on many routine needs, volume contracts on items common to all agencies of the state, saves us time due to contracts, immediate availability of commonly used items, various contracts established for expediting the purchase of items used by all state agencies at a better price.
3	11	Better prices on some items, low prices and standard delivery on standardized items, generally lower prices, financial savings, better prices, better prices in most cases, procurement economy for major building contracts, lower prices through quantity buying (2), saves money through state contracts, various contracts established for expediting the purchase of items used by all state agencies at a better price.
4	9	Volume buying (2), volume discounts, lower prices due to quantity purchasing of non-

technical items common to all agencies of the state, increased purchasing power offers advantage of large quantity buying, volume contracts on items common to all agencies of the state, quantity price on standard items, quantity.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| 5 | 6 | None (5), hardly any. |
| 6 | 1 | Use of competitive bids, central purchase of motor vehicles. |

INSTITUTION QUESTION #7

Rank	Number of Responses	Response
1	26	<p>Delay in processing orders, time, delay in processing without commensurate savings in prices, slow, time loss, delay in bidding, too long a waiting period, time delay if desired change to meet University's needs arises, added delays, time required to process orders, delay caused by additional red tape in processing, time delay, too damn slow, lack of speed, slow (2), delay (2), too slow, delayed purchases, time element in research areas where equipment and materials are needed immediately, quotation and purchase order delays on standard items, bureaucratic delays, requisition processing quite time consuming, order adjustments and invoice (payment) processings quite technical and time consuming, time of delivery.</p>
2	15	<p>Too much red tape and paper work, red tape, too much paper work, costly communications for records sake, unnecessary controls, too cumbersome, too complex and unweildy, too much politics, politics not in the best interest of the University, duplication of clerical effort, unable to function efficiently to purchase creatively, order adjustments and invoice (payment) processings quite technical and time consuming, dollar limitation on optional purchases too restrictive, communications, over centralization.</p>
3	11	<p>Items not received as needed, poorer delivery, poorer sales representation, poorer service, loss of personal contact with vendors representatives, slower delivery, too difficult to cancel order when vendor is delinquent, higher cost and poorer service from companies, unreliable vendors, quality control is poor, slow delivery.</p>

- 4 9 Technical knowledge of product not known, lack of knowledge of use of the product, not qualified to handle university purchasing, lack of knowledge of university's needs (especially research), lack of understanding of academic problems, do not know how to buy for universities, lack of product and resource knowledge on technical items, lack of knowledge on specified items, unawareness of special needs of the particular institution.
- 4 9 Lack of institutional autonomy to determine what meets its needs best, purchases not meeting our specifications (2), we are required to purchase items we feel are not satisfactory for our needs, not enough say-so as to quality, too many contracts are on cheapest and not always the best, too much emphasis on contracts and not enough on service, competitive purchasing of items which in some cases are not equal to that originally specified, preference for particular brand or model of commodity not necessarily honored.
- 4 9 None
- 5 6 Not using our experience and say-so, educational supplies and items needed for teaching could not be purchased as needed, prevents free hand in soliciting quotes which we are large enough and better prepared to do, loss of manufacturers discounts to teaching hospitals, etc., agency contract prices sometimes higher than we would have to pay for the same or comparable items, compulsory centralized purchase of items under a term contract when our institution can purchase the same items under bid procedures at significantly lesser prices.
- 6 5 Distance factor, no direct contact with user and his needs, delay in distribution of new contracts, local business firms do not have the advantage of selling to the college, continuous shortage of warehouse stock items causing us to expensively buy small quantities until warehouse is again stocked.

INSTITUTION QUESTION #8

Rank	Number of Responses	Response
1	27	Vehicles (27)
2	20	Gasoline (8), fuels, fuel oil (8), lube, petroleum products, oil.
3	19	Furniture (15), household appliances (2), fans, air conditioners.
4	14	Insurance (14)
5	13	Tires (8), batteries (3), auto supplies, vehicle batteries.
6	12	Office supplies and equipment (not including furniture) (6), computer tape, tab cards, IBM cards, forms, stationers supplies, office supplies.
7	10	Farm equipment, seeds, fertilizer, animal feed, all (3), all general name brand items, supplies, major building projects.
8	9	Standard items, items common to all agencies for contracts (2), large volume contracts, only where institutions needs are minimal and the states needs are voluminous, bulk items (2), GSA prices, POL, contract items.
9	8	Paper (6), printing supplies, photo supplies.
9	8	None
10	7	Food (2), canned foods (5).
10	7	Medical supplies, drugs, surgical supplies, lab supplies (3), glassware.
11	6	Hardware, pipe fittings, lumber, lamps, light bulbs (2).

INSTITUTION QUESTION #9

Rank	Number of Responses	Response
1	32	Laboratory supplies and equipment (14), science supplies and equipment (2), scientific apparatus, science research items (2), laboratory furniture and equipment, dental supplies, hospital supplies, medical equipment, optical equipment, chemicals, electronic equipment, technical supplies and equipment (3), laboratory supplies (2), medical supplies.
2	15	Building supplies, operation and maintenance supplies (2), janitor supplies, sanitary supplies, light bulbs (2), paint, lumber, hardware, supplies, cutlery, industrial equipment, refrigeration equipment, any or all selected MRO items (2).
3	10	Furniture (8), dormitory furniture, household furniture and furnishings.
4	9	Office supplies (4), office machines (4), business machines.
5	8	All (3), almost all, practically all, most commodities, all except for small institutions, all not common to all state departments.
6	7	Farm animals, cattle, fertilizer, feed (2), seed, farm equipment.
7	6	None (5), none if large enough institution.
8	5	Paper (2), paper and paper products, some paper (2).
9	4	Food (4)
10	3	Sole source items, specialized equipment.
10	3	Photo paper (2), photo supplies.

10	3	Insurance (3)
10	3	Automobiles (3)
11	2	Education equipment, books.
11	2	\$200.00 orders or less, general procurement.
11	2	Tires (2)
12	1	Service
12	1	Gasoline
12	1	Athletic supplies.

VITA\

Fred L. McBride

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES OF PURCHASING DIRECTORS OF THE STATE CENTRAL PURCHASING AGENCIES AND THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE UNITED STATES REGARDING USE OF A STATE CENTRAL AGENCY BY THE LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS.

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born December 7, 1936, at Walnut Ridge, Arkansas, but grew up and attended elementary and secondary schools at Ripley, Oklahoma. Served as an officer in the United States Army Medical Service Corps.

Education: Graduated from Ripley (Oklahoma) High School, May, 1955; received the Bachelor of Science degree from Oklahoma State University, May, 1960, with a major in Science Education; received the Master of Science from Oklahoma State University, May, 1962, with a major in Science Education; attended Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee (Oklahoma), summer of 1963, on a National Science Foundation Grant in Physics; completed requirements for the Ed.D. from Oklahoma State University, May, 1970, with a major in Higher Education.

Professional Experience: Taught Science at Ripley High School, Ripley, Oklahoma, 1960-1962. Taught Science at Cushing High School, Cushing, Oklahoma, 1963-1964. Employed as Assistant Purchasing Agent at Oklahoma State University, 1965-1969. Member of the National Association of Educational Buyers.