

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

75-2965

COLCLAZIER, James L., 1929-
AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
PERCEIVED GOALS AND PRACTICES IN FOUR
OKLAHOMA COMMUNITY COLLEGES.

The University of Oklahoma, Ed.D., 1974
Education, higher

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
PERCEIVED GOALS AND PRACTICES IN FOUR
OKLAHOMA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY

JAMES L. COLCLAZIER

Norman, Oklahoma

1974

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
PERCEIVED GOALS AND PRACTICES IN FOUR
OKLAHOMA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

APPROVED BY:

Dorothy T. W. 24

Robert R. J. Leggett

Lucy Williams

Jack J. Barker

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appreciation is expressed to the members of the dissertation committee for their guidance throughout my studies. I am especially indebted to Dr. Herbert R. Hengst for his valuable assistance in the study, and to my major advisor, Dr. Dorothy Truex for her constant support and guidance. Dr. Lloyd Williams and Dr. Jack Parker have also provided wise counsel.

Appreciation is offered to Dr. William H. Graves for his assistance on computer and statistical problems related to the study.

The permission and encouragement of Mr. Elmer Tanner, President of Seminole Junior College and its Board of Regents, and the cooperation of faculty, students, and administrators of the four community colleges studied (Carl Albert Junior College, El Reno Junior College, Sayre Junior College, and Seminole Junior College) is deeply appreciated.

The investigator also expresses gratitude for the encouragement and support of the Center for the Study of Higher Education of the University of Oklahoma and the five research team members who participated in the coordinated goals

study project: Leon D. Kroeker, Lynn W. Lindemann, Maryjo C. Lockwood, and especially Robert L. Lynn and Kenneth J. Peterson.

Deepest appreciation is due my wife and typist, Pat, and my children, Jay David, Jerry Lynn, and Tricia Lee, who have allowed me time away from them to pursue this study.

Finally, I wish to dedicate this work to my parents, Roy and Thelma Colclazier, who, despite a limited formal education for themselves, have never lost sight of this goal for me throughout the years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Need for the Study	6
Purpose of the Study	9
Statement of the Problem	9
Theoretical Assumptions	12
Hypotheses	14
Definition of Terms	15
Limitations of the Study	16
II. SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE	18
Summary	30
III. METHODOLOGY	32
Design	32
Instrumentation	33
Populations and Data Collection	42
Statistical Analysis	44
Summary	47
IV. REPORT OF FINDINGS	49
Goals	50
Practices	58
Correlation	71
Summary	79

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . .	84
Summary	84
College A	84
College B	90
College C	94
College D	98
Faculty	103
Students	107
Administrators	109
Conclusions	111
Recommendations for Further Study	114
APPENDICES.	116
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	131

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Coefficient Alpha Reliabilities, Standard Errors of Measurement, and Means on IGI-Present Dimension.	38
2. IFI-OUM Test-Retest Reliability Coefficients (Three Administrations).	40
3. Spearman's Coefficient of Rank Correlation Between Rankings of IFI-OUM Grand Means and Rankings of Independent Raters	42
4. Number of Participants From Each College Providing Data for the Study	49
5. Approximate F Test for MANOVA on the IGI for Significant Interaction of Groups and Colleges	50
6. Univariate F Tests for MANOVA on the IGI for Significant Interaction Effects.	51
7. Approximate F Test for MANOVA on the IGI for Significant Differences Among Groups Within Colleges.	52
8. Univariate F Tests for MANOVA on the IGI for Significant Differences Among Groups Within Colleges.	54
9. Approximate F Test for MANOVA on the IGI for Significant Differences Within Groups Across Colleges.	55
10. Univariate F Tests for MANOVA on the IGI for Significant Differences Within Groups Across Colleges.	56

Table	Page
11. Approximate F Test for MANOVA on the IFI-OUM for Significant Interaction of Groups and Colleges on Twelve Scales.	59
12. Univariate F Tests for MANOVA on the IFI-OUM for Significant Interaction of Groups and Colleges on Twelve Scales.	59
13. Approximate F Test for MANOVA on the IFI-OUM for Significant Differences Among Groups Within Colleges on Twelve Scales	60
14. Univariate F Tests for MANOVA on the IFI-OUM for Significant Differences Among Groups Within Colleges on Twelve Scales	61
15. Approximate F Test for MANOVA on the IFI-OUM for Significant Differences Within Groups Across Colleges on Twelve Scales	63
16. Univariate F Tests for MANOVA on the IFI-OUM for Significant Differences Within Groups Across Colleges on Twelve Scales	64
17. Approximate F Test for MANOVA on the IFI-OUM for Significant Interaction of Groups and Colleges on Eight Scales	66
18. Univariate F Tests for MANOVA on the IFI-OUM for Significant Interaction of Groups and Colleges on Eight Scales	67
19. Approximate F Test for MANOVA on the IFI-OUM for Significant Differences Between Groups Within Colleges on Eight Scales.	67
20. Univariate F Tests for MANOVA on the IFI-OUM for Significant Differences Between Groups Within Colleges on Eight Scales.	68
21. Approximate F Test for MANOVA on the IFI-OUM for Significant Differences Within Groups Across Colleges.	69

Table	Page
22. Univariate F Tests for MANOVA on the IFI-OUM for Significant Differences Within Groups Across Colleges	69
23. Summary of Significant Differences Among Groups and Among Colleges	72
24. Pearson R Correlation Coefficients for All Participants on Twenty Scales	74
25. Pearson R Correlation Coefficients for Twenty Scales and Two Groups and Twelve Scales and Three Groups	75
26. A Comparison of Pearson R and Eta Correlation Coefficients for Paired Scores of All Participants	78
27. A Comparison of Pearson R and Eta Correlation Coefficients of Faculty and Administrators . . .	80
28. A Comparison of Pearson R and Eta Correlation Coefficients for Paired Scores of Three Groups on Twelve Scales	81

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
PERCEIVED GOALS AND PRACTICES IN FOUR
OKLAHOMA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Growth has traditionally been used as a measure of progress. The number of institutions, the number of students enrolled, and the amount of money committed to higher education all indicate remarkable growth.

Between 1955 and 1965, the number of high school graduates increased more than eighty-five percent; the number of those graduates going on to college increased one-hundred percent.¹ Today, more than half of our young people enter colleges, compared to less than twenty-five percent only twenty years ago.²

In the last two decades the total number of institutions of higher education has increased from 1,850 to nearly 2,500 and average enrollment has doubled.³

¹U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, Digest of Educational Statistics, 1970 (Washington: 1970), p. 49.

²U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, "School Enrollment: October, 1969" (Washington: 1969), Series P-20, No. 206, table 1, p. 67.

³Digest of Educational Statistics, 1970, "Opening Fall Enrollment in Higher Education, 1969", table 102.

Total higher education outlays, public and private have been increased at two-and-one-half times the rate of increase in the Gross National Product--which has itself grown nearly fourfold since 1950.¹

Higher education has served as a social instrument and has contributed to the accelerating progression of technological advancement, increasing productivity, and rising standard of living. Education is a social "good" in our society.²

Despite this growth, however, and maybe partially because of it, higher education is faced with continuing stress. This stress varies from declarations that higher education has "failed to serve the education needs of students" to an assertion that "they fail to achieve their own stated purposes".³

Heyns uses the phrase, "a mindless and inefficient stumbling from crisis to crisis".⁴

¹U. S. Bureau of the Census, The Statistical Abstract of the United States, 91st edition (Washington: 1970), Table 147, p. 104.

²Jane Matson, "Student Constituencies--Real and Potential", An Agenda for National Action, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (Washington: 1972), p. 9.

³Nevitt Sanford, The American College (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967), p. 2.

⁴Roger Heyns, "Stress and Administrative Authority", Stress and Campus Response, p. 163

Frankel declares that "no thinking man could pronounce anything but a severe judgment on the present condition of higher education."¹ Mayhew begins an essay by stating that American higher education stands on the verge of "imminent impotency".² Van Waes contends that students measure colleges by the criteria that the colleges have taught are appropriate for judging social institutions and found them wanting.³

Hartnett, Research Psychologist with Educational Testing Service, states that the time has arrived for higher education to take a closer look at itself. While there has always been a need for institutions to evaluate themselves, the external pressure for higher education to take stock of itself is higher than ever before in history.⁴

According to a report by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, "higher education has come upon hard times.

¹Charles Frankel, "The Educational Impact of American Foreign Policy", Stress and Campus Response, p. 52.

²Lewis Mayhew, "A Rendering of Accounts", *ibid.*, p. 144.

³Robert Van Waes, "Student Freedoms and Educational Reform", *ibid.*, p. 66.

⁴Rodney T. Hartnett, Accountability in Higher Education (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1971), p. 1.

The trouble is serious enough to be called a depression."

This study predicts that, if the current trend continues, almost all higher education institutions eventually will be in financial trouble.¹ Support for this position is given by a report from the American Association for Higher Education, which claims that not only is support for higher education descending rapidly, but also that there is no indication of a let-up in the money squeeze for at least the next five years.²

Closer to home, the Oklahoma Higher Education Alumni Council stated in September, 1972, that Oklahoma's investment in higher education has rapidly declined in comparison with other states, ranking forty-ninth among the fifty states in terms of state or local appropriations per student. In 1971-72, Oklahoma invested \$894 per student compared with a national average of \$1,625. Oklahoma ranked 42nd nationally in appropriations to higher education compared to per capita personal income within the state.³

¹Earl F. Cheit, The New Depression in Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), p. 4.

²Robert T. Blackburn, "Changes in Faculty Life Styles", Research Report Number 1, American Association for Higher Education (Washington: 1972), p. 41.

³Higher Education Alumni Council of Oklahoma Newsletter, Vol. 2, No. 9, July, 1972.

But what about the specific institution, the most recent development of higher education in America, the junior college? Medsker calls it "... (a) unique institution, found nowhere else in the world."¹ The growth of these two year colleges approximated one per week during the decade of the sixties. This rate of growth was only slightly less sensational during 1971 and 1972, with a total of 1,141 two year colleges reported at the end of that period.²

The decade of the sixties also saw an explosion in two year college enrollments, with 2,704,000 enrolled in 1973 compared to 660,000 in 1960. Average enrollment of individual institutions increased from less than 1,000 to more than 2,500 during the same period.³

Oklahoma has not followed the national trend toward large increases in the number of junior colleges during the decade of the sixties due to a near over-abundance of these and four year institutions established prior to the sixties. There were twenty junior colleges in Oklahoma in 1943, the

¹Leland Medsker, The Junior College: Progress and Prospect, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960), p. v.

²American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1973 Community and Junior College Directory, (Washington: 1973), p. 86.

³ibid., p. 86.

most ever, with this number falling to twelve in 1958, prior to the new emphasis during the decade of the sixties.¹

Since 1960, one junior college has become a four year institution, three large, urban community colleges have been established, and a military academy has been converted to a comprehensive junior college. At the present time there are eight state-owned colleges, three urban community junior colleges, and four rural community junior colleges, along with several private two year colleges. Three of the rural community colleges have recently been accepted into the State System of Higher Education and it is anticipated that the fourth will be soon.

Despite the relative lack of increase in the number of junior colleges, there have been significant enrollment increases. Approximately one-third of all lower division students are currently enrolled in a two year college within the state. Projections point toward the enrollment of half by the end of the seventies.²

Need for the Study

Dressel insists that higher education has a special

¹Medsker, The Junior College, p. 266.

²Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, A Plan for the Seventies, p. 14.

obligation to carry a program of institutional research beyond obvious concerns for efficiency and effectiveness, and many colleges and universities have not yet faced even those problems. He cites the need for decisions based upon evidence, for higher education models that students are supposed to emulate.¹

Most of this type of attention has been given prestigious institutions, while those that are less restrictive such as the junior colleges, whose problems are undoubtedly more severe, have been largely ignored.²

Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson warn that the tremendous recent growth of the junior college causes additional problems for those engaged in their administration and control. Many beliefs about two year colleges are held with "an emotional fervor analagous to that of the religious zealot".³ While this fervor is necessary during the early period of an institution's existence, maturity must come with age. This

¹Paul L. Dressel, Institutional Research in the University: A Handbook (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1971), p. xi.

²American Association of Higher Education, Report on Higher Education, 1971, (Washington: 1971), p. 9.

³Clyde E. Blocker, Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, Jr., The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. vi.

fervor must give way to a willingness to examine a variety of points of view, regardless of how heretical some may seem.¹

The two year college must also move toward a comprehensive program to provide evidence toward its future development. Gleazer says it well:

That the community college is now a big segment of post-secondary education is a fact. That it is still in process of establishing its identity is apparent. That great expectations are held by its adherents is obvious. But the highway is not straight and clear enough to eliminate the need for forethought so that risks can be minimized.²

Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson also cite the need for examination of the over-all concepts which govern the methods and procedures of the junior college.³

John Roueche is another of the large number of educational theorists and practitioners who are calling for an examination of goals and actual practices in order to discover where the institution perceives itself to be going and whether or not they are achieving their goals. Roueche reasons that the goals of an institution constitute its reason .

¹Paul L. Dressel, Institutional Research in the University: A Handbook (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1971, p. xi.

²Edmund Gleazer, This is the Community College (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1968), p. 79.

³Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson, The Two Year College, p. v.

to exist. Consequently, educational leaders must continually ask themselves task-oriented questions. Is the college accomplishing its mission? Are its goals up to date? Are its objectives being achieved? If not, what changes are needed to get back on target?¹

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between perceived goals and practices in four community colleges in the State of Oklahoma. It is a portion of a larger study which will investigate these relationships in a number of different types of higher education institutions. Are these institutions participating in practices that are perceived by the most active participants to be related to over-all goals and objectives?

Statement of the Problem

There can be little doubt that higher education needs to discover new and better ways to measure the effectiveness of its mission and it appears that the need may be even greater in the two year college than in the remainder of the higher education spectrum. Felix Robb says:

¹John Roueche, Accountability for Student Learning, a paper presented to the 1970 Convention of the Oklahoma Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

To know the score in education (and millions of Americans are clamoring for just that), we need first to identify in a clear and precise way our goals.¹

It appears evident that this is so, the difficulty being, of course that too few institutions have seriously considered what their goals are, and those that have often find that the various members of the college community disagree over what the purposes of the institution should be. A second step must certainly be an evaluation of the extent to which these goals are being reached or at least strived for.

How can effectiveness be measured? How can a small two year college discover whether its goals and objectives are being met?

A number of political and social developments have converged to produce widespread demands for accountability. Evaluation has traditionally been concerned with how well or to what degree the goals of a program were attained. In many ways educational accountability and educational evaluation are much the same. Accountability, like evaluation, is primarily concerned with the effect of certain practices affecting the students. Accountability deals with effectiveness, but also with efficiency, or its capacity to achieve results with a

¹Felix C. Robb, "Regional Accrediting Faces New Challenges", American Association of Community and Junior Colleges Journal, Vol. 42, May, 1972, p. 17.

given expenditure of resources. Our concern here is primarily that of effectiveness, or the degree to which the institution succeeds in doing whatever it is trying to do, once that is ascertained. Robb asks the question:

Is the educational system fulfilling its general goals?
Are students attaining their highest level of personal,
social, intellectual, and vocational development?¹

Can we ascertain the goals of an institution and the practices so that the relationship between them might be determined? Would this relationship indicate the extent to which practices contributed to the goals of the institution?

It has been seen that the problems are greatest where the institution is growing fastest and in the smaller institutions. Thus, this study is based upon this problem:

What is the relationship between the goals and practices of four community junior colleges as perceived by three groups of participants, i.e., faculty, students, and administrators?

Sub-problems will be: How do the three groups of participants perceive the goals and practices within their own institution? How do the institutions differ in their perceptions of goals and practices both among the individual groups and among the institutions as a whole?

¹Felix Robb, "Regional Accrediting", p. 18.

Operationally, the relationship will be studied by computing the variances of the three groups in twenty goal areas on the Institutional Goals Inventory and related areas on the Institutional Functioning Inventory (University of Oklahoma Modification). Correlations between goals and practices will produce evidence of the extent to which the institutions are working toward their perceived goals.

Theoretical Assumptions

This study is based upon four basic assumptions.

These are:

(1) Organizations are capable of being studied. Parsons¹ studied organizations as a social process based upon three problems: first, formal organizations contain sub-units and can in turn be thought of as sub-units of larger systems; secondly, activities in formal organizations are clearly motivated, i. e., oriented toward the achievement of some goal; and finally, organizations, more than other kinds of aggregates, have explicit mechanisms for solving the twin problems of how to maintain their identity vis-a-vis their environment, maintaining whatever patterns of internal relationships

¹Henry A. Landsberger, "Parson's Theory of Organizations", The Social Theories of Talcott Parsons (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961), p. 31

they have established, while at the same time obtaining from the environment the support they need for survival.

Etzioni studied organizations as social units. He maintained that the actual effectiveness of a specific organization is determined by the degree to which it realizes its goals. Efficiency is measured by the amount of resources necessary to produce a unit of output.¹

Getzels and Guba studied the organization as a social system based upon an administrative hierarchy of subordinate-superordinate relationships. This model is based upon the human relations concept of organization and focuses on factors that influence behavior in the organization.²

(2) "Organizations are social units (or human groupings) deliberately constructed and reconstructed to seek specific goals." This statement by Parsons is based upon his definition, "Goals are future states of affairs that are seen as desirable and worth striving for".³

(3) "...the participants may act as informants." We

¹Amatai Etzioni, Modern Organizations, Foundations of Modern Sociology Series (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 8.

²J. W. Getzels and E. G. Guba, "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process", School Review, vol. 65, December, 1957, pp. 423-441.

³Landsberger, "Parson's Theory of Organizations", The Social Theories of Talcott Parsons, p. 30.

may interview executives and employees of various departments to establish what they see as the organization's goals. This is an answer by Etzioni to the question, "How, then, does one determine what is the goal of an organization?"¹

(4) Activities of an organization may be studied as a means of discovering goals. Gross and Grambsch say:

Two kinds of evidence are necessary before one can confidently assert that a goal is present: intentions and activities. By intentions we refer to what participants see the organization as trying to do: what they believe its goals to be, what direction they feel it is taking as an organization. By activities, we refer to what persons in the organization are in fact observed to be doing: how they are spending their time; how resources are being allocated.²

Hypotheses

There are three general Hypotheses stated in the null form that will be investigated. These are:

H₁ There are no significant differences among Faculty, Students, nor Administrators of four selected community colleges in the perceived importance of twenty goal areas within their institutions.

H₂ There are no significant differences among Faculty, Students, nor Administrators of four selected community

¹Etzioni, Modern Organizations, p. 6.

²Edward Gross and Paul V. Grambsch, University Goals and Academic Power (Washington: American Council on Education, 1971), p. 9.

colleges in the perceived emphasis of twenty practice areas within their institutions.

H₃ There are no significant correlations between goals and practices as perceived by Faculty, Students, and Administrators of four selected community colleges.

Definition of Terms

Organization--A social unit constructed to seek specific goals.

Institutional Goals--A future state of affairs that is seen as desirable and worth striving for as perceived by participants of this study.

Institutional Practices--An event, program, intention, or attitude perceived by participants as contributing toward one or more goals.

Perception--An individual judgment by a participant of the emphasis placed on an institutional goal or practice.

Administrator--A full time person engaged primarily in administration of the institutions involved.

Faculty--A full time person engaged primarily in Classroom instruction.

Student--Those persons participating in the study and who were carrying a minimum of twelve semester hours of work.

Community College--The four junior colleges in Oklahoma with three distinctive characteristics: 1. Operated under local control, board of control elected by local constituents; 2. Received partial funding from the State Regents for Higher Education (seventy-five percent at the time of the study); 3. Had developed from thirteenth and fourteenth grades of local secondary schools. Although not necessarily distinctive to the community colleges, each had an enrollment of less than 1,000 and was located in a rural community (municipalities less than 15,000 population).

Limitations of the Study

1. This study is limited to the time period in which the data were collected. This is an important limitation due to the rapid development of most of the institutions studied.

2. This study included all full time administrators and faculty members, and a sample of approximately fifty students. Because of the distinctive nature of the colleges, generalizations to other populations would be limited.

3. The small population of both Administrators and Faculty members in the colleges affects the confidence level for the study.

4. The instruments used in this study are limited in their applicability to the junior college as a particular type of higher education institution because of their development for all types of institutions. Goal/practice areas such as Advanced Training, Research, and Traditional Religiousness have greater applicability to large universities in the case of the first two, and private, church-related colleges in the latter instance.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

A study of the nature of institutional goals is critical to this research project. Etzioni describes a goal as "depicting a future state of affairs which the organization strives to realize". Guidelines are set for organizational activity, thus justifying the activities of an organization, even its very existence. Goals also serve as standards by which an organization may be evaluated by both its members and outsiders in an attempt to measure both its effectiveness and its efficiency.¹

Effectiveness of an institution is determined by the degree to which it realizes its goals. The efficiency is measured by the amount of resources used to produce a unit of output.² Since this study is not concerned with financial data, efficiency will not be considered further. Output is closely related to organizational goals, but for a higher education institution, output must be the student

¹Etzioni, Modern Organizations, p. 6.

²Ibid., p. 7.

himself, hopefully enlarged and benefitted by the process of two years of junior college education. Measurement of this sort is extremely difficult, if not impossible, because of the non-material nature of the output. The more limited and concrete the goal, the easier it is to measure effectiveness.¹

Goal displacement is also a problem of higher education, i.e., the institution frequently substitutes its legitimate goal for another, usually the promulgation of the institution itself or those operating it. Administrators and faculty members sometimes foster goals more for their own benefits than for the benefit of the students involved. Policies become more important than people, caused by the institution turning its goals upon itself, thereby no longer serving its original goals.²

Etzioni describes the differences between goal models and system models. A goal model attempts to measure the effectiveness of the organization by determining how closely it came to achieving its goals. This approach tends to give organizational studies a tone of social criticism rather than scientific analysis. It also defines success as a complete

¹Etzioni, Modern Organizations, p. 9.

²Ibid., p. 10.

or substantial realization of the organizational goal. The systems model, on the other hand, measures the organizational goals against a set of independent criteria.¹

To turn the emphasis to studies concerned more directly with the study of goals in higher education, the Gross and Grambsch study is one of the foundation studies in this area. At the time of its publication in 1967, it was "one of the few objective studies ever undertaken, at least on such an ambitious scale, of the actual goals of universities." Forty-seven different goals were studied by means of a questionnaire submitted to administrators and faculty members of sixty-eight universities. Although originally intended as a statement on both goals and practices, the magnitude of the study required an eventual study of goals, alone. Perceived goals were related to preferred goals, showing dissonance or concensus between them, as well as differences between goals as perceived by the administrators and the faculty members.²

At least two of the major questions of this study relate directly to this problem. These are: What are the

¹Etzioni, Modern Organizations, p. 16.

²Edward Gross and Paul V. Grambsch, University Goals and Academic Power (Washington: American Council on Education, 1971), p. 9.

actual goals at the present time (as perceived by administrators and faculty members? and: What if any dissonances exist between our statements about our goals and our actual goals as revealed by what we are in fact doing (practices)?

The study discerned that the seven top goals of both administrators and faculty were: 1. Protect the faculty's right to academic freedom; 2. Increase or maintain the prestige of the university; 3. Maintain top quality in those programs felt to be especially important; 4. Ensure the continued confidence and hence support of those who contribute substantially to the finances and other material resource needs of the university; 5. Keep up to date and responsible; 6. Train students in methods of scholarship and/or scientific research and/or creative endeavor; and 7. Carry on pure research.¹

Only one of the seven top goals treats students as a major focus, and that one is closely associated with the scholarly interests of the faculty and the emphasis on pure research.

The four lowest-ranked goals (from bottom up) were:

1. Make a good consumer of the student--a person who is elevated culturally, has good taste, and can make good consumer choices.

¹Gross and Grambsch, University Goals, p. 30.

2. Keep the university from becoming something different from what it is now; that is, preserve its peculiar emphases and points of view, its "character".
3. Involve students in the government of the university.
4. Emphasize undergraduate instruction even at the expense of the graduate program.

Gross and Grambsch sum up the findings in the following manner:

In general we may say that American universities emphasize the faculty's academic freedom, concern themselves primarily with goals relating to pure research and with maintaining or enhancing the university's position, and manifest relatively little interest in the student beyond developing his scholarly abilities.¹

A second major study was conducted for the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education in California by Peterson of the Educational Testing Service. This study utilized the Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI) in studying the goals of 116 higher education institutions in the state of California. Approximately 30,000 persons were surveyed including faculty, upper division and graduate students (day and evening students at community colleges), administrators, trustees of both public and private colleges, and community people living near the campuses. This study differentiated between "output goals"--as substantive objectives conditions may be seeking to achieve; and "process

¹Gross and Grambsch, University Goals, p. 31.

goals" which are conceived as internal campus objectives which may facilitate achievement of the output goals.¹

In this study, most all constituencies rated certain of the goals very high. These included Intellectual Orientation, a student outcome goal, and Community, an educational process goal. Advanced Training ranked very high in the university community; Vocational Preparation in the community colleges, and Individual Personal Development in the private colleges. Students showed less variation between the importance of goals than did other groups, especially administrators and faculty members.²

Nash and a group from the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University instituted a study of sixty-four goal statements, the respondents being the Academic Dean of every college in the country. The Deans were asked to indicate the extent to which their college emphasized each goal. The results demonstrated the fact that different goals were "strongly emphasized" universally.³

¹Richard E. Peterson, Institutional Goals Inventory Preliminary Technical Manual (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1970), p. 63.

²Ibid., p. 69.

³Patricia Nash, "The Goals of Higher Education--An Empirical Assessment". Columbia University: Bureau of Applied Social Research, June, 1968. (Mimeographed)

Chickering led a study by The Project on Student Development which was conducted by and at thirteen of the member colleges of the Council for Advancement of Small Colleges. This was an attempt to measure output, with all faculty members and administrators asked to rank twenty-five stated characteristics of graduates in terms of "importance for graduates of your institution". On the basis of the results, the project staff was able to divide the thirteen colleges into four categories.¹

The Gross and Grambsch questionnaire was revised for application to private liberal arts colleges. The form was administered to the administrators, a twenty percent sample of faculty, and 100 students at thirteen liberal arts colleges and one private junior college. This Danforth Foundation sponsored study found that: (1) great emphasis is placed upon teaching and student-oriented activities and there is a lack of emphasis on research and related activities; (2) there is significant agreement among administrators, faculty, and students on most matters related to college goals and governance.

¹A. W. Chickering, "Research for Action", Saratoga Springs, New York: Empire State College, 1970. (Mimeographed).

²Danforth Foundation, "A Report: College Goals and Governance", Danforth News and Notes, St. Louis, Missouri, 1969.

Martin completed a study in 1969 of the institutional character of eight colleges and universities. He found that generally there were substantial differences between newer, innovative colleges and older, more conservative institutions. Seventy-three percent of the faculty respondents at the innovative colleges, compared with six percent at the conventional universities in the sample reported that institutional objectives were discussed at length when they considered joining the faculty. Forty percent of the total faculty sample reported that the emphasis in recruiting was clearly on the work of the department; sixteen percent said institutional goals were emphasized. Entering students were found to know little about their college's philosophy.¹

In testing the Institutional Goals Inventory, Uhl, of the Educational Testing Service administered the instrument to five institutions of higher education. This study attempted to bring about agreement on goals among the administrators, faculty, students, and members of each community. Respondents tended to move toward concensus in each of the twenty goal areas.²

¹W. B. Martin, Conformity: Standards and Change in Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1969), p. 97.

²Norman P. Uhl, Identifying Institutional Goals (Durham, N.C.: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1973 p. 47-52.

Medsker conducted a study relating to goals and practices, among other factors, in fifteen states in 1958. The sample was drawn from fifteen states which comprised fifty-eight percent of all two-year colleges in the country at that time. Seventy-six, or approximately twenty percent of the institutions of the area were included in the study. It included a visit by the director of the study as well as a questionnaire which was mailed in the spring of 1956 to each of 342 participating institutions. From these the final sample was drawn. The data was analyzed in the office of the Center for the Study of Higher Education in Berkeley. It was found that little progress had been made in the function of general education--few had formulated the objectives in operational terms. An attempt was also made to determine how far the colleges had gone in formulating and expressing their educational philosophy. It was found that most faculty members consider their college to have a basic philosophy and agreed with it, but it was often unwritten and implied. There was virtual consensus on the goals of providing both vocational-technical and transfer programs, but were equally divided between open admissions and restricted entrance for students.¹

¹Leland Medsker, The Junior College, Progress and Prospect (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960)

Bushnell compiled data collected by Gleazer in a study of "Project Focus", which tried to determine the direction of the American two year college "...by assessing current population and economic trends; and by drawing upon other research efforts...identify and analyze the forces influencing the future direction of community and junior colleges."¹

The American College Testing Service Institutional Self-Study Inventory was used, sampling students and faculty within stratified samples of institutions. Stratification was based upon geographic area, size, type, and support (public, private, church related). According to this survey, there is an emerging consensus on the multiple purposes to be served by the two year college. The public now recognizes two-year occupations and the need for education throughout the life span. One phase of the study utilized the Institutional Goals Inventory with presidents and faculty respondents. It found a high degree of congruity in the rank-ordering of goals by presidents and faculty. Presidents tend to emphasize responding to community needs more strongly and the faculty emphasized student development.²

¹David S. Bushnell, Organizing for Change: New Priorities for Community Colleges (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973) p. 1.

²Ibid., p. 53.

There were few changes between the "Is" responses and "Should Be" responses indicating that both groups felt that the institutions were striving toward perceived goals. One exception was the goal area, "providing some form of education for any student regardless of his academic ability", on which the Presidents rated it fourteenth on the current goals, and the faculty second. On the "Should Be" side, the faculty rated it seventh, and the Presidents eighteenth. All higher ranked preferred goals except "providing for curricular and instructional evaluation" which was fifth among preferred goals and thirteenth in terms of current practice.¹

The fact that the majority of top-ranked goals in both the present and preferred categories focus on serving the needs of students contrasts with the findings of Gross and Grambsch, where only one student-oriented goal was found among the top seven.

Students gave considerably higher rankings to "making financial assistance available to any student who wants to enroll in college" and "providing some form of education for any student regardless of his academic ability," than either faculty or administrators.²

¹Bushnell, Organizing for Change, p. 56

²Ibid., p. 57.

A recent study applying directly to Oklahoma Junior Colleges was completed by Ballard of Oklahoma State University. This study investigates the roles and functions of public junior colleges in Oklahoma as perceived by citizens, students, faculty, administrators, and trustees. Although the study concerned only roles or functions and not goals, some of the conclusions were interesting.¹

The study indicated a great deal of disagreement on which activities were appropriate and on the priorities of many of the functions. The publics' perceptions of the appropriate activities and the priorities of the functions were so diverse at some of the fourteen public junior colleges tested that over eighty-three percent of the hypotheses were rejected (the hypotheses were for congruence). While a majority of the rejections occurred because the perceptions of the citizens and students differed with those of the other publics, differences were noted between all the publics, even between administrators and trustees. It was concluded that the perceptions of the appropriate activities and function priorities of the institutions held by the publics of all the colleges with the possible exception of one were so divergent

¹James Barry Ballard, The Role and Function of Public Junior Colleges in Oklahoma as Perceived by Citizens, Students, Faculty, Administrators, and Trustees, Oklahoma State University, 1973. (Doctoral Dissertation)

as to constitute an obstacle in the achievement of educational excellence.¹

Summary

Literature devoted to the study of the organization is not new, nor is the study of goals and practices a new phenomenon on the American scene, but it appears to be an under-emphasized subject in higher education. Organizational theory has been treated primarily by social theorists and the business field. The study of goals appears to have been a companion to that basic realm, also. Higher education must, however, widen its view of what constitutes responsible and scientific study so that it might continue to draw on other disciplines for the future.

For the purpose of this study, the theories of both Etzioni and Parsons appear to offer helpful insights concerning proper methods of studying the organization based upon its goals (intentions) and output (finished product). Support has also been demonstrated using perceived practices as indications of the effectiveness of the organization.

In higher education, the goals study by Gross and Grambsch and the California Study by Peterson stand paramount in the literature. They have "broken the ground" for what

¹Ballard, Role and Function of Junior Colleges, p. 71

must become a large number of related studies into the question of whether an institution's goals are being attained.

The Medsker study on the junior college is not generally helpful in this study, but here again stands as a landmark of goal-oriented research. Project Focus appears to be the most ambitious undertaking at the moment, and imminently useful as the IGI was used to ascertain perceived goal emphases.

The Ballard study is a timely study but limited in its use in this study due to its relatively low level of statistical sophistication.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationships between goals and practices of four community junior colleges in Oklahoma as perceived by the Faculty, Students, and Administrators of those institutions. This chapter will report the methodology used in the study including: (1) Design; (2) Instrumentation; (3) Population and Data Collection; and (4) Statistical Treatment.

Design

This study is designed as a perceptual survey of chosen publics.

Survey research is that branch of social scientific investigation that studies large populations by selecting and studying samples chosen from the populations to discover the relative incidence, distribution, and inter-relations of sociological and psychological variables.¹

In this study, the object was to determine the significant differences existing among the publics' perceptions

¹Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), p. 393.

of the goals and practices of the four institutions in order to discover the extent to which the institutions are perceived to participate in the practices that would lead to achievement of those goals. It will include a study of the variances present among the various publics' perceptions of goals and of practices, as well as the correlations between them.

It is necessary to differentiate between perceived goals and desired goals. Perceived goals ("is" category on the IGI) are those goals which are seen to exist within the institution. Desired goals ("Should Be" category on the IGI) on the other hand, would be those goals that the various publics believe ought to exist. Perceived goals, then, are actual goals if perceptions are correct, whereas desired goals may have little or no relationship to the actual goals of the institution.

Instrumentation

An important question for any institution is that of realistic identification of its goals. A number of instruments are available which propose to serve this purpose, but after some study, the Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI), developed by Educational Testing Service, was chosen. The IGI was developed for the use of universities and colleges in defining their goals and establishing priorities among them.

The IGI identifies twenty goal areas, each of which is derived from four statements in a ninety item questionnaire. Ten questions deal with miscellaneous goals that can be ascertained from a single statement. Each statement is rated on a five-point scale consisting of: (1) of no importance or not applicable; (2) of low importance; (3) of medium importance; (4) of high importance; and (5) of extremely high importance. The twenty goal areas identified by the IGI are:

Academic Development
 Intellectual Orientation
 Individual Personal Development
 Humanism/Altruism
 Cultural/Esthetic Awareness
 Traditional Religiousness
 Vocational Preparation
 Advanced Training
 Research
 Meeting Local Needs
 Public Service
 Social Egalitarianism
 Social Criticism/Activism
 Freedom
 Democratic Governance
 Community
 Intellectual/Esthetic Environment
 Innovation
 Off Campus Learning
 Accountability/Efficiency¹

The IGI allows for two separate scorings, "Is", representing the current presence of the goal, and "Should Be",

¹A description of each of the twenty goals and statements from both the IGI and IFI-OUM used to derive the raw data is presented in the Appendix.

which represents a preferred future state of goals. Due to the over-all length of the two instruments used and the purpose of this study, only the "Is" response, representing the present perception of goals, was utilized.

In the development of the IGI, two experimental versions were constructed and pilot tested--one involving 1,000 participants representing several constituent groups, the second including 1,300 faculty and students at ten colleges and universities on the West Coast. Educational Testing Service has conducted extensive investigation concerning validity and reliability, this information to be published in an Institutional Goals Inventory Technical Manual.¹

In determining validity, the statements were correlated with institutional data (such as number of volumes in the library, income per student, student-faculty ratio, selectivity in admission), providing validity for all but three goal areas (Social Criticism/Activism, Democratic Governance, and Accountability/Efficiency). A group of higher education specialists' judgments were compared with the faculty, student, administrator, and community ratings of present importance for each goal area. Agreements were obtained except for

¹Norman P. Uhl and Richard E. Peterson, Preliminary Draft, Institutional Goals Inventory Technical Manual, 1973, (Mimeographed)

the areas of Democratic Governance, Off Campus Learning, and Accountability/Efficiency.¹

Correlations were made between present and preferred ratings, including factorial analyses of these intercorrelations. These were valid except for the areas of Traditional Religiousness, Vocational Preparation, Advanced Training, and Research.²

An adaptation of Campbell and Fiske's (1959) convergent and discriminant validity procedure was employed to examine whether faculty, students, and community attach similar meanings to the goal areas. General agreement was found among these three groups with three exceptions. There was disagreement among the three groups on Accountability/Efficiency. Whereas faculty and students agreed on the meaning of Social Criticism/Activism and Democratic Governance, the community groups disagreed with both.³

Uhl, in conducting this investigation, stated that these varied procedures--

...have provided support for the validity of the IGI. However, one goal area, Accountability/Efficiency, seems

¹Uhl, IGI Technical Manual, p. 29-31.

²Ibid., p. 32.

³Ibid., p. 33.

to hold different meanings for different groups and therefore should be used with caution.¹

Reliability data was developed by Uhl based upon the ratings of present and preferred importance by each constituent group. Academic Development had more low coefficient alphas than any other scale with a median value of .69 for ratings of present importance. Of the twenty median reliability estimates, all are above .65, with well over half above .80. Intercorrelations among the goal areas were calculated separately for each constituent group's ratings of present and preferred importance. High correlations were achieved. In conclusion, Uhl writes, "...the reliability of the goal areas are of sufficient magnitude for group comparisons and interpretation."² Table 1 presents this data.

In searching for an instrument that could be directly related to the IGI goal areas, it was found that the Institutional Functioning Inventory, also developed by Educational Testing Service, related to eleven of the same goals as the IGI. Consequently, with the permission of the Educational Testing Service, the IFI was revised to relate to the same goal areas as the IGI, primarily by representatives of the

¹Uhl and Peterson, IGI Technical Manual, p. 33.

²Ibid., p. 35.

TABLE 1

COEFFICIENT ALPHA RELIABILITIES, STANDARD
ERRORS OF MEASUREMENT, AND MEANS
ON IGI-PRESENT DIMENSION

GOAL AREA	COEFFICIENT ALPHA	STAND ERROR OF MEAS.	MEAN
Academic Development	.61	.13	3.24
Intellectual Orientation	.75	.12	2.93
Individual Personal Dev.	.94	.08	2.99
Humanism/Altruism	.88	.09	2.79
Cultural/Esthetic Awareness	.90	.09	2.76
Traditional Religiousness	.98	.09	1.59
Vocational Preparation	.97	.09	2.99
Advanced Training	.89	.22	1.97
Research	.94	.17	1.99
Meeting Local Needs	.91	.13	2.99
Public Service	.80	.12	2.58
Social Egalitarianism	.91	.14	2.84
Social Criticism/Activism	.84	.09	2.45
Freedom	.99	.04	3.23
Democratic Governance	.93	.08	2.94
Community	.97	.07	3.06
Intellectual/Esthetic Env.	.80	.14	2.89
Innovation	.92	.11	2.94
Off Campus Learning	.99	.03	1.99
Accountability/Efficiency	.75	.11	3.12

Center for the study of Higher Education of the University
of Oklahoma.

Seventy-five of the original items were retained and
an additional forty-five items were written to correspond to
the twenty IGI goal areas. As in the original instrument,
two types of items were used, a three-point response, "Yes/

No/I Don't Know", and a four-point response, "Strongly Agree/Agree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree". Students did not respond to items in the following scales on the IFI-OUM.

Vocational Preparation
Advanced Training
Research
Meeting Local Needs
Community
Innovation
Off Campus Learning
Accountability/Efficiency

Eight higher education practitioners evaluated the instrument for appropriateness, discarding statements over which there was any disagreement. In addition, a split-half correlation coefficient measurement was used utilizing the Kuder-Richardson Prophecy Formula.¹ The instruments were completed by a group of University of Oklahoma students and faculty members for the pre-test evaluation. These correlations were quite low in some scales, ranging from .05 for Off Campus Learning and .06 for Humanism/Altruism, to .73 for Accountability/Efficiency and .75 for Community. Twelve of the scales achieved a correlation coefficient of .50 or greater.

Due to the questionable correlation of some scales on the split-half data, test-retests were given in three different types of institutions: a private four year college; a new

¹N. M. Downie and R. W. Heath, Basic Statistical Methods (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), p. 246.

state university; and the largest community college in the study by this researcher. This data is presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2
IFI-OUM TEST-RETEST RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS
(Three Administrations)

GOAL/PRACTICE AREAS	COMMUNITY COLLEGE n=80 (n=31a)	PRIVATE FOUR YEAR COLLEGE n=38 (n=13a)	STATE UNIV. n=50 (n=20a)
Academic Development	.57	.64	.34
Intellectual Orientation	.38	.71	.20 ^b
Individual Personal Dev.	.68	.69	.55
Humanism/Altruism	.56	.61	.63
Cultural/Esthetic Awareness	.68	.65	.64
Traditional Religiousness	.65	.83	.59
Vocational Preparation	.56	.52 ^b	.86
Advanced Training	.73	.37 ^b	.77
Research	.73	.56	.80
Meeting Local Needs	.64	.73	.84
Public Service	.65	.68	.61
Social Egalitarianism	.59	.74	.52
Social Criticism/Activism	.65	.77	.60
Freedom	.84	.73	.51
Democratic Governance	.75	.84	.53
Community	.75	.79	.85
Intellectual/Esthetic Env.	.62	.68	.75
Innovation	.60	.88	.85
Off Campus Learning	.54	.73	.78
Accountability/Efficiency	.51	.63	.83
Median	.64	.70	.64

^aSmaller n for eight scales not answered by students.

^bAll scales except these significant at .05

Improved reliability measures were achieved with all twenty scales significant at the .05 level at the junior college, only one of which fell below a coefficient of .50 (Intellectual Orientation). Only two were not significant at the private four year college (Vocational Preparation and Advanced Training), and one (Intellectual Orientation) at the new state university. These evidences provide confidence in the reliability of the IFI-OUM.

Validity support for twelve of the twenty IFI-OUM scales may be found in the IFI Preliminary Technical Manual¹ for those scales taken from the original IFI.

Lynn conducted a validity study in which sixteen independent raters were asked to rank the twenty IFI-OUM areas in terms of how each goal was emphasized in practice at a private four year college.² Table 3 presents the results of the calculations of Spearman's coefficient of rank order correlation of the rankings by the sample and the raters. It

¹Richard E. Peterson, J. A. Centra, Rodney T. Hartnett and Robert L. Linn, Institutional Functioning Inventory: Preliminary Technical Manual (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1970)

²Robert L. Lynn, An Investigation of Institutional Goal Congruence: Intention and Practice in a Private Four-Year College (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma, 1973). p. 72. (Doctoral Dissertation)

TABLE 3

SPEARMAN'S COEFFICIENT OF RANK CORRELATION BETWEEN
RANKINGS OF IFI-OUM GRAND MEANS AND
RANKINGS OF INDEPENDENT RATERS

IFI-OUM SCALE	RANK		DIFFERENCE	
	ON- CAMPUS (n=168)	INDEP. RATERS (n=16)	d	d ²
Traditional Religiousness	1	8	-7	49
Academic Development	2	1	1	1
Community	3	6	-3	9
Individual Personal Dev.	4	3	1	1
Humanism/Altruism	5	7	-2	4
Vocational Preparation	6	13	-7	49
Meeting Local Needs	7	16	-9	81
Accountability/Efficiency	8	12	-4	16
Intellectual/Esthetic Env.	9	5	4	16
Social Egalitarianism	10	14	-4	16
Intellectual Orientation	11	2	9	81
Public Service	12	17	-5	25
Social Criticism/Activism	13	15	-2	4
Innovation	14	9	5	25
Democratic Governance	15	10	5	25
Off Campus Learning	16	18	-2	4
Cultural/Esthetic Awareness	17	4	13	169
Freedom	18	11	7	49
Advanced Training	19	20	-1	1
Research	20	19	1	1

P = .529. Significance level at .425 required at .05.

was found that the correlation coefficient of rank order was significant at greater than the .05 level.

Populations and Data Collection

All administrators and faculty members were asked to

complete both the IGI and the IFI-OUM at each of the four institutions. A sample of fifty students from each institution was asked to respond, resulting in a range of usable instruments from forty-four at College A to fifty at College C. The discrepancy in size was due to mutilation of instruments by the scoring machine.

The investigator visited either personally or by telephone with the President of each of the four colleges, receiving assurances of cooperation and the assignment of the Academic Dean in each school to assist in the administration of the instruments. Plans were then coordinated with the Deans for the investigator to visit a day at each college during the late spring of 1973. Each Dean cooperated fully by presenting the instruments to the other administrators and faculty, as well as assisting in the random selection of fifty students. Both written and oral instructions were provided each person completing the instruments, as well as the investigator being present to answer pertinent questions.

The four colleges involved were: Seminole Junior College, El Reno Junior College, Sayre Junior College, and Carl Albert Junior College. Each of the colleges are small, relatively rural institutions with similar patterns of establishment, funding, and development.

Statistical Analysis

Data obtained from the four administrations were compiled at the University of Oklahoma Computer Center, utilizing the Multiple Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) program developed at the University of North Carolina.¹

To test the first hypothesis, i.e., that there were no differences among either groups or colleges in their perceptions of the importance of each of the goals, the program produced error correlations of variables, estimates of effects tested against this error term, and an over-all test of significance using Wilk's lambda criterion or likelihood ratio test. The approximate F test uses Rao's approximation. An approximate test is also computed for the remaining roots after eliminating each in turn.²

Univariate F tests were generated for Colleges and Groups; Colleges; and Groups. These tests of significance determined the goal scales which could be individually analyzed within the colleges across groups and within the groups across colleges.

¹Elliott Cramer and L. L. Thurston, The University of North Carolina MANOVA Program (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: Psychometric Laboratory, University of North Carolina)

²Ibid.

Treatment of the IFI-OUM results was the same as for the IGI, except that separate computations were made on those scales to which all three groups responded and those scales to which students did not respond. One involved twelve practice scales with Students, Faculty, and Administrators; and the other eight practice scales and Faculty and Administrators.

A test of simple main-effects was computed on both the IGI and IFI-OUM data if significance were indicated at the .05 level or greater on the approximate F tests for college/group interaction.

A decision to compute simple main-effects is usually made following an examination and statistical analysis of the data. The procedure recommended for such tests is to design the same family error rate to the simple main-effects tests as that allotted to the over-all F ratio.¹

This procedure separates the interaction effect from true differences that might exist among the colleges or groups. The test of simple main-effects was computed on each of the scales achieving significance at the .05 level, both within groups across colleges and within colleges among groups.

The Scheffe' method for post-hoc multiple comparisons was then computed for the variables in which the

¹Roger E. Kirk, Experimental Design: Procedures For the Behavioral Sciences (Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1968), p. 181.

univariate F tests had indicated significant differences. The Scheffe' method is more rigorous than other multiple comparison methods, leading to fewer significant differences, but no special problems arise from unequal n's and it employs the already available F tests.¹

The third step of statistical treatment was to test the general hypothesis of intercorrelation between goals and practices. The Pearson r (product-moment correlation) was computed on the paired scores of each participant. An intercorrelation matrix was generated for the total sample and for each individual college. Upon discovering that the correlation coefficients were quite low, it was suspected that one of the assumptions of the Pearson r might not be consistent with the data--that of linear relationship.²

To test the assumption of linearity, the Polynomial Regression Formula was computed, using the Biomedical Program BMD05R which plotted the scores for each group within each college for all goal/practice areas to which they had responded. It was found that most of the relationships were

¹George A. Ferguson, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1966), p. 296.

²BMD03D Computer Program, "Correlation with Item Deletion", W. J. Dixon, ed., BMD Biomedical Computer Programs (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1973).

non-linear, thus the coefficient of non-linear relationship (Eta) was computed so as to achieve a more precise representation of the relationship.

Eta indicates the degree of concentration of paired observation (X,Y) about a regression curve, just as $\underline{r}$ measures the concentration of paired values (X,Y) about a regression line. Eta is a more general measure than $\underline{r}$, and can be applied to linear as well as non-linear relationship patterns.¹

Summary

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationships between goals and practices of four community junior colleges in Oklahoma as perceived by the Faculties, Students, and Administrators of those institutions. It is a perceptual survey designed to discover the extent to which the institutions are perceived to participate in the practices that would lead to the achievement of their goals. The Institutional Goals Inventory was selected and the Institutional Functioning Inventory modified to relate to twenty goal/practice areas consistent with higher education.

All administrators and faculty members and a sample of fifty students from each of four community colleges were randomly selected as participants in the survey. Following

¹Joseph E. Hill and August Kerber, Models, Methods, and Analytical Procedures in Education Research (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1967), p. 271.

the collection of data in the spring of 1973, a multiple analysis of variance was computed for both goals and practices. Where interaction of the colleges and groups was significant at greater than the .05 level, a test of simple main-effects was computed. Scheffe' Tests were then computed to ascertain within which groups in each college there were significant differences, and within which colleges the groups were significantly different.

A Pearson r was then computed on the paired scores of all participants, and this resulting in low correlation coefficients, a polynomial regression formula was computed to test the linear relationship. Upon finding that in most instances the relationship was truly curvilinear, an Eta correlation was computed from information derived from the polynomial regression output.

CHAPTER IV

REPORT OF FINDINGS

The statistical analyses and findings presented in this chapter are based upon the data derived from the administration of the Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI) and the Institutional Functioning Inventory--Oklahoma University Modification (IFI-OUM) to all administrators and faculty members and a sample of fifty students from each of four Oklahoma community colleges. Data showing the number of participants in each group from each college is presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS FROM EACH COLLEGE
PROVIDING DATA FOR THE STUDY

COLLEGE	ADMINISTRATORS	FACULTY	STUDENTS	TOTAL
A	5	10	44	59
B	3	11	50	64
C	4	11	46	61
D	<u>5</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>80</u>
Total	17	58	189	264

The .05 level of significance is used throughout, except where greater levels are specifically reported.

Goals

The first null hypothesis was: There are no significant differences among Faculty, Administrators, nor Students of four selected community colleges in their perceived importance of twenty goal areas within their institutions. To test this hypothesis, the groups were analyzed by using the MANOVA which produced an approximate F test for the interaction effects between the groups and colleges and univariate F tests of these variables; approximate F tests for the analysis of the variance found among groups within colleges, and univariate F tests for each variable; and approximate F test for the analysis of variance found among colleges within groups, and the univariate F tests for each of these goal scales.

Table 5 presents the approximate F test for interaction.

TABLE 5

APPROXIMATE F TEST FOR MANOVA ON THE IGI
FOR SIGNIFICANT INTERACTION OF
GROUPS AND COLLEGES

F	DF HYP	DF ERROR	PROBABILITY LESS THAN
1.627	120	1354	.001

The approximate F test was significant at greater than .05 level, making it necessary to compute a test of simple main-effects on those goal scales which also showed significance on the univariate F tests. These tests are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6
UNIVARIATE F TESTS FOR MANOVA ON THE IGI
FOR SIGNIFICANT INTERACTION EFFECTS

VARIABLE	F(6,252)	MEAN SQ.	PROBABILITY LESS THAN
Acad Dev	0.586	0.250	.741
Int Or	1.757	0.784	.108
Ind Per Dev	1.046	0.683	.396
Hum/Alt	1.560	1.109	.159
Cult/Esth	1.732	0.817	.114
Trad Rel	0.868	0.649	.519
Voc Prep	2.691	1.512	.015*
Adv Trng	0.241	0.183	.962
Research	0.502	0.344	.807
Mtg Loc Nds	5.026	2.488	.001*
Pub Ser	3.266	2.023	.004*
Soc Egal	3.036	1.537	.007*
Soc Cr/Act	2.252	1.463	.039*
Freedom	1.251	0.828	.281
Democ Gov	1.167	0.728	.325
Community	1.630	1.085	.139
Int/Est Env	2.243	1.575	.040*
Innovation	4.913	2.743	.001*
Off Camp Lrn	0.865	0.539	.521
Acct/Eff	1.073	0.573	.379

*Significant at .05 level

The test of simple main-effects was computed on each of the seven scales in which significance was shown and one,

Public Service, indicated that the variance was due to group-college interaction and not to significant differences in perception of the participants. Significant univariate F tests both within groups across colleges and within colleges across groups could thus be attributed to different perceptions on the part of the participants. The test of simple main-effects indicated the following significant variances:

Vocational Preparation Among Students
 Meeting Local Needs. Among Faculty
 Among Groups in College D
 Social Egalitarianism. Among Faculty
 Intellectual/Esthetic Env. . . Among Faculty
 Innovation Among Faculty
 Social Criticism/Activism. . . Among Groups in College A

Significant approximate F tests for the differences found among the groups within the colleges were then inspected. These approximate F tests are presented in Table 7.

TABLE 7

APPROXIMATE F TEST FOR MANOVA ON THE IGI
 FOR SIGNIFICANT INTERACTION AMONG
 GROUPS WITHIN COLLEGES

F	DF HYP	DF ERROR	PROBABILITY LESS THAN
10.098	40	466	.001

The approximate F test achieving a significance level greater than .05, the univariate F tests were examined in order to discern which groups produced significant differences within which colleges. Scheffe' tests were computed on each scale indicating significance, limiting the analysis to those factors showing significance on the test of simple main-effects and to additional scales in their entirety that had not shown significant interaction effects. Univariate F tests are presented in Table 8.

Students placed more importance on the goal areas of Advanced Training and Research than both Faculty and Administrators at all four colleges. Students also placed greater importance on the goal area of Off Campus Learning than both Faculty and Administrators at Colleges A and B, but only more than the Faculty at Colleges C and D.

Administrators at College A placed greater emphasis on the goal areas of Intellectual Orientation and Individual Personal Development than did the Students and also the Faculty for the latter area.

Faculty members at Colleges C and D perceived greater participation in the goal of Cultural/Esthetic Environment than did the Students, and for College D, even the Administrators.

TABLE 8

UNIVARIATE F TESTS FOR MANOVA ON THE IGI FOR
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG GROUPS
WITHIN COLLEGES

VARIABLE	F (2,252)	MEAN SQ.	PROBABILITY LESS THAN
Acad Dev	2.919	1.245	.056
Int Or	6.215	2.773	.002*
Ind Per Dev	7.139	4.659	.001*
Hum/Alt	1.384	0.984	.252
Cult/Esth	8.266	3.900	.001*
Trad Rel	8.167	6.105	.001*
Voc Prep	0.798	0.448	.451
Adv Trng	70.915	53.895	.001*
Research	52.074	35.754	.001*
Mtg Loc Nds	5.133	2.541	.007*
Pub Ser	2.292	1.420	.103
Soc Egal	0.381	0.193	.683
Soc Cr/Act	4.281	2.782	.015*
Freedom	6.911	4.574	.001*
Democ Gov	0.345	0.215	.709
Community	1.911	1.272	.150
Int/Est En	0.349	0.245	.706
Innovation	0.172	0.096	.842
Off Camp Lrn	24.242	15.102	.001*
Acct/Eff	4.522	2.415	.012*

*Significant at .05 level

At College D, both the Administrators and Faculty perceived the goal of Meeting Local Needs to be of greater importance than did the Students.

Students at College A put greater emphasis on the goal of Social Criticism/Activism than did the Faculty members of that College.

Perceptions of the goal area of Accountability/Efficiency produced different results at Colleges A and D. At College A, the Students emphasized it to a greater extent than the Faculty, and at College D, both the Administrators and Faculty perceived the goal area as being significantly more important than was perceived by the Students.

Significant difference in perceptions of the emphasis on goals within colleges among the groups was found in ten of the twenty goal areas, including a total of thirty-three separate significant results of the Scheffe' test.

Approximate F tests were inspected to ascertain the relationship among the groups, across the institutions, as presented in Table 9.

TABLE 9

APPROXIMATE F TEST FOR MANOVA ON THE IGI
FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WITHIN
GROUPS ACROSS COLLEGES

F	DF HYP	DF ERROR	PROBABILITY LESS THAN
4.053	60	695.979	.001

The approximate F test being significant at the .001 level, the univariate F tests were then examined in order to determine within which scales the significance could be found. Univariate F tests are presented in Table 10.

TABLE 10

UNIVARIATE F TESTS FOR MANOVA ON THE IGI
FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WITHIN
GROUPS ACROSS COLLEGES

VARIABLE	F (2,252)	MEAN SQ.	PROBABILITY LESS THAN
Acad Dev	1.486	0.634	.219
Int Or	1.039	0.464	.376
Ind Per Dev	0.301	0.197	.825
Hum/Alt	0.298	0.212	.827
Cult/Esth	6.625	3.125	.001*
Trad Rel	5.473	4.092	.001*
Voc Prep	11.243	6.315	.001*
Adv Trng	3.395	2.580	.019*
Research	1.050	0.721	.371
Mtg Loc Nds	3.774	1.868	.011*
Pub Ser	2.298	1.424	.078
Soc Egal	6.169	3.123	.001*
Soc Cr/Act	1.833	1.191	.142
Freedom	1.449	0.959	.229
Democ Gov	1.074	0.670	.360
Community	2.546	1.694	.057
Int/Est Env	3.655	2.566	.013*
Innovation	6.995	3.905	.001*
Off Camp Lrn	5.239	3.264	.002*
Acct/Eff	2.384	1.274	.070

*Significant at .05 level

The univariate F tests indicate significant variances for ten of the twenty scales. The greatest diversity was among Faculty of the four colleges.

Faculty members of Colleges C and D perceived the goal of Cultural/Esthetic Environment to be of greater importance than the Faculty of College B. The Administrators

of College A perceived this goal to be of greater importance in their college than any of the Administrators of the other colleges. Students of College A also perceived this goal as having significantly more importance than Students from Colleges B, C, and D.

College A Faculty perceived the goal area of Vocational Preparation to be of less importance than all of the other college Faculties. College D Faculty, on the other hand, perceived this goal as having significantly greater importance in their institution than the Faculties of all three other colleges. Students of College B placed significantly greater emphasis on this goal area than Students from the other three colleges.

Faculty members of Colleges C and D placed significantly greater emphasis on the presence of the goal of Social Egalitarianism than the Faculties of Colleges A and B.

Faculties of Colleges C and D perceived the goal of Intellectual/Esthetic Environment to be of more importance at their colleges than the Faculty of College B. College D Faculty emphasized this goal to a greater extent than College A Faculty.

College D Faculty emphasized the goal area of Innovation to a greater extent than all the other Faculties.

College C and D Faculties placed greater emphasis on the goal of Off Campus Learning than College B Faculty, and College D Faculty also perceived this goal to be of greater importance than Faculties of Colleges A and C.

Students of Colleges A and D placed significantly greater importance on the goal area of Off Campus Learning than Students from Colleges B and C.

Thirty-four separate significant differences between groups within colleges were discovered by Scheffe' tests, on nine scales.

Practices

The second null hypothesis was: There are no significant differences among Faculty, Students, nor Administrators of four selected community colleges in the emphasis perceived to be given twenty practice areas within their institutions.

For the purpose of analysis, two sections will be presented, the first concerning the twelve practice areas to which all three groups responded; and the second for two groups on eight practice areas, to which Students did not respond.

The first step of the MANOVA computation produced an Approximate F test for interaction between the groups and colleges. The approximate F test is presented in Table 11.

TABLE 11

APPROXIMATE F TEST FOR MANOVA ON THE IFI-OUM
FOR SIGNIFICANT INTERACTION OF GROUPS
AND COLLEGES ON TWELVE SCALES

F	DF HYP	DF ERROR	PROBABILITY LESS THAN
1.335	72	1316.986	.035

The approximate F test was significant at the .05 level, thus the test of simple main effects was computed for those scales in which the univariate F tests were also significant. The univariate F tests are presented in Table 12.

TABLE 12

UNIVARIATE F TESTS FOR MANOVA ON THE IFI-OUM
FOR SIGNIFICANT INTERACTION OF GROUPS
AND COLLEGES ON TWELVE SCALES

VARIABLE	F(6,252)	MEAN SQ.	PROBABILITY LESS THAN
Acad Dev	0.278	0.039	.947
Int Or	0.700	0.063	.650
Ind Per Dev	3.554	0.918	.002*
Hum/Alt	1.595	0.317	.149
Cult/Esth	0.279	0.170	.946
Trad Rel	0.942	0.156	.465
Pub Ser	2.190	0.868	.044*
Soc Egal	1.464	0.416	.191
Soc Cr/Act	1.538	0.388	.166
Freedom	1.100	0.259	.362
Democ Gov	1.675	0.204	.653
Int/Est	0.696	0.204	.653

*Significant at .05 level

Significant interaction effects were found in only two practice areas: Individual Personal Development and Public Service. Neither of these produced significant main-effects results, thus any significant differences found in the univariate F tests must be caused by differences among the groups of participants.

The approximate F test was then inspected for the differences among groups within institutions on the twelve practice scales in which all groups participated. This test is presented in Table 13.

TABLE 13

APPROXIMATE F TEST FOR MANOVA ON THE IFI-OUM FOR
DIFFERENCES AMONG GROUPS WITHIN
COLLEGES ON TWELVE SCALES

F	DF HYP	DF ERROR	PROBABILITY LESS THAN
5.035	24	482	.001

The level of significance being greater than .05, the univariate F tests were inspected to discern within which groups the differences existed. Univariate F tests are presented in Table 14.

Six of the twelve practice scales produced significance, thus Scheffe' tests were computed on each.

TABLE 14

UNIVARIATE F TESTS FOR MANOVA ON THE IFI-OM FOR
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG
GROUPS WITHIN COLLEGES

VARIABLE	F(6,252)	MEAN SQ.	PROBABILITY LESS THAN
Acad Dev	1.840	0.258	.161
Int Or	0.897	0.080	.409
Ind Per Dev	8.437	2.178	.001*
Hum/Alt	0.104	0.021	.901
Cult/Esth	9.380	5.714	.001*
Trad Rel	0.013	0.002	.987
Pub Ser	3.310	1.312	.038*
Soc Egal	9.968	2.832	.001*
Soc Cr/Act	4.207	1.060	.016*
Freedom	2.546	0.600	.080
Democ Gov	0.358	0.072	.699
Int/Est	19.325	5.671	.001*

*Significant at .05 level

The four scales (excepting Individual Personal Development and Public Service which produced no significant differences on the Scheffe' tests, even though the test of simple main-effects also failed to achieve significance) to achieve significant differences were: Cultural/Esthetic Environment, Social Egalitarianism, Social Criticism and Activism, and Intellectual/Esthetic Environment. In College A, Students perceived the practice of Social Egalitarianism to be emphasized more than the Faculty and the same was true for Intellectual/Esthetic Environment, except that Students also

emphasized this practice more than Administrators as well as Faculty.

In College B, Students perceived the practice of both Cultural/Esthetic Awareness and Intellectual/Esthetic Environment to be emphasized to a significantly greater extent than did the Faculty. The Administrators agreed with the Students in the area of Social Criticism/Activism in placing greater emphasis on this practice than Faculty.

In College C, the Faculty perceived the practice of Social Egalitarianism to be emphasized to a greater extent than did the Faculty. In the areas of Social Criticism/Activism and Intellectual/Esthetic Environment, the Students placed a greater emphasis on this practice than either the Faculty or Administrators.

The Students of College D felt that greater emphasis was placed on the practices of Cultural/Esthetic Awareness and Intellectual/Esthetic Environment than did the Faculty. And the Faculty and Administrators both put greater emphasis on the practice of Social Egalitarianism than the Students.

The third phase of the investigation of this hypothesis involved the generation of approximate F tests to determine the differences among the colleges within each of the groups. This data is presented in Table 15.

TABLE 15

APPROXIMATE F TEST FOR MANOVA ON THE IFI-OM FOR
DIFFERENCES WITHIN GROUPS ACROSS
COLLEGES ON TWELVE SCALES

F	DF HYP	DF ERROR	PROBABILITY LESS THAN
6.274	36	712.789	.001

Since the approximate F test indicated a level of significance of .001, univariate F tests were computed on each of the twelve areas, producing significance at greater than the .05 level in eight scales, one of which was significant only from the interaction effect (Public Service). The seven areas on which Scheffe' tests were computed were: Academic Development, Cultural/Esthetic Awareness, Social Egalitarianism, Social Criticism/Activism, Freedom, Democratic Governance, and Intellectual/Esthetic Environment. Univariate F tests are presented in Table 16.

Significant differences were found among Students on six scales. One of these was the area of Academic Development which was the only significant difference in this area as a goal or practice. Students of College B perceived it to be emphasized to a significantly greater extent at their college than Students of Colleges A and D.

TABLE 16

UNIVARIATE F TESTS FOR MANOVA ON THE IFI-OUM
FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WITHIN
GROUPS ACROSS COLLEGES

VARIABLE	F(3,252)	MEAN SQ.	PROBABILITY LESS THAN
Acad Dev	3.856	0.540	.010*
Int Or	1.600	0.143	.190
Ind Per Dev	2.352	0.607	.073
Hum/Alt	1.632	0.324	.182
Cult/Est	13.883	8.457	.001*
Trad Rel	1.794	0.298	.149
Pub Ser	3.982	1.579	.008*
Soc Egal	11.879	3.375	.001*
Soc Cr/Act	7.464	1.881	.001*
Freedom	4.046	0.954	.008*
Democ Gov	4.650	0.932	.003*
Int/Est Env	5.144	1.509	.002*

*Significant at .05 level

College D Students perceived that four of the practice areas were afforded greater emphasis at their college than at one or more of the other colleges. In the area of Cultural/Esthetic Awareness, the difference was significantly greater than Students at all three other colleges. College D Students perceived the practice of Social Egalitarianism to be emphasized more strongly at their college than did Students at College B. College D Students were joined by College A and C Students in emphasizing the practice of Intellectual/Esthetic Environment to a greater extent than

Students of College B. Finally, for College D, its students placed greater emphasis on the practice of Social Criticism and Activism than Students from Colleges B and C. The only other significant difference among Students was found in the practice of Democratic Governance, in which Students of College B placed greater emphasis than Students of College C.

Four scales indicated diversity among Faculty members sufficient to achieve significance. These areas were Cultural/Esthetic Environment, Social Egalitarianism, Democratic Governance, and Intellectual/Esthetic Environment. College D Faculty placed greater emphasis on the practices related to Cultural/Esthetic Environment than the Faculties of Colleges B and C. College D Faculty emphasized the practices related to the area of Intellectual/Esthetic Environment to a greater extent than all three of the other Faculties. College D Faculty also emphasized the area of Social Egalitarianism to a greater extent than the Faculties of Colleges A and B. In this same area, the College C Faculty also perceived greater emphasis within their college than the Faculty of College A perceived in theirs. Practices related to the area of Democratic Governance received more emphasis from the Faculties of Colleges B and D than they did in Colleges A and C.

The eight goal/practice areas to which Students did not respond were computed separately from the other twelve to

which they did respond. The approximate F test for interaction of variables is presented in Table 17.

TABLE 17

APPROXIMATE F TEST FOR MANOVA ON THE IFI-OUO FOR
SIGNIFICANT INTERACTION OF GROUPS
AND COLLEGES ON EIGHT SCALES

F	DF HYP	DF ERROR	PROBABILITY LESS THAN
.578	24	171.719	.943

The approximate F test failed to achieve significance at greater than the .05 level, indicating that any differences shown in the univariate F tests may be accepted as differences between the groups or among the colleges. Table 18 indicates that no areas achieved significance.

Approximate F tests were then inspected for significant interaction between groups within institutions. This did not achieve significance at the .05 level of confidence, as presented in Table 19.

This approximate F test failing to achieve significance would suggest that Faculty and Administrators were in agreement concerning the emphasis placed on these eight scales. Even though this would preclude further analysis, the univariate F tests are presented in Table 20.

TABLE 18

UNIVARIATE F TESTS FOR MANOVA ON THE IFI-OUM
FOR SIGNIFICANT INTERACTION OF GROUPS
AND COLLEGES ON EIGHT SCALES

VARIABLE	F(3,66)	MEAN SQ.	PROBABILITY LESS THAN
Voc Prep	0.833	0.199	.480
Adv Trng	1.374	0.353	.258
Research	0.504	0.078	.681
Mtg Loc Nds	0.226	0.044	.787
Community	0.322	0.067	.810
Innovation	0.858	0.123	.467
Off Camp Lrn	0.101	0.011	.959
Acct/Eff	0.882	0.206	.455

TABLE 19

APPROXIMATE F TEST FOR MANOVA ON THE IFI-OUM
FOR SIGNIFICANT INTERACTION BETWEEN
GROUPS WITHIN COLLEGES

F	DF HYP	DF ERROR	PROBABILITY LESS THAN
.914	8	59	.511

The univariate F tests were consistent with the Approximate F test, since none of the eight practice areas produced a significant difference at greater than the .05 level.

TABLE 20

UNIVARIATE F TESTS FOR MANOVA ON THE IFI-OUM FOR
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS
WITHIN COLLEGES

VARIABLE	F(1,66)	MEAN SQ.	PROBABILITY LESS THAN
Voc Prep	0.102	0.024	.751
Adv Trng	0.197	0.051	.659
Research	0.952	0.146	.333
Mtg Loc Nds	0.409	0.080	.525
Community	0.195	0.041	.660
Innovation	0.218	0.031	.642
Off Camp Lrn	2.871	0.310	.095
Acct/Eff	0.925	0.216	.340

The approximate F test was then inspected for significant differences within groups across colleges and found to be significant at the .001 level. This data is presented in Table 21.

Univariate F tests were then inspected to discern the differences among colleges within groups. This data is presented in Table 22.

Univariate F tests were significant at greater than the .05 level in all but two practice scales among colleges within groups. The two scales not significantly different were Advanced Training and Research.

TABLE 21

APPROXIMATE F TEST FOR MANOVA ON THE IFI-OUM FOR
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WITHIN
GROUPS ACROSS COLLEGES

F	DF HYP	DF ERROR	PROBABILITY LESS THAN
4.675	24	171.719	.001

TABLE 22

UNIVARIATE F TESTS FOR MANOVA ON THE IFI-OUM FOR
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WITHIN
GROUPS ACROSS COLLEGES

VARIABLE	F(3,66)	MEAN SQ.	PROBABILITY LESS THAN
Voc Prep	10.475	2.508	.001*
Adv Trng	0.471	0.121	.703
Research	2.649	0.407	.056
Mtg Loc Nds	9.418	1.850	.001*
Community	3.478	0.729	.021*
Innovation	7.174	1.027	.001*
Off Camp Lrn	30.515	3.293	.001*
Acct/Eff	6.080	1.418	.001*

*Significant at .05 level

Significant differences were computed among both Faculty and Administrators in the area of Vocational Preparation. The Faculties of Colleges B and D emphasized the practices related to this area to a greater extent than the Faculties of Colleges A and C. Administrators of College D

placed greater emphasis on this practice than Administrators of College C.

Administrators differed significantly on only two other practice areas, Meeting Local Needs and Off Campus Learning. In the area of Meeting Local Needs, Administrators of Colleges A and B perceived greater emphasis on this practice than the Administrators of College C. And Administrators of College D perceived the practices related to Off Campus Learning to be emphasized to a greater extent at their college than the Administrators of all the other colleges.

Faculties of the colleges agreed with the Administrators in the practice area of Off Campus Learning with the Faculty of College D perceiving this practice to be emphasized greater at their college than all the other Faculties.

College A Faculty perceived the practices related to the area of Community to be less emphasized in their college than the Faculties of Colleges B, C, and D. College D Faculty, on the other hand, placed significantly greater emphasis on the practice than College B Faculty.

Significant differences were found among Faculties in practices related to the area of Innovation, with College D Faculty perceiving practices at the institution as being emphasized more than all the other college Faculties. College

B and C Faculties also perceived greater emphasis on Innovative practices than Faculty of College A.

Practices related to the area of Accountability/Efficiency were emphasized to a significantly greater extent by the Faculties of Colleges C and D than the Faculties of Colleges A and B.

This concludes the findings of the Multiple Analysis of Variance computed on the results of the Institutional Goals Inventory and the Institutional Functioning Inventory-University of Oklahoma Modification. A summary of significant differences computed among groups and among colleges is presented in Table 23. In interpreting the table, the alphabetic character in parentheses under the "Groups" column is the college within which significant differences were found among groups. The alphabetic character under "Colleges" within the parentheses is the group within which significant differences were discovered among the colleges.

Correlation Data

The third major hypothesis of this study was: There is no relationship between goals and practices at four community colleges as perceived by Faculty, Students and Administrators of those colleges.

TABLE 23

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES
AMONG GROUPS AND AMONG COLLEGES

VARIABLES	GOALS		PRACTICES	
	GROUPS	COLLEGES	GROUPS	COLLEGES
Acad Dev				(S)B>A,D
Int Or	(A)A>S			
Ind Per Dev	(A)A>S,F (D)F>S			
Hum/Alt				
Cult/Esth	(C)F>S (D)F>S,A	(F)C,D>B (A)A>B,C,D (S)A>B,C,D	(B)S>F (D)S>F	(F)D>B,C (S)D>A,B,C (A)D>A,C
Trad Rel	(A)S>F,A (C)S>F (D)S>F			
Voc Prep		(F)B,C,D>A (F)D>B,C (S)B>A,C,D		(F)B,D>A,C (A)D>C
Adv Trng	(A)S>F,A (B)S>F,A (C)S>F,A (D)S>F,A			
Research	(A)S>F,A (B)S>F,A (C)S>F,A (D)S>F,A			
Mtg Loc Nds	(D)F,A>S			(F)B,D>A,C (A)D>A,C
Pub Ser				
Soc Egal		(F)C,D>A,B	(A)S>F (C)F>S (D)F,A>S	(F)C>A (F)D>A,B (S)D>B,C
Soc Cr/Act	(A)S>F		(B)S,A>F (C)S>F,A	(S)D>B,C
Freedom				
Dem Gov				(F)B,D>A,C (S)B>C (A)A,B>D
Community				(F)B,C,D>A (F)D>B
Int/Est Env		(F)D>A,B (F)C>B	(A)S>F,A (C)S>F,A (B)S>F (D)S>F	(F)D>A,B,C (S)A,C,D>B
Innovation		(F)D>A,B,C		(F)D>A,B,C (F)C,B>A
Off Camp Lrn	(A)S>F,A (B)S>F,A (C)S>F (D)S>F	(F)D>A,B,C (F)C>B (S)A,D>B,C		(F)D>A,B,C (A)D>A,B,C
Acct/Eff	(A)S>F (D)A,F>S			(F)C,D>A,B

The first step was to compute Pearson r correlation coefficients on all paired scores for each scale. These results are presented in Table 26. It was noted that all but two scales (Cultural/Esthetic Awareness and Traditional Religiousness) achieved significance at greater than the .05 level. Eleven were significant at the .001 level: Academic Development, Individual Personal Development, Vocational Preparation, Research, Meeting Local Needs, Public Service, Social Criticism/Activism, Democratic Governance, Community, Innovation, and Off Campus Learning. Six were significant at the .01 level: Intellectual Orientation, Humanism/Altruism, Social Egalitarianism, Freedom, Intellectual/Esthetic Environment, and Accountability/Efficiency. Only one was significant at the .05 level, Advanced Training. Only one coefficient was above the .50 level, however.

Pearson r correlation coefficients were then computed for each college; twenty goal/practice areas for two groups, and twelve goal/practice areas for three groups (the areas to which Students responded on the IFI-OUM. This data is presented in Table 27.

Computing Pearson r correlation coefficients on two groups in each college, only one scale achieved significance at College A (Social Egalitarianism); seven at College B (Vocational Preparation, Research, Social Egalitarianism,

TABLE 24

PEARSON R CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR
ALL PARTICIPANTS ON TWENTY SCALES

GOAL/PRACTICE SCALE	r
Academic Development	.362a
Intellectual Orientation	.294b
Individual Personal Development	.327a
Humanism/Altruism	.273b
Cultural/Esthetic Awareness	.102
Traditional Religiousness	.168
Advanced Training	.223c
Research	.352a
Meeting Local Needs	.369a
Public Service	.347a
Social Egalitarianism	.272b
Social Criticism/Activism	.447a
Freedom	.280b
Democratic Governance	.323a
Community	.411a
Intellectual/Esthetic Environment	.267b
Innovation	.369a
Off Campus Learning	.502a
Accountability/Efficiency	.306b

a Significant at .001 level
b Significant at .01 level
c Significant at .05 level

Freedom, Democratic Governance, Community, and Accountability/Efficiency); four at College C (Academic Development, Intellectual Orientation, Traditional Religiousness, and Freedom); and two at College D (Traditional Religiousness and Innovation). The correlation coefficient computation for three groups achieved significant correlation of .05 in only three

TABLE 25

PEARSON R CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR TWENTY
 SCALES AND TWO GROUPS AND TWELVE SCALES
 AND THREE GROUPS

GOAL/ PRACTICE AREAS	COLLEGES							
	A		B		C		D	
	<u>Groups</u>		<u>Groups</u>		<u>Groups</u>		<u>Groups</u>	
	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3
Acad Dev	-.107	.369b	.140	.214	.501c	.306c	.217	.460a
Int Or	-.004	.242	.237	.235	.523c	.329b	.023	.383a
Ind Per Dev	.071	.147	.468	.245c	.477	.362b	.175	.476a
Hum/Alt	.246	.050	.212	.353b	.249	.376b	.014	-.021
Cult/Esth	.139	.099	.109	.276c	.281	.170	-.324	.091
Trad Rel	-.026	.097	-.076	.108	.509c	.273c	.404c	.189
Voc Prep	.045		.729a		.103		-.108	
Adv Trng	-.179		.294		-.335		.315	
Research	.102		.727b		.264		-.042	
Mtg Loc Nds	-.036		.230		.335		-.309	
Pub Ser	.102	.277c	.230	.384b	.264	.382b	-.018	.283b
Soc Egal	.698b	.091	.519c	.293c	.215	.236	.054	.195
Soc Cr/Act	-.043	.329b	.387	.480a	-.001	.515a	.090	.396a
Freedom	.081	.219	.566c	.197	.602c	.206	-.066	.415a
Democ Gov	.302	.176	.563c	.286c	.216	.259c	.058	.512a
Community	.100		.651c		.340		.119	
Int/Est Env	-.145	.045	.058	.246c	.125	.267c	.010	.342b
Innovation	.121		.271		.111		.368c	
Off Camp Lrn	.314		.118		.240		.178	
Act/Eff	.082		.702b		.198		-.137	

a Significant at .001 level

b Significant at .01 level

c Significant at .05 level

scales at College A (Academic Development, Public Service, and Social Criticism/Activism); eight scales at College B (Individual Personal Development, Humanism/Altruism, Cultural/Esthetic Awareness, Public Service, Social Egalitarianism, Social

Criticism/Activism, Democratic Governance, and Intellectual/
Esthetic Environment); eight scales in College C (Academic
Development, Intellectual Orientation, Individual Personal
Development, Humanism/Altruism, Traditional Religiousness,
Public Service, Social Criticism/Activism, Democratic Govern-
ance, and Intellectual/Esthetic Environment); and eight scales
at College D (Academic Development, Intellectual Orientation,
Individual Personal Development, Public Service, Social Criti-
cism/Activism, Freedom, Democratic Governance, and Intellect-
ual/Esthetic Environment).

These findings of significance were sufficient to
reject the hypothesis, but after inspection of a large number
of paired scores of individuals in goal/practice areas which
achieved low correlation coefficients, it was suspected that
one of the assumptions necessary for computation of the Pear-
son r might not be met--the assumption of linearity of rela-
tionship. It appeared that the relationship was not being
truly represented by the correlation coefficients computed by
the Pearson r program.

The BMD program, "O5R--Polynomial Regression" was
computed in order to determine whether or not the relation-
ships were linear or curvilinear. Scattergrams plotted by the
polynomial regression program indicated a degree of curviline-
arity on all scales. The decision was made to compute

correlation coefficients from data presented in the polynomial regression program, thus resulting in Eta correlation coefficients. Eta produced greater correlation coefficients in all twenty scales on paired scores on all participants with the difference between Pearson r coefficients and Eta coefficients ranging from a low of .028 in the area of Meeting Local Needs to a maximum of .486 in the area of Cultural/Esthetic Awareness. A comparison of Pearson r and Eta correlation coefficients of all participants on twenty scales is presented in Table 28.

For the two group data, instead of two significantly correlated goal/practice areas achieved by the Pearson r , Eta identified nine such areas in College A; instead of seven at College B, there were fourteen significantly correlated; thirteen achieved significance at College C instead of four; and at College D, the greatest difference was shown with fourteen achieving significance in comparison to only two with Pearson r computation. Similar differences were found in the three group computations.

As a result of the computations of Eta, it was determined that in further discussion the Eta correlation would be discussed as it applied to an analysis of the findings.

Comparing the Eta correlation coefficients for two groups vs. three groups, it was noted that with few exceptions

TABLE 26

A COMPARISON OF PEARSON R AND ETA CORRELATION
COEFFICIENTS FOR PAIRED SCORES
OF ALL PARTICIPANTS

GOAL/PRACTICE AREAS	<u>r</u>	Eta
Academic Development	.362a	.6155a
Intellectual Orientation	.294b	.4868a
Individual Personal Dev.	.327a	.4880a
Humanism/Altruism	.273b	.4606a
Cultural/Esthetic Awareness	.102	.4878a
Traditional Religiousness	.168	.4710a
Vocational Preparation	.389a	.3825a
Advanced Training	.223c	.5655a
Research	.352a	.4413a
Meeting Local Needs	.369a	.3974a
Public Service	.347a	.4427a
Social Egalitarianism	.272b	.4003a
Social Criticism/Activism	.447a	.4963a
Freedom	.280b	.6543a
Democratic Governance	.323a	.5958a
Community	.411a	.5916a
Intellectual/Esthetic Env.	.267b	.5708a
Innovation	.369a	.5907a
Off Campus Learning	.502a	.5444a
Accountability/Efficiency	.306b	.3847a

a Significant at .001 level

b Significant at .01 level

c Significant at .05 level

the three group data achieved lower correlations than the two group data, indicating greater congruence between goals and practices among Faculty and Administrators than among Students. No exceptions were found in College A. In College B there were two exceptions, in the areas of Intellectual Orientation and

Social Criticism/Activism, the three group data produced the higher correlations indicating greater correlation among the Students than among the Faculty and Administrators. The same information was noted in the Humanism/Altruism and Public Service areas in College C and the Individual Personal Development and Social Egalitarianism areas in College D.

Not only were all twenty scales significant at the .001 level, eight coefficients exceeded .50, and all but three were above .40.

Comparisons were made between Pearson r and Eta correlation coefficients for each school with two groups on twenty scales--see Table 29; and three groups on twelve scales--see Table 30.

Summary

This chapter has presented an analysis of the data obtained from the administration of the IGI and the IFI-OUM to administrators, faculty, and a sample of students of four small community colleges. Three null-hypotheses were tested and rejected, utilizing the statistical procedures outlined in Chapter III.

Significant interaction was detected on the IGI, among groups within colleges. Eleven scales achieved

TABLE 27

A COMPARISON OF PEARSON R AND ETA COEFFICIENTS FOR
PAIRED SCORES OF FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS

VARIABLES	COLLEGES							
	A		B		C		D	
	<u>r</u>	Eta	<u>r</u>	Eta	<u>r</u>	Eta	<u>r</u>	Eta
Acad Dev	-.107	.388	.140	.668b	.501c	.581c	.217	.712a
Int Or	-.004	.652b	.237	.237	.523c	.664b	.023	.440c
Ind Per Dev	.071	.399	.468	.643b	.477	.594c	.175	.443c
Hum/Alt	.246	.497c	.212	.549c	.249	.436	.014	.417c
Cult/Esth	.139	.374	.109	.469	.281	.714b	-.324	.439c
Trad Rel	-.026	.404	-.076	.465	.509c	.574c	.404c	.455b
Voc Prep	.045	.327	.729a	.834a	.103	.447	-.108	.173
Adv Trng	-.179	.510c	.294	.519c	.335	.756a	.315	.520b
Research	.102	.298	.727b	.773a	.360	.617b	-.042	.272
Mtg Loc Nd	-.036	.366	.230	.493c	.335	.519c	.309	.310
Pub Ser	.102	.415	.230	.493c	.264	.398	-.018	.455b
Soc Egal	.698b	.753a	.519c	.549c	.215	.575c	.054	.090
Soc Cr/Act	-.043	.429	.387	.501c	.001	.658b	.090	.447b
Freedom	.081	.597c	.566c	.650b	.602c	.652b	-.066	.684a
Democ Gov	.302	.450	.563c	.732a	.216	.610b	.058	.594a
Community	.100	.575c	.561c	.695b	.340	.445	.119	.624a
Int/Est/Env	.145	.573c	.058	.692b	.125	.517c	.010	.542b
Innovation	.121	.590c	.271	.719b	.111	.425	.368c	.614a
Off Camp Lrn	.314	.790a	.118	.700b	.240	.297	.178	.245
Acct/Eff	.082	.314	.702b	.749a	.198	.403	-.137	.244

a Significant at .001 level

b Significant at .01 level

c Significant at .05 level

significance at the .05 level, resulting in thirty-nine significant differences between groups within colleges. Twenty-two of these differences were between Faculty and Students and fifteen between Administrators and Students. Only two significant differences were found between Faculty and Administrators.

TABLE 28

A COMPARISON OF PEARSON R AND ETA CORRELATION
COEFFICIENTS FOR PAIRED SCORES OF
THREE GROUPS ON TWELVE SCALES

VARIABLES	COLLEGES							
	A		B		C		D	
	<u>r</u>	Eta	<u>r</u>	Eta	<u>r</u>	Eta	<u>r</u>	Eta
Acad Dev	.369b	.402b	.214	.368b	.306c	.351b	.460a	.525a
Int Or	.242	.340b	.235	.364b	.329b	.355b	.383a	.402a
Ind Per Dev	.147	.286c	.245c	.261c	.362b	.514a	.476a	.514a
Hum/Alt	.050	.152	.353b	.376b	.376b	.450a	.021	.190
Cult/Esth	.099	.203	.276c	.390b	.170	.419a	.021	.190
Trad Rel	.097	.203	.108	.235	.273c	.294c	.189	.265c
Pub Ser	.277c	.318c	.384b	.491a	.382b	.408a	.283b	.304b
Soc Egal	.091	.423a	.293c	.364b	.236	.404b	.195	.225c
Soc Cr/Act	.329b	.376b	.480a	.542a	.515a	.535a	.396a	.402a
Freedom	.219	.275c	.197	.268c	.206	.239	.415a	.451a
Democ Gov	.176	.271c	.286c	.364b	.259c	.357b	.512a	.518a
Int Est Env	.045	.343b	.246c	.274c	.267c	.432a	.342b	.395a

a Significant at .001 level

b Significant at .01 level

c Significant at .05 level

Significant interaction was also detected on the IGI among colleges within groups. Six scales resulted in thirty-four significant differences among colleges within groups. Twenty-one of these differences were between Faculty members and ten between Students of the four colleges.

Twelve scales of the IFI-OUM in which three groups had participated resulted in four significantly different scales, with sixteen separate significant differences found

among groups within colleges. Eleven of these differences were detected between Students and Faculty, four between Students and Administrators, and only one between Faculty and Administrators.

The same twelve scales produced significantly different scales with twenty-nine separate findings of significant differences between colleges within groups. Thirteen were between Faculties, twelve between Students, and four between Administrators of the colleges.

On the eight scales to which only two groups responded, on the IFI-OUM, none produced significant differences among groups within colleges. Five scales were significant among colleges within groups with thirty separate college differences within groups. Twenty-four significant differences were found between Faculties and six between Administrators of the four colleges.

Pearson r correlations resulted in few significantly correlated scales, thus it was suspected that the data might be curvilinear. A polynomial regression program was computed which verified that fact and resulted in significantly higher Eta correlation coefficients which can be computed on curvilinear data.

A computation of Eta on all paired scales resulted in significant correlations on all twenty scales at the .001 level

of confidence. Computation of Eta for each college resulted in an aggregate of twelve scales among the colleges significant at the .001 level; twenty additional scales at the .01 level; eleven scales at the .02 level; and seven additional scales at the .05 level of confidence. Thus, for all four colleges a total of fifty scales achieved at least the .05 level of confidence of eighty possible.

Computing the correlation of three groups among the colleges, sixteen achieved .001 significance; fifteen, .01; two, .02; and eight, .05. Thus forty-one of the forty-eight scales achieved at least a .05 level of confidence of correlation.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study has been to determine the relationship between goals and practices at four small community colleges as perceived by administrators, faculty, and students of those colleges. In addition, it has sought to ascertain differences among the groups within the colleges and among the colleges within the groups in their perception of the importance of each of twenty goal areas and related practices. The first step in a summary will be to identify the significant differences found among the groups within each college, as well as the relationship as measured by correlation of goals and practices.

College A

College A achieved significant correlation between goals and practices at the .001 level in only two goal/practice areas: Social Egalitarianism and Off Campus Learning. This would indicate a high level of congruence between these goals and practices. In other words, it may be said with

reasonable confidence that practices are related highly to the same level given these goals. The area of Social Egalitarianism was seen to be of medium importance as a goal. Students did not respond to statements on the IFI-OUM in the area of Off Campus Learning, but both Faculty and Administrators perceived this goal to be of low importance.

There were no significant differences among the groups in their perceptions of the importance of Social Egalitarianism as a goal, but as a practice Students perceived its achievement at a significantly higher level than Faculty members. It would thus appear that Students perceive practices related to College A being an open door institution as being emphasized to a greater extent than Faculty members. Thus, it might be assumed that Students perceive the activities related to "the open door" such as developmental education and providing an education for all students to the limit of their ability as being achieved to a greater extent than the Faculty members.

In the area of Off Campus Learning, Students perceived its importance as a goal as greater than both Faculty and Administrators. Students perceived it to be of medium importance whereas both Faculty and Administrators perceived it below the level of low importance. No significant differences were detected among the groups in the emphasis placed upon practices related to the area of Off Campus Learning.

Only one area was significantly related at the .01 level of confidence--Intellectual Orientation. Administrators perceived this goal as significantly more important than was perceived by Students. It was the highest scored goal by the Administrators, placing midway between "high importance" and "extremely high importance". Students perceived it to be of above medium importance. Dissonance between Students and Administrators may indicate that Administrators are over-estimating their perceptions of the goal, or that Students are not fully aware of the practices of the college which are indicative of high goal orientation.

Six additional goal/practice areas achieved correlation significance at greater than the .05 level but less than .01. Five of these (all except Humanism/Altruism) attained correlation coefficients of .50 or above. These five areas were: Advanced Training, Freedom, Community, Intellectual/Esthetic Environment, and Innovation. There were no significant differences among the groups in College A in the areas of Humanism/Altruism, Freedom, Community, and Innovation. This would indicate congruence among the groups in these areas as well as congruence between goal perceptions and practices. Three of these, Humanism/Altruism, Freedom, and Innovation, were perceived to be of medium importance as a goal, with Community achieving medium to high importance.

Students placed significantly greater importance on the goal of Advanced Training than did either Faculty or Administrators. Students perceived it to be of medium importance whereas Faculty and Administrators perceived it to be of low importance. It might be assumed that this difference could be attributed to a better understanding of the two-year college on the part of Faculty and Administrators and a desire on the part of Students to complete their college education at the local college. This dissonance was discovered in all four colleges studied.

Students perceived the practices related to Intellectual/Esthetic Environment to be emphasized to a greater extent than either Faculty or Administrators. The goal was perceived to be of medium importance by all three groups. Practices related to this goal included an emphasis on rich programs of cultural events and an intellectually inspiring campus.

Statistical dissonance was detected in the eleven remaining goal/practice areas due to the failure to achieve significant correlation coefficients at the .05 level or greater. These eleven goal/practice areas were: Academic Development, Individual Personal Development, Cultural/Esthetic Awareness, Traditional Religiousness, Vocational Preparation, Research, Meeting Local Needs, Public Service, Social Criticism/Activism, Democratic Governance, and Accountability/Efficiency.

Six of the goal/practice areas achieved no significant differences between groups (Academic Development, Cultural/Esthetic Awareness, Public Service, Democratic Governance, Vocational Preparation, and Meeting Local Needs). Academic Development was perceived to be of high importance as a goal by both Administrators and Faculty but of medium importance by the Students of College A.

The area of Cultural/Esthetic Awareness is perceived to be of medium importance by Students and Faculty, but Administrators perceived it to be midway between medium and high importance.

Faculty perceived Public Service to be of low importance, but Administrators and Students perceived it to be of medium importance.

All three groups perceived the goal of Democratic Governance to be of medium importance.

The area of Vocational Preparation was perceived to be of medium importance by Faculty members of College A, but midway between medium and high importance by Students and Administrators.

Students perceived the goal of Meeting Local Needs to be above medium importance, as did the Administrators, but the Faculty perceived it to be below medium importance.

Students perceived the goal of Research to be of significantly greater importance than both Faculty and Administrators. Students perceived it to be of medium importance and Faculty and Administrators of low importance.

Students perceived the goal of Accountability/Efficiency to be of significantly greater importance than Faculty, with all groups perceiving it to be of between medium and high importance.

In the area of Traditional Religiousness, Students perceived it to be of significantly greater importance than both Faculty and Administrators, the Students rating it of medium importance and the Faculty and Administrators of low importance.

Administrators perceived the goal of Individual Personal Development as being of significantly greater importance than both Faculty and Students. Administrators rated it between high and extremely high importance whereas Faculty and Students perceived it to be of medium-high importance.

Students perceived the goal of Social Criticism/Activism to be significantly more important at College A than Faculty members. Both Administrators and Students rated it of medium importance, but Faculty of low importance as a goal.

In Summary, College A achieved significant correlation coefficients above the .05 level on nine goal/practice

areas, indicating congruence between the importance placed on the goals and the emphasis perceived on the practices related to them.

College B

College B achieved significant relationships between goals and practices in seventeen of the twenty goal/practice areas. There was, thus, congruence between goals and practices at greater than the .05 level of confidence in all but three areas: Intellectual Orientation, Cultural/Esthetic Awareness, and Traditional Religiousness.

Four areas achieved significant correlation at the .001 level of confidence: Vocational Preparation, Research, Democratic Governance, and Accountability/Efficiency. These areas are highly congruent. Only one of the four (Research) achieved significant differences among the groups, with Students placing greater importance on this area as a goal than both Administrators and Faculty. Students rated the goal as being of medium importance and Faculty and Administrators perceived it to be between "of no importance" and "low importance."

The goal of Intellectual Orientation was perceived to be of between medium and high importance by all three groups. The goal of Cultural/Esthetic Awareness was perceived to be

of between low and medium importance, and the goal of Traditional Religiousness perceived to be of low importance.

Seven additional areas achieved significant correlation coefficients at greater than the .01 level of confidence. These areas were: Academic Development, Individual Personal Development, Freedom, Community, Intellectual/Esthetic Environment, Innovation, and Off Campus Learning. Only two of the goal/practice areas achieved significant differences among the groups.

In the area of Intellectual/Esthetic Environment, Students emphasized the practice related to this goal to a greater extent than Faculty. Students perceived it to be of medium emphasis and Faculty midway between low and medium emphasis.

The goal of Off Campus Learning was perceived as being of significantly more importance by Students than by both Faculty and Administrators. Students perceived the goal to be of above medium importance and Faculty and Administrators perceived it to be below medium importance.

Academic Development achieved no significant differences among the groups and was considered of high importance by Faculty, Administrators and Students.

Individual Personal Development was similarly rated

by the three groups, but no significant differences were detected among the groups.

There were no significant differences among the groups in the area of Freedom. Students and Faculty perceived the goal to be of medium importance, but Administrators perceived it to be of low importance.

The three groups, Faculty, Administrators, and Students perceived the goal of Innovation to be of below medium importance at College B.

Six additional goal/practice areas achieved correlation significance at greater than the .05 level. These areas were: Humanism/Altruism, Advanced Training, Meeting Local Needs, Public Service, Social Egalitarianism, and Social Criticism/Activism. Congruence can thus be attributed between goals and practices in these areas. Significant differences among groups were detected in only two areas, Advanced Training and Social Criticism/Activism.

Students at College B joined all other colleges in placing greater importance on the goal of Advanced Training than either Faculty or Administrators. Students perceived the goal to be of medium importance and both Faculty and Administrators perceived it as being below low importance.

A significant difference was detected in the emphasis placed on the practice of Social Criticism/Activism, as Student

perceived this practice to be emphasized to a greater extent than perceived by Faculty. The goal of Social Criticism/Activism was perceived to be between low and medium importance by Students and low importance by Faculty and Administrators.

Congruence was perceived in the goal/practice area of Humanism/Altruism and the goal was perceived to be of high importance by the three groups.

The goal of Meeting Local Needs was perceived to be of above medium importance by Faculty, Administrators, and Students of College B.

The goal of Public Service was perceived to be of below medium importance by all three groups, as was the goal of Social Egalitarianism.

Only three areas failed to achieve significance at College B at the .05 level of confidence: Intellectual Orientation, Cultural/Esthetic Awareness, and Traditional Religiousness. The only one of the three to achieve significant differences among the groups was the goal/practice area of Cultural/Esthetic Awareness. Students perceived the practices related to this area as being emphasized to a greater extent than was perceived by Faculty members of College B. The level of the goal of Cultural/Esthetic Awareness was midway between low and medium for all three groups.

The goal of Intellectual Orientation was perceived to be of a level midway between medium and high importance by the three groups.

College B was the only college not to achieve significant differences among the groups in Traditional Religiousness. The goal was perceived to be in the low to medium range by the three groups.

In summary, College B achieved the greatest number of congruent goal/practice areas than any of the other colleges with seventeen significant at the .05 level or greater. There were only six significantly different means among the groups, as well. This would indicate a high degree of congruence, both among goals and practices and among the groups.

College C

College C achieved the second lowest number of significant relationships between goals and practices with a total of twelve achieving significance at greater than .05.

Only one area achieved significance at the .001 level of confidence--the area of Advanced Training. There was an extremely high degree of congruence between goal and practice with both perceived to be of low importance. As in the other colleges, Students perceived this goal to be of greater importance than Faculty and Administrators.

Six goal/practice areas achieved significant relationship at greater than .01. These six are: Intellectual Orientation, Cultural/Esthetic Awareness, Research, Social Criticism/Activism, Freedom, and Democratic Governance.

This would indicate a relatively high level of congruence between goal and practice in these areas.

Significant differences among groups were detected in only three of the six areas: Research, Social Criticism/Activism and Cultural/Esthetic Awareness. As in the other colleges, Students perceived the area of Research to be of greater importance in the college than both Administrators and Faculty. The practices related to the goal of Social Criticism/Activism were perceived to be emphasized greater by Students than both Administrators and Faculty. Faculty placed significantly greater importance on the goal of Cultural/Esthetic Awareness than Students. Administrators and Faculty perceived the goal to be above medium importance, whereas Students perceived the practice of Social Criticism/Activism to be emphasized to a greater extent than both Faculty and Administrators. Administrators perceived the goal to be of low importance, as did the Faculty, whereas Students perceived it to be of below medium importance.

The goal of Intellectual Orientation was perceived to be of above medium importance by all three groups in College C

The goal of Freedom was perceived to be of medium importance by Students and below medium importance by Faculty and Administrators.

The goal of Democratic Governance was perceived to be of low importance by Faculty and medium importance by Students and Administrators, but the difference was not significant.

An additional five goal/practice areas achieved significant correlations at the .05 level. These five areas were: Individual Personal Development, Traditional Religiousness, Meeting Local Needs, Social Egalitarianism, and Intellectual/Esthetic Environment. This would indicate congruence, but not at an extremely high level of confidence.

Two of the areas achieved significantly different results at the .05 level of confidence among the groups. In the area of Social Egalitarianism, Faculty perceived the practices related to this area to be emphasized to a greater extent than the Students. The goal of Social Egalitarianism was perceived to be of medium importance by the groups.

Students perceived the practice of Intellectual/Esthetic Environment to be emphasized to a greater extent than Faculty members and Administrators. The goal of Intellectual/Esthetic Environment was perceived to be of below medium importance.

The goal of Individual Personal Development was perceived to be midway between medium and high importance by the three groups.

The goal of Traditional Religiousness was perceived to be of low to below medium importance.

Meeting Local Needs was perceived to be of medium importance by the three groups as a goal.

Eight goal/practice areas failed to achieve significance at College C at the .05 level or greater. These areas were: Academic Development, Humanism/Altruism, Vocational Preparation, Public Service, Community, Innovation, Off Campus Learning, and Accountability/Efficiency. In the area of Academic Development, all three groups placed an importance of between high and extremely high degree. No differences were detected between groups.

The area of Humanism/Altruism was in the high medium level of importance as a goal and no significant differences were detected between groups.

No significance was detected between groups in the area of Vocational Preparation and the goal was perceived to be of medium importance.

The area of Public Service achieved low medium importance as a goal and no significant differences were detected between groups.

No significance was detected between groups in the areas of Community, Innovation, and Accountability/Efficiency. Community was perceived to be of medium high importance, Innovation of medium to low importance, and the goal of Accountability/Efficiency was perceived to be well above high importance.

The only area to achieve significant differences between groups that was not correlated was the area of Off Campus Learning in which Students perceived it as of greater importance than the Faculty of College C. The goal was perceived to be of low importance by all three groups.

To summarize, twelve goal/practice areas achieved significance at greater than .05. This would indicate a lack of congruence between goals and practices in at least eight of the goal areas. The greatest differences between groups was detected between Students on the one hand and Faculty and/or Administrators on the other.

College D

Fourteen goal/practice areas achieved significance at greater than the .05 level of confidence at College D. Five of these were significant at the .001 level: Academic Development, Freedom, Democratic Governance, Community, and

Innovation. An extremely high level of congruence is thus present in these areas.

Not only were the five areas highly congruent between goals and practices, there were also no significant differences between groups in these areas. This would indicate an extremely high level of congruence for these areas, both among the groups and between practices and goals.

The level of importance perceived by the three groups in these five areas was: Academic Development--midway between high and extremely high; Freedom--high importance; Democratic Governance--midway between medium and high importance; Community--above medium to high importance; and Innovation--medium to high importance.

An additional five areas achieved significant relationship between goal and practices at the .01 level of confidence. These areas were: Traditional Religiousness, Advanced Training, Public Service, Social Criticism/Activism, and Intellectual/Esthetic Environment. Two of the areas achieved no significant differences among the groups--Public Service and Social Criticism/Activism. Public Service was perceived to be of medium importance as a goal. Social Criticism/Activism was perceived to be of low medium importance.

Traditional Religiousness achieved a low importance

as a goal. Students perceived the goal to be of significantly greater importance than Faculty members of College D.

As in the other colleges, Students perceived the goal of Advanced Training to be of greater importance than Faculty and Administrators. Students perceived it to be of high level of importance as a goal, while Faculty and Administrators perceived it to be of low level of importance.

All three groups perceived a high level of importance for the goal of Public Service, and there were no significant differences among the groups.

Students of College D placed a greater level of importance on the practices related to Intellectual/Esthetic Environment than did Faculty members. The goal was perceived to be of medium importance.

Four additional goal/practice areas achieved significant correlation at the .05 level. These areas were: Intellectual Orientation, Individual Personal Development, Humanism/Altruism, and Cultural/Esthetic Awareness. No differences were significant among the groups in the areas of Intellectual Orientation and Humanism/Altruism. Intellectual Orientation was perceived as a high medium goal and Humanism/Altruism as a goal of low to medium importance.

In the area of Individual Personal Development, Faculty perceived the goal to be more important than did Students.

Faculty perceived the goal to be below high importance and Students of above medium importance.

Significant differences were detected on both the goal and practice of Cultural/Esthetic Awareness. Faculty perceived this goal to be more important than both Students and Administrators. Both Students and Administrators perceived the goal to be above the level of low importance and the Faculty perceived it to be of medium importance. As a practice, Students perceived greater emphasis related to this area than Faculty.

Six goal/practice areas failed to achieve significant correlation. These were: Vocational Preparation, Research, Meeting Local Needs, Social Egalitarianism, Off Campus Learning, and Accountability/Efficiency. Only one, Vocational Preparation, failed to produce significant differences among the groups. The goal was perceived to be a medium to high level goal by participants at College D.

The Research area was the same as for all other colleges with Students perceiving greater importance for it than both Faculty and Administrators. A medium level of importance was perceived for this goal by Students and a low level of importance by Faculty and Administrators.

In the area of Meeting Local Needs, both Faculty and Administrators perceived the goal to be of greater importance

than the Students. Whereas Students perceived it to be of medium importance, Faculty and Administrators perceived it to be of high importance.

Faculty and Administrators also perceived the area of Social Egalitarianism to be emphasized in practice to a greater extent than Students. The goal is perceived to be between medium and high importance by the participants.

The area of Off Campus Learning produced significant differences between Students, who perceived this goal to be of medium low importance, and Faculty, who perceived it to be of low importance.

Both Faculty and Administrators perceived the goal of Accountability/Efficiency to be of greater importance than Students. Students perceived it to be of medium importance, whereas Administrators and Faculty perceived it to be of high importance.

College D achieved significant correlation at greater than the .05 level in fourteen goal/practice areas. This would indicate congruence in these areas between goals and practices. Correlation was not significant in six areas, leading to questions concerning practices related to associated goals.

Faculty

Faculties of the four colleges differed significantly in six of the twenty goal areas and ten of the practice areas. In the area of Cultural/Esthetic Awareness, the Faculty of Colleges C and D perceived the goal to be significantly more important than the Faculty of College B. Both College C and D Faculty perceived this goal to be of above medium importance, and the Faculty of College B perceived it to be of low importance. The Faculty of College D perceived the practice of Cultural/Esthetic Awareness to be emphasized to a significantly greater extent than College B Faculty.

In the area of Vocational Preparation, Faculty D perceived the goal to be more important than all other Faculties. Whereas College D Faculty perceived it to be of high importance, it was perceived to be of high medium importance by the Faculties of Colleges B and C, and below medium importance by the Faculty of College A. College B and C Faculty also perceived this goal to be significantly more important than College A Faculty. As a practice, College B and D Faculties perceived significantly greater emphasis on this area than the Faculties of Colleges A and C.

Faculties of Colleges B and D also perceived greater

emphasis on the practice of Meeting Local Needs in their colleges than Faculties of Colleges A and C.

Significant differences were detected on both goals and practices in the area of Social Egalitarianism among Faculty members. College C and D Faculties perceived the goal to be more important than College A and B Faculties. Whereas the Faculties of Colleges C and D perceived the goal to be of high medium importance, College A and B Faculties perceived the goal to be of medium low importance.

There were no significant differences among Faculties in the area of Democratic Governance as a goal, but the Faculties of Colleges B and D perceived the practice as receiving more emphasis than the Faculties of Colleges A and C. College B and D Faculties perceived this practice to be emphasized to a low medium extent, whereas A and C Faculties perceived it to be emphasized to a low extent.

In the area of Community, the Faculties of Colleges B, C and D emphasized this practice to a greater extent than the Faculty of College A. Colleges B, C and D emphasized this practice to a high medium extent, whereas the Faculty of College A placed a below medium emphasis on it. College D Faculty also perceived greater emphasis on this practice than College B, with the College D Faculty perceiving it to be of

high medium emphasis and College B Faculty perceived it to be of medium emphasis.

Significant differences were noted among the Faculties in the area of Intellectual/Esthetic Environment, both as a goal and as a practice. College D Faculty perceived this goal to be more important than the Faculties of Colleges A and B. An emphasis of high medium extent was placed on the goal by College D Faculty, and an emphasis of low medium and low by the Faculties of Colleges A and B respectively. College C Faculty also perceived this goal to be of significantly greater importance than College B Faculty. College C Faculty placed medium importance on the goal, and College B Faculty, low importance. College D Faculty perceived this practice as being emphasized significantly more than the Faculties of all the other colleges. College D Faculty perceived it to be of low emphasis and the other Faculties as midway between none and low.

The only significant differences found in the area of Innovation were found among the Faculties. Faculty D perceived this goal to be of greater importance than the three other Faculties. Faculty D perceived it to be of high medium importance, and the other Faculties as midway between low and medium. The same significant differences were found among

the practice, with Faculty D perceiving the practice to be above medium importance and the other Faculties perceiving this practice as being between low and medium importance. Colleges C and B perceived this practice to be emphasized greater by their Faculties than the Faculty of College A.

Significant differences were found among both the goal and the practice of Off Campus Learning among the Faculties. The College D Faculty perceived the goal to be more important than all three other Faculties. College D Faculty perceived it to be of above low importance, whereas the other college Faculties perceived it to be between no and low importance. College C also perceived greater emphasis on the goal than College B Faculty. As a practice, College D Faculty also perceived it as receiving greater emphasis than was perceived by the three other Faculties. College D Faculty perceived it to be above low importance and the other Faculties between no importance and low importance.

College C and D Faculties perceived the practice of Accountability/Efficiency to be emphasized greater at their colleges than the Faculties of Colleges A and B. Colleges C and D Faculties perceived the practice to be emphasized to an extent above medium, whereas the Faculties of Colleges A and B perceived it to be of below medium importance.

The greatest significant differences within groups were found among the Faculty members of the four colleges. Six areas were found to be significantly different as goals and eight areas as practices. College D Faculty rated every one of the significant goal or practice areas at a higher level than one or more of the other Faculties.

Students

Significant differences were found among the Students at the four colleges in only three goal areas and six practice areas. This would indicate greater congruence among Students than was found among Faculty members of the four colleges.

The only significant interaction discovered in the area of Academic Development was found among the Students at three of the colleges with Students from College B perceiving greater emphasis on this area than Students from Colleges A and D. Students of College B perceived this practice to be emphasized to an above medium extent at their institution, whereas Students of Colleges A and D perceived it to be of below medium emphasis.

Differences were found among Students in both the goal and practice of Cultural/Esthetic Environment. Students of College A perceived this goal to be more important than Students at the other three colleges, with College A Students

perceiving it to be of medium importance and the other three colleges approximately midway between low and medium importance. College D Students, however, perceived this practice to be emphasized significantly more at their institution than the Students of the other three colleges. College D Students perceived this practice to be emphasized to an extent midway between low importance and medium importance, whereas the other three Students placed practically no emphasis on the area.

In the area of Social Egalitarianism, the only significant difference between Students at the four institutions was in the practices. Students of College D perceived this area as receiving greater emphasis than Students of Colleges B and C. Students of College D perceived it to be of medium importance, whereas Students of Colleges B and C perceived it to be below medium importance.

Students of College D also perceived the practice of Social Criticism/Activism to be emphasized more at their college than Students of Colleges B and C. Students at College D perceived it to be of medium low emphasis and students at Colleges B and C below the mid-point between low and medium importance.

Students of College B perceived greater emphasis on the practice of Democratic Governance than Students at College

College B Students perceived it to be above the midway point between low and medium emphasis and the Students of College C well below that mid-point.

Colleges A, C, and D Students perceived greater emphasis on the practice of Intellectual/Esthetic Environment than Students from College B. Students of Colleges A, C, and D perceived it to be of low medium emphasis and the Students of College B of low emphasis.

Students of Colleges A and D perceived the goal of Off Campus Learning to be of more importance than the Students of Colleges B and C. Students of A and D perceived it to be of low-medium importance and Students of B and C to be of low importance.

Students achieved significant differences in only three goal areas and six practice areas, thus this would appear to be high congruence, since only nine of the forty-eight possible relationships achieved significant differences.

Administrators

Administrators achieved significant differences in only one goal area and five practice areas. Part of the lack of significance may be due to the small number of Administrators in the four colleges, as inspection of means indicate more variation than is statistically evident.

The only goal area to achieve significant difference was the area of Cultural/Esthetic Awareness. In this area, Administrators of College A perceived this goal to be of more importance than Administrators of the other three colleges. Administrators of College A perceived the goal to be above medium importance, whereas the Administrators of College C perceived it to be midway between low and medium importance and Administrators of Colleges B and D of low importance. There were also significant differences among the Administrators in the perception of practices in this area. Administrators of College D perceived greater emphasis on this practice than Administrators of Colleges A and C. Administrators of College D perceived it to be above low importance and Administrators of Colleges A and C of no importance.

Administrators of College D also perceived the practice of Vocational Preparation to be of greater significance in their institution than Administrators of College C. Administrators of College D perceived it to be midway between medium and high importance, whereas Administrators of College C perceived it to be midway between low and medium importance.

College D Administrators perceived the practice of Meeting Local Needs to be emphasized to a greater extent in their institution than Administrators of Colleges A and C.

Administrators of College D perceived this practice to be emphasized to a high extent, whereas the Administrators of College A emphasized it to a high medium extent.

Democratic Governance as a practice received greater emphasis from College D Administrators than College B Administrators. It was emphasized between low and medium extent by College D Administrators and below medium extent by Administrators of College B.

Off Campus Learning was also emphasized to a greater extent by College D Administrators than Administrators of all three other colleges. College D Administrators emphasized it to an extent above the low level, whereas the other Administrators of the other colleges emphasized it midway between no emphasis and low emphasis.

Thus, the least differences among groups was found among the Administrators, a fact partially true due to the small number of Administrators in the study. Except for the area of Democratic Governance, College D Administrators placed greater emphasis on the practices that achieved significance than one or more of the other colleges.

Conclusions

1. Goals of colleges are perceived differently by primary participants, especially by Students on the one hand

and Faculty and/or Administrators on the other. In this study, the greatest number of differences are detected in the areas of Traditional Religiousness, Advanced Training, Research, and Off Campus Learning. Of thirty-nine significant differences between groups in this study on perceptions of goals, twenty-two were between Students and Faculty members, fifteen were between Students and Administrators, and only two were between Faculty and Administrators.

2. Practices of Colleges are perceived differently by their primary participants, especially by Students on the one hand and Faculty and/or Administrators on the other. In this study, the greatest number of differences was detected in the areas of Social Egalitarianism and Intellectual/Esthetic Environment. Of sixteen significant differences between groups in perception of practices within institutions, eleven of them were between Students and Faculty, four between Students and Administrators, and only one between Faculty and Administrators.

3. Participants perceive emphasis placed on practices in a more congruent fashion than they perceive college goals and their importance within their institutions but vary more widely in perceptions of practices across the colleges.

4. The greatest dissonance in the perception of goals across the colleges is found among the Faculty members. Of

thirty-five statistically significant differences detected within groups across colleges, twenty-one of them were differences between Faculty members of the four colleges. Students differed significantly ten times and Administrators only three times.

5. The greatest dissonance in the perception of practices across colleges is among Faculty members of the colleges. Of fifty-nine significant differences detected among the groups across the colleges, Faculty members accounted for thirty-six, Students for thirteen, and Administrators for ten.

6. Colleges are different in both the degree of relationship between goals and practices and in the number and variety of areas. The greatest number of significant correlations was detected in the areas of Advanced Training, Social Egalitarianism, Freedom, and Intellectual/Esthetic Environment, in which areas all four colleges achieved significant correlation on the paired scores of Faculty and Administrators. More areas were significantly correlated using three group data, but at a generally lower level of significance. Areas achieving significant correlation in all four colleges with three group data were: Social Criticism/Activism, Intellectual Orientation, Individual Personal Development, Democratic Governance, Academic Development, and Public Service. It is

interesting to note that no area was significantly correlated in all four colleges for both the two and three group data.

7. Student's perceptions of goals and practices tend not to correlate as highly as Faculty and Administrator perceptions. This is indicated by the generally lower level of correlations for three group data than for two group data.

8. Evaluation of a college's effectiveness must include both a definition and recognition of goals, but also some measure of the practices that contribute to them. This is consistent with Etzioni's theory of organizational goals.

Recommendation for Further Study

1. This study should be replicated in other institutions, especially slightly larger ones in which there are a sufficient number of faculty and administrators for a clearer statistical format.

2. This study should include additional publics, especially the community surrounding a community college and boards of control.

3. This study should be replicated in other geographic areas to ascertain whether or not the findings can be generalized outside the immediate area of this study.

4. The IFI-OUM should be again modified to include

statements pertaining to the eight areas to which Students did not respond in this study.

5. The levels of goal areas in each of the colleges should be related to some model of effective junior college functions and objectives.

6. The IGI and IFI should be modified to apply to junior college functions and practices.

APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTIONS OF TWENTY GOAL/PRACTICE AREAS AND STATEMENTS
FROM THE INSTITUTIONAL GOALS INVENTORY AND
INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING INVENTORY~
OKLAHOMA UNIVERSITY MODIFICATION
USED TO DERIVE RAW SCORES

DESCRIPTIONS OF TWENTY GOAL/PRACTICE AREAS AND STATEMENTS
FROM THE INSTITUTIONAL GOALS INVENTORY AND
INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING INVENTORY-
OKLAHOMA UNIVERSITY MODIFICATION
USED TO DERIVE RAW SCORES

ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT

This goal has to do with acquisition of general and specialized knowledge, preparation of students for advanced scholarly study, and maintenance of high intellectual standards on the campus.

IGI

1. to help students acquire depth of knowledge in at least one academic discipline.*
4. to ensure that students acquire a basic knowledge in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences...
6. to prepare students for advanced academic work, e.g., at a four-year college or graduate or professional school...
9. to hold students throughout the institution to high standards of intellectual performance...

IFI-OUM

30. How best to communicate knowledge to undergraduates is not a question that seriously concerns a very large proportion of the faculty. (D-SD)**
33. Capable undergraduates are encouraged to collaborate with faculty on research projects or to carry out studies of their own. (SA-A)
36. Almost every degree program is constructed to enable the student to acquire a depth of knowledge in at least one academic discipline. (SA-A)
42. This institution takes pride in the percentage of graduates who go on to advanced study. (SA-A)
51. A 4.0 grade average brings to a student the highest recognition on this campus. (SA-A)
62. It is almost impossible for a student to graduate from this institution without a basic knowledge of the social sciences, natural sciences and humanities. (SA-A)

*Individual estimates present (Is) and preferred (Should Be) importance of goal statement on five-point scale: of no importance, of low importance, of medium importance, of high importance, or of extremely high importance.

**Some IFI-OUM items (55) require a choice among "Yes," or "No," or "Don't Know"; Sixty-five statements call for a choice among "Strongly Agree," "Agree," "Disagree," and "Strongly Disagree." The keyed response is indicated in parentheses.

***Special permission to use the IGI and to revise the IFI for this study was granted by Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

INTELLECTUAL ORIENTATION

This goal area relates to an attitude conducive to learning and intellectual work on the campus. Likewise, some conception of the scholarly, rational, analytical, inquiring mind has perhaps always been associated with the academy or university.

IGI

2. to train students in methods of scholarly inquiry, scientific research, and/or problem definition and solution...
5. to increase the desire and ability of students to undertake self-directed learning...
7. to develop students' ability to synthesize knowledge from a variety of sources...
10. to instill in students a life-long commitment to learning...

INDIVIDUAL PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

This goal area means identification by students of personal goals and development of means for achieving them, enhancement of sense of self-worth and self-confidence.

IGI

3. to help students identify their own personal goals and develop means of achieving them...
8. to help students develop a sense of self-confidence, and a capacity to have an impact on events...
11. to help students achieve deeper levels of self-understanding...
13. to help students be open, honest, and trusting in their relationships with others...

IFI-OUM

31. Students who display traditional "scholar" behavior are held in low esteem in the campus community. (D-SD)
34. Undergraduate programs of instruction are designed to include demonstration of the methods of problem analysis. (SA-A)
37. A major expectation of faculty members is that they will help students to synthesize knowledge from many sources. (SA-A)
43. Student publications of high intellectual reputation exist on this campus. (SA-A)
52. Academic advisors generally favor that a meaningful portion of each degree program be allocated to individual study. (SA-A)
63. Programs for the adult (out-of-school) age student are primarily designed to treat his vocational needs. (D-SD)

IFI-OUM

3. Regulations of student behavior are detailed and precise at this institution. (N)
9. Advisement (counseling) is offered students concerning personal as well as academic goals. (Y)
19. A testing-counseling program is available to students to help them achieve self-understanding. (Y)
44. Professors get to know most students in their undergraduate classes quite well. (SA-A)
53. Most faculty members do not wish to spend much time in talking with students about students' personal interests and concerns. (D-SD)
64. Formal organizations designed to provide special assistance to students are accorded favorable recognition by individual members of the faculty. (SA-A)

CULTURAL/ESTHETIC AWARENESS

This goal area entails a heightened appreciation of a variety of art forms, required study in the humanities or arts, exposure to forms of non-Western art, and encouragement of active student participation in artistic expression.

IGI

15. to increase students' sensitivity to and appreciation of various forms of art and artistic expression...
18. to require students to complete some course work in the humanities or arts...
21. to encourage students to express themselves artistically, e.g., in music, painting, film-making...
24. to acquaint persons with forms of artistic or literary expression in non-Western countries...

IFI-OUM

1. There is a campus art gallery in which traveling exhibits or collections on loan are regularly displayed. (Y)
4. Foreign films are shown regularly on or near campus. (Y)
11. This institution attempts each year to sponsor a rich program of cultural events --lectures, concerts, plays, art exhibits, and the like. (Y)
12. At least one modern dance program has been given within the past year. (Y)
21. At least one chamber music concert has been given within the past year. (Y)
28. At least one poetry reading, open to the campus community, has been given within the past year. (Y)

HUMANISM/ALTRUISM

This goal area reflects a respect for diverse cultures, commitment to working for world peace, consciousness of the important moral issues of the time, and concern about the welfare of man generally.

IGI

14. to encourage students to become conscious of the important moral issues of our times...
17. to help students understand and respect people from diverse backgrounds and cultures...
20. to encourage students to become committed to working for world peace...
23. to encourage students to make concern about the welfare of all mankind a central part of their lives...

IFI-OUM

10. Successful efforts to raise funds or to perform voluntary service to relieve human need and suffering occur at least annually on this campus. (Y)
38. The important moral issues of the time are discussed seriously in classes and programs. (SA-A)
20. An organization exists on campus which has as its primary objective to work for world peace. (Y)
45. Foreign students are genuinely respected and are made to feel welcome on this campus. (SA-A)
65. Faculty members are more concerned with helping students to acquire knowledge and professional skills than they are in helping students to be better persons. (D-SD)
54. When a student has a special problem, some of his peers usually are aware of and respond to his need. (SA-A)

TRADITIONAL RELIGIOUSNESS

This goal area is intended to mean a religiousness that is orthodox, doctrinal, usually sectarian, and often fundamental--in short, traditional rather than "secular" or "modern".

IGI

16. to educate students in a particular religious heritage...
19. to help students become aware of the potentialities of a full-time religious vocation...
22. to develop students' ability to understand and defend a theological position...
25. to help students develop a dedication to serving God in everyday life...

VOCATIONAL PREPARATION

This goal area means offering: specific occupational curricula (as in accounting or nursing), programs geared to emerging career fields, opportunities for re-training or upgrading skills, and assistance to students in career planning.

IGI

26. to provide opportunities for students to receive training for specific occupational careers, e.g., accounting, engineering, nursing...
30. to develop educational programs geared to new and emerging career fields...
36. to provide retraining opportunities for individuals whose job skills have become out of date...
38. to assist students in deciding upon a vocational career...

IFI-OUN

5. Religious services are conducted regularly on campus involving a majority of the students. (Y)
13. Ministers are invited to the campus to speak and to counsel students about religious vocations. (Y)
22. The institution sponsors groups and programs which provide students opportunities to witness to others concerning their faith. (Y)
46. Religious diversity is encouraged at this institution. (D-SD)
55. Religious ideals of the institution's founding fathers are considered by most faculty members to be obsolete. (D-SD)
66. By example, the administration and faculty encourage the students to dedicate their lives to God. (SA-A)

IFI-OUN

74. Counseling services are available to adults in the local area seeking information about educational and occupational matters. (Y)
77. There is a job placement service through which local employers may hire students and graduates for full- or part-time work. (Y)
81. Some of the strongest and best-funded undergraduate academic departments are professional departments which prepare students for specific occupations, such as nursing,
114. The faculty is receptive to adding new courses geared to emerging career fields. (SA-A)
87. Courses or seminars are conducted in order that former students and others may be re-trained or upgraded in their skills. (Y)
93. Counseling services are available to students to assist them in choosing a career. (Y)

ADVANCED TRAINING

This goal area can be most readily understood simply as the availability of post-graduate education.

IGI

- 27. to develop what would generally be regarded as a strong and comprehensive graduate school...
- 31. to provide training in one or more of the traditional professions, e.g., law, medicine, architecture...
- 32. to offer graduate programs in such "newer" professions as engineering, education, and social work...
- 41. to conduct advanced study in specialized problem areas, e.g., through research institutes, centers, or graduate programs...

RESEARCH

This goal area involved doing contract studies for external agencies, conducting basic research in the natural and social sciences, and seeking generally to extend the frontiers of knowledge through scientific research.

IGI

- 28. to perform contract research for government, business, or industry...
- 34. to conduct basic research in the natural sciences...
- 35. to conduct basic research in the social sciences...
- 37. to contribute, through research, to the general advancement of knowledge...

IFI-OUT

- 82. A number of departments frequently hold seminars or colloquia in which a visiting scholar discusses his ideas or research findings. (Y)
- 88. New advanced degrees have been authorized and awarded within the last three years. (Y)
- 94. One or more non-traditional graduate departments (or centers) has been established within the last five years. (Y)
- 105. More recognition is regularly accorded faculty members for research grants received than for service grants. (SA-A)
- 109. The graduates of such professional colleges as the Colleges of Law and Medicine at this institution are recognized by the public as strong practitioners. (SA-A)
- 115. Undergraduates interested in study beyond the B.A. level receive little or no formal encouragement from the faculty or staff. (D-SD)

IFI-OUT

- 75. Quite a number of faculty members have had books published in the past two or three years. (Y)
- 78. There are a number of research professors on campus i.e., faculty members whose appointments primarily entail research rather than teaching. (Y)
- 83. The average teaching load in most departments is eight credit hours or fewer. (Y)
- 89. Faculty promotions generally are based primarily on scholarly publication. (Y)
- 95. In general, the governing board is committed to the view that advancement of knowledge through research and scholarship is a major institutional purpose. (Y)
- 116. Few, if any of the faculty could be regarded as having national or international reputations for their scientific or scholarly contributions. (D-SD)

MEETING LOCAL NEEDS

This goal area is defined as providing for continuing education for adults, serving as a cultural center for the community, providing trained manpower for local employers, and facilitating student involvement in community-service activities.

IGI

29. to provide opportunities for continuing education for adults in the local area, e.g., on a part-time basis...
33. to serve as a cultural center in the community served by the campus...
39. to provide trained manpower for local-area business, industry, and government...
40. to facilitate involvement of students in neighborhood and community-service activities...

PUBLIC SERVICE

This goal area means working with governmental agencies in social and environmental policy formation, committing institutional resources to the solution of major social and environmental problems, training people from disadvantaged communities, and generally being responsive to regional and national priorities in planning educational program.

IGI

44. to help people from disadvantaged communities acquire knowledge and skills they can use in improving conditions in their own communities...
47. to work with governmental agencies in designing new social and environmental programs...
50. to focus resources of the institution on the solution of major social and environmental problems...
51. to be responsive to regional and national priorities when considering new educational programs for the institution...

IFI-OUN

73. This institution operates an adult education program, e.g., evening courses open to local area residents. (Y)
76. Courses are offered through which local area residents may be retrained or upgraded in their job skills. (Y)
79. Facilities are made available to local groups and organizations for meetings, short courses, clinics, forums, etc. (Y)
84. There are a number of courses or programs that are designed to provide manpower for local area business, industry, or public services. (Y)
90. Courses dealing with artistic expression or appreciation are available to all adults in the local area. (Y)
96. Attention is given to maintaining fairly close relationships with businesses and industries in the local area. (Y)

IFI-OUN

2. There are programs and/or organizations at this institution which are directly concerned with solving pressing social problems, e.g., race relations, urban blight, rural poverty, etc. (Y)
6. A number of professors have been involved in the past few years with economic planning at either the national, regional, or state level. (Y)
14. Professors from this institution have been actively involved in framing state or federal legislation in the areas of health, education, or welfare. (Y)
23. A number of faculty members or administrators from this institution have gone to Washington to participate in planning and operating various federal programs. (Y)
56. Senior administrators generally support (or would support) faculty members who spend time away from the campus consulting with governmental agencies about social, economic, and related matters. (SA-A)
67. Administrators and faculty have in the past three years been responsive to regional and national priorities in planning educational programs. (SA-A)

SOCIAL EGALITARIANISM

This goal area has to do with open admissions and meaningful education for all admitted, providing educational experiences relevant to the evolving interests of minority groups and women, and offering remedial work in basic skills.

IGI

42. to provide educational experiences relevant to the evolving interests of women in America...
45. to move to or maintain a policy of essentially open admissions, and then to develop meaningful educational experiences for all who are admitted.
48. to offer developmental or remedial programs in basic skills (reading, writing, mathematics)...
52. to provide educational experiences relevant to the evolving interests of Blacks, Chicanos, and American Indians...

SOCIAL CRITICISM/ACTIVISM

This goal area means providing criticisms of prevailing American values, offering ideas for changing social institutions judged to be defective, helping students learn how to bring about change in American society, and being engaged, as an institution, in working for basic changes in American society.

IGI

43. to provide critical evaluations of prevailing practices and values in American society...
46. to serve as a source of ideas and recommendations for changing social institutions judged to be unjust or otherwise defective...
49. to help students learn how to bring about change in American society...
53. to be engaged, as an institution, in working for basic changes in American society...

IFI-OLM

7. There are provisions by which some number of educationally disadvantaged students may be admitted to the institution without meeting the normal entrance requirements. (Y)
15. A concerted effort is made to attract students of diverse ethnic and social backgrounds. (Y)
24. One of the methods used to influence the flavor of the college is to try to select students with fairly similar personality traits. (N)
29. The curriculum is deliberately designed to accommodate a great diversity in student ability levels and educational-vocational aspirations. (Y)
57. Compared with most other colleges, fewer minority groups are represented on this campus. (D-SD)
68. There are no courses or programs for students with educational deficiencies, i.e., remedial work. (D-SD)

IFI-OLM

16. Quite a number of students are associated with organizations that actively seek to reform society in one way or another. (Y)
25. This institution, through the efforts of individuals and/or specially created institutes or centers, is actively engaged in projects aimed at improving the quality of urban life. (Y)
39. Many faculty members would welcome the opportunity to participate in laying plans for broad social and economic reforms in American society. (SA-A)
47. Application of knowledge and talent to the solution of social problems is a mission of this institution that is widely supported by faculty and administrators. (SA-A)
58. The notion of colleges and universities assuming leadership in bringing about social change is not an idea that is or would be particularly popular on this campus. (D-SD)
69. The governing board does not consider active engagement in resolving major social ills to be an appropriate institutional function. (D-SD)

FREEDOM

This goal area is defined as protecting the right of the faculty to present controversial ideas in the classroom, not preventing students from hearing controversial points of view, placing no restrictions on off-campus political activities by faculty or students, and ensuring faculty and students the freedom to choose their own life styles.

IGI

54. to ensure that students are not prevented from hearing speakers representing controversial points of view...
57. to ensure the freedom of students and faculty to choose their own life styles (living arrangements, personal appearance, etc...
60. to place no restrictions on off-campus political activities by faculty or students...
63. to protect the right of faculty members to present unpopular or controversial ideas in classroom...

DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

This goal area means decentralized decision-making arrangements by which students, faculty, administrators, and governing board members can all be significantly involved in campus governance; opportunity for individuals to participate in all decisions affecting them; and governance that is genuinely responsive to the concerns of everyone at the institution.

IGI

55. to create a system of campus governance that is genuinely responsive to the concerns of all persons at the institution...
53. to develop arrangements by which students, faculty, administrators, and trustees can be significantly involved in campus governance...
61. to decentralize decision making on the campus to the greatest extent possible...
64. to assure individuals the opportunity to participate or be represented in making any decisions that affect them...

IFI-OUM

17. There are no written regulations regarding student dress. (Y)
26. The institution imposes certain restrictions on off-campus political activities by faculty members. (N)
41. Certain radical student organizations, such as Students for a Democratic Society, are not, or probably would not be, allowed to organize chapters on this campus. (D-SD)
49. Certain highly controversial figures in public life are not allowed or probably would not be allowed to address students. (D-SD)
60. Faculty members feel free to express radical political beliefs in their classroom. (SA-A)
71. The governing body (e.g., Board of Trustees) strongly supports the principle of academic freedom for faculty and students to discuss any topic they may choose. (SA-A)

IFI-OUM

32. In dealing with institutional problems, attempts are generally made to involve interested people without regard to their formal position or hierarchical status. (SA-A)
35. Power here tends to be widely dispersed rather than tightly held. (SA-A)
40. Serious consideration is given to student opinion when policy decisions affecting students are made. (SA-A)
48. Governance of this institution is clearly in the hands of the administration. (D-SD)
59. In arriving at institutional policies, attempts are generally made to involve all the individuals who will be directly affected. (SA-A)
70. Students, faculty, administrators all have opportunities for meaningful involvement in campus governance. (SA-A)

COMMUNITY

This goal area is defined as maintaining a climate in which there is faculty commitment to the general welfare of the institution, open and candid communication, open and amicable airing of differences, and mutual trust and respect among students, faculty, and administrators.

IGI

- 56. to maintain a climate in which faculty commitment to the goals and well-being of the institution is as strong as commitment to professional careers...
- 59. to maintain a climate in which communication throughout the organizational structure is open and candid...
- 62. to maintain a campus climate in which differences of opinion can be aired openly and amicably...
- 65. to maintain a climate of mutual trust and respect among students, faculty, and administrators...

INTELLECTUAL/ESTHETIC ENVIRONMENT

This goal area means a rich program of cultural events, a campus climate that facilitates student free-time involvement in intellectual and cultural activities, an environment in which students and faculty can easily interact informally, and a reputation as an intellectually exciting campus.

IGI

- 66. to create a campus climate in which students and faculty may easily come together for informal discussion of ideas and mutual interests...
- 69. to create a campus climate in which students spend much of their free time in intellectual and cultural activities...
- 73. to sponsor each year a rich program of cultural events--lectures, concerts, art exhibits, and the like...
- 76. to create an institution known widely as an intellectually exciting and stimulating place...

IFI-OUN

- 99. Most faculty members consider the senior administrators on campus to be able and well-qualified for their positions. (SA-A)
- 101. Generally speaking, top-level administrators are providing effective educational leadership.
- 103. Generally speaking, communication between the faculty and administration is poor. (D-SD)
- 106. Staff infighting, backbiting, and the like seem to be more the rule than the exception. (D-SD)
- 110. Although they may criticize certain practices, most faculty seem to be very loyal to the institution. (SA-A)
- 117. There is a strong sense of community, a feeling of shared interests and purposes, on this campus. (SA-A)

IFI-OUN

- 8. A number of nationally known scientists and/or scholars are invited to the campus each year to address student and faculty groups. (Y)
- 18. Students publish a literary magazine. (Y)
- 27. There are a number of student groups that meet regularly to discuss intellectual and/or philosophic topics.
- 50. Little money is generally available for inviting outstanding people to give public lectures. (D-SD)
- 61. The student newspaper comments regularly on important issues and ideas (in addition to carrying out the more customary tasks of student newspapers). (SA-A)
- 72. Many opportunities exist outside the classroom for intellectual and esthetic self-expression on the part of students (SA-A)

INNOVATION

This goal area is defined as a climate in which continuous innovation is an accepted way of life, it means established procedures for readily initiating curricular or instructional innovations, and, more specifically, it means experimentation with new approaches to individualized instruction and to evaluating and grading student performance.

IGI

67. to build a climate on the campus in which continuous educational innovation is accepted as an institutional way of life...
70. to experiment with different methods of evaluating and grading student performances...
74. to experiment with new approaches to individualized instruction such as tutorials, flexible scheduling, and students planning their own programs...
77. to create procedures by which curricular or instructional innovations may be readily initiated...

OFF CAMPUS LEARNING

This goal area includes time away from the campus in travel, work-study, VISTA work, etc.; study on several campuses during undergraduate programs; awarding degrees for supervised study off the campus; awarding degrees entirely on the basis of performance on an examination.

IGI

68. to encourage students to spend time away from the campus gaining academic credit for such activities as a year of study abroad, in work-study programs, in VISTA, etc...
72. to participate in a network of colleges through which students, according to plan, may study on several campuses during their undergraduate years...
75. to award the bachelor's and/or associate degree for supervised study done away from the campus, e.g., in extension or tutorial centers, by correspondence, or through field work...
78. to award the bachelor's and/or associate degree to some individuals solely on the basis of their performance on an acceptable examination (with no college-supervised study, on-or off-campus, necessary)...

IFI-OUT

100. It is almost impossible to obtain the necessary financial support to try out a new idea in educational practice. (D-SD)
102. There is a general willingness here to experiment with innovations that have shown promise at other institutions. (SA-A)
104. High ranking administrators or department chairmen generally encourage professors to experiment with new courses and teaching methods. (SA-A)
107. This institution would be willing to be among the first to experiment with a novel educational program or method if it appeared promising. (SA-A)
111. In my experience it has not been easy for new ideas about educational practice to receive a hearing. (D-SD)
118. This institution has experimented with new approaches to either individualized instruction or evaluation of student performance. (SA-A)

IFI-OUT

80. Credit for numerous courses can be earned now solely on the basis of performance on an examination. (Y)
85. A plan exists at this institution whereby a student may be awarded a degree based primarily on supervised study off campus. (Y)
112. A graduate is usually considered by faculty to be better educated if all of his credit hours were earned at this institution, than if he had studied on several campuses in qualifying for his degree. (D-SD)
91. Several arrangements exist by which students may enroll for credit in short terms away from the campus in travel, work-study, VISTA type work, etc. (Y)
97. Every student is encouraged to include some study abroad in his educational program. (Y)
119. Off-campus learning experiences of various types are considered as valuable, or more valuable, to the student's education, as regular courses. (SA-A)

ACCOUNTABILITY/EFFICIENCY

This goal area is defined to include use of cost criteria in deciding among program alternatives, concern for program efficiency, accountability to funding sources for program effectiveness, and regular submission of evidence that the institution is achieving stated goals.

IGI

- 79. to apply cost criteria in deciding among alternative academic and non-academic programs...
- 81. to regularly provide evidence that the institution is actually achieving its stated goals...
- 83. to be concerned about the efficiency with which college operations are conducted...
- 87. to be accountable to funding sources for the effectiveness of college programs...

IFI-OUM

- 86. One or more individuals are presently engaged in long-range financial planning for the total institution. (Y)
- 92. Analyses of the philosophy, purposes, and objectives of the institution are frequently conducted. (Y)
- 98. Planning at this institution is continuous rather than one-shot or completely nonexistent. (Y)
- 108. Laying plans for the future of the institution is a high priority activity for many senior administrators. (SA-A)
- 113. Seldom do faculty members prepare formal evaluations of institutional goal achievement. (D-SD)
- 120. The approval of proposals for new instructional programs is regularly dependent on an estimate of potential efficiency. (SA-A)

APPENDIX B

GOAL AND PRACTICE MEANS FOR EACH GROUP
IN EACH COLLEGE FOR TWENTY
GOAL/PRACTICE AREAS

APPENDIX B

GOAL AND PRACTICE MEANS FOR EACH GROUP IN EACH COLLEGE FOR TWENTY GOAL/PRACTICE AREAS

AREAS		COLLEGES							
		A		B		C		D	
		G	P	G	P	G	P	G	P
Ac Dev	F	3.825	2.921	3.727	3.209	3.591	2.935	3.657	2.897
	S	3.483	2.873	3.715	3.013	3.468	2.946	3.524	2.813
	A	4.200	2.998	4.167	3.220	3.625	2.997	3.600	2.994
Int Or	F	3.575	2.848	3.705	2.664	3.477	2.725	3.740	2.710
	S	3.327	2.716	3.355	2.647	3.234	2.739	3.333	2.697
	A	4.400	3.030	3.417	2.660	3.250	2.705	3.150	2.730
In Per D	F	3.450	3.478	3.886	3.201	3.795	2.818	3.952	3.360
	S	3.500	2.983	3.460	3.106	3.410	2.977	3.380	2.819
	A	4.350	3.762	4.083	3.387	3.375	2.662	3.950	3.096
Hum/Alt	F	2.725	2.542	2.909	2.613	2.841	2.299	3.279	2.736
	S	2.977	2.506	2.830	2.619	2.835	2.547	2.672	2.573
	A	3.250	2.876	3.333	2.607	2.500	2.205	2.650	2.650
Cul/Est	F	2.925	1.456	2.523	1.282	3.250	1.191	3.183	1.883
	S	2.938	1.848	2.415	1.776	2.633	1.549	2.531	2.455
	A	3.500	1.200	2.500	1.333	3.063	1.125	2.550	2.300
Trad Rel	F	1.850	1.868	1.955	2.152	1.386	2.052	1.635	1.991
	S	2.670	2.079	2.180	2.009	2.149	2.110	2.031	1.943
	A	1.850	1.962	2.333	2.273	2.000	2.247	1.700	1.830
Voc Prep	F	2.975	2.772	3.841	3.371	3.205	2.895	4.048	3.585
	S	3.443		3.975		3.261		3.464	
	A	3.700	3.096	3.750	3.163	2.750	2.690	3.300	3.464
Adv Trn	F	1.850	1.848	1.705	1.997	1.386	1.849	1.692	2.137
	S	3.080		3.255		2.817		3.049	
	A	1.432	2.080	1.333	1.830	1.375	2.057	1.700	1.716
Res	F	1.675	1.509	1.636	1.276	1.409	1.195	1.971	1.530
	S	2.949		2.805		2.691		2.927	
	A	1.700	1.496	1.083	1.160	1.250	1.245	2.050	1.246
M L N	F	2.675	3.278	3.250	3.764	3.250	3.164	4.048	3.846
	S	3.263		3.150		3.023		3.073	
	A	3.250	3.400	3.250	3.667	3.000	3.375	3.750	3.900

GOAL AND PRACTICE MEANS FOR EACH GROUP
IN EACH COLLEGE FOR TWENTY
GOAL/PRACTICE AREAS
(Continued)

			COLLEGES							
			A		B		C		D	
			G	P	G	P	G	P	G	P
Pub Ser	F		2.100	1.933	2.182	1.699	2.659	1.883	3.212	2.542
	S		3.080	2.331	2.840	2.192	2.851	2.467	2.927	2.397
	A		3.150	2.296	2.583	1.940	2.250	1.872	3.750	2.608
Soc Egal	F		2.575	2.921	2.545	2.793	3.310	3.391	3.702	3.562
	S		3.091	2.910	2.950	2.699	3.085	2.899	3.158	3.070
	A		3.200	3.352	2.667	3.110	3.188	2.955	3.550	3.562
Soc Cr	F		2.100	2.201	1.818	1.988	2.364	2.056	2.817	2.675
	S		2.909	2.488	2.685	2.332	2.590	2.381	2.693	2.632
	A		1.700	2.116	2.167	1.988	2.000	1.912	2.750	2.330
Free	F		2.650	2.441	2.750	2.722	2.682	2.482	3.096	2.376
	S		3.358	2.630	1.917	2.277	2.375	2.162	3.350	2.630
	A		2.800	2.630	1.917	2.277	2.375	2.162	3.350	2.630
Dem Gov	F		2.675	2.238	3.182	2.678	2.068	2.269	3.375	2.690
	S		3.347	2.567	3.245	2.644	3.092	2.435	3.240	2.570
	A		3.200	2.798	3.333	2.887	2.813	2.122	3.600	2.664
Comm	F		3.175	2.857	3.659	3.088	3.409	3.240	3.846	3.363
	S		3.494		3.805		3.436		3.359	
	A		3.950	2.928	4.083	3.163	3.250	2.977	4.250	3.264
I E E	F		2.725	1.623	2.182	1.588	2.909	1.661	3.317	2.077
	S		3.250	2.353	2.870	2.028	2.894	2.268	2.958	2.418
	A		3.150	1.794	2.333	1.833	2.750	1.747	3.466	2.190
Inno	F		2.500	2.424	2.682	2.740	2.591	2.724	3.769	3.079
	S		3.227		2.845		2.271		2.844	
	A		3.350	2.698	2.417	2.720	2.750	2.870	3.716	2.928
O C L	F		1.625	1.751	1.409	1.596	1.750	1.735	2.212	2.418
	S		2.688		2.410		2.271		2.844	
	A		1.800	1.598	1.167	1.387	1.875	1.665	2.366	2.230
Acc/Eff	F		3.075	2.733	3.432	2.743	3.114	3.134	3.724	3.369
	S		3.386		3.270		3.119		3.295	
	A		3.700	2.998	3.750	3.220	3.688	2.983	4.050	3.398

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1973 Community and Junior College Directory. Washington.
- Ballard, James Barry. The Role and Function of Public Junior Colleges in Oklahoma as Perceived by Citizens, Students, Faculty, Administrators, and Trustees. Stillwater, Oklahoma: Oklahoma State University, 1973.
- Blocker, Clyde E.; Plummer, Robert H.; and Richardson, Richard C., Jr. The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Bushnell, David S. Organizing For Change: New Priorities For Junior Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The More Effective Use of Resources: An Imperative for Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Cheit, Earl F. The New Depression in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Chickering, Arthur W. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1972.
- Dixon, W. J. Biomedical Computer Programs. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1973.
- Downie, N. M., and Heath, R. W. Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Dressel, Paul L. Institutional Research in the University: A Handbook. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1971.
- Etzioni, Amatai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

- Etzioni, Amitai. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1960.
- Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1966.
- Frankel, Charles. "The Educational Impact of American Foreign Policy." Stress and Campus Response, edited by Kerry G. Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1970.
- Gleazer, Edmund J. This is the Community College. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1968.
- _____. Project Focus: A Project Study of Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Gross, Edward, and Grambsch, Paul B. University Goals and Academic Power. Washington: American Council on Education, 1971.
- Hartnett, Rodney T. Accountability in Higher Education. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1971.
- Heyns, Roger. "Stress and Administrative Authority", Stress and Campus Response, edited by Kerry G. Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1970.
- Hill, Joseph E., and Kerber, August. Models, Methods, and Analytical Procedures in Education Research. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1967.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- Kirk, Roger E. Experimental Design: Procedures for the Behavioral Sciences. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1968.
- Landsberger, Henry A. The Social Theories of Talcott Parsons. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.

- Lynn, Robert L. An Investigation of Institutional Goal Congruence: Intention and Practice in a Private Four-Year College. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma, 1973.
- Martin, W. B. Conformity: Standards and Change in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1969.
- Matson, Jane. "Student Constituencies--Real and Potential," Stress and Campus Response, edited by Kerry G. Smith, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1970.
- Mayhew, Lewis. "A Rendering of Accounts," Stress and Campus Response, edited by Kerry G. Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1970.
- Medsker, Leland. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Peterson, Richard E. Goals for California Higher Education: A Survey of 116 Academic Communities. Berkeley, California: Educational Testing Service, 1972.
- _____. Toward Institutional Goal-Consciousness. Berkeley, California: Educational Testing Service, 1971.
- Sanford, Nevitt. The American College. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.
- Uhl, Norman P. Identifying Institutional Goals. Durham, North Carolina: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1973.
- United States Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports. Washington: 1969.
- _____. The Statistical Abstract of the United States. Washington: 1970.
- United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Digest of Educational Statistics. Washington: 1970.
- Van Waes, Robert. "Student Freedoms and Educational Reform," Stress and Campus Response, edited by Kerry G. Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1970.

PERIODICALS AND REPORTS

- American Association of Higher Education. Report on Higher Education, 1971. Washington: 1972.
- Blackburn, Robert. "Changes in Faculty Life Styles," Research Report Number One. American Association for Higher Education. Washington: 1972.
- Chickering, A. W. Research for Action. Plainfield, Vermont: Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, 1970. Mimeographed.
- Cramer, Elliot, and Thurston, L. L. The University of North Carolina MANOVA Program. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: Psychometric Laboratory, University of North Carolina. Unpublished.
- Danforth Foundation. "A Report: College Goals and Governance". Danforth News and Notes, St. Louis, Mo., 1969.
- Educational Testing Service. Description of I.G.I. Goal Areas. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1972. Mimeographed.
- Getzels, J. W., and Guba, E. G. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process", School Review, vol. 65, December, 1957.
- Gross, Neal. "Organizational Lag in American Universities." Harvard Educational Review, 33, No. 1.
- Higher Education Alumni Council Newsletter, vol. 2, no. 9, July, 1972.
- Jordan, Bennett. "Educational Accountability: A Crucial Question". Junior College Journal, March, 1971.
- McKenna, D. L. "Changing Objectives in American Higher Education, 1842-1960". School and Society, 91, March 9, 1963.
- Nash, Patricia. "The Goals of Higher Education--An Empirical Assessment." Columbia University: Bureau of Applied Research, June, 1968. Mimeographed.

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. A Plan For The Seventies, 1968.

Peterson, Richard E. College Goals and the Challenge of Effectiveness. Proceedings, Western Regional Conference on Testing Problems, Berkeley, California: Educational Testing Service, 1971.

_____. The Crisis of Purpose: Definition and Uses of Institutional Goals. Washington: E.R.I.C. Clearinghouse on Higher Education. October, 1970. Unpublished Report.

Peterson, Richard E., et al. Institutional Functioning Inventory Preliminary Technical Manual. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1970.

Robb, Felix C. "Regional Accrediting Faces New Challenges". American Association of Community and Junior Colleges Journal, vol. 42, May, 1972.

Roueche, John. Accountability for Student Learning. A paper presented to the 1970 Convention of the Oklahoma Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Uhl, Norman P., and Peterson, Richard E. Preliminary Draft, Institutional Goals Inventory Technical Manual, October, 1973. Mimeographed.