This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received

66-14,204

DELOACHE, Dan Franklin, 1934-

ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS AND JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS TOWARD SELECTED DESCRIPTIONS OF THE OFFICE OF COLLEGE PRESIDENT.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1966
Education, administration

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/2070

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS AND JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS TOWARD SELECTED DESCRIPTIONS OF THE OFFICE OF COLLEGE PRESIDENT

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

DAN FRANKLIN DELOACHE

Norman, Oklahoma

1966

ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS AND JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS TOWARD SELECTED DESCRIPTIONS OF THE OFFICE OF COLLEGE PRESIDENT

APPROVED BY

Herbert R. Hengst

Robert E. Ellis

W. B. Rogers

Lloyd S. Williams

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to the memory of my father

SAM DeLOACHE

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Appreciation is extended to all who have participated in this study. To the faculties and presidents of the seven state junior colleges, my sincere thanks for their participation and cooperation. Also, to the dissertation committee, Dr. Herbert R. Hengst, for his helpful suggestions and encouragement, and to the members of the committee: Dr. Robert E. Ohm, Dr. William B. Ragan--David Ross Boyd professor, and Dr. Lloyd P. Williams for their valuable time, consideration, and cooperation.

The assistance and cooperation of Charles R. Galbraith and Ronnie Moss is acknowledged. Individual indebtedness to the many friends and University faculty members who made this study possible is recognized. Only through their combined efforts and cooperation was this study possible.

Special appreciation is extended to all the members of my family: Frances and Bill Erwin, Betty and Sam DeLoach, James W. DeLoache, Sharon and Christopher DeLoache, and my mother--Ernestine DeLoache for their willingness to sacrifice their resources, time, and energies during the period required for this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENT iv

LIST OF TABLES vii

Chapter

I. THE PROBLEM. 1

Introduction
Purpose of the Study
Statement of the Problem
Assumptions
Statement of Limitations
Organization of Study
Summary

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 13

Introduction
Personal Characteristics and Qualifications
Professional Preparation
Instructional Responsibilities
Administrative Duties and Functions
Public Relations
Personnel Relationships
Summary

III. DESIGN OF STUDY. 35

Introduction
The Seven Colleges
The Population
Instrumentation
Data Collecting Procedures
Statistical Analysis
Summary

IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA 52

Introduction
Analysis of Faculty and Presidential Opinions

Chapter Page

Analysis by Percentages of Faculty and Presidential Responses to Statements Inapplicable to the Chi-square Test
Summary
Analysis of the Opinions of Faculty Members in Rural or Urban Institutions
Analysis of Opinions of Rural and Urban Faculties to Items Inapplicable to the Chi-square Test
Summary

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. 92

Summary
Findings
Conclusions
Recommendations

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. 97

Appendices
I. COVER LETTERS. 104

Item One: To Presidents
Item Two: To Faculty Members
Item Three: To Cameron President
Item Four: Follow-up to Faculty Members
Item Five: Follow-up Post Cards to Faculty Members
Item Six: 2nd Follow-up Post Cards to Faculty Members
Item Seven: Follow-up Post Cards to Cameron Faculty

II. QUESTIONNAIRE. 113

III. LOGICAL STRUCTURE OF ITEMS PERTAINING TO THE PRESIDENCY. 120

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Frequency of Statements to Six Logical Categories Selected to Represent the Office of College President	33
2.	Population of Counties and Cities in Which the Seven State Supported Junior Colleges Are Located	38
3.	The Seven State Supported Junior Colleges of Oklahoma and Their Faculty Compositions	40
4.	Questionnaire Responses of 311 Full-time Faculty Members	46
5.	Questionnaire Item No. 51: Faculty and Presidential Populations	50
6.	Summary of Response Frequencies and Chi-square Values by Questionnaire Response Categories for 311 Faculty Members and Seven Junior College Presidents	54
7.	Summary of Differences by Logical Categories on the Dimensions of the Presidency as Reported by Faculty Members and College Presidents	58
8.	311 Faculty Members' and 7 Presidents' Responses by Percentages to the Category on Presidential Professional Preparation	70
9.	311 Faculty Members' and 7 Presidents' Responses by Percentages to the Category on Presidential Instructional Responsibilities	72
10.	311 Faculty Members' and 7 Presidents' Responses by Percentages to the Category on Presidential Public Relations Duties	73

Table Page

11. 311 Faculty Members' and 7 Presidents' Responses by Percentages to the Category on Presidential Personnel Relationships. . . . 74

12. 311 Faculty Members' and 7 Presidents' Responses by Percentages to the Category on Presidential Administrative Duties. 75

13. Summary of Response Frequencies and Chi-square Values by Questionnaire Response Categories for 219 Urban Junior Colleges and 99 Rural Junior Colleges. 81

14. Summary of Differences by Logical Categories on the Dimensions of the Presidency as Reported by Rural and Urban Institutions . . . 86

15. Percentages of Responses of 219 Urban and 99 Rural Institutions to Twenty-three Statements Inapplicable to the Chi-square Test 87

ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS AND JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS TOWARD SELECTED DESCRIPTIONS OF THE OFFICE OF COLLEGE PRESIDENT

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The turn of the century marked a new chapter in the history of American higher education. The founding of a public junior college in Joliet, Illinois, in 1901, introduced a different institutional form to the processes of American higher education.[1] Today there are approximately 780 such institutions of which 376 are under private auspices (188 being church related), and nearly 400 of a public nature. California, with 80 junior colleges, has been most notable in the public phase.[2] This educational movement has been a means of providing more college opportunities to a large segment of American youth who otherwise would be unable to continue their education past the twelfth year of secondary school. The growth of the junior

---

[1] John J. Neumaier. "Functions of the Junior College," Junior College Journal, Vol. 27, No. 6 (Nov., 1957), p. 333.

[2] Junior College Journal. Vol. 36, No. 1 (Nov., 1965) p. 42.

college has been remarkable, and no other type of post-high school institution in this century has experienced a comparable development.[3]

Oklahoma established the framework for what has become a state junior college system when the first state legislature in 1907 provided "that as soon as possible, schools should be established in each judicial district to provide instruction for Oklahoma's students at the upper elementary and secondary levels."[4] In 1922, by Act of the Oklahoma Legislature, Murray State School of Agriculture received legal junior college status. By 1941, Oklahoma had established the seven state supported junior colleges which it maintains today.[5] The state institutions experienced rapid growth after World War II and by June 30, 1964, they enrolled 5,748 students.[6]

The rapid growth of junior colleges throughout the United States, especially since World War II, has not been without "growing-pains." They are currently in the process of discovering their true purpose and their rightful place in the scheme of American education. Consequently,

---

[3]Neumaier, loc. cit.

[4]Frank Balyeat. Junior Colleges in Oklahoma. Reprinted from The Chronicles of Oklahoma, Vol. 26, No. 1, (1948), p. 60.

[5]Ibid., p. 61.

[6]Twelfth Biennial Report. Period ending June 30, 1964, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, pp. 131-133.

considerable variation exists among them in objectives, curricula, enrollment, and administrative policies. Reliable statistics on junior colleges are difficult to obtain and are soon outdated.[7] The failure of the colleges to achieve in some instances an identity of their own has been one continual criticism by educators. However, the diversities of the junior colleges underlie the different purposes served by higher education in this country. The President's Commission on Higher Education in 1947 accepted this fact when it concluded:

> ...the time has come to make education through the fourteenth grade universally available throughout the country, just as free high school education is now available. The time has come to provide monetary assistance to competent but needy students in the tenth grade through the fourteenth grade who might otherwise discontinue their education. The time has come for a great expansion of our adult education programs and for placing these under the supervision of our colleges and universities. In short, the time has come to make education at every level accessible to all Americans who can benefit from it, regardless of age, race, creed, sex, national origin, or economic status.[8]

Administrative problems in rapidly growing institutions with diverse and unclear purposes are of a complex nature. The administrative machinery has had necessarily to be enlarged to cope with the increased numbers of

---

[7]James Starrak, Raymond M. Hughes. The Community College in the United States. (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State College Press, 1954), p. 24.

[8]Tyrus Hillway. The American Two-Year College. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958), p. 2.

students, faculty, building, dormitories, financial transactions, and other institutional responsibilities. A study by Shannon considered these factors and suggested that contemporary administrators be prepared for the multiple responsibilities of autonomous institutions and have an understanding of the special mission of the junior college.[9] To meet the requirements for the position, it is now necessary for the administrator to be a business executive as well as an educational leader. Educational administration has become so complex a problem that governing boards have often sought in their presidential appointments men with business, administrative, or even military records who may not necessarily have had scholarly or educational experience.[10] Such individuals may not be appreciative of faculty members who differ in their academic interests and educational philosophies or who differ in general attitudes toward the collegiate administrative process.

Problems of administration may be obscure to many faculty members who are actively involved in the daily academic or educational processes. If the modern college administrator is to be effective and proficient in administering his institution, he must understand and respect the

---

[9]William George Shannon. "The Community College Presidents: A Study of the Role of Presidents of the Community Junior College." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962).

[10]Harold Taylor. On Education and Freedom. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), pp. 2-5.

attitudes and opinions of the personnel who comprise the human elements in the system. Likewise, the college faculty must understand the educational and professional responsibilities, duties, and functions of the college president.

Thus, by reviewing a few of the many problems affecting junior college administration, it is apparent that a need exists for investigation of specific administrative-faculty difficulties. Immediate attention must be placed on the problems which have beset the institutions. The educational and administrative problems which hinder the colleges must in all necessity be reduced if the institutions are to function efficiently and adequately meet the needs of a modern complex American society.

Purpose of the Study

It is the purpose of this study to examine the attitudes held toward the presidency by a selected group of junior college faculty members and presidents. The need for administration and faculty understanding has been stressed as an important factor in effective educational processes. For example, the results of a work conference in 1957 on "Faculty-Administrative Relationships" conducted by the American Council on Education highlighted this set of concerns. McConnell's report to the conference described one of the causes of administrative and faculty misunderstanding:

> One cause of the difficulties we are discussing is that we tend to assume in the case of either faculty members or administrators, that the characteristics of human nature are suspended. I think we would be much more effective in our relationships if we would assume that the motivations of people in education are essentially like motivations of other people. This would lead us to attribute a monopoly of ethical wisdom neither to the administration or to the faculty.[11]

This study, therefore, was structured to investigate the attitudes and opinions of selected faculty members and presidents in seven Oklahoma junior colleges in order that the question of the similarities or differences in attitudes held by the two groups might be examined.

An additional or secondary purpose was suggested by such comments as that of Starrak who stated that educators should "encourage the study of the college or university as a 'social organization" including the problems of administration.[12] Thus, in the investigation of the attitudinal responses of the junior college faculty members and presidents, this study included an analysis of the responses of the faculties and presidents in Oklahoma junior colleges classified as urban or rural. This analysis was included to investigate whether or not the location of an institution had any effect upon the opinions of the faculty members and presidents employed there. In addition, it was

---

[11]Report of a Work Conference. Faculty-Administration Relationships. (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, May 7-9, 1957), p. 86.

[12]Ibid., pp. 87-88.

considered relevant to investigate the commonly perceived rural and urban value patterns by the responses of the two groups to the attitudinal questionnaire. In view of the fact Oklahoma politics was long influenced if not controlled by rural elements, this study, therefore, investigated whether or not there is a relationship based upon this variable which would effect faculty and administrative opinions of the presidency.

Finally, an important and necessary need for investigation of faculty and presidential attitudes toward the office of president is suggested in light of the recent increase in administrative staffs and overhead in American colleges and universities. This growth has affected both the faculty and presidential attitudes toward the office of president. With the inevitable increases in enrollment and the growing variety of essential administrative services, growth in the size of managerial overhead has been considered not only necessary but desirable. The faculty members and college presidents have not remained unaffected by this attitude. Tead took the position that the administrative growth in imperative, but that:

> ...the criterion to apply to this growth and the interpretative argument to emphasize to disgruntled faculty members is that (in) all of this administrative development, we witness a facilitative service to the teaching process and a supplementation of learning opportunities in a great variety beyond the classroom. Administration does not exist as an end itself; it is justified as the avowed purposes of the organization are

forwarded with greater expedition and economy.[13]

Consequently, various aspects of college administration and the office of president need to be investigated. The information provided by this study will contribute toward a better understanding of the junior college and presidency. Also, it will provide a useful basis for future research in the area of educational administration.

Statement of the Problem

In order for the educational processes in American colleges and universities to function harmoniously and without misunderstandings, grievancies, dissatisfactions, and inadequate esprit de corps, it is necessary to study specific areas of possible faculty and administrative misunderstanding. Also, in view of the recent trend toward urbanization, it is necessary to investigate whether an institution's locus effects the attitudes of the faculty members and presidents toward the presidency. The American junior college has been labeled the enfant terrible of American higher education.[14] But the causes of many of its administrative and faculty difficulties have not been absent

---

[13]Ordway Tead. "The History and Philosophy of American Education," Administration in Higher Education, Edited by Gerald Burns, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962) p. 19.

[14]Clyde E. Blocker, Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, Jr. The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1965), p. viii.

in other higher educational institutions. The evidence provided by this study can consequently be helpful in providing information which may be used in establishing an effective and beneficial educational climate for the administrators, the faculty, and the students in all Oklahoma colleges and universities.

The basic problem with which this study deals may be stated as the following question: Do faculty members and presidents attach importance to the same aspects of the functions of the president? The problem can be stated more specifically.

a) Are there significant statistical differences in responses of faculty members and junior college presidents to written statements selected from the literature descriptive of the office of president?

b) Are there significant statistical differences between institutions classified as urban or rural as indicated by the responses of faculty members and college presidents of the respective institutions to statements selected from the literature and descriptive of the office of president?

In addition, there are several operational problems that relate to the conduct of a study of this problem. They deal with developing the necessary instrumentations and identifying appropriate analysis patterns. The procedures are discussed in subsequent sections of the paper.

Assumptions

The basic assumption necessary for pursuit of this study is that the descriptive statements selected from the literature regarding the duties, functions, characteristics and responsibilities of the college president reflect a summation of attitudes and opinions of those who have studied and written on the office of president. An attempt to validate this assumption appears in Chapter II. Furthermore, since the junior college is a social institution, the various elements of the system are not devoid of social pressures, interaction, inputs, and outputs. It is therefore necessary to assume that these variables affect the attitudes and opinions of both the faculty members and the college presidents.

Assumptions pertinent to the statistics used in the analysis of data are treated in Chapter III.

Statement of Limitations

This study is limited to the investigation of the attitudes and opinions of state supported junior college faculty members and presidents and their perceptions of the role of the presidency. The presidents and faculties of municipal and private junior colleges in Oklahoma are excluded. The information, therefore, obtained from this study pertains directly only to the seven state supported junior colleges in Oklahoma.

The investigation imposed certain limitations in the selection of expert sources from which the descriptions of the office of president were drawn. This limitation, although pertinent, is treated by the detail in Chapter II.

Organization of Study

Chapter I of this investigation introduces the study, background and importance of the study, states the problem, assumptions, limitations, and organization of the study. Chapter II reviews the literature, criteria for inclusion of sources and reviews the sources by logical categories. Chapter III describes the colleges and populations, instrumentation, treatment of data and statistical procedures. Chapter IV presents the analysis of data, report of findings, identification of items of difference and analysis of the differences. Chapter V presents the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for future study.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes toward the office of the junior college presidency by faculty members and presidents. The basic problem of the study was to ascertain whether the faculty members and presidents in seven Oklahoma junior colleges hold similar or differing opinions about selected aspects of the presidency. In addition, the problem was to investigate whether there are similar or differing opinions between institutions

classified as rural or urban. To study the problem, it was necessary to develop an attitude sampling instrument, gather the necessary information, and identify an appropriate analysis pattern. The study was limited to the seven state operated junior colleges in Oklahoma. It was also limited by the nature of the sources from which a description of the college presidency was developed.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The pattern followed in the review of pertinent literature was to investigate the literature according to six aspects of the office of president. These categories represent the range of professional functioning of the president and were logically determined. The six logical categories used for this purpose are: (1) personal characteristics, (2) professional preparation, (3) instructional responsibilities, (4) personnel relationships, (5) public relations, and (6) administrative duties.

Standard bibliographic tools such as Dissertation Abstracts and the Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature were investigated for studies written within the past ten years on the area of the college presidency. One particular source listed over 2,708 articles, books, and studies written on the presidency between 1950-1959.[1] In order to

---

[1] The College Presidency 1900-1960: An Annotated Bibliography. Walter C. Eels, consultant, and Ernest V. Hollis, director, College and University Administration Branch, Division of Higher Education, (Washington: U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, 1961), pp. 1-123.

sample this large number of potential sources, the works of the following authors and sources were selected as representative of sound educational thinking evidenced by their demonstrated professional and scholarly contributions. The American Council on Education, for example, is well known as a spokesman for higher education in the Nation's capital. The Junior College Journal has also been the major voice for American junior colleges and constantly provides the latest facts and figures of developments on the American two-year college.

Louis T. Benezet, former President of Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colorado, currently chancellor of the Claremont Graduate School and University Center, California, and author of General Education in the Progressive College, has had experience both as a college president and Chairman of the American Council of Education Committee on Education of Women. Prior to assuming the presidency of Colorado College, Benezet was President of Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania. He has contributed articles to the Journal of Higher Education and the AAC Bulletin.[2]

Recognized as an authority on the junior college, Jesse P. Bogue served as President of the Association of Junior Colleges in 1945 and as Executive Secretary of the

---

[2]Robert C. Cook (ed.), Who's Who in American Education. (Nashville: Who's Who in American Education, Inc., Vol. 17, 1955-56), p. 24.

American Association of Junior Colleges from 1946-48. He also served as a high school principal and President of the New England College Council from 1938 to 1948.[3]

E. D. Duryea is a contemporary American educator who has had administrative experience as Dean of the Evening Program and Director of Graduate Studies at Hofstra. Having taught higher educational administration at the University of Oregon, his contributions are mainly in the area of educational administration. Duryea's "The Theory and Practice of Administration" published in Administration in Higher Education, is an informative description of what Duryea considers to be the fundamental facets of modern educational administration.[4]

Howard J. McGinnis has had educational and administrative experience as a teacher, principal, superintendent, instructor and registrar, and President of West Liberty State Normal School in West Virginia. He also was Acting President at East Carolina Teachers College in North Carolina from 1944-46. In addition, he served as Vice President of the North Carolina College Conference in 1933. McGinnis, a member of Phi Beta Kappa, and Phi Delta Kappa, has been both a director of field service and lecturer, and

---

[3] Ibid., (Vol. 16, 1953-54), p. 129.

[4] E. D. Duryea. "The Theory and Practice of Administration," Administration in Higher Education, Edited by Gerald Burns. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962), p. 29.

in addition, has written on the areas of teachers' colleges and educational administration.[5]

Robert M. Hutchins has a long and active career in American education. He has served as Acting Dean, and Dean of Law at Yale University, and President of the University of Chicago. Hutchins was director of Encyclopedia Britannica and an executive of Ford Foundation. Currently, he is a fund executive for the Fund of the Republic. He is a member of Phi Beta Kappa and Phi Delta Kappa. Some of his outstanding educational contributions are "No Friendly Voice," "Education for Freedom," and "Higher Learning in America."[6]

Hugh G. Price served as President of the American Association of Junior Colleges from 1954 to 1955. He also served as President of the Maryland Association of Junior Colleges from 1948 to 1950. Price, a Phi Delta Kappa and Phi Gamma Delta member, has gained experience as a teacher, principal, superintendent, and President of Private Schools Association of the Central States. He currently is Director of Ventura College, Ventura, California. Price has contributed to the Junior College Journal and is the author of "Educational Administration" published in that journal.[7]

---

[5]Jacques Cattell and E. E. Ross (eds.). Leaders in Education: A Biographical Directory. (3rd edition; Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Science Press, 1948), p. 691.

[6]Ibid., p. 536.

[7]Who's Who, op. cit., (Vol. 16, 1953-54), p. 1018.

Ralph Prator, President of Bakersville College, Bakersville, California, has served as Dean of Men at Mesa College, Grand Junction, Colorado, and Director of Admissions and Records at the University of Colorado. In addition, Prator has also been a principal and athletic director. He is a Phi Delta Kappan and author of The College President.[8]

Harold A. Taylor, contributor of works to education in philosophy, psychology, and educational administration, has had experience as a teacher, professor, and President of Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, New York. Also, during World War II, he worked with the Office of Scientific Research and Development. Taylor is the author of Essays in Teaching, Goals in American Education and On Education and Freedom. In addition, he has contributed to philosophical journals.[9]

Leland Medsker is a contemporary authority on American junior colleges. As Director of Contra Costa Junior College, Concord, California, he gained administrative experience before becoming associated with the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of California. He currently is Vice Chairman of the Center. Prior to becoming Director of Contra Costa Junior College, Medsker was Director of the Bureau of Occupational Research and Guidance for the Chicago Public Schools. He has been

---

[8] Ibid., (Vol. 17, 1955-56), p. 203.

[9] Ibid., p. 246.

a contributor to the "Carnegie Series in American Education" and is well known as author of The Junior College: Progress and Prospect.

Although other sources are reviewed in this chapter, emphasis is placed on those sources selected and described above. The purpose of this review, therefore, was to develop a list of statements descriptive of the aspects of the office of college president. Consequently, the review is structured in accordance with the six logical categories identified previously.

Personal Characteristics and Qualifications

The sources of reference included a varied list of presidential characteristics, qualifications and requirements. The sources all seemed to agree that the junior college, municipal college, state college, university and large state university have individual needs. Still there are also similarities between administrative positions, and by implication, between administrators in different kinds of institutions. Following his study, LaVire concluded that completely separate preparation programs for particular college administration would be economically unsound.[10] With wide diversities among colleges, it is unlikely that presidential characteristics, qualifications and requirements

---

[10]Willis Alvin LaVire. "The Critical Tasks for Public College Administrators," (Unpublished Dissertation, University of Florida, 1961), p. 34.

will ever fall within a limited pattern. Prator stated, "The great cultural orientations, as well as the differences in geographical locations among American colleges, are reflections in the wide span of qualities required and represented in their presidents."[11]

The selected sources included comments on both characteristics and qualifications. Hutchins attempted to minimize the qualifications of the office by reducing them to: (1) courage, (2) fortitude, (3) justice, and (4) prudence or practical wisdom.[12] Purposely, Hutchins excluded patience since he believed administrators have too much patience rather than too little. Furthermore, he considered the highest qualification for presidential office to be philosophical wisdom.[13] Price listed as necessary characteristics for a president: (1) faith in people, (2) confidence in human integrity, and (3) sincere interest in each individual man.[14] Prator maintained a president should: (1) have facility in public speaking, (2) be married, preferably with children, (3) be a scholar, and

---

[11]Ralph Prator. The College President. (Washington D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1963), pp. 21-94.

[12]Robert M. Hutchins. "The Administrator," The Journal of Higher Education. Vol. 17, No. 8 (Nov.,1946) pp. 396-407.

[13]Ibid., p. 397.

[14]Hugh Price. "The Role of the Administrator in Excellent Teaching," Junior College Journal. Vol. 24, No. 1 (Sept., 1953), pp. 37-42.

(4) have patience.[15] McGinnis, on the other hand, contrived a rather extensive list of necessary presidential characteristics. His list included the following:

1. initiative
2. tact
3. progressiveness
4. sense of humor
5. keenness of wit
6. liberality of spirit
7. forbearance
8. generosity
9. intellectual altruism
10. moral honesty
11. intellectual honesty
12. appreciation
13. sympathy
14. approachableness
15. friendliness
16. richness in personality
17. humility
18. resilience
19. firmness
20. attitude of respect
21. constructive conservatism
22. judicialness
23. scholarship
24. energy
25. fellowship
26. devotion
27. spiritual warmth
28. loyalty
29. fortitude
30. hopefulness
31. optimism
32. balance of temper
33. vision
34. discernment
35. resourcefulness
36. imagination
37. adaptability
38. leadership
39. foresight
40. patience
41. health[16]

The sources of reference, therefore, stressed a variety of personal characteristics and qualifications for the presidency. McGinnis developed an extensive list of such characteristics and qualifications while Price, Hutchins, and Prator minimized the necessary characteristics for the office. They all agreed, however, that a president should have particular qualities, but they differed somewhat on just what the necessary characteristics should be.

---

[15] Prator, op. cit., p. 86.

[16] Howard J. McGinnis. The State Teachers College. (Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1932), pp. 13-36.

Professional Preparation

The sources of reference agreed that the president should be adequately prepared for the position. The degree of preparation necessary, however, varies in that not all the sources stated the president should have a doctor's degree. Prator, however, stated the president should not only have a doctor's degree, but that it should be a high quality one from a good university.[17] The references stressed administrative experience, but the kind of administrative experience recommended varies according to the type and size of the institution to be served. Hutchins, for example, stated that the university president is more like a political leader than any other kind of administrator.[18] By necessity, the modern complex institution with its vast administrative problems requires that the modern executive be trained specifically to cope with its problems.[19] He should, therefore, be prepared to work with problems of educational importance but which are not necessarily of an educational nature.

According to Benezet, the president should be an educator.[20] McGinnis, on the other hand, stressed the

---

[17] Prator, op. cit., p. 25.

[18] Hutchins, op. cit., p. 395.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Louis T. Benezet, "The Office of the President," Administration in Higher Education. Edited by Gerald Burns, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), pp. 99-108.

importance of being not only an educator, but a business executive as well.[21] Teaching experience is also mentioned as a necessary factor, and the Work Conference on "Faculty-Administrative Relationships" stressed the importance of a president coming up through the academic ranks.[22]

The sources of reference, therefore, agree that the president should be adequately trained for the presidency. However, opinions differ regarding the kind of training necessary for successful fulfillment of the office of president. Where one source favored coming up through the academic ranks another favored specific training for the office. The sources did, however, indicate that the presidency does require certain skills in administration and that a president, to be successful, should have proficiency in a number of the skills.

Instructional Responsibilities

A college president as the official executive of an educational institution must lend active support to the instructional personnel of the institution, according to Duryea.[23] The president, however, can not be expected to be an expert in every instructional field. It is necessary

---

[21] McGinnis, loc. cit.

[22] Report of a Work Conference, op. cit., pp. 86-89.

[23] E. D. Duryea. "The Theory and Practice of Administration," Administration in Higher Education. Edited by Gerald Burns. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962), p. 43.

for him to draw upon the abundance of sources available to keep himself informed about academic procedures. Wriston stated this position as follows: "Few men have all the talents. Most have limited abilities. No one whom I've ever known could do all the things expected of a college president and do all of them well."[24]

Prator believed it is a presidential responsibility to ascertain whether or not the curricula of the college is meeting the needs of the students.[25] In addition, he stated that the president should develop criteria of good teaching and stressed those values which express the highest goals of higher education.[26] Other sources believed the president should delegate instructional responsibilities. McGinnis, for example, stated that the executive's chief business is to organize, deputize and supervise.[27] The president's instructional responsibility, according to McGinnis, is only to study the curriculum and advise associates who in turn implement the educational program.[28]

The sources selected, therefore, agreed that the president should be actively involved in the instructional

---

[24]Henry M. Wriston. Academic Relfections: Reflections of a College President. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), p. 20.

[25]Prator, op. cit., p. 42.

[26]Ibid.

[27]McGinnis, op. cit.

[28]Ibid.

program, but he should be more concerned with matters of an administrative nature. Consequently, the sources maintained that a president's instructional responsibilities must be defined since most presidents have only limited abilities and specialized training.

Administrative Duties and Functions

Administrative action was considered to be primarily the task of the president with the counsel of administrative assistants. Certain duties, however, were prescribed as primarily a presidential responsibility while other duties were defined as being outside presidential responsibility and thus should be delegated to other personnel. Prator, for example, listed five duties the president should perform. The five duties were: (1) develop criteria of good teaching, (2) discover the aims and ends of the college, (3) interpret to the faculty community interests and concerns, (4) assert the highest values of higher education, and (5) making monthly payroll.[29]

McGinnis maintained that state legislatures and other official bodies do not generally lay down specific duties for college executives, but simply indicate the types of duties for which the president should be held responsible.[30] Although the president's first duty is to the

---

[29]Prator, op. cit., p. 41.

[30]McGinnis, op. cit., p. 149.

institution over which he presides, he should not be expected to be completely proficient in every collegiate responsibility. Williams concluded, "the president is preoccupied with administrative trivia..."[31] Consequently, the president must delegate many duties of administration to other employees and must counsel with the members of his administration and faculty.

Barnard's position concerning effective administrative leadership and action stressed the creative responsibility of the college president. He listed three essential executive functions as being necessary to creative administration: (1) to provide the system of communication involving the executive personnel, (2) to promote the securing of essential efforts, and cooperative relationships, and (3) to formulate and define programs of the college.[32] Barnard believed the creative responsibility of the executive to be the highest exemplification of executive responsibility. The essence of leadership, according to Barnard, requires the identification of personal and organizational codes in view of the leader. Without such identification, Barnard concluded an administrator to be less than creative.[33]

---

[31]Lloyd P. Williams. "Quiescence, Tradition, and Disorder--Cross Section of a Small College," AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 43, No. 4, (Dec., 1957), p. 616.

[32]Chester I. Barnard. The Functions of the Executive. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947), pp. 167-173.

[33]Ibid.

The sources of reference agreed, therefore, that certain administrative duties must be delegated to other personnel. Since state governmental agencies do not specifically lay down duties for college presidents, menial duties are generally delegated, and the more important duties of administration are performed by the president. In addition, the sources of reference agreed that able, qualified assistants and adequate lines of communications are necessary for successful administration.

Public Relations

According to Taylor, the president, as the chief executive of the college, must constantly meet with various groups and report upon the institution's progress.[34] His leadership role is a continuous one, with the students, the administrative and teaching faculty, the non-professional staff, and community leaders. He is always an opinion maker and pace-setter.[35] His personal qualities are his most effective assets, and he must adequately utilize the qualities to excel in public relations.

Community involvement is another facet of public relations which the sources of the literature believed necessary for active and dynamic collegiate administration. Benezet, for example, maintained that the president should

---

[34]Harold Taylor. On Education and Freedom. (New York: Abelard-Schuman, 1954), p. 90.

[35]Prator, op. cit., p. 52.

be an active citizen and well aware of the events taking place within the general vicinity of his institution.[36]

Keeping abreast of events can be a burdensome task for a president and his staff. However, in order to be effective in public relations, the president needs an abundance of facts about his institution. Taylor stated "the president is responsible for informing the alumni and general public about the educational policies of the institution.[37] Information and facts concerning all facets of the college community must, therefore, be supplied to the president in order for him to be completely and adequately informed.

Regarding public relations for the faculty, Prator stated, "the president should interpret to his faculty community interests and concerns."[38] McGinnis stated, "the president must keep the institution constructively related to its social environment."[39] Thus, keeping in contact with local groups and community leaders and relaying the information when relevant to institutional personnel should be a constant concern of the president. When necessary, the information should be relayed not only to the faculty

---

[36]Benezet, op. cit., p. 106.

[37]Taylor, loc. cit.

[38]Prator, op. cit., pp. 26-27.

[39]McGinnis, op. cit., p. 29.

and employees of the institution, but also to the alumni and governing board of the college. The governing board especially needs to be kept informed since many members are removed from the campus community. Educational policy can be made satisfactory only when there is a genuine understanding on the part of the trustees or regents as to the function of the institution in a democratic society.[40] Alumni who also have little direct contact with the institution should be kept informed and the president should make additional effort to provide institutional information to them. According to Duryea, cultivating active and positive support from all interested agencies is of primary importance to successful educational administration.[41]

Thus, the sources of reference agreed that the president should be cognizant of the importance of public relations to the institutions. He should be actively involved and constantly aware of events taking place in order to accurately interpret the happenings to all those concerned.

Personnel Relationships

A variety of different concepts regarding faculty-administrative relationships was indicated by the sources. Taylor stressed democratic procedures in deciding

---

[40] Taylor, op. cit., p. 91.

[41] Duryea, op. cit., pp. 38-43.

administrative techniques for the entire college:

> If a faculty member is to act strictly in accordance with rules and authority, it must be the authority of a democratic community whose rules the teacher accepts as the conditions of his work. Even an autocratic president has quite limited power since he too must work according to rules set by the academic community.[42]

Prator, however, discussed the need for presidential insight into the general background of the teaching faculty, and he maintained, "a president must understand that the teaching faculty is composed of scholars, teachers, and researchers who have intense interest."[43] Furthermore, Prator took the position that the pride and prejudice of highly competent specialists caused them to jealously guard their specialties. Thus, the president may find it hard to achieve the peer status he would like with his colleagues. Petry, however, did not agree completely with Prator's description of faculty-administrative relationships. Despite a general opinion to the contrary, he maintained:

> The faculty, including all ranks, is remarkably homogeneous in character. All faculty members come from the same training and experience. They are individualistic; that is, they are nonconformists in small matters at least, and frequently in larger ones. They are ambitious, dissatisfied, critical and committed to education as a career.[44]

---

[42] Taylor, op. cit., p. 35.

[43] Prator, op. cit., p. 69.

[44] Loren C. Petry. "Faculty View," A Report of a Work Conference, Faculty-Administration Relationships. (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, May 7-9, 1957) p. 14.

Whether or not the teaching faculty is as homogeneous as Petry maintained is open to question. The differences of philosophy or goals among the teaching faculty and between the administrative officials seems to indicate the teaching faculty is unlike in many respects. Their academic responsibilities tend to foster different orientations, and many faculty members feel closer to colleagues in their own discipline than to other academic departments.[45] Often faculty loyalty is given first to the discipline, then to the division, and afterwards to the administration and college as a whole. Problems of a college-wide import may be more remote from the teaching faculty than problems that arise in their own discipline.[46]

Regarding faculty-administrative rivalry, Horn maintained that administrators must unite against the common foe, the faculty.[47] His thesis held that aggressive efforts of the teaching faculty have reduced much of the power and authority of the president and other administrators. Furthermore, Horn observed that present administrators have a responsibility to take the offensive, to recover and re-establish their lost authority and power. Administrative officers, according to Horn, have worked for unity and

---

[45] Prator, op. cit., p. 68.

[46] Ibid.

[47] Francis Horn. "Academic Administration, Unite," College and University Business. Vol. 30, No. 12, (June, 1961), p. 33.

cohesion with the teaching faculty, but he believed the teaching faculty has marshalled its resources in opposition to the administrators.[48]

Horn's position regarding the loss of presidential power and authority in making decisions is supported by an earlier thesis held by Hutchins. Hutchins reported that administrators who want the support of the faculty now make as few decisions as possible. In neglecting decisions, they attempt to develop automatic rules covering all subjects to avoid the embarrassment which decisions on individual cases can cause them. Thus, Hutchins concluded that presidents now resort to every undercover technique they can think of in order to have it appear that they did not make the decision, even when they did.[49]

The position held by Bartky maintained that the tasks of an administrator have become menial and that the administrator has relegated himself to the status of a messenger boy, janitor, or policeman. He believed no teacher in his right mind should want to become an administrator.[50] Bartky, therefore, believed the status of a teacher is so far superior to that of an administrator that it is difficult to understand why the teaching faculty want

---

[48] Ibid.

[49] Hutchins, op. cit., p. 339.

[50] John Bartky. "More About the Nature of Junior College Administration," Junior College Journal. Vol. 28, No. 4, (Dec., 1957), pp. 330-333.

to administer. Williams somewhat followed Bartky's position when he stated that "administration is general and educational administration in particular are a much over-rated commodity, perhaps the most over-rated commodity on the market today."[51]

Summary

Chapter II reviewed the literature pertinent to the investigation of the office of president. Table 1 presents the frequency of the statements selected from twelve sources of the literature and distributes the items over six categories pertaining to the college presidency. Administrative duties were most frequently mentioned by the sources. Instructional responsibilities, personal characteristics, personnel relationships, professional preparation, and public relations followed respectively. Public relations had a frequency of ten, but five sources made no reference to the category. Prator and McGinnis contributed thirty-three statements of the total 119. Two sources, Prator and Benezet, presented statements that were distributed over all six categories.

An investigation of selected sources thus revealed that the predominant aspects of the presidency appear to be administrative in nature. As Table 1 illustrates, the

---

[51]Lloyd P. Williams. "Some Heretical Reflections on Educational Administration," Journal Higher Education. Vol. 27, No. 4, (April, 1956), p. 182.

TABLE 1

FREQUENCY OF STATEMENTS TO SIX LOGICAL CATEGORIES SELECTED TO REPRESENT THE OFFICE OF COLLEGE PRESIDENT

Categories	Selected Sources 1 ACE	2 Barnard	3 Bogue	4 Benezet	5 Duryea	6 JCJ	7 Hutchins	8 McGinnis	9 Medsker	10 Prator	11 Price	12 Taylor	13 TOTAL
1. Pers. Charac.	2	1	2	3	2	1	1		1	3	2		19
2. Prof. Prep.	2	2		1	1	1	3	1	1	2			14
3. Instruc. Res.			2	3		1	2	4	3	5	1	1	21
4. Personnel Rel.	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	3	2	1	18
5. Public Rel.		1	1	1				1		3	1	1	10
6. Adm. Duties	1	3	2	2	4	4	3	5	2	5	2	4	36
TOTALS	7	8	8	11	9	8	10	12	9	21	9	7	119

frequency of references to Administrative Duties was thirty-six. Instructional Responsibilities was considered second in importance to Administrative Duties, and as Table 1 indicates, the frequency of reference to that category was twenty-one. Personal Characteristics and Personnel Relationships followed closely behind Instructional Responsibilities in frequency of references by the selected sources. Their frequencies were nineteen and eighteen respectively.

Professional Preparation and Public Relations received the least frequencies of references by the sources investigated. As Table 1 illustrates, Professional Preparation had a frequency of fourteen while Public Relations had a frequency of ten. It appears, therefore, that the selected sources favor particular aspects of the presidential role when writing about the presidency. Thus, some aspects of the presidency are only slightly referred to by the sources.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF STUDY

Introduction

As previously mentioned, this study was concerned with the opinions of faculty members and college presidents of seven state supported junior colleges in Oklahoma, and the attitudes and opinions of those two groups toward the office of college president. This chapter, therefore, discusses the various operational procedures and techniques followed in investigating the problems and collecting and analyzing the information needed to interpret what opinions the two groups hold regarding the role of the college president.

The Seven Colleges

An investigation of the descriptive characteristics of the seven state supported junior colleges revealed the institutions are not as homogeneous as one would think. Historically, the colleges differ. Three of the colleges, Cameron State Agricultural College, Connors State Agricultural College, and Murray State Agricultural College were established as secondary agricultural schools later adding

junior college work to their curricula.[1] Two institutions, Northern Oklahoma College[2] and Oklahoma Military Academy,[3] evolved from preparatory schools, while Northeastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College[4] and Eastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College[5] were originally mining or technical institutions. The seven state colleges, then, have diversified origins and the diversifications no doubt affect the contemporary institutions, the faculties, the student bodies, and the attitudes and opinions of the presidents and faculties toward the office of president.

Further investigation of descriptive characteristics of the institutions revealed that two colleges, Northern Oklahoma College[6] and Oklahoma Military Academy[7] have separate boards of regents governing them. Cameron, Connors, Eastern A & M, Murray, and Northeastern A & M are all controlled and regulated by the Board of Regents for the

---

[1]Oklahoma. Session Laws, (1927), p. 74.

[2]Oklahoma. Session Laws, (1901), p. 197.

[3]Bruce Carter. "A Proposed Distribution of Junior College for Oklahoma," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation: University of Oklahoma, 1950), p. 33.

[4]Oklahoma. Session Laws, (1919), p. 116.

[5]Carter, op. cit., p. 34.

[6]Oklahoma Legislature Reporter. (Reference to HB 810 passed July, 1965), Edited by Leroy A. Ritter, Oklahoma City: July 9, 1965), p. 25.

[7]Twelfth Biennial Report. Period ending June 30, 1964, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, p. 19.

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical Colleges.[8] All the institutions, however, are coordinated and regulated by the nine-man Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.[9]

The descriptive analysis of the seven colleges also indicated that the communities in which the institutions are located vary in size and geographic location. Thus, it was considered necessary in this study to investigate whether the faculties differed in opinions regarding the presidency when their institutions were classified either rural or urban. To classify the seven colleges into the two categories, the 1960 U.S. Population Census was used. By the 1960 Census, three institutions, Connors, Eastern A & M, and Murray were located in communities of less than 2,500 and the three communities were classified rural.[10] Four colleges, Cameron, Northern Oklahoma College, Northeastern A & M, and Oklahoma Military Academy were located in communities with 2,500 or more inhabitants and were classified urban by the same census.[11] Table 2 presents the populations of the cities and counties in which the seven state junior colleges are located. By the populations thus presented, the seven institutions were divided

---

[8] Ibid., p. 18-20.

[9] Ibid.

[10] U.S. Census of Population, 1960. Number of Inhabitants: Oklahoma. (Final Report, PC (1) - 38A), p. 5.

[11] Ibid.

into two groups so that the faculties' opinions regarding the presidency could be studied accordingly.

TABLE 2

POPULATION OF COUNTIES AND CITIES IN WHICH THE SEVEN STATE SUPPORTED JUNIOR COLLEGES ARE LOCATED[12]

County	Population	City	Population
Comanche	90,803	Lawton	61,697
Johnston	8,517	Tishomingo	2,281
Kay	51,042	Tonkawa	3,415
Latimer	7,738	Wilburton	1,772
Muskogee	61,866	Warner	881
Ottawa	28,301	Miami	12,869
Rogers	20,614	Claremore	6,630

An investigation of the seven state supported junior colleges thus indicated various descriptive differences between the institutions. Taking into consideration the many different characteristics of the institutions, it is, therefore, important to investigate the opinions of the faculties and presidents who are associated with the institutions.

The Population

The population investigated in this study included 340 junior college faculty members and seven junior college

[12] Ibid.

presidents. The faculty population included only those instructors who were employed full-time at the institutions for the academic year 1965-66. Table 3 presents the faculty compositions of the institutions for 1965-66. As Table 3 indicates, Cameron had 87 instructors and the largest full-time faculty for 1965-66. Northeastern A & M, with 70 full-time faculty members was second largest in size. Eastern A & M, with 44 instructors, was third in size, but the college had only about half the number of instructors as Cameron. Northern Oklahoma College, with 40 faculty members; Oklahoma Military Academy, with 38 instructors; Murray, with 35 and Connors, with 26 instructors, followed respectively in size of full-time faculty. It is interesting to note that Connors had only 29.8 per cent the number of full-time faculty members as Cameron. As noted in Table 2, Connors also had the smallest community population of the seven state institutions.

Regarding the gender of the population investigated, Cameron again had the largest female faculty having 28 female instructors. Northeastern A & M, with 25 female faculty members was second in size. Eastern A & M, and Northern Oklahoma College had 14 and 10 female instructors respectively. Connors and Murray both had 9 female instructors while Oklahoma Military Academy, a military institution serving only young men, had only 2 female instructors.

TABLE 3

THE SEVEN STATE SUPPORTED JUNIOR COLLEGES OF OKLAHOMA AND THEIR FACULTY COMPOSITIONS

Colleges	Men	Women	Total
Cameron	59	28	87
Connors	17	9	26
Eastern A & M	30	14	44
Murray	26	9	35
Northeastern A & M	45	25	70
Northern	30	10	40
Oklahoma Military Academy	36	2	38
TOTAL	243	97	340

An investigation of the faculty populations of the seven state junior colleges thus revealed differences in faculty size and composition. From the responses of the 340 full-time instructors and seven college presidents it was, therefore, possible to determine the opinions of the faculty members and presidents regarding the college presidency. Likewise, when the institutions were classified rural or urban, it was possible to determine whether or not there were differences of opinions between the two groups regarding the role of the presidency. The results of the statistical analyses of faculty, presidential, and rural or urban responses thus made possible the findings of this study.

Instrumentation

To obtain a sample of the opinions of faculty members and presidents, this study utilized the questionnaire method as a means of educational investigation. Koos encouraged the use of such methodology in educational research as early as 1928 when he stated:

> Use the questionnaire to ascertain the state of practice in some field of activity, to secure basic data to be used in ways more fundamental than to afford a mere description of practice, and to secure opinions, judgments, or the expression of attitudes of respondents from which, if nothing more, tentative measures or evaluations may be derived. The questionnaire permits the gathering of such information obtainable in no other way.[13]

This method of investigation has subsequently been realized as a valuable research tool, and in 1959, Good supported this method when he maintained:

> As to uses and applications, the questionnaire extends the investigator's power and techniques of observations by reminding the respondent of each item, helping to insure responses to the same item from all respondents, and tending to standardize and objectify the observations of different enumerators...[14]

Scates and Yeomans likewise added support to the questionnaire method of educational investigation when in 1962 they stated:

---

[13]Leonard V. Koos. The Questionnaire in Education: A Critique and Manual. (New York: Macmillan Co., Inc., 1928), pp. 147-49.

[14]Carter V. Good. Introduction to Educational Research. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1959), pp. 190-205.

> The questionnaire should be important not only to the investigator and to the particular field of knowledge, but also to the respondent, whose psychology of motivation involves his attention, sympathy, interests, cooperation, and honesty in answering questions.[15]

In the development of the instrument used in this study, items of statements were selected from the selected sources mentioned in Chapter II. Statements pertaining to six logical categories representing the professional function of the president were used to categorize the items. The six categories were: (1) personal relationships, (2) professional preparation, (3) instructional responsibilities, (4) personnel relationships, (5) public relations, and (6) administrative duties.

Regarding the placement of items in the instrument, the statements were assembled in the questionnaire without regard to the six logical categories. Individual statements were purposely ungrouped to prevent respondents from giving emphasis to favorite areas of administration. The respondents in responding to the statements were instructed to weigh each statement in relation to the entire scope of the college presidency. For their responses, a four-point category of importance was provided opposite each statement. The categories of relative importance were: (1) little or no importance, (2) moderately important, (3) significantly

---

[15]Douglas E. Scates and Alice V. Yeomans. "Developing a Depth Questionnaire to Explore Motivation and Likelihood of Actions," Educational and Psychological Measurement. Vol. 12 (1962), pp. 620-631.

important, and (4) extremely important.

Efforts were made to eliminate duplications and ambiguities in the original verbatim statements by rephrasing and rewording. Over one-hundred originally selected were reduced to seventy-two items. Then a preliminary form of the questionnaire was prepared and administered to fifteen graduate students in Education at the University of Oklahoma. They were asked to respond to the statements in order to correct, clarify, and eliminate any statements which might be ambiguous, duplicative, or otherwise invalid for the purpose of the study. Ten statements were omitted from the preliminary questionnaire and five other statements had to be corrected because of ambiguities. The questionnaire was afterwards revised from the information obtained and the final form was reproduced on a four page sheet for distribution to the Oklahoma junior college faculty members and presidents. The final form of the questionnaire is presented in Appendix II.

The final form of the questionnaire was mailed first class with a return envelope to all full-time faculty members and presidents of the seven state supported junior colleges in Oklahoma. Preliminary contact with each college president yielded complete faculty directories of all full-time faculty members employed at each institution for the academic year 1965-66. The population, as previously mentioned, included the 340 full-time faculty members and

seven college presidents. An analysis of their responses to the questionnaire produced the results of this study.

Data Collecting Procedures

The responses to the presidential cover letter yielded six completed questionnaires and faculty directories by the end of September, 1965. A follow-up letter to the president of Cameron State Agricultural College on October 13, 1965 was successful in collecting both the response of the president to the questionnaire and a Cameron 1965-66 faculty directory. Upon receipt of the response of the Cameron president, all 340 full-time faculty members and seven college presidents of the seven state supported junior colleges were mailed questionnaires. To facilitate and insure maximum returns from the colleges concerned, a coding system was used to record every questionnaire received from each institution. Every college, therefore, was assigned an alphabetical letter and each instructor a number to permit a check on each response and a follow-up procedure.

With the responses of six of the seven state junior college presidents to the September 14, 1965 presidential letter, 253 faculty cover letters and questionnaires were mailed October 4, 1965 to all full-time instructors at Connors State Agricultural College, Eastern A & M College, Murray State Agricultural College, Northeastern A & M College, Northern Oklahoma College, and Oklahoma Military

Academy. Each questionnaire was accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope for the convenience of the faculties in remitting the instrument. Following the initial mailing of the questionnaires to the six colleges, the final president responded with a completed questionnaire and faculty directory. On October 18, 1965, follow-up questionnaires were mailed to non-respondents of the six colleges contacted previously, and on that same date, initial contact by faculty cover letter was made with eighty-seven full-time faculty members who had not been contacted previously.

On November 8, 1965, further effort was made to encourage faculty participation by mailing post cards to the non-respondents of all the colleges but Cameron. The Cameron non-respondents on that date received follow-up letters with additional questionnaires in the event the previous questionnaires had been lost or misplaced. Follow-up post cards to the non-respondents of the six colleges who had not responded to any of the several previous questionnaires were mailed November 23, 1965. Effort was continued to receive more completed questionnaires from the Cameron non-respondents December 8, 1965 when follow-up post cards were mailed to those individuals. Final efforts to receive additional questionnaires from the colleges were made by personal letters to friends and acquaintances at the colleges, telephone conversations, and direct contact with several non-respondents.

By December 16, 1965, 311 of the total 340 full-time faculty members and presidents of the seven state junior colleges had responded to the instrument. Table 4 presents the populations and the responses of the individuals for comparison and analysis.

TABLE 4

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES OF 311 FULL-TIME FACULTY MEMBERS

Colleges	Total No. Men	Returns Men	Total Women	Returns Women	Total Sent	Total Returned
Cameron	59	48	28	26	87	74
Connors	17	17	9	9	26	26
Eastern A&M	30	25	14	13	44	38
Murray	26	25	9	7	35	32
N'eastern	45	45	25	24	70	69
Northern	30	29	10	10	40	39
Okla. M. A.	36	31	2	2	38	33
TOTALS	243	220	97	91	340	311

After the final attempts had been made to secure as many questionnaire returns as possible from the seven state institutions, a Chi-square test was applied to test the representativeness of the number of returns. Utilizing the method described by Cella,[16] the men and women of each

[16] Francis R. Cella. Sampling Statistics in Business and Economics. (Norman: Oklahoma University Bureau of Business Research, 1950), p. 224.

college were divided into two respective groups according to sex. Using the Chi-square procedure, the theoretical frequencies were then computed for each college and the Chi-square analysis applied. The Chi-square analysis indicated the number of responses was significant at the 0.05 level and thus representative of the college population. Further statistical computations could, therefore, be applied to answer the questions of the problem.

Statistical Analysis

To determine whether significant statistical differences existed between responses of faculty members and college presidents as stated in Question "a" of the problem, the Chi-square method as a test of independence, and as generalized from the methods described in Guilford,[17] Edwards,[18] and Garrett[19] was applied to the data. According to Garrett: (a) Chi-square is computed from frequencies, (b) the theoretical or expected frequencies in any cell must be at least 5.0 to be valid, (c) observed and expected frequencies should add up to the same total, and (d) categories or items should be independent and not overlapping.[20]

---

[17]Guilford. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965), p. 235.

[18]Allen L. Edwards. Statistical Methods for Behavioral Sciences. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964), pp. 366-369.

[19]Henry E. Garrett, Statistics in Psychology and Education. (New York: Longsmans, Green and Co., 1959), pp. 262-264.

To statements "a" and "c", the data satisfied the two assumptions. For statement "b", those cells not having the necessary theoretical frequency were omitted from the Chi-square test and analyzed by percentages of responses. Finally, for statement "d", the Chi-square assumption was met in developing the questionnaire statements and analyzing the responses of the faculty members and presidents independently. Thus, the four assumptions of Chi-square being met, the statistical measure was utilized for the previously mentioned purpose of the study. The formula for application of the test as well as an example of the application of the test to the data collected from the questionnaire was as follows:

$$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$$

where O = the observed or obtained frequencies in the various categories.
E = corresponding frequencies expected under some hypotheses.

The difference between each observed and each expected frequency is squared and divided by the expected or theoretical frequency and the sum of these quotients is Chi-square.[21] When applied to the data collected by the questionnaire, the formula was interpreted as follows:

---

[20]Henry E. Garrett. Elementary Statistics. (2nd edition; New York: David McKay, Inc., 1962), p. 153-54.

[21]Don Louis and C. J. Burke. "The Use and Misuse of the Chi-square Test," Psychological Bulletin. Vol. 46, No. 6, (Nov., 1949), p. 34.

Questionnaire Item No. 21:
Urban and Rural Populations

Responses	1	2	3	4
Urban	17 (17.22)	35 (37.19)	98 (88.84)	69 (75.75)
Rural	8 (7.78)	19 (16.81)	31 (40.16)	41 (34.25)

$$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(O - E)^2}{E} = \frac{(17 - 17.22)^2}{17.22} + \frac{(35 - 37.19)^2}{37.19} + \frac{(98 - 88.84)^2}{88.84} + \frac{(69 - 75.75)^2}{75.75} + \frac{(8 - 7.78)^2}{7.78} + \frac{(19 - 16.81)^2}{16.81} + \frac{(31 - 40.16)^2}{40.16} + \frac{(41 - 34.25)^2}{34.25} = 5.38$$

As noted above, the sum on the additive Chi-square to Questionnaire Item No. 21 was 5.38.

As noted in a study by Louis and Burke[22], the numerical values of the total number of responses of the faculty members and college presidents needed to be equalized. Since the presidential group was smaller than the faculty group, that group was equalized so that the Chi-square test could be accurately applied to the data. The method used for equalization of the responses of the presidential group was the method of percentages described by Cella.[23] To utilize the method of Cella, a constant

---

[22] Ibid.

[23] Cella, loc. cit.

multiplier was obtained and the presidential group thus equalized with the faculty. The following formula was used to obtain the constant multiplier:

$$\frac{N_1}{N_2} = k$$

where k = the constant multiplier
N_1 = the total responses of the faculty
N_2 = the total responses of the presidents to any one statement.

An example of the above formula applied to the smaller presidential group is presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM NO. 51:
FACULTY AND PRESIDENTIAL POPULATIONS

Responses	Frequency of Responses				Totals
	1	2	3	4	
Pres. (Equal.)	133.29	44.42	44.42	88.86	
Pres. (Act.)	(3)	(1)	(1)	(2)	310.99
Fac.	101	87	74	49	311.00

As Table 5 above indicates, one presidential response equaled 44.42; two responses, 88.86; three responses, 133.29; four responses, 177.71; five responses, 222.14; six responses, 266.57; and seven responses, 311.0. Thus, the actual presidential responses were equalized to the

larger faculty group and by the application of the Chi-square analysis to the weighted responses of the presidents it was determined whether a significant statistical difference existed between the faculty members and presidents at the 0.05 level of significance.

Using the urban and rural classifications as defined by the 1960 U.S. Population Census mentioned previously, the seven state supported junior colleges of Oklahoma were divided into urban and rural groups. To determine the significant statistical differences between the rural and urban faculties and presidents, the same method previously mentioned for Question "a" of the problem was utilized. Thus by the Chi-square analysis, it was determined whether significant statistical differences existed between the urban and rural colleges at the 0.05 level of significance.

Summary

This chapter presented the background of the seven state supported junior colleges in Oklahoma and the faculty populations of each institution. The chapter also described the data collecting procedures and the total number of received responses from the seven institutions. In addition, the chapter described the instrument, statistical procedures utilized in analyzing the data, and the application of the statistical methods to the data collected from the questionnaire.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study as mentioned previously was to examine the similarities and differences in the opinions of faculty members and presidents regarding the office of president. In addition, the study examined the similarities and differences between institutions classified as urban or rural. To examine the similarities and differences in responses of faculty and presidents, and the rural and urban institutions, a Chi-square test as a test of independence was applied to the data received from the responses of the two groups. For those statements inapplicable to the Chi-square test, the responses were analyzed by percentages to determine the intensity of importance the two groups placed upon the statements. Six logical categories pertaining to the office of president were used to report the results of the Chi-square test and the percentages of responses to those statements inapplicable to the Chi-square test.

Analysis of Faculty and Presidential Opinions

The responses of the faculty members and presidents were analyzed by the Chi-square test and by percentages. The results were reported by six logical categories on the office of president. As described in Chapter III, the presidential responses were equalized for statistical computations with the larger faculty group. Forty-six items to which the faculty members and presidents responded were applicable to the Chi-square test. The results of the Chi-square test indicated that on each of the specific items of the questionnaire, the sum of the additive Chi-squares was greater than 7.815 and significant at the 0.05 level. This indicated that there were significant statistical differences in opinions between the faculty members and presidents to selected statements on the office of president. Table 6 presents the responses of the faculty members and presidents to the statements with the Chi-square values indicated in the right hand column. A reading of Table 6 indicates that the differences were produced by the response patterns in column three and four, or the columns representing "significant importance" or "extreme importance." It is clear, therefore, that the differences between faculty and presidential responses are in degree of importance attached to the specific descriptive items and not in the fact the statements are unimportant to the presidency. Eleven items could not meet the assumptions

of the Chi-square test since the values of their theoretical frequencies were less than 5.0. They were treated by percentages to determine the intensity of importance the faculty members and presidents placed upon the statements.

TABLE 6

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE FREQUENCIES AND CHI SQUARE VALUES BY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE CATEGORIES FOR 311 FACULTY MEMBERS AND SEVEN JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS
(N = 311)

Respondents	Ques. Item No.	Response Frequencies 1	2	3	4	Value of Chi-square 3df
Pres.	1	0	0	133.29	177.71[a]	
Fac.	1	26	32	108	145	54.48
Pres.	2	0	0	88.86	222.14	
Fac.	2	12	18	116	165	37.62
Pres.	3	0	0	88.86	222.14[b]	
Fac.	3	8	14	75	214	
Pres.	4	222.14	0	88.86	0	
Fac.	4	69	96	106	40	212.32
Pres.	5	44.43	88.86	88.86	88.86	
Fac.	5	82	92	98	39	29.70
Pres.	6	0	0	0	311.00[b]	
Fac.	6	9	9	46	247	
Pres.	7	0	0	177.71	133.29	
Fac.	7	14	34	104	159	64.94
Pres.	8	0	44.43	177.71	88.86	
Fac.	8	12	51	110	138	36.06
Pres.	9	0	0	88.86	222.14[b]	
Fac.	9	9	15	99	188	
Pres.	10	0	0	222.14	88.86	
Fac.	10	36	73	115	87	138.46
Pres.	11	0	88.86	88.86	133.29	
Fac.	11	55	94	130	32	121.34
Pres.	12	0	0	88.86	222.14	
Fac.	12	12	30	111	158	50.82
Pres.	13	0	0	222.14	88.86	
Fac.	13	25	77	131	78	121.62
Pres.	14	0	0	177.71	133.28	
Fac.	14	17	49	127	118	71.00

TABLE 6--Continued

Respondents	Ques. Item No.	Response Frequencies 1	2	3	4	Value of Chi-square 3df
Pres.	15	0	44.42	133.29	133.29	
Fac.	15	37	97	124	53	87.82
Pres.	16	44.43	0	133.29	133.29	
Fac.	16	71	87	93	60	124.52
Pres.	17	0	44.43	177.71	88.86	
Fac.	17	31	85	130	65	52.28
Pres.	18	0	0	177.71	133.29	
Fac.	18	12	18	125	156	36.60
Pres.	19	0	0	266.57	44.43[b]	
Fac.	19	7	36	139	129	
Pres.	20	0	44.43	133.29	133.29	
Fac.	20	20	42	101	148	22.92
Pres.	21	0	88.86	133.29	88.86	
Fac.	21	25	52	126	108	34.00
Pres.	22	0	44.43	133.29	133.29	
Fac.	22	18	39	139	115	17.58
Pres.	23	0	0	133.29	177.71	
Fac.	23	20	49	128	114	78.64
Pres.	24	0	44.43	166.57	0	
Fac.	24	22	61	144	84	140.32
Pres.	25	0	0	88.86	222.14[b]	
Fac.	25	8	8	91	204	
Pres.	26	0	44.43	44.43	222.14	
Fac.	26	15	20	116	160	62.40
Pres.	27	0	0	88.86	222.14[b]	
Fac.	27	7	17	107	180	
Pres.	28	0	0	266.57	44.43	
Fac.	28	12	40	120	139	150.64
Pres.	29	0	0	133.29	177.71	
Fac.	29	17	47	123	124	69.62
Pres.	30	0	0	44.43	266.57[b]	
Fac.	30	7	27	122	155	
Pres.	31	0	44.43	88.86	177.71	
Fac.	31	13	50	143	105	41.66
Pres.	32	0	0	44.43	266.57[b]	
Fac.	32	6	12	96	197	
Pres.	33	0	0	44.43	266.57	
Fac.	33	10	15	115	171	72.66
Pres.	34	0	44.43	177.71	88.86	
Fac.	34	25	51	149	86	25.70
Pres.	35	0	0	88.86	222.14[b]	
Fac.	35	9	14	101	187	
Pres.	36	0	44.43	133.29	133.29	
Fac.	36	43	92	104	72	78.00

TABLE 6--Continued

Respondents	Ques. Item No.	Response Frequencies 1	2	3	4	Value of Chi-square 3df
Pres.	37	44.43	0	88.86	177.71	
Fac.	37	22	72	120	97	104.40
Pres.	38	0	0	266.57	44.43	
Fac.	38	21	48	114	128	164.96
Pres.	39	0	0	44.43	266.57	
Fac.	39	15	11	61	224	27.98
Pres.	40	0	0	222.14	88.86	
Fac.	40	33	63	121	94	121.38
Pres.	41	88.86	133.29	88.86	0	
Fac.	41	104	96	84	27	31.90
Pres.	42	0	266.57	0	44.43	
Fac.	42	72	105	104	30	242.24
Pres.	43	0	88.86	133.29	88.86	
Fac.	43	34	51	117	109	116.54
Pres.	44	0	0	0	311.00[b]	
Fac.	44	8	8	60	235	
Pres.	45	0	0	44.42	266.57[b]	
Fac.	45	7	30	127	147	
Pres.	46	0	0	88.86	22.14	
Fac.	46	44	71	118	78	173.46
Pres.	47	0	44.43	0	266.57	
Fac.	47	10	18	59	224	78.98
Pres.	48	0	0	88.86	222.14	
Fac.	48	15	26	101	169	50.12
Pres.	49	44.43	88.86	177.71	0	
Fac.	49	88	84	104	35	65.54
Pres.	50	0	44.43	88.86	177.71	
Fac.	50	27	42	121	121	40.06
Pres.	51	0	0	133.29	177.71	
Fac.	51	18	39	118	136	59.18
Pres.	52	133.29	44.43	44.43	88.86	
Fac.	52	101	87	74	49	36.52
Pres.	53	0	44.43	133.29	133.29	
Fac.	53	29	69	140	73	49.10
Pres.	54	88.86	133.29	88.86	0	
Fac.	54	104	76	75	56	71.56
Pres.	55	0	44.43	177.71	88.86	
Fac.	55	50	68	125	68	64.46
Pres.	56	0	0	177.71	133.29	
Fac.	56	29	55	124	103	92.88
Pres.	57	44.43	44.43	88.86	133.29	
Fac.	57	35	75	119	82	24.04

TABLE 6--Continued

[a]Presidential responses equalized to 311.

[b]Inapplicable to Chi-square. Significant at 0.05 level.

Public Relations

The results of the Chi-square analysis previously mentioned indicated that there were differences in intensity of responses to selected statements on the office of college president. As Table 7 indicates, the faculty and presidents had significant differences to the forty-six items of the questionnaire applicable to the Chi-square test. Certain categories of items, however, had greater Chi-square values than others. Public Relations, for example, had four of six items with Chi-square values greater than 100. This indicated differences in intensity of responses by the two groups. The items in that category on which the faculty members and presidents differed by Chi-square values greater than 100 were:

1. The president is a politician.
13. A president is responsible for informing the alumni and general public about the educational policies of the institution.
24. A president knows how he appears to others.
28. A president makes explicit to the community the role of the college.

The items in the Public Relations category on which the two groups differed with Chi-square values less than 100 were:

8. A president acts constantly as a public relations officer of the college.

31. A president is an active citizen reflecting the application of educational values to community living.

TABLE 7

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BY LOGICAL CATEGORIES ON THE DIMENSIONS OF THE PRESIDENCY AS REPORTED BY FACULTY MEMBERS AND COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Logical Categories	No. of Items in Category	No. of Items of Difference	X^2 less* than 100.0	X^2 more* than 100.0
1. Personal Characteristics	12	12	9	3
2. Professional Preparation	6	6	4	2
3. Instructional Reponsibilities	8	8	6	2
4. Personnel Relationships	7	7	6	1
5. Public Relations	6	6	2	4
6. Administrative Duties	7	7	6	1
TOTALS	46	46	33	13

*0.05 level of significance for 3 df.

Analyzing the responses of the two groups to individual statements, it is apparent that presidents place little importance on Item No. 4 since 71 per cent of the presidents rated it as little or no importance to the office of president. The faculty responses, on the other hand, indicated they place greater importance to the item since only 22 per cent of the respondents rated the item as

of little or no importance. To Item No. 28, 85 per cent of the presidents rated the statement significantly important in comparison with 38 per cent for the faculty. On Item No. 24, 85 per cent of the presidents rated it significantly important in comparison to 38 per cent for the faculty. The response to Item No. 13 indicated the presidents place greater importance to the statement than do the faculty members since 85 per cent rated the item significantly important. Only 43 per cent of faculty rated the statement significantly important.

The two items with Chi-square values less than 100. indicated also that while the faculty and presidents differ on the statements, the intensity of their differences vary. For example, on Item No. 8, 57 per cent of the presidents rated the item significantly important, in comparison to 36 per cent for the faculty. For Item No. 31, 57 per cent of the presidents rated the item extremely important. The faculty members, on the other hand, had only 33 per cent of the responses in the extremely important category.

The responses to the category of Public Relations, therefore, indicated that only on one statement, Item No. 4, did the faculty members place greater importance than the presidents. On the other statements, the presidential responses indicated greater importance than the faculty members.

Personal Characteristics

The faculty and presidential responses to the category of Personal Relationships yielded three items with Chi-square values exceeding 100. The items were:

37. A president is a man with respect for understanding religious ideas and ideals.
40. A president is a scholar.
43. A president has friends outside the college and outside higher education.

The presidential responses to Item No. 37 indicated 57 per cent of the presidents rate the statement extremely important in comparison to 31 per cent for the faculty. To Item No. 40, 71 per cent of the presidential responses fell in the category of significantly important in comparison to 38 per cent for the faculty. For Item No. 43, the faculty placed 35 per cent of their responses in the category of extremely important in comparison to 28 per cent for the presidents.

The nine statements in the Personal Characteristics category which had Chi-square values of less than 100. were:

5. A president is married and has a family.
17. A president has a good aesthetic-cultural background.
15. A president has broad social sympathies.
20. A president is democratic.
29. A president has patience.
33. A president inspires leadership ability.
47. A president is of sound moral character.
53. A president reads seriously and extensively.
56. A president has a sense of humor.

The responses of the presidents to Item No. 5 indicated they had 85 per cent of their responses in the

categories of moderately to extremely important. The faculty had 73 per cent in the same two categories of importance. To Item No. 17, 57 per cent of the presidents rated the statement significantly important in comparison to 41 per cent for the faculty. Eighty-five per cent of the presidents rated Item No. 15 from significantly to extremely important in comparison to 56 per cent for the faculty. To Item No. 20, 47 per cent of the faculty rated the statement extremely important in comparison with 42 per cent for the presidents. Fifty-seven per cent of the presidents rated Item No. 29 extremely important compared to 39 per cent for the faculty. To Item No. 33, 85 per cent of the presidents rated the statement extremely important in comparison to 54 per cent for the faculty. The faculty responded with 72 per cent of their replies in the extremely important category for Item No. 47, while the presidents had 85 per cent in that category. To Item No. 53, 42 per cent of the presidents rated the statement significantly important in comparison to 45 per cent for the faculty. For Item No. 56, 57 per cent of the presidents rated the statement significantly important while the faculty had only 39 per cent in the same category.

The responses to the category of Personal Characteristics indicated, therefore, that only on Items No. 20, 43 and 53 were the faculty responses greater than the presidents. The presidents placed greater importance on

nine of the statements in the category. However, on Items No. 20 and 53, the two groups did not differ greatly in the intensity of their responses.

Instructional Responsibilities

The results of the Chi-square test to the category of Instructional Responsibilities indicated two items of significant difference with Chi-square values over 100. The two items in the category were:

11. A president favors liberal admission requirements for junior colleges.
38. A president ascertains whether the curricula of the college is meeting the needs of the students and society.

To Item No. 11, 42 per cent of the presidents rated the statement extremely important in comparison with 13 per cent of the faculty. On Item No. 38, 85 per cent of the presidents rated the statement significantly important but only 13 per cent of the faculty indicated the statement to be significantly important to the office of president.

The six statements in the Instructional Responsibilities category with Chi-square values below 100. yet still with significant statistical differences, were:

2. A president favors a comprehensive educational program for the junior colleges.
18. A president anticipates coming trends and coming events.
22. A president's educational duty is to decide educational issues without regard to pressure.
26. A president acts on educational matters as a representative of education, of scholarship, of the teaching faculty, and students.

34. A president develops criteria of good teaching and their identification.
48. A president asserts those values which express the highest goals of higher education, the search for truth and the right of free inquiry.

To Item No. 2, 28 per cent of the presidents believed the statement significantly important in comparison to 37 per cent for the faculty. Seventy-one per cent of the presidents and 53 per cent of the faculty rated the statement extremely important. Finally, to Item No. 18, 57 per cent of the presidents rated the item significantly important, but 50 per cent of the faculty thought the statement to be extremely important. The presidents had an 85 per cent significantly to extremely important response to Item No. 22 while the faculty responses indicated an 81 per cent response in comparison. On Item No. 26, 51 per cent of the faculty rated the statement extremely important compared to 71 per cent for the presidents. Four presidents gave a 57 per cent response to Item No. 34 in comparison to 44 per cent for the faculty. Finally, 71 per cent of the presidential responses to Item No. 48 fell within the extremely important category while 51 per cent of the faculty believed the statement extremely important.

Personnel Relationships

The results of the Chi-square analysis to the category of Personnel Relationships indicated only one statement with a statistically significant difference

Chi-square above 100. The single item was:

> 46. A president assists in providing for the personal and family security of the members of the staff.

To the item, 71 per cent of the presidents rated the statement extremely important in comparison to only 25 per cent for the faculty.

The six statements in the same category with significantly different Chi-squares below 100. were:

> 12. A president knows and understands the points of view of the various groups in the faculty.
> 23. A president encourages participation and leads the faculty in studies pertaining to the purposes of the two-year college.
> 49. A president canvasses the college community before circulating information of vacancies off-campus.
> 51. A president maintains an "open-door" policy toward faculty visitations.
> 54. A president allows the faculty to elect representatives for participation in selection and dismissal of all college administrators.
> 57. A president has the instinctive capacity to appraise the quality and promise of scholars.

For Item No. 12, 47 per cent of the faculty rated the statement extremely important in comparison with 71 per cent for the presidents. Forty-seven per cent of the faculty rated Item No. 23 significantly important in comparison to 43 per cent of the presidents. Thirty-three per cent of the faculty rated Item No. 49 significantly important while the presidents gave 57 per cent of their responses to the significantly important category. To Item No. 51, all the

presidents' responses fell within the categories of significantly to extremely important but the faculty had only 81 per cent of their responses in those categories of importance. To Item No. 54, 33 per cent of the faculty rated the statement as little or no importance in comparison with 28 per cent for the presidents. The other faculty responses fell in the categories of moderately to extremely important but the presidential responses fell from moderately to significantly important. Finally, to Item No. 57, 37 per cent of the faculty rated the statement significantly important in comparison to 28 per cent for the presidents. Forty-two per cent of the presidents rated the statement extremely important in comparison with 20 per cent for the faculty. The remaining responses for both groups fell from little or no importance to moderately important.

For the category of Personnel Relationships, the responses of the two groups, therefore, indicated that on five of the seven items the presidents place greater importance than the faculty members. Only on Items No. 23 and 54 were the faculty percentages greater than the presidents.

Administrative Duties

The category of Administrative Duties had only one statement with a significantly different Chi-square value greater than 100. The single statement was:

42. A president is a man of management more than a man of learning.

To the statement, 85 per cent of the presidents rated the item moderately important in comparison to 33 per cent for the faculty. Thirty-three per cent of the faculty also rated the statement significantly important while no president thought the statement significant. However, 14 per cent of the presidents rated the statement extremely important in comparison to nine per cent for the faculty.

The remaining six statements in the Administrative Duties category with Chi-square values below 100. were:

14. A president takes the lead in policy formulation.
36. A president makes up his own mind about what he thinks his college should be and where it should be going.
39. A president has the ability and willingness to make decisions.
50. A president realizes the final decision of policy rests with the Board of Regents.
52. A president is responsible only to the Board of Regents.

To Item No. 14, 57 per cent of the presidents rated the statement significantly important in comparison to 48 per cent of the faculty. Eighty-five per cent of the presidents rated Item No. 36 from significantly to extremely important in comparison with 56 per cent for the faculty. Item No. 39 had 85 per cent of the presidential responses in the extremely important category compared to 72 per cent for the faculty. To Item No. 50, 57 per cent of the presidents rated the statement extremely important in comparison to only 39 per cent for the faculty. The faculty had a 32 per cent little or no importance response

to Item No. 52 in comparison to 42 per cent for the presidents. Twenty-eight per cent of the presidents and 15 per cent of the faculty rated Item No. 52 extremely important. Finally, for Item No. 55, 57 per cent of the faculty responses fell in the categories of little or no importance to significantly important in comparison to 71 per cent for the presidents.

It is therefore apparent that the presidents place greater importance to all the items in the category of administrative duties than do the faculty members.

Professional Preparation

There were six statements applicable to the Chi-square test in the category of Professional Preparation. Only two statements, however, had a significant difference in Chi-square values above 100. The two statements were:

10. A president has a substantial background of educational courses dealing with the two-year college.
16. A president comes up through the academic ranks.

The presidents had 71 per cent of their responses in the significantly important category for Item No. 10. Only 36 per cent of the faculty rated the statement significant to the office of president. For Item No. 16, 85 per cent of the presidents rated the statement from significant to extremely important in comparison to 45 per cent for the faculty. Seventy-nine per cent of the faculty responses to Item No. 16, fell in the categories of from little or no importance to significantly important.

The statements in the category with Chi-square values below 100. were:

1. A president has a doctor's degree.
7. A president has a broad foundation in general education.
21. A president has adequate administrative experience in junior college administration.
41. A president is trained specifically for the junior college job.

For Item No. 1, all the presidential responses fell within the significantly to extremely important categories. The faculty, on the other hand, had only 68 per cent of their responses in the two categories. Forty-two per cent of the presidents rated Item No. 7 extremely important in comparison to 51 per cent for the faculty. To Item No. 21, 42 per cent of the presidents rated the item significantly important in comparison to 40 per cent for the faculty. Thirty-four per cent of the faculty and 28 per cent of the presidents rated the statement extremely important. Three presidents had 42 per cent moderately important responses for Item No. 41 compared to 37 per cent response for the faculty. Thirty-three per cent of the faculty rated the item of little or no importance. The results of the responses of the faculty members and presidents thus indicated that only on Items No. 1, 10, and 16 were there great differences of opinions in the importance of the item to the presidency. On Item No. 7, the faculty placed slightly more importance than the presidents. The presidents, on the other hand, placed slightly more importance to Items No. 21 and 41 than the faculty members.

Analysis by Percentages of Faculty and Presidential Responses to Statements Inapplicable to the Chi-square Test

As mentioned previously, eleven items of the questionnaire were omitted from the Chi-square analysis since their theoretical frequencies could not meet the Chi-square assumptions. Three items were identified with the category of Administrative Duties, and Public Relations, two with Instructional Responsibilities, three with Personnel Relationships, and two with Professional Preparation. They were investigated by the six logical categories pertaining to the office of president and presented by tables with the percentage responses of the two groups listed under the four categories of importance on the questionnaire. The items omitted from the Chi-square test were:

3. A president is frank on matters in which the faculty has an important interest.
6. A president has the ability to organize.
9. A president has a broad understanding of the processes of working with groups.
19. A president has facility in public speaking.
25. A president has a mature professional attitude.
27. A president understands people and is able to get along with them.
30. A president recognizes that successful teaching is the major factor in determining faculty promotion.
32. A president establishes clear and reasonable lines of authority.
35. A president establishes an atmosphere conducive to cooperation and mutual effort.
44. A president has sound professional ethics.
45. A president has interest in professional activities.

The percentages of faculty and presidential responses to the eleven statements, however, did indicate certain differences of opinion between the faculty and presidents. Although the Chi-square test could not be applied to the eleven statements, the intensity of their responses can be analyzed by percentages and by the six logical categories on the office of president.

Professional Preparation

Two statements in the category of Professional Preparation were inapplicable to the Chi-square test.

25. A president has a mature professional attitude.
48. A president has sound professional ethics.

The percentages of response to the statements by the four categories of importance are presented in Table 8.

TABLE 8

311 FACULTY MEMBERS AND 7 PRESIDENTS RESPONSES BY PERCENTAGES TO THE CATEGORY ON PRESIDENTIAL PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

Respondents	Ques. Item No.	Importance by Percentages of Responses			
		1	2	3	4
Presidents	25	0	0	29	71
Faculty	25	3	3	29	65
Presidents	44	0	0	0	100
Faculty	44	3	3	19	75

As indicated in Table 8, 71 per cent of the presidents rated Item No. 25 extremely important to the office of president in comparison to only 65 per cent for the faculty group. The presidents had 100 per cent in the extremely important category for Item No. 44 dealing with professional ethics. The faculty, on the other hand, had only 75 per cent of their responses fall in the significantly important category and 3 per cent each in the categories of little or no importance and moderately important.

Instructional Responsibilities

Two statements in the category of Instructional Responsibilities were inapplicable to the Chi-square test.

30. A president recognizes that successful teaching is the major factor in determining faculty promotion.
45. A president has an interest in professional activities.

The percentages of response to the two statements by the four categories of importance are presented in Table 9.

Table 9 indicates that 50 per cent of the faculty rated Item No. 30 extremely important in comparison to 86 per cent for the presidents. It appears the presidents place more importance on successful teaching for faculty promotion than do the faculty members. Regarding Item No. 45, 71 per cent of the presidents rated the statement extremely important while only 48 per cent of the faculty believed it extremely important for the president to have an interest in professional activities. The results of

presidential responses to the category of Professional Preparation therefore indicated that on both items the presidents placed greater importance than the faculty members.

TABLE 9

311 FACULTY MEMBERS AND 7 PRESIDENTS RESPONSES BY PERCENTAGES TO THE CATEGORY ON PRESIDENTIAL INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Respondent	Ques. Item No.	Importance by Percentages of Responses			
		1	2	3	4
Presidents	30	0	0	14	86
Faculty	30	2	9	39	50
Presidents	45	0	0	29	71
Faculty	45	2	10	40	48

Public Relations

Only one statement in the category of Public Relations could not be tested by the Chi-square test:

19. A president has facility in Public Speaking.

The percentages of response to the statement are presented in Table 10.

Table 10 indicates that 86 per cent of the presidents consider the statement significantly important to the office of president while only 45 per cent of the faculty rated the item significantly important. However,

45 per cent of the faculty rated the statement extremely important in comparison to 14 per cent for the presidents.

TABLE 10

311 FACULTY MEMBERS AND 7 PRESIDENTS RESPONSES BY PERCENTAGES TO THE CATEGORY ON PRESIDENTIAL PUBLIC RELATIONS DUTIES

Respondents	Ques. Item No.	Importance by Percentages of Responses			
		1	2	3	4
Presidents	19	0	0	86	14
Faculty	19	2	12	45	41

Personnel Relationships

Three items were excluded from the Chi-square test in the category of Personnel Relationships.

3. A president is frank on matters in which the faculty has an interest.
35. A president establishes an atmosphere conducive to cooperation and mutual understanding.
27. A president understands people and is able to get along with them.

The percentages of responses by the two groups to the statements are presented in Table 11.

Table 11 indicates that the presidents have greater percentages of extremely important responses than the faculty members. For Item No. 3, the presidents had 71 per cent to 69 per cent for the faculty in the extremely important category. The presidents had 86 per cent in the extremely

important category for Item No. 35 in comparison to only 60 per cent for the faculty. Finally, for Item No. 27, only 58 per cent of the faculty rated the statement extremely important in comparison to 86 per cent for the presidents. The presidents, therefore, placed greater importance on the three items than did the faculty members although on Item No. 3, the differences of opinion were slight.

TABLE 11

311 FACULTY MEMBERS AND 7 PRESIDENTS RESPONSES BY PERCENTAGES TO THE CATEGORY ON PRESIDENTIAL PERSONNEL RELATIONSHIPS

Respondents	Ques. Item No.	Importance by Percentages of Responses			
		1	2	3	4
Presidents	3	0	0	29	71
Faculty	3	3	4	24	69
Presidents	27	0	0	29	86
Faculty	27	2	6	34	58
Presidents	35	0	0	29	86
Faculty	35	4	4	32	60

Administrative Duties

In the category of Administrative Duties, three statements were excluded from the Chi-square test.

6. A president has the ability to organize.
9. A president has a broad understanding of the processes of working with groups.

32. A president establishes clear and reasonable lines of authority.

The percentages of responses to the statements are presented in Table 12.

TABLE 12

311 FACULTY MEMBERS AND 7 PRESIDENTS RESPONSES BY PERCENTAGES TO THE CATEGORY ON PRESIDENTIAL ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES

Respondents	Ques. Item No.	Importance by Percentages of Responses			
		1	2	3	4
Presidents	6	0	0	0	100
Faculty	6	3	3	15	79
Presidents	9	0	0	29	71
Faculty	9	3	5	32	60
Presidents	32	0	0	14	86
Faculty	32	2	4	31	63

The table indicates that on Item No. 6, all the presidents believed the statement extremely important to the office of president. The faculty, in comparison, had only a 79 per cent response in that category. Sixty per cent of the faculty rated Item No. 9 extremely important in contrast to 71 per cent for the presidents. On Item No. 32, 86 per cent of the presidents rated the statement extremely important in comparison to only 63 per cent for the faculty. Thirty-one per cent of the faculty rated Item No. 32 significantly important. The presidents, therefore,

indicated they place greater importance than the faculty members to all items in the category of Administrative Duties.

Summary

An analysis of the data received from the responses of the faculty members and presidents to selected statements on the office of president indicated that on all forty-six statements applicable to the Chi-square test, the two groups differed significantly. Thirteen statements had Chi-square values that exceeded 100.0 thus indicating a highly significant difference. Four were in the category of Public Relations. The categories of Instructional Responsibilities and Personal Characteristics had three statements each. The categories of Professional Preparation, Personnel Relationships, and Administrative Duties each had one such statement.

The nature of these highly significant differences requires further comment. The data demonstrate that the differences between presidents and faculty response patterns are in fact differences in degree rather than differences in direction. That is to say, the data reported in the preceding pages indicate that presidents and faculty are in essential agreement regarding the nature of the office of presidency, but that they differ in the degree of importance ascribed to the duties as expressed in the questionnaire.

On seven of the thirteen statements with Chi-square values exceeding 100.0, the presidents had a greater percentage of extremely important responses than the faculty members. The faculty members, on the other hand, had a greater percentage of extremely important responses on six statements. The faculty members had a greater percentage of extremely important responses in the category of Public Relations than the presidents, but the presidents' extremely important responses were greater than the faculty members in the Instructional Responsibilities category. The faculty members also exceeded the presidents' extremely important responses in the Personal Characteristics category, but the statements in the categories of Administrative Duties, Professional Preparation, and Personnel Relationships had a greater percentage of extremely important responses than the faculty.

A similar pattern was observed in the thirty-three statements with Chi-square values less than 100.0. The percentages of presidential extremely important responses were greater than the faculty members' extremely important responses on twenty-five statements, and the faculty members' extremely important responses exceeded the presidents on only eight statements. This indicated that the difference was in the degree of importance. On all six statements in the Administrative Duties category,

the presidents placed greater importance. On three of four statements in the Professional Preparation category, the presidents had a greater percentage of extremely important responses. Only on the statement, "A president has a broad foundation in general education," did the faculties' extremely important responses exceed the presidents. Regarding the Personal Characteristics category, the presidents exceeded the faculty members extremely important responses on eight of nine statements. Only on Item No. 20, "A president is democratic," did the faculty members have extremely important responses greater than the presidents. The presidents placed greater importance on five of six statements in the Instructional Responsibilities category. Only on Item No. 18, "A president anticipates coming trends and coming events," were the faculties' extremely important responses greater than the presidents. Regarding the category of Personnel Relationships, the presidents placed greater importance on four of six statements. The faculty members exceeded the presidential extremely important responses on Item No. 49, "A president canvasses the college community before circulating information of vacancies off-campus," and Item No. 54, "A president maintains an 'open-door' policy toward faculty visitations." The presidents and faculty members each had one statement in the category of Public Relations which they rated extremely important. On Item No. 8, "A president

acts constantly as a public relations officer of the college," the faculty members placed more importance than the presidents. The presidents exceeded the faculties' responses by placing more importance on Item No. 31, "A president is an active citizen reflecting the application of educational values to community living."

The faculty members and presidents responded to eleven statements which later proved inapplicable to the Chi-square test. Only on one statement, Item No. 19, "A president has facility in public speaking," did the faculty members have greater percentage of extremely important responses. Thus, in analyzing the responses of both groups, the results of the investigation revealed that on the thirteen statements with Chi-square values greater than 100.0, the faculty members placed greater importance and exceeded the presidents' on the categories of Public Relations and Personal Characteristics. The presidents placed greater importance than the faculty members on the remaining four categories. The results of the investigation also revealed that on the thirteen statements with Chi-square values less than 100.0, the presidents placed greater importance than the faculty members on twenty-five of the thirty-three statements. The faculty members did not exceed the presidents' responses to any statement in the category of Administrative Duties.

Analysis of the Opinions of Faculty Members in Rural or Urban Institutions

The purpose of this analysis is to examine the impact of the location of the seven state junior colleges on the descriptions of the office of president by faculty members. As mentioned in Chapter III, there were four institutions classified urban. They were: (1) Cameron, (2) Northeastern A & M, (3) Northern Oklahoma College, and (4) Oklahoma Military Academy. The three colleges classified rural were: (1) Eastern A & M, (2) Murray, and (3) Connors.

The statistical differences between institutions classified as urban or rural were determined by the same procedure followed in the preceding section. The data are presented in a summary table of responses and Chi-square values, a summation table of differences by logical categories, and a summary table with the percentages of responses for those statements inapplicable to the Chi-square test.

In testing whether there were statistically significant differences existing between the two groups, the presidents and faculties were grouped together by colleges. The Chi-square test was applied to the data when applicable and the statistical differences between the two groups were determined. Thirty-four items were applicable to the Chi-square test. Table 13 presents the responses of the

TABLE 13

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE FREQUENCIES AND CHI-SQUARE VALUES BY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE CATEGORIES FOR 219 URBAN JUNIOR COLLEGES AND 99 RURAL JUNIOR COLLEGES (N - 318)

Respondents	Quest. Item No.	Response Frequencies				Value of Chi-square 3df
		1	2	3	4	
Urban	1	23	21	74	101[a]	
Rural	1	3	11	37	48[b]	4.46
Urban	2	9	14	81	115[c]	
Rural	2	3	4	37	55[c]	
Urban	3	6	10	61	142[c]	
Rural	3	2	4	16	77	
Urban	4	55	59	79	26	
Rural	4	19	37	29	14	4.68
Urban	5	66	64	60	29	
Rural	5	17	30	40	12	8.14
Urban	6	6	8	33	172[c]	
Rural	6	3	1	13	82[c]	
Urban	7	10	27	80	102[c]	
Rural	7	4	7	28	60[c]	
Urban	8	11	37	89	82[c]	
Rural	8	1	15	25	58[c]	
Urban	9	7	15	77	120[c]	
Rural	9	2	0	24	73	
Urban	10	27	51	78	63	
Rural	10	9	22	42	26	4.97
Urban	11	40	69	91	20	
Rural	11	15	28	41	15[c]	2.88
Urban	12	9	25	77	108[c]	
Rural	12	3	5	36	55	
Urban	13	22	55	88	54	
Rural	13	3	22	48	26	5.59
Urban	14	11	30	99	79	
Rural	14	6	19	32	42	4.85
Urban	15	27	74	82	36	
Rural	15	10	24	45	20	3.88
Urban	16	47	61	66	45	
Rural	16	25	26	30	18	1.06
Urban	17	21	66	90	42	
Rural	17	10	20	44	25[c]	3.85
Urban	18	9	16	86	108[c]	
Rural	18	3	2	43	51	

TABLE 13--Continued

Respondents	Quest. Item No.	Response Frequencies				Value of Chi-square 3df
		1	2	3	4	
Urban	19	7	28	96	88[c]	
Rural	19	0	8	49	42	
Urban	20	15	34	76	94	
Rural	20	5	9	28	57	6.24
Urban	21	17	35	98	69	
Rural	21	8	19	31	41	5.38
Urban	22	17	28	101	73	
Rural	22	1	12	41	45	7.77
Urban	23	16	37	87	79	
Rural	23	4	12	44	39	2.43
Urban	24	16	51	98	54	
Rural	24	6	11	52	30	6.95
Urban	25	7	7	69	136[c]	
Rural	25	1	1	24	73	
Urban	26	12	15	83	109[c]	
Rural	26	4	6	33	56	
Urban	27	5	15	86	113[c]	
Rural	27	2	2	23	72	
Urban	28	9	28	91	91[c]	
Rural	28	3	12	35	49	
Urban	29	11	31	99	78	
Rural	29	6	16	27	50	9.54
Urban	30	6	18	88	107[c]	
Rural	30	1	9	35	54	
Urban	31	7	39	105	68[c]	
Rural	31	6	12	40	41	
Urban	32	4	11	65	139[c]	
Rural	32	2	1	32	64	
Urban	33	5	11	83	120[c]	
Rural	33	5	4	33	57	
Urban	34	17	34	109	59	
Rural	34	8	18	44	29	0.83
Urban	35	5	12	78	124[c]	
Rural	35	4	2	25	68	
Urban	36	32	69	71	47	
Rural	36	11	24	36	28	3.52
Urban	37	16	50	95	58	
Rural	37	7	22	27	43	10.78
Urban	38	16	36	83	84	
Rural	38	5	12	37	45	2.01

TABLE 13--Continued

Respondents	Quest. Item No.	Response Frequencies				Value of Chi-square 3df
		1	2	3	4	
Urban	39	11	8	44	156[c]	
Rural	39	4	3	18	74	
Urban	40	25	47	90	57	
Rural	40	8	16	36	39	6.12
Urban	41	77	65	60	17	
Rural	41	29	34	26	10	1.48
Urban	42	51	75	70	23	
Rural	42	21	36	34	8	.61
Urban	43	26	36	74	83	
Rural	43	8	18	46	27	6.15
Urban	44	7	7	41	164[c]	
Rural	44	1	1	19	78	
Urban	45	6	24	93	96[c]	
Rural	45	1	6	35	57	
Urban	46	29	52	84	54	
Rural	46	15	19	36	29	1.44
Urban	47	7	13	43	156[c]	
Rural	47	3	6	16	74	
Urban	48	9	22	70	118[c]	
Rural	48	6	4	33	56	
Urban	49	61	66	74	18	
Rural	49	28	20	34	17	7.43
Urban	50	21	31	87	80	
Rural	50	6	12	36	45	2.53
Urban	51	13	27	88	91	
Rural	51	5	12	33	49	1.85
Urban	52	81	49	52	37	
Rural	52	23	39	23	14	11.39
Urban	53	20	52	101	46	
Rural	53	9	18	42	30	3.66
Urban	54	66	55	56	42	
Rural	54	40	24	21	14	3.67
Urban	55	36	47	89	47	
Rural	55	14	22	40	23	0.34
Urban	56	21	45	84	69	
Rural	56	8	10	44	37	5.71
Urban	57	28	55	80	56	
Rural	57	8	21	41	29	2.54

[a]Total Urban Responses 219
[b]Total Rural Responses 99
[c]Inapplicable to Chi-square. Significant at 0.05 level.

institutions to the selected statements with the Chi-square values indicated in the right-hand column. The results of the Chi-square test indicated that only on four items were the additive Chi-squares greater than 7.815 and significant at the 0.05 level. Three items of significant difference were in the Personal Characteristics category, and one statement was in the category of Administrative Duties. The items on which there were significant statistical differences between the two groups were:

5. A president is married and has a family.
29. A president has patience.
37. A president is a man with respect for understanding religious ideas and ideals.
52. A president is responsible only to the Board of Regents.

Item No. 52 was in the category of Administrative Duties. To the statement, 37 per cent of the urban colleges rated the item moderately important in comparison to 23 per cent for the rural institutions. Thirty-nine per cent of the rural institutions rated the item significantly important compared to only 22 per cent for the urban group. On Item No. 5, 30 per cent of the urban institutions rated the statement little or no importance in comparison to 17 per cent for the rural colleges. Forty per cent of the rural colleges rated the statement significantly important. Forty-five per cent of the urban colleges and 27 per cent of the rural institutions rated Item No. 29 as significantly important. However, fifty per cent of the rural colleges

rated Item No. 29 extremely important. For Item No. 37, 43 per cent of the urban and 27 per cent of the rural colleges rated the statement significantly important.

The results of a percentage analysis of the four statements statistically significant by the Chi-square test indicated that on each of the four items the rural institutions placed greater importance than the urban institutions.

As Table 14 indicates, thirty statements applicable to the Chi-square test had no statistically significant differences since their values were less than 7.815 at the 0.05 level of significance. However, like the presidential and faculty groups, the frequency of responses of the two groups did indicate slight differences in the importance the institutions placed upon the statements.

Analysis of Opinions of Rural and Urban Faculties to Items Inapplicable to the Chi-square Test

The percentages of responses by institutions classified rural and urban indicated certain differences of opinions between the two groups. As previously mentioned, twenty-three items of the questionnaire were excluded from the Chi-square analysis since their theoretical frequencies proved to be less than five, or the required theoretical frequency necessary for Chi-square analysis. The intensity of the rural and urban responses, however, were analyzed by percentages and the six logical categories as indicated in Table 15. Three statements to which the rural and urban

TABLE 14

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BY LOGICAL CATEGORIES ON THE DIMENSIONS OF THE PRESIDENCY AS REPORTED BY RURAL AND URBAN INSTITUTIONS

Logical Categories	No. of Items of Category	No. of Items of Difference	X^2 less* than 7.815	X^2 more* than 7.815
1. Personal Characteristics	10	3	7	3
2. Professional Preparation	5	0	5	0
3. Instructional Responsibilities	4	0	4	0
4. Personnel Relationships	6	0	6	0
5. Public Relations	3	0	3	0
6. Administrative Duties	6	1	5	1
TOTALS	34	4	30	4

*0.05 level of significance for 3 df.

institutions responded were identified with the category of Professional Preparation. Two items were located in the category of Personal Characteristics and four statements each were identified with the categories of Public Relations, Personnel Relationships, and Administrative Duties. Six items were identified with the category of Instructional Responsibilities.

As Table 15 indicates, only on Item No. 30, "A president recognizes that successful teaching is the major

TABLE 15

PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES OF 219 URBAN AND 99 RURAL INSTITUTIONS TO TWENTY-THREE STATEMENTS INAPPLICABLE TO THE CHI-SQUARE TEST

Respondents	Quest. Item. No.	Importance by Percentages of Responses			
		1	2	3	4
Professional Characteristics					
Urban	7	5	12	36	47
Rural	7	4	7	28	61
Urban	25	3	3	32	62
Rural	25	1	1	24	74
Urban	44	3	3	19	75
Rural	44	1	1	19	79
Personal Characteristics					
Urban	33	2	5	38	55
Rural	33	5	4	33	58
Urban	47	3	6	20	71
Rural	47	3	6	16	75
Instructional Responsibilities					
Urban	26	5	7	38	50
Rural	26	4	6	33	57
Urban	30	3	8	40	49
Rural	30	1	9	35	35
Urban	45	3	11	42	44
Rural	45	1	6	35	58
Urban	48	4	10	32	54
Rural	48	6	4	33	57
Urban	2	4	6	37	53
Rural	2	3	6	37	56
Urban	18	4	8	39	49
Rural	18	3	2	43	52
Public Relations					
Urban	8	5	17	41	37
Rural	8	1	15	25	59
Urban	19	3	13	44	40
Rural	19	0	8	50	42
Urban	28	4	12	42	42
Rural	28	3	12	35	50
Urban	31	3	18	48	31
Rural	31	6	12	40	42
Personnel Relationships					
Urban	3	30	4	28	65
Rural	3	2	4	16	78

TABLE 15--Continued

Respondents	Quest. Item. No.	Importance by Percentage of Responses			
		1	2	3	4
Urban	12	4	12	35	49
Rural	12	3	5	36	56
Urban	35	2	5	36	57
Rural	35	4	2	25	69
Urban	27	2	7	39	52
Rural	27	2	2	23	73
Administrative Duties					
Urban	6	3	4	15	78
Rural	6	3	1	13	83
Urban	9	3	7	35	55
Rural	9	2	0	24	74
Urban	32	2	5	30	63
Rural	32	2	1	32	65
Urban	39	5	4	20	71
Rural	39	4	3	18	75

factor in determining faculty promotion," were the percentages of the urban institutions greater than the rural colleges. On that particular statement, 57 per cent of the urban responses were rated extremely important in comparison to 35 per cent for the rural group. On the other twenty-two statements to which a Chi-square analysis could not be applied, the rural group placed more importance on the statements than the urban institutions.

Summary

An analysis of the data received from the rural and urban institutions' responses indicated that only on four of thirty-four statements were there significant statistical

differences between the two groups. Three of the statements were in the category of Personal Characteristics and one statement was in the category of Administrative Duties. On two of the three statements in the Personal Characteristics category, the rural institutions had a greater percentage of extremely important responses. Only on Item No. 5, "A president is married and has a family," did the urban institutions' extremely important responses exceed the rural colleges. On the single statement in the category of Administrative Duties, Item No. 52, "A president is responsible only to the Board of Regents," the urban colleges' extremely important responses exceeded those of the rural institutions.

There were thirty statements on which the rural and urban institutions did not differ significantly by the Chi-square test. On the seven statements in the category of Personal Characteristics, the rural institutions rated six items extremely important. Only on Item No. 43, "A president had friends outside the college and outside college education," were the urban institutions' extremely important responses greater than the rural colleges' responses. The rural and urban institutions each rated two statements extremely important in the Professional Responsibilities category. The urban colleges' percentages on Item No. 1, "A president has a doctor's degree," and Item No. 10, "A president has a substantial background of

educational courses dealing with the two-year college," exceeded the extremely important responses of the rural institutions. However, the rural group had a greater percentage of extremely important responses on Item No. 21, "A president had adequate administrative training and experience in junior college administration," and Item No. 41, "A president is trained specifically for the junior college presidency." The rural colleges exceeded the extremely important responses of the urban institutions on five of six statements in the Instructional Responsibilities category. Only on Item No. 16, "A president comes up through the academic ranks," did the urban institutions have a greater percentage of extremely important responses. On five of six statements in the category of Personnel Relationships, the rural institutions had a greater percentage of extremely important responses. Only on Item No. 54, "A president allows the faculty to elect representatives for meaningful participation in selection and dismissal of deans, presidents, and other college administrators," were the urban institutions' extremely important responses greater than the rural colleges'. On the three statements in the category of Public Relations, the rural colleges exceeded the urban institutions' extremely important responses on two statements. Only on Item No. 4, "A president is a politician," did the urban colleges have a greater percentage of extremely important responses.

Finally, there were five statements in the category of Administrative Duties. Only on Item No. 42, "A president is a man of management more than a man of learning," did the urban colleges have a greater percentage of extremely important responses than the rural institutions.

The rural and urban institutions responded to twenty-three statements which later proved inapplicable to the Chi-square test. Only on one statement, Item No. 30, "A president recognizes that successful teaching is the major factor in determining faculty promotion," in the Instructional Responsibilities category, did the urban institutions have a greater percentage of extremely important responses than the rural colleges.

Thus, an investigation of the responses of the rural and urban institutions by the percentages of their responses to the fifty-seven statements of the questionnaire revealed that the rural institutions placed greater importance on the items than the urban institutions. The urban institutions exceeded the rural colleges on only one statement each in the categories of Personal Characteristics, Administrative Duties, Personnel Relationships, Instructional Responsibilities, and Public Relations. On the four statements in the category of Professional Preparation, which were proved not to have statistically significant differences by the Chi-square test, the rural and urban institutions were equally divided having rated two statements each in the extremely important category.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were significant statistical differences in responses between faculty members and junior college presidents to written statements selected from the literature descriptive of the office of president. A further purpose was to determine if there were significant statistical differences between institutions classified rural or urban as indicated by the responses of faculty members and presidents of the respective institutions to statements selected from the literature and descriptive of the college presidency.

Statements descriptive of the office of president were collected from selected sources of the literature. These statements were then organized into six logical categories pertaining to the various aspects of the presidency and placed randomly in an attitudinal questionnaire for distribution to the population of the seven state supported junior colleges in Oklahoma. The population included all full-time junior college instructors and the seven junior college presidents employed at the seven state

institutions for the academic year 1965-66. The two groups responded to each statement in the questionnaire by checking a blank corresponding to their interpretation of the importance of the statement to the office of president. Percentages were used to determine the intensity of importance the faculty members and presidents and the rural and urban institutions placed upon the statements. The Chi-square test of independence was applied to test the significant statistical differences between the faculties and presidents and between the institutions classified rural or urban.

Findings

The first question of the problem investigated whether there were significant statistical differences between faculty members and junior college presidents to written statements selected from the literature on the office of president. The results of the Chi-square test indicated that there were significant statistical differences at the 0.05 level between faculty members and presidents to all forty-six statements applicable to the use of the Chi-square test. However, the differences between the two groups were in the degree of importance each attributed the statements to the office of president rather than the fact that the stat ments were not considered important to the presidency.

The second question of the problem investigated whether there were significant statistical differences between institutions classified rural or urban as indicated by the responses of the two groups to the selected statements. The results of the Chi-square test indicated that there were significant statistical differences between rural and urban colleges in only four of thirty-four statements applicable to the use of the Chi-square test.

Using percentages to determine the intensity of importance the faculty members and presidents placed upon the statements, it was found that on thirty-one of forty-six statements applicable to the Chi-square test the presidents had higher or greater expectations of the office of president than the faculty members. On the entire questionnaire, the presidents had greater expectations than the faculty members on forty-two of the fifty-seven statements.

Using percentages to determine the intensity of importance the rural and urban institutions placed upon the statements, it was found that on the four statements with significant statistical differences, the two groups were equally divided regarding the importance of the statement to the presidency. However, on the thirty statements to which the rural and urban colleges did not differ, the rural colleges had a greater expectation of the presidency on twenty-four items. As for the entire fifty-seven

statements in the questionnaire, the rural institutions had a higher expectation than urban colleges on forty-eight items.

Conclusions

The results of statistical analysis of the data received from the faculty members and junior college presidents indicate that significant statistical differences do exist between the two groups regarding the importance they place on the various aspects of the presidency. Furthermore, it is found that college presidents have a greater expectation of the office of president than the faculty members.

The results of statistical analysis of the data received from the responses of rural and urban institutions indicate that few significant statistical differences exist between rural and urban colleges since only four of thirty-four statements had a significant statistical difference at the 0.05 level. However, by the use of percentages, the data indicate that the rural institutions have a greater expectation of the presidency than do the urban colleges.

Recommendations

The following recommendations for further study of the office of president became evident as a result of the findings presented:

1. Immediate attention should be given to the factors which cause faculty members and college presidents

to place more importance on specific aspects of the presidency.

2. Research should be conducted which emphasizes the similarity of opinions and intensity of differences which faculty members and college presidents have concerning the college presidency.

3. The results of this study indicate that factors other than location of the institution should be investigated to determine what effect they have upon the opinions of the faculty members and presidents to various aspects of the presidency.

4. Studies of this type should be extended to other educational institutions in other geographical areas. Such studies would provide data that could be useful in developing a better faculty and administrative esprit de corps.

5. There seems to be a general need in the area of the American two-year college to investigate faculty-administrative conflict and misunderstanding. Research in the area would provide information that would be helpful in eliminating faculty and administrative problems.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barnard, Chester I., The Functions of the Executive. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947), pp. 167-173.

Benezet, Louis T., "The Office of the President," Administration in Higher Education, Edited by Gerald Burns. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), pp. 99-108.

Black, James W., Executive on the Move: Tackling Your New Management Job. (New York: American Management Association, 1964), p. 8.

Blocker, Clyde E., Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richards, Jr., The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), pp. viii, 20.

Bogue, Jessee Parker, The Community College. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1950), pp. 286-290.

Cella, Francis R., Sampling Statistics in Business and Economics. (Norman: Oklahoma University Bureau of Research, 1950), pp. 224.

Cooper, Joseph D., The Art of Decision Making, (New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1961), pp. 4-8.

Dixon, Wilfred J., and Frank J. Massey, Jr., Introduction to Statistical Analysis. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1957), pp. 291-243.

Duryea, E. D., "The Theory and Practice of Administration," Administration in Higher Education. Edited by Gerald Burns. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962), pp. 29-43.

Edwards, Allen L., Statistical Methods for Behavioral Sciences. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964), pp. 366-369.

Ewing, David W., and Dan H. Fenn, Editors. Incentives for Executives.

Garrett, Henry E., Statistics in Psychology and Education. (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1959), pp. 262-264.

Good, Carter W., Introduction to Educational Research. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1959), p. 207.

Guilford, Joy F., Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965), p. 235.

Hillway, Tyrus, The American Two-Year College. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958), pp. 185-206.

Koos, Leonard V., The Questionnaire in Education: A Critique and Manual. (New York: MacMillan Co., Inc., 1928), pp. 147-149.

Krag-Pederson, Geraldine, Personality Factors in Work and Employment. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1955), pp. 87-102.

McGinnis, Howard J., The State Teachers College. (Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1932), pp. 13-153.

Medsker, Leland, The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960), pp. 196-199.

Newborn, H. K. Faculty Personnel Policies in State Universities. (Messaula, Montana: Montana State University, 1959), p. 127.

Parker, Franklin, and Anne Bailey, The Junior and Community Colleges: A Bibliography of Doctoral Dissertations, 1918-1965. (Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1965).

Petry, Loren, "A Faculty View," A Report of a Work Conference, Faculty-Administration Relationships. (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, May 7-9, 1957), p. 14.

Prator, Ralph, The College President. (Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1963), pp. 21-94.

Report of a Work Conference. Faculty-Administration Relationships. (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, May 7-9, 1957), p. 86.

Starrak, James A., and Raymond Hughes, The Community College in the United States. (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State College Press, 1954), pp. 1-36.

Stokes, Harold W., The American College President. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), pp. 1-36.

Taylor, Harold, On Education and Freedom. (New York: Abelard-Schuman, 1954), pp. 57-91.

Tead, Ordway, "The History and Philosophy of American Education," Administration in Higher Education, Edited by Gerald Burns. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962), p. 18.

The College Presidency, 1900-1960: An Annotated Bibliography, Walter C. Eells, consultant, and Ernest V. Hollis, director College and University Administration Branch, Division of Higher Education. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, 1961), pp. 1-123.

White, Goodrich C., The Education of the Administrator. (Nashville: Division of Educational Institutions, Board of Education, The Methodist Church, 1957), pp. 12-47.

Wriston, Henry W., Academic Processions: Reflections of a College Presidency. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), pp. 1-43.

Periodicals

Abrahamson, Mark, "Cosmopolitanism, Dependence-Identification and Geographical Mobility," Administrative Science Quarterly. Vol. 10, No. 1, (June, 1965), pp. 98-106.

Balyeat, Frank, Junior Colleges in Oklahoma. Reprinted from The Chronicles of Oklahoma, Vol. 26, No. 1 (1948), p. 60.

Bartky, John, "More About the Nature of Junior College Administration," Junior College Journal. Vol. 28, No. 4, (Dec., 1957), pp. 220-222.

Brochure. Claremore Tourist Association. (1965), pp. 2-8.

Brochure. Oklahoma Military Academy. (1965), pp. 5-53.

"Clinical Training for Future Administrators," Junior College Journal. Vol. 34, No. 3, (Oct., 1963), p. 22.

Colvert, Clyde C., "Significant Characteristics of Successful Administration," Junior College Journal. Vol. 21, No. 2, (Nov., 1950), pp. 145-147.

Evan, William M., "Superior-Subordinate Conflict in Research Organization," Administrative Science Quarterly. Vol. 10, No. 1, (June, 1965), pp. 52-54.

"Faculty-Administration Relationships," Junior College Journal. Vol. 34, No. 3, (Oct., 1963), p. 22.

Gordon, Mordeca, Edward H. Loveland, and Edward E. Cureton, "An Extended Table of Chi-Square for the Two Degrees of Freedom for Use in Combining Probabilities from Independent Samples," Psychometrika. Vol. 14, No. 3, (Sept., 1952), pp. 311-316.

Horn, Francis, "Academic Administration, Unite," College and University Business. Vol. 30, No. 12, (June, 1961), p. 33.

Hutchins, Robert M., "The Administrator," The Journal of Higher Education. Vol. 17, No. 8, (Nov., 1946), pp. 395-400.

Jones, Lyle, and Donald W. Fiske, "Models for Testing Significance of Combined Results," Psychological Bulletin. Vol. 50, No. 5, (1953), pp. 375-382.

Louis, Don, and C. J. Burke, "The Use and Misuse of the Chi-Square Test," Psychological Bulletin. Vol. 46, No. 6, (Nov., 1949), p. 434.

Neumaier, John J., "Functions of the Junior College," Junior College Journal. Vol. 34, No. 6, (March, 1957,) p. 333.

Oklahoma Legislature Reporter, Edited by A. Ritter, (Oklahoma City: July 9, 1965), p. 25.

Price, Hugh G., "The Role of the Administrator in Excellent Teaching," Junior College Journal. Vol. 24, No. 1, (Sept., 1953), pp. 37-42.

Priest, Bill J., "Faculty-Administrative Relationships," Junior College Journal. Vol. 34, No. 6, (March, 1964), p. 6.

Reynolds, James W., "Images or Services of Junior Colleges," Junior College Journal. Vol. 33, No. 6, (Sept., 1962), p. 1.

Scates, Douglas E., and Alice V. Yeomans, "Developing a Depth Questionnaire to Explore Motivation and Likelihood of Actions," Educational and Psychological Measurement. Vol. 12, (1962), pp. 620-631.

Thompson, Victor H., "Bureaucracy and Innovation," Administrative Science Quarterly. Vol. 10, No. 1, (June, 1965), pp. 1-20.

Twelfth Biennial Report. Period ending June 20, 1964, Oklahoma Regents for Higher Education, pp. 3-133.

Wetzler, Wilson F., "A Look at the President of the Small College," Journal of Higher Education. Vol. 25, (Nov., 1954), pp. 439-441.

Williams, Lloyd P., "Quiescence, Tradition, and Disorder--Cross-Section of a Small College," AAUP Bulletin. Vol. 43, No. 4, (Dec., 1957), pp. 615-625.

Williams, Lloyd P., "Some Heretical Reflections on Educational Administration," Journal of Higher Education. Vol. 27, No. 4 (April, 1956), pp. 182-188.

Dissertations

Carter, Bruce, "A Proposed Distribution of Junior Colleges for Oklahoma," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation: University of Oklahoma, 1950).

Kosow, Irving L., "Factors Affecting Faculty Morale in Four Community Colleges," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, New York University, 1960).

Landrith, Harold F., "A Study of the Academic Backgrounds, Professional Experience, and Administrative Duties of Texas Public College Administrators," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Houston, 1960).

LaVire, Willis Alvin, "The Critical Tasks for Public College Administrators," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, 1961).

Rutherford, Floyd J., "An Analysis and Evaluation of Politics and Practices in Selection, Training, and Employment of Science Educators," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University, 1962).

Shannon, William George, "The Community College Presidents: A Study of the Role of Presidents of the Community Junior College," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962).

Stephens, Richard W., "The Academic Administrator, the Role of the University President," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1956).

College Catalogs

Catalog. Cameron State Agricultural College, 1964-65.

Catalog. Connors State Agricultural College, 1965-66.

Catalog. Eastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1963-65.

Catalog. Murray State Agricultural College, 1965-66.

Catalog. Northeastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1963-65.

Catalog. Northern Oklahoma (Junior) College, 1964-66.

Catalog. Oklahoma Military Academy, 1964-65.

Documents

Oklahoma. Session Laws, (1901).

Oklahoma. Session Laws, (1919).

Oklahoma. Session Laws, (1927).

Oklahoma. Session Laws, (1935).

U.S. Census of Population, 1960. Number of Inhabitants: Oklahoma. (Final Report, PC (1) - 38A).

APPENDIX I

APPENDIX I

Item One: Cover Letter to Presidents for Questionnaire Response and Faculty Directories

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Norman, Oklahoma

September 14, 1965

President _____
(Name of School)
(Location)

Dear President _____:

The purpose of this letter is to request your cooperation in securing data for a research study concerning the attitudes of junior college faculty members and presidents toward the office of college president. The primary purpose of the study is to test the validity of item descriptions of the office of college president as selected from the authoritative literature.

Your participation in the study will involve checking a list of items according to your attitude or opinion of the office of college president. The questionnaire should take only five minutes of your time. I would also appreciate receiving a faculty directory of all full-time faculty members employed at your institution for the academic year 1965-66.

This study is being conducted under the auspices of the College of Education, University of Oklahoma. All information will be treated in a professional and ethical manner.

Please return the completed questionnaire and faculty directory in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Dan F. DeLoache
Office of Financial Aids
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

DFD:pj
Enclosure

Item Two: Cover Letter Faculty Members

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Norman, Oklahoma

October 4, 1965

Dear Faculty Member:

The purpose of this letter is to request your cooperation in securing data for a research study concerning the office of college president and the attitudes or opinions of faculty members and college presidents toward that office. The primary purpose of the study is to test the validity of item descriptions of the office of college president as selected from the authoritative literature.

It is believed such a study will contribute to a better understanding between faculty members and college presidents. Your participation in the study will involve checking a list of items according to your attitude or opinion of the office of junior college president. The questionnaire should take no longer than five minutes of your time.

The study is being conducted under the auspices of the College of Education, University of Oklahoma. All information will be treated in a professional and ethical manner. An abstract of the study will be made available to those who participate.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Dan F. DeLoache
Office of Financial Aids
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

DFD:pj
Enclosure

Item Three: Follow-up to Cameron President

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Norman, Oklahoma

October 13, 1965

President Richard Burch
Cameron State Agricultural College
Lawton, Oklahoma 73501

Dear President Burch:

Recently you received a questionnaire pertaining to the office of president and a request for a 1965-66 faculty directory of all full-time faculty members employed at Cameron State Agricultural College.

Presidential responses from the other six state supported junior colleges have been received. I still need your questionnaire and the faculty directory to include Cameron in my study.

If you have not already mailed your questionnaire and the faculty directory in the stamped, self-addressed envelope, would you please do so at your earliest convenience. I will be grateful for your cooperation.

I hope you are having a pleasant and successful semester, and I sincerely thank you for any assistance you may offer.

Sincerely yours,

Dan F. DeLoache
Office of Financial Aids
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

DFD:pj
Enclosure

Item Four: Follow-up to Faculty Members

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Norman, Oklahoma

October 18, 1965

Dear Faculty Member:

Recently you received a questionnaire pertaining to the office of college president. The questionnaire was developed by selecting statements from the professional literature on the office of college president for the purpose of evaluating the attitudes and opinions of both the faculty members and junior college presidents to the selected statements.

Faculty and presidential responses have been good, but far short of the required ninety per cent needed for a representative study. Since I am attempting to meet the deadline for a dissertation reading copy, I need to complete my questionnaire research as soon as possible.

If you have not already mailed your questionnaire in the stamped, self-addressed envelope, would you please do so at your earliest convenience? I will be grateful for your cooperation.

I hope you are having a pleasant and successful semester, and I sincerely thank you for any assistance on the matter of the questionnaire.

Yours very truly,

Dan F. DeLoache
Office of Financial Aids
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

DFD:er
Enclosure

Item Five: Follow-up Post Cards to Faculty Members

November 8, 1965

Dear _____:

Recently you received a questionnaire pertaining to the office of college president. Won't you please take just a moment to complete and return the instrument so I can record your reaction?

Your cooperation and participation will be greatly appreciated. Thank you. . .

Yours truly,

Dan F. DeLoache

Item Six: 2nd Follow-up Post Cards
to Faculty Members

November 23, 1965

Dear _____:

I sincerely need and would greatly appreciate receiving your response to one of the questionnaires I recently mailed you.

I would be very grateful if you could take just a moment to complete and return a copy.

Thank you,

Dan F. DeLoache

Item Seven: Follow-up Post Cards
to Cameron Faculty

December 8, 1965

Dear _____:

I sincerely need and would appreciate receiving your response to one of the questionnaires I recently mailed you.

Won't you take just a moment to complete and return a questionnaire so I can record your reaction?

Thank you,

/S/

Dan F. DeLoache

APPENDIX II

APPENDIX II

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Norman, Oklahoma

QUESTIONNAIRE

ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS TOWARD THE JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENT

The purpose of this study is to secure the considered judgment of junior college faculty members regarding the junior college president. From authoritative sources on administration and leadership, statements were selected pertaining to various characteristics, functions, duties, and responsibilities of the college president. The respondent should rate the statements not according to whether his or her president is particularly good or bad, but according to his or her attitude of the office of junior college president.

The information requested is arranged to allow the respondent to make either a check mark or simple response. Please answer all questions and check all statements in the blank spaces provided. Although some of the items appear similar in nature, please answer each item independently of the others.

Sex: M___: F___. Marital status: M___: S___:
D___: W___.

STATEMENTS PERTAINING TO THE JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENT

Please check each item according to the following choices:

Column 1--Little or no importance

Column 2--Moderately important

Column 3--Significantly important

Column 4--EXTREMELY important

Items:	Degree of Importance 1	2	3	4
1. A president has a doctor's degree				
2. A president favors a comprehensive educational program for the junior college				
3. A president is frank on matters in which the faculty has an important interest.				
4. A president is a politician				
5. A president is married and has a family.				
6. A president has the ability to organize .				
7. A president has a broad foundation in general education.				
8. A president acts constantly as a public-relations officer for the college				
9. A president has a broad understanding of the processes of working with groups.				
10. A president has a substantial background of educational courses dealing with the two-year college				
11. A president favors liberal admission requirements for junior colleges.				
12. A president knows and understands the points of view of the various groups in the faculty.				
13. A president is responsible for informing the alumni and general public about the educational policies of the institution				

Column 1--Little or no importance
Column 2--Moderately important
Column 3--Significantly important
Column 4--EXTREMELY important

Items:	Degree of Importance 1	2	3	4
14. A president takes the lead in policy formulation				
15. A president has broad social sympathies .				
16. A president comes up through the academic ranks.				
17. A president has a good aesthetic-cultural background				
18. A president anticipates coming trends and coming events				
19. A president has facility in public speaking.				
20. A president is democratic				
21. A president has adequate administrative training and experience in junior college administration.				
22. A president's educational duty is to decide educational issues without regard to pressure.				
23. A president encourages participation and leads the faculty in studies pertaining to the purposes of the two-year college.				
24. A president knows how he appears to others.				
25. A president has a mature professional attitude.				
26. A president acts on educational matters as a representative of education, of scholarship, of the teaching faculty, and students.				

Column 1--Little or no importance
Column 2--Moderately important
Column 3--Significantly important
Column 4--EXTREMELY important

Items:	Degree of Importance 1	2	3	4
27. A president understands people and is able to get along with them				
28. A president makes explicit to the community the role of the college				
29. A president has patience.				
30. A president recognizes that successful teaching is the major factor in determining faculty promotion				
31. A president is an active citizen reflecting the application of educational values to community living				
32. A president establishes clear and reasonable lines of authority				
33. A president inspires leadership ability .				
34. A president develops criteria of good teaching and their identification				
35. A president establishes an atmosphere conducive to cooperation and mutual effort.				
36. A president makes up his own mind about what he thinks his college should be and where it should be going				
37. A president is a man with respect for understanding religious ideas and ideals.				
38. A president ascertains whether the curriculum of the college is meeting the needs of the students and society . .				

Column 1--Little or no importance
Column 2--Moderately important
Column 3--Significantly important
Column 4--EXTREMELY important

Items:	Degree of Importance 1	2	3	4
39. A president has the ability and willingness to make decisions				
40. A president is a scholar.				
41. A president is trained specifically for the junior college presidency				
42. A president is a man of management more than a man of learning				
43. A president has friends outside the college and outside higher education. . .				
44. A president has sound professional ethics.				
45. A president has an interest in professional activities				
46. A president assists in providing for the personal and family security of the members of the staff.				
47. A president is of sound moral character .				
48. A president asserts those values which express the highest goals of higher education, the search for truth, and the right of free inquiry				
49. A president canvasses the college community before circulating information of vacancies off-campus				
50. A president realizes the final decision of policy rests with the Board of Regents				
51. A president maintains an "open-door" policy toward faculty visitations				

Column 1--Little or no importance
Column 2--Moderately important
Column 3--Significantly important
Column 4--EXTREMELY important

Items:	Degree of Importance 1	2	3	4
52. A president is responsible only to the Board of Regents.				
53. A president reads seriously and extensively				
54. A president allows the faculty to elect representatives for meaningful participation in selection and dismissal of deans, presidents, and other college administrators.				
55. A president acts as the educator of the Board of Regents.				
56. A president has a sense of humor.				
57. A president has the instinctive capacity to appraise the quality and promise of scholars				

Comments:

APPENDIX III

APPENDIX III

LOGICAL STRUCTURE OF ITEMS PERTAINING TO THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT

I. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. A president is married and has a family.
2. A president has a good aesthetic-cultural background.
3. A president has broad social sympathies.
4. A president is democratic.
5. A president has patience.
6. A president inspires leadership ability.
7. A president is a man with respect for understanding religious ideas and ideals.
8. A president is a scholar.
9. A president has friends outside the college and outside higher education.
10. A president is of sound moral character.
11. A president reads seriously and extensively.
12. A president has a sense of humor.

II. PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

1. A president has a doctor's degree.
2. A president has a broad foundation in general education.
3. A president has a substantial background of educational courses dealing with the two-year college.
4. A president comes up through the academic ranks.
5. A president has adequate administrative training and experience in junior college administration.
6. A president has a mature professional attitude.
7. A president is trained specifically for the junior college presidency.
8. A president has sound professional ethics.

III. INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

1. A president favors a comprehensive educational program for the junior colleges.

2. A president favors liberal admission requirements for junior colleges.
3. A president acts on educational matters as a representative of education, of scholarship, of the teaching faculty, and students.
4. A president recognizes that successful teaching is the major factor in determining faculty promotion.
5. A president develops criteria of good teaching and their identification.
6. A president has an interest in professional activities.
7. A president ascertains whether the curriculum of the college is meeting the needs of the students and society.
8. A president asserts those values which express the highest goals of higher education, the search for truth, and the right of free inquiry.
9. A president anticipates coming trends and coming events.
10. A president's educational duty is to decide issues without regard to pressure.

IV. PERSONNEL RELATIONSHIPS

1. A president is frank on matters in which the faculty has an interest.
2. A president knows and understands the points of view of the various groups in the faculty.
3. A president encourages participation and leads the faculty in studies pertaining to the purposes of the two-year college.
4. A president establishes an atmosphere conducive to cooperation and mutual effort.
5. A president understands people and is able to get along with them.
6. A president assists in providing for the personal and family security of the members of the staff.
7. A president canvasses the college community before circulating information of vacancies off-campus.
8. A president maintains an "open-door" policy toward faculty visitations.
9. A president allows the faculty to elect representatives for meaningful participation in selection and dismissal of deans, presidents and other college administrators.
10. A president has the instinctive capacity to appraise the quality and promise of scholars.

V. PUBLIC RELATIONS

1. A president is a politician.
2. A president acts constantly as a public-relations officer for the college.
3. A president is responsible for informing the alumni and general public about the educational policies of the institution.
4. A president has facility in public speaking.
5. A president knows how he appears to others.
6. A president makes explicit to the community the role of the college.
7. A president is an active citizen reflecting the application of educational values to community living.

VI. ADMINISTRATION DUTIES

1. A president has the ability to organize.
2. A president has a broad understanding of the processes of working with groups.
3. A president takes the lead in policy formulation.
4. A president establishes clear and reasonable lines of authority.
5. A president makes up his own mind about what he thinks his college should be and where it should be going.
6. A president has the ability and willingness to make decisions.
7. A president is a man of management more than a man of learning.
8. A president realizes the final decision of policy rests with the Board of Regents.
9. A president is responsible only to the Board of Regents.
10. A president acts as the educator of the Board of Regents.