INFORMATION TO USERS

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

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

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/3707

74-12,318

PETERSON, Kenneth James, 1941-
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL GOALS AND THE PERCEIVED EMPHASIS OF INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONS AT TWO JUNIOR COLLEGES IN OKLAHOMA.

The University of Oklahoma, Ed.D., 1973
Education, higher

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL GOALS AND THE PERCEIVED EMPHASIS OF INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONS AT TWO JUNIOR COLLEGES IN OKLAHOMA

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY

KENNETH JAMES PETERSON

Norman, Oklahoma

1973

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL GOALS AND THE PERCEIVED EMPHASIS OF INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONS AT TWO JUNIOR COLLEGES IN OKLAHOMA

APPROVED BY

Herbert R. Hengst
Chairman

William H. Harris

Jack D. Parker

Dorothy Tracy

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my advisor, Herbert R. Hengst, Interim Dean of the College of Education for his advice and guidance throughout my graduate study at the University of Oklahoma.

Sincere appreciation is also extended to William Graves who spent so many tireless hours assisting me with the statistical design of this research. I would also like to express appreciation to Dorothy Truex and Jack Parker for their assistance and encouragement.

Fellow students, Robert Lynn and Lynn Lindeman are due my sincere thanks for the many hours spent with me in preparing for this research.

It has been through the many sacrifices made by my loving wife Kathi and daughter Karen that have made my graduate study possible. It is to these special ladies that these pages are dedicated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES v

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Background of the Problem
Statement of the Problem
Hypotheses
Need for the Study
Definition of Terms
Limitation of the Study
Organization of the Study

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND RELATED LITERATURE . . 14

Theoretical Background
Related Literature

III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY 32

Restatement of the Problem and Hypotheses
Methodology
Description of the Instruments
Analysis of the Data
Summary

IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 61
Summary

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 102

APPENDIX A . . . . .

APPENDIX B . . . . .

APPENDIX C . . . . .

APPENDIX D . . . . .

APPENDIX E . . . . .

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Reliability Coefficients for the Preliminary I.G.I.	44
2	Reliability of the Present I.G.I.	45
3	Reliability Coefficients for the I.F.I.	47
4.	Test-retest Reliability Coefficients for the I.F.I.-U.O.M.	51
5	Approximate F Test for Multiple Analysis of Variance on the I.G.I. for Interaction	62
6	Approximate F Test for Multiple Analysis of Variance on the I.G.I. for Differences Among Groups Across Institutions	63
7	Group Means and Standard Deviations for the Public Junior College on the I.G.I.	64
8	Group Means and Standard Deviations for the Private Junior College on the I.G.I.	65
9	Univariate F Tests for Group Differences Across Institutions on the I.G.I.	66
10	Approximate F Test for Multiple Analysis of Variance on the I.G.I. Between Institutions	67
11	Means and Standard Deviations for the two Junior Colleges on the I.G.I.	68
12	Univariate F Tests Between Institutions on the I.G.I.	70
13	Approximate F Test for Multiple Analysis of Variance on the I.F.I.-U.O.M. for Interaction of Administrators and Faculty Within Institutions	71
14	Univariate F Tests for Interaction of Groups Within Institutions for the I.F.I.-U.O.M.	72
15	Approximate F Test for Multiple Analysis of Variance on the I.F.I.-U.O.M. for Interaction of Groups Within Institutions on the Twelve Scales in Which All Groups Participated	73

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
16	Univariate F Tests for Interaction of Groups Within Institutions on the I.F.I.-U.O.M. for All Groups	75
17	Group Means and Standard Deviations for the Public Junior College on the I.F.I.-U.O.M.	77
18	Group Means and Standard Deviations for the Private Junior College on the I.F.I.-U.O.M.	78
19	Tests of Simple Main-Effects for Administrator and Faculty Groups of Both Institutions on the I.F.I.-U.O.M.	80
20	Scheffe Tests for Post-hoc Multiple Comparisons	81
21	Tests of Simple Main-Effects for Administrator, Faculty, and Student Groups of Both Institutions on the I.F.I.-U.O.M.	83
22	Approximate F Test for Multiple Analysis of Variance on the I.F.I.-U.O.M. for Differences Between Institutions Across the Administrator and Faculty Groups	84
23	Univariate F Tests for Differences Between Institutions Across the Administrator and Faculty Groups on the I.F.I.-U.O.M.	86
24	Approximate F Test for Multiple Analysis of Variance on Twelve Scales of the I.F.I.-U.O.M. Between Institutions	87
25	Means and Standard Deviations for the Two Colleges on the I.F.I.-U.O.M.	88
26	Univariate F Tests Between Institutions on Twelve Scales of the I.F.I.-U.O.M.	90
27	Means and Standard Deviations of the Two Instruments in Rank Order With Pearson r Coefficients for the Public Junior College	92
28	Coefficients of Linear and Curvilinear Correlation for the Two Instruments at the Public Junior College	94

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table Page

29 Means and Standard Deviations for the Two Instruments in Rank Order With Pearson r and Eta Correlation Coefficients for the Private Junior College 97

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The goals of American Higher Education have undergone considerable change during the past twenty-five years. During this period the idea that higher education should be made available to a larger proportion of the population became a motivating factor leading to an unprecedented expansion of educational programs and facilities. The 1947 President's Commission on higher education reflected this idea when it recommended that facilities be made available to serve approximately 50% of the college age population.[1] The decade of the 1950's touched off a rapid expansion in all areas of higher education. This growth has been associated with the unquestioned belief that higher education will bring about both economic and social progress.[2]

To fulfill this dream that higher education can be the cure to all social ills, large state systems have

---

[1]Presidents Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American Democracy (1947), pp. 24-27.

[2]Richard E. Peterson, "College Goals and the Challenge of Effectiveness," Proceedings, Western Regional Conference on Testing Problems (Berkeley, California: Educational Testing Service, 1971), p. 1.

been created. These systems have generally attempted to create different types of institutions to meet different sets of goals or objectives. For example, The Plan for the '70's in Oklahoma recommended that the state universities give first priority to graduate programs of education and research: the state four-year colleges should have as their major responsibility upper-division programs; and the two year colleges, the responsibility for transfer and terminal programs.[3]

The latter institutions, the two-year community college became the panacea in the minds of supporters of the egalitarian philosophy for higher education. These institutions were to take all those students who previously could not have been accepted into institutions of higher education and either train them for immediate employment or make them ready for the traditional work toward the B.A. degree in the four-year institutions.

The community colleges began to pride themselves on being community-centered, adopting their offerings to the changing community needs by planning and developing new trades programs.[4] Likewise, they would help significantly in raising the number of students attending the four-year institutions by preparing students who could not meet the admissions standards of the four-year insti-

---

[3]Oklahoma State Reports for Higher Education, A Plan for the '70s (1970), pp. 4-10.

[4]Arthur M. Cohen & Florence B. Brawer, Confronting Identy, (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972), p. 21.

tutions. However, their main emphasis would be to provide students with the technical skills necessary to qualify for non-professional occupations. The findings of Burton Clark and others have testified that the largest programs of the community colleges are the transfer programs.[5] Likewise, Jencks and Riesman indicate that the community colleges have failed to significantly increase the number of students obtaining B.A. degrees. They point out that the evidence indicates that the community colleges are successful with those students who could have been accepted into the four-year institutions but are failing with those students who could not. They further suggest that higher education has failed to close the economic gap between the poor and the rich. The evidence seems to show that the gap has actually increased during the past twenty-five years.[6]

It is evident that though Americans have grown to expect more and more from their colleges and universities, they have become unwilling to pay the price. The cost of higher education has risen to unprecedented levels. Student fees have risen much more repidly than prices for other goods and services.[7] The Carnegie Commission has

---

[5]Burton R. Clark, The Open Door College, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), and Leland L. Medsker & Dorothy Knoells, From Junior to Senior College, (Berkley: University of California, Center for Studies of Higher Education, 1965).

[6]David Riesman & Christopher Jenks, Academic Revolution (New York, Doubleday, 1968).

[7]Louis T. Benezet, "Continuity and Change: The

stated that the rate of rise in cost per student at many institutions has been four to eight per cent above the annual rate of inflation.[8]

Though the costs of higher education have increased, financial resources to meet these growing costs have hit a plateau.[9] Other social institutions are also soliciting a larger amount of resources each year and thus higher education is caught in the middle of increased demands for limited resources.[10] Along with this competition for limited resources with other social organizations the economic realities of the present have undermined the rather enviable position that higher education had attained during the 1960's.[11] Richard Peterson concludes that:

> These new economic realities, the slowdown in college enrollments, and the lingering animosity toward the University in some localities, have combined to undermine the rather enviable position that higher education

---

Need For Both," The Future Academic Community; Continuity and Change, John Caffrey (ed.), Washington, D.C., 1969, pp. 18-19.

[8]Carnegie Commission of Higher Education, The More Effective Use of Resources: An Imperative for Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Bond Co., 1972), p. 7.

[9]Earl F. Cheit, The New Depression in Higher Education, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1971).

[10]Richard E. Peterson, The Crisis of Purpose: Definition and Uses of Institutional Goals, Washington D.C., E.R.I.C. Clearinghouse on Higher Education, (Report, No.5), October, 1970, pp. 1-3.

[11]Richard E. Peterson, "College Goals and the Challenge of Effectiveness," p. 3.

> systems over the years came to enjoy vis-a-vis other state-supported activities.[12]

The Carnegie Commission noted in 1973 that if many colleges and universities are to survive the financial crisis, they must be more concerned with the relationship between goal accomplishment and resource allocation.[13] Likewise, others believe that program effectiveness will become an important criterion for determining which programs will receive what share of the public dollar.[14]

Therefore:

> Absolutely critical to a college's planning, evaluation, and related institutional-renewal activities, let me assert, is a consciousness among people on the campus about the goals of the institution. Planning makes no sense unless planners know what ends they are seeking to realize or maximize. Program objectives have coherence to the extent they reflect broader institutional goals. Assessment of institutional effectiveness is most sensibly understood, it seems to me, as determination of the extent to which acknowledged goals are being achieved.[15]

However, the problem that arises is whose goals should the institution adopt? Should it adopt those of the older tenured professors who are usually more tradition-oriented, of the research and discipline conscious,

---

[12]Ibid., p. 3.

[13]Carnegie Commission of Higher Education, The More Effective Use of Resources: An Imperative for Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Bond Co., 1972), pp. vii-ix.

[14]Peterson, "College Goals and the Challenge of Effectiveness," p. 4.

[15]Ibid., p. 7.

of liberal students, or conservative trustees? On many campuses these groups hold widely differing views on the goals of the institution.[16]

Likewise, there is a feeling of grave concern on the part of many about the basic goals of higher education. Some feel the goals should be redefined so as to be more in relation to the present social problems.[17] Others feel that goals are not clearly defined and therefore it is impossible to determine whether or not they are being accomplished.[18]

Therefore, it is evident that there is a pressing need for a vehicle that will enable administrators of institutions of higher education to clarify goals so that progress toward them can effectively take place. Such a procedure would make evaluation a more meaningful institutional endeavor.

The area of concern for this study will be the identification of the goals and practices of two junior colleges (one public and one private) and to determine whether there is a relationship between the goals of these

---

[16]Richard E. Peterson, "Toward Institutional Goal-Consciousness," Proceedings from the 1971 Western Regional Conference on Testing Problems, (Berkeley, California: Educational Testing Service, 1971), p. 11.

[17]Ernest G. Palola, Timothy Lehmann, and William R. Blesihke, "The Reluctant Planner: Faulty in Institutional Planning," The Journal of Higher Education, XLII (October, 1971), pp. 587-602.

[18]Philip C. Winstead & Edward N. Hobson, "Institutional Goals: Where to From Here?" Journal of Higher Education, XLII (October, 1971), pp. 669-677.

institutions and the practices within these institutions. In short, is there agreement as to what the goals are and is there a relationship between the goals and what is actually taking place within the institutions? Is there an attempt to meet the goals? Likewise, will the goals and practices of a public junior college differ from those of a private junior college?

Statement of the Problem

The problem for this research is: What is the relationship between the perceived importance of institutional goals and the perceived emphasis of institutional functions or practices at a public and a private junior college in Oklahoma?

This study proposes to examine the relationships between perceived institutional goals and perceived institutional practices, and the differences in the perceptions of goals and practices between the respondents of the two community colleges. The following questions will therefore be investigated:

1. Is there agreement on what the perceived goals of the community college are among administrators, faculty, and students of the two institutions?

2. Is there agreement on the emphasis of perceived functions or practices among administrators, faculty, and students of the two institutions?

3. Is there a relationship between the perceived importance of goals and the perceived emphasis of functions

or practices at the two institutions?

4. Are there significant differences on the perceived importance of goals between the two colleges?

5. Are there significant differences on the emphasis of perceived functions or practices between the two colleges?

Hypotheses To Be Tested

1. There is no significant interaction of the perceived importance of institutional goals among administrators, faculty, and students within the two institutions as measured by the Institutional Goals Inventory.

2. There is no significant agreement on the perceived importance of institutional goals among administrators, faculty, and students across the two institutions as measured by the Institutional Goals Inventory.

3. There is no significant agreement on the perceived importance of institutional goals between the two institutions across groups as measured by the Institutional Goals Inventory.

4. There is no significant interaction of the perceived emphasis given institutional functions or practices among administrators, faculty, and students within the two institutions.

5. There is no signficant agreement on the perceived emphasis given institutional practices among administrators, faculty, and students across the two institutions as measured by the Institutional Functioning Inventory - the University of Oklahoma Modification.

6. There is no significant agreement on the perceived emphasis given institutional practices between the two institutions across groups as measured by the Institutional Functioning Inventory - the University of Oklahoma Modification.

7. There is no significant relationship between the perceived importance of institutional goals as measured by the Institutional Goal Inventory and the perceived degree of emphasis of institutional practices as measured by the Institutional Functioning Inventory - the University of Oklahoma Modification at a public junior college.

8. There is no significant relationship between the perceived importance of institutional goals as measured by the Institutional Goal Inventory and the perceived degree of emphasis of institutional practices as measured by the Institutional Functioning Inventory - the University of Oklahoma Modification at a private junior college.

Need for the Study

The present status of higher education in the United States is characterized as in a state of re-evaluation. The current literature provides ample evidence that the American public has become disillusioned with the present course that many institutions of higher education seem to be moving toward.[19] Likewise, there are those critics who argue that at most colleges process has taken

---

[19]Palola, Lehmann, and Blesihke, "The Reluctant Planner: Faulty in Instructional Planning," pp. 587-602.

over leaving purpose to wander aimlessly. No one seems to be concerned with the goals of the college except the catalog writers.[20] However, with the appearance of the present financial crisis in higher education, it is imperative that institutions of higher education actively attempt to define clearly and articulate their educational missions so as to provide a basis for public understanding and support.[21]

Likewise, institutions that have clear conceptions of their goals, can put them to use in several important ways. Institutional goals can serve as the basic element in formulating the institution's policy. A well formulated policy that contains clearly defined goals enables constituency groups to know exactly what to expect from the institution. Secondly, well-defined goals can serve the entire community as a guide with which to make decisions, solve problems, and allocate scarce resources. Thirdly, well-formulated goals also provide the vital ingredient for institutional planning. And finally, an institution cannot be effectively evaluated unless its goals are well-formulated and understood. The goals of the institution become the yardstick to which results must be compared.[22]

Therefore, any attempt to improve techniques

---

[20]Arthur W. Chickering, Education and Identity (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1972), p. 158.

[21]Peterson, The Crisis of Purpose, p. 11.

[22]Ibid, pp. 4-5.

to clarify institutional goals will be of value to the practicing administrator of higher education.

Definition of Terms

1. Institutional Goals: Goals as used in this study refer to non-operational goals, those perceived future states which administration, faculty and students tend to agree are presently of importance.

2. Institutional Functions: The perceived actions and practices of the organization which tend to operationalize the perceived goals.[23]

3. Congruence: The degree to which perceived goal importance and the perceived practice emphasis are correlated.

4. Consensus: The degree of agreement between administrators, faculty, and students on the importance of perceived institutional goals (or perceived practices emphasis).

5. Perception: An individual judgment by an administrator, faculty member or student concerning the importance attached at present to an institutional goal or to the emphasis given an institutional practice.

6. Faculty Member: A full time professional employee whose primary responsibilities are in teaching.

7. Administrator: A full time professional employee whose primary responsibilities lie outside of

---

[23]James G. March & Herbert A. Simon, Organizations, (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958), p. 156.

instruction. For purposes of this study persons occupying the following positions are administrators-- president, vice-presidents, deans, directors, assistant directors, and student personnel specialists.

8. Students: Those persons who were enrolled in ten or more semester hours during both the Fall and Spring semesters of the 1972-1973 academic year at either junior college.

Limitations of the Study

1. This study was limited to a sample of full time administrators, faculty, and students at one public and one private junior college. Therefore, generalization to other two-year colleges is limited.

2. The results of the study are limited to the general time period in which the study was conducted.

3. The results of the study are interpretable only as descriptions of the statistical relationships between selected measurements of the variables, the results are not measures of causal relationships between the research variables.

4. The instruments used in measuring the perceived importance of institutional goals and the perceived emphasis of institutional practices most certainly did not cover all of the possible areas. Therefore, it is possible that other significant relationships exist.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter I is a description of the study and includes the introduction, statement of the problem, hypotheses to be tested, need for the study, definition of terms, and limitations of the study. Chapter II presents the related research. The design of the study is contained in Chapter III. Presentation and analysis of the data is contained in Chapter IV. The findings, conclusions based on the finds, recommendations, and summary are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER-II

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND RELATED LITERATURE

Theoretical Background

This investigation will not test the administrative theory of any one theorist but will draw upon the works of several theorists. The conceptual models of Parsons, Etzioni, and Simon will serve as the basis for describing institutional goals and goal attainment.

The Parsonian concept of goal is central to the study and understanding of organizations. Organizations purposely set goals that may or may not be realized. Once a goal is realized it becomes a part of the organization or its environment and in consequence is no longer a goal. For Parsons an organizational goal is the state of affairs that the organization is trying to realize. It is an image of a future state. He goes further to postulate that one of the distinctive features of social organizations that separates them from other social systems is that their central problem is goal attainment. One of the major reasons for this phenomenon is that the adequacy of the organization is evaluated in terms of its success in attaining its goals.[1]

---

[1]Edward Gross, "Universities as Organizations: A Research Approach," Sociological Review, XXXIII, No. 4.

However, Etzioni does not believe that one can fairly evaluate the effectiveness of an organization in terms of goal attainment. This procedure gives the impression that most organizations are ineffective because goals are not ordinarily reached. Therefore, he recommends an alternative view of goals which does not require that an organization measure its effectiveness by comparing itself to goal attainment but rather to other similar organizations in terms of activities that take place in it. A similar organization would be one of similar structure and resources.[2] Thus it is the activities that one is concerned with in determining an organization's effectiveness: that is, all the activities which take place within the organization regardless of whether or not they are related to goal attainment.

Simon points out that organizational goals are dynamic and continually changing. The objectives of an organization must appeal to its customers so that they will continue to make the necessary contributions to sustain it. Consequently, organizational goals are constantly being adapted to the changing values of customers. For this reason organizations simultaneously and legitimately serve multiple goals. However, many times some

---

(August, 1968), pp. 518-544.

[2]Amatai Etzioni, Modern Organizations, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1964. pp. 14-19.

of the goals will be in conflict.[3]

The setting of goals is essentially a problem of defining desired relationships on the part of an organization and its environment, change in either requires intensive study and probably alteration of goals. For example, the university or college may have unchanging abstract goals but the clientele, the needs of students, and the methods of teaching change and create a new definition and reinterpretation of those objectives. "Reappraisal of goals thus appears to be a recurrent problem for large organizations, albeit a more constant problem is an unstable environment than a stable one."[4]

The question that must be answered is, how do we identify the goals of the organization? Edward Gross contends that one method is to collect statements from people within the organization and ascertain what they think the organization's goals are. However, it is important to distinguish between personal goals and organizational goals. One cannot assume that the personal goals of the individuals will be the same as those of the organization, for in fact, in the majority of cases they will not be. Thus, in the Gross and Grambsch investigation of university goals, personal goals were

---

[3]Herbert A. Simon, Administrative Behavior, (New York: The Free Press, 1945), pp. 112-115.

[4]James D. Thompson and William J. McEwen, "Organizational Goals and Environment: Goals-Setting As An Interaction Process," American Sociological Review, Vol. 23, Feb., 1958, No. 1, pp. 23-24.

distinguished from organizational goals by asking their respondents to state what they felt the organizational goals were at their institution.[5] It is evident then that organizations must offer an inducement so that members might fulfill personal goals through attaining the organization's goals. That is, organizations must have subgoals that lead to maintenance of the organization as well as those connected to output in order to bring about organizational equilibrium. If an equilibrium state is not reached at some level, the organization will cease to exist.[6]

In determining what the goals of an organization are, Simon states that they must be inferred from observation of the organization's decision-making process.[7] In short, the real goals that an institution is moving toward can only be determined by observing what is happening at the institution.

Charles Perrow believes that for a thorough understanding of organizations and the behavior of their personnel, a critical analysis of organizational goals is imperative. Further he indicates that

> The type goals most relevant to understand-

---

[5]Edward Gross, "Universities as Organizations: A Research Approach," American Sociological Review, pp. 518-544.

[6]Herbert A. Simon, "On the Concept of Organizational Goal," Readings in Organization Theory: A Behavior Approach (Boston: Allyson and Bacon, Inc., 1966), ed. Walter A. Hill and Douglas Egan, p. 71.

[7]Herbert A. Simon, Administrative Behavior, p. 71.

> ing organizational behavior are not the official goals but those embedded in major operating policies and daily decisions of personnel. Second, these goals will be shaped by the particular problems or tasks an organization must emphasize, since these tasks determine the characteristics of those who will dominate the organization.[8]

Similarly, Etzioni points out that when examining the organizational processes, the organization's goals will soon become apparent when one determines the priorities and how they are set. For example the goals of an institution will be reflected in the allocation of resources and the assignment of personnel. The actual goals will not necessarily be congruent with the stated goals of the organization.[9]

In a study of associations (organizations) Warriner found that the statements of purpose listed in the organizational documents and reaffirmed by the members were many times irrelevant to what was actually taking place in the organization.[10] That is the goals as perceived by the members of the organization were not always congruent with the practices of the organizations.

Therefore, it appears that organizational goals (or in this study institutional goals) should be defined

---

[8]Charles Perrow, "The Analysis of Goals in Complex Organizations," American Sociological Review, Vol. 26, No. 6 Dec., 1961, pp. 854-856.

[9]Amatai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc.), p. 196

[10]Charles K. Warriner,"The Problem of Organizational Purpose," Sociological Quarterly, VI (Spring, 1965), pp.139-46.

by two types of data: that concerning the future state of affairs that the institution is trying to realize[11] and that concerning decisions or operating policies.[12] Or as Etzioni points out, the real goals of the organization will be reflected in the allocation of resources and the assignment of personnel.[13]

Related Literature

Parsons sees the concept of goals to be central to the study of organizations. He states further that organizations cannot survive unless they attain the goals that they set for themselves. Thus goal attainment has primacy over all other organizational problems.[14]

Administrators of institutions of higher education have a special responsibility to see that the goals are attained effectively. Therefore, it is essential that present goals be clarified and a distinction be made between the real goals and supposed goals of the institution so that progress toward them can take place. Likewise, it is important that goals themselves be con-

---

[11]Talcott Parsons, Structure and Process in Modern Societies, pp. 16 - 20; and Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations, p. 6.

[12]Simon, "On the Concept of Organizational Goals, p. 70.

[13]Etzioni, Modern Organization, p. 7.

[14]Talcott Parsons, Structure and Process in Modern Societies, (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960), pp. 16-20.

tinually re-evaluated.[15] However, as Thompson and McEwen indicate, reappraisal of goals seems to be much more difficult in organizations where the product or output becomes less tangible and more difficult to measure objectively. Goals tend to be non-operational in organizations of this sort.[16]

However, while it is clear to many theorists that goals are central to the study of organizations, there has not been adequate research in this area. Although Etzioni and others have pointed out the real goals of the institution cannot be defined unless one knows the internal activities or practices of it,[17] very little research has been done in the area of practices or functions of organizations of higher education. Similarly, after an extensive research of the literature relating to goals and practices, no study was found that analyzed the relationship between goals and practices in institutions of higher education.

There have been several studies concerning the perceptions of college and university goals. The Gross and Grambsch study (1968), considered by many as the

---

[15]Edward Gross & Paul V. Grambsch, University Goals and Academic Power, (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968), p. v.

[16]James D. Thompson & William J. McEwen, "Organizational Goals & Environment: Goal-Setting as an Interaction Process," American Sociological Review, XXIII (February, 1958), No. 1, pp. 23-31.

[17]Etzioni, Modern Organizations, p. 7.

most significant empirical study to investigate university goals,[18] described university goals as they were perceived by administrators and faculty members of 68 American universities in 1964. The inventory used in this research contained statements concerning 47 goals which were rated in terms of present and preferred goals. The findings of their research indicates that administrators and faculty were generally in agreement in their ratings of present goals. Likewise, generally speaking there was agreement that things are the way they ought to be, or the gap between present and preferred goals was quite small, especially among the highest and lowest ranked goals.[19] Furthermore, "the larger universities in the sample pursue essentially the same goals as the smaller ones, whether bigness is measured by size of the student body or of the staff."[20] Similarly, no differences were found among institutions when comparing rural universities with those in urban settings.[21]

In 1969 under the auspices of the Danforth Foundation a shortened version of the Gross and Grambsch instrument was administered to the faculty, administra-

---

[18]Norman P. Uhl, Identifying Institutional Goals, (Durham, N.C.: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1973), p.5.

[19]Gross & Grambsch, University Goals and Academic Power, pp. 27-42.

[20]Ibid, p. 111.

[21]Ibid, p. 114-115.

tors, and students of fourteen small private liberal arts colleges. The purpose of this study was to assist these colleges in identifying their goals and to compare the data with the original Gross and Grambsch study to see if there were differences between universities and liberal arts colleges. It was found that the faculty of these colleges generally perceived that the administration made major decisions about goals. However, both groups generally perceived the goals in the same manner. They, likewise, agreed on changes that should be made.[22]

In 1968 a research group at Columbia University surveyed all college and university academic deans concerning the goals of their institutions. The deans were to respond on 64 goal statements to the extent that they were emphasized at their institutions. The results of this survey indicated that different type institutions emphasized different goals, however certain goals were considered important universally.[23]

Thirteen member colleges of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges conducted a study on student development and one aspect of this study was to analyze goals. All of the faculty and administrators were asked to rank 25 characteristics of graduates in

---

[22]Danforth News and Notes, (St. Louis, Danforth Foundation, November, 1969), Vol. 5, No. 1.

[23]Patricia Nash, "The Goals of Higher Education - An Empirical Assessment," Mimeographed, Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research, June, 1968.

terms of their importance at their institutions. The results indicated that the thirteen colleges could be grouped into four general goal categories: Christ - Centered, Intellectual - Social, Professional - Vocational, and Personal - Social.[24]

Another study involving institutional goals was conducted by the National Laboratory for Higher Education in the Carolinas and Virginias. A new instrument was created by the Educational Testing Service called the Institutional Goals Inventory. This instrument was administered to five dissimilar institutions of higher education. The Delphi technique was then used in an effort to bring about agreement on goals on the part of administrators, faculty, students, and members of the community (convergence on goals). The method was successful in that the respondents tended to move toward the middle or mean score in each goal area.[25]

In 1971 the Gross and Grambsch instrument was used in a study of four undergraduate colleges in New York. Unlike the other two studies, utilizing this same instrument listed above, this study made use of mean scores for analyzing the data as opposed to the rank order technique. The results indicate that those administrators,

---

[24]Arther W. Chickering, Education In Identity, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1972, pp. 162-165.

[25]Uhl, Identifying Institutional Goals, pp. 47-52.

who were perceived as holding more power than faculty were more satisfied in the degree of importance of given goals at their institution than were faculty.[26]

A similar study of perceived institutional goals using the Institutional Goals Inventory was conducted by Richard Peterson in cooperation with the Joint Committee on the Master Plan in California for the purpose of identifying the goals of higher education in California. The Institutional Goals Inventory was administered to administrators, faculty, students, board members, and members of the community of 116 colleges and universities in California. The results indicated that certain goals were rated high by all constituencies in all segments of the population. However, other goals were rated high in one segment and not in the others. For example advanced training was ranked high by the University of California constituencies and Vocational preparation in the community colleges. It was also found that students and members of the community were more in agreement on certain goals than were the faculty and administrative groups.[27]

There have been several studies concentrating

---

[26]Philip C. Swarr, "Goals of Colleges and Universities as Perceived and Preferred by Faculty and Administrators," Unpublished report, Cortland, New York: Office of Institutional Research, State University College, 1971.

[27]Richard E. Peterson, Goals for California Higher Education: A Survey of 116 Academic Communities, (Berkeley: Educational Testing Service, 1972).

specifically on the institutional goals of two-year colleges. In a national survey Medsker found almost unanimous agreement by faculty that the first two years of the traditional college education (97%) and terminal vocational programs (92) were important goals of the junior college. Similarly a minority of the respondents were opposed to the more extended objectives, such as remedial high school courses (28%), supplementary study in English and math (19%), vocational inservice classes for adults (20%). The transfer program was ranked higher in importance by teachers of academic subjects and terminal programs by teachers of applied subjects.[28] Likewise Patterson, studying attitudes of community college faculties in Pennsylvania, found that younger faculty members, vocational-technical faculty members, and those not holding the Ph.D. tended to show more supportive attitudes toward junior college goals.[29]

In a study involving the extent of faculty agreement on community college goals, Bloom compared the attitudes of faculty members of three different types of Pennsylvania colleges that offer two year college programs. The three types of colleges were public community colleges,

---

[28]Leland Medsker, The Junior College, Progress and Prospect, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.

[29]Robert A. Patterson, An Investigation of the Relationship Between Career Patterns of Pennsylvania Community College Teachers and Their Attitudes toward Educational Issues. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1970.

private junior colleges and the Pennsylvania State University Commonwealth campuses. The findings indicated that the total group (all three faculties) was slightly positive to community college goals. The community college group was slightly more positive than the other two groups. Likewise, the community college faculty felt most strongly that service to the community was an appropriate goal for the two year college.[30]

In a similar study Garrison visited twenty community college campuses of varying sizes and locations and interviewed over 500 faculty members. He concluded that these instructors were generally, in agreement with the goals of the community colleges.[31]

In an attempt to measure differences in faculty perceptions concerning institutional functioning and responsiveness to change a study was undertaken in three Pennsylvania colleges that were, in the opinion of the researchers, different from one another in respect to their goals, method, or styles of attaining those goals, overall institutional climate, and their settings. Two different instruments were used. The Institutional Functioning Inventory (I.F.I.) and the Student Perceptions of Institutional Response (S.P.I.R.). The mean scores

---

[30]Karen L. Bloom "Goals and Ambivalence: Faculty Values and the Community College Philosophy," ERIC Clearinghouse, ED-056-679, November, 1971..

[31]Roger H. Garrison, Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems, A Preliminary National Appraisal, Washington D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

for the faculty groups on the two instruments were compared by faculty type and institution to determine the nature and extent of the relationships between the variables. The result showed differences between the faculty respondents' perceptions of their institution. For example, the prestigious private liberal arts college faculty rated their institution higher on all but two of the I.F.I. scales, meeting local needs, and self-study and planning. The researchers attributed the first of these to the fact that this college offers little to the surrounding area by way of continuing education or extension courses. In short the college faculty did not see itself as being service oriented and the functions of the college were perceived as not stressing this goal. However, there did not seem to be a relationship between faculty type and their perceptions of institutional functioning.[32]

The only study found during the search of the literature that attempted to identify institutional goals and institutional functions or practices was that conducted by Martin in 1968. In the study administrators, faculty, and students of eight colleges were interviewed

---

[32]Donald C. Sedgren, "Differences on Perceived Institutional Functioning and Responsiveness to Change as Related to Faculty Types in Selected Four-Year Colleges," E.R.I.C. Clearinghouse Microfische, ED-062-934, University of Michigan, 1972.

and completed open-ended questionaires.[33] Institutions that took part in the study were selected because they were characterized by one or both of the following developments: they were in the process of substantial change or were involved in some variation of the cluster college plan.[34] One of the conclusions of this study was that administrators and faculty at service institutions. aspire to much the same institutional goals and professional interests as do their colleagues at the elitist universities. The findings agree with the Gross and Grambsch study with respect to emphasis on goals. The crucial distinction is not between the administrator and faculty as many believed but between institutions. "It is between the outsiders (legislators, the state government, regents) who technically within the university actually share little of its day-to-day life - and the academicians."[35] Martin contends that it is the outsiders who defend the service and practical goals and not the academicians.[36]

Another conclusion of this study was that most institutions have institutional character, but it was

---

[33]Warren Bryan Martin, Conformity: Standards and Change in Higher Education, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1969, p. xvi.

[34]Ibid, p. 41.

[35]Gross and Grambsch, University Goals and Academic Power, pp. 114-115.

[36]Warren Bryan Martin, p. 225.

provided by the "superinstitutional value orientation, professionalism... It means that a school's educational philosophy as well as any efforts at innovation and change are made to support the standard."[37] In support of this conclusion Martin states that the goal: teaching in an area of specialization was rated very important by 85% of the standard institutions and by 72% of the faculty at the radical colleges.[38]

However, there is considerable evidence in the current literature to document the belief that there is in many instances a lack of congruence between institutional goals and practices. As Neal Gross indicates, the University is the basic institution concerned with graduate training and research. However, in most instances the graduate schools not only do not have their own faculties, but also have an extremely small proportion of their budgets designated for research. In fact in most instances the vast majority of money spent on research activities comes from outside the normal operating budget allocation provided by the state legislature.[39]

Similarly, Winstead and Hobson report that many administrators are caught up in the day to day activities of their positions and many times they lose sight of the

---

[37]Ibid, p. 228.

[38]Ibid, p. 228.

[39]Neal Gross, "Organizational Lag in American Universities," Harvard Educational Review, XXXIII, No. 1, pp. 58-73.

goals of the institution. The result in many instances leads to lack of congruence between their practices or activities and the goals of the institution. They conclude that the answer to the problem is to formulate clear statements of goals in operational forms and provide administrative leadership to attain these objectives.[40]

As indicated above, the community college constituencies in the California study of goals rated vocational training very high, however, as Burton Clark, Medsker and Knoells and others testify the largest program in the community colleges is usually the transfer program. In their national study of junior colleges, Medsker and Knoells report that approximately two-thirds of all new students entering the community colleges enroll in the transfer program.[41]

Therefore, it has become exceedingly evident that a better understanding of the relationship between institutional goals and institutional functions or practices is necessary. The findings from this study through the use of the Institutional Goals Inventory and the Modified Institutional Functions Inventory as measures of

---

[40]Philip C. Winstead and Edward Hobson, "Institutional Goals: Where from Here?" Journal of Higher Education, XLII, (October, 1971), pp. 669-677.

[41]Dorothy Knoells & Leland Medsker, From Junior to Senior College: A National Study of the Transfer Student, (Berkeley: University of California, Center for Studies of Higher Education, 1965).

perceived institutional goals and perceived institutional functions may provide additional insight into the problem. It is hoped that this investigation will also suggest areas for further research.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Restatement of the Problem and Hypotheses

This research is one of a series of studies concerning the relationship between institutional goals and institutional practices in institutions of higher education. Each study has been conducted at dissimilar types of institutions.

The problem of this research is: What are the relationships between the perceived importance of institutional goals and the perceived emphasis of institutional functions or practices of a public and a private community college in Oklahoma?

The following hypotheses will be tested:

Hypotheses

1. There is no significant interaction of the perceived importance of institutional goals among administrators, faculty, and students within the two institutions as measured by the I.G.I.

2. There is no significant agreement on the perceived importance of institutional goals among administrators, faculty, and students across the two institutions as measured by the Institutional Goals Inventory.

3. There is no significant agreement on the perceived importance of institutional goals between the two

institutions across groups as measured by the Institutional Goals Inventory.

4. There is no significant interaction of the perceived emphasis given institutional functions or practices among administrators, faculty, and students within the two institutions as measured by the I.F.I.-U.O.M.

5. There is no significant agreement on the perceived emphasis given institutional practices among administrators, faculty, and students across the two institutions as measured by the Institutional Functioning Inventory - the University of Oklahoma Modification.

6. There is no significant agreement on the perceived emphasis given institutional practices between the two institutions across groups as measured by the Institutional Functioning Inventory - the University of Oklahoma Modification.

7. There is no significant relationship between the perceived importance of institutional goals as measured by the Institutional Goals Inventory and the perceived degree of emphasis of institutional practices measured by the Institutional Functioning Inventory - the University of Oklahoma Modification at a public junior college.

8. There is no significant relationship between the perceived importance of institutional goals as measured by the Institutional Goals Inventory and the perceived degree of emphasis of institutional practices as measured by the Institutional Functioning Inventory - the University

of Oklahoma Modification at a private junior college.

Methodology

The population includes all administrators, full-time faculty members, and full-time students during the Spring semester of the 1972-1973 academic year at a public and at a private two-year college in Oklahoma. These two colleges were selected because of their differences in support. One is a public controlled junior college and the other a religiously controlled two-year college. The California Goals Study indicated that there are differences in the perceived importance of goals at public and private colleges. Therefore, by selecting a public and a private junior college it would not only be possible to determine if there are differences in the perceived importance of institutional goals at each institution but also between institutions. Similarly, it would be possible to determine the perceived institutional practices being emphasized in order to achieve goals within and between institutions. The purpose is to determine if there are differences in the perceived importance of institutional goals at each institution and between institutions as well as what institutional practices are being emphasized in order to achieve goals within and between institutions.

A conference was held with the administration of each institution to explain the study and to secure their permission and cooperation. Upon obtaining permission to conduct the study at each institution a sample was drawn

from each college. Since the full-time administrator and faculty groups at both institutions were quite small, it was decided to include all of them in the sample so as to obtain a reliable measure of the perceptions of these groups. A random sample of seventy full-time students approximately ten per cent of the total group, was chosen from each institution to meet the same criterion.

However, at the public institution three of the students chosen had withdrawn from the college and six could not be contacted. Therefore, the sample was reduced to 61. At the private college three students had withdrawn and two could not be contacted. Therefore, this sample was reduced to 65 students. Since the student groups were already considerably larger than the faculty and administrative groups, it was deemed unnecessary to replace these students.

There were 20 administrators and 29 full-time faculty at the private institution and 25 administrators and 30 full-time faculty at the public institution. Therefore, a total of 230 people made up the two samples.

Questionnaire research has several important drawbacks unless certain safeguards are built in. The most serious defect is that of possible lack of response. Returns of higher than 60% are rare and therefore valid generalization is impossible. Consequently in situations involving returns of less than 80% an effort should be made to learn something about the characteristics of

the nonrespondents.[1]

There are a number of factors that have an influence on the percentage of returns to questionnaires. Selltiz suggests that the following are among the most important:

> 1. the sponsorship of the questionnaire; 2. the attractiveness of the questionnaire format; 3. the length of the questionnaire; 4. the nature of the accompanying letter requesting cooperation; 5. the ease of filling out the questionnaire and mailing it back.[2]

Therefore, in order to secure the highest possible return, special consideration was given to the above information. Questionnaire packets were constructed and included the following items: 1. A letter of endorsement signed by a college administrator; 2. The Institutional Goals Inventory; 3. Institutional Functions Inventory; 4. A return envelope so that questionnaires could be returned anonymously; and 5. Special instructions.[3] Each administrator and faculty member at both institutions was met personally by the researcher to discuss the purpose and importance of the study. It was not feasible to hand out student packets personally. Therefore, at the public college, students received their

---

[1]Claire Selltiz et al., Research Methods in Social Relations (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1961), pp. 241-243.

[2]Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.) p. 397.

[3]See Appendix A for specimen letters and Appendix B for a sample copy of the Institutional Goal Inventory and a copy of the Institutional Functions Inventory.

questionnaires by mail, and at the private college students received them from their teachers, residence hall counselor, or by mail.

At the public institution 80% of the faculty and administrators returned completed questionnaires, while only 35% of the students returned questionnaires. The response rates were similarly high for the administrative and faculty groups at the private college with 85% and 77% respectively. However, the student group had only 40% respond. When comparing student respondents to the total student sample on demographic variables, age and class, the respondents were found to be similar to the total sample (see Appendix C).

Description of the Instruments

Institutional Goals Inventory

The Institutional Goals Inventory was developed under auspices of the Educational Testing Services by Norman Uhl and Richard E. Peterson in 1970. The instrument contains 20 scales, each measuring the perceived importance of a particular goal area. Each scale has four items with five possible responses ranging from "of no importance" to "of extremely high importance." Each item has an "is" response column and a "should be" response column. Therefore, each

scale has two measures, one indicating the perceived importance of the goal, and the second, the preferred importance of the goal. Further, the instrument makes it possible to get a measure of agreement between present and preferred goals by comparing these two measures on each scale.

The Educational Testing Service description of the twenty goal areas of the I. G. I. are given below:

> 1. Academic Development. The first kind of institutional goal covered by the I.G.I. has to do with the acquisition of general and specialized knowledge, preparation of students for advanced scholarly study, and maintenance of high intellectual standards on the campus.
>
> 2. Intellectual Orientation. While the first goal area had to do with acquisition of knowledge, this second general goal of instruction relates to an attitude about learning and intellectual work. Likewise, some conception of the scholarly, rational, analytical, inquiring mind has perhaps always been associated with the academy or university. In the I.G.I., Intellectual Orientation means familiarity with research and problem solving methods, the ability to synthesize knowledge from many sources, the capacity for self-directed learning, and a commitment to life-long learning.
>
> 3. Individual Personal Development. In contrast to most of the goals covered by the I.G.I., this one was set forth and has found acceptance only in roughly the past decade. It was conceived by psychologists and has found its main support among professional psychologists, student personnel people, and other adherents of "humanistic psychology" and the "human potential movement". As defined in the I.G.I., Individual Personal Development means identi-

fication by students of personal goals and development of means for achieving them, enhancement of sense of self-worth and self-confidence, self-understanding, and a capacity for open and trusting interpersonal relations.

4. Humanism/Altruism. More or less explicit discernment of this concept may also be of fairly recent vintage, although variously construed it has long had its place in the catalogues of liberal arts and church-related colleges. It reflects the belief (in many quarters) that a college education should not mean just acquisition of knowledge and skills, but that it should also somehow make students better people--more decent, tolerant, responsible, humane. Labeled Humanism/Altruism, this fundamental ethical stance has been conceived in the I.G.I. as respect for diverse cultures, commitment to working for world peace, consciousness of the important moral issues of the time, and concern about the welfare of man generally.

5. Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness. Some conception of cultural sophistication and/or artistic appreciation has traditionally been in the panoply of goals of many private liberal arts colleges in America, perhaps especially liberal arts colleges for women. In the I.G.I., the conception entails heightened appreciation of a variety of art forms, required study in the humanities or arts, exposure to forms of non-Western art, and encouragement of active student participation in artistic activities.

6. Traditional Religiousness. This goal is included in the I.G.I. in recognition of the fact that a great many colleges and universities in America are explicitly religious in their control, functioning, and goals, while many more retain ties of varying strength with the Roman Catholic Church or, more often, a Protestant denomination. Traditional Religiousness, as conceived in the I.G.I., is meant to mean a religiousness that is orthodox, doctrinal, usually sectarian, and often fundamental--in short, traditional (rather than "secular" or "modern"). As defined in the I.G.I., this goal means educating students in a particular religious heritage, helping them to see the potentialities of full-time religious work, developing students' ability to defend a theo-

logical position, and fostering their dedication to serving God in everyday life.

7. Vocational Preparation. While universities have perhaps always existed in part to train individuals for occupations, this role was made explicit for American public higher education by the Land Grant Act of 1862, and then extended to a broader populace by the public two-year college movement of the 1950's and 1960's. As operationalized in the I.G.I., this goal means offering: specific occupational curricula (as in accounting or nursing), programs geared to emerging career fields, opportunities for retraining or upgrading skills, and assistance to students in career planning. It is important to distinguish between this goal and the next one to be discussed, Advanced Training, which involves graduate-level training for various professional careers.

8. Advanced Training. This goal, as defined in the I.G.I., can be most readily understood simply as the availability of post-graduate education. The items comprising the goal area have to do with developing/maintaining a strong and comprehensive graduate school, providing programs in the "traditional professions" (law, medicine, etc.), and conducting advanced study in specialized problem areas--as through a multi-disciplinary institute or center.

9. Research. According to most historians of the matter, the research function in the American university was a late 19th century import of the German concept of the university as a center for specialized scientific research and scholarship. Attempting to embrace both "applied" or "problem-centered" research as well as "basic" or "pure" research, the Research goal in the I.G.I. involves doing contract studies for external agencies, conducting basic research in the natural and social sciences, and seeking generally to extend the frontiers of knowledge through scientific research.

10. Meeting Local Needs. While in times past some institutions of higher learning must certainly have functioned in some way to meet a range of educational needs of local individuals and corporate bodies, the notion of Meeting Local Needs (in the I.G.I.) is drawn pri-

marily from the philosophy of the post-war (American) community college movement. Which is not to say, as will be seen, that this is a goal that four-year institutions cannot share. In the I.G.I. Meeting Local Needs is defined as providing for continuing education for adults, serving as a cultural center for the community, providing trained manpower for local employers, and facilitating student involvement in community-service activities.

11. Public Service. While the previous goal focused on the local community, this one is conceived more broadly--as bringing to bear of the expertise of the university on a range of public problems of regional, state, or national scope. As it is defined in the I.G.I., Public Service means working with governmental agencies in social and environmental policy formation, committing institutional resources to the solution of major social and environmental problems, training people from disadvantaged communities, and generally being responsive to regional and national priorities in planning educational programs.

12. Social Egalitarianism has to do with open admissions and meaningful education for all admitted, providing educational experiences relevant to the evolving interests of (1) minority groups and (2) women, and offering remedial work in basic skills.

13. Social Criticism/Activism. This is a higher educational goal conception that has been put forth only in the past five years or so. Owing its origin almost entirely to the student protest movement of the 1969's, the central idea of the goal is that the university should be an advocate or instrument for social change. Specifically in the I.G.I., Social Criticism/Activism means providing criticism of prevailing American values, offering ideas for changing social institutions judged to be defective, helping students to learn how to bring about change in American society, and being engaged, as an institution, in working for basic changes in American society.

14. Freedom. Some of the standard dictionary definitions include: civil liberty, as opposed to subjection to an arbitrary or despotic government; exemption from external con-

trol, interference, regulation, etc.; personal liberty, as opposed to bondage or slavery; autonomy; relative self-determination. Freedom, as an institutional goal bearing upon the climate for and process of learning, is seen as relating to all the above definitions. It is seen as embracing both "academic freedom" and "personal freedom," although these distinctions are not always easy to draw. Specifically in the I.G.I., Freedom is defined as protecting the right of faculty to present controversial ideas in the classroom, not preventing students from hearing controversial points of view, placing no restrictions on off-campus political activities by faculty or students, and ensuring faculty and students the freedom to choose their own life cycles.

15. Democratic Governance. The central notion of this goal, as here conceived, is the opportunity for participation--participation in the decisions that affect one's working and learning life. Colleges and universities in America have probably varied a good deal in the degree to which their governance is participatory, depending on factors such as nature of external control (e.g., sectarian), curricular emphases, and personalities of presidents and or other campus leaders. Most all institutions, one surmises, as they expanded during the 1950's and 1960's, experienced a diminution in participatory governance. A reaction set in the late 1960's spurred chiefly by student (power) activitists. As defined in the I.G.I., Democratic Governance means decentralized decision-making; arrangements by which students, faculty, administrators, and governing board members can (all) be significantly involved in campus governance, opportunity for individuals to participate in all decisions affecting them, and governance that is genuinely responsive to the concerns of everyone at the institution.

16. Community. While community in some sense has perhaps always characterized most academic organizations, especially small ones, the more modern concept of community has risen in only the past decade in reaction to the realities of mass higher education, the "multiversity," and the factionalism and individual self-interest within the university. In the I.G.I., Community is defined as maintaining a climate

in which there is faculty commitment to the general welfare of the institution, open and candid communication, open and amicable airing of differences, and mutual trust and respect among students, faculty, and administrators.

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

18. Innovation, as here defined as an institutional goal means more than simply having recently made some changes at the college; instead the idea is that innovation has become institutionalized, that throughout the campus there is continuous concern to experiment with new ideas for educational practice. In the I.G.I., Innovation means a climate in which continuous innovation is an accepted way of life, it means established procedures for readily initiating curricular or instructional innovations, and, more specifically, it means experimentation with new approaches to (1) individualized instruction and (2) evaluating and grading student performance.

19. Off-Campus Learning. The elements of the I.G.I. definition of Off-Campus Learning, as a process goal an institution may pursue, form a kind of scale. They include: (short term) time away from the campus in travel, work-study, VISTA work, etc.; arranging for students to study on several campuses during their undergraduate years; awarding degrees for supervised study off the campus; awarding degrees entirely on the basis of performance on an examination.

20. Accountability/Efficiency is defined to include use of cost criteria in deciding among program alternatives, concern for program efficiency (not further defined), accountability to funding sources for program effectiveness (not defined), and regular submission of evidence that the institution is achieving stated goals.[4]

---

[4]Educational Testing Service, Descriptions of

The preliminary version of Institutional Goals Inventory was pretested by Norman Uhl in 1970. The data from this study were used in obtaining initial reliability figures. The Coefficient Alpha method, a generalization of the Kuder-Richardson formula 20, was used as a measure of internal consistency. Reliability information was reported by Uhl on eighteen goal areas of which fourteen are in the present instrument. Table 1 below reports these coefficients for the scales in the present instrument.[5]

Table 1

Reliability Coefficients for the Present Importance of Goals on the Preliminary I.G.I.

	Goal Scales	Coefficients
2.	Intellectual Orientation	.78
3.	Individual Personal Development	.85
6.	Traditional Religiousness	.97
7.	Vocational Preparation	.58
8.	Advanced Training	.65
9.	Research	.82
10.	Meeting Local Needs	.53
11.	Public Service	.84
12.	Social Egalitarianism	.46
13.	Social Criticism/Activism	.63
14.	Freedom	.65
15.	Democratic Governance	.76
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	.78
18.	Innovation	.52

I.G.I. Goal Area (Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1972). (Mimeographed)

[5]Norman Uhl, Identifying Institutional Goals

The Goals for California Higher Education reported by Richard E. Peterson was also used by the Educational Testing Service to obtain additional reliability data for the Institutional Goals Inventory. The reliability coefficients reported in this study for each of the present twenty goal areas are reported in Table II.

Table 2

RELIABILITY OF INSTITUTIONAL GOALS INVENTORY GOAL SCALES

	Goal Scales	Present Importance
1.	Academic Development	.61
2.	Intellectual Orientation	.75
3.	Individual Personal Development	.94
4.	Humanism/Altruism	.88
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	.90
6.	Traditional Religiousness	.98
7.	Vocational Preparation	.97
8.	Advanced Training	.89
9.	Research	.94
10.	Meeting Local Needs	.91
11.	Public Service	.80
12.	Social Egalitarianism	.91
13.	Social Criticism/Activism	.84
14.	Freedom	.99
15.	Democratic Governance	.93
16.	Community	.97
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	.80
18.	Innovation	.92
19.	Off-Campus Learning	.99
20.	Accountability/Efficiency	.75

In reporting the validity of the instrument Uhl stated that a group of five higher education specialists

(Durham, N. C.: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1971), pp. 18-19.

who were familiar with the five institutions in the study selected those institutions that they thought would attach the greatest and least importance to each goal area. This procedure yielded fifteen selections representing the greatest importance attached to present goals and twelve selections representing the least amount of importance. Agreement could not be obtained in three instances (Innovation, Governance, and Self-Study and Planning). When the ratings of the specialists were compared to the test data, 24 out of 27 selections were confirmed and thus sufficient validity of the instrument was obtained.[6]

Institutional Functions Inventory

The Institutional Functions Inventory was created by the Educational Testing Service during the late 1960's. In February of 1968 the instrument was pretested by administering it to the faculty, students, and administrators at 67 colleges and universities. An attempt was made to select a cross section of institutions; institutions that were thought to stand high or low on one or another dimension of the instrument.[7] The instrument used in this pretest contained 11 function scales with 12 items per scale.

---

[6]Ibid., p. 48.

[7]Richard E. Peterson, Institutional Functioning Inventory Preliminary Technical Manual, (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1970), p. 63.

Peterson reported that the Coefficient Alpha method for internal consistency was utilized for obtaining reliability for the instrument. Table 3 reports individual reliability coefficients for each scale for administrators, faculty, and students.[8] Students answered items to only six function scales because it was felt that they do not have sufficient access to the necessary information to answer items in the other five scales.[9]

Table 3

COEFFICIENT ALPHA RELIABILITIES FOR INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING INVENTORY FOR FOR ADMINISTRATORS, FACULTY AND STUDENTS

	Functioning Scales	Administrators	Faculty	Students
1.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Extracurriculum	.88	.88	.91
2.	Freedom	.86	.90	.93
3.	Human Diversity	.86	.90	.95
4.	Concern for Improvement	.92	.95	.90
5.	Concern for Undergraduate	.88	.92	.87
6.	Democratic Governance	.93	.96	.96
7.	Meeting Local Needs	.89	.92	
8.	Self-Study and Planning	.83	.86	
9.	Concern for Advancing	.94	.96	
10.	Concern for Innovation	.87	.92	
11.	Institutional Esprit	.90	.92	

However, since the Institutional Goals Inventory con-

[8]Ibid., pp. 15-16.

[9]Ibid., p. 7.

tained twenty goal areas, it was deemed important to revise the Institutional Functioning Inventory so that the function scales would correspond to the goal scales of the Institutional Goals Inventory. Therefore, permission was obtained from the Educational Testing Service to modify the Institutional Functioning Inventory so that the scales relate directly to the scales of the Institutional Goals Inventory.

The University of Oklahoma Modification of the Institutional Goals Inventory was developed by Herbert R. Hengst and Robert L. Lynn. In modifying the Institutional Functioning Inventory seventy-five of the existing items used in those function areas were deemed appropriate An additional forty-five new items were written for those areas of the instrument where the existing items were judged to be inappropriate. Two types of items were included in the instrument; those calling for factual information and those calling for opinions. The items calling for factual information allow the respondent to answer "yes," "no," or "I don't know." The opinion items have four possible responses ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree."

The University of Oklahoma Modification of the Institutional Functioning Inventory was then given to a panel of eight practitioners in higher education for the purpose of evaluating the appropriateness of each item in each scale. In those instances where the panel could

not agree on the appropriateness of an item for a scale, the item was removed. As a consequence, the final draft of the University of Oklahoma Modification contains six items per scale for a total of one-hundred twenty items. The instrument was designed to measure the perceptions of present institutional functioning.

The twenty scales of the Institutional Functioning Inventory - University of Oklahoma Modification are as follows:

1. Academic Development
2. Intellectual Orientation
3. Individual Personal Development
4. Human/Altruism
5. Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness
6. Traditional Religiousness
7. Vocational Preparation
8. Advanced Training
9. Research
10. Meeting Local Needs
11. Public Service
12. Social Egalitarianism
13. Social Criticism/Activism
14. Freedom
15. Democratic Governance
16. Community
17. Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment
18. Innovation
19. Off-Campus Learning
20. Accountability/Efficiency

For a complete description of each functioning area the reader is referred to the description of the goal scales of the Institutional Goals Inventory on page 37 since this instrument (I.F.I.-O.U.M.) was designed to relate directly to it.

In redesigning the instrument a decision was made to follow the Educational Testing Services guidelines in regard to students. Students do not answer items

in the following scales:

7. Vocational Preparation
8. Advanced Training
9. Research
10. Meeting Local Needs
16. Community
18. Innovation
19. Off-Campus Learning
20. Accountability/Efficiency

It was decided that students do not have sufficient access to the necessary information in these areas to adequately answer items in these functioning areas. Therefore, separate test booklets were created for students that do not include items for these scales.

Reliability data for the modified I.F.I. was obtained by administering the instrument to a sample of administrators, faculty, and students at three dissimilar public institutions of higher education in Oklahoma. The test-retest reliability procedure was utilized for this purpose. The median coefficients for the three samples were .70, .65, and .64. In only one instance did two of three coefficients for a scale fall below .50. Therefore, these coefficients were considered to demonstrate adequate reliability for the instrument. Table 4 reports the reliability coefficients for the three testings.

Analysis of the Data

The main purpose of this study is to determine whether or not there is a statistical relationship between the perceived importance of institutional goals and the perceived emphasis on institutional functions or

Table 4

INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING INVENTORY - THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA MODIFICATION
TEST-RETEST RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS

	Scales	Reliability Coefficients- State University	Reliability Coefficients- Public Jr. College	Reliability Coefficients- Public 4 Yr. College
1.	Academic Development	.64	.57	.34
2.	Intellectual Orientation	.71	.38	.20
3.	Individual Personal Development	.69	.68	.55
4.	Human/Altruism	.61	.56	.63
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	.65	.68	.64
6.	Traditional Religiousness	.83	.65	.59
7.	Vocational Preparation	.52	.56	.86
8.	Advanced Training	.37	.73	.77
9.	Research	.56	.73	.80
10.	Meeting Local Needs	.73	.64	.84
11.	Public Service	.68	.65	.61
12.	Social Egalitarianism	.74	.59	.52
13.	Social Criticism/Activism	.77	.65	.60
14.	Freedom	.73	.84	.51
15.	Democratic Governance	.84	.75	.53
16.	Community	.79	.75	.85
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	.68	.62	.75
18.	Innovation	.88	.60	.85
19.	Off-Campus Learning	.73	.54	.78
20.	Accountability/Efficiency	.63	.51	.83

practices. In order to meet this objective it was deemed necessary to first determine if there is consensus on institutional goals and institutional functions or practices on part of administrators, faculty, and students of both institutions. That is, is there agreement among administrators, faculty, and students at each institution on the perceived importance of institutional goals and the perceived emphasis given to institutional functions or practices? Likewise, are there differences between the two institutions in their perceptions of goals and practices? Therefore, it was determined that a three stage data analysis was necessary.

The first stage of the analysis dealt with the data obtained from the administration of the Institutional Goals Inventory at both institutions and was designed to test hypotheses 1, 2, and 3. A factorial multiple analysis of variance was performed across all twenty goal scales of the instrument for the independent variables of schools and groups.

> Fishers theorem for partitioning the sum of squares in analysis of variance into orthogonal, additive components permits the number of hypothesis partitions to be extended as far as g-1, where g is the number of interaction cells; thus it is possible to test several hypotheses simultaneously.[10]

This procedure thus makes it possible to determine; (a) whether or not there were statistically different

---

[10]William W. Cooley and Paul R. Lohnes, Multivariate Data Analysis (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1971), p. 299.

response patterns among groups within each institution, (b) whether or not there were statistically significant differences in the perceptions of the importance attached to institutional goals among groups across institutions, and (c) whether or not there were statistically significant differences in the perceived importance of institutional goals between the two institutions. The factorial multiple analysis of variance then makes it possible to test hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 simultaneously. However, when systematic interaction effects are detected a one way analysis of variance must be computed in order to determine in which scales the interaction effect occurs. Likewise, further steps must be taken in order to determine whether or not there are significant differences among groups within each institution; and if there are significant differences across groups between institutions.

When statistically significant interaction effects are detected, this should be a cue to the experimenter that additional insight can be obtained from the results of the study by computing tests of simple main-effects on those scales with significant univariate F ratios.[11] Therefore, in those instances where statistically significant interaction effects were found, tests of simple main-effects for factorial designs were computed.

A decision to compute simple main-effects

---

[11]Roger E. Kirk, Experimental Design: Procedures For the Behavioral Sciences (Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1968), p. 179.

> is usually made following an examination and statistical analysis of the data. The procedure recommended for such tests is to design the same family error rate to the simple main-effects tests as that allotted to the overall F ratio.[12]

This procedure separates the interaction effects from other levels of the design so as to determine if other statistically significant differences exist. That is, are the three groups within each institution really different or is this difference due to the interaction effect? Similarly, are the differences found in perceptions of the importance of institutional goals across groups between the two institutions significantly different or are these differences actually part of the interaction effect? Thus if interaction effects are detected, then tests of simple effects must be performed in order to test hypotheses 2 and 3.

In those instances where the tests for simple main-effects were significant for differences among groups within colleges Scheffé's method for post-hoc multiple comparisons were computed to determine what group or groups within each institution were significantly different in their perceptions of the importance being attached to each institutional goal. Scheffé's method was chosen because it has

> ... advantages of simplicity, applicability to groups of unequal sizes, and suitability for any comparison. This method is also known

---

[12]Ibid., p. 181.

> to be relatively insensitive to departures from normality and homogeneity of variance."[13]

The second stage of the analysis dealt with the data obtained from the administration of the I.F.I.-O.U.M. at both institutions and was designed to test hypotheses 4, 5, and 6. However, because the student groups did not respond to items on eight scales, the analysis of the data had to be accomplished in the following manner: (a) A factorial multiple analysis of variance was computed across twenty scales of the instrument for the administrator and faculty groups, and (b) A factorial multiple analysis of variance was computed across the twelve scales in which all three groups of both institutions responded.

In the first step a factorial multiple analysis of variance was computed in order to detect systematic interaction effect of the perceived emphasis being given institutional functions among the faculty and administrative groups within the two institutions. A one-way analysis of variance was then computed in order to determine in what goal areas the significant interaction occurs. In those scales where a significant interaction was found, simple main-effects tests were computed so as to detect other significant differences, that is, to test hypotheses 5 and 6 for administrators and faculty on those scales in which students did not respond.

---

[13]William L. Hays, Statistics (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963), p. 484.

In the second step of this stage of the analysis a factorial multiple analysis of variance was computed on the twelve scales of the I.F.I.-U.O.M. in which all three groups of each institution responded in order to detect a systematic interaction effect. A one-way analysis of variance was also computed so as to determine in what functioning scales the interaction effects occur. In those instances where a significant univariate F ratio was obtained, tests of simple main-effects were computed so as to test hypotheses 5 and 6 for all three groups for the twelve scales. Where the simple main-effects tests were significant for differences among the three groups within a particular institution, Scheffe's method for post-hoc multiple comparisons was computed in order to determine what group or groups were varying significantly in their perceptions of the emphasis being given to institutional functions or practices.

The third stage of the analysis was designed to test hypotheses 7 and 8. An inter-correlation matrix was computed for each institution by computing Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients for each respondent's pair of corresponding scale scores on the I.G.I. and the I.F.I.-U.O.M. That is, each respondent's score on scale one of the I.G.I. and his score on scale one of the I.F.I.-U.O.M. was used in computing the correlation coefficient for the first pair of scales. This same procedure was followed for each of the twenty pairs of scales. Each

matrix then indicates the degree of relationship between the perceived importance of institutional goals and the emphasis on institutional functions at one institution. Likewise, the matrix indicates how each scale correlates with the other scales in the same instrument. A high correlation with another scale in the same instrument indicates that the two scales overlap.

Two computer programs were used in order to accomplish the statistic computations in the three stages of the analysis of the data. The University of North Carolina Multiple Analysis of Variance Program was utilized for the computations in stages one and two. This program performs univariate and multivariate analyses of variance with and without factorial designs of covariance and regression. It also provides an exact solution in either the orthogonal or non-orthogonal case. Options include single or multiple degree of freedom contrasts in the main-effects or interactions, transformations of variable, and orthogonal polynomial contrasts with equally or unequally spaced points.[14]

The following measures were computed in stages 1 and 2 by using this program: means and standard deviations for each group in both institutions, factorial multiple analysis of variance, approximate F tests for multi-

---

[14]Elliot Cramer and L. L. Thurstone, The University of North Carolina Manova Program (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: Psychometric Laboratory, University of North Carolina, N.D.).

variate analysis of variance, the sum of squares, mean squares within and univariate F tests on each scale. Scheffé's method for post-hoc multiple comparisons was computed by hand. To compute the intercorrelation matrix for each institution the Biomedical Computer Program 03D was utilized. This program computes a simple correlation matrix with deletion of specified data values. That is, those instruments with missing data on particular scales could be deleted for particular scales. The program also included measures of grand means and grand standard deviations for each of forty scales.[15]

An item analysis was completed on the I.F.I.-U.O.M. to determine the percentage of "I don't know" responses for each group on each scale. These percentages were utilized in comparing the groups at each institution to see if there were differences in the level of information about institutional practices among the groups. This procedure was accomplished by a hand tally method.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to describe the design for this research, that is, to describe the procedures utilized in testing the stated hypothesis.

The I.G.I. and the I.F.I.-U.O.M. were administered to all full-time administrators, faculty, and a group of

---

[15]W. J. Dixon, Biomedical Computer Programs (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1973), pp. 85-87.

full-time students at two junior colleges. At the public institution 80% of the administrators and faculty returned completed questionnaires, while only 36% of the students returned questionnaires. The rate of response was similar at the private junior college with 85% of administrators, 77% of faculty, and 40% of students responding.

The administrator, faculty, and student groups were compared on their scores on the two instruments in order to determine: (a) whether or not there were significantly different response patterns among the groups within each college, (b) whether there were significant differences among the groups across institutions, and (c) whether there were significant differences between the two colleges across groups.

A factorial multiple analysis of variance was computed on the data obtained from the administration of the I.G.I. and the I.F.I.-O.U.M. in order to determine if there were systematic differences across the twenty scales of each instrument. If systematic interaction effects are detected, then a univariate F test must be computed to determine in what scales the interaction effects exist. Likewise, tests of simple main-effects exist. Likewise, tests of simple main-effects must be computed in order to determine if other differences exist. That is, to determine if there are statistically significant differences among the groups across institutions, and if there are differences between colleges across groups. In cases where

differences are found among the groups within colleges, Scheffe's method for post-hoc multiple comparisons must be computed in order to determine what group or groups are significantly different in their perception within each college. Correlation coefficients were then computed on the corresponding scale scores on each instrument for each respondent in each institution in order to determine if there was a relationship between institutional goals and institutional functions at both institutions.

Finally, an item analysis was completed on the I.F.I.-U.O.M. in order to determine if there were differences in the percentages of "I don't know" responses for each group.

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The statistical analyses and findings presented in this chapter are based upon the data derived from the Administration of the Institutional Goals Inventory and the Institutional Functioning Inventory - The University of Oklahoma Modification to faculty, administrators, and students at two junior colleges in Oklahoma. The data were prepared and ordered so that the statistical procedures described in Chapter 3 could be performed. Though the .05 level of significance was used throughout the analyses in order to reject the stated hypotheses, actual levels of significance are also reported.

The first null hypothesis was: There is no significant interaction of the perceived importance of institutional goals among administrators, faculty, and students within the two institutions as measured by the Institutional Goals Inventory. In testing this hypothesis the groups were compared by using their scale scores on the Institutional Goals Inventory. This was accomplished by utilizing the approximate F test for multiple analysis of variance. No statistically significant interaction effects were detected and consequently,

there was a failure to reject this hypothesis. The results of the approximate F test for the multiple analysis of variance on the data obtained from the Institutional Goals Inventory is presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5

APPROXIMATE F TEST FOR MANOVA ON THE I.G.I. FOR SIGNIFICANT INTERACTION OF GROUPS WITHIN INSTITUTIONS

F	DF Hyp	DF ERROR	Probability Less Than
1.178	40	210	.230

The second null hypothesis was: There is no significant agreement on the perceived importance of institutional goals among administrators, faculty, and students across the two institutions. The approximate F test for multiple analysis of variance was utilized to test this hypothesis. A statistically significant difference was obtained at the .001 level of significance and therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. Table 6 reports this finding. The groups therefore were significantly different in their perceptions of the importance being attached to the institutional goals at their institutions. Tables 7 and 8 present comparisons of the group means and standard deviations for the twenty goal areas for both institutions.

TABLE 6

APPROXIMATE F TEST FOR MANOVA ON THE I.G.I. FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG GROUPS ACROSS INSTITUTIONS

F	DF Hyp	DF ERROR	Probability Less Than
2.850	40	210	.001

Since a systematic difference was found among the groups on the perceived importance of institutional goals across institutions a univariate F test was computed on each scale of the Institutional Goals Inventory in order to determine what scales were producing the systematic variance. This procedure indicates that the groups varied significantly across institutions at the .05 level or beyond on two scales; advanced training and research. That is, students at the public institution scored higher than both faculty and administrators; and faculty scored higher than administrators on both scales. Similarly, the students at the private institution scored higher than both faculty and administrators; and administrators scored higher than faculty on both scales. Table 9 presents the results of the univariate F tests and reports the actual levels of significance.

TABLE 7

GROUP MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE ON THE I.G.I.

	Goal Scales	Faculty		Administrators		Students	
		Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.
1.	Academic Development	3.448	.489	3.138	.553	3.364	.510
2.	Intellectual Orientation	3.514	.708	3.313	.567	3.602	.473
3.	Individual Personal Development	3.500	.834	3.183	.759	3.398	.759
4.	Human/Altruism	2.475	.707	2.363	.732	2.807	.876
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	2.688	.613	2.450	.554	2.795	.747
6.	Traditional Religiousness	1.406	.793	1.375	.441	1.882	.852
7.	Vocational Preparation	3.760	.845	3.950	.872	3.670	.683
8.	Advanced Training	1.729	.741	1.288	.284	2.534	1.021
9.	Research	1.833	.690	1.200	.310	2.716	.914
10.	Meeting Local Needs	3.423	.842	3.500	.900	3.227	.677
11.	Public Service	2.698	.730	2.500	.654	3.068	.733
12.	Social Egalitarianism	3.274	.773	3.375	.772	3.443	.778
13.	Social Criticism/Activism	2.552	.695	2.204	.771	2.952	.768
14.	Freedom	3.031	.819	2.941	.695	3.432	.867
15.	Democratic Governance	2.688	.951	2.675	.977	3.250	1.049
16.	Community	3.097	1.097	3.188	1.169	3.519	.872
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	3.292	.736	2.863	.767	3.345	.640
18.	Innovation	4.048	.717	3.888	.829	3.830	.579
19.	Off-Campus Learning	2.639	.739	2.363	.825	2.455	.766
20.	Accountability/Efficiency	3.677	.682	3.678	.682	3.489	.515

TABLE 8

GROUP MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGE ON THE I.G.I.

	Goal Scales	Faculty		Administrators		Students	
		Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.
1.	Academic Development	3.446	.523	3.426	.642	3.375	.722
2.	Intellectual Orientation	3.007	.690	3.152	.824	3.356	.762
3.	Individual Personal Development	3.795	.815	3.706	.924	3.577	.916
4.	Human/Altruism	3.375	.658	3.588	.729	3.096	.922
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	3.080	.600	3.044	.444	2.817	.658
6.	Traditional Religiousness	4.023	.752	4.000	.795	3.500	1.249
7.	Vocational Preparation	3.182	.613	3.397	.702	3.250	.809
8.	Advanced Training	1.523	.715	2.103	.862	2.587	.990
9.	Research	1.773	.813	2.088	.739	2.529	.917
10.	Meeting Local Needs	3.114	.586	3.191	.541	3.032	.868
11.	Public Service	2.466	.717	2.765	.726	2.731	.806
12.	Social Egalitarianism	2.875	.680	2.941	.665	2.702	.800
13.	Social Criticism/Activism	2.511	.629	2.627	.745	2.346	.949
14.	Freedom	2.246	.542	2.547	.691	2.548	1.000
15.	Democratic Governance	2.413	.815	2.750	.879	2.769	1.086
16.	Community	2.913	.867	3.118	.898	3.260	1.137
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	2.905	.909	2.971	.760	2.830	1.003
18.	Innovation	2.909	.908	2.882	.619	2.823	.619
19.	Off-Campus Learning	2.205	.861	2.471	.765	2.417	1.092
20.	Accountability/Efficiency	3.356	.714	2.941	.748	3.385	.816

TABLE 9

UNIVARIATE F TESTS FOR GROUP DIFFERENCES ACROSS INSTITUTIONS ON THE I.G.I.

	Goal Scales	f(2, 124)	Mean Square Among	Probability Less Than
1.	Academic Development	1.135	0.383	0.325
2.	Intellectual Orientation	2.087	0.959	0.128
3.	Individual Personal Development	0.853	0.601	0.429
4.	Human/Altruism	0.005	0.003	0.995
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	0.603	0.232	0,549
6.	Traditional Religiousness	0.045	0.034	0.956
7.	Vocational Preparation	0.747	0.434	0.476
8.	Advanced Training	20.612	13.190	0.001*
9.	Research	22.072	12.911	0.001*
10.	Meeting Local Needs	0.726	0.418	0.486
11.	Public Service	2.875	1.502	0.060
12.	Social Egalitarianism	0.131	0.075	0.877
13.	Social Criticism/ Activism	1.026	0.615	0.361
14.	Freedom	2.084	1.370	0.129
15.	Democratic Governance	2.610	2.480	0.078
16.	Community	1.744	1.803	0.179
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	0.989	0.661	0.375
18.	Innovation	0.448	0.283	0.640
19.	Off-Campus Learning	0.040	0.030	0.961
20.	Accountability/Efficiency	0.930	0.519	0.397

*Significant at .05 level or beyond

The third null hypothesis was: there is no significant agreement on the perceived importance of institutional goals between the two institutions across the groups. The approximate F test for multiple analysis of variance was utilized in testing this hypothesis. A statistically significant difference was obtained between the two institutions across

groups at the .001 level of significance, and therefore the null-hypothesis was rejected. Table 10 reports this finding. The perceptions of institutional goals between the two institutions across groups were significantly different. Table 11 presents comparisons of the grand mean and standard deviation for each goal area for the two institutions.

TABLE 10

APPROXIMATE F TEST FOR MANOVA
ON THE I.G.I.
BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS

F	DF Hyp	DF ERROR	Probability Less Than
13.901	20	105	.001

Because a systematic difference was detected between the institutions on the perceived importance of institutional goals across groups, univariate F tests were computed in order to determine what scales were producing the systematic variance. This procedure indicates that there were statistically significant differences in the importance attached to institutional goals between the institutions across groups at or beyond the .05 level on twelve of the scales: Intellectual Orientation, Individual Personal Development, Humanism/Altruism,

TABLE 11

COMPARISONS OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE TWO JUNIOR COLLEGES ON THE I.G.I.

	Goal Scales	Public Junior College		Private Junior College	
		Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations
1.	Academic Development	3.326	.524	3.413	.630
2.	Intellectual Orientation	3.482	.598	3.185	.759
3.	Individual Personal Development	3.369	.786	3.685	.876
4.	Human/Altruism	2.552	.785	3.319	.805
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	2.652	.650	2.965	.593
6.	Traditional Religiousness	1.556	.754	3.808	1.009
7.	Vocational Preparation	3.788	.799	3.259	.714
8.	Advanced Training	1.836	.903	2.100	.973
9.	Research	1.936	.918	2.158	.889
10.	Meeting Local Needs	3.381	.805	3.101	.696
11.	Public Service	2.761	.736	2.650	.756
12.	Social Egalitarianism	3.361	.772	2.823	.723
13.	Social Criticism/Activism	2.573	.788	2.476	.796
14.	Freedom	3.138	.816	2.472	.821
15.	Democratic Governance	2.871	1.014	2.643	.949
16.	Community	3.265	1.043	3.105	.988
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	3.179	.735	2.892	.901
18.	Innovation	3.927	.707	2.868	.852
19.	Off-Campus Learning	2.494	.772	2.359	.932
20.	Accountability/Efficiency	3.614	.737	3.259	.777

Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, Traditional Religiousness, Vocational Preparation, Meeting Local Needs, Social Egalitarianism, Freedom, Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment, Innovation, and Accountability/Efficiency. That is, the respondents at the public institution scored significantly higher than the respondents at the private institution on the following goal areas: Intellectual Orientation, Vocational Preparation, Meeting Local Needs, Social Egalitarianism, Freedom, Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment, Innovation, and Accountability/Efficiency. Similarly, the respondents at the private junior college scored significantly higher than the respondents of the public college on the following goal scales: Individual Personal Development, Humanism/Altruism, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, and Traditional Religiousness. Table 12 reports the results of the univariate F tests for the twenty scales of the Institutional Goals Inventory with the actual levels of significance for differences across groups between the two institutions.

The fourth null hypothesis was: there is no significant interaction of the perceived emphasis given institutional functions or practices among administrators, faculty, and students within the two institutions as measured by the Institutional Functioning Inventory - the University of Oklahoma Modification. This hypothesis was tested by comparing the groups on their scale scores on the Institutional Functioning Inventory - the Univer-

TABLE 12

UNIVARIATE F TESTS BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS ON THE I.G.I.

	Goal Scales	f(1, 124)	Mean Square Among	Probability Less Than
1.	Academic Development	0.582	0.196	0.447
2.	Intellectual Orientation	6.822	3.134	0.010*
3.	Individual Personal Development	4.320	3.041	0.040*
4.	Human/Altruism	29.747	18.044	0.001*
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	8.291	3.190	0.005*
6.	Traditional Religiousness	215.029	163.240	0.001*
7.	Vocational Preparation	16.175	9.400	0.001*
8.	Advanced Training	2.169	1.388	0.143
9.	Research	2.335	1.366	0.129
10.	Meeting Local Needs	4.882	2.809	0.029*
11.	Public Service	1.157	0.604	0.284
12.	Social Egalitarianism	16.808	9.639	0.001*
13.	Social Criticism/ Activism	0.607	0.364	0.438
14.	Freedom	21.696	14.257	0.001*
15.	Democratic Governance	1.861	1.768	0.175
16.	Community	0.994	1.027	0.321
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	4.505	3.011	0.036*
18.	Innovation	58.437	36.839	0.001*
19.	Off-Campus Learning	0.914	0.681	0.341
20.	Accountability/Efficiency	7.976	4.453	0.006*

*Significant at .05 level or beyond

sity of Oklahoma Modification. However, since the student groups did not respond to items on eight scales, two separate comparisons were made. The approximate F test for multiple analysis of variance was computed for the faculty and administrator groups of both institutions across the twenty functioning scales. A systematic interaction effect

was detected among the groups within the two institutions at the .036 level of significance, and therefore the null-hypothesis was rejected. Table 13 reports this finding.

TABLE 13

APPROXIMATE F TEST FOR MANOVA
ON THE I.F.I.-U.O.M.
FOR INTERACTION OF ADMINISTRATORS
AND FACULTY WITHIN INSTITUTIONS

F	DF Hyp	DF ERROR	Probability Less Than
1.838	20	60	.036

Because a systematic interaction effect was detected, a univariate F test was computed on each scale of the instrument in order to determine in which scales the significant interaction effects occur. The results of this procedure indicated that there were significant interaction effects at the .05 level in six functioning scales. That is, the response patterns between the two groups within the two institutions were significantly different on six scales: Academic Development, Individual Personal Development, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, Advanced Training, Public Service, and Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment. In all six instances the faculty at the public college scored higher than the administrators, while

the administrators scored higher than faculty at the private college. Table 14 presents the findings of the univariate F tests and reports the actual significance level for each scale.

TABLE 14

UNIVARIATE F TESTS FOR INTERACTION OF GROUPS WITHIN INSTITUTIONS FOR THE I.F.I.-U.O.M.

	Goal Scales	F(1, 79)	Mean Square Among	Probability Less Than
1.	Academic Development	7.886	1.026	0.006*
2.	Intellectual Orientation	3.384	0.372	0.070
3.	Individual Personal Development	15.425	2.109	0.001*
4.	Human/Altruism	2.292	0.564	0.134
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	7.212	2.990	0.009*
6.	Traditional Religiousness	0.015	0.001	0.901
7.	Vocational Preparation	1.482	0.552	0.227
8.	Advanced Training	8.299	1.927	0.005*
9.	Research	0.003	0.001	0.955
10.	Meeting Local Needs	3.565	1.346	0.063
11.	Public Service	4.391	2.378	0.039*
12.	Social Egalitarianism	0.050	0.010	0.824
13.	Social Criticism/ Activism	1.421	0.516	0.237
14.	Freedom	0.000	0.000	1.000
15.	Democratic Governance	1.461	0.643	0.230
16.	Community	0.253	0.149	0.617
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	4.925	1.742	0.029*
18.	Innovation	0.063	0.024	0.803
19.	Off-Campus Learning	0.854	0.323	0.358
20.	Accountability/Efficiency	3.549	1.821	0.063

*Significant at .05 level or beyond

The approximate F test for multiple analysis of variance was then computed for all three groups within both

institutions on the twelve scales in which students responded. A systematic interaction effect was detected among the groups with the two institutions at the .001 level of significance. Table 15 reports this finding.

TABLE 15

APPROXIMATE F TEST FOR MANOVA
ON THE I.F.I.-U.O.M.
FOR INTERACTION OF GROUPS WITHIN
INSTITUTIONS ON THE TWELVE SCALES
IN WHICH ALL GROUPS PARTICIPATED

F	DF Hyp	DF ERROR	Probability Less Than
2.457	24	288	.001

Because a systematic interaction effect was detected a univariate F test was computed on each of the twelve scales in order to determine in which the significant interaction effects occur. The results of this procedure indicated that there were significant interaction effects at the .05 level or beyond in six of the twelve functioning scales. That is, significantly different response patterns were detected among the three groups within the two junior colleges. Four of these scales were also detected in comparisons of the administrators and faculty of the two schools. These scales were: Academic Development, Individual Personal Development, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, and Intellectual/Aesthetic

Environment. Added to the interaction effects found in the administrator and faculty comparisons was the fact that students varied in their response patterns. In the Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness and Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment scales the students at the public institution scored higher than administrators and faculty while at the private college they scored lower than the administrators and faculty. On the Academic Development and Individual Personal Development scales the patterns were similar in that students in the private college continued to be the lowest scoring group while at the public college students scored higher than faculty and administrators on Academic Development and higher than administrators on Individual Personal Development. The two scales that did not reach significance in the administrator and faculty comparisons were Traditional Religiousness and Social Criticism/Activism. However, the response patterns remained the same with students at the public institution scoring higher than both faculty and administrators and at the private institution students scored lower than faculty and administrators. Table 16 presents the findings of the univariate F tests for the twelve scales in which all three groups of both institutions responded.

The fifth null hypothesis was: there is no significant agreement on the perceived emphasis given institutional practices among administrators, faculty,

TABLE 16

UNIVARIATE F TESTS FOR INTERACTION OF GROUPS WITHIN INSTITUTIONS FOR THE I.F.I.-U.O.M. FOR ALL GROUPS

	Function Scales	F(2, 125)	Mean Square Among	Probability Less Than
1.	Academic Development	4.036	0.533	0.020*
2.	Intellectual Orientation	2.068	0.239	0.131
3.	Individual Personal Development	6.833	1.289	0.002*
4.	Human/Altruism	1.242	0.316	0.292
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	7.542	4.745	0.001*
6.	Traditional Religiousness	6.904	0.984	0.001*
7.	Public Service	2.405	1.292	0.094
8.	Social Egalitarianism	0.884	0.244	0.416
9.	Social Criticism/ Activism	3.294	1.271	0.040*
10.	Freedom	0.002	0.000	0.998
11.	Democratic Governance	1.297	0.528	0.277
12.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	6.958	2.821	0.001*

*Significant at the .05 level

and students across the two institutions as measured by the I.F.I.-U.O.M. Since interaction effects were found in testing the fourth null hypothesis simple main-effects tests had to be performed in order to determine whether or not other significant differences exist. Likewise, as in testing the previous null hypothesis the administrator and faculty groups had to be compared first because students did not respond to items on eight functioning scales. Therefore, simple main-effects were computed on those scales

where a significant interaction effect was detected between administrators and faculty within the two institutions. This procedure detected significant differences in the agreement on the perceived emphasis being given institutional functions among the groups across institutions for the following scales: Individual Personal Development, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, Advanced Training, and Accountability/Efficiency, Meeting Local Needs, Public Service, Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment and Intellectual Orientation. Thus the null-hypothesis was rejected. Tables 17 and 18 report group means and standard deviations for both institutions on I.F.I.-U.O.M.

In four instances the tests for simple main effects detected significant differences between administrators and faculty at the public junior college. These scales were: Individual Personal Development, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, Advanced Training, and Accountability/Efficiency. In all four cases the faculty scored significantly higher than administrators.

Likewise, significant differences were found between the two faculty groups between institutions on the following scales: Individual Personal Development, Cultural/Aesthetic Environment, Meeting Local Needs, Public Service, and Intellectual Orientation. In all five cases the faculty at the public junior college scored significantly higher than the faculty of the private junior college.

TABLE 17

GROUP MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
FOR THE PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE
ON THE I.F.I.-U.O.M.

Function Scales	Faculty		Administrators		Students	
	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.
1. Academic Development	2.791	.309	2.590	.388	2.814	.230
2. Intellectual Orientation	2.857	.309	2.704	.396	2.893	.255
3. Individual Personal Development	3.521	.328	3.043	.408	3.322	.527
4. Human/Altruism	2.592	.599	2.324	.433	2.717	.467
5. Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	2.735	.617	2.150	.595	2.993	1.045
6. Traditional Religiousness	1.685	.272	1.685	.283	2.037	.459
7. Vocational Preparation	3.306	.520	3.249	.780		
8. Advanced Training	2.085	.504	1.682	.391		
9. Research	1.452	.430	1.535	.671		
10. Meeting Local Needs	3.829	.356	3.495	.790		
11. Public Service	2.575	.761	2.222	.708	2.482	.797
12. Social Egalitarianism	3.495	.288	3.312	.459	3.413	.308
13. Social Criticism/Activism	2.532	.629	2.169	.524	2.817	.817
14. Freedom	2.743	.521	2.675	.418	2.959	.309
15. Democratic Governance	2.316	.703	2.097	.710	2.624	.432
16. Community	2.724	.714	2.479	.908		
17. Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	2.084	.670	1.729	.440	2.436	.680
18. Innovation	3.357	.406	3.004	.861		
19. Off-Campus Learning	2.565	.454	2.401	.650		
20. Accountability/Efficiency	3.309	.415	2.844	.853		

TABLE 18

GROUP MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
FOR THE PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGE
ON THE I.F.I.-U.O.M.

	Function Scales	Faculty		Administrators		Students	
		Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.
1.	Academic Development	2.700	.385	2.948	.363	2.850	.452
2.	Intellectual Orientation	2.857	.307	2.692	.308	2.613	.421
3.	Individual Personal Development	2.897	.422	3.062		3.322	.527
4.	Human/Altruism	2.633	.444	2.698	.467	2.811	.558
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	1.752	.584	1.932	.796	1.423	.958
6.	Traditional Religiousness	3.314	.333	3.329	.289	3.163	.510
7.	Vocational Preparation	3.145	.617	3.416	.476		
8.	Advanced Training	2.132	.523	2.343	.490		
9.	Research	1.636	.472	1.706	.579		
10.	Meeting Local Needs	3.450	.633	3.629	.645		
11.	Public Service	2.139	.722	2.469	.751	2.515	.671
12.	Social Egalitarianism	3.315	.595	3.178	.486	3.002	.797
13.	Social Criticism/Activism	2.584	.584	2.539	.670	2.493	.778
14.	Freedom	2.077	.598	2.009	.439	2.283	.632
15.	Democratic Governance	2.050	.637	2.187	.575	2.282	.698
16.	Community	2.673	.655	2.598	.794		
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	2.304	.676	2.534	.520	2.198	.722
18.	Innovation	2.831	.383	2.546	.745		
19.	Off-Campus Learning	2.439	.689	2.526	.668		
20.	Accountability/Efficiency	2.773	.824	2.905	.728		

The administrator groups were found to be significantly different from each other on their perceptions of the emphasis being given to institutional functions or practices. They were significantly different on Advanced Training and Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment with the administrators of the private college scoring higher than the administrators of the public college. Table 19 reports the findings of the tests of simple main-effects on the data obtained from the I.F.I.-U.O.M. for the administrators and faculty of the two institutions.

Tests of simple main-effects were also performed on those scales in which significant interaction effects were detected on the twelve scales in which all three groups in each institution responded. This procedure also detected significant differences among the groups across institutions on agreement on the perceived emphasis being given institutional functions for the following scales: Academic Development, Social Criticism, Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment, Individual Personal Development, Curltural/Aesthetic Awareness, and Traditional Religiousness. In five of the six cases significant differences were found among the groups within the public college in their perceptions of the emphasis being given to institutional functions or practices. Scheffe's method for post-hoc multiple comparisons was computed on all five scales where a significant univariate F ratio was obtained at or beyond the .05 level so as to

TABLE 19

TESTS OF SIMPLE MAIN-EFFECTS FOR FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATOR GROUPS OF BOTH INSTITUTIONS ON THE I.F.I.-U.O.M.

Function Scales	Level	df	Mean Square Among	F
1. Academic Development	G-1	1	.095	.252
	G-2	1	1.777	3.116
	S-1	1	.441	1.166
	S-2	1	.580	1.560
2. Individual Personal Development	G-1	1	4.469	11.824*
	G-2	1	.003	.008
	S-1	1	2.492	6.594*
	S-2	1	.261	.690
3. Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	G-1	1	11.091	26.720*
	G-2	1	.437	1.052
	S-1	1	3.733	8.996*
	S-2	1	.311	.749
4. Advanced Training	G-1	1	.025	1.094
	G-2	1	4.049	17.452*
	S-1	1	1.777	7.679*
	S-2	1	.427	1.840
5. Accountability/ Efficiency	G-1	1	3.298	6.428*
	G-2	1	.034	.067
	S-1	1	2.559	4.986*
	S-2	1	.167	.326
6. Meeting Local Needs	G-1	1	1.671	4.420*
	G-2	1	.165	.437
	S-1	1	1.217	3.210
	S-2	1	.307	.813
7. Public Service	G-1	1	2.182	4.026*
	G-2	1	.560	1.034
	S-1	1	1.359	2.508
	S-2	1	1.044	1.927
8. Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	G-1	1	.556	1.569
	G-2	1	5.945	16.821*
	S-1	1	1.375	3.884
	S-2	1	.507	1.433
9. Intellectual Orientation	G-1	1	.906	8.238*
	G-2	1	.001	.012
	S-1	1	.255	2.321
	S-2	1	.129	.364

G-1 = Faculty Groups Across Institutions
G-2 = Administrative Groups Across Institutions
S-1 = Public Jr. Col. S-2 = Private Jr. Col.
*Significant at the .05 Level

determine which group/s varied significantly from the other groups in their perceptions of the emphasis being given institutional functions. Table 20 summarizes the findings of the Scheffe tests and reports those comparisons that exceeded the critical value for significance.

TABLE 20

SCHEFFE TESTS FOR POST-HOC MULTIPLE COMPARISONS

Functioning Scale	0 > 1	0 > 2	1 > 0	1 > 2
1. Individual Personal Development		X		
2. Humanism/Altruism				X
3. Social Criticism/ Activism				X
4. Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness		X		X
5. Traditional Religiousness				X
6. Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment				X

0 = Faculty 1 = Students 2 = Administrators

Similarly, significant differences were detected between the faculty groups of the two institutions. The faculty group from the public institution scored significantly higher than the faculty of the private college on Individual Personal Development and Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness. The faculty of the private college score significantly higher than the faculty of the public college on Traditional Religiousness.

Significant differences were also detected between the administrator groups of the two junior colleges on three scales. The administrator group of the private institution scored significantly higher on Academic Development, Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment and Traditional Religiousness than the administrator group of the public institution.

The student groups of the two colleges also varied significantly in their perception of the emphasis being given institutional functions. The student group at the public institution scored significantly higher than the student group at the private institution on Individual Personal Development and Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness and lower on Traditional Religiousness. Table 21, on the following page reports the findings of the tests of simple main-effects on the data obtained from the twelve scales of the Institutional Functioning Inventory - the University of Oklahoma Modification in which all three groups at each institution responded.

The sixth null hypothesis was: there is no significant agreement on the perceived emphasis given institutional functions or practices between the two institutions across groups as measured by the I.F.I.-U.O.M. Two statistical procedures were computed on the data from the I.F.I.-U.O.M. for the twenty scales for the administrators and faculty of both institutions and like-

TABLE 21

TESTS OF SIMPLE MAIN-EFFECTS FOR ADMINISTRATOR, FACULTY, AND STUDENT GROUPS OF BOTH INSTITUTIONS ON THE I.F.I.-U.O.M.

Function Scales	Level	df	Mean Square Among	F
1. Academic Development	G-1	1	.095	.370
	G-2	1	1.778	4.579
	G-3	1	.013	.051
	S-1	2	.321	1.251
	S-2	2	.386	1.206
2. Individual Personal Development	G-1	1	4.237	22.420*
	G-2	1	.003	.017
	G-3	1	4.106	21.725*
	S-1	2	1.249	6.606*
	S-2	2	.562	2.975*
3. Traditional Religiousness	G-1	1	30.459	213.001*
	G-2	1	24.836	173.678*
	G-3	1	15.109	105.656*
	S-1	2	.909	6.354*
	S-2	2	.195	1.361
4. Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	G-1	1	11.091	17.633*
	G-2	1	.437	.694
	G-3	1	29.373	46.698*
	S-1	2	3.880	6.168*
	S-2	2	1.450	2.306
5. Social Criticism/ Activism	G-1	1	.031	.079
	G-2	1	1.258	3.259
	G-3	1	1.251	3.241
	S-1	2	2.204	5.709*
	S-2	2	.049	.128
6. Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	G-1	1	.556	1.372
	G-2	1	5.955	14.703*
	G-3	1	.675	1.666
	S-1	2	2.620	6.469*
	S-2	2	.585	1.445

G-1 = Faculty Groups Across Institutions
G-2 = Administrative Groups Across Institutions
G-3 = Student Groups Across Institutions
S-1 = Public Jr. Col. S-2 = Private Jr. Col.
*Significant at .05 Level

wise for the twelve scales in which all three groups at both institutions responded so as to test the null hypothesis. These procedures were the approximate F test for multiple analysis of variance and tests of simple main-effects. The approximate F test for multiple analysis of variance was computed for the twenty scales of I.F.I.-U.O.M. for the administrators and faculty of the two institutions in order to detect systematic differences in the perceived emphasis being given institutional functions or practices between the two institutions across groups. The results of this procedure show a systematic difference between the two institutions in the perception of the emphasis being given institutional practices at the .001 level of significance. Table 22 reports this finding.

TABLE 22

APPROXIMATE F TEST FOR MANOVA ON THE I.F.I.-U.O.M. FOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS ACROSS THE FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATOR GROUPS

F	DF Hyp	DF Error	Probability Less Than
45.801	20	60	.001

Because the approximate F for multiple analysis of variance was significant, univeriate F tests were computed on each scale in order to determine which scales

were producing the systematic variance. This procedure detected significant differences between the two schools across the administrator and faculty groups on the perceptions of the emphasis being given institutional practices on eight of the scales: Intellectual Orientation, Individual Personal Development, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, Traditional Religiousness, Advanced Training, Freedom, Intellectual/Aesthetic Awareness, and Innovation. Table 19 reports the findings of the univariate F tests on the twenty scales of the I.F.I.-U.O.M. for the administrator and faculty groups.

However, four of the scales: Individual Personal Development, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, Advanced Training, and Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment, that reached significance also had significant interaction effects. The results of the tests of simple main-effects that were computed in testing the fifth null hypothesis show that all four of these scales failed to reach significance when the interaction effects were removed (See Table 18). Therefore, the functioning areas in which there were significant differences between the two junior colleges across the faculty and administrator groups were: Intellectual Orientation, Traditional Religiousness, Freedom, and Innovation. The administrators and faculty of the public junior college scored significantly higher than the administrators and faculty of the private junior college on Intellectual Orientation, Freedom,

TABLE 23

UNIVARIATE F TESTS FOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS ACROSS THE FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATOR GROUPS ON THE I.F.I.-U.O.M.

	Goal Scales	F(1, 79)	Mean Square Among	Probability Less Than
1.	Academic Development	1.866	0.243	0.176
2.	Intellectual Orientation	4.881	0.536	0.030*
3.	Individual Personal Development	16.958	2.319	**
4.	Human/Altruism	3.051	0.751	0.085
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	20.329	8.430	**
6.	Traditional Religiousness	634.650	55.320	0.001*
7.	Vocational Preparation	0.016	0.006	0.900
8.	Advanced Training	9.219	2.141	**
9.	Research	2.326	0.647	0.131
10.	Meeting Local Needs	1.217	0.459	0.273
11.	Public Service	0.667	0.361	0.417
12.	Social Egalitarianism	2.382	0.503	0.127
13.	Social Criticism/ Activism	2.227	0.809	0.140
14.	Freedom	35.833	9.139	0.001*
15.	Democratic Governance	0.534	0.235	0.467
16.	Community	0.027	0.016	0.871
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	13.559	4.795	**
18.	Innovation	13.119	4.952	0.001*
19.	Off-Campus Learning	0.011	0.004	0.918
20.	Accountability/Efficiency	2.872	1.473	0.094

*Significant at .05 or beyond
**Significant interaction effect reported in Table 14

and Innovation while scoring significantly lower on Traditional Religiousness. Because significant differences were found between the two institutions across the administrator and faculty groups on their perceptions of the emphasis

being given institutional functions the null-hypothesis was rejected.

The same procedures were then performed on the data obtained from the twelve scales in which all three groups at each institution responded. The approximate F test for multiple analysis of variance was significant at the .001 level. Thus, a systematic variance between the two schools across groups across the twelve scales was detected. Table 24 reports this finding. The perceptions of institutional functions between the two institutions across groups were significantly different. Table 25 presents comparisons of the grand means and standard deviations for each function area for the two junior colleges.

TABLE 24

APPROXIMATE F TEST FOR MANOVA ON TWELVE SCALES OF THE I.F.I.-U.O.M. BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS

F	DF Hyp	DF ERROR	Probability Less Than
48.961	12	114	.001

Because a systematic difference in variance was found between the two institutions across groups (six groups) on perceptions of the emphasis being given institutional

TABLE 25

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
FOR THE TWO JUNIOR COLLEGES
ON THE I.F.I.-U.O.M.

	Goal Scales	Public Junior College		Private Junior College	
		Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations
1.	Academic Development	2.737	.323	2.825	.414
2.	Intellectual Orientation	2.823	.327	2.621	.355
3.	Individual Personal Development	3.310	.464	2.857	.454
4.	Human/Altruism	2.553	.527	2.721	.497
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	2.684	.781	1.807	.690
6.	Traditional Religiousness	1.802	.382	3.258	.406
7.	Vocational Preparation	3.280	.643	3.263	.570
8.	Advanced Training	1.902	.495	2.224	.513
9.	Research	1.490	.548	1.667	.492
10.	Meeting Local Needs	3.677	.609	3.528	.636
11.	Public Service	2.475	.700	2.376	.719
12.	Social Egalitarianism	3.412	.357	3.154	.659
13.	Social Criticism/Activism	2.517	.597	2.576	.650
14.	Freedom	2.794	.439	2.141	.579
15.	Democratic Governance	2.352	.654	2.179	.645
16.	Community	2.674	.708	2.710	.570
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	2.094	.668	2.358	.599
18.	Innovation	3.270	.457	2.718	.375
19.	Off-Campus Learning	2.490	.551	2.477	.673
20.	Accountability/Efficiency	3.098	.684	2.831	.776

functions univariate F tests were computed in order to determine which scales were producing the variance. This procedure detected significant differences between the schools across groups on the perceptions of the emphasis being given institutional practices on seven scales: Intellectual Orientation, Individual Personal Development, Cultural/Aesthetic Environment, Traditional Religiousness, Social Egalitarianism, Freedom, Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment. Table 26 reports the findings of the univariate F tests.

However, four of the seven scales, Individual Personal Development, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, Traditional Religiousness, and Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment also had interaction effects. The results of the tests of simple main-effects that were computed when testing Hypothesis 5 show that all but Traditional Religiousness failed to reach significance when the interaction effects were removed (see Table 20). Therefore, the functioning areas in which there were significant differences between the two institutions across groups were Intellectual Orientation, Social Egalitarianism, Freedom, and Traditional Religiousness. The three groups at the public junior college scored significantly higher than the three groups at the private junior college on Intellectual Orientation, Social Egalitarianism, and Freedom while scoring significantly lower on traditional religiousness.

TABLE 26

UNIVARIATE F TESTS BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS ON TWELVE SCALES OF THE I.F.I.-U.O.M.

Goal Scales	F(1, 125)	Mean Square Among	Probability Less Than
1. Academic Development	1.885-	0.249	0.172
2. Intellectual Orientation	11.521	1.334	0.001*
3. Individual Personal Development	32.794	6.186	**
4. Human/Altruism	3.639	0.927	0.059
5. Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	49.608	31.210	**
6. Traditional Religiousness	486.575	69.354	0.001*
7. Public Service	0.233	0.125	0.630
8. Social Egalitarianism	7.866	2.174	0.006*
9. Social Criticism/ Activism	0.031	0.012	0.860
10. Freedom	54.305	13.964	0.001*
11. Democratic Governance	2.418	0.984	0.122
12. Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	4.196	1.701	**

* Significant at .05 level or beyond
** Significant interaction effect reported in Table 16

The seventh null hypothesis was: there is no significant relationship between the perceived importance of institutional goals as measured by the Institutional Goals Inventory and the perceived degree of emphasis of institutional functions or practices as measured by the I.F.I.-U.O.M. at a public junior college. This hypothesis was tested by computing correlation coefficients on the scale scores for the sixty-six respondents from the public junior college on both instruments. That is, each person's score

on the first scale of the I.G.I. was correlated to his score on scale one of the I.F.I.-U.O.M. Therefore, a Pearson r was computed for each of the twenty pairs of scales. Table 27 presents the institutional means and standard deviations for each scale of both instruments in rank order along with the correlation coefficients.

Twelve of the 20 correlation coefficients were statistically significant at the .01 level or beyond and thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. However, Table 27 gives evidence that there may be problems in using the Pearson r in this situation. For example scale ten, Meeting Local Needs, is considered to be quite important as an institutional goal and likewise is seen by the respondents as being given the most emphasis of any function area and yet the correlation coefficient did not reach significance. On Individual Person Development, Vocation Preparation, and Accountability/Efficiency the pattern was the same in that all three scales were given rather high scores by the respondents on both goals and functions and yet failed to reach significance. Similarly, Advanced Training and Off-Campus Learning received extremely low scores on both the goals and functions instruments and failed to reach significance.

Therefore, the Biomedical Computer Program, "05R - Polynomial Regression," was utilized in order to determine whether or not the relationship between institutional goals and functions was linear. The correlation coefficient is

TABLE 27

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE TWO INSTRUMENTS IN RANK ORDER WITH PEARSON r COEFFICIENTS FOR THE PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE

Goal No.	Goal Areas	Means	S.D.	r	Ranks	Function No.	Means	S.D.
18.	Innovation	3.927	.707	.66*	1	10	3.677	.609
7.	Vocational Preparation	3.788	.799	.28	2	12	3.412	.357
20.	Accountability/Efficiency	3.614	.737	.19	3	3	3.310	.464
2.	Intellectual Orientation	3.482	.598	.50*	4	7	3.280	.643
10.	Meeting Local Needs	3.381	.805	.12	5	18	3.270	.457
12.	Social Egalitarianism	3.361	.772	.47*	6	20	3.098	.684
3.	Individual Personal Development	3.369	.786	.27	7	2	2.823	.327
1.	Academic Development	3.326	.524	.36*	8	14	2.794	.439
16.	Community	3.265	1.043	.74*	9	1	2.737	.323
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	3.179	.735	.38*	10	5	2.684	.781
14.	Freedom	3.138	.816	.30	11	16	2.674	.708
15.	Democratic Governance	2.871	1.014	.64*	12	4	2.553	.527
11.	Public Service	2.761	.736	.44*	13	13	2.517	.597
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	2.652	.650	.40*	14	19	2.490	.551
13.	Social Criticism/ Activism	2.573	.788	.43*	15	11	2.475	.700
4.	Humanism/Altruism	2.552	.785	.50*	16	15	2.352	.654
19.	Off-Campus Learning	2.494	.772	.29*	17	17	2.094	.668
9.	Research	1.936	.918	.19	18	8	1.902	.495
8.	Advanced Training	1.836	.903	.42*	19	6	1.802	.382
6.	Traditional Religiousness	1.556	.754	.29	20	9	1.490	.548

*Significant at the .01 level

a measure of linear relationship and thus if the relationship is non-linear, it will be underestimated.

The polynomial regression procedure indicated that there were several scales that severely deviated from linear regression. Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, Vocational Preparation, Meeting Local Needs, Off-Campus Learning, and Accountability/Efficiency were the five scales that varied the most from a linear relationship. However, there were several other scales that had statistically significant nonlinear properties: Traditional Religiousness, Advanced Learning, Research, Social Criticism/Activism and Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment.

Therefore, the coefficient of nonlinear relationship "eta" was employed so as to get a more precise representation of the relationship.

> Eta indicates the degree of concentration of paired observations (X,Y) about a regression curve, just as r measures the concentration of paired values (X,Y) about a regression line. Eta is a more general measure than r, and can be applied to linear as well as nonlinear relationship patterns.[1]

Table 28 presents comparisons of the Pearson r and the eta coefficients for the public junior college. It will be noticed in every instance that the eta coefficients were higher than the Pearson r's. Likewise, whereas the Pearson r's indicate that eight scales failed to reach a statistically significant relationship, the

---

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

TABLE 28

COEFFICIENTS OF LINEAR AND CURVILINEAR CORRELATION FOR THE TWO INSTRUMENTS AT THE PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE

	Goal Scales	r	Eta
1.	Academic Development	.36	.38
2.	Intellectual Orientation	.50	.53
3.	Individual Personal Development	.27	.30
4.	Humanism/Altruism	.50	.54
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	.40	.51*
6.	Traditional Religiousness	.29	.40
7.	Vocational Preparation	.28	.55*
8.	Advanced Training	.42	.61*
9.	Research	.19	.43*
10.	Meeting Local Needs	.12	.48*
11.	Public Service	.44	.47
12.	Social Egalitarianism	.47	.50
13.	Social Criticism/Activism	.43	.50
14.	Freedom	.30	.36
15.	Democratic Governance	.64	.69
16.	Community	.74	.77
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	.38	.42
18.	Innovation	.66	.68
19.	Off-Campus Learning	.29	.48*
20.	Accountability/Efficiency	.19	.41*

*Varies significantly from linearity

eta coefficients indicate that there is a significant relationship in nineteen of the twenty cases. However, this relationship is quite weak in several instances. Any coefficient lower than .50 may be considered a weak relationship for present purposes.

The intercorrelation matrix also provides correlation coefficients for each scale with the other scales of the same instrument. The intercorrelations for the I.G.I. for the public junior college shows considerable overlap

in several of the goal scales. That is, several scales correlate very high with other scales in the instrument. For example, Intellectual Orientation correlates .63 with Academic Development, 171 with Individual Personal Development, .60 with Democratic Governance and .67 with Community (see Appendix D for the intercorrelation matrix for the I.G.I. at the public junior college).

The intercorrelations for the I.F.I.-U.O.M. also indicates that several scales overlap (see Appendix D) for the intercorrelation matrix for the I.F.I.-U.O.M. for the public junior college.

The eighth null hypothesis was: there is no significant relationship between the perceived importance of institutional goals as measured by the I.G.I. and the perceived degree of emphasis of institutional functions or practices as measured by the I.F.I.-U.O.M. at a private junior college. This hypothesis was tested by computing correlation coefficients on the scale scores of the sixty-five respondents from the private junior college on both instruments. Thus, a Pearson r was computed for each of the twenty pairs of scales. Fourteen of the twenty correlation coefficients were statistically significant at the .01 level or beyond and consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected.

However, as in the case of the public junior college, there were cases where a goal scale had a high mean indicating that it was perceived as being of high importance and the corresponding functioning scale had a high mean

indicating that it was perceived as being given high emphasis. However, the correlation coefficient did not reach significance. For example, Traditional Religiousness had a mean of 3.808 which was the highest mean of the twenty goal scales and a mean of 3.250 which was the third highest mean of the twenty functioning scales but had a correlation coefficient of .03. Similarly, Freedom and Off-Campus Learning received low means on both the I.G.I. and the I.F.I.-U.O.M. and had correlation coefficients of .25 and .19 respectively.

Therefore, the Biomedical Computer Program, "O5R - the Polynomial Regression," was utilized to determine if the relationships were nonlinear. This procedure detected rather extreme deviations from linear regression in the following scales: Intellectual Orientation, Humanism/ Altruism, Traditional Religiousness, Freedom, Democratic Governance, Off-Campus Learning, and Accountability/Efficiency. Table 29 presents the institutional means and standard deviations for the scales of the two instruments in rank order along with the Pearson r and the eta correlation coefficients. It can be noticed that in every case the eta coefficients were higher than the Pearson r's. Likewise, there are six Pearson r's that failed to reach statistical significance. However, all but two of the eta coefficients reached significance at the .01 level. It should be pointed out once again however, that those coefficients below .50 are considered rather weak relationships.

TABLE 29

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE TWO INSTRUMENTS IN RANK ORDER WITH PEARSON r AND ETA CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR THE PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGE

Goal No.	Goal Areas	Means	S.D.	r	Eta	Rank	Function No.	Means	S.D.
6.	Traditional Religiousness	3.808	1.009	.03	.39*	1	10	3.528	.636
3.	Individual Personal Development	3.685	.876	.13	.20	2	7	3.263	.570
1.	Academic Development	3.413	.630	.45**	.46	3	6	3.258	.406
4.	Humanism/Altruism	3.319	.805	.39**	.52*	4	12	3.154	.659
7.	Vocational Preparation	3.265	.714	.54**	.54	5	3	2.857	.454
20.	Accountability/Efficiency	3.259	.777	.44**	.61*	6	20	2.831	.777
2.	Intellectual Orientation	3.185	.759	.42**	.56*	7	1	2.825	.414
16.	Community	3.105	.988	.73**	.78*	8	4	2.721	.497
10.	Meeting Local Needs	3.101	.696	.34	.47	9	18	2.718	.375
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	2.965	.593	.16	.19	10	16	2.710	.570
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	2.892	.901	.52**	.57	11	2	2.621	.355
18.	Innovation	2.868	.852	.49**	.51	12	13	2.576	.650
12.	Social Egalitarianism	2.823	.723	.59**	.65*	13	19	2.477	.673
11.	Public Service	2.650	.756	.36**	.37	14	11	2.376	.719
15.	Democratic Governance	2.643	.949	.56**	.64*	15	17	2.358	.599
13.	Social Criticism/Activism	2.476	.796	.45**	.46	16	8	2.224	.513
14.	Freedom	2.472	.821	.25	.61*	17	15	2.179	.645
19.	Off-Campus Learning	2.359	.932	.19	.40	18	14	2.141	.579
9.	Research	2.158	.889	.42**	.45	19	5	1.807	.690
8.	Advanced Training	2.100	.973	.39**	.46	20	9	1.667	.492

*Varies significantly from linearity

**Significant at the .01 level

An intercorrelation matrix is presented in Appendix D for both the I.G.I. and the I.F.I.-U.O.M. for the private junior college.

The I.F.I.-U.O.M. has fifteen scales that include items calling for factual information. These items have three possible responses: "yes," "no," and "I don't know." These items were analyzed in order to determine the extent to which the respondents reported that they did not have sufficient information concerning institutional practices. Percentages of the "I don't know" responses for each group in the public junior college are reported in Appendix E. The student group had the highest percentage of "I don't know" responses in all scales in which they responded. Their percentages ranged from 35.9% to 80.6%. The faculty group had slightly higher percentage than did the administrators. The faculty percentages ranged from 6.4% to 35.4%, the administrator percentages ranged from 1.7% to 20%. The highest percentages for all three groups occurred in Public Service and Social Criticism/Activism.

The reporting of "I don't know" response was very similar for the three groups of the private junior colleg. Student percentages of "I don't know" responses were higher than the faculty and administrator groups in every instance. Their percentages ranged from 20.5% to 66.3%. The faculty and administrator groups were quite similar in their reporting of "I don't know" responses. The

faculty percentages ranged from 0 to 22.7%. The administrator percentages ranged from 0 to 35.2%. The highest percentages for all three groups occurred in Public Service, Social Criticism/Activism, and Social Egalitarianism. Percentages of "I don't know" responses for each group in the private junior college are reported in Appendix E.

Summary

This chapter has presented an analysis of the data obtained from the administration of the I.G.I. and the I.F.I.-U.O.M. to the administrators, faculty, and students of two junior colleges. Eight null-hypotheses were tested by utilizing the statistical procedures described in Chapter III. Seven of the eight hypotheses were rejected at the .05 level or beyond.

No statistically significant interaction effects were detected among the administrator, faculty, and student groups within both junior colleges on their perceptions of the importance of institutional goals. The first hypothesis was not rejected. However, statistically significant differences were found among the groups within each institution on the agreement of the perceived importance of institutional goals at the .001 level. Likewise, a statistically significant difference was also found in the perceived importance of institutional goals between colleges across groups at the .001 level. Therefore, hypotheses two and three were rejected.

The fourth hypothesis was found to be statistically significant at the .001 level and thus the response patterns of the groups on the I.F.I.-U.O.M. were significantly different within each institution. Similarly, the tests of simple main-effects also detected significant differences among groups across colleges and between colleges across groups at the .05 level or beyond. Therefore hypotheses four, five, and six were rejected.

Nineteen of the twenty corresponding scales of the I.G.I. and the I.F.I.-U.O.M. were found to be significantly correlated at the .01 level at the public junior college and, therefore, the seventh null hypothesis was rejected. The perceived importance of institutional goals and the perceived emphasis given institutional practices were congruent.

At the private junior college eighteen of the twenty corresponding scales of the I.G.I. and the I.F.I.-U.O.M. were found to be significantly correlated at the .01 level and, therefore, the eighth null hypothesis was rejected. The perceived importance of institutional goals and the perceived emphasis given institutional functions were congruent.

The percentages of "I don't know" responses on the I.F.I.-U.O.M. for the respondents at the public junior college were highest for the students and lowest for the administrators, at the private junior college the the pattern was similar in that the highest percentage of "I

don't know" responses were reported for students with the administrators and faculty having approximately the same percentages.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The problem of this research has been to determine whether or not there is a relationship between the perceived importance of institutional goals (future intentions) and the perceived emphasis being given institutional functions or practices at two junior colleges (internal activities taking place within the institutions). There were also three secondary problems or corollaries of the main problem: (a) to determine if there were differences on the perceived importance of institutional goals or emphasis being given institutional functions or practices among the groups across colleges, (b) whether or not there were differences in the perceived importance of institutional goals or the emphasis being given institutional practices between the two institutions, and (c) whether or not there were different response patterns among the groups within each institution on the two instruments.

The first hypothesis was: there is no significant interaction of the perceived importance of institutional goals among administrators, faculty, and students within the two institutions as measured by the I.G.I. This hypothesis was not found to be significant at the .05

level and consequently, there was a failure to reject this hypothesis. The administrators, faculty, and students within the public junior college tended to have response patterns similar to the administrators, faculty, and students of the private junior college on their perceptions of the importance of institutional goals.

Hypothesis two: there is no significant difference on the perceived importance of institutional goals among administrators, faculty, and students across the two institutions. This hypothesis was statistically significant at the .001 level and thus was rejected. The groups were found to be statistically different in their perceptions of the importance attached to two institutional goals: Advanced Training and Research. The students at the public junior college perceived these two goal areas as being more important than did either the faculty or administrator groups. They perceived both goal areas as being of low-medium importance. While the faculty perceived both of these areas to be of low importance, the administrators perceived Advanced Training and Research to be of no importance at the public junior college.

The students at the private junior college also perceived Advanced Training and Research to be of low-medium importance, while administrators and faculty perceived them as being of no importance and of low importance respectively.

With the exception of two scales, Advanced Training

and Research, the administrators, faculty, and student groups of the two colleges tended to agree on the perceived importance of institutional goals.

The third hypothesis was: there is no significant difference on the perceived importance of institutional goals between the two institutions across groups. This hypothesis was found to be significant at the .001 level and thus was rejected. The perceived importance attached to institutional goals was found to be significantly different at the two junior colleges on twelve goal areas: Intellectual Orientation, Individual Personal Development, Humanism/Altruism, Traditional Religiousness, Vocational Preparation, Meeting Local Needs, Social Egalitarianism, Freedom, Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment, Innovation, and Accountability/Efficiency. The administrators, faculty, and students of the public junior college perceived the following goals to be more important at their institution than the administrators, faculty, and students of the private junior college: Intellectual Orientation, Vocational Preparation, Meeting Local Needs, Social Egalitarianism, Freedom, Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment, Innovation, and Accountability/Efficiency. While the respondents of the private college perceived the following goals to be more important at their institution than did the respondents of the public institution: Individual Personal Development, Humanism/Altruism, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, and Traditional Religiousness.

The public junior college seemed to place more importance on the traditional junior college goals than the private junior college. That is,

> Vocational Preparation: In the Institutional Goals Inventory it means offering: specific occupational curricula (as in accounting or nursing), programs geared to emerging career fields, opportunities for retraining or upgrading skills, and assistance to students in career planning.
>
> Meeting Local Needs: In the Institutional Goals Inventory this goal is defined as providing for continuing education for adults, serving as a cultural center for the community, providing trained manpower for local employers, and facilitating student involvement in community-service activities.
>
> Social Egalitarianism is defined as having to do with open admissions and meaningful education for all admitted, providing educational experiences relevant to the involving interests of (1) minority groups and (2) women, and offering remedial work in basic skills.

The private junior college seemed to place higher importance on those goals traditionally in line with religiously controlled liberal arts colleges. That is,

> Traditional Religiousness: this goal means educating students in a particular religious heritage, helping them to see the potentialities of full-time religious work, developing students' ability to defend a theological position, and fostering their dedication to serving God in everyday life.
>
> Humanism/Altruism: this fundamental ethical stance has been conceived in the Institutional Goals Inventory as respect for diverse cultures, committment to working for world peace, consciousness of the important moral issues of the time, and concern about the welfare of man generally.
>
> Academic Development has to do with the acquisition of general and specialized knowledge, preparation of students for advanced scholarly

study, and maintenancy of high intellectual standards on the campus.

It is interesting to note that Public Service was perceived as being of low to medium importance at the public junior college, especially since its governing board is constituted of predominantly local individuals and receives a large portion of its resources from the local district. It is also interesting to note that innovation was perceived to be the most important goal of the institution. This particular junior college was designed to be extremely non-traditional, placing high importance on individualized instruction.

Neither institution seemed to place importance on Democratic Governance. It would thus appear that the respondents of both institutions saw decisions being made at the top rather than participatory.

The fourth hypothesis was: there is no significant interaction of the perceived emphasis given institutional functions or practices among administrators, faculty, and students within the two institutions as measured by the I.F.I.-U.O.M. Systematic interaction effects were detected at the .036 level for administrators and faculty of the two colleges and thus this hypothesis was rejected. Significant interaction effects were also found among the three groups within each school at the .001 level on those scales in which students responded. In the first instance significant interaction effects were detected in scales: Academic Development, Individual

Personal Development, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, Advanced Training, Public Service, and Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment. In all six instances the response patterns at the public junior college were the same, the faculty scored higher than the administrators. At the private college the opposite situation occurred in that the administrators scored higher on these six functioning areas than did the faculty. It is interesting to note that four of these six areas are academic goals.

When all three groups in both institutions were compared, significant interaction effects were found in two additional functioning scales: Traditional Religiousness and Social Criticism/Activism. The students at the public junior college scored higher on these two functioning areas than did the administrators and faculty. At the private junior college the opposite situation was true where students scored lower than administrators and faculty. The pattern for the student groups was the same for Academic Development, Individual Personal Development, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, and Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment.

The fifth hypothesis was: there is no significant agreement on the perceived emphasis given institutional functions or practices among administrators, faculty, and students across the two institutions as measured by the I.F.I.-U.O.M. Tests of simple main-effects detected differences in agreement on eleven functioning scales,and

therefore, this hypothesis was rejected.

Differences were detected in agreement on the emphasis being given institutional functions among the groups at the public institution on seven functioning scales. The faculty disagreed with administrators on the perceived emphasis being given four functioning areas. They perceived that more emphasis was being given to Individual Personal Development, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, Advanced Training, and Accountability/Efficiency. Students disagreed with administrators on Humanism/Altruism, Social Criticism/Activism, Traditional Religiousness, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, and Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment. In all five instances students perceived that more emphasis was being given to these dimensions. It is interesting to note that both faculty and students perceived Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness as being highly emphasized while administrators perceived it to be of rather low emphasis. It would appear that both faculty and students saw the transfer function as being more emphasized than did administrators.

Differences were also found on the agreement on the perceived emphasis given institutional functions between the two faculty groups on the following scales: Individual Personal Development, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, Meeting Local Needs, Public Service, Intellectual Orientation, and Traditional Religiousness. In all dimensions with the exception of Traditional Religiousness the

faculty of the public junior college perceived these functions to be given more emphasis at their institution than did the faculty of the private junior college. However, while the three groups of the private college tended to perceive the traditional transfer program goals to be of higher importance than the three groups of the public college, the functions associated with these goals were perceived as being given more emphasis by the faculty of the public college than by the faculty of the private college.

The administrator groups also perceived the emphasis being given institutional functions differently. The administrators of the private junior college perceived Academic Development, Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment, and Traditional Religiousness as being emphasized more than did the administrators of the public junior college.

The students of the public junior college perceived the functions of Individual Personal Development and Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness as being more emphasized and Traditional Religiousness being less emphasized than did students at the private junior college. The student groups seemed to be quite similar to the faculty groups in that the students of the public institution perceived as much or more emphasis being placed on the transfer or academic functions as did the students of the private institution. Whereas the administrator group of the public college perceived the transfer functions as being less

emphasized than did the administrators of the public college.

It is interesting to note that there were no significant differences detected among the groups within the private junior college. This may be due to tradition or hiring practices since the college is religiously endowed and has been in existence for approximately twenty-five years. On the other hand, the public junior college was in its first year of existence at the time of this study.

The sixth hypothesis was: there is no significant difference on the perceived emphasis given institutional functions or practices between the two institutions across groups as measured by the I.F.I.-U.O.M. Systematic differences were found between the two institutions in the perceptions of the emphasis being given institutional practices at the .001 level of significance on scales in which interaction effects were not detected, and therefore, this hypothesis was rejected. Differences were detected in Intellectual Orientation, Social Egalitarianism, Traditional Religiousness, Freedom, and Innovation. The respondents of the public junior college perceived Intellectual Orientation, Social Egalitarianism, Freedom, and Innovation as being given more emphasis at their institution than did the respondents of the private college. Traditional Religiousness was perceived as being given more emphasis at the private junior college.

The seventh hypothesis was: there is no signifi-

ficant relationship between the perceived importance of institutional goals as measured by the I.G.I. and the perceived degree of emphasis of institutional functions or practices as measured by the I.F.I.-U.O.M. at the public junior college. Nineteen of the twenty correlation coefficients for the corresponding scales of the two instruments reached significance at the .01 level and thus this hypothesis was rejected.

On Community, Democratic Governance, Innovation, and Advanced Training the relationship between goals and practices was quite strong with coefficients higher than .60. That is, a large majority of the administrators, faculty, and students perceived the college to be moving in the direction of the importance of these four goal areas. That is, the respondents perceived the goal areas of Community and Innovation to be important and perceived the college as moving to implement them. On the other hand the respondents perceived Democratic Governance and Advanced Training to be of medium and low importance respectively and perceived the college as emphasizing them to the same degree in practice.

A moderate relationship (between .50 and .60) was detected on Intellectual Orientation, Humanism/Altruism, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, Vocational Preparation, Social Egalitarianism, and Social Criticism. In these instances most of the respondents perceived the college as generally moving in the direction of the importance of these goal areas.

A significant relationship was obtained in nine of the ten remaining areas. However, this relationship was weak indicating that there was considerable disagreement among the respondents that the college was moving in the direction of the importance of these goals.

In several cases the respondents of the public junior college rated the importance of a goal and the emphasis of the corresponding functioning area at the same levels but the relationship was either of medium or low strength. Accountability/Efficiency was rated as being the third most important institutional goal and the sixth most emphasized function. However, the relationship as represented by the eta coefficient was .41. Therefore, it appears that the correlation coefficient is a better measure of congruence or lack of congruence than comparing the means. However, the fact that a significant curvilinear relationship was found in five instances indicated that there may be problems in the composition of some of the scales in the instruments.

An analysis was made of the items on the I.F.I.-U.O.M. calling for factual information so as to compare the groups. This procedure showed that a smaller percentage of administrators selected the "I don't know" responses to these items than did faculty. However, the student group had much higher percentages of "I don't know" responses than did either administrators or faculty. On four scales, Humanism/Altruism, Public Service, Social

Criticism/Activism, and Intellectual/Aesthetic Development, the student group had more than 60% "I don't know" responses.

The eighth hypothesis was: there is no significant relationship between the perceived importance of institutional goals as measured by the I.G.I. and the perceived degree of emphasis of institutional functions or practices as measured by the I.F.I.-U.O.M. at the private junior college. Eighteen of the twenty correlation coefficients for the corresponding scales of the two instruments reached significant at the .01 level and therefore, this hypothesis was rejected. However, as in the case of the public junior college, six scales deviated significantly from linear regression: Intellectual Orientation, Humanism/Altruism, Traditional Religiousness, Accountability/Efficiency, Freedom, Meeting Local Needs, and Off-Campus Learning. Three of these scales were also characterized by a non-linear relationship at the public junior college: Meeting Local Needs, Off-Campus Learning, and Accountability/Efficiency.

In the areas of Accountability/Efficiency, Community, Social Egalitarianism, Democratic Governance, and Freedom the relationship between perceived goals and practices was quite strong having coefficients of .60 or higher. That is, a majority of the administrators, faculty, and students felt that the college was moving in the direction of the importance of these goal areas. They perceived these goals and practices to be strongly congruent. A relationship of medium strength between (.50 and .60) was obtained in the following areas: Humanism/Altruism, Vo-

cational Preparation, Intellectual Orientation, Intellectual/Aesthetic Awareness, and Innovation. In these instances most of the respondents perceived the college as generally moving in the direction of the importance of these goals.

In eight of the ten remaining areas a significant relationship was detected. However, this relationship was weak indicating that there was considerable disagreement among the respondents that the college was moving in the direction of the importance of these goal areas.

An analysis of the items on the I.F.I.-U.O.M. calling for factual information showed that students selected "I don't know" responses in far greater percentages than did administrators and faculty. Administrators and faculty tended to choose this response inapproximately the same percentages. On six scales the students had more than 40% "I don't know" responses. On three scales Public Service, Social Egalitarianism, and Social Criticism/Activism all three groups had rather high percentages. Both Public Service and Social Criticism/Activism had similarly high percentages for the groups at the public junior college. Likewise, both scales had low correlation coefficients at both colleges and thus it appears that they are weak scales.

Conclusions

1. The findings of this study agree with the conclusion of Gross and Grambsch that administrators and faculty

tend to perceive the present importance of institutional goals in the same manner. The crucial difference on the perceived importance of institutional goals is not between administrators and faculty but between institutions. The only differences found among administrators, faculty, and students at both institutions were on the goal areas of Advanced Training and Research. In both instances the administrators and faculty perceived these goals to be "of low importance" to "of no importance." The students perceived these goals to be "of medium importance" to "low medium importance." These differences between administrators and faculty are somewhat meaningless. However, there were wide differences on the perceived importance of institutional goals between the two institutions.

2. The findings of this study support the conclusion that administrators, faculty, and students of both public and private junior colleges tend to perceive the same set of institutional practices being emphasized at their respective institutions. Of the six most emphasized practices at each institution, five of the six are the same for both colleges. Likewise, of the six least emphasized functions at each institution four of the six are the same for both colleges. In only five instances significant differences were detected between institutions. These findings are in marked contrast to the findings concerning the importance being given institutional goals. In this instance only two of the six most important goals are the

same for both junior colleges. Similarly, significant differences were found on the importance being given institutional goals between the two colleges in twelve goal areas.

3. The findings resulting from testing hypotheses 7 and 8 indicated that there was a relationship between the perceived importance of institutional goals and the perceived emphasis being given institutional practices at both institutions. That is, goals and practices are congruent. However, ten goal-practice areas at each institution had correlations of below .50 which can be interpreted as very low relationships and thus tending toward a lack of congruence.

4. Differences in response patterns among administrators, faculty, and students on the emphasis given institutional practices may be one of the variables influencing the degree of relationship between the perceived importance of institutional goals and the perceived emphasis given institutional functions. Significantly different response patterns were detected among the groups within institutions in eight functioning areas. In only two instances at both junior colleges did correlation coefficients between these practice scales and goal scales exceed .50. Similarly, in all three instances where a non-significant relationship was detected, interaction effects were present. Therefore, it is impossible to generalize about response patterns among groups within

institutions or between institutions.

5. The findings resulting from the analyses of the "I don't know" responses of the I.F.I.-U.O.M. support the conclusion that students do not have sufficient access to information concerning institutional practices as do administrators and faculty. This study has shown that students reported at much higher rates, than administrators and faculty, that they did not know if certain practices were being emphasized at their institutions. However, this finding was less pronounced at the private junior college where approximately 20% to 25% of the full-time students reside on campus. Thus it may be concluded that residing on campus is a factor influencing student access to information concerning institutional practices.

6. In relation to administrative theory the findings of this study support the conclusion that institutional goals cannot be determined by measures of goal intentions alone but must be related to institutional practices. In the case of the public junior college the goal areas of Accountability/Efficiency, Academic Development, and Individual Personal Development were perceived to be of high importance (intentions) while at the same time having very little relationship with institutional practice. Similar findings were reported for the private junior college. The goal areas of Traditional Religiousness and Individual Personal Development were perceived to be of high importance while having very little relation-

ship with practice. This information may become useful to practicing administrators of higher education in clarifying the goals of their institutions so that effective progress toward these goals can take place.

Recommendations for Further Study

The findings of this research indicate that there was a relationship between the perceived importance of institutional goals (intentions) and the perceived emphasis given institutional functioning (activities) at two junior colleges. However, only the variables of group and institution were studied and thus more information is needed so as to explain the relationship of institutional goals and practices. Therefore, the following recommendations will be offered for further research.

1. This study should be replicated at other junior colleges in other geographical locations in order to determine if similar findings occur.

2. Other variables should be identified and studied in order to more adequately describe the relationship between goals and practices. That is, geographical location, size of institution, tradition, support, hiring practices, and response patterns may influence the perceptions of institutional goals and practices as well as the relationships between them. Likewise, investigation of other variables may provide further information on whether or not there is a real difference

in institutional functioning between public and private colleges.

3. Since no significant differences in perception of institutional practices were detected among administrators, faculty, and students at the private junior college, tradition and hiring practices may be variables that influence perceptions of institutional practices. Further study should attempt to identify those variables that influence perceptions of institutional practices. This information could be valuable to the practicing administrator.

4. Since it appeared that students had less access to information concerning institutional practices, it is questionable as to whether or not their responses were valid descriptions of institutional practices. Further study should attempt to discover if this finding is generalizable to all students. Likewise, information concerning why students do not have access to institutional practices may be valuable to the practicing administrator.

5. Since significant curvilinear relationships were detected, individual responses should be analyzed so as to determine if a particular group or groups is causing the relationship to depart from linearity. That is, the lack of information on the part of students may be a factor or certain items in the instruments may be ambiguous.

6. The I.F.I.-U.O.M. should be further validated. The findings from this study indicate that several dimensions may not be adequately measuring the emphasis of certain activities.

7. The instruments should be factor analyzed, and those items that are highly correlated with more than one scale should either be dropped or the scales combined.

8. Research should be conducted to provide further information concerning whether or not this technique for determining goals is useful to practicing administrators of institutions of higher education.

APPENDIX A

SPECIMEN LETTERS

Dear

Ken Peterson, a student at the University of Oklahoma has requested our assistance in doing the research for his doctoral dissertation. His study concerns perceptions of institutional goals and practices of faculty, students, and administrators of South Oklahoma City Community College. The results from this study should be most helpful to us. Therefore, the College has agreed to participate in this study.

Your cooperation and your opinions are essential and vital to the success of this study. The questionnaire instruments will take approximately one hour to complete. The anonymity of your response is guaranteed.

Please mail the questionnaires in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope or return them to the reception desk at the College by Tuesday, May 8, 1973.

I realize the many demands on your time and I am sure that Mr. Peterson will greatly appreciate your cooperation in this study.

Sincerely,

Hugh Turner
Executive Vice President

OKLAHOMA CITY SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE
4700 Northwest Tenth Street Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73127



Dear

Mr. Ken Peterson is doing a study which concerns perceptions of institutional goals and practices of faculty, students, and administrators of Oklahoma City Southwestern College. The results from this study should be most helpful to us. Therefore, the College has agreed to participate in this study.

Your cooperation and your opinions are essential and vital to the success of this study. The questionnaire instruments will take approximately one hour to complete. The anonymity of your response is guaranteed.

There will be a container at the PBX for depositing the questionnaires. Please return the questionnaires in the enclosed envelopes to the switchboard operator by Monday, May 7, 1973.

I realize the many demands on your time and I am sure that Mr. Peterson will greatly appreciate your cooperation in this study.

Sincerely,

Orin L. Wilkins
Academic Dean
Oklahoma City Southwestern College

APPENDIX B

INSTITUTIONAL GOALS INVENTORY

AND THE

INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING INVENTORY-

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA MODIFICATION

PLEASE NOTE:

Pages 125-130, "Institutional Goals Inventory", copyright 1972 by Educational Testing Service not microfilmed at request of author. Available for consultation at the University of Oklahoma Library.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS.

INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING INVENTORY
(University of Oklahoma Modification)

TO THE RESPONDENT:

This is a questionnaire for institutional self-study. In it you are asked for your perceptions about what your institution is like--administrative policies, teaching practices, types of programs, characteristic attitudes of groups of people, etc. This inventory is not a test; the only "right" answers are those which reflect your own perceptions, judgments, and opinions.

No names are to be written on the inventory. Comments and criticisms are invited regarding any aspect of the inventory. Please use the back of the test booklet for any such comments.

DIRECTIONS:

1. PENCILS. Any type of marking instrument may be used. Please mark out the appropriate response by using an (X) .

2. INFORMATION ITEMS. Check only one answer box for each question that applies to you. All respondents should answer Item A and each of the Items, B-J that apply.

3. MARKING YOUR RESPONSES. Sections 1 and 3 consist of statements about policies and programs that may or may not exist at your institution. Indicate whether you know a given situation exists or does not exist by marking either YES (Y); NO (N); or DON'T KNOW (?).

4. RESPOND TO EVERY QUESTION. Please mark an answer for every statement in the inventory.

5. MARK ONLY ONE ANSWER FOR EACH STATEMENT, but please respond to each and every statement.

The IFI-(OUM) was developed by the Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of Oklahoma.

From Institutional Functioning Inventory. Copyright © 1968 by Educational Testing Service. All Rights Reserved. Adapted and Reproduced by Permission.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Please select one answer for each questions below that applies to you.

A. Select the one response that best describes your role.

( ) 0. Faculty member
( ) 1. Student
( ) 2. Administrator
( ) 3. Governing board member
( ) 4. Alumna/Alumnus
( ) 5. Member of off-campus community group
( ) 6. Staff
( ) 7. Other

B. Faculty and students: select one field of teaching and/or research interest or, for students, major field of study.

( ) 0. Biological sciences
( ) 1. Physical sciences
( ) 2. Mathematics
( ) 3. Social sciences
( ) 4. Humanities
( ) 5. Fine arts, performing arts
( ) 6. Education
( ) 7. Business
( ) 8. Engineering
( ) 9. Other

C. Faculty: indicate academic rank.

( ) 0. Instructor
( ) 1. Assistant professor
( ) 2. Associate professor
( ) 3. Professor
( ) 4. Other

D. Faculty: indicate current teaching arrangement.

( ) 0. Full-time
( ) 1. Part-time
( ) 2. Evening only
( ) 3. Off-campus only - extension, etc.
( ) 4. Research only
( ) 5. Other

E. All respondents: indicate age at last birthday.

( ) 0. 17 to 18
( ) 1. 19 to 20
( ) 2. 21 to 23
( ) 3. 24 to 26
( ) 4. 27 to 29
( ) 5. 30 to 39
( ) 6. 40 to 49
( ) 7. 50 to 59
( ) 8. 60 or over

F. Students: indicate class in college.

( ) 0. Freshman
( ) 1. Sophomore
( ) 2. Junior
( ) 3. Senior
( ) 4. Graduate
( ) 5. Other

G. Students: indicate current enrollment status.

( ) 0. Full-time, day
( ) 1. Part-time, day
( ) 2. Evening only
( ) 3. Off-campus only-e.g. extension, correspondence, TV, Etc.
( ) 4. Other

H. Optional information question (special supplemental sheet will be provided if this item is used.)

I. Optional information question (special supplemental sheet will be provided if this item is used.)

J. Optional information question (special supplemental sheet will be provided if this item is used.)

Respond to statements in this section by selecting either:

YES (Y)	NO (N)	DON'T KNOW (?)
If the statement applies or is true at your institution.	If the statement does not apply or is not true at your institution.	If you do not know whether the statement applies or is true.

(Y) (N) (?) 1. There is a campus art gallery in which traveling exhibits or collections on loan are regularly displayed.

(Y) (N) (?) 2. There are programs and/or organizations at this institution which are directly concerned with solving pressing social problems, e.g., race relations, urban blight, rural poverty, etc.

(Y) (N) (?) 3. Regulations of student behavior are detailed and precise at this institution.

(Y) (N) (?) 4. Foreign films are shown regularly on or near campus.

(Y) (N) (?) 5. Religious services are conducted regularly on campus involving a majority of the students.

(Y) (N) (?) 6. A number of professors have been involved in the past few years with economic planning at either the national, regional, or state level.

(Y) (N) (?) 7. There are provisions by which some number of educationally disadvantaged students may be admitted to the institution without meeting the normal entrance requirements.

(Y) (N) (?) 8. A number of nationally known scientists and/or scholars are invited to the campus each year to address student and faculty groups.

(Y) (N) (?) 9. Advisement (counseling) is offered students concerning personal as well as academic goals.

(Y) (N) (?) 10. Successful efforts to raise funds or to perform voluntary service to relieve human need and suffering occur at least annually on this campus.

(Y) (N) (?) 11. This institution attempts each year to sponsor a rich program of cultural events--lectures, concerts, plays, art exhibits, and the like.

(Y) (N) (?) 12. At least one modern dance program has been presented in the past year.

(Y) (N) (?) 13. Ministers are invited to the campus to speak and to counsel students about religious vocations.

(Y) (N) (?) 14. Professors from this institution have been actively involved in framing state or federal legislation in the areas of health, education, or welfare.

(Y) (N) (?) 15. A concerted effort is made to attract students of diverse ethnic and social backgrounds.

(Y) (N) (?) 16. Quite a number of students are associated with organizations that actively seek or reform society in one way or another.

(Y) (N) (?) 17. There are no written regulations regarding student dress.

(Y) (N) (?) 18. Students publish a literary magazine.

(Y) (N) (?) 19. A testing-counseling program is available to students to help them to achieve self-understanding.

(Y) (N) (?) 20. An organization exists on campus which has as its primary objective to work for world peace.

(Y) (N) (?) 21. At least one chamber music concert has been given within the past year.

(Y) (N) (?) 22. The institution sponsors groups and programs which provide students opportunities to witness to others concerning their faith.

(Y) (N) (?) 23. A number of faculty members or administrators from this institution have gone to Washington to participate in planning and operating various federal programs.

(Y) (N) (?) 24. One of the methods used to influence the flavor of the college is to try to select students with fairly similar personality traits.

(Y) (N) (?) 25. This institution, through the efforts of individuals and/or specially created institutes or centers, is actively engaged in projects aimed at improving the quality of urban life.

(Y) (N) (?) 26. The institution imposes certain restrictions on off-campus political activities by faculty members.

(Y) (N) (?) 27. There are a number of student groups that meet regularly to discuss intellectual and/or philosophic topics.

(Y) (N) (?) 28. At least one poetry reading, open to the campus community, has been given within the past year.

(Y) (N) (?) 29. The curriculum is deliberately designed to accommodate a great diversity in student ability levels and educational-vocational aspirations.

SECTION 2

Respond to statements in this section by selecting either:

STRONGLY AGREE (SA)	AGREE (A)	DISAGREE (D)	STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)
If you strongly agree with the statement as applied to your institution.	If you mildly agree with the statement as applied to your institution.	If you mildly disagree with the statement as applied to your institution.	If you strongly disagree with the statement as applied to your institution.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 30. How best to communicate knowledge to undergraduates is not a question that seriously concerns a very large proportion of the faculty.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 31. Students who display traditional "scholar" behavior are held in low esteem in the campus community.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 32. In dealing with institutional problems, attempts are generally made to involve interested people without regard to their formal position or hierarchical status.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 33. Capable undergraduates are encouraged to collaborate with faculty on research projects or to carry out studies of their own.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 34. Undergraduate programs of instruction are designed to include demonstration of the methods of problem analysis.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 35. Power here tends to be widely dispersed rather than tightly held.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 36. Almost every degree program is constructed to enable the student to acquire a depth of knowledge in at least one academic discipline.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 37. A major expectation of faculty members is that they will help students to synthesize knowledge from many sources.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 38. The important moral issues of the time are discussed seriously in classes and programs.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 39. Many faculty members would welcome the opportunity to participate in laying plans for broad social and economic reforms in American society.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 40. Serious consideration is given to student opinion when policy decisions affecting students are made.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 41. Certain radical student organizations, such as Students for a Democratic Society, are not, or probably would not be, allowed to organize chapters on this campus.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 42. This institution takes pride in the percentage of graduates who go on to advanced study.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 43. Student publications of high intellectual reputation exist on this campus.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 44. Professors get to know most students in their undergraduate classes quite well.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 45. Foreign students are genuinely respected and are made to feel welcome on this campus.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 46. Religious diversity is encouraged at this institution.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 47. Application of knowledge and talent to the solution of social problems is a mission of this institution that is widely supported by faculty and administrators.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 48. Governance of this institution is clearly in the hands of the administration.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 49. Certain highly controversial figures in public life are not allowed or probably would not be allowed to address students.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 50. Little money is generally available for inviting outstanding people to give public lectures.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 51. A 4.0 grade average brings to a student the highest recognition on this campus.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 52. Academic advisers generally favor that a meaningful portion of each degree program be allocated to individual study.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 53. Most faculty members to not wish to spend much time in talking with students about students' personal interests and concerns.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 54. When a student has a special problem, some of his peers usually are aware of and respond to his need.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 55. Religious id ls of the institution's founding fathers are considered by most faculty members to be obsolete.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 56. Senior administrators generally support (or would support) faculty members who spend time away from the campus consulting with governmental agencies about social, economic, and related matters.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 57. Compared with most other colleges, fewer minority groups are represented on this campus.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 58. The notion of colleges and universities assuming leadership in bringing about social change is not an idea that is or would be particularly popular on this campus.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 59. In arriving at institutional policies, attempts are generally made to involve all the individuals who will be directly affected.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 60. Faculty members feel free to express radical political beliefs in their classrooms.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 61. The student newspaper comments regularly on important issues and ideas (in addition to carrying out the customary tasks of student newspapers).

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 62. It is almost impossible for a student to graduate from this institution without a basic knowledge in the social sciences, natural sciences and humanities.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 63. Programs for the adult (out-of-school) age student are primarily designed to treat their vocational needs.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 64. Formal organizations designed to provide special assistance to students are accorded favorable recognition by individual members of the faculty.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 65. Faculty members are more concerned with helping students to acquire knowledge and professional skills than they are in helping students to be better persons.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 66. By example, the administration and faculty encourage students to dedicate their lives to God.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 67. Administrators and faculty have in the past three years been responsive to regional and national priorities in planning educational programs.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 68. There are no courses or programs for students with educational deficiencies, i.e., remedial work.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 69. The governing board does not consider active engagement in resolving major social ills to be an appropriate institutional function.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 70. Students, faculty and administrators all have opportunities for meaningful involvement in campus governance.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 71. The governing body (e.g., Board of Trustees) strongly supports the principle of academic freedom for faculty and students to discuss any topic they may choose.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 72. Many opportunities exist outside the classroom for intellectual and aesthetic self-expression on the part of students.

SECTION 3

Respond to statements in this section by selecting either:

YES (Y)	NO (N)	DON'T KNOW (?)
If the statement applies or is true at your institution.	If the statement does not apply or is not true at your institution.	If you do not know whether the statement applies or is true.

(Y) (N) (?) 73. This institution operates an adult education program, e.g., evening courses open to local area residents.

(Y) (N) (?) 74. Counseling services are available to adults in the local area seeking information about educational and occupational matters.

(Y) (N) (?) 75. Quite a number of faculty members have had books published in the past two or three years.

(Y) (N) (?) 76. Courses are offered through which local area residents may be retrained or upgraded in their job skills.

(Y) (N) (?) 77. There is a job placement service through which local employers may hire students and graduates for full or part-time work.

(Y) (N) (?) 78. There are a number of research professors on campus, i.e., faculty members whose appointments primarily entail research rather than teaching.

(Y) (N) (?) 79. Facilities are made available to local groups and organizations for meetings, short courses, clinics, forums, and the like.

(Y) (N) (?) 80. Credit for numerous courses can be earned now solely on the basis of performance on an examination.

(Y) (N) (?) 81. Some of the strongest and best-funded undergraduate academic departments are professional departments which prepare students for specific occupations, such as nursing, accounting, etc.

(Y) (N) (?) 82. A number of departments frequently hold seminars or colloquia in which a visiting scholar discusses his ideas or research findings.

(Y) (N) (?) 83. The average teaching load in most departments is eight credit hours or fewer.

(Y) (N) (?) 84. There are a number of courses or programs that are designed to provide manpower for local area business, industry, or public services.

(Y) (N) (?) 85. A plan exists at this institution whereby a student may be awarded a degree based primarily on supervised study off-campus.

(Y) (N) (?) 86. One or more individuals are presently engaged in long-range financial planning for the total institution.

(Y) (N) (?) 87. Courses or seminars are conducted in order that former students and others may be retrained or upgraded in their skills.

(Y) (N) (?) 88. New advanced degrees have been authorized and awarded within the last three years.

(Y) (N) (?) 89. Faculty promotions generally are based primarily on scholarly publication.

(Y) (N) (?) 90. Courses dealing with artistic expression or appreciation are available to all adults in the local area.

(Y) (N) (?) 91. Several arrangements exist by which students may enroll for credit in short terms away from the campus in travel; work-study, VISTA-type work, etc.

(Y) (N) (?) 92. Analyses of the philosophy, purposes, and objectives of the institution are frequently conducted.

(Y) (N) (?) 93. Counseling services are available to students to assist them in choosing a career.

(Y) (N) (?) 94. One or more non-traditional graduate departments (or centers) has been established within the last five years.

(Y) (N) (?) 95. In general, the governing board is committed to the view that advancement of knowledge through research and scholarship is a major institutional purpose.

(Y) (N) (?) 96. Attention is given to maintaining fairly close relationships with businesses and industries in the local area.

(Y) (N) (?) 97. Every student is encouraged to include some study abroad in his educational program.

(Y) (N) (?) 98. Planning at this institution is continuous rather than one-shot or completely non-existent.

Respond to statements in this section by selecting either:

STRONGLY AGREE (SA)	AGREE (A)	DISAGREE (D)	STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)
If you strongly agree with the statement as applied to your institution.	If you mildly agree with the statement as applied to your institution.	If you mildly disagree with the statement as applied to your institution.	If you strongly disagree with the statement as applied to your institution.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 99. Most faculty members consider the senior administrators on campus to be able and well-qualified for their positions.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 100. It is almost impossible to obtain the necessary financial support to try out a new idea for educational practice.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 101. Generally speaking, top-level administrators are providing effective educational leadership.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 102. There is a general willingness here to experiment with innovations that have shown promise at other institutions.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 103. Generally speaking, communication between the faculty and the administration is poor.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 104. High ranking administrators or department chairmen generally encourage professors to experiment with new courses and teaching methods.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 105. More recognition is regularly accorded faculty members for research grants received than for service grants.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 106. Staff infighting, backbiting, and the like seem to be more the rule than the exception.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 107. This institution would be willing to be among the first to experiment with a novel educational program or method if it appeared promising.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 108. Laying plans for the future of the institution is a high priority activity for many senior administrators.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 109. The graduates of such professional colleges as the Colleges of Law and Medicine at this institution are recognized by the public as strong practitioners.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 110. Although they may criticize certain practices, most faculty seem to be very loyal to the institution.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 111. In my experience it has not been easy for new ideas about educational practice to receive a hearing.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 112. A graduate is usually considered by faculty to be better educated if all of his credit hours were earned at this institution, than if he had studied on several campuses in qualifying for his degree.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 113. Seldom do faculty members prepare formal evaluations of institutional goal achievement.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 114. The faculty is receptive to adding new courses geared to emerging career fields.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 115. Undergraduates interested in study beyond the B.A. level receive little or no formal encouragement from the faculty or staff.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 116. Few, if any, of the faculty could be regarded as having national or international reputations for their scientific or scholarly contributions.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 117. There is a strong sense of community, a feeling of shared interests and purposes, on this campus.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 118. This institution has experimented with new approaches to either individualized instruction or evaluation of student performance.

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 119. Off-campus learning experiences of various types are considered as valuable, or more valuable, to the student's education, as regular courses. .

(SA) (A) (D) (SD) 120. The approval of proposals for new instructional programs is regularly dependent on an estimate of potential efficiency.

APPENDIX C

COMPARISONS OF STUDENT SAMPLES AND STUDENT RESPONDENTS BY AGE AND GRADE

COMPARISON OF STUDENT SAMPLE AND RESPONDENTS ON AGE AND CLASS FOR THE PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE

	Sample		Responding Group	
Age	f	%	f	%
17-18	7	11.6	2	9.0
19-20	13	21.3	4	18.1
21-23	8	13.2	4	18.1
24-26	9	14.7	2	9.0
27-29	7	11.4	3	13.6
30-39	11	18.1	5	22.7
40-49	6	9.9	2	9.0
50-59				
60-				
Freshmen	44	73.2	14	63.7
Sophomores	17	27.8	8	36.3

COMPARISON OF STUDENT SAMPLE AND RESPONDENTS ON AGE AND CLASS FOR THE PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGE

	Sample		Responding Group	
Age	f	%	f	%
17-18	15	22.7	5	19.2
19-20	24	36.3	8	30.7
21-23	11	16.7	3	11.6
24-26	7	10.7	4	15.3
27-29	6	9.1	3	11.6
30-39	2	3.0	2	7.7
40-49	1	1.5	1	3.8
50-59				
60-				
Freshmen	32	48.5	12	46.1
Sophomores	34	51.5	14	53.9

APPENDIX D

INTERCORRELATION MATRICES FOR THE INSTITUTIONAL GOALS INVENTORY AND THE INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING INVENTORY-THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA MODIFICATION

INTERCORRELATION MATRIX FOR THE INSTITUTIONAL GOALS INVENTORY
AT THE PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE

Goal No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1																			
2	.63																		
3	.57	.71																	
4	.46	.59	.68																
5	.49	.47	.37	.48															
6	.13	.08	.19	.35	.13														
7	.35	.47	.52	.37	.19	.08													
8	.31	.32	.32	.45	.46	.44	.14												
9	.28	.35	.24	.39	.40	.50	.03	.70											
10	.35	.49	.55	.39	.25	.08	.79	.14	.10										
11	.25	.54	.53	.58	.34	.16	.55	.40	.42	.50									
12	.42	.64	.69	.51	.34	.15	.69	.25	.28	.63	.68								
13	.41	.58	.58	.73	.59	.42	.22	.50	.53	.32	.57	.54							
14	.22	.49	.49	.36	.39	.10	.39	.31	.31	.40	.49	.53	.41						
15	.40	.60	.69	.54	.33	.22	.42	.33	.44	.45	.60	.69	.52	.69					
16	.40	.67	.66	.49	.32	.03	.57	.30	.28	.53	.60	.67	.43	.75	.86				
17	.52	.57	.63	.44	.46	.11	.48	.41	.44	.56	.56	.67	.50	.62	.69	.66			
18	.20	.30	.45	.26	.26	.18	.59	.05	.06	.61	.42	.54	.25	.57	.45	.58	.68		
19	.35	.26	.29	.31	.35	.19	.34	.44	.34	.45	.36	.41	.35	.29	.40	.44	.57	.40	
20	.17	.32	.36	.10	.19	.17	.56	.02	.07	.54	.38	.53	.15	.47	.51	.62	.46	.60	.43

INTERCORRELATION MATRIX FOR THE INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING INVENTORY - THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA MODIFICATION AT THE PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE

Function No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1																			
2	.43																		
3	.30	.35																	
4	.53	.57	.34																
5	.17	.32	.12	.45															
6	.11	.02	.08	.13	.27														
7	.21	.54	.47	.32	.31	.21													
8	.24	.32	.55	.29	.56	.04	.38												
9	.24	.24	.15	.35	.10	.30	.42	.17											
10	.35	.47	.44	.26	.34	.21	.63	.26	.23										
11	.38	.55	.26	.58	.47	.18	.29	.43	.41	.38									
12	.27	.54	.19	.44	.29	.01	.57	.25	.27	.42	.41								
13	.38	.52	.25	.61	.58	.25	.21	.54	.44	.14	.65	.45							
14	.11	.22	.13	.15	.23	.04	.34	.25	.30	.15	.39	.13	.36						
15	.44	.46	.30	.63	.38	.18	.24	.28	.18	.35	.60	.32	.54	.13					
16	.42	.47	.36	.52	.36	.05	.37	.20	.22	.53	.55	.29	.29	.10	.81				
17	.39	.45	.14	.61	.71	.20	.17	.48	.29	.19	.56	.32	.68	.23	.58	.48			
18	.34	.55	.34	.54	.35	.05	.34	.09	.16	.43	.50	.31	.21	.17	.55	.68	.39		
19	.28	.41	.39	.45	.28	.24	.60	.27	.34	.47	.22	.39	.28	.27	.35	.38	.31	.51	
20	.26	.61	.53	.45	.50	.27	.59	.27	.20	.77	.55	.57	.23	.10	.55	.73	.43	.64	.45

INTERCORRELATION MATRIX FOR THE INSTITUTIONAL GOALS INVENTORY
AT THE PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGE

Goal No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1																			
2	.66																		
3	.67	.60																	
4	.59	.46	.61																
5	.65	.46	.53	.73															
6	.28	.02	.20	.44	.34														
7	.67	.54	.57	.63	.53	.08													
8	.27	.52	.24	.19	.09	.16	.53												
9	.11	.28	.12	.13	.00	.06	.39	.74											
10	.58	.38	.48	.62	.53	.19	.80	.32	.42										
11	.44	.50	.45	.52	.32	.01	.68	.59	.58	.63									
12	.42	.41	.45	.50	.42	.03	.61	.34	.29	.53	.67								
13	.36	.46	.49	.61	.46	.04	.46	.33	.37	.51	.72	.65							
14	.20	.26	.25	.27	.13	.34	.30	.22	.18	.52	.48	.42	.47						
15	.37	.53	.47	.39	.27	.13	.43	.40	.39	.39	.57	.63	.52	.63					
16	.51	.61	.62	.48	.36	.12	.55	.31	.29	.47	.55	.56	.47	.59	.85				
17	.53	.56	.64	.51	.46	.04	.70	.48	.37	.53	.69	.64	.61	.48	.70	.73			
18	.47	.58	.50	.36	.31	.19	.62	.47	.30	.49	.67	.60	.51	.41	.59	.57	.72		
19	.17	.32	.24	.10	.08	.12	.39	.50	.29	.23	.50	.38	.23	.25	.31	.23	.51	.56	
20	.48	.40	.41	.26	.17	.05	.46	.32	.23	.48	.49	.35	.29	.24	.42	.50	.58	.57	.38

INTERCORRELATION MATRIX FOR THE INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING INVENTORY -
THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA MODIFICATION
AT THE PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGE

Function No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1																			
2	.47																		
3	.37	.51																	
4	.55	.46	.36																
5	.24	.15	.21	.32															
6	.16	.12	.07	.30	.15														
7	.46	.37	.35	.57	.21	.11													
8	.52	.41	.25	.19	.20	.13	.59												
9	.39	.48	.15	.35	.38	.30	.46	.46											
10	.44	.29	.31	.49	.10	.11	.71	.49	.15										
11	.45	.51	.37	.59	.16	.13	.48	.27	.56	.37									
12	.26	.21	.30	.19	.08	.06	.47	.38	.15	.49	.16								
13	.42	.60	.47	.54	.38	.21	.43	.30	.54	.21	.59	.27							
14	.02	.31	.18	.20	.06	.07	.34	.04	.27	.21	.34	.20	.34						
15	.54	.46	.13	.60	.36	.08	.57	.37	.53	.40	.48	.08	.52	.46					
16	.52	.51	.51	.46	.05	.25	.59	.50	.47	.50	.50	.63	.41	.33	.62				
17	.35	.58	.34	.46	.25	.24	.51	.37	.58	.31	.60	.34	.59	.25	.41	.54			
18	.10	.17	.03	.34	.41	.22	.35	.04	.17	.10	.10	.08	.28	.22	.38	.20	.18		
19	.18	.19	.05	.35	.51	.18	.34	.39	.41	.35	.24	.19	.30	.09	.25	.15	.24	.42	
20	.42	.42	.34	.60	.30	.21	.60	.48	.47	.43	.44	.49	.61	.31	.71	.81	.60	.36	.28

APPENDIX E

PERCENTAGES OF "I DON'T KNOW" RESPONSES FOR EACH GROUP ON THE INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING INVENTORY - THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA MODIFICATION FOR BOTH COLLEGES

PERCENTAGES OF "I DON'T KNOW" RESPONSES ON THE INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING INVENTORY - THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA MODIFICATION FOR BOTH JUNIOR COLLEGES

Functioning Scales	Public Junior College			Private Junior College		
	Administrators	Faculty	Students	Administrators	Faculty	Students
Individual Personal Development	12.0%	7.0%	42.0%	11.7%	9.0%	21.7%
Human/Altruism	10.0%	21.0%	66.0%	11.7%	18.0%	46.1%
Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	1.7%	10.0%	38.0%	14.7%	14.7%	41.6%
Traditional Religiousness	11.8%	16.6%	45.0%	00.0%	00.0%	20.5%
Vocational Preparation	10.0%	7.5%		8.2%	14.7%	
Advanced Training	15.2%	15.2%		11.7%	12.1%	
Research	14.0%	17.5%		10.5%	6.8%	
Meeting Local Needs	8.3%	6.4%		2.9%	8.3%	
Public Service	18.7%	34.5%	80.6%	17.6%	22.7%	66.3%
Social Egalitarianism	6.2%	16.6%	36.3%	23.5%	10.3%	43.1%
Social Criticism/Activism	20.0%	35.4%	63.6%	35.2%	15.3%	44.7%
Freedom	7.5%	14.6%	35.9%	14.7%	6.8%	30.2%
Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	11.6%	16.6%	62.1%	9.8%	13.1%	40.0%
Off-Campus Learning	10.0%	16.6%		5.8%	10.2%	
Accountability/Efficiency	6.0%	13.8%		3.9%	4.5%	

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Benezet, Louis T. "Continuity and Change: The Need For Both" in The Future Academic Community: Continuity and Change, ed. by John Caffrey. Washington. D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

Bloom, Karen L. Goals and Ambivalence: Faculty Values And The Community College Philosophy. E.R.I.C. Clearinghouse, ED-056-679, November, 1971.

Budig, Gene, ed. Perceptions in Public Higher Education. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1970.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The More Effective Use of Resources: An Imperative for Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Chickering, Arthur W. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1972.

Cheit, Earl F. The New Depression in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Clark, Burton R. The Open Door College. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Brawer, Florence, B. Confronting Identy. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Cooley, William W., and Lohnes, Paul R. Multivariate Data Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1971.

Cramer, Elliot, and Thurstone, L. L. The University of North Carolina Manova Program. Chapel Hill North Carolina: Psychometric Laboratory, University of North Carolina. Unpublished.

Dixon, W. J. Biomedical Computer Programs. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1973.

Educational Testing Service. Descriptions of I.G.I. Goal Area. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1972. Mimeographed.

Etzioni, Amatai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

_____. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organization. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1960.

Garrison, Roger H. Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems. A Preliminary National Appraisal. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

Gross, Edward, and Grambsch, Paul V. University Goals and Academic Power. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

Hack, Walter, et al. eds. Educational Administration: Selected Readings. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.

Hays, William L. Statistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Hill, Joseph E., and Kuber, August. Models, Methods, and Analytical Procedures in Education Research. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1967.

Hill, Walter A., and Egan, Douglas. Readings in Organization Theory: A Behavioral Approach. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1966.

Horn, Francis. Challenge and Perspective in Higher Education. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1971.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1964.

Kirk, Roger E. Experimental Design: Procedures for the Behavioral Sciences. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1968.

March, James G., and Simon, Herbert A. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

Martin, Warren Bryan. Conformity: Standards and Change in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1967.

McGrath, Earl J., ed. Universal Higher Education. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Medsker, Leland L., and Knoells, Dorothy. From Junior to Senior College. Berkeley, California: University of California, Center for Studies of Higher Education, 1965.

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

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

Oklahoma State Report for Higher Education. A Plan for the '70s. 1970.

Parsons, Talcott. Structure and Process in Modern Societies. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960.

Patterson, Robert A. An Investigation of the Relationship Between Career Patterns of Pennsylvania Community College Teachers and Their Attitudes Toward Educational Issues. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1970.

Peterson, Richard E. Goals for California Higher Education: A Survey of 116 Academic Communities. Berkeley, California: Educational Testing Service, 1972.

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

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

_____. Toward Institutional Goal-Consciousness. Berkeley, California: Educational Testing Service, 1971.

Peterson, Richard E.; Centura, John A.; Hartnett, Rooney T. and Linn, Robert L. Institutional Functioning Inventory Preliminary Technical Manual. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1970.

Presidents Commission on Higher Education. Higher Education for American Democracy. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1947.

Riesman, David, and Jenks, Christopher. Academic Revolution. New York: Doubleday, 1968.

Sedgren, Donald C. Differences on Perceived Institutional Functioning and Responsiveness to Change as Related to Faculty Types in Selected Four-Year Colleges. E.R.I.C. Clearinghouse, ED-062-934. University of Michigan, 1972.

Selltiz, Claire, et al. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1961.

Simon, Herbert A. "On the Concept of Organizational Goal," Reading in Organization Theory: A Behavior Approach. Edited by Walter A. Hill and Douglas Egan. Boston: Allyson and Bacon, Inc., 1966.

_____. Administrative Behavior. New York: The Free Press, 1945.

Swanson, Elaine, and Swanson, G.I., ed. Educational Planning in the United States. Itasic, Ill., 1969.

Swarr, Philip C. Goals of Colleges and Universities as Perceived and Preferred by Faculty and Administrators. Unpublished Report. Cortland, New York: Office of Institutional Research, State University College, 1971.

Uhl, Norman P. Identifying Institutional Goals. Durham, N.C.: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1973.

_____. Identifying College Goals the Delphi Way. Topical Papers and Reprints, No. 2. Durham, N.C.: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1971.

Weaterford, Willis D. The Goals of Higher Education. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Wieland, George F. Organizational Goals and Their Clarity in Liberal Arts Colleges. E.R.I.C. Microfische, ED-010557. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan.

Wilson, Logan, ed. Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

PERIODICALS

Case, H. L. "Declaration of Aims and Policies of University X." Educational Record, (Fall, 1969), 50.

Danforth News and Notes. November, 1969.

Faulkner, Donald. "The Formation of Institutional Objectives." Journal of Higher Education, 29 (November, 1958), 425-430.

Gronsky, Oscar. "Organizational Goals and the Behavior of Informal Leaders." American Journal of Sociology, 65 (1959).

Gross, Edward. "Universities as Organizations: A Research Approach." Sociological Review, 33, No. 4 (August, 1968).

Gross, Neal. "Organizational Lag In American Universities." Harvard Educational Review, 33, No. 1.

Kampf, Louis. "The Radical Faculty - What Are It's Goals?" Liberal Education, 55, No. 1 (March, 1969).

McConnell, T. R. "The Function of Leadership in Academic Institutions." Educational Record, 49, (Spring, 1968), 145-153.

McKenna, D. L. "Changing Objectives in American Higher Education, 1842-1960." School and Society, 91 (March 9, 1963).

Morse, H.T. "Traditional Goals in Higher Education." School and Society, 91 (March 23, 1963).

Palola, Ernest G.; Lehmann, Timothy; Blesihke, William R. "The Reluctant Planner: Faculty in Institutional Planning." The Journal of Higher Education, XLII (October, 1971).

Perrow, Charles. "The Analysis of Goals in Complex Organizations." American Sociological Review, Vol. 26, No. 6 (December, 1961).

Peterson, Richard E. "Reform in Higher Education: Remarks of the Left and Richt." Liberal Education, 55 (March, 1969), 60-74.

Tead, Ordway. "Higher Goals for Higher Education." Educational Record, 96.

Thompson, James D., and McEwen, William J. "Organizational Goals and Environment: Goal-Setting As an Interaction Process." American Sociological Review, Vol. 23, No. 1 (February, 1958).

Warner, W. Keith, and Havens, A. Eugene. "Goal Displacement and The Intangebility of Organizational Goals." Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 12, 1968, 540-555.

Warriner, Charles K. "The Problem of Organizational Purpose." Sociological Quarterly, VI, (Spring, 1965).

Winstead, Philip C., and Hobson, Edward N. "Institutional Goals: Where to From Here?" Journal of Higher Education, XLII (October, 1971).