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/11244/3642

74-6962

KROEKER, Leon Dale, 1938-
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FACULTY, STUDENT, AND ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTIONS OF GOALS AND PRACTICES OF A STATE FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTION. [Pages 93-93j, previously copyrighted material not microfilmed at request of author. Available for consultation at University of Oklahoma Library.]

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

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© 1974

LEON DALE KROEKER

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FACULTY, STUDENT, AND ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTIONS OF GOALS AND PRACTICES OF A STATE FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTION

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY

LEON DALE KROEKER

Norman, Oklahoma

1973

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FACULTY, STUDENT, AND

ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTIONS OF GOALS

AND PRACTICES OF A STATE

FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTION

APPROVED BY

Herbert R. Hengst
Chairman

William H. Fram

Jack F. Parker

Dorothy Twex

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

DISSERTATION

THE RELATIONSHIPS OF THE INSTITUTIONAL GOALS AND INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES OF A STATE FOUR YEAR INSTITUTION OF HIGHER LEARNING

The basic problem of this study was to determine if there were relationships among the faculty, students and administrators between the perception of institutional goals and institutional practices in a state four year institution of higher learning.

The faculty, students and administrators of one state four year institution were sampled. The participant samples answered two questionnaires covering twenty goal scales and twenty functioning scales. The three participant samples were then compared on the basis of their perception of the importance attached to institutional goals and the emphasis being given institutional functions as measured by the Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI), and the Institutional Functioning Inventory-University of Oklahoma Modification (IFI-UOM).

The analysis of the data indicated that significant differences exist among the faculty, students and administrators of this one subject institution in the perception of the importance attached to institutional goals and the institutional functions. Faculty and administrators tended to agree on the perceptions in both goals and functions, but the students' responses were divergent.

The relationship between perceptions of goals and functions was also analyzed as an indication of the "appropriateness" of the institutional goal position. Positive correlations larger than the critical value were observed in each of the twenty scale areas.

The study indicated that the institution's functions were consistent with the institution's goals.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. Herbert R. Hengst for the generous and unselfish giving of his time, his invaluable advice and guidance throughout the period of the doctoral program. Further acknowledgment is made for the valuable assistance provided by Dr. Dorothy Truex, Dr. Jack Parker, and Dr. William Graves.

The study would not have been possible without the cooperation and support of the participants. The writer is indebted to all those who took time out from their busy schedules to complete questionnaires. It is hoped that the results of the study will be of some interest to them. Expressions of gratitude also go to fellow participants in the Center for Studies in Higher Education Goals Study Group: Robert Lynn, Kenneth Peterson, Maryjo Lockwood, Lynn Lindemann, and Jim Colclazer, with whom many hours of study and time were spent.

The writer has received continuous encouragement from his wife, Sharon, which helped make this endeavor possible. Appreciation is expressed to his mother- and father-in-law, brother-in-law, and other relatives for their faith and assistance.

The writer wishes to thank the president and vice-presidents of Central State University for their support, as well as the many friends at this institution. Without their efforts and help, this investigation would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		iii
LIST OF TABLES		vii
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	10
	Need for the Study	11
	Definition of Terms	12
	The Hypotheses	13
	Limitations of the Study	14
II.	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH	15
	Theoretical Framework	15
	Related Research	18
	Summary	22
III.	RESEARCH DESIGN	24
	Restatement of the Problem and Hypotheses	24
	Description of the Sample: History of the Institution	25
	Description of the Instrument: Institutional Goals Inventory	32
	Institutional Functioning Inventory; University of Oklahoma Modification	40
	Procedure for Collection of Data	43
	Statistical Methodology	45
	Summary	47
IV.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	49
	Hypothesis One	49
	Hypothesis Two	57
	Hypothesis Three	65
V.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	69
	Summary	69
	Conclusions	70
	Implications for Further Study	76

Page

BIBLIOGRAPHY 78

APPENIXES

A. TRENDS IN STUDENT HEADCOUNT 85

B. INSTITUTIONAL GOALS INVENTORY 92

C. INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING INVENTORY-(University of Oklahoma Modification 94

D. SPECIMEN LETTERS 111

E. CLASSES FROM WHICH STUDENT PARTICIPANT SAMPLES WERE TAKEN 115

F. INFORMATION ITEMS ON PARTICIPANT SAMPLES ON FACULTY, STUDENTS AND ADMINISTRATORS COMPILED FROM QUESTIONNAIRES 117

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Full-time Tenured and Non-tenured Faculty	28
2.	Number of Faculty and Number in Each Rank	30
3.	Qualifications of Faculty (Full-time and Part-time)	31
4.	Reliability of Preliminary IGI Goal Area	38
5.	California Higher Education Reliability of IGI Goal Areas	39
6.	IFI-UOM Test-retest Reliability Coefficients Three Administrators	42
7.	Approximate F Test for Multivariate Analysis of Variance	50
8.	Group and Overall Means for Perceived Goal Components of the IGI	51
9.	Institutional Goals Inventory F Tests	53
10.	Findings of Scheffe Test for IGI Perceived Goal Component	55
11.	Scheffe Test for IGI Showing Agreement	56
12.	Approximate F Test for Multivariate Analysis of Variance (IFI-UOM) Test Group A	57
13.	Group and Overall Means for Perceived Functioning Components of the IFI-UOM (Test Group B)	59
14.	Institutional Functioning Inventory-University of Oklahoma Modification F Tests	61
15.	Approximate F Test for Multivariate Analysis of Variance of IFI-UOM Test Group B	61
16.	Group and Overall Means for Perceived Functioning Components of the IFI-UOM (Test Group B)	62

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table		Page
17.	Institutional Functioning Inventory-University of Oklahoma Modification F Tests (Test Group B)	63
18.	Findings of Scheffe Test for IFI-UOM Perceived Functional Component (Test Group B)	64
19.	Correlation between the IGI and IFI-UOM	66
20.	The Twenty Goal Areas and Their Correlations . .	74
21.	Trends in Freshman Headcount Enrollments by Term 1960-1961, 1965-1966, 1970-1971, 1971-1972 and 1972-1973	86
22.	Trends in Sophomore Class Headcount Enrollments by Term for the years 1960-1961, 1965-1966, 1970-1971, 1971-1972, 1973-1974 (Summer Term)	87
23.	Trends in Junior Class Headcount Enrollments by Terms for 1960-1961, 1965-1966, 1970-1971, 1971-1972, 1972-1973, and 1973-1974 (Summer)	88
24.	Trends in Senior Class Headcount Enrollments by Terms for 1960-1961, 1965-1966, 1970-1971, 1971-1972, 1972-1973, and 1973-1974 (Summer)	89
25.	Trends in Graduate Class Headcount Enrollments by Terms: 1960-1961, 1965-1966, 1970-1971, 1971-1972, 1972-1973, and 1973-1974 (Summer)	90
26.	Trends in Total Headcount Enrollments by Term: 1960-1961, 1965-1966, 1970-1971, 1971-1972, 1972-1973, 1973-1974 (Summer)	91
27.	Information Items on Participant Samples on Faculty, Students and Administrators Compiled from Questionnaires	118

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FACULTY, STUDENT, AND ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTIONS OF GOALS AND PRACTICES OF A STATE FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTION

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The literature on higher education expresses interest in college and university goals and practices. Educators are interested in discovering and pursuing these everchanging goals of the institution and the organizations within the institution. "They are trying to develop what is called the 'perfect university.'"[1] There is not now, never has been, and possibly never will be, this type of institution; however, there should always be the search. McGrath (currently director of higher education at Temple University in Philadelphia) stated that education could draw more public support if its spokesmen were more articulate in defining the purposes of their institution. He further stated that

[1]Kenneth M. Cuthbertson, "Ways in Which American Higher Education Can Better Inform the Public of Its Goals, Values, Needs, and Opportunities," Current Issues in Higher Education (1961), p. 197.

the public is not impressed with vague generalities, but they want a clearer definition of what the institution is doing.[2] In order to inform the public of their goals, educators of higher education obviously must know and define the college and university goals. Cuthbertson, another educator in higher education further supports this idea by saying: "The public needs a statement for now--a statement from each institution and from each segment of higher education as to where it is going in the light of today's world, a world which seems to threaten the goals of our free society."[3]

It is often stated that the American college and university is in a state of crisis. Clark Kerr states:

> A segment of the university is in a crisis, and an important segment, but most of it is not. Most of it is moving along with unparalleled vitality and productivity, and in harmony. This is part of the trouble. It is only half-hearted about doing something about the part in crisis.[4]

The American university of today is primarily derived from three streams of history. The English tradition of training for a select group of undergraduates is the first stream; the second stream is from the German tradition of research for society and specialized training for graduates; the third is the American service to the community surrounding

---

[2]The Daily Oklahoman, August 11, 1973.

[3]Cuthbertson, op. cit., p. 198.

[4]Clark Kerr, "Toward the More Perfect University," The Campus in the Modern World (New York: MacMillan Co., 1969), p. 299.

the college or university. From these three streams of history have come functions of our contemporary colleges and universities. The functions of research and graduate training have proved to be in disagreement with service as to how to attain their own specific goals, and their goals are all specifically different.[5]

The conflict that exists between the three areas of purposes is quite clear. Millett says it is customary to describe the purposes or goals of higher education as being three in number: instruction, research, and public service. This description is adequate but at the same time is misleading, since it confuses process and objective. "Instruction is a process; addition to knowledge is an objective. Public service is a process; services actually performed are the objectives."[6] Research, graduate training, and they increasingly relate also to the outside community, to the government, and to the industries in the surrounding area. Undergraduate programs, on the other hand, appear to be more internally oriented--toward the student--and some students are interested more in generalization than in specialization.

Educators feel it is necessary for higher education to find a new unity in the undergraduate curriculum in which

---

[5]Ibid., p. 300

[6]John Millett, Decision Making and Administration in Higher Education (Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1968), p. 48.

liberal and vocational interests are both recognized.[7] Dressel (Assistant Provost and Director of Institutional Research at Michigan State University) states that

> interest in the quality of undergraduate education must force educators into encouraging their best minds to engage in the development of new syntheses of subject matter, but within and across departmental lines, and to examine at the same time what they know about the problem of the novice in mastering these bodies of subject matter.[8]

If educators were to do this they could improve the quality of learning and economize on the amount of learning time required so that the individuals may more quickly and more easily come abreast of the frontiers of scientific and humanistic study.[9]

Because of the basic differences between undergraduate instruction and the other functions of the college or university, a conflict of goals often is easily recognized. Each part of the college or university has its own set of values or goals and they strive to attain them. "The 'word' goal is a central concept in the study of organizations."[10] Goal attainment is an aspect of all systems which, in order

---

[7]Paul L. Dressel, "Goals for the Future of Undergraduate Education," Current Issues in Higher Education (New York: MacMillan Co., 1969), p. 144.

[8]Ibid., p. 144.

[9]Ibid., p. 145.

[10]Edward Gross and Paul Grambsch, University Goals and Academic Power (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968), p. 4.

to survive, must attain whatever goals they set for themselves.[11] In a special kind of system, the formal organization, the problem of goal attainment has primacy over all other problems.[12] Such would be the case for each of the different undergraduate and graduate departments and other functions of the college or university. The academic departments are more than basic operating units of a college or university. They are the major educational resources of the institution. Colleges are more than structures of coordination for the academic departments. They are agencies of educational planning and development.[13] The faculty or faculties of a college or university are more than an instrument of personnel management. Clark (chairman of the Sociology Department, Yale University) has stated that there are two interest groups in the colleges and universities. These two groups are the faculty and administrators. The administrators have developed an "administrative class with interests and ideologies of its own."[14] It appears while the administrators have seemingly been gaining greater power, some of

---

[11]Talcott Parsons, "A Sociological Approach to the Theory of Normal Organizations," Structure and Process in Modern Societies (N.Y.: Free Press of Glencoe, 1960), p. 4.

[12]Talcott Parsons, et al., eds., Theories of Society (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), pp. 38, 41.

[13]Millett, Decision Making, p. 48.

[14]Burton R. Clark, "The New University," Carlos Kruytbosch and Sheldon Messinger, eds., The State of the University: Authority and Change (Beverly Hills: Sage Publishing Co., 1968), pp. 17-26.

the faculty have been demanding a greater role in planning and setting of institutional goals and priorities.[15] A frequent complaint in the college or university is that the administrator fails to use his power in setting goals,[16] and by the same token another complaint is that the faculty are not allowed enough influence in goal determination.[17]

> A growth in the power of administrators represents an upset in the presumed balance between academic activities and support activities on campus. The faculty often grumbles that administrators are overpaid, and that too much attention is given to support activities (often called simply red tape) rather than to the goals of the university. Faculty members resent too what they feel to be the illegitimate pretensions of some administrators to "represent" the faculty or the university. The growth in the power of administrators is not, in itself, regarded as necessary undesirable, even by the academic person (who typically holds highly traditional views of what the university ought to be doing), provided that administrators use their power to help the university attain goals that academic people accept. The situation becomes a source of genuine concern only when administrators are seen both as having more power than the faculty and as using that power to pursue goals considered undesirable or, at least, tangential to desirable goals.[18]

While Gross and Grambsch state that the faculty resent the administrators having too much power, Harrington, the

---

[15] Ibid., p. 26.

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

[17] William E. Moran, "A Systems View of University Organizations," Managing the University: A Systems Approach, edited by Paul Hamelman. (See Faulkner and Barzun.)

[18] Gross and Grambsch, University Goals, p. 2.

vice-president for Academic Affairs at the University of Wisconsin, states that some faculty do not have time for problem solving and decision making in dealing with long-range goals for the college or the university. They are either too busy working with the student or doing research. Many faculty, on the other hand, state an interest in establishing long-range goals, and assume that the administration should welcome their advice and not feel imposed on.[19]

The faculty, students, and the administrators of the college and/or university should all be involved in deciding on the basic goals and procedures. They should work together to control the curriculum, and make the necessary changes when the goals tend to change.[20] There is much debate on this issue today. As recently as 1959, Ruml asserts flatly that

> governing boards must take control of curriculum away from the faculty. Ruml argues that professors can be trusted individually but not collectively; that trustees and administrators can make colleges run more efficiently by regulating size of class, type of instruction, and the like. The faculty, shorn of its power in this key area of instructional improvement and evaluation, will be rewarded by the higher salaries which will be made possible by the new efficiency of management.[21]

---

[19]Fred Harrington, "Goals, Practices, and Procedures for Implementing Joint Responsibility for Institutional Policy Formation and for Instructional Evaluation and Improvement," Current Issues in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education, 1961), p. 112.

[20]Ibid.

[21]Beardsley Ruml and Donald Morrison, Memo To a College Trustee (N.Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1951), pp. 2-5.

There are those who desire the president to be the goal determiner, for they feel that this is the basic and most important function of that office. "An essential part of the president's job is long-range planning."[22] Simon has similar thoughts coordinating with the above statement by adding that the president "should be a leader in setting institutional goals."[23] Osmunson, in a study of presidential inaugural speeches, discovered that approximately 95 percent included references to the presidential role as being a leader and providing institutional direction.[24]

Although the connection with tensions on campus is not always made clear, there are many expressions of concern about disagreements or vagueness in defining institutional goals and standards.

Linowitz stated that trustees appear to be aware of their obligation to help relate institutional objectives to the needs and aspirations of the supporting society. They reject the idea that the college or university is an organization intended solely to meet the needs of individual

---

[22]Henry Wriston, The Academic Procession (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), p. 116.

[23]Herbert Simon, "The Job of a College President," Educational Record, XLVII (Winter, 1969), 70.

[24]Robert Lee Osmunson, "Higher Education as Viewed by College and University Presidents," School and Society, XCVIII (October, 1970), 369.

students as defined by the students themselves.[25] Trustees resist the syndicalist view of some professors that the academic profession should control virtually all of the educational aspects of institutions of higher learning. There is a need to clarify the objectives of American higher education as a whole and the role of each institution within the system. Many realize that traditional programs do not always fit current needs, and that better institutional guidelines should stem from long-range planning and the establishment of campus priorities. "Trustees perceive that the heightened importance of higher education and the prospect of its becoming universal will thrust most colleges and universities into a closer relationship with the surrounding society."[26]

Kerr stated that the colleges and universities of today need to develop mechanisms of "self-renewal," the need to keep themselves in position to make appropriate contributions to society. In their educational function, he saw colleges and universities needing renewal to enhance their ability to prepare young people to cope with the kind of world that they will actually encounter.[27]

---

[25]Sol M. Linowitz, "What's Troubling the Trustees," Campus Tensions: Analysis and Recommendations (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Higher Education, 1970), p. 30.

[26]Ibid.

[27]Clark Kerr, "Institutional Goals," Campus Tensions: Analysis and Recommendations (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Higher Education, 1970), p. 49.

There is no more important task involved in education than the functions and goals of the public institution of higher learning. What part, then, do the goals play in the development of the institution? Concern with goals has taken on an important place in educational literature and should to some degree focus on their functions and their influences on goal attainment. What are the functions of a public four-year institution of higher learning, and therefore the goals? While this study does not provide the answer to these questions, it does suggest that the question itself is valid and relevant.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine the relationship between the perceived institutional goals of a state four-year institution and the perceived functions or practices of that institution. The secondary research problem was to describe the differences between the perception of institutional goals as reported by students, faculty, and administration of the public four-year institution. More specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. Is the degree of agreement between faculty members, students, and administrators on the importance of perceived institutional goals significant?
2. Is the degree of agreement between faculty members, students, and administrators on the importance of perceived institutional functions significant?

3. Is there a relationship between the perceived institutional goals of a state four-year institutional and the perceived functions or practices of that institution?

Need for the Study

In order to inform the public of their goals, values, needs, and opportunities, institutions of higher education must be able to describe them with clarity. But are colleges and universities able to do this? Probably each college embraced a resounding statement of purpose at the time of its founding, and such statements undoubtedly produced initial public support and applause. One contemporary observer claims that, "What the public needs now is a statement from the institutions stating what they are doing and where they are going today in our free society."[28]

Etzioni and others indicate that the real goals of the organization can only be determined from investigation of organizational process.

> Sometimes organizations go so far as to abandon their initial goals and pursue new ones more suited to the organization's needs. This is what we meant when we say that the organizational goal becomes the servant of the organization rather than its master.[29]

Consequently, if perceived goals and perceived practices are not related, then it may be concluded that the organization

---

[28]Cuthbertson, op. cit., p. 197.

[29]Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 5.

has abandoned the stated goals and is pursuing other goals.

It is important that the college or university that is being identified, know its goals for the purpose of planning.[30] This study will provide information on the perceived goals of the student, faculty member, and the administrator of a large multipurpose state institution. A review of the literature indicates that there have been similar studies undertaken in North Carolina and in California, but that no study has yet been undertaken in the central part of the continental United States. The present study further provides information on the perceived practices of the student, faculty members, and the administrators of an Oklahoma four-year institution and a comparative analysis of the perceived goals and the practices of that institution. Furthermore, this study investigated attitudes toward the institutional practices and institutional goals and attempted to determine if relationships existed among the students, faculty, and the administrators.

Definitions of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following terms which lack consensual definition are presented:

Administrators - Are those administrative officers who hold positions of director or departmental head and above in the administrative hierarchy within the institution.

---

[30] Ibid.

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

Consensus - The degree of agreement among administrators, faculty, and students on the importance of perceived institutional goals as measured.

Dissatisfaction - A Significant difference between the importance attached to a perceived institutional goal and a preferred institutional goal as measured.

Faculty - Any full-time staff holding academic rank who is not an administrator.

Institutional Functions - The actions and practices of the organization which tend to operationalize the perceived goals.[31]

Institutional Goals - Are those perceived future states which administrators, faculty, and students tend to agree are presently important and which they are moving toward.[32]

The Hypotheses

Three null hypotheses were investigated in this study.

1. There is no significant difference on agreement on the perceived importance of goals among administrators, faculty, and students as measured by the Institutional Goal Inventory (IGI).

2. There is no significant difference on agreement on the perceived emphasis given institutional practices among administrators, faculty, and students as measured by the Institutional

---

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

[32]Etzioni, op. cit., p. 7.

Functioning Inventory-University of Oklahoma Modification (IFI-UOM).

3. There is no significant relationship between the perceived importance of the institutional goals and the perceived degree of emphasis given the institutional practices.

Limitations of the Study

The investigator recognized and acknowledged the following general limitations of the study.

1. The study was limited to a sample of the full-time faculty, administrators and full-time students of a large multipurpose state institution of higher learning.
2. The results of the study were limited to the general time period in which the study was conducted.
3. This study was limited to one institution of a particular type. Thus, results were not to be generalized to higher educational institutions for the most part.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH

Theoretical Framework

A review of selected research indicated that authorities are attempting to learn all the facts relating to goals and functions on organizations and institutions of higher learning. According to March and Simon's, formal organizations distinguish between two types of goals, operational and nonoperational. Operational goals allow for means-ends analysis, and nonoperational goals require sub-goals to be operational.[1] Nonoperational (intangible) goals are unstandardized mental "products" that lend themselves to evaluation much less readily than tangible (operational goals) standardized physical products. In the former case, evaluation criteria (standards) are difficult to define, performance is difficult to measure, and a comparison of performance is difficult to make.[2] Etzioni provides ample evidence that there

---

[1]James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, Organizations (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), p. 42.

[2]Nicholas Demerath, Richard Stephens, and Robb Taylor, Power, Presidents, and Professors (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967), p. 204.

is a feeling by the public that the goals of higher education are confusing.

> In many cases the legitimate goal is neglected and emphasis is put on means. . . . A secondary goal threatens to become the major goal. Although there is some controversy over what constitutes the primary and the secondary goals of outstanding universities, it seems fair to conclude that a majority of the members of their professional staff would see research as primary and teaching as secondary. This is well reflected in the prestige and promotion system.[3]

Administrators of institutions of higher learning have a special responsibility to see that the goals are attained effectively. Therefore, it is essential that present goals be clarified and distinction made between the real goals and the intended goals of the institution so that progress toward achieving them can be measured. Likewise, it is important that goals themselves be continually re-evaluated. This is very difficult to do in organizations where the product or output is intangible.[4]

Were the goals of departments of universities and colleges more clearly specified, evaluation would be less burdensome. In other words, if the products of academic departments were something other than they are, departmental performances would be less noticeable. However, until

---

[3]Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 5.

[4]James D. Thompson and Wm. J. McEwen, "Organizational Goals and Environment: Goal Setting As an Interaction Process," American Sociological Review, XXIII (Feb., 1958), 23-31.

colleges and universities are transformed into industrial-type organizations whose outputs are technicians, technical services, patients or hardware products--like certain development laboratories and trade schools--the products of academic departments will continue to be chiefly mental products encapsulated and carried in human beings and literatures.[5]

Perrow has stated that a major hindrance to the comprehension of organizational behavior has been the lack of adequate distinction between goals. He further states that "operative goals" and not "official goals" are the most relevant goals in the understanding of behavior. "Official goals" are the general purpose goals that are put forth in charters and public statements. They are generally (with purpose) vague and broad. "Operative goals" show ends sought through operating policies, and they are the means to the official goals. "Operative goals" are the goals that reflect choices among competing values. These goals are shaped by the dominant groups, reflecting the imperatives of a particular task area that is most critical.[6]

The head of an organization or heads of departments think that they are directing toward certain goals, while in reality the organization is actually pursuing others.

---

[5]Demerath, Stephens, and Taylor, op. cit., p. 204.

[6]Charles Perrow, "The Analysis of Goals in Complex Organizations," American Sociological Review, XXVI (Dec., 1961), 854-866.

> In some instances the head may be unaware of the discrepancy; the true situation is hidden from him. The heads of some university departments, for instance, have only very inaccurate information on what happens to most of their product, the graduates.[7]

Therefore, the heads of departments see the "official goals" as the goals that are general and vague. If the administrators of the institutions take the responsibility to see that the goals are attained effectively, the official goals will be clarified and distinctions made between operative, real goals, and the official (intended) goals.[8]

Related Research

Theorists such as Gross and Grambsch[9] have regarded the thought of goals as being related to the study of organizational behavior; there has been little investigation of organizational goals in higher education until the late 1960s.

Sanford stressed that "it is one of our tasks to study goals, discovering what we can about their origins . . . means through which they can be reached."[10] With interest growing in goals within the last ten years a number

---

[7]Etzioni, op cit., pp. 6-7.

[8]Thompson and McEwen, op. cit., pp. 23-31.

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

[10]Nevitt Sanford, The American College (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962), p. 102.

of people have begun delving into the studies of institutional goals and practices in higher education.

There have been three main studies concerning goals of colleges and universities, within the past five years. One such study was conducted by Gross and Grambsch and reported in 1968. Their study described university goals in 1964 as they were perceived by the administrators, faculty, and students of 68 universities in the United States. The Gross and Grambsch inventory consisted of 47 goal statements, each rated in terms of present and preferred importance. Generally speaking, the faculty, and administrators were in 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.[11] In 1969, the Gross and Grambsch inventory was revised and applied to 14 liberal arts colleges. One of the findings of this study was that faculty at small liberal arts colleges felt that the major decisions on goals were made by the administrators, but in general the administrators and faculty perceived the relative importance of goals the same way. In the same study strong emphasis was being placed on teaching, and little emphasis placed on research.[12]

Another investigation of institutional goals was conducted by the National Laboratory for Higher Education in

---

[11]Gross and Grambsch, op. cit., pp. 530-533.

[12]Ibid.

the Carolinas and Virginia under the direction of Uhls. An instrument called the Institutional Goal Inventory (IGI) was administered to five dissimilar institutions of higher education on three different occasions. The Delphi technique was then used in an effort to bring about agreement on goals on the part of the administrators, faculty, students and community members.[13]

In 1972 Peterson used the Institutional Goals Inventory in his study of institutional goals in cooperation with the Joint Committee on the Master Plan in California. This study was to identify the goals of the higher education of 116 California institutions. At this time, only a preliminary and incomplete draft of the survey is available, but the report indicated the value of the IGI as an instrument to identify and clarify the goal priorities.[14]

In 1968 the Council for Advancement of Small Colleges conducted an analysis of college and institutional goals as an aspect of their "Project Student Development." The administrators and faculty members of 13 different small colleges were asked to participate in a ranking of graduates in terms of their perceived importance to characteristics.

---

[13]Norman Uhl, Identifying College Goals and Delphi Way, Topical Papers and Reprints No. 2 (Durham, N.C.: National Laboratory of Higher Education, 1971), p. 19.

[14]Richard E. Peterson, "Goals for California Higher Education: A Survey of 116 Academic Communities." A preliminary and incomplete draft (Berkeley: Educational Testing Service, 1972), p. 3.

After receiving the results the 13 colleges were then grouped into four categories: Christ-centered, Intellectual-Social-centered, Personal-Social-centered, and Professional-Vocational-centered.[15]

In 1968 there was a series of groups studying goals in institutions of higher education. One of these groups was the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University. This goal study group sent a survey form consisting of 64 goal items or statements to every college academic dean in the United States. The deans were asked to indicate to what extent their college placed importance on each of the different goals. The study found that different colleges in different areas of the United States placed different emphasis on different goals.[16]

The Danforth Foundation, in 1969, financed the administration of the Gross and Grambsch instrument to select administrators and faculty members of fourteen private colleges. The results of this study showed that the faculty, students and administrators generally perceived the same importance on most matters relating to college goals and governances. The areas with strongest agreement were in the areas of supporting the general welfare of the community, and supporting adult educational programs.

---

[15]A. W. Chickering, Education and Identity (San Francisco: Jossey-Boss, Inc., 1968, p. 156.

[16]Patricia Nash, "The Goals of Higher Education--An Empirical Assessment," New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1968 (Mimeographed).

A preliminary Institutional Goals Inventory Instrument was developed by Uhl in 1969. This instrument was to provide goal statements which could be used to test the value of the Delphi method. With the repeated administering of the Instrument, it was noticed that beliefs about goals tended to merge or tend to one point, thus proving the validity of the Delphi method.[17]

Summary

This chapter reports of the research in the area of goals, both long- and short-range. In the present study the definition of goals from many sources has been discussed. There seems to be an element of agreement that all colleges and universities have long-range "official" goals and short-range "operative" goals. In some instances colleges and universities short-range goals are not always directed toward the long-range ones. There is also some difference as to the importance of goals within the institution. The greater population of the faculty, administrators, and students are aware that the goals are there, but many cannot see them.

It is evident that there is a need for the administrators, teachers, and students to become more aware of the value of providing and encouraging opportunities for the development of and attaining of goals in the college or institution of higher learning.

---

[17]Uhl, op. cit.

To help the educators identify their goals Uhl (sponsored in 1969 by the National Laboratory for Higher Education) developed a preliminary Institutional Goals Inventory. This instrument has been refined by Richard Peterson and is now being developed by the Educational Testing Service for commercial use to assist the institutions in identifying their constituents' perceptions of the institutions of higher education goals.

The relationship between institutional goals perceptions and institutional functioning perceptions has been examined in this study. It is expected that this present study will further identify institutional behavior and create additional interest in this subject both generally and in the institution being investigated.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Restatement of the Problem and Hypotheses

The state four-year institution of higher learning chosen for this study is located in Oklahoma and is growing from a teachers' college to a multipurpose institution. The president of this institution endorsed the research. The study is part of a series of six studies being done in the region. The other studies include a private institution, public and private Junior Colleges and studies within a multipurpose university.

The major problem investigated in this study was the perception of goals in a public four-year institution as reported by its faculty, students, and administrators. More specifically, this study was designed to seek answers to the following questions:

1. Is the degree of agreement among administrators, faculty, and students on the importance of perceived institutional goals significant?
2. Is the degree of agreement among administrators, faculty, and students on the importance of institutional functions significant as measured?

The proposition that there is a relationship between faculty, students, and administrators perceptions of institutional goals and functions was tested through the following null hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in agreement on the perceived importance of goals among administrators, faculty, and students as measured by the IGI.

Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences in agreement on the perceived emphasis given institutional practices among administrators, faculty, and students as measured by the IFI-UOM.

Hypothesis 3: There are no significant relationships between the perceived importance of the institutional goals and the perceived degree of emphasis given the institutional practices.

This chapter includes a description of the design of the research. The population and sample are first described, followed by a review of the instruments, data collection procedures and statistical treatment.

Description of the Sample: History of the Institution

The institution that was the subject of this research was established 1890 in the central part of the state. In 1919 the function of the institution was changed to that of a four-year teachers college. The class of 1921, consisting of nine members, was the first to receive baccalaureate degrees. The state legislature designated the institution a state college in 1939 and authorized the granting of degrees without teaching certificates. In 1954, the State Regents

for Higher Education authorized programs leading to the Master of Teaching degree. The M.T. became the Master of Education in 1969, and in 1971 programs leading to the Master of Arts in English and Master of Business Administration degrees were initiated.

From an institution of twenty-three students in 1891, the subject institution has grown to an enrollment of more than 10,500 students. It has been in nearly a constant state of change since its inception, and in 1971 it was officially redesignated as a state university.[1]

Further evidence of change is seen in the enrollment at this institution. From 1960-1961 to 1973-1974 they increased from 3,968 to 10,481 full-time students. The graduates doubled in this same period of time, from 732 in 1960-1961 to 1,408 in 1973-1974. The majority of the students are off-campus commuters and travel daily to and from classes. (See Table 1 for trends in total head count by terms from 1960-1961 to 1973-1974. See Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 for the trends in head count for the different classes of students: freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors, graduates from 1960-1961 to 1973-1974.)

The faculty of the institution, totaling 352 full- and part-time instructors, are organized into five schools (see Table 1). These faculty hold a rank from that of

---

[1]General Catalog, LIX (Edmond: Central State University, October, 1972), 3-4.

lecturer (part-time) to full-time instructors up to full professors (see Table 2). (The qualifications of the faculty full-time and part-time are listed showing how many hold Bachelors degrees, Juris Doctorates, Masters degrees and Doctorates. Table 3 presents this demographic data.)

The power of statistical decisions is, among other factors, related to the size of the sample. The participant samples for this study include 125 members each from faculty, students, and administration of the subject institution. It was decided that at least 100 subjects within each group would probably complete the research which would provide ample power for this study. The faculty sample was selected at random utilizing a table of random numbers. No attempt was made to make the sample proportional to discipline areas or faculty academic ranks, but representatives of every discipline and rank were included among the respondents.

A total of 119 faculty correctly completed and returned the questionnaires. This response represented a 95 percent participation on the part of the faculty. The second group sampled was the administrative officers. As defined by the institution in the faculty register, administrative officers were those in assignments of department chairman level and above. Of the 125 administrators receiving the questionnaire, 107 completed and returned them. This response represents better than 85 percent participation of sampled administrators. The third sample consisted of 103

TABLE 1

FULL-TIME TENURED AND NON-TENURED FACULTY

FALL 1973-1974

SCHOOL	Number Full-Time Faculty	Number Tenured	Number Non-Tenured	Percent Tenured
School of Business				
Dean	1	0	1	0
Accounting	7	5	2	71
General Business	11	9	2	82
Management	7	4	3	57
Marketing	5	4	1	80
Business Education	6	6	0	100
Total School of Business	37	28	9	76
School of Education				
Dean	1	1	0	100
Administration	4	4	0	100
Counseling & Guidance	5	5	0	100
Elementary Education	8	5	3	62
Secondary Education	8	7	1	87
Reading	6	1	5	17
Psychology	7	5	2	71
Special Education	10	4	6	40
Vocational Education	5	0	5	0
Total School of Education	54	32	22	59
School of Liberal Arts				
Dean	1	1	0	100
Art	10	8	2	80
Economics	7	4	3	57
English	24	18	6	75
Geography	4	4	0	100
Government	11	8	3	73
History	15	14	1	93
Humanities	8	6	2	78
Journalism	6	3	3	50
Philosophy	2	2	0	100
Sociology	6	4	2	67
Oral Communications	8	4	4	50
Modern Languages	4	2	2	50
Music	15	10	5	67
Total Liberal Arts	121	88	33	73

TABLE 1--Continued

SCHOOL	Number Full-Time Faculty	Number Tenured	Number Non-Tenured	Percent Tenured
School of Math & Science				
Dean	1	1	0	100
Biology	16	13	3	81
Chemistry	10	10	0	100
Math & Comp. Science	18	13	5	72
Physics	10	10	0	100
Total Math & Science	55	47	8	85
School of Sp. Arts & Sciences				
Dean	1	1	0	100
Funeral Service	3	1	2	33
Home Economics	5	4	1	80
Industrial Arts	5	5	0	100
Library Science	4	1	3	33
Nursing	8	2	6	25
Women's H.P.E. & R.	11	7	4	64
Men's H.P.E. & R.	13	6	7	46
Safety	4	2	2	50
Total Sp. Arts & Sciences	54	29	25	54
Total University	321	224	101	70
Academic Advisers	8	3	5	37

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF FACULTY AND NUMBER IN EACH RANK

Sept. 1, 1973

NUMBER	RANK
54	Professors
66	Assoc. Professors
135	Assist. Professors
66	Instructors
321	Total Full-time
31	(Lecturers)
352	Total

TABLE 3

QUALIFICATIONS OF FACULTY

(Full-time and Part-time)

Doctorates	157
Masters + 90 hours	39
Masters + 60 hours	92
Masters + 45 hours	12
Masters	30
J.D.	4
Bachelors	18
Total	352

students who returned usable questionnaires, representing a return of 82 percent of the sampled students.

Description of the Instrument: Institutional Goals Inventory

The Institutional Goal Inventory was chosen for this study because the instrument measures goals covering a broad area. The study used by Gross and Grambsch was limited to universities only, and the Danforth study was limited to private institutions. With the development of the state four-year college toward university status, an instrument was needed to cover the goal areas in a broad sense.

The Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI) was developed for Educational Testing Service by Uhl and Peterson in 1970. The instrument consists of twenty scales, each measuring a certain goal area. Each scale has four questions, and each question allows for five responses from "extremely high importance" to "no importance." Each question allows for two responses to be answered. The "is" referring to present conditions and the "should be" referring to more desirable conditions. With these two responses, each goal area could measure the perceived importance of a goal and the preferred importance of a goal. In this study, only the "is" response was deemed to be appropriate.

The twenty scales which comprise the IGI are described as follows by the Educational Testing Service:

1. Academic Development. The first kind of institutional goal covered by the IGI has to do with the acquisition of general 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 IGI, Intellectual Orientation means familiar 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 IGI, 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 IGI, Individual Personal Development means identification by students of personal goals and 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 IGI 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 IGI, the conception entails heightened appreciation of variety

of art forms, required study in the humanities of 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 IGI 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 IGI, 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 IGI, 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.

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 1950s and 1960s. As operationalized in the IGI, 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 IGI, 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 nineteenth 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 IGI 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 IGI) is drawn primarily 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 IGI Meeting Local Needs is defined as 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 IGI, Public Service means working with governmental agencies in social and environmental policy formation, committing institutional resources to the solution if 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 1960s, the central idea of the goal is that the university should be an advocate or instrument for social change. Specifically in the IGI, 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 control, 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 IGI, Freedom is defined as protecting the right of faculty to present controversial ideas in the classroom, not preventing 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 other campus leaders. Most all institutions, one surmises, as they expanded during the 1950s and 1960s, experienced a diminution in participatory governance. A reaction set in in the late 1960s spurred chiefly by student (power) activities. As defined in the IGI, 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 IGI, 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 IGI, 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 IGI 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.[2]

Uhl utilized the introductory IGI in his study, Identifying Institutional Goals. He reported the reliability found for fourteen of the twenty scales now in the revised

---

[2]Educational Testing Service, "Descriptions of IGI Goal Areas." Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1972 (Mimeographed).

Institutional Goals Inventory.[3] He utilized coefficient alpha, a generalization of the Kuder-Richardson formula 20. The fourteen scales mentioned are reported in Table 4. The Goals for California Higher Education Study, utilized by the Educational Testing Service for norming of the IGI reported

TABLE 4

RELIABILITY OF PRELIMINARY IGI GOAL AREA

Goal Number	Goal Area	Present Importance	Preferred Importance
1	Intellectual Orientation	.81	.74
2	Individual Personal Development	.89	.77
3	Traditional Religiousness	.97	.95
4	Vocational Preparation	.77	.76
5	Advanced Training	.75	.73
6	Research	.82	.76
7	Meeting Local Needs	.77	.83
8	Public Service	.85	.85
9	Social Egalitarianism	.53	.77
10	Social Criticism/Activism	.73	.69
11	Freedom	.78	.81
12	Democratic Governance	.78	.73
13	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	.79	.61
14	Innovation	.52	.31

the reliability of the goal scales which appear in Table 5.[4]

Uhl added support of the validity scale of the Institutional Goals Inventory by having five specialists

[3]Normal Uhl, Identifying Institutional Goals (N.C.: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1971), pp. 18-20.

[4]Ibid., p. 19.

TABLE 5

CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION

RELIABILITY OF IGI
GOAL AREAS

Test-Retest

Goal Number	Goal Area	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

Note: Faculty N = 105. This table shows the reliability of each goal area scale significant at the .05 level.

in higher education who had not participated in the study but were familiar with the institutions sampled predict the institutions which would give the most and the least importance to each of the goal areas. This method yielded results consistent with test results, for example: the church-related

institutions placed a greater importance to the goal area "Religious Orientation" than did the public institutions. When there was no agreement among raters, the scales could not be validated.[5]

Institutional Functioning Inventory-University of Oklahoma Modification

The IFI had its beginnings in 1967 when a group at Educational Testing Service began discussions with McGrath (Teachers College, Columbia University) about developing a measure of "institutional vitality." By that summer McGrath and his associates had a format for the instrument encompassing twelve dimensions of institutional functions. Early in 1968 seventy-two colleges were invited to administer the experimental IFI, of the seventy-two institutions originally invited, fifty agreed to participate. In addition, nine colleges associated with the Central States College Association and eight colleges linked to the Regional Educational Laboratory of the Carolinas and Virginia heard of the project, volunteered to participate, and were included, bringing the total number of participants to sixty-seven.[6]

The IFI-UOM was developed by revising the Educational Testing Service to conform to the twenty scales of the

---

[5]Ibid., p. 28.

[6]Institutional Functioning Inventory Preliminary Technical Manual (Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, 1970), p. 3.

Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI). Where appropriate to the new scales, existing items were used in the IFI-UOM. There were forty-five new items written for the IFI-UOM. Each of the twenty inventory scales of the modified instrument contain six items, totaling 120 items.

Hengst (director of higher education at the University of Oklahoma), and Lynn (vice-president of Oklahoma Baptist University), wrote the first draft of the IFI-UOM. This draft was examined by eight practitioners in higher education to evaluate the appropriateness of each of the items to its scale. The first draft was modified according to the responses of the practitioners. This instrument was designed to show perceptions of what institutional functions are.

The twenty scales within the IFI-UOM were constructed to correspond to the twenty goal area scales of the IGI.

The reliability of IFI-UOM was examined with data from three different institutions. A sampling of students, faculty, and administrators underwent the test-retest. Table 3 summarizes these data evidencing typical reliability coefficients for scales for this type of instrument. The only coefficients of marginal value were r=.37 for the advanced training scale for sample A and r=.34 and .20 for the Academic Development and Intellectual Orientation scales for sample C.

TABLE 6

IFI-UOM TEST-RETEST RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS
THREE ADMINISTRATORS

Scale Number	Practice Area	A n=38 (r=13*)	B n=80 (r=31*)	C n=50 (r=20*)
1.	Academic Development	.64	.57	.34[d]
2.	Intellectual Orientation	.71	.38[c]	.20[e]
3.	Individual Personal Development	.69	.68	.55
4.	Humanism/Altruism	.61	.56[a]	.63
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	.65	.68	.64
6.	Traditional Religiousness	.83	.65	.59
7.	*Vocational Preparation	.52[b]	.56[b]	.86
8.	*Advanced Training	.37[c]	.73	.77
9.	*Research	.56	.73	.80
10.	*Meeting Local Needs	.73	.64[a]	.84
11.	Public Service	.68	.65	.61
12.	Social Egalitarianism	.74	.59	.52[b]
13.	Social Criticism/Activism	.77	.65	.60[a]
14.	Freedom	.73	.84	.51[b]
15.	Democratic Governance	.84	.75	.53[b]
16.	*Community	.79	.75	.85
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Awareness	.68	.62	.75
18.	*Innovation	.88	.60[b]	.85
19.	*Off-Campus Learning	.73	.54	.78
20.	*Accountability/Efficiency	.63	.51[a]	.83

*Students were not knowledgeable enough to answer these areas.

[a]This scale correlates higher with 1 of 19 other scales.
[b]This scale correlates higher with 2 of 19 other scales.
[c]This scale correlates higher with 6 of 19 other scales.
[d]This scale correlates higher with 10 of 19 other scales.
[e]This scale correlates higher with 17 of 19 other scales.

A = University
B = Community College
C = State four-year institution.

In sample C of the Table 6, the following test-retest procedures were conducted. Twenty-five of each group

(faculty, students, and administrators) were selected to serve for a reliability check, taking a retest of the IFI-UOM and sending the completed questionnaires to the office of the institutional research. Five days after the participants had answered the first IFI-UOM questionnaire, they were given the second questionnaire with the same instructions for answering and returning. Each group reported on its own institution. The reliability coefficients are given in Table 3. The institution in the reliability study was C on this table.

The IFI-UOM was divided into two parts: the faculty and administrators were the only participants on the first testing, they were joined by the students on the second testing. The first questionnaire consisted of 120 items measuring the twenty functioning areas. The second questionnaire, including the students measured only twelve functioning areas, the reason being stated by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) that the students of the institution did not know enough about the actual running or the functions of the institution over the remaining eight functioning areas.

Procedure for Collection of Data

Permission to conduct the study was requested from the president and vice-president of Academic Affairs of the institution. After a personal interview was conducted with both officials and an endorsement was written by the administrators, research was continued to the next phase of the data collection.

The second step in data collection involved obtaining a current list of full-time faculty and administrators employed at the institution. From this list, 125 faculty and as many administrators were selected at random by utilizing a list of random numbers. All full-time faculty were chosen from the five schools within the institution. After the list of participants had been obtained the president of the institution then wrote a letter to each one asking his cooperation by filling out the questionnaires and returning them to the office of institutional research at his earliest convenience.

The participating students were all full-time seniors, juniors, sophomores and second semester freshmen. The students were selected by going into an unidentified general education class (classes required by all students at the institution) and requesting their participation. The students were asked to return their questionnaires to the office of institutional research at their earliest convenience. The general education classes were chosen at random times with the first class starting at 7:30 in the morning and the last class being taught at 7 o'clock in the evening. There were a total of five classes where students participated and where the instructor gave permission for the questionnaires to be given to the students. Each class consisted of freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors. See Appendix D for time and class schedule.

Statistical Methodology

The University of Oklahoma Multiple Analysis of Variance Program was utilized for some of the above computations.[7] This program performs univariate and multivariate analysis of variance, analysis of covariance, and of regression. It provides an exact solution of orthogonal or non-orthogonal case. Options in the program include single or multiple degree of freedom contrasts in the main effects or interactions, transformations of variables, and orthogonal polynomial contrasts with equal or unequally spared points. The program also provides for reanalysis with different criteria, contrasts, models, and covariates. The following measures were computed by this program for the IGI responses for the "is" component of the instrument: means and standard deviations for each group on each scale, multiple anova, a test of significance using approximate F test for multivariate analysis of variance, Univariate F tests over all goal scales, the sum of the squares, degrees of freedom, mean squares within, and significance level. The Scheffe method for unequal cells was hand computed for those goal scales where significant group variances were found.

The principal interest of the study was the relationship between institutional goals and functions. A three stage analysis of the data was undertaken.

---

[7]Elliot Cramer and L. L. Thurston, O.U. Manova Program (Chapel Hill, N.J.: Psychometric Laboratory, University of North Carolina, n.d.).

The first stage of the analysis dealt with the data obtained from the IGI. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was completed on the scores over the twenty scales of the instrument for the three groups: faculty, students, and administrators. This procedure was to determine if there were systematic differences in group means among the three groups over the twenty goal scales. When systematic differences were detected in the univariate analysis of variance, post-hoc analyses using the Scheffé procedure were performed to determine within which groups the variation occurred. This procedure provided information as to whether there are group differences in the perceptions of the importance attached to each institutional goal. The second stage of the analysis was to determine whether there were group differences on the emphasis placed on practices or functions. The same procedures used in the first stage were completed on the data obtained from the IFI-UOM on twenty goal scales.

The third stage of the analysis determined the relationships between the perceived importance of the institutional goals (IS Responses) and the perceived emphasis of institutional functions or practices. This was accomplished by obtaining correlation coefficients for each pair of scales across all the "IS" responses. These were used to determine the relationship between each goal area and its corresponding function area. The intercorrelation matrix also told how each scale correlated with each of the other

scales. It was assumed that because of the type of institution being used there would be a stronger relationship between some goals/functions pairs than others. It was also considered that this investigation might uncover conflicting situations where a particular goal area might have been perceived as very important and its corresponding functioning area quite low resulting in a negative relationship.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present a description of the manner in which the problem was investigated. The problem was identified as the relation among the perceptions of institutional goals and institutional functions of three groups of people, the faculty, students, and administrators of selected institutions.

Two instruments were selected to collect the data necessary to an analysis of the problem, the Institutional Goals Inventory and the Institutional Functioning Inventory-University of Oklahoma Modification. The instruments were distributed to a randomly selected sample of 125 participants within each group of full-time faculty, students, and administrators. More than 80 percent of the sample responded to the instruments.

The three groups (faculty, students, and administrators) were compared on the basis of their scores on the IGI and the IFI-UOM. A multivariate analysis of variance was

computed for the three groups over the goal scales and another over the function scales of the instruments to determine if there were systematic mean differences among the three groups. If significant differences were found, one-way analyses of variance were computed on each goal and function scale to determine within which scales significant differences occurred. The Scheffé testing method was utilized for those scale areas where significant differences were found, to determine how the groups were varying.

A correlation was computed to determine the relationship between the selected variables of the respondents and their answers toward the IGI and the IFI-UOM based on the IGI and IFI-UOM scale scores. An analysis of response patterns to the IGI and IFI-UOM scales was completed. This procedure provided the data for testing the hypotheses of the study.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Questionnaire responses of administrators, faculty, and students in a public four-year institution of higher learning were analyzed. The two questionnaires were the IGI and the IFI-UOM.

Randomly selected respondents from the faculty, administrators, and student body constituted the three test groups. Data obtained from the IGI for perceived goals components and the IFI on these three groups were compared. The data were organized so that statistical analyses described in chapter iii could be performed. A significance level of .05 was used throughout for hypothesis testing.

Hypothesis One

The first null hypothesis was: There is no significant difference on agreement on the perceived importance of goals among administrators, faculty, and students as measured by the IGI.

This hypothesis was tested by comparing the groups on the basis of the mean scores on the perceived goals component of the IGI. Using the approximate F test to test

significance, the null hypothesis was rejected at the .001 level (Table 7). The three groups had significant differences in their perceptions of the importance of the

TABLE 7

APPROXIMATE F TEST FOR MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

F	D.F. Hyp.	D.F. Error	Probability Less Than
3.101	40	59	.001

institutional goals at their institution. The overall mean and group means for each goal area of the IGI is presented in Table 8.

Since there was a significant difference found among the groups on their perceptions on the importance attached to institutional goals, univariate F tests were computed to determine within which of the twenty goal area scales the differences occurred. Significant differences were found among the three groups within four goal areas: Personal Development, Vocational Preparation, Off-campus Learning and Accountability/Efficiency. There were sixteen goal areas where significant differences were not found (see Table 9).

A Scheffé post hoc comparison was conducted on the goal area scales to show how the groups differed from one

TABLE 8

GROUP AND OVERALL MEANS FOR PERCEIVED GOAL COMPONENTS OF THE IGI

	Goal Area	Faculty Mean (117)	Students Mean (91)	Administrators Mean (107)	Overall Mean	Standard Deviation
1.	Academic Development	3.278	3.262	3.419	3.3094	.6504
2.	Intellectual Orientation	2.796	2.906	3.014	2.9364	.7405
3.	Individual Personal Development	2.863	2.636	3.026	2.8515	.8598
4.	Humanism/Altruism	2.538	2.320	2.511	2.5326	.7109
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	2.693	2.621	2.753	2.7566	.6341
6.	Traditional Religiousness	1.982	2.021	1.817	1.9606	.8056
7.	Vocational Preparation	2.976	2.652	3.044	2.9913	.6540
8.	Advanced Training	2.859	2.798	2.833	2.8720	.7247
9.	Research	2.251	2.481	2.347	2.4290	.7398
10.	Meeting Local Needs	2.765	2.731	2.741	2.7791	.7269
11.	Public Service	2.535	2.519	2.484	2.5323	.7418
12.	Social Egalitarianism	2.600	2.651	2.701	2.7100	.7315
13.	Social Criticism/Activism	2.244	2.367	2.436	2.4036	.7543

TABLE 8--Continued

	Goal Area	Faculty Mean (117)	Students Mean (91)	Administrators Mean (107)	Overall Mean*	Standard Deviation
14.	Freedom	2.547	2.610	2.692	2.6930	.7476
15.	Democratic Governance	2.545	2.637	2.776	2.7193	.7974
16.	Community	2.668	2.745	2.935	2.8902	.8969
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	2.525	2.544	2.733	2.6952	.7983
18.	Innovation	2.294	2.508	2.536	2.5638	.7526
19.	Off-campus Learning	1.948	2.327	1.938	2.0785	.7048
20.	Accountability/Efficiency	3.072	2.812	3.256	3.1533	.7574

*This value will not necessarily be equal to the weighted means of the groups as this value was calculated for the 315 participants.

TABLE 9

INSTITUTIONAL GOALS INVENTORY F TESTS

	Goal Area	F (2,312)	Mean Sq.	p Less Than
1.	Academic Development	1.534	.778	.217
2.	Intellectual Orientation	1.844	1.330	.160
3.	Individual Personal Development	4.733	3.763	.009
4.	Humanism/Altruism	2.061	1.378	.129
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	.776	.430	.461
6.	Traditional Religiousness	1.586	1.212	.206
7.	Vocational Preparation	6.989	4.241	.001
8.	Advanced Training	.481	.329	.618
9.	Research	2.095	1.355	.125
10.	Meeting Local Needs	.053	.034	.948
11.	Public Service	.102	.075	.903
12.	Social Egalitarianism	.378	.285	.686
13.	Social Criticism/Activism	1.477	1.063	.230
14.	Freedom	.784	.589	.457
15.	Democratic Governance	1.719	1.496	.181
16.	Community	1.953	2.061	.144
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	1.743	1.415	.177
18.	Innovation	2.365	1.947	.096
19.	Off-campus Learning	7.473	4.771	.001
20.	Accountability/Efficiency	5.366	4.869	.005

another where the univariate F tests indicated significant difference among the three groups. The faculty (group one) scored differences from students (group two) on four of the twenty goal areas: Individual Personal Development, Off-campus Learning, Vocational Preparation, and Accountability/Efficiency. Faculty scored significantly higher than the students in the goal areas of Individual Personal Development, Vocational Preparation, and Accountability/Efficiency. The students scored significantly more than the Faculty in the goal area of Off-campus Learning. Students and administrators differed over four of the twenty goal areas: Individual Personal Development, Vocational Preparation, Off-campus Learning and Accountability/Efficiency. The students scored significantly higher than administrators in the goal area Off-campus Learning, while the administrators scored significantly higher than the students in Individual Personal Development, Vocational Preparation, and Accountability/Efficiency. Table 10 summarizes the Scheffé test findings in the twenty goal areas.

Table 11 also shows the findings of the Scheffé tests and explains the agreement in each goal area. Table 10 shows there is significant difference only. Scheffé tests showed generally no disagreement between faculty and administrators, in both groups scoring higher on three goal areas than students. The three goal areas were Individual Personal Development, Vocational Preparation, and Accountability/Efficiency.

TABLE 10

FINDINGS OF SCHEFFE TEST FOR IGI
PERCEIVED GOAL COMPONENT

Goal Area	S>F	F>S	A>S	S>A*
Academic Development				
Intellectual Orientation				
Individual Personal Development		X	X	
Humanism/Altruism				
Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness				
Traditional Religiousness				
Vocational Preparation		X	X	
Advanced Training				
Research				
Meeting Local Needs				
Public Service				
Social Egalitarianism				
Social Criticism/Activism				
Freedom				
Democratic Governance				
Community				
Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment				
Innovation				
Off-campus Learning	X			X
Accountability/Efficiency		X	X	

*F Faculty
S Students
A Administrators

TABLE 11

SCHEFFE TEST FOR IGI
SHOWING AGREEMENT

Goal Areas	Faculty/ Student in Agreement	Faculty/ Administration Agreement	Student/ Administration Agreement
Academic Development	yes	yes	yes
Intellectual Orientation	yes	yes	yes
Individual Personal Development	yes	yes	yes
Humanism/Altruism	yes	yes	yes
Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	yes	yes	yes
Vocational Preparation	no	yes	no
Advanced Training	yes	yes	yes
Meeting Local Needs	yes	yes	yes
Public Service	yes	yes	yes
Social Egalitarianism	yes	yes	yes
Social Criticism/Activism	yes	yes	yes
Freedom	yes	yes	yes
Democratic Governance	yes	yes	yes
Community	yes	no	yes
Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	yes	yes	yes
Innovation	yes	yes	yes
Accountability/Efficiency	yes	yes	no
Traditional Religiousness	yes	yes	yes*
Research	yes	yes	yes*
Off-campus Learning	no	yes	no*

*These three groups showed agreement on three goal areas in the IGI: Traditional Religiousness, Research, and Off-campus Learning.

The only goal area in which the students scored higher was Off-campus Learning.

Hypothesis Two

The second null hypothesis was: There is no siginificant difference on agreement on the perceived emphasis given institutional practices among the administrators, faculty, and students, as measured by the IFI-UOM. This was tested by a Multivariate Analysis of Variance across groups using their scores on the IFI-UOM and dependent variable. This test was divided into two parts: the faculty and administration (test group A), and the faculty, students, and administration (test group B).

The approximate F Test for significance was used. The frequency was significant at the .058 level on the first part of the IFI-UOM (test group A) and the null hypothesis was not rejected (see Table 12). The two groups tested individual significant differences in their perceptions of

TABLE 12

APPROXIMATE F TEST FOR MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (IFI-UOM) TEST GROUP A

F	D.F. Hyp.	D.F. Error	Probability Less Than
1.585	20	210	.058

the importance of the institutional functions at their institution. The overall and group means for each functioning area of the instrument is presented in Table 13.

Since there was a significant difference found between the groups on their perceptions on the importance attached to institutional functions, univariate F tests were computed to determine within which of the twenty functioning area scales the differences occurred. Significant differences were found between the two groups within two goal areas: Advanced Training, and Democratic Governance. There were no significant differences found on the other eighteen functioning areas (see Table 14).

The second part of the second hypothesis was tested by comparing the test groups on the basis of their scores on the perceived functioning components of the IFI-UOM. The approximate F test was again used on the second part of the IFI-UOM (test group B), differences were significant at the .001 level, and the null hypothesis was rejected (see Table 15). The three groups differed significantly in their perception of the degree to which the institution was performing in the function areas tested (see Table 16 for the overall mean and group means for each functioning area).

Because a significant difference was found among the groups on their perceptions of the appropriate functioning area scales, an analysis of variance on each of the twelve functioning scales groups differed significantly. It was

TABLE 13

GROUP AND OVERALL MEANS FOR PERCEIVED FUNCTIONING COMPONENTS OF THE IFI-UOM (TEST GROUP A)

	Goal Area	Faculty (119)	Administrators (112)	Overall Mean	Standard Deviation
1.	Academic Development	2.842	2.946	2.8509	.458
2.	Intellectual Orientation	2.631	2.686	2.6668	.432
3.	Individual Personal Development	2.965	2.911	2.8115	.543
4.	Humanism/Altruism	2.550	2.480	2.4963	.551
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	3.138	3.063	3.1498	.869
6.	Traditional Religiousness	2.417	2.470	2.3970	.552
7.	Vocational Preparation	3.122	3.267	3.3787	.707
8.	Advanced Training	2.441	2.725	2.7888	.632
9.	Research	1.668	1.835	1.8612	.721
10.	Meeting Local Needs	2.942	3.054	3.1734	.921
11.	Public Service	2.473	2.552	2.5446	.791
12.	Social Egalitarianism	3.066	3.116	3.0835	.629

TABLE 13--Continued

	Goal Area	Faculty (119)	Administrators (112)	Overall Mean	Standard Deviation
13.	Social Criticism/Activism	2.404	2.492	2.4241	.606
14.	Freedom	2.356	2.425	2.3719	.547
15.	Democratic Governance	2.243	2.464	2.3616	.599
16.	Community	2.353	2.601	2.8005	.624
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	2.390	2.501	2.4878	.683
18.	Innovation	2.014	2.221	2.4123	.5345
19.	Off-campus Learning	2.159	2.163	2.2874	.587
20.	Accountability/Efficiency	2.661	2.816	2.9194	.695

TABLE 14

INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING INVENTORY-
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
MODIFICATION F TESTS

Functioning Area	F (1,585)	Mean Sq.	p Less Than
1. Academic Development	2.578	.631	.110
2. Intellectual Orientation	.795	.176	.297
3. Individual Personal Development	.834	.165	.362
4. Humanism/Altruism	.962	.286	.328
5. Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	.416	.162	.463
6. Traditional Religiousness	.540	.162	.463
7. Vocational Preparation	1.244	1.227	.266
8. Advanced Training	6.304	4.631	.013*
9. Research	2.899	1.608	.090
10. Meeting Local Needs	.586	.718	.445
11. Public Service	.187	.139	.665
12. Social Egalitarianism	.351	.142	.554
13. Social Criticism/Activism	1.115	.447	.292
14. Freedom	.997	.275	.319
15. Democratic Governance	7.242	2.814	.008*
16. Community	3.085	3.572	.080
17. Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	1.603	.713	.207
18. Innovation	2.724	2.497	.100
19. Off-campus Learning	.002	.001	.967
20. Accountability/Efficiency	1.509	1.386	.221

TABLE 15

APPROXIMATE F TEST FOR MULTIVARIATE
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF IFI-UOM
TEST GROUP B

F	D.F. Hyp.	D.F. Error	Probability Less Than
2.888	24	572	.001

TABLE 16

GROUP AND OVERALL MEANS FOR PERCEIVED FUNCTIONING COMPONENTS OF THE IFI-UOM (TEST GROUP B)

	Functioning Area	Faculty	Students	Administrators	Overall Mean	Standard Deviation
1.	Academic Development	2.838	2.774	2.939	2.8509	.458
2.	Intellectual Orientation	2.613	2.610	2.682	2.6668	.432
3.	Individual Personal Development	2.957	2.606	2.903	2.8115	.543
4.	Humanism/Altruism	2.545	2.458	2.504	2.4963	.551
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	3.145	3.322	3.061	3.1498	.869
6.	Traditional Religiousness	2.390	2.431	2.505	2.3970	.552
7.	Public Service	2.482	2.554	2.500	2.5446	.792
8.	Social Egalitarianism	3.064	3.049	3.174	3.0835	.629
9.	Social Criticism/Activism	2.415	2.437	2.518	2.4241	.606
10.	Freedom	2.355	2.363	2.436	2.3719	.547
11.	Democratic Governance	2.216	2.353	2.451	2.3616	.599
12.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	2.384	2.527	2.505	2.4878	.683

found that there were significant differences among the groups within two of the twelve areas: Individual Personal Development and Democratic Governance. These findings are presented in Table 17.

Where the analysis of variance indicated a significant difference among the groups, a Scheffé test was

TABLE 17

INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING INVENTORY-
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA MODIFICATION
F TESTS (TEST GROUP B)

	Goal Area	F (2,297)	Mean Sq.	p Less Than
1.	Academic Development	2.747	.678	.066
2.	Intellectual Orientation	.858	.163	.425
3.	Individual Personal Development	14.413	3.564	.001
4.	Humanism/Altruism	.636	.195	.530
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	2.265	1.729	.106
6.	Traditional Religiousness	1.172	.336	.311
7.	Public Service	.189	.139	.828
8.	Social Egalitarianism	1.162	.456	.314
9.	Social Criticism/Activism	.792	.290	.454
10.	Freedom	.638	.196	.529
11.	Democratic Governance	3.750	1.406	.025
12.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	1.329	.611	.266

conducted to determine within which of the three groups significant differences occurred. Table 18 reports the findings of the Scheffé test, indicating within which group the critical value was exceeded.

TABLE 18

FINDINGS OF SCHEFFE TEST FOR IFI-UOM PERCEIVED FUNCTIONAL COMPONENT (TEST GROUP B)

	Functioning Area	S>F	F>S	A>S	S>A
1.	Academic Development				
2.	Intellectual Orientation				
3.	Individual Personal Development		X	X	
4.	Humanism/Altruism				
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness				
6.	Traditional Religiousness				
7.	Public Service				
8.	Social Egalitarianism				
9.	Social Criticism/Activism				
10.	Freedom				
11.	Democratic Governance	X		X	
12.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment				

Note: The faculty and administrators agreed on all the items while the students disagreed with both faculty and administrators on two of the twelve items.

The faculty and administrators were in agreement in all twelve of the functioning areas. The faculty and administrators perceive that more emphasis is given the functioning area Individual Personal Development while the students saw low functioning in this scale area. Students perceived more emphasis given Democratic Governance than the faculty, while administrators perceived more emphasis in this functioning area than both the faculty group and student group.

Hypothesis Three

The third null hypothesis was: There is no signicant relationship between perceived importance of the institutional goals and the perceived degree of emphasis given the institutional practices. This hypothesis was tested by correlating corresponding areas from the IGI and IFI-UOM across all respondents. The product-moment correlation procedure was applied and twenty coefficients were computed. The .01 significance level was adopted. Inspection of Table 19 verifies that all twenty correlations exceeded the critical value of .148 required to reject the hypothesis of no correlation between corresponding areas in the IGI and IFI-UOM. The twenty areas have been ordered in Table 19 on the basis of the magnitude of the correlation between the two instruments.

It was observed that the faculty, students, and administrators felt that the state institution was internally consistent on its emphasis and its functioning in the area of

TABLE 19

CORRELATION BETWEEN THE IGI AND IFI-UOM

	Scale	IGI Rank in Order of Magnitude	r
1.	Academic Development	14	.28
2.	Intellectual Orientation	7	.35
3.	Individual Personal Development	16	.23
4.	Humanism/Atruism	13	.28
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	19	.19
6.	Traditional Religiousness	20	.15
7.	Vocational Preparation	10	.30*
8.	Advanced Training	12	.28*
9.	Research	9	.31*
10.	Meeting Local Needs	3	.40*
11.	Public Service	8	.32
12.	Social Egalitarianism	15	.26
13.	Social Criticism/Activism	6	.37
14.	Freedom	18	.22
15.	Democratic Governance	4	.40
16.	Community	1	.56*
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	5	.38
18.	Innovation	2	.53*
19.	Off-campus Learning	17	.22*
20.	Accountability/Efficiency	11	.30*

*Students did not answer IFI-UOM items pertaining to these functioning area scales.

Community. The moderately high correlation of .56 between the perceived practices of Community on the IGI would suggest that there is rather strong tendency for agreement at this state institution regarding present practices and importance of the goal of Community. The Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness and Traditional Religiousness had a very low correlation. Although the correlations are positive and statistically significant from zero, they represent weak tendencies toward agreement. Respondents do not see the operation of the institution being performed consistently with the importance of the areas. Respondents are in agreement on the functioning and goal areas of: Community, Innovation, and Meeting Local Needs. The correlation was high showing that the three groups agree the institution is implementing the goal areas of Community, Innovation, and Meeting Local Needs. The respondents, on the other hand, saw low implementation of the scales, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, Freedom, and Traditional Religiousness. The low correlation does not tell whether the institution is functioning toward these goal scales, but it does reveal that there is disagreement between the respondents as to the implementation of the goals. The respondents see the practices as being different from the goal areas. When the correlation is significantly high the students, faculty, and administrators perceive the institution as implementing the goal areas with their practices. As the correlation

becomes smaller, it can be inferred that the respondents report that the practices do not aid in goal attainment.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Summary

The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on the questionnaire responses submitted by 119 faculty, 103 students, and 107 administrators from one state institution of higher learning in one southwestern state. Two questionnaires were utilized testing twenty broad ranged goal and functioning scales. The Institutional Goals Inventory was concerned with the goals of the institution, and the Institutional Functioning Inventory-University of Oklahoma Modification, was concerned with the functions of the institution.

The first hypothesis, that of no difference among the groups on goal scales, was rejected because significant disagreement was observed between the students, faculty, and administrators on the importance given institutional goals. The second hypothesis of the study was concerned with the functions of the institution as seen by the faculty, students, and administrators. The students again disagreed with the

faculty and administrators. Therefore, there were significant differences among the three groups in the perceptions of the emphasis given institutional functions. Tests of the third hypothesis, which dealt with the relationships between the goals and functions scales, found significant correlation coefficients between each institutional goal and its corresponding institutional function at the .01 level. Thus all three hypothesis were rejected.

Conclusions

The faculty and administration agreed on all the goals of the institution and on the importance being placed on all the institutional functions, according to the scales of the IGI. The students disagreed with the administrators on four of the twenty goal areas, and they disagreed with the faculty on two goal areas. Factors related to the students' divergence were not clearly reconciled. Reasonable inference suggests, however, that students may not have understood the items on the instrument, or were unfamiliar with the goals of the institution. In addition, the four levels of students involved in the sample, would also contribute to wide ranges of student understanding.

Another interesting observation was the response of all three groups to the two scales: Community and Meeting Local Needs. All groups ranked both areas high as goals, and the correlations between goal scales and function scales

were strong and positive. Community is a goal of the four-year college or university, and Meeting Local Needs is a goal area shared by both the community or junior college and the four-year college or university.

The faculty and administration agreed on the emphasis being given the institutional functions. These two samples placed the function areas: Vocational Preparation and Meeting Local Needs as the leading "Functioning" areas among the twenty scales. It should be noted that the students did not respond to these two scales. It is apparent that the faculty and administrators see these Functioning areas as important. In addition, high correlations were observed between the "goals" and "functions" scales in these two areas. It is, therefore, inferred that both faculty and administrators are congruent on their emphasis on goals and their implementation of practices to accomplish these goals.

Two of the lowest ranked functioning areas were Research and Off-campus Learning. Research was ranked as a low functioning area. A high correlation with the goals scales suggested the institution placed low value on research as a goal and behaved that way. By placing low values on this function and goal scale, it is possible to infer that the institution is not presently engaged in research, nor does it highly regard research efforts. Off-campus Learning, another low function area has low correlation with the corresponding goal scale. This indicates that the members of

the institution are in disagreement over the desirability of the goal. The institution is attempting to fulfill the function of Off-campus Learning at a relatively low level. The administrators perceived that relatively high emphasis was given the functioning areas of Academic Development, Individual Personal Development, and Democratic Governance. The students' responses disagreed with the administrators in each of these functioning areas. Four functioning areas were given high emphasis by all three groups: Vocational Preparation, Meeting Local Needs, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, and Social Egalitarianism. These four functioning areas appear to be more traditional and suggest that the institution tends still to function more like a four-year college than an institution developing into a multipurpose university.

The data provided by the participants indicated the existence of relationships between the perceived importance of the goals of the institution and the perceived degree of emphasis given the institutional practices. There were four variations of the goal/function correlations. For example, a goal such as Academic Development was a high valued goal and had a correlation coefficient of .28. The second variation was represented by a goal of low value with a high coefficient of correlation. An example of this configuration is the goal scale Social Criticism/Activism. Such data suggests that the institution neither values this goal area nor indulges in practices that promote its implementation. The

third variation on the correlation of goals and functions made apparent in the study was the goal area that was highly valued and also highly correlated with functioning scales. A good example is the goal Community, which was among the most valued goal areas and the most highly correlated with the functioning scale. In this case, it can be reported that the institution is practicing this valued goal in ways that promote its implementation. The last goal of the correlations of goals and functions is represented by the low ranking goal that was also correlated at low levels. An example of this pattern is represented by the Traditional Religiousness. It was valued at low levels and correlated with functions at .15. There is a low implementation of this goal, which is consistent with its value level. Table 20 is the list of the twenty goal scales with their correlations.

The institution should investigate the low value goals with low correlations and consider possibly discontinuing their function. The institution should concentrate on the goals with high values and low correlations, and investigate procedures on implementing these goals. This would strengthen these goals that are high and their implementation would be fulfilled. The high goals with low correlations should be researched to see why the low correlation and proceed to alter the implementations so these high valued goals could be fulfilled. The high valued goals with high

TABLE 20

THE TWENTY GOAL AREAS AND THEIR CORRELATIONS

I.	High Value Goal Scale (Scale Name)	- With - Rank on IGI	Low Correlation between Goals and Functions "r" Rank
1.	Academic Development	1	14
2.	Accountability/ Efficiency	2	11
7.	Vocational Preparation	3	10
8.	Advanced Training	4	12
3.	Individual Personal Development	5	16
5.	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	6	19

(This institution places high values on these goals but there is low implementation of them.)

II.	Low Value Goal Scale (Scale Name)	- With - Rank on IGI	Low Correlation between Goals and Functions "r" Rank
12.	Social Egalitarianism	7	15
14.	Freedom	8	18
4.	Humanism/Altruism	9	13
19.	Off-campus Learning	10	17
20.	Traditional Religiousness	11	20

(The institution is placing little importance on these goals and they are receiving low implementation.)

TABLE 20--Continued

III.	High Value Goal Scale (Scale Name)	- With - Rank on IGI	High Correlation between Goals and Functions "r" Rank
2.	Intellectual Orientation	12	7
16.	Community	13	1
10.	Meeting Local Needs	14	3
15.	Democratic Governance	15	4
	(The institution places high values on these goals and there is high implementation of these goals.)		

IV.	Low Value Goal Scale (Scale Name)	- With - Rank on IGI	High Correlation between Goals and Functions "r" Rank
17.	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	16	5
18.	Innovation	17	2
11.	Public Service	18	8
19.	Research	19	9
13.	Social Criticism/ Activism	20	6
	(The institution places low values on these goals and they implement them highly.)		

correlation should be researched to see if these should be the goals for a four-year institution of higher learning or if they are the old goals of a "bygone" institution. The low value goals with high correlations need to be investigated to see why their high implementation. They possibly are goals that the members of the institution see value in and stress the implementation of these goals. This would be

a situation of goal change if this were to happen.

Implications for Further Study

Recommendations, based on procedures, survey of authoritative literature, and analysis of data for further research are presented as follows:

1. Analysis of the causes of high and low goal values need to be investigated at this institution of higher learning.
2. Comparative studies need to be made of other institutions of higher learning, such as other four-year state institutions in this geographic location, in order to determine if similar findings result.
3. Comparative studies to determine the correlation between the tests used in this study and other tests that have been produced to measure goals and practices.
4. This study should be utilized in comparing other similar institutions in other geographical locations, in order to determine if similar findings result.

The results of this study have strengthened the findings of previous research and laid the groundwork for more complicated and detailed investigations. These suggestions should be ample incentive for well-trained investigators who intend to conduct further studies in institutional goals and institutional practices.

The results of this study and the findings of previous research efforts in the same area indicate that perception of institutional goals and institutional functions or practices

are related, and meaningful investigations could be conducted in other institutions of higher learning in this area.

There are certain disadvantages to the questionnaire that was used by the participating groups. There should be some revision made in the direction of having the students, as well as the faculty and administration, answering all twenty of the Functioning scale areas. There possibly should be some attempt made to equalize the two scales for all participants. It appears to be unbalanced when one is using the IGI and utilizing the twenty goal scales; using three participant sample groups, and using the IFI-UOM; and dividing this second scale into two parts. The imbalance occurs when one uses two participant groups in the first part and then all three participant groups in the second part, but letting one group take only twelve of the twenty functioning scales.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Baldridge, J. Victor. Power and Conflict in the University. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1971.

Barzun, Jacques. The American University: How It Runs and Where It Is Going. New York: Harper, 1968.

Bauer, Ronald C. Cases in College Administration. New York: Vintage Books, Div. of Random House, 1962.

Blackwell, Thomas. College and University Administration. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.

Brooks, Glen, and Rourke, Francis. The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education. Maryland: John Hopkins Press, 1966.

Bryson, Lyman, ed. Goals for American Education, A Symposium. New York: Harper & Bros., 1950.

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

Caffrey, John, ed. The Future Academic Community: Continuity and Change. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

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

Chickering, A. W. Education and Identity. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Boss, Inc., 1968.

Cramer, Elliot, and Thurston, L. L. O.U. Manova Program. Chapel Hill, N.C.: Psychometric Labratory, University of North Carolina, n.d.

Cremin, Laurence A., and Butts, Freeman. A History of Education in American Culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1953.

Demerath, Nicholas; Stephens, Richard; and Taylor, Robb. Power, Presidents, and Professors. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967.

Dressel, Paul. College and University Curriculum. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1968.

Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Frankel, Charles, ed. Issues in University Education. New York: Harper and Bros., 1959.

General Catalog, LIX (Edmond: Central State University, October, 1972).

Goldwin, Robert A., ed. Higher Education and Modern Democracy. Illinois: Rand McNally and Co., 1967.

Gross, Edward, and Grambsch, Paul V. University Goals and Academic Power. Washington, D.C.: A.C.E., 1968.

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

Hodgkinson, Harold, and Blog, Myron B., Jr. Identity Crisis in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971.

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

Hutchins, Robert. Higher Learning in America. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1962. Copyright, 1936.

_____. The University in America. Santa Barbara, Calif.: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1966.

Kerr, Clark. The Uses of the University. New York: Harper, 1963.

Lunsford, Terry, ed. Study of Academic Administration. Boulder: Western Institute Commission for Higher Education, 1963.

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

Margolis, John. The Campus in the Modern World. New York: MacMillan Co., 1969.

Mayhew, Lewis. Literature of Higher Education during 1969. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1969.

Millett, John. Administration in Higher Education. Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1968.

_____. Decision Making and Administration in Higher Education. Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1968, p. 48.

_____. The Academic Community. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962.

Minter, W. J., and Lawrence, Ben, eds. Management Information Systems: Their Development and Use in the Administration of Higher Education. Boulder, Colo.: W.I.C.H.E., 1969.

Parsons, Talcott. Structure and Process in Modern Societies. New York: Free Press, 1960.

Parsons, Talcott, et al., eds. Theories of Society. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961, pp. 38, 41.

Perkins, James. The University in Transition. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Peterson, Richard E. Goals for California Higher Education Study. Berkeley: E.T.S., 1973.

_____. The Crisis of Purpose: Definitions and Uses of Institutional Goals. Report No. 5. Washington, D.C.: E.R.I.C. Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1970.

_____. Toward Institutional Goal Consciousness. Berkeley: E.T.S., 1971.

Peterson, Richard E.; Centra, John A.; Hartnett, Rodney T.; and Linn, Robert. Institutional Functioning Inventory Preliminary Manual. Princeton, N.J.: E.T.S., 1970.

Phelps, Edmond S. The Goal of Economic Growth. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1962.

Report of the Special Committee on Campus Tension. Sol M. Linowitz, Chairman. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970.

Ruml, Beardsley, and Morrison, Donald. Memo To a College Trustee. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Sanford, Nevitt. The American College. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

Smith, G. Kerry, ed. Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education, 1961.

Stoke, Harold. The American College President. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.

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

_____. Identifying Institutional Goals. Durham, N.D.: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1971.

Wiles, Kimball. Supervision for Better Schools. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.

Wriston, Henry. The Academic Procession. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

Articles

Carmichael, Oliver C. "Major Strengths and Weaknesses in Higher Education." Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: A.A.H.E., 1953.

Clark, Burton R. "The New University,"Carlos Kruytbosch and Sheldon Messinger, eds. The State of the University: Authority and Change. Beverly Hills: Sage Publishing Company (1968), pp. 17-26.

Cuthbertson, Kenneth M. "Ways in which American Higher Education Can Better Inform the Public of Its Goals, Values, Needs, and Opportunities." Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D.C. Association for Higher Education, 1961, p. 197.

Dressel, Paul L. "Goals for the Future of Undergraduate Education." Current Issues in Higher Education. New York: MacMillan Co., 1969, p. 144.

Faulkner, Donald. "The Formation of Institutional Objectives." Journal of Higher Education, XXIX (Nov., 1958), 425-430, 469.

Harrington, Fred. "Goals, Practices, and Procedures for Implementing Joint Responsibility for Institutional Policy Formation and for Instructional Evaluation and Improvement." Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education (1961), p. 112.

Henderson, Also. "Control in Higher Education: Trends and Issues." Journal of Higher Education, XL (Jan., 1969), 1-11.

Hullfish, Gordon. "A Theoretical Consideration of Educational Administration." in Education Administration: Selected Readings. Edited by Walter G. Hack, et al. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1965.

Kerr, Clark. "Toward the More Perfect University." The Campus in the Modern World. New York: MacMillan Co., 1969, p. 299.

Linowitz, Sol M. "What's Troubling the Administrators?" Campus Tensions: Analysis and Recommendations. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education (1970), p. 30.

_____. "What's Troubling the Trustees." Campus Tensions: Analysis and Recommendations. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Higher Education (1970), p. 34.

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

Moran, William E. "A Systems View of University Organization." in Managing the University: A Systems Approach. Edited by Paul Hamelman. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972.

Osmunson, Robert Lee. "Higher Education as Viewed by College and University Presidents." School and Society, XCVIII (Oct., 1970), 369-370.

Parsons, Talcott. "A Sociological Approach to the Theory of Normal Organizations." Structure and Process in Modern Societies. New York: Free Press of Glencoe (1960).

Perrow, Charles. "The Analysis of Goals in Complex Organizations." American Sociological Review, XXVI (Dec., 1961), 854-866.

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

Simon, Herbert A. "The Job of a College President." Educational Record, XLVII (Winter, 1969), 70.

_____. "On the Concept of Organizational Goals." Administrative Science Quarterly, IX (June, 1964), 2-22.

Thompson, James D., and McEwen, William J. "Organizational Goals and Environment: Goal Setting as an Interaction Process." American Sociological Review, XXIII (Feb., 1958), 23-31.

Winstead, Philip, and Hobson, Edward. "Institutional Goals: Where to From Here?" Journal of Higher Education, XLII (Nov., 1971), 669-677.

Other Sources

Educational Testing Service. "Descriptions of I.G.I. Goal Areas." Princeton, N.J.: E.T.S., 1972. (Mimeographed.)

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

Peterson, Richard E. "Goals for California Higher Education: A Survey of 116 Academic Communities." Berkeley, Calif.: Educational Testing Service, 1972. (A preliminary and incomplete draft.)

Swarr, Philip. "Goals of Colleges and Universities As Perceived and Preferred by Faculty and Administrators." Unpublished report. Cortland, N.Y.: Office of Institutional Research, State University College, 1971.

The Daily Oklahoman. "Educator Recommends Contract System for Colleges and Universities," by Earl McGrath, August 11, 1973, p. 4.

A P P E N D I X A

TRENDS IN STUDENT HEADCOUNT

APPENDIX A

TRENDS IN STUDENT HEADCOUNT

TABLE 21

Trends in Freshman Headcount Enrollments by Term
1960-1961, 1965-1966, 1970-1971, 1971-1972
and 1972-1973

Year	Summer	Fall	Spring
1960-1961	156	1,114	996
1965-1966	465	3,091	2,364
1970-1971	943	3,289	2,699
1971-1972	858	3,416	2,847
1972-1973	1,011	3,367	2,828
1973-1974	1,116		

Freshman Headcount Enrollment by Sex

Year	Summer			Fall			Spring		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
1960-1961	78	78	156	787	327	1,114	685	311	996
1965-1966	206	259	465	2,002	1,089	3,091	1,437	927	2,364
1970-1971	473	470	943	1,939	1,350	3,289	1,621	1,078	2,699
1971-1972	426	432	858	1,930	1,486	3,416	1,643	1,204	2,847
1972-1973	470	541	1,011	1,888	1,479	3,367	1,605	1,223	2,828
1973-1974	473	643							

First Time Entering Freshmen

1971-1972	1,086
1972-1973	1,396

First Time Freshmen at CSU

1971-1972	2,237
1972-1973	2,651

TABLE 22

Trends in Sophomore Class Headcount Enrollments by Term for the years 1960-1961, 1965-1966, 1970-1971, 1971-1972, 1973-1974 (Summer Term)

Total Enrollment

Year	Summer	Fall	Spring
1960-1961	246	947	820
1965-1966	416	1,771	1,496
1970-1971	498	2,173	2,102
1971-1972	776	2,029	1,898
1972-1973	868	1,927	1,786
1973-1974	590		

Total Enrollment by Sex

Year	Summer			Fall			Spring		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
1960-1961	123	123	246	671	276	947	602	218	820
1965-1966	196	220	416	1,150	621	1,771	978	518	1,496
1970-1971	277	221	498	1,328	845	2,173	1,253	849	2,102
1971-1972	314	462	776	1,245	784	2,029	1,127	771	1,898
1972-1973	411	457	868	1,054	873	1,927	1,091	695	1,786
1973-1974	311	279	590						

TABLE 23

Trends in Junior Class Headcount Enrollments by Terms for 1960-1961, 1965-1966, 1970-1971, 1971-1972, 1972-1973, and 1973-1974 (Summer)

Total Enrollment

Year	Summer	Fall	Spring
1960-1961	303	779	791
1965-1966	462	1,330	1,241
1970-1971	709	1,921	1,864
1971-1972	784	1,813	1,836
1972-1973	641	1,761	1,896
1973-1974	892		

Total Enrollment by Sex

Year	Summer			Fall			Spring		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
1960-1961	167	136	303	575	204	779	569	222	791
1965-1966	243	219	462	920	410	1,330	831	410	1,241
1970-1971	421	288	709	1,253	668	1,921	1,228	636	1,864
1971-1972	448	336	784	1,166	647	1,813	1,142	694	1,836
1972-1973	345	296	641	1,070	691	1,761	1,176	719	1,896
1973-1974	462	430	892						

TABLE 24

Trends in Senior Class Headcount Enrollments by Terms for 1960-1961, 1965-1966, 1970-1971, 1971-1972, 1972-1973, and 1973-1974 (Summer)

Total Enrollment

Year	Summer	Fall	Spring
1960-1961	312	540	579
1965-1966	650	1,189	1,188
1970-1971	1,341	2,170	2,241
1971-1972	1,401	2,335	2,417
1972-1973	1,345	2,340	2,432
1973-1974	1,425		

Total Enrollment by Sex

	Summer			Fall			Spring		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
1960-1961	200	112	312	392	154	540	399	180	579
1965-1966	361	289	650	787	402	1,189	797	391	1,188
1970-1971	859	482	1,341	1,533	637	2,170	1,568	673	2,241
1971-1972	929	472	1,401	1,605	730	2,335	1,668	749	2,417
1972-1973	892	453	1,345	1,523	817	2,340	1,663	769	2,432
1973-1974	915	510	1,425						

TABLE 25

Trends in Graduate Class Headcount Enrollments by Terms: 1960-1961, 1965-1966, 1970-1971, 1971-1972, 1972-1973, and 1973-1974 (Summer)

Total Enrollment

Year	Summer	Fall	Spring
1960-1961	732	355	386
1965-1966	866	647	717
1970-1971	1,094	1,055	1,107
1971-1972	1,290	1,085	1,056
1972-1973	1,510	1,086	1,368
1973-1974	1,408		

Total Enrollment by Sex

	Summer			Fall			Spring		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
1960-1961	194	538	732	155	200	355	182	204	386
1965-1966	369	497	866	314	333	647	379	340	717
1970-1971	424	670	1,094	444	611	1,055	509	598	1,107
1971-1972	487	803	1,290	533	552	1,085	482	574	1,056
1972-1973	543	967	1,510	487	599	1,086	689	679	1,368
1973-1974	601	807	1,408						

TABLE 26

Trends in Total Headcount Enrollments by Term: 1960-1961, 1965-1966, 1970-1971, 1971-1972, 1972-1973, 1973-1974 (Summer)

Total Enrollment

Year	Summer	Fall	Spring
1960-1961	1,749	4,028	3,737
1965-1966	2,859	8,038	7,008
1970-1971	4,667	10,608	10,013
1971-1972	5,109	10,678	10,050
1972-1973	5,377	10,481	10,309
1973-1974	5,434		

Total Enrollment by Sex

	Summer			Fall			Spring		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
1960-1961	762	987	1,749	2,663	1,365	4,028	2,490	1,247	3,737
1965-1966	1,375	1,484	2,849	5,183	2,855	8,038	4,222	2,586	7,008
1970-1971	2,518	2,149	4,667	6,497	4,111	10,608	6,179	3,834	10,013
1971-1972	2,604	2,505	5,109	6,479	4,199	10,678	6,058	3,992	10,050
1972-1973	2,661	2,716	5,377	6,022	4,459	10,481	6,224	4,085	10,309
1973-1974	2,764	2,670	5,434						

A P P E N D I X B

INSTITUTIONAL GOALS INVENTORY

Please Note:

Pages 93-93J "Institutional Goals Inventory", copyright 1972 by Educational Testing Service, not microfilmed at request of author. Available for consultation at University of Oklahoma Library.

University Microfilms

A P P E N D I X C

INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING INVENTORY

(University of Oklahoma Modification)

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
© 1968 by Educational Testing Service
All Rights Reserved
Adapted and Reproduced by Permission

INFORMATION ITEMS

Please select one answer for each question 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-extension, e.g., 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.

SECTION 1

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 of 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 to 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 of 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)

If you strongly agree with the statement as applied to your institution.

AGREE (A)

If you mildly agree with the statement as applied to your institution.

DISAGREE (D)

If you mildly disagree with the statement as applied to your institution.

STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)

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 portion 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 do 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 ideals 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, 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 service.

(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 nonexistent.

SECTION 4

Respond to statements in this section by selecting either:

STRONGLY AGREE (SA)

If you strongly agree with the statement as applied to your institution.

AGREE (A)

If you mildly agree with the statement as applied to your institution.

DISAGREE (D)

If you mildly disagree with the statement as applied to your institution.

STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)

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.

A P P E N D I X D

SPECIMEN LETTERS

Central State University
100 North University Drive – Edmond, Oklahoma 73034

Office of the President

May 1, 1973

Ms. Kathryn Alcorn
Chairman, Dept. of Art
Campus

Dear Ms. Alcorn:

Mr. L. D. Kroeker of the Art Department is completing requirements for his doctorate degree in higher education at the University of Oklahoma. Since the topic of his dissertation is in direct relationship to Central State University and the data can be used to our advantage in planning and evaluation, I have asked Dr. Barbara Ryan to work with him in data collection. The personnel of the Office of Institutional Research can then analyze and organize the data for our internal needs.

Therefore, I request your cooperation in filling out the enclosed questionnaires. Return them directly to the Office of Institutional Research no later than May 11, 1973.

Respectfully,

Garland Godfrey

Garland Godfrey
President

GG/jm

Enclosures: 2

CRANFORD, NEW JERSEY 07016

December 15, 1972

Mr. Robert L. Lynn
Assistant to the President
Oklahoma Baptist University
Shawnee, Oklahoma 36104

Dear Mr. Lynn:

Dr. Joseph Sutton, of The University of Alabama, has forwarded your letter regarding institutional goals to me. I shall be happy to supply you with a brief report of my effort in this area.

I chose the Educational Testing Service's Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI) as my data gathering device. This instrument asks respondents to rate a series of goals on a five point scale in terms of what they perceive the goals of the institution to be and what they feel the goals ought to be.

I administered the IGI to random samples of teaching faculty, students, academic administrators, local active alumni and local Chamber of Commerce, asking that they respond in terms of the University as a whole. Simultaneously, I administered the IGI to random samples of teaching faculty and students in each of seven Schools within the University, asking that they respond in terms of their particular school. The principles of the Delphi technique were applied to both administrations.

The results indicated significant convergence of opinion through the three iterations. The greatest institution-wide emphasis centered on goal areas traditional to the University environment and a rejection of faddish, unproven programs and activities. Minor exceptions to this result occurred in some Schools within the University. For example, the institution-wide sample emphisized Basic Area Learning Competence, Research and the upgrading of internal operations, while rejecting External Degrees, Social Activism and expansion of student services and activities. Exceptions were the Schools of Law and Social Work.

If you need further information, please do not hesitate to call or write.

Sincerely,

Edward Udut

Edward Udut
Assistant to the President

EU:ms

A P P E N D I X E

CLASSES FROM WHICH STUDENT PARTICIPANT SAMPLE WERE TAKEN

CLASSES FROM WHICH STUDENT PARTICIPANT SAMPLE WERE TAKEN

1023-4000	Fundamentals of Art	7:30 a.m.
1113-4217	English Grammar and Composition	9:30 a.m.
1113-4606	Elements of Human Geography	12:30 p.m.
2112-4801	General Humanities	5:30 p.m.
2103-5705	Sociology	1:30 p.m.
1114-6009	General Biology	11:30 a.m.
1114-6308	General Physical Science	7:30 p.m.
1143-6402	Basic Math	7:30 a.m.
1101-7200	Physical Education	11:30 a.m.
1511-7300	Beginning Team Sports	1:30 T-Th.
2113-1010	Accounting I	5:30 p.m.

Note: It is the requirement of all students (who are in pursuit of a degree) to take part of the above course work. These eleven classes were scattered through the five schools of the institution. The classes consisted of freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors.

A P P E N D I X F

INFORMATION ITEMS ON PARTICIPANT SAMPLES ON FACULTY, STUDENTS AND ADMINISTRATORS COMPILED FROM QUESTIONNAIRES

APPENDIX F

TABLE 27

Information Items on Participant Samples on Faculty, Students and Administrators Compiled from Questionnaires

Faculty -- 119 Participant Samples
(All respondents full-time)

	Respondents
Age	
20-29	9
30-39	40
40-49	40
50-59	20
60-up	10
Rank	
Professors	24
Associate Professors	28
Assistant Professors	35
Instructors	32
Field of Study	
Biological Science	7
Physical Science	10
Mathematics	7
Social Science	12
Humanities	13
Fine Arts	8
Education	23
Business	15
Engineering	10
Other	13

TABLE 27--Continued

Students -- 103 Participant Samples (All respondents full-time)	
	Respondents
Age	
under 20	26
21-29	68
30-39	6
40-49	2
50-59	1
60-up	0
Freshmen	21
Sophomores	27
Juniors	37
Seniors	18
Field of Study	
Biological Science	11
Physical Science	13
Mathematics	6
Social Science	7
Humanities	7
Fine Arts	13
Education	31
Business	5
Engineering	5
Other	5

TABLE 27--Continued

Administrators -- 107 Participant Samples
(All respondents full-time)

	Respondents
Age	
20-29	8
30-39	27
40-49	40
50-59	19
60-up	13
Rank	
Instructors	8
Assistant Professors	16
Associate Professors	12
Professors	18
Other	53

THE GRADUATE COLLEGE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

ANNOUNCES THE FINAL EXAMINATION OF

LEON DALE KROEKER

B.A. Southwestern State College, Weatherford, 1961
M.Ed. Central State University, Edmond, 1969

FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Friday, August 31 -- 4:30 p.m.
Room 521 -- Physical Sciences Tower

COMMITTEE IN CHARGE:
Herbert Hengst, ~~Ph.D.~~, Chairman
William Graves, Ph.D.
Jack Parker, Ph.D.
Dorothy Truex, Ed.D.

OUTLINE OF STUDIES:

MAJOR CONCENTRATION: Higher Education

Emphasis on Higher Education Administration

OTHERS:

Educational Foundations and General Administration

BIOGRAPHY:

Born in Cordell, Oklahoma, July 4, 1938. Graduated from Weatherford High School, Weatherford, Oklahoma, 1957. Received B.A. degree from Southwestern State College, Weatherford, Oklahoma, 1961. Received M.Ed. degree in Art Education from Central State University, Edmond, Oklahoma, 1969. From 1961-1964 junior high teacher, Chickasha, Oklahoma. 1965-1966 Art Consultant and Coordinator, Union City Public Schools in Union City, Michigan. 1967-1969 reservations agent for American Airlines in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. 1969-1973 art instructor at Central State University, Edmond, Oklahoma. 1973-present, instructor at Central State University, Edmond, Oklahoma.