



8-1979

A Comparative Study of Effectiveness of Users and Non-Users of the Management-by-Objectives System in Student Personnel Divisions in Baccalaureate Institutions

Berthold Michael Price
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations>



Part of the Counseling Commons, and the Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons

Recommended Citation

Price, Berthold Michael, "A Comparative Study of Effectiveness of Users and Non-Users of the Management-by-Objectives System in Student Personnel Divisions in Baccalaureate Institutions" (1979). *Dissertations*. 2708.

<https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/2708>

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF EFFECTIVENESS
OF USERS AND NON-USERS OF THE
MANAGEMENT-BY-OBJECTIVES SYSTEM
IN STUDENT PERSONNEL DIVISIONS
IN BACCALAUREATE INSTITUTIONS

by

Berthold Michael Price

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of the Graduate College
in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Doctor of Education

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
August 1979

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very grateful to a number of people who have given me encouragement, support, guidance and love during the completion of this dissertation. I wish to convey my sincere thanks and appreciation to these persons:

To the late Drs. Faunce and Martinson, whose faith and trust in my ability was always evident:

To Drs. Robert Hannah, Paul Griffeth, Robert Hopkins and Robert Brashear, for their continuing assistance, encouragement and friendship which will never be forgotten during my lifetime;

To my late father-in-law, Mr. William Brooks, Jr., for his pride and confidence;

To the family, Michael, for their lasting support and inspiration;

To my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph C. Price, for their encouragement and continuing interest in the consumation of this project;

To my children, Kimberly, Dana and Chris, for their patience;

To my wife, Louise, without whose love, trust and confidence this dissertation would not have been completed.

Berthold Michael Price

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. 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 material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations 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 through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

7925986

PRICE, BERTHOLD MICHAEL
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF EFFECTIVENESS OF USERS
AND NON-USERS OF THE MANAGEMENT-BY-OBJECTIVES
SYSTEM IN STUDENT PERSONNEL DIVISIONS IN
BACCALAUREATE INSTITUTIONS.

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY, ED.D., 1979

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
I THE PROBLEM	1
Rationale for the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	13
Hypothesis	14
Scope and Limitations of the Study	15
Definition of Terms	16
II REVIEW OF LITERATURE	19
Introduction	19
Management-by-Objectives	21
MBO in Higher Education	34
Organizational Effectiveness	43
III METHODOLOGY	47
Introduction	47
Instrumentation	47
Reliability	49
Validity	49
Population and Sample	50
Data Collection Procedures	51
Data Analysis Procedures	55

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	PAGE
CHAPTER	
IV ANALYSIS	59
Introduction	59
Findings	61
Questions Equalling or Exceeding Standard	66
V SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY . .	72
Summary of Findings	72
Conclusions	85
Recommendations for Further Study . .	87
REFERENCES	92
APPENDICES	103
Appendix A - Instruction for Use of the Inventory of Student Personnel Objectives and the Survey of Student Personnel Objectives	104
Appendix B - An Inventory of Student Personnel Objectives	106
Appendix C - A Survey of Student Personnel Objectives	111
Appendix D - Information Which Indicates That Each Survey Question is Representative of an Inventory Objective	115
Appendix E - An Inventory of Student Personnel Objectives - Thirty-six Objectives Used in This Study	116
Appendix F - Chart Showing Survey Questions to Their Related Questions	119

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	PAGE
APPENDICES	
Appendix G - Survey Questions Delineated by Major Categories and Sub-categories . . .	126
Appendix H - Objectives Attained - Non-MBO University	128
Appendix I - Objectives Attained - Non-MBO College	129
Appendix J - Objectives Attained - MBO College	131
Appendix K - Student Responses - Survey Questionnaire - Non-MBO University	133
Appendix L - Student Responses - Survey Questionnaire - MBO University	134
Appendix M - Student Responses - Survey Questionnaire - Non-MBO College	135
Appendix N - Student Responses - Survey Questionnaire - MBO College	136

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Percentage of <u>yes</u> responses - all institutions	60
2. Percentage of <u>no</u> responses - all institutions	62
3. Percentage of <u>don't know</u> responses - all institutions	64

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Rationale for the Study

Management-by-Objectives is a system developed to enable organizations to operate in a results-oriented style. This system of management was first identified by Peter Drucker in his work with large corporations (Dannemiller and Linta, 1975). In terms of financial pay-off and employee satisfaction, Drucker discovered the most effective organizations were those in which everyone in the organization was clear about what the goals of the organization were and how their jobs fit into achieving those goals. George Odiorne (1965) took Drucker's findings, developed a goal-oriented system for managing organizations effectively and labeled it Management-by-Objectives. This system has been introduced extensively in the last ten years into business and industry throughout the United States and other countries (Dannemiller and Linta, 1975). The interest in Management-by-Objectives among educators arose because of its prospects for increasing effectiveness in school districts and postsecondary institutions. Effectiveness is evaluated according to objectives attained organizationally and over a specific period of time (Levy and Schreck, 1975). The purpose of this study was to

evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel divisions in baccalaureate institutions which use the Management-by-Objectives system of management. This study measured effectiveness by determining the extent to which objectives were being attained.

Accountability, as a term associated with education, made its first significant appearance in 1970 at the annual American Association of School Administrators meeting (Hostrop, Mecklenberger and Wilson, 1973). James E. Allen, then U. S. Commissioner of Education, explained that the public's disillusionment and lack of confidence in the public schools was "in large measure due to our inability to substantiate results. The strengthening of the concept of accountability . . . is imperative," he said. Allen called for research to improve society's ability to assess the effectiveness of educational programs. Less than a month later, on March 3, 1970, in a special message to Congress, President Richard Nixon endorsed the concept of accountability by calling upon school systems to "begin the responsible, open measurement of how well the educational process is working." President Nixon claimed that administrators and school teachers alike are responsible for their own performance, and it is in their interest as well as in the interest of their pupils that they be held accountable. These calls for accountability by

national leaders reflected a deepening national focus on accountability in education for the 1970's. A Gallup Poll in 1970 found that sixty-seven percent of the people contacted believed teachers and school administrators should be held more accountable for the progress of their students (Riles, 1971).

The source of the current interest in accountability in education has been fairly well publicized: school operating budgets have exceeded available funds, priorities have not been established and the public is concerned about budget allocations that do not appear to support priorities. Other public services such as health, welfare, corrections, environmental control, transportation and public safety are placing increasing demands on public revenues. Consequently, education could easily become just another major consideration in the total funding plan used for all public services. If education is to compete successfully with other services, educators must be able to demonstrate that whatever funds are allocated are being used to attain desired results. Accountability, as we have known it thus far, has been a relatively fumbling, ad hoc process (Marland, 1972). However, Marland believed that the new dimensions of accountability which have emerged bring better organized and more precise methods of measurement to the practice of accountability.

The multiplicity of uses of the term accountability has resulted in a situation in which it is difficult for most people to grasp the full meaning and to achieve full understanding of the concept. Alkin (1972) underscored the problem when he stated:

Educational accountability is very much like other abstract virtues such as patriotism and truthfulness, which are universally acknowledged but not amenable facile description. Lack of adequate description has been one of the major shortcomings of accountability. (p. 49)

An investigator studying the concept of accountability is inundated with a plethora of views, ideas, descriptions, and definitions. Barro (1970) believed the underlying premises of accountability is that educators are held responsibility for educational outcomes -- for what children learn. Popham (1970) believed educational accountability meant that the instructional personnel take responsibility for achieving the kinds of instructional objectives which were previously established. Accountability, according to Lopez (1970), referred to the process of having each member of an organization answer to someone for doing specific things according to specific plans and within certain timetables to accomplish tangible performance results. Lieberman (1970) offered the opinion that the objective of accountability is to relate educational results to resources in ways that are useful for policy-making, resource allocation, or compensation. Program accountability, process accountabil-

ity and fiscal accountability are three types of accountability suggested by Smith (1971). Lessinger (1970) stated:

Accountability is the product of a process; at its most basic level, it means that an agent, public or private, entering into a contractual agreement to perform a service will be answerable for performing according to agreed upon terms within an established time period, and with a stipulated use of resources and performance standards. (p. 217)

Alkin (1972) placed emphasis on a negotiated relationship in the formulation of his definition of accountability:

Accountability is a negotiated relationship in which each of the participants agrees in advance to accept specified rewards and costs on the basis of evaluation findings as to the attainment of specified ends. (p. 51)

Alkin then suggested there are three types of accountability: goal accountability, program accountability, and outcome accountability.

Mortimer (1972) noted the confusion with defining accountability when he stated, "The multiplicity of uses of the term accountability has resulted in a situation in which it is difficult to ascertain what reforms are necessary to achieve it and what activities should be revised. He placed the confusion into three separate areas of concern: 1) managerial accountability, 2) accountability versus evaluation, and 3) accountability versus responsibility. Marland's (1972) definition of accountability was quite similar to the definition of effectiveness. He defined accountability as "the process of establishing ob-

jectives and assessing the degree to which those objectives have been fulfilled"

The term accountability is a concept whose definition appears to impinge upon the interests and priorities of the user. Consequently, its implementation in different settings for various reasons could alter its character and engender a myriad of purposes. However, Harnett (1971) was able to isolate and define what concerns accountability should be addressing. Simply, he believed "accountability is concerned with effectiveness and efficiency." He defined effectiveness as the degree to which the organization succeeds in whatever it is trying to do. Efficiency is an organization's capacity to achieve results with a given expenditure of resources, according to Harnett (1971). The focus in this study is concentrated on determining effectiveness because one of the major goals of Management-by-Objectives is to increase the effectiveness of organizations. Brenneman (1975) believed Management-by-Objectives fulfills the need for accountability in education because the system is a result-oriented process. H. H. Ashan (1974) specifically tied together the concepts of accountability and Management-by-Objectives:

Educational accountability is, in the strictest sense, programs and personnel 'Management-by-Objectives.' This is a condition in which programs and people are evaluated to determine the quality of the results they obtain in achieving the objectives for which they have been given

responsibility. Accountability is best accomplished through a systems approach to the planning, implementation and evaluation of educational programs. (p. 16)

To summarize, accountability accentuates results -- it aims squarely at what comes out of an educational system rather than what goes into it (Mortimer, 1972). The adoption of the MBO system of management by postsecondary institutions is a direct means of responding to the accountability issue. If colleges and universities adopt a management system that increases effectiveness, institutional chances for becoming more accountable are increased.

The higher education community is facing increasing public concern about the management of higher education and has attempted to relate managerial efficiency to educational effectiveness (Mortimer, 1972). In a keynote address at a national conference dealing with management in higher education, Millett (1972) discussed the issue of a crisis in higher education management. Two reasons contributing to the crisis, he claimed, were 1) that the general public does not believe that colleges are effectively managed and 2) that there is an absence of unique management techniques to solve problems in higher education. Hodgkinson (1972) underscored the issue of accountability when he stated, "The question really is, are we willing to state what it is we think we do for and to students?" Mortimer (1972) provided a fitting introduction to the problem of accountability

in higher education when he made the following observation:

Colleges and universities have been and will continue to be under severe pressures for increased accountability to a wide variety of agencies and interests, including the general public, legislatures, governors, governmental agencies, the courts, governing boards, faculty, students and other internal constituents. It is not clear exactly what each wants from institutions of postsecondary education or what reforms should or can be made to enhance accountability. In many cases the desires and proposals of various constituencies result in mutually incompatible demands and some difficult choices have to be made. In other cases, there appears to be viable options for increased accountability that may be consistent with institutional functions, purposes, goals and objectives. (p. 1)

Whether or not institutions are aware of all options may not be nearly as important as their mobilizing to be more accountable via the accomplishment of objectives. In 1940, Tyler indicated that evaluation was a process for determining whether objectives were being realized. In a widely studied educational syllabus, Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction, Tyler (1950) identified four questions fundamental to the development of curriculum and instruction: 1) What educational purposes should the school seek to attain? 2) What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes? 3) How can these educational experiences be effectively organized? and, 4) How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained? Without a doubt, the questions Tyler pro-

posed in 1950 are applicable to higher education in the seventies.

One approach to administering education in an accountable manner is a system first utilized in the business sector. The system, known as Management-by-Objectives, has important potential for higher education and public school systems. Management-by-Objectives, commonly referred to by its acronym, MBO, is a system of management which begins by defining outputs. Statements of outputs are used as criteria to evaluate the quality of activity and/or behavior (Vande Guchte, 1973).

Odiorne described MBO in a 1971 article:

MBO is a system under which the manager and subordinate sit down at the beginning of each period and talk until agreement upon job goals are achieved. During the period, the subordinate is given wide latitude in choice of method. At the end of the period the actual results are jointly reviewed against agreed upon goals, and an assessment of the degree of success made. The process is begun again. (p. 14)

The current interest in the utilization of MBO in higher education management is more widespread today than several years ago. In November, 1972, the Catholic University of America sponsored a First National Conference on Management-by-Objectives in Higher Education in Washington, D. C. to inform educators about the applicability of MBO to higher education. In addition to the numerous publications that have been written, support for Management-by-Objectives in higher education can be found on numerous campuses. A

consortium called GT-70, centered in Florida, is composed of thirty junior colleges involved in establishing MBO systems. Harper College (Palatine, Illinois), headed by Robert Lahti, has led the way in MBO and organizational development in education by establishing an operational system based on MBO theory (Heaton, 1975). Other institutions which have begun similar programs include Brigham Young University, Prince George Community College, Nasson College and others. In the state of Michigan, several community colleges and baccalaureate institutions are using MBO in one or several of their divisions. Institutions such as Ferris State College, Oakland University, and the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor are examples of post-secondary institutions applying MBO in the administration of student personnel divisions. Sholtzberger (1972) offered the following perspective on administration in higher education:

We need to learn more about managing-by-objectives. This means more than our important, but specific, statement of purpose. We should be stating objectives in terms of quantities and qualities of output, at what costs, with what resources, and by what devices. (p. 22)

The applicability and utilization of Management-by-Objectives to student personnel administration in baccalaureate degree-granting institutions is the specific interest of this study. Advocates of the MBO system who are thoroughly acquainted with student personnel work believe

that MBO is applicable to higher education generally and student personnel specifically (Harvey, 1968, 1972; Lahti, 1968; Dannemiller and Linta, 1975; Hostrop, 1973). Continual interest in the use of MBO is evident from the increased number of student personnel divisions using it. Some areas, such as admissions, job placement, registration, and financial aid, are natural settings for the use of MBO since historically these functions have been able to set concrete objectives and have had available the criteria to measure the attainment of objectives (Vande Guchte, 1973). Other functions within student personnel work, such as counseling, have found accountability to be difficult to ascertain because of the difficulty of measuring the elusive and intangible characteristics of the outcomes expected. Although some student personnel workers view the subject of accountability with caution, others find the potential utilization of MBO challenging and a possible answer to accountability. Hurnes (1972) saw definite advantages for guidance. Easthope (1975) had a change in attitude when he was able to observe positive results from the utilization of MBO at the University of Michigan. At Ferris State College located in Big Rapids, Michigan, Dr. Edward Linta, Vice-President for Student Affairs, was cited by the Michigan Efficiency Task Force for implementing MBO in his area of responsibility. The Task Force made the following observation:

Results have been successful and his experience should be utilized to establish a system for the entire college. Implementation will enhance the school's capabilities in the areas of training, performance, evaluation, long-range planning and communications. (p. 45)

As noted above, student personnel workers in baccalaureate degree-granting institutions are increasingly using the Management-by-Objectives system in an attempt to significantly increase the effectiveness of individual student personnel units and the divisions as a whole.

Hagemeyer (1972) summarized the subject quite adequately when he made the following astute observation in a speech to student personnel workers:

Now, the big question. How can these conditions be turned around and changed into a positive, dynamic program which can be articulated and one for which we can be held accountable? What can we do? The first ingredient, may I suggest, is commitment Commitment to the notion that there should be institutional, measurable objectives, and a willingness on your part as student personnel people to play in their development. (p. 3)

Because of its recentness in higher education MBO has not been tested to determine its effects in student personnel work (Vande Guchte, 1973). This study was planned for a time when a diminution of resources for higher education was occurring and as a result, student personnel workers were being requested to provide evidence that student personnel units were meeting their objectives.

Statement of the Problem

Past and current review of the literature suggests that the system of management known as Management-by-Objectives is a viable management alternative and equally applicable to the management of institutions of higher education. Advocates of MBO maintain that no system of management yet devised will assist educational administrators in attaining objectives more than MBO. Essentially, the more objectives attained by a student personnel division, the more effective the division, and consequently the better chance the institution has of being more accountable.

The problem of this study was to evaluate and determine the effectiveness of selected student personnel divisions that use the MBO system approach to management. Results of this investigation should provide insight into whether MBO is a viable alternative system for managing student personnel programs in higher education more effectively. Before the study could be completed, the concerns listed below had to be addressed:

1. To research the various methods used to determine whether an organization or institution is attaining its objectives and to select one suitable for the purposes of this study.
2. To obtain the appropriate instrument suitable

for implementing the selected technique.

3. To select student personnel divisions in baccalaureate institutions that have used the MBO system of management for at least five years.
4. To identify all the essential components contained within the Management-by-Objectives system of management.

There were two important discoveries related to the eventual consummation of this study. First, an instrument was located whose specific development and purpose are to assist with the determination of objectives attained by any student personnel division. Another important discovery was locating a list of essential components of the MBO system of management.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis that was posed for this study was the following:

Student personnel divisions in baccalaureate institutions which use the MBO approach to managing will attain more objectives and, as a result, can be presumed to have a more effective student personnel program than student personnel divisions that do not use the MBO system of managing.

Since this study was concerned with only one component (effectiveness) of the accountability concept, it was not necessary to make reference to accountability within the hypothesis. For the hypothesis to be extended beyond the concern for effectiveness and include the concept of accountability, equal study would have to be given to both the efficiency and effectiveness components.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study investigated the relationship between the use of MBO and the effectiveness of student personnel divisions at baccalaureate institutions. The study was limited to senior institutions because a review of the literature revealed little or no work attempted in the area of evaluating effectiveness relative to MBO utilization in four-year colleges and universities. At least one study had been completed at the community-junior college level.

Another limitation of the study is the inclusion of only residence hall students in the investigation. To insure maximum response to the survey instrument, random sampling was not used. However, residence halls chosen for the survey contained a representative constituency relative to sex and class status.

A third limitation of the study was the inclusion

of only two MBO schools. It was difficult to select more schools since a review of the literature revealed that institutions must have been using the MBO system for at least five years before a fair evaluation could be made (Albanese, 1975).

A fourth and final limitation of this study involves deciding on a standard for determining whether student personnel divisions are effective. The review of literature did not reveal any particular standards for determining levels of effectiveness. Two reasons this problem has occurred are that 1) there have been few measures developed for the purpose of determining levels of organizational effectiveness; 2) criteria for determining levels or extent of effectiveness cannot be agreed to by management experts and theorists. Because of this critical limitation, this study focused on comparing effectiveness between MBO and non-MBO institutions.

Definition of Terms

Accountability - is a concept concerned with assessing both effectiveness and efficiency. (Harnett, R. T. Accountability in higher education. Princeton: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971. Ed 054 754 MF - 0. 65.)

Objectives - are more specific statements of desired re-

sults to be achieved within a definite time period; also, objectives, in measurable or observable terms, should be set with goals in mind and should point toward achievement of long-range, broadly stated goals. (Brenneman, D. S. Management by objectives: A Process for educational administration. In C. P. Heaton (Ed.), Management by objectives in higher education. Durham, D. C.: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1975.)

Goals - are broad, long-range statements of expected results and are used to describe and define an institution's basic directions and purposes. (Brenneman, D. S. Management by objectives: A process for educational administration. In C. P. Heaton (Ed.) Management by objectives in higher education. Durham, N. C.: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1975.)

Effectiveness - is the measure of success in the achievement of agreed upon educational objectives. (Levy, S. R. and Schreck, T. C. Management effectiveness: An introduction. NASPA Journal, 1975, 12 (3), 142-143.)

Efficiency - is an organization's capacity to achieve results with a given expenditure of resources. (Harnett, R. T. Accountability in higher education. Princeton: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971. Ed 054 754. MF - 0.65.)

Student Personnel - is the college or university program

which assists students, individually and in groups, to take full advantage of the opportunities offered in the academic community. Emphasis is placed on the student -- needs and aspirations, intellectual, personal, psychological, social and physical growth -- so that he/she may achieve their own goals of society as reflected by the particular institution they attend. (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Definitions of student personnel terms in higher education. Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1968.)

Divison - is a collective group of units containing a group of persons employed in professional, administrative or management positions in the work of student personnel; all these units report to the chief personnel officer.

Management-by-Objectives (MBO) - is a process whereby the superior and subordinate managers of an organization jointly identify its common goals, define each individual's major area of responsibility in terms of the results expected of him, and use these measures as guides for operating the unit and assessing the contribution of each of its members. (Odiorne, G. S. Management by Objectives: A system of managerial leadership. New York: Pitman Publishing Co., 1965.)

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Within the past decade, public confidence in higher education has eroded considerably. The lack of confidence is due primarily to the belief that colleges and universities are being mismanaged. Richman and Farmer (1974) stated, "Today's chorus of critics of educational administrators believe that most universities and colleges are seriously mismanaged." Educators and laymen closely associated with higher education would probably agree that post-secondary institutions are difficult to manage effectively and efficiently. The nature of their goals, ambiguities relating to power, and the kind of professionals that work for academic institutions all contribute to the complexity of managing them (Richamn and Farmer, 1974). Perhaps Deegan and Fritz (1975) stated the case more pointedly than any other critics when they added:

And while many inside and outside the educational field lay the blame for increased costs on increased demand for degrees, on inadequate buildings, on archaic procedures, on militant unionism, or what have you, respected educational thinkers place the blame squarely where it belongs: on ineffective management. (p. 5)

The general public's belief in the mismanagement theory has reduced public confidence in higher education and has led

to a demand for greater emphasis being placed on accountability in higher education.

At the heart of the mismanagement problem is the lack of goals and priorities of postsecondary institutions. In 1970, management consultant Keane warned:

There will be increasing pressure on the nation's colleges and universities to make more effective use of available resources through improved management and administrative techniques The most serious problem of most colleges and universities is that they do not have clearly defined goals If an institution does not have a very clear idea of its roles and goals, it obviously has no basis for determining whether it is effectively organized or managed. (p. 56)

The president of the Academy for Educational Development, Inc., Alvin C. Eurich (1970), believed the key to survival is good planning -- specifically long-range planning, which means setting manageable goals. Also, Eurich alleged that one of the critical problems facing colleges and universities today are vague, poorly defined goals. Lahti (1973) believed the direction an institution takes is determined in large part by goals and objectives established; if there are none, the answer is obvious. According to Richman and Farmer (1974), the whole question of goals and priorities in higher education -- what they really are and should be at most academic institutions -- has been obscure, inoperative, and unverified. Apparently, the matter of setting goals and objectives is gradually becoming recognized as a

problem of utmost importance, but there have been very few studies that have focused on this problem in a systematic or comprehensive way (Peterson, 1973; Gross and Grambsch, 1968, 1974; Gross, 1971). The emphasis on setting goals is necessary because the allocation and use of institutional resources should be directly related to the institution's goals and priorities. If goals and priorities are obscure, the allocation and utilization of resources are not likely to be very efficient or effective (Richman and Farmer, 1974).

Management-by-Objectives

One approach many organizations are using to make goals operational is Management-by-Objectives, or MBO. The term Management-by-Objectives was first used by Peter Drucker more than twenty years ago. In 1954 he wrote:

What the business enterprise needs is a principle of management that will give full scope to individual strength and responsibility and at the same time give common direction of vision and effort, establish teamwork, and harmonize the goals of the individual with the common weal. The only principle that can do this is Management-by-Objectives and self-control. (p. 135-136)

Drucker then proceeded to expand on this perception of the MBO philosophy and process. Since 1954, the basic concept of MBO has gained notable attention and acceptance in business firms, hospitals, colleges, government agencies and banks (Albanese, 1975). In 1965, George S. Odiorne provided

a definition of MBO that is more well-known than any other.

He wrote:

MBO is a process whereby the superior and subordinate managers of an organization jointly identify its common goals, define each individual's major areas of responsibility in terms of results expected and use these measures as guides for operating the unit and assessing the contributions of each of its members. (p. 55-56)

Management literature is replete with assumptions regarding the advantages of adopting MBO. Lahti (1975) outlined the following benefits of MBO:

Other positive factors which should accrue to an organization through a well-implemented MBO system are improved planning, improved organizational and base-subordinate communication, a more objective base for measuring organizational and managerial performance, an improved participative style of management, better delegation, and better team building. (p. vi)

Harlacher is also complimentary of MBO, particularly because it is a systems approach to managing. He wrote:

This systematic approach to management can increase productivity, improve planning, permit more objective evaluation of managerial performance, and improve morale throughout the organization by implementing participative management that involves supervisors and subordinates alike. (p. 29)

Albanese (1975) agreed with some of the benefits stated by Lahti and Harlacher. He stated that some of the assumed benefits of MBO are:

Improving short and long range planning;
providing a basis for checking progress;
improving motivation and commitment of

managers; providing a results orientation; improving the clarity of a manager's role; providing feedback to managers; and increasing and improving the interaction between superiors and subordinates. (p. 91)

A review of the literature shows there are other benefits derived from the implementation of MBO which are more related to employee performance. It is the aforementioned assumed benefits that are causing student personnel administrators to adopt and implement the MBO system of management. In addition, it is believed that if the assumed benefits are actual results of the adoption of MBO, then overall effectiveness of the student personnel program cannot help but improve.

In order to determine which baccalaureate institutions were fully utilizing the MBO system, it was important to this study that the components be identified. A review of the literature revealed that Vande Guchte (1973) identified twelve essential components of MBO. The list of components is:

1. Overall organizational goals and purposes are defined and stated.
2. Organizational departmental units have stated goals and purposes.
3. Each worker states his major objectives for a future time period.
4. Each worker and his boss mutually agree on the worker's statement of objectives.

5. Boss and worker clearly understand how progress toward goals and objectives will be measured.
6. Workers set objectives and obligate themselves to the completion of these.
7. Goals of individuals and groups in the organization tie in with overall organizational goals.
8. Periodic review of progress towards objectives is made by boss and workers.
9. Boss and worker meet at end of time to review the degree of accomplishment of objectives.
10. Appraisal of performance is judged on the basis of the employee's accomplishment of objectives.
11. Top management (administration) is committed to Management-by-Objectives.
12. Efforts are made to train and develop worker capabilities so that the workers can reach objectives.

It is important to note the interrelatedness of terms used in MBO literature. Brenneman (1975) stated, "The terms 'goals' and 'objectives' are sometimes used interchangeably in the MBO literature. Although their synonymous use is not usually harmful or misleading, the distinction between the two should be kept in mind." Price (1972) related several terms to effectiveness by saying, "Those who define effect-

iveness in terms of the degree of goal-achievement typically equate goal, objective, purpose, mission, aim and task." Glasner (1969) believed even the MBO system goes by various names: management by results (MBR), work planning and review (WPR), charter of accountability (COACH), objectives-strategies-tactics (OST), individual goal-setting and self-control. This interchange of terms is noted because a review of related studies reflects these many different terms.

Although the advocates of MBO believe there are many advantages in using MBO in the management process, Ivanevich and Donnally (1974) noted there is little scientific evidence to support those assumed benefits. By scientific evidence, Ivanevich and Donnally meant "there are very few tightly controlled, methodologically sound and conclusive research results that verify the excellence of MBO." In 1972, Ivanevich stated the following:

A vital question is whether MBO has been able to accomplish the planning, controlling, and motivational objectives claimed by its advocates. From a scientific and empirical point of view, this question is yet unanswered.

Studies by numerous scholars (Drucker, 1954; Odiorne, 1965; Howell, 1967; Gell and Molander, 1970; Odiorne, 1971) emphasize both the positive and negative attributes of dynamic MBO programs. These works are primarily descriptive studies or, at most, case analyses that do not examine the cost and benefits of MBO with scientific rigor. (p. 126)

According to Albanese (1975), there are very few experimentally designed studies that verify the value of any particular approach to managing. He believed management research and practice was not at that stage of development. The lack of convincing evidence in support of the assumed benefits of MBO suggests that more research studies should be done in order to attempt to verify the actual outcomes of the MBO system of management. The review of literature revealed that the MBO approach to managing appears logical, appeals to managerial common sense, and enjoys widespread support of managers. However, its advantages need to be verified through research and not assumed to exist. Research studies completed so far have studied only a few aspects of the MBO system: the setting of goals and objectives, feedback, and subordinate participation in decision-making. (Carroll and Tosi, 1978)

One of the most significant findings in the area of goal-setting was attained by Lewin, Dembo, Festinger and Sears in 1944. Results showed that subjects were inclined to set high performance levels and then work to keep them higher. Zander and Medow (1963; Moulton (1965); and Feather and Saville (1967), found that the degree to which new goals are set higher is related to the extent of success attained in achieving previously established goals. In a study completed by Fryer (1963), two important results were revealed:

1. The goal-setting process had a greater impact

on subject's performance than did feedback or knowledge of results; and,

2. Level of performance increased significantly when the goals were difficult to attain.

Stedry and Kay (1966) found that level of performance of employees depended on the attitude of supervisors towards predetermined goals. Locke and Bryan (1968) revealed that specific goal-setting resulted in higher levels of performance. Locke and Bryan verified the Fryer study by concluding that goal-setting increases performance more than just feedback alone. In another study, Bryan and Locke (1968) discovered that a low motivation group will increase its motivation when given specific goals to accomplish. Raia (1965, 1966) conducted research studies in a large business organization in order to appraise participative goal-setting. The results revealed "some degree of improvement in organizational performance despite the problems uncovered."

Harvey (1972) believed the most important step in the MBO system is setting objectives. According to Hitt (1970), organizations move towards goal achievement in incremental steps, and to insure that the steps go in the right direction, each step is carefully defined and oriented. Harpel (1976) believed the incremental steps or intermediate levels of success should be defined prior to making institutional goals operational and translating goals into actual events.

If all the incremental steps occur, the organization is moving toward achievement of its goals. The intermediate levels of success of incremental steps toward the achievement of goals are called objectives (Harpel, 1976). Objectives have been defined by various authors (Hitt, 1970; Brenneman, 1975; Harpel, 1976) as specific statements which are short-range, attainable, and which function as steps to goals. Also, objectives ideally describe desired behavior in measurable terms and acceptable criteria of performance which can be measured quantitatively and serve as milestones of progress. Objectives vary from long to short range and from general to specific. General objectives appear to be designed and established primarily to give direction to groups such as a student personnel division. Conversely, specific objectives are established for the purpose of providing detailed direction for individuals. Brenneman (1975) believed establishment of specific performance objectives is the critical point in the MBO process. Also, he felt that the specific performance objectives must integrate with the goals of the institution and sub-groups and, equally important, they must be an integral part of the individual's own needs and personal goals.

Whether general or specific, typical guidelines call for clear, concise, unambiguous objectives that are accurately stated in terms of desired results consistent with existing

institutional policies, reasonable in terms of competence of the individual, and as interesting, motivating, and challenging as is reasonably possible (Tosi et al., 1970). Knezevich (1972) listed his criteria as the following:

An operational MBO system demands specification of objectives written in terms that are understandable, behavior-oriented, measurable, operational, challenging, and realistic. It is imperative that they be significant, developmental, comprehensive, balanced and expressed in as few words as possible. (p. 18)

Some of the criteria expressed above was verified in studies that dealt specifically with the establishment of objectives. In 1971, Connellan conducted a study within several institutions and organizations. He was trying to determine employee knowledge of specific individual objectives and the relationship of individual objectives to overall organizational goals. Evidence obtained revealed that a lack of clearly defined objectives leads to conflict because individuals do not reach management expectations. A study conducted by Maher and Pierson (1970) further substantiated the belief that a lack of clarity about individual job objectives may be a cause for employee dissatisfaction with the job and the organization. Conversely, Levinson (1970) warned that extremely detailed job descriptions may lead to employee ineffectiveness, particularly if there is a myriad of tasks.

There are research studies which show evidence of a

positive relationship between objective-setting, job satisfaction, and objective achievement. A laboratory study done by Stedry (1962) found that subjects achieved maximum personal satisfaction if objectives were of moderate difficulty, but that satisfaction was minimal if objectives were perceived not to be attainable. Svetlick, et al. (1964) found that as job difficulty increased, employees felt increasingly positive about their jobs and their work environment. It would appear that employees prefer challenging objectives rather than easy objectives. A Bryan and Locke (1967a) study supported the findings of Svetlick. The researchers assigned difficult specific objectives to a group of low-motivation employees and a set of do-your-best objectives to a high-motivation group of employees. As the experiment progressed, the low-motivation group became increasingly interested and concentrated more intensely on their work; the high-motivation group did the opposite. In a series of studies (1965, 1966b, 1967a, 1967b), Locke confirmed the theory that employees get greater enjoyment from activities in which they are able to attain their objectives. Also, Locke reached the conclusion that liking the task and satisfaction with the job are both positively affected by attainment of objectives. Research on goal- and objective-setting revealed that goals and objectives tend to increase levels of performance provided there are proper time limits and they are specified, challenging and acceptable.

A comprehensive review of research studies done on MBO provided evidence that feedback or knowledge of results can improve individual and group performance. Pryer and Bass (1957) discovered that groups receiving feedback solved their problems with acute accuracy and became extremely motivated to solve future problems. Zajonc (1961) increased the individual performance of group members by providing feedback to the group on both individual and group performance. Smith and Knight (1959) observed that personal feedback of one group member to another improved the overall efficiency of the group. Other research studies (Noble and Taylor, 1963; Alluisi and Chinn, 1964; Ringel and Hammer, 1965) provided evidence that indicated the extent of feedback is positively related to the level of performance attained. Weitz, Antoinetti, and Wallace (1954) found that life insurance agents who received periodic production bulletins and personal letters commenting on their performance were inspired to improve their level of performance. Miller (1965) found in a series of studies completed at General Electric that if the amount of feedback from foreman to workers increased, the performance of the workers improved.

There have been several studies done that provide evidence that the effect of feedback on level of performance is correlated to the quality of feedback. In his very important study at General Electric, Miller (1966) discovered that specific, relevant and timely feedback had

positive influence on levels of performance. French (1956) and Trowbridge (1932) also found that performance improves with the quality of feedback.

In 1968, Locke and Bryan completed two studies in which they found that feedback did not improve performance unless it is used to establish goals. Locke apparently was convinced that knowledge of results does not influence performance significantly unless feedback is directly related to a comparison of performance with previously established goals. Although Locke believed feedback by itself will only improve performance conditionally, in an MBO program, feedback would be related to specific objectives and therefore could be expected to contribute to performance. Not only must feedback be related to specific objectives, but also research studies verify feedback should be timely, specific and relevant to the task.

Tosi and Carroll (1973) believed participation, or influence that an individual has on decisions that affect him, can affect performance levels and job satisfaction. In a field study conducted by Lawrence and Smith (1955), they found that production increased when two groups of workers were allowed to set their own production goals and standards. Studies done by Likert (1961), French and Coch (1948), and Whyte (1955) revealed a positive relationship between participative management and increased performance in rank-and-file workers. The Maier studies (1950, 1960,

1963) found that participation results in greater acceptance by subordinates of decisions and that with competent leadership decisions can be of high quality. Vroom (1965) reached the conclusion in his study that there is substantial evidence to support the perception that job satisfaction is positively correlated with participation.

The research studies in the area of participative management appear to be the most contradictory. Some studies provide evidence of a positive correlation between participation and increased performance. On the other hand, some studies suggest no relationship at all. However, there does not appear to be any studies that indicate performance decreased as a result of participation. Tosi and Carroll (1973) believed the key intervening variable may be legitimate participation. According to these two theorists, if an individual does, in fact, have some control over both the means of reaching his goals and the manner in which they are set, this is legitimate participation and higher performance may result.

There have been other research studies which focused on the peripheral aspects of MBO rather than the core concepts. Tosi and Carroll (1968) did a study on managerial reactions to the Management-by-Objectives system implemented in a business setting. The results revealed that managers perceived both advantages and disadvantages of its utilization. They reached the conclusion that more research

focused on problems incurred as a result of MBO implementation is needed. In fact, Tosi and Carroll summed up their study by stating, "Management-by-Objectives is not the sovereign remedy that some seem to suggest." Babcock (1970), in a doctoral research study, reported that conditions must be correct and continued monitoring done if the MBO system was to be successful.

A review of some research studies supports the contention that the MBO approach to managing should result in higher employee performance levels than those management approaches that do not involve the establishment of goals and objectives. The literature also showed evidence that feedback related to performance and goal achievement and participation in the setting of goals improved employee performance.

MBO in Higher Education

In this period of declining enrollments and increasing competition for limited resources, accountability has become a major concern for institutions of higher education. Colleges and universities are required to demonstrate that they deserve the dollars they request. A recent report by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, entitled "The More Effective Use of Resources; An Imperative for Higher Education (1972)," did not omit student personnel services. The Commission's recommendation for cost reduction

in higher education mandates cost reduction in student personnel services. When the demand for accountability results from a funding crisis, student personnel services are particularly vulnerable to the budgeting restrictions on expansion of services and staffing (Satryb, 1974). With the pressure placed on colleges to be more accountable, student personnel services have special problems. The overriding concern for the welfare and development of young adults has been paramount in developing activities, programs and services. How to measure these offerings has been and remains especially elusive. Satryb (1974) believed that the concept of accountability as applied to a student personnel service has not been quantified except as a chargeback to the total instructional program.

Levy and Schreck (1975) believed student development work has not been defined in a programmatic fashion. The activities and objectives of the student affairs staff are not usually derived in ways that allow for ready comparison with, or evaluation against, existing or competing programs for students. Traditionally, student personnel programs have often materialized as a direct response to campus needs. Levy and Schreck (1975) concluded, "Once established, a program sustains itself through its own efforts, with neither evaluation nor periodic review built into the system of decision-making." Glick (1972) warned:

As the resources of higher education become

stretched and competition for limited available funds among different areas of the university increases, institutions of higher education will not be able to afford any student services that do not pay their own way and operate efficiently. (p. 300)

According to Levy and Schreck (1975), the Dean of Students is finding that two terms are critical to an understanding of accountability: effectiveness and efficiency. Therefore, they believed the challenge to student affairs officers is substantial. These two student personnel administrators believed the challenge is substantial because goal clarification is essential; programs and services must be defined in terms of desired results; resource allocations will require conditional review; and evaluative measures, both quantitative and qualitative, must be developed which will produce hard evidence of goal attainment.

Management-by-Objectives is one system being used increasingly by student personnel administrators, both to conform to the demands of accountability and to legitimize the role of student personnel work in American higher education (Saurman and Nash, 1975). These two educators also believed that:

MBO, as an administrative device, is often justified on the basis that it will allow maximum utilization of scarce resources; insure more accurate measurement of student outcomes; make student personnel operations more accountable to various constituencies; and guarantee cost effectiveness, greater systematization, more effective evaluation, and maximize efficiency. (p. 179)

Other writers identified advantages of using the MBO

system. Lahti (1973) identified six advantages and, one year earlier, Harvey (1972) identified ten advantages in using MBO in educational settings. Regardless of the total number of advantages, supporters of MBO believe strongly that the system responds affirmatively to the accountability question (Harvey, 1972; Lahti, 1973; Brenneman, 1975; Sims and Kozoll, 1974).

There has been little research reported on the utilization of MBO in education, and a few case studies are now being revealed. In a study at Brookdale Community College, Harlacher (1975) concluded that "no definitive conclusions can be drawn at this stage of the Brookdale study" but some suggestions can be made about how to avoid certain problems when implementing MBO. Heaton (1975) studied the MBO program at Eminence College and found:

Even though the MBO program at Eminence College had its share of problems during its first year, a surprising number of objectives were subsequently achieved. The college continues to believe that MBO is one way to demonstrate academic accountability and to improve the total functioning of the college. (p. 51)

There has been some speculation as to whether MBO could be used in academic departments. In a study done by Painter (1975) in the Marketing Department of the University of Utah, MBO proved to be a very useful device for generating achievement. Apparently, the keys to success of the system were allowing faculty to participate in determining their own futures, which in turn resulted in high motivation

and commitment to goal achievement. A study done by Rawls (1975) provided evidence that MBO could work in a medical school setting, although there was still considerable resistance to any type of accountability. Gaither (1975) completed a study of MBO use at the University of Tennessee and arrived at this very important conclusion, "The ultimate objective of improved management and measurement of results can be achieved in academia by a results-oriented system of management such as MBO."

In the area of student personnel administration, only one study was found which attempted to evaluate the effectiveness of MBO. Vande Guchte (1973), studying the utilization of MBO in community-junior colleges, found:

Student personnel units which define goals and objectives and which direct resources toward the accomplishment of these objectives are likely to evidence greater presence of the characteristics of effectiveness than those units that do not do these things. (p. 95)

He added:

Although this study cannot relate MBO to student personnel effectiveness in a cause-effect manner, the data strongly suggest that the full use of MBO would result in increased student personnel effectiveness. (p. 95)

Thus far, there have been no reports of studies attempting to evaluate the effectiveness of MBO utilized in student personnel divisions in baccalaureate institutions.

Implied, but not explicitly stated, in the MBO system is evaluation of sub-unit's goals and objectives. While

appraisal of employees is an important component of MBO, appraisal of the collective group progress towards goals and objectives is not receiving the attention it should. In student personnel, the problem is particularly acute for two reasons:

1. Programs that do not contribute significantly toward meeting institutional objectives will be curtailed.
2. The increasing amount of basic research regarding students, impact of college on students and the nature of the college environment need to be considered (Robinson, 1962).

Robinson conceded that evaluation may require re-evaluation of current concepts of student personnel work and programs. While many student personnel administrators have long recognized the need for evaluation, little evidence exists that recognition has been followed by action (Robinson, 1962). Delaying accountability until pressed by the general public, state legislatures, institutional budget administrators, or parents and students can be disastrous to any program (Miller and Prince, 1976). As was noted earlier, the push for accountability is on the higher education community. As a result, Miller and Prince (1976) concluded that "systematic evaluation is essential whether one is accountable to an external agent or not."

While there might have existed a general reluctance for student personnel workers to do evaluations, either because they lacked the training or because they feared that negative outcomes would reflect negatively on them, the importance of evaluation is noted by professional educators. According to Stufflebeam (1971), evaluation is a continuous process of delineating, obtaining, and providing information with which to judge various choices. As early as 1962, Robinson identified six major reasons why student personnel administrators need to conduct frequent, ongoing evaluations. Interestingly, those six major reasons provide a connection between MBO and the effectiveness construct. The six reasons are:

1. Evaluation provides the best possible means of clarifying program goals and objectives.
2. Evaluation provides a means of relating program objectives to the broad educational goals of the institution, and clarifies the relationship of the student personnel program to the educational program of the institution.
3. Evaluation is the only means by which effectiveness of the total program and its several subdivisions can be measured.
4. Evaluation insures that all phases of the student personnel program will remain in proper

perspective -- and that the total program remains in focus with institutional goals.

5. Evaluation lays the groundwork for further planning.
6. Evaluation may well provide the stimulus for basic research regarding the student personnel programs.

How evaluations are to be done will depend upon the discretion of the individual student personnel divisions; however, it is important that an evaluation be done with some regularity. McIntyre (1974) believed evaluation should include an assessment by the person for whom the programs and services are offered. Chamberlain (1975) stated, "Student personnel is seen by many to be in particular need of self-evaluation following a decade and a half of severe program redefinition beginning with Dixon versus Alabama State Board of Education in 1960." The measurement of outcomes (results) in higher education and student personnel has become a great concern to many different groups because of the accountability issue. However, student personnel is an area which is complex and handicapped by ambiguity and a lack of explicit measures (Harpel, 1976). A major difficulty with evaluation in student personnel is the limited research and developments to date of evaluative instruments which are responsive to the uniqueness of various student personnel programs. Another major problem with evaluation

is the difficulty involved with evaluating a student personnel program for which there are no clear objectives. In such situations, results are either passed over or any outcome is found acceptable. Harpel (1976) believed when objectives are clearly stated and there are purposeful goals, evaluation becomes considerably easier.

For evaluation to be meaningful, there should probably be some predetermined criteria. While there have been attempts to establish general standards of criteria, the decision has been left to the discretion of individual student personnel divisions at each institution. There are several different approaches to evaluation that have been offered by researchers, but none have really gained consensus from student personnel workers. In the final analysis, the heart of evaluation rests squarely on careful study of the basic objectives of the student personnel program in relation to institutional goals (Robinson, 1962). Robinson continued his analysis by asking several critical questions which are essential to evaluation of the overall student personnel programs. Specifically, what are the stated objectives of the total program? Are these in agreement with institutional objectives? How well are objectives being achieved? Is the personnel staff cognizant of goals and objectives and do they understand their role in meeting these objectives? Summing up, evaluation must occupy, more than ever, a central place in sound student personnel admin-

istration (Robinson, 1962).

Organizational Effectiveness

If institutions of higher learning accept the premise that management effectiveness is a desirable trait, then the major purpose for evaluating colleges and universities is to determine the extent of institutional effectiveness. Steers (1975) offered the opinion that although effectiveness is generally considered a desirable attribute in organizations, few serious attempts have been made to explain the construct either theoretically or empirically. Unfortunately, the notion of organizational effectiveness is referred to in the literature far more than it is studied in any systematic way. A review of the literature revealed that a variety of models exist which have been employed to measure the concept of organizational effectiveness. Steers (1974) believed little overlap exists between the competing models; therefore, the absence of consistency makes it difficult to evaluate an organization for goodness of fit against the effectiveness construct. He amplified the problem by noting that if agreement cannot be reached as to what actually constitutes the evaluation criteria, then it is logical to assume that considerable difficulty would be incurred in any attempt to assess the relative effectiveness of an organization or set of organizations.

Since organizational effectiveness is considered the

bottom line of managerial work, it is not surprising that goals are central to the notion of organizational effectiveness (Albanese, 1978). Organizations are often viewed as goal-seeking entities, "In fact, on a general level, it has been suggested that effectiveness itself could best be understood in terms of the extent to which an organization is successful . . . in the pursuit of . . . goals" (Steers, 1977). Relating the goal-system idea to organizational effectiveness, it may be stated that effectiveness ultimately must be evaluated in terms of a satisfactory degree of attainment of individual performance and group goals.

There have been several important assumptions made about the effectiveness of MBO. Some of the assumptions were identified in this chapter. For the most part, the assumptions appear to be supportive of and directed at the positive aspects of MBO. However, at this point it cannot be concluded with absolute certainty that MBO is as effective as its supporters would have the public believe. Ivanevich's (1972) observation concerning the business sector is significant, "Although these studies and many others provide valuable guidelines for companies that are adopting MBO, there is a lack of scientific evaluation of MBO programs in the professional literature." Collins (1971) emphasized the dearth of research on MBO effectiveness by concluding that the amount of research concerned with the application and effectiveness of MBO is rather

limited.

Very little research has been done pertaining to the effectiveness of MBO in educational settings. Harlacher (1975) stated:

Although much has been written about MBO, actual research to substantiate or refute the assumptions underlying MBO theory is scarce. As a result, even among business and industrial organizations, implementation of Management-by-Objectives has been based upon its seeming theoretical soundness and practical advantages. Its implementation, especially in educational institutions, thus becomes something of an empirical study of the MBO system itself. (p. 29)

Hacker (1971) was suspicious about the implementation of MBO in educational settings. His finding supported the concern of Harlacher when he concluded that "unanticipated and undesirable effects can be expected from introducing MBO into a school system . . ." and that "means are needed for assessing how well it serves its intended purposes and at what cost to other components of the school system."

More and more educators are being asked to respond to two questions: What goals are you seeking and what methods will you use to achieve them? Those questions are being asked with increasing frequency by those who fund education -- federal granting agencies, legislatures, tax payers, parents, alumni groups and concerned individuals (Brenneman, 1975). Essentially, the funding groups are asking higher education to be accountable. Supporters of higher education

are interested in efficient use of resources and results. According to Brenneman (1975), "management-by-objectives fulfills the need for accountability in education because MBO is a results-oriented process. Educators must establish goals and objectives for themselves and their institutions."

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to compare the effectiveness of selected student personnel divisions that use the MBO system of management with those that do not. Two student personnel divisions were selected for this study because they had been in the process of implementing MBO for minimally three to five years. Two additional student personnel divisions were selected because they were not using MBO and had not adopted any formal system resembling MBO. The hypothesis posed for this study was: Student personnel divisions in baccalaureate institutions who use the MBO approach to managing will attain more objectives and, as a result, can be presumed to have a more effective student personnel program than student personnel divisions that do not use the MBO approach to managing.

Instrumentation

The evaluative instrument chosen for this study was a survey developed and field-tested by Roderick McDavis, Assistant Professor in the Department of Counselor Education at the University of Florida. This instrument was chosen because the specific design of the survey is to de-

termine whether any college's or university's student personnel program is attaining its objectives. The instrument is composed of an inventory of objectives and a survey questionnaire containing questions which are representative of the objectives.

The inventory of student personnel objectives

The development of the objective section of the Inventory of Student Personnel Objectives began with a review of student personnel literature. The purpose of the review was to identify objectives that were stated as outcomes (McDavis, 1976). Objectives were selected on the basis of being a minimally essential (absolutely needed) objective for any student personnel program (McDavis, 1976). A final list of fifty objectives was categorized under four major headings: assistance to students, assistance to university community, assistance to faculty and assistance to administrators. A list of the fifty objectives is contained in Appendix B.

The survey of student personnel objectives

The Survey of Student Personnel Objectives contained a list of thirty-six questions representative of the objectives in the Inventory. Student responses to each question, which are based on their awareness, observances, or actual involvement in programs or services, determined

whether objectives were being attained. A list of the thirty-six questions is provided in Appendix C.

Reliability

The problem of reliability was essentially one of determining the degree of consistency present in any set of observations or measurements (Sax, 1968). Two methods were used to determine the reliability of the instrument used for this study: odd-even procedures and the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula (McDavis, 1976). The odd-even procedures resulted in a correlation coefficient of +.84 between the two halves of the instrument. The Spearman-Brown formula yielded a correlation coefficient of +.91 for the entire instrument. The correlation coefficients indicate a strong, positive relationship between the different halves of the instrument.

Validity

Validity is a generic term signifying various methods that indicate the extent to which a test correlates with some criterion external to the test itself (Sax, 1968). As for the instrument used in this study, the developer used the content validity method to determine validity. He secured experts in the area of student personnel services to review the instrument at the objectives writing stage

and the questions development stage. Two different panels of student personnel experts reviewed and finalized the objectives and the questions. In addition, the survey was field-tested at two different universities. The instrument was adaptable for use in this study.

Population and Sample

Four baccalaureate institutions located in the Midwest were selected for this study. The MBO institutions selected included a state college and a large university. They were selected because each of their student personnel divisions had been using the Management-by-Objectives system of management for minimally five years. In order to make a comparative analysis of effectiveness of MBO and non-MBO student personnel divisions, two additional institutions were selected that were not using MBO. The two non-MBO institutions were selected because they resembled their MBO counterparts in five areas: size, residential student population, curriculum, degrees offered and are co-educational. The two non-MBO institutions selected included a state college and a large university.

The population in this study were all students residing in residence halls at the four institutions. Because residential students were more accessible and were recipients of programs and services offered by student personnel

divisions, they were the group surveyed as to their familiarity with and involvement in those programs and services that were provided for them.

The instructions accompanying the Survey suggested that minimally, two hundred responses be obtained in order to apply the appropriate statistical analysis. One method suggested for accomplishing the two hundred response requirement was to obtain permission to visit selected classes for the purpose of administering the Survey. That procedure was not followed since it was extremely difficult to obtain permission to enter classes. Therefore, residence hall students were selected as the sample group that was surveyed. A random sample of students could possibly have minimized significantly the return rate of surveys and made it almost impossible to do the statistical technique required. Each of the four institutions had substantial residence hall populations with an adequate cross section of students.

Data Collection Procedures

In order to obtain support and cooperation for the study from each of the four institutions, an appointment was made with the chief student personnel administrator. In separate meetings with each of the administrators, the purpose, objectives and details of the study, were explained. All of the institutions selected for the study

agreed to participate. Once support and cooperation were obtained, the following data collection plans and procedures were implemented:

1. The chief student personnel administrator was given a copy of the Inventory containing the list of objectives. He read each objective and decided if it was appropriate for his college's or university's student personnel program.
2. If there was any objective the chief student personnel administrator thought was inappropriate or if there was an objective the unit was not trying to attain, that objective was removed from the Inventory. In addition, the corresponding question in the Survey was removed. The purpose of this procedure was to have the four institutions working towards the same objectives and the students responding to identical questions.
3. The Inventory included fifty objectives, however, the Survey contained only thirty-six questions. By matching the thirty-six questions to the related objectives, a determination was made that fourteen objectives did not have related questions. A final

list of thirty-six objectives was used rather than fifty.

4. The four chief student personnel administrators selected all thirty-six objectives as appropriate for their individual student personnel programs.
5. Each chief student personnel administrator was given an opportunity to review the Survey questions for the purpose of gaining an understanding of the relationship between the questions in the Survey and the objectives in the Inventory.
6. Housing personnel were informed about the study, and time was taken to discuss with the housing staff the purposes, objectives and details of the study.
7. After specifically requesting that only those residence halls which housed a cross section of students relative to class standing, sex and academic majors be included in the study, the housing staff in conjunction with the chief student personnel administrator decided which residence halls would be given the Survey.
8. Future dates were then set for delivering and distributing the Survey. During the interim, residence hall directors informed their stu-

dent resident assistants about the study and finalized the administration dates.

9. In order to make administration of the Survey easier and reduce the number of human errors in later computational procedures, the Survey questions were printed on optical scanning forms by a professional typesetter. Three thousand Survey questionnaires were produced for the study. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix E.
10. The administration of the Survey took place during the spring term and/or semester.
11. The number of surveys were distributed in the following manner:
 - MBO Institutions
 - State University - 900
 - State College - 600
 - Non-MBO Institutions
 - State College - 600
 - State University - 900
12. The residence hall director and student residential assistants distributed the Survey to all the students residing in the hall. Three days later, the student assistants retrieved the surveys and returned them to the chief student personnel administrator.

13. In the initial meeting with the chief student personnel administrators of the MBO institutions, a review was made of each of the twelve components of MBO. In order to be declared an MBO division, all twelve components had to be included as part of the MBO programs.

Data Analysis Procedures

In order to determine whether an objective was attained, a single standard was applied to each question on the Survey. The standard used for this study was a sixty percent level of yes responses on each question. A percentage standard was selected because it is used extensively in research in which data is expressed as classified frequencies. A sixty percent standard exceeds the simple majority notion, and it was also the level recommended by the developer of the instrument.

The Survey of Student Personnel Objectives provided the respondent with three response categories: yes, no, and don't know. For each question, if a yes category received sixty percent of the total responses, then it was assumed there was significant student awareness and/or involvement with the program or service. Therefore, the related objective was deemed to be attained. If the no category for any question received sixty percent of the

total responses to each question, the related objective was deemed to be not attained. No responses by students to questions regarding programs and services being offered was interpreted as meaning that students did not believe the student personnel program was doing what it was purposed to do. The don't know category was neutral in terms of acceptance or rejection of objectives. A don't know response was interpreted as meaning the student lacks enough information to respond yes or no.

The Survey was divided into two parts. Part I was composed of questions one to fourteen. Questions in Part I were designed to elicit responses based on the respondents awareness or knowledge of opportunities, services or programs being offered. Part II contains questions fifteen to thirty-six. This section required more from the respondent than just simple awareness. Questions in Part II imply an actual doing, a course of action or behavior on the part of the college or university. Thus, the respondent is required to reach beyond awareness to almost a knowing posture.

After the standard was applied to each question, a tabulation was made of all the questions in which the yes category met the sixty percent criterion. The identical procedure was followed for the no and don't know categories. The affirmative questions were determined and the number of related objectives noted and tabulated. This process

was followed for each of the four institutions.

When the process of determining whether or not objectives were attained was completed, a statistical technique was presumed to be appropriate to use on the affirmative responses from the four institutions. This procedure is used to observe if there might be factors influencing student responses other than pure chance. The appropriate statistical technique selected for this study was the chi square.

To tabulate the number of objectives attained by each institution student personnel program, a related question had to record sixty percent or more of the total responses in the yes category. Appendix F shows there were some objectives which had more than one related question. For tabulation purposes, objectives having more than one related question were counted as many times as there were numbers of related questions equalling or exceeding the sixty percent standard; meaning certain objectives were counted as being attained more than once.

This study evaluated the effectiveness of MBO student personnel programs on the basis of the number of objectives attained in comparison with the number of objectives attained by non-MBO institutions. The hypothesis for this study was stated in the following way: Student personnel divisions in baccalaureate institutions who use the MBO approach to managing will attain more objectives

and, as a result, can be presumed to have a more effective student personnel program than student personnel divisions that do not use the MBO approach to managing. The expectation was that MBO programs would attain a sufficient number of objectives, substantially more than the non-MBO institutions. MBO would then be declared a more effective approach to managing student personnel programs when compared to non-MBO student personnel programs. If a sufficient number of objectives was obtained by each of the four institutions, then a chi square analysis would be used to compare the four student personnel programs. The chi square technique would assist in determining whether or not pure chance factors were influencing the data. Given the major obstacles faced by researchers trying to evaluate the effectiveness of organizations, institutional comparisons appeared to be a viable alternative method for evaluating effectiveness.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to compare the effectiveness of student personnel programs in baccalaureate institutions that use the MBO system of management with those student personnel divisions that do not use MBO. Effectiveness was evaluated on the basis of the number of program objectives attained by each student personnel division. Objectives were tabulated on the basis of a survey questionnaire containing questions representative of and related to a specific list of objectives. A sixty percent standard was applied against the total number of responses made to the yes category for each question on the Survey. If any question received sixty percent or more of the total responses under the yes category, the objective related to that particular question was judged to be attained. The chi square statistical technique was to be used at the .05 level of significance in order to make comparisons between institutions. This could not be accomplished since the MBO University did not accomplish any objectives. Minimally, six objectives needed to be accomplished with each institution before chi square could be computed.

TABLE 1
 PERCENTAGES OF YES RESPONSES - ALL INSTITUTIONS

	University Non-MBO	University MBO	College Non-MBO	College MBO
Question 1.	47.83	47.40	45.68	36.36
Question 2.	38.80	34.25	41.37	47.81
Question 3.	23.83	29.10	32.01	37.22
Question 4.	34.68	35.64	44.60	39.19
Question 5.	37.12	32.87	55.75	52.38
Question 6.	69.90*	51.90	72.30*	72.99*
Question 7.	56.86	43.25	62.59*	61.68*
Question 8.	58.19	42.91	63.67*	60.95*
Question 9.	60.87*	42.91	65.83*	59.12
Question 10.	59.20	48.10	66.19*	67.15*
Question 11.	63.10*	42.91	75.54*	77.94*
Question 12.	29.20	31.14	32.73	34.19
Question 13.	59.53*	41.17	79.50*	59.56*
Question 14.	37.58	30.10	46.04	47.25
Question 15.	34.56	36.68	34.89	32.84
Question 16.	35.91	26.30	34.53	40.66
Question 17.	19.13	20.41	20.86	32.23
Question 18.	31.21	26.64	34.89	33.09
Question 19.	35.35	29.41	51.43	43.38
Question 20.	63.10*	46.02	63.67*	67.40*
Question 21.	48.32	34.60	51.44	54.74
Question 22.	50.00	37.72	63.67*	52.55
Question 23.	51.51	29.41	53.24	53.28
Question 24.	32.55	29.76	26.62	36.13
Question 25.	26.60	23.69	25.90	32.11
Question 26.	19.46	22.49	23.74	26.01
Question 27.	18.12	23.87	19.06	29.20
Question 28.	18.46	21.80	18.70	28.47
Question 29.	25.50	22.14	23.38	29.20
Question 30.	21.55	28.03	21.94	28.10
Question 31.	49.83	40.97	56.11	66.91*
Question 32.	47.31	40.62	58.99	62.27*
Question 33.	44.29	40.83	59.35	64.60*
Question 34.	21.21	21.45	22.30	34.06
Question 35.	22.22	26.39	18.34	32.97
Question 36.	24.16	26.39	26.98	31.25
Questions Equalling 60% Standard	=5	=0	=9	=10
Objectives Attained	=5	=0	=9	=10

*The percentage of yes responses equalling or exceeding the sixty percent standard.

Findings

Table One shows the total percentage of yes responses for each individual question. For tabulation purposes, the percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. An asterisk was placed beside the percentage of each question that equalled or exceeded the sixty percent standard. Three of the four institutions had one or more questions reach the sixty percent level. The MBO University did not have any question reach the sixty percent level; as a result, it was the only institution that did not attain any objectives. The institution that recorded the highest number of questions reaching the sixty percent level was the MBO College with ten, followed closely by the non-MBO College with nine, and the non-MBO University with five. The table shows a wide range of percentages from a low of 18.12 at the non-MBO University to a high of 79.50 percent at the non-MBO College.

Table Two shows the overall responses, defined in percentages, to the no category for each of the thirty-six questions. What is readily noticeable is the fact that no question at any of the four institutions reached the sixty percent standard, meaning that students generally did believe their respective student personnel programs were providing the opportunities, services, and programs or

TABLE 2
 PERCENTAGES OF NO RESPONSES - ALL INSTITUTIONS

	University Non-MBO	University MBO	College Non-MBO	College MBO
Question 1.	15.05	21.10	27.34	24.54
Question 2.	19.73	26.64	31.29	23.72
Question 3.	28.52	31.14	37.41	37.74
Question 4.	25.59	27.68	29.86	24.54
Question 5.	25.42	31.49	26.98	22.34
Question 6.	12.04	19.03	17.27	12.77
Question 7.	14.05	23.53	20.86	16.79
Question 8.	14.05	26.99	17.63	15.33
Question 9.	13.04	25.95	16.19	16.42
Question 10.	15.72	22.84	26.98	20.07
Question 11.	12.75	28.37	14.39	9.19
Question 12.	27.85	30.45	30.22	27.94
Question 13.	15.05	28.03	8.99	14.34
Question 14.	15.44	25.61	12.95	13.55
Question 15.	25.50	21.80	35.35	25.91
Question 16.	22.14	28.37	35.25	26.00
Question 17.	36.91	29.76	44.60	27.11
Question 18.	25.17	33.22	34.89	25.37
Question 19.	23.57	26.99	27.34	26.84
Question 20.	16.44	21.11	21.58	16.48
Question 21.	18.12	21.11	25.54	19.34
Question 22.	17.78	24.91	24.82	23.72
Question 23.	17.50	28.03	29.87	23.36
Question 24.	25.17	25.95	40.65	30.29
Question 25.	23.91	29.96	32.01	27.00
Question 26.	27.52	27.68	35.61	31.50
Question 27.	34.90	31.49	36.33	33.94
Question 28.	28.86	29.76	33.09	35.04
Question 29.	30.54	39.76	36.69	39.05
Question 30.	30.98	28.37	37.41	38.32
Question 31.	28.96	26.74	25.90	30.59
Question 32.	31.21	30.90	30.58	23.81
Question 33.	33.56	29.41	28.78	18.61
Question 34.	39.73	35.99	44.24	34.43
Question 35.	27.27	27.78	28.41	23.07
Question 36.	29.53	25.35	27.70	25.73
Questions Equalling 60% Standard	=0	=0	=0	=0
Objectives Rejected	=0	=0	=0	=0

actually were doing what had been promised.

Questions recording the highest percentages under the no category dealt with student personnel administrators serving as student advocates, facilitators, interpreters and evaluators. Also, questions pertaining to student values received a high percentage of no responses.

Another interesting result was the tendency of students at the non-MBO College to respond affirmatively or negatively to the questions rather than to respond don't know. There appeared to be a reluctance on the part of students at the non-MBO University to respond negatively. Fourteen questions recorded no percentage responses under twenty percent. No significant no results materialized with the MBO College.

Table Three shows the percentage of don't know responses for each of the four institutions. With the exception of the non-MBO College, there appeared to be a tendency of the students to give their respective institutions the benefit of the doubt by responding in the don't know category. However, non of the questions in the don't know category reached the sixty percent standard. With the exception of the MBO University, students appeared to be aware of certain programs and services on their respective campuses, otherwise, the no and don't know columns could feasibly have higher percentages, with some reaching

TABLE 3
 PERCENTAGES OF DON'T KNOW RESPONSES
 ALL INSTITUTIONS

	University Non-MBO	University MBO	College Non-MBO	College MBO
Question 1.	37.12	31.49	26.26	39.19
Question 2.	41.47	38.75	26.62	28.47
Question 3.	47.65	39.79	29.86	35.04
Question 4.	39.73	36.68	25.18	36.26
Question 5.	37.46	35.64	16.91	25.27
Question 6.	18.06	28.72	10.10	14.23
Question 7.	29.10	33.22	15.83	21.53
Question 8.	27.76	30.10	17.99	23.72
Question 9.	26.09	31.14	17.63	24.45
Question 10.	25.08	29.10	6.47	12.77
Question 11.	24.16	28.72	9.71	12.87
Question 12.	42.62	38.10	35.97	37.87
Question 13.	25.42	30.80	10.43	26.10
Question 14.	46.98	43.94	39.57	39.19
Question 15.	39.93	41.52	29.86	40.88
Question 16.	41.95	45.33	30.22	33.33
Question 17.	43.96	49.83	34.53	40.66
Question 18.	43.62	40.14	30.22	41.18
Question 19.	41.08	43.60	21.22	29.78
Question 20.	21.13	32.87	14.75	16.12
Question 21.	33.56	44.29	22.66	25.91
Question 22.	32.21	37.37	11.51	23.72
Question 23.	30.98	42.56	10.91	23.36
Question 24.	42.28	44.29	32.37	33.58
Question 25.	49.49	46.34	41.73	40.88
Question 26.	52.68	49.83	40.65	42.49
Question 27.	46.98	44.64	44.60	36.86
Question 28.	52.68	48.44	48.20	36.50
Question 29.	43.96	48.10	39.57	31.75
Question 30.	46.80	43.60	40.65	33.58
Question 31.	21.21	32.29	16.91	12.13
Question 32.	21.48	28.47	10.07	13.92
Question 33.	21.81	29.76	11.51	16.79
Question 34.	39.06	42.56	33.09	31.50
Question 35.	50.17	45.83	52.88	43.59
Question 36.	45.64	48.26	44.60	43.01
Questions Equalling 60% Standard	=0	=0	=0	=0

the sixty percent standard.

Results obtained from the data showed that it was not possible to apply the chi square statistical technique since an insufficient number of objectives were attained by two of the four institutions. The chi square technique was to be used at the .05 level of significance to compare effectiveness of the four programs. This was not possible because application of the chi square required a minimum of six objectives be contained in each of the cells. The state universities attained less than the six objectives required. Therefore, any reference made regarding effectiveness of the four individual student personnel programs was based strictly on a comparison of objectives attained by each of the four institutions rather than by inferences drawn from results obtained from application of statistical analysis.

Again, applying the total number of questions accumulated for each institution under the sixty percent standard to the total number of objectives attained, the results showed that the non-MBO University attained five objectives compared to zero for its counterpart in this study. Also, the MBO College attained ten objectives compared to nine for the non-MBO College. Therefore, the hypothesis posed in this study -- that student personnel programs in baccalaureate institutions who use the MBO

system of managing will attain more objectives and, as a result, can be presumed to have a more effective student personnel program than student personnel divisions that do not use the MBO approach to managing -- was not supported by the data. The data revealed that MBO student personnel programs were no more effective than student personnel programs that do not use the MBO system of managing. The conclusion was reached on the basis of the number of related objectives attained by each institutional student personnel program.

Questions Equalling or Exceeding Standard

A list of questions and corresponding percentages that equalled or exceeded the sixty percent standard is provided below. The list is provided for the purpose of graphically illustrating the consistency of response on several questions by three of the four institutions. A brief discussion of each question is provided below.

Question 6: See Appendix C.

Non-MBO University	-- 69.90%	MBO University	-- 51.90%
Non-MBO College	-- <u>72.30%</u>	MBO College	-- <u>72.99%</u>

According to percentages recorded, this was one of the highest ranking questions. Programs and services established to accomplish this objective appeared to be quite successful. This is understandable, given the cur-

rent attention and institutional resources being put into career planning, exploration and development at all levels of education.

Question 7: See Appendix C.

Non-MBO University	-- 56.86%	MBO University	-- 43.25%
Non-MBO College	-- <u>62.59%</u>	MBO College	-- <u>61.68%</u>

This question referred to the different types of governance opportunities in which students may participate. The data indicated greater awareness of leadership and participatory opportunities at the small institutions. Although the fifty-seven percent responses from the large non-MBO University fell three percentage points below the sixty percent standard, the data indicated that more than a majority of students were aware of leadership and organizational opportunities at a large institution. Conversely, this is not the situation at the large MBO University as reflected by the data.

Question 8: See Appendix C.

Non-MBO University	-- 58.19%	MBO University	-- 42.91%
Non-MBO College	-- <u>63.67%</u>	MBO College	-- <u>60.95%</u>

This question was related to Question 7 in that respondents were queried about whether they were given opportunities to apply their leadership skills on campus. Note that there was very little deviation in terms of percentage responses of all four institutions between Questions 7 and 8.

Question 9: See Appendix C.

Non-MBO University	--	<u>60.87%</u>	MBO University	--	42.91%
Non-MBO College	--	<u>65.83%</u>	MBO College	--	59.12%

Students in at least three of the four institutions knew about opportunities available for them to become involved with the governance of their respective institutions. From this data, it would appear as though students had obtained more opportunities for involvement in governance. The MBO University ranked fourth among the four institutions, indicating that a significant majority of students were not aware of opportunities to become involved with institutional governance.

Question 10: See Appendix C.

Non-MBO University	--	59.20%	MBO University	--	48.10%
Non-MBO College	--	<u>66.19%</u>	MBO College	--	<u>67.15%</u>

One of the traditional programs and services offered by student personnel divisions was in the area of student activities. A comprehensive program of activities, designed to attract as many student participants as possible, was usually an important part of most student personnel programs. This particular question also received a high percentage response under the yes category, especially with the two state colleges. The non-MBO University was less than one percentage point off the sixty percent standard, and again, the MBO University received the lowest percentage of the four institutions.

Question 11: See Appendix C.

Non-MBO University	--	<u>63.10%</u>	MBO University	--	42.91%
Non-MBO College	--	<u>75.54%</u>	MBO College	--	<u>77.94%</u>

This was the sixth question in which two or more institutions reached the sixty percent standard. Whatever three of the four institutions were doing about providing opportunities for students to receive individual help worked. Overall, this question received the greatest percentage response under the yes category. Even in the large non-MBO University setting, a significant percentage of students felt they could receive individual attention. Again, the MBO University reflected a low percentage of responses.

Question 13: See Appendix C.

Non-MBO University	--	59.53%	MBO University	--	41.17%
Non-MBO College	--	<u>79.50%</u>	MBO College	--	<u>59.56%</u>

The students at the non-MBO College felt particularly strong about this question, and consequently the question received the highest response rate in the yes column of any question in the Survey. Traditionally, counseling has been one of the core student personnel services and it was not surprising it was one of the services known by a significant percentage of students at three of the institutions.

Question 20: See Appendix C.

Non-MBO University	--	<u>63.10%</u>	MBO University	--	46.02%
NON-MBO College	--	<u>63.67%</u>	MBO College	--	<u>67.40%</u>

This question was related to number 6 and both were related to the same objective on the Inventory. Assistance was provided in many ways, including such examples as career development seminars, placement services, counseling and especially academic advising. This was one of the few combinations of questions (6 and 20) in which questions on both Part I and Part II of the instrument reached the sixty percent standard.

Question 22: See Appendix C.

Non-MBO University	-- 50.00%	MBO University	-- 37.72%
Non-MBO College	-- <u>63.67%</u>	MBO College	-- 52.55%

Of the four institutions, the non-MBO College was the only institution reaching the sixty percent standard. In comparison with the other institutions, the percentage was quite substantial, which showed an individual institutional characteristic.

Question 31: See Appendix C.

Non-MBO University	-- 49.83%	MBO University	-- 40.97%
Non-MBO College	-- 56.11%	MBO College	-- <u>66.91%</u>

Question 32: See Appendix C.

Non-MBO University	-- 47.31%	MBO University	-- 40.62%
Non-MBO College	-- 58.99%	MBO College	-- <u>62.27%</u>

Question 33: See Appendix C.

Non-MBO University	-- 44.29%	MBO University	-- 40.83%
Non-MBO College	-- 59.35%	MBO College	-- <u>64.60%</u>

These three questions exemplified another example of institutional individuality manifesting itself via the data.

The MBO College was the only institution to reach the set standard. Questions 31, 32, and 33 referred to institutional orientation programs. Students attending the MBO College apparently believed that they were oriented sufficiently to the campus, encouraged to use the available programs and services, and made to feel a vital part of the community.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Summary of Findings

Because of increased public pressure being placed on the higher education community to be more accountable, management systems are being adopted by administrators, including student personnel workers. One management system that is becoming increasingly popular with student personnel administrators is Management-by-Objectives. MBO is a results-oriented system first developed and used in the business sector. The system is assumed to provide many advantages including increasing organizational and divisional effectiveness. Since effectiveness is concerned with the attainment of objectives, and within the MBO system emphasis is placed on the establishment and attainment of objectives, the system has therefore been suggested as an appropriate, responsive management approach.

The first problem encountered in trying to determine effectiveness of organizations was the discovery of a lack of general measures to do so. While a few measures existed for the business sector, there was a definite paucity of instruments available for educational and non-profit institutions.

The second problem encountered was discovering that there was not a standard approach used to study effectiveness. The strengths and weaknesses of the several different approaches militate against agreement being reached by management theorists on one proper approach for evaluating effectiveness.

A third problem encountered was trying to determine the different levels of effectiveness of organizations and institutions. One reference made regarding this problem was a quotation made by Eztioni (1964) "that organizations characteristically have low levels of effectiveness." Can it be assumed, then, that low levels of effectiveness are inherent in the nature of organizations? It remains to be researched whether Etzioni's hypothesis is true.

The next findings were concerned specifically with the Management-by-Objectives system. While there were many assumptions made about the benefits of MBO, there was not enough research to substantiate those assumptions. Research completed thus far had been more concerned with appraising employee performance than with determining the effectiveness of the complete MBO system. Even in the business sector research was scarce concerning the effectiveness of MBO.

One of the components contained within the MBO system was the evaluation of sub-units of the organization such as student personnel divisions. A review of the

literature revealed that little had been done to evaluate sub-units. Furthermore, little had been done to evaluate the effectiveness of MBO implemented in sub-units such as student personnel divisions. It could not be stated conclusively through research that MBO was a strong, viable alternative for managing student personnel programs and services. Additionally, within the field of student personnel, evaluation of programs and services had not become a standard procedure. There appeared to be apprehension among student personnel workers concerning periodic evaluation.

A review of the management literature revealed a problem with definition of terms. Three were variations of definition of identical terms, so much so that there was confusion. For example, the terms goals and objectives were used interchangeably and were typically taken to mean the same thing. However, this study suggested the two terms are not the same and care should be taken to use them within the proper context.

The following summary of findings relates directly to the data obtained from the four institutions. Even though precise conclusions could not be reached concerning the results, the data did provide some interesting indications into effectiveness of MBO in student personnel programs. A review of the summary of findings from the

data is provided below:

1. The hypothesis posed for this study -- that student personnel divisions in baccalaureate institutions who use the MBO approach to managing will attain more objectives and, as a result, can be presumed to have a more effective student personnel program than student personnel divisions that do not use the MBO system of managing -- was not supported. A chi square statistical technique was not used because an insufficient number of objectives was attained by two of the four institutions. Therefore, no inferences based on results of statistical analysis could be made regarding effectiveness of the individual student personnel programs. The institutions could not be compared statistically.
2. Based strictly on the number of objectives attained by each student personnel program, a comparative analysis showed that the most effective student personnel program was located at an MBO College. The second most effective student personnel program was located at a non-MBO College. Placing third in terms of effectiveness was the non-MBO University.

The MBO University had the least effective student personnel program of the four institutions.

3. Based strictly on the number of objectives attained by each institution, the student personnel programs at the two state colleges (MBO and non-MBO) showed more effectiveness than the student personnel programs at the two larger universities (MBO and non-MBO).
4. Based strictly on the number of objectives attained by each institution, the MBO program at the state college showed more effectiveness than the MBO student personnel program at the large university.
5. Evaluated strictly on the number of objectives attained by each institution, the non-MBO College student personnel program was more effective than the non-MBO student personnel program at the large university.
6. Student personnel programs at the more vocationally-technically oriented colleges (MBO and non-MBO) showed more effectiveness than student personnel programs at the large universities.
7. Objectives were more likely to be attainable

with the traditional student personnel programs such as counseling, career planning and placement, student governance, social organizations and activities and orientation.

8. Students were more cognizant of the college or university providing programs and services rather than knowing with some assurance that students at the college or university were actually assisted by the programs or services.
9. Questions receiving the lowest percentage of responses had to do with student personnel administrators serving as facilitators and interpreters for students to other administrators, faculty and the local community.
10. The largest number of objectives attained under the four categories of assistance was in the category of Assistance to Students.

There were some other significant general factors related to the four institutions that were reflected in the data. These general factors are discussed below.

Response rate

There were nine hundred questionnaires distributed to the two large universities. Six hundred questionnaires were given to the two colleges. The large multiversity

with MBO returned 289 questionnaires for a 32.11 percent return rate. Its counterpart in this study returned 299 questionnaires for a 33 percent return rate. The two small institutions had the highest percentage of return of questionnaires: the small college without MBO recording a 40 percent rate and the small college with MBO returning slightly over 39 percent. Two hundred and seventy-eight questionnaires were returned by the non-MBO College, and 274 were returned by the MBO College. Overall, the small colleges had the best percentage return on the questionnaires, almost seven percent higher than the large universities. Between the two large institutions, the non-MBO University had a higher percentage return rate. For the two colleges, the return rate favored the non-MBO school. Therefore, the data revealed that both non-MBO schools returned a greater percentage of questionnaires.

Size of institution

The data revealed that attainment of objectives was highest at the smaller institutions. The two universities attained fewer objectives than the state colleges. The data showed that student personnel programs may be more effective at smaller institutions.

Longevity of MBO programs

A review of the literature indicated that results of the implementation of MBO required three to five years, minimally, especially in large organizations. From looking at the data, it was conceivable that results would begin to materialize more quickly in smaller institutions. This may have accounted for the better showing of the small college MBO program. Results in large universities may take longer to materialize. The attainment of no objectives by the MBO University was difficult to interpret.

Institutional character

It was interesting to note that with a curriculum that was vocationally-technically oriented, the two state colleges were the most effective according to the data. It is conceivable that effective managing can be accomplished more successfully in vocationally-technically oriented colleges rather than large universities.

Overall performance of effectiveness

On the basis of overall performance, the state college with the MBO program displayed the most effective program. The institution not only attained the most objectives; received the highest number of questions with sixty percent yes responses; and received the highest per-

centage of yes responses on twenty-five questions, but also showed exceptional strength in one area that none of the other three institutions was able to match. From the manner in which the questions were asked, the unit had to be the orientation program.

Three institutions reflected greater overall effectiveness than the large university with MBO. In fact, the highest percentage reached on any question in the yes category for the MBO University was fifty-two percent standard applied to all questions. All types of generalizations probably could have been made on why the MBO University did not reflect better effectiveness. It was somewhat perplexing to attempt an understanding of the reasons versus causes behind the data reflecting little or no effectiveness of the MBO University student personnel program.

The large university with no MBO student personnel program did record five questions at the sixty percent standard or higher in the yes category. Therefore, the large university without MBO reflected more effectiveness than its counterpart with MBO, but did not come close to matching the overall effectiveness of the two state colleges as recorded by the data.

Without a doubt, the data reflected that in terms of overall effectiveness, the colleges were more effective

than the universities. The MBO College was slightly more effective than the universities. Conversely, the non-MBO University was more effective than the MBO University but not nearly as effective as the two colleges. The MBO College was the most effective of all the institutions and the MBO University was the least effective of all four institutions.

Student personnel programs

Data, in the form of questionnaires, retrieved from all four institutions, showed that objectives were attained, primarily, under the traditional core of student personnel programs and services. The units referred to are counseling, student activities, placement and career planning, orientation and social organizations. If any of the four institutions attained any objectives, the pattern was that they were more attainable in these areas. The two colleges, more so than the universities, showed strong effectiveness in these areas.

What was interesting to note was the consistency across all four institutions relative to the core areas. Even though the MBO University did not attain any objectives, the highest percentage of yes responses was recorded in questions relating to the areas listed above. The same phenomenon was true for the non-MBO University. Although

only five questions reached the sixty percent standard, they were in relationship to the core program.

It appeared that the pattern that emerged was too strong to assume that the results were pure chance. Three questions for the non-MBO University were just barely under the sixty percent standard, otherwise that institution would have come close to showing the overall effectiveness that the two colleges accomplished. Again, in terms of effectiveness related to student personnel programs, the MBO University was the least effective.

The programs and services that served to operationalize objectives in the core units at the two colleges were attracting the attention and involvement of students. Again, the effectiveness of the college with MBO was reflected by the data. Of the four colleges, the MBO College student personnel program was the only one attaining objectives in the area of orientation. The non-MBO College came very close to the sixty percent standard on questions relating to orientation. If the standard was dropped one percentage point, the non-MBO College would have acquired two additional questions, thus the non-MBO College would have exceeded the MBO College.

Part I versus Part II of Instrument

Table One shows an interesting result. Most of the

objectives attained were recorded on Part I of the Survey rather than Part II. Part I was structured in such a manner as to elicit knowledge or awareness from a respondent. Part II, on the other hand, required more from the respondent than just simple awareness. The respondent was required to reach beyond an awareness to almost a knowing stage. It was quite conceivable, then, that the instrument was seeking more from the respondents than they were willing to or could provide.

However, students at the MBO College did commit themselves when they felt comfortable doing so. This was substantiated by the results obtained from questions 31, 32, and 33. These questions, more than likely, referred to orientation. It seemed that this program was quite successful at the MBO College, more so than at any of the other three institutions, although the non-MBO College came close to reaching the sixty percent standard on the questions.

Some thought was given to the notion that generally students were aware of services in at least three institutions and were really aware of whether the university or college was doing what they indicated they were doing. The instrument construction offered no subtle distinction between the two parts of the Survey.

An effort was made to isolate five questions re-

ceiving the lowest percentage of yes responses. The purpose was to observe any kind of pattern that may have developed. Questions receiving the lowest percentages of yes responses across the four institutions were questions 17, 26, 27, 28, and 34. Interestingly enough, all the questions were contained in Part II of the Survey. No strong patterns appeared to have emerged. Student personnel professionals oftentimes consider themselves facilitators and interpreters for students. Percentages recorded from the data collected indicated that student personnel staff at all four institutions may want to put more effort into increasing the effectiveness of that role.

The Inventory of Student Personnel Objectives was divided into four categories of assistance. Cumulative objectives attained under each category were as follows: assistance to students -- four objectives attained; assistance to university community -- two objectives attained; assistance to faculty -- zero objectives attained; and, assistance to administrators -- three objectives attained.

The literature review and results from the data suggested some interesting questions concerning the adaptation and implementation of MBO into student personnel programs. If any conclusion could be reached, it was that MBO may not be the most effective management system for student personnel programs and services. While it appeared

to be as effective as any system in college settings, it may not be effective in large universities. Therefore, its unequivocal adoption by all student personnel divisions in baccalaureate institutions could potentially be a disaster.

Conclusions

With enrollments beginning to decline drastically in higher education, coupled with limitations imposed on available resources, it would appear that the concern for accountability will not disappear. In fact, the reverse may happen -- there may be an even greater emphasis placed on higher education to be more accountable.

There is no doubt that higher education must respond to the issue of accountability. How that will be done and what approaches will be used remains to be seen. Advocates of MBO have suggested this is the system that has potential for higher education in general and student personnel specifically. It is indeed one viable alternative for approaching effectiveness. From a review of the literature, it was determined that many assumptions are being made about the overall effectiveness of MBO, yet research directed at testing those assumptions has been limited. Before there is a declaration that MBO is the panacea to the question of accountability in student personnel, more

evaluation and research should take place. It seems there has been a hesitancy on the part of student personnel professionals to do any evaluation of programs and services. On the contrary, hesitancy should not be the guiding force since accountability now is crucial. Evaluation of all managing systems in student personnel should continue. Strengths and weaknesses of all the systems should be identified and shared with all student personnel administrators. Conceivably, there could be more than one approach to managing that would help in achieving objectives of student personnel programs. Also, it is possible that one type of system may be more conducive to one educational setting than another, to one type of institution more than another, to one organization sub-unit more than another.

In this study, MBO reflected a certain degree of effectiveness in a particular type of educational institution. Also, effectiveness was shown in particular programs, especially with orientation, under the MBO system. Conversely, MBO was not shown to be effective at all in a large university. For those student personnel administrators who work in large universities and who might be giving some thought to implementing MBO in their divisions, the results of this study should be of some concern.

One of the unique features of this study was that

there was an attempt to evaluate a business management system with a business management approach using an instrument that coincided with the objective of the study. One question that should be raised as a result of this study is whether business management systems are really suited for any educational setting, particularly student personnel. What this study has really demonstrated is that more research needs to be done in the area of evaluating organizational effectiveness and effectiveness of management systems, particularly those used in educational settings.

Recommendations for Further Study

Since the accountability concept is concerned with effectiveness, there is a need for more research addressing how effectiveness is determined in educational settings, particularly higher education. Specifically, there is a need to know which approaches to the study of effectiveness are more suitable for what type of institution; which variables constitute accurate measurements of effectiveness; which evaluation criteria are suitable for higher education; how the criteria for determining effectiveness is to be measured; and, to what extent results of research studies can be generalized to other institutions. The previous listing of concerns are just a few of the important questions that need to be researched.

More and more, MBO is being used in the administration of higher education. Certainly, research studies should be done which will evaluate not only its appropriateness, but also its effectiveness in higher educational settings. The review of literature revealed that studies completed thus far have concentrated on only a few aspects of the MBO system. There is a need for research to be concentrated on all components of the MBO system. Some components of the system that should be addressed in the very near future are evaluations of subunits in the organization; setting of organizational goals and the relationship to individual goals; and measurement of individual employee objectives. In addition, a long list of assumed benefits has been suggested regarding the results of organizations implementing MBO. Many of those benefits are only assumed; they need to be verified through actual research. Some important assumed benefits that require verification are: improved organizational planning; improved organizational communication; better team building; improved productivity; improved morale; and, improved employee motivation. Management research literature suggests the previously listed benefits are important concerns within the overall management fabric of any organization.

With respect to student personnel specifically, the rapid adoption of MBO emphasizes the need to continue research into its effectiveness. First, student personnel

administrators must continue to evaluate effectiveness of their divisions. Under the MBO system, divisional goal-setting and subsequent evaluation is one component requiring more attention because of the general concern now for accountability. Second, research might determine if there are particular educational settings which are more suitable to the implementation of MBO. MBO still appears to be a viable alternate system of managing for student personnel divisions. The results of this study did not reflect MBO as a viable system for large state universities. More research is needed to verify its advantages or disadvantages in those settings. Third, studies should be initiated which would determine effectiveness of MBO in such student personnel units as housing, admissions, orientation or financial aid. Residence halls might be a perfect place to compare MBO administered and non-MBO administered residence hall programs. Finally, while there has been some research done surrounding certain components of the MBO system in the business setting, very little research has been consummated using the same components in educational and student personnel settings. Specifically, is there a relationship between the implementation of MBO and job satisfaction, feedback and appraisal, and goal-setting in student personnel work? What conclusions might be reached concerning the benefits derived from implementing MBO in student personnel divisions? The same method-

ological approaches used to research these concerns in the business sector could be used in student personnel. Does goal-setting improve work performance of student personnel administrators? Is feedback and appraisal important to improve productivity of college counselors? Will turnover in the admissions office be reduced if there is better organizational communication? The previous questions exemplify the potentialities for furthering research into the study of MBO in student personnel work. Many research questions asked in the business sector are equally applicable to education. They may be structured differently, but the underlying concern of managers and administrators alike is to improve organizational and institutional effectiveness.

It would appear as though there are important similarities between the research completed thus far in the business sector and research that could be done in educational settings. However, research has not shown that results obtained in the business sector can be generalized to the educational sector. Therefore, the same concerns identified and researched in business and industry, feasibly, could be somewhat identical to those concerns confronted by educational administrators. Educational administrators need to know if the assumed benefits are equally applicable and true for education; or, if there is a different set of benefits that would be more intrinsic to the

nature of educational settings. Under either the business or educational sectors, assumed benefits will need to be substantiated through extensive research. Nothing could be so disastrous to the integrity of student personnel work as to implement any management system that could potentially undermine or erode the effective delivery of programs and services to the very recipients student personnel workers are there to serve -- the students.

REFERENCES

- Albanese, R. Management: Toward accountability for performance. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1975.
- Alkin, M. C. Accountability defined. In R. W. Hostrop, J. A. Mecklenberger, and J. A. Wilsont (Eds.), Accountability. Hamden, Connecticut: Linnet Books, 1973.
- Alluisi, E. A. and Chinn, R. C. Effects of three kinds of knowledge of results information on three measures of vigilance performance. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1964 3, 901-912.
- Babcock, R. D. An analysis of MBO in three different enterprise environments. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1970.
- Balderson, F. E. Managing today's university. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974.
- Barro, S. M. An approach to developing accountability measures for the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 1970, 2, 196-205.
- Brenneman, D. S. Management by objectives: A process for educational administration. In C. P. Heaton (Ed.) Management by objectives in higher education. Durham, North Carolina: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1975.
- Bryan, J. F. and Locke, E. A. Goalsetting as a means of increasing motivation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51, 120-130.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The more effective use of resources: An imperative for higher education. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Papers on efficiency in the management of higher education. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

- Chamberlain, P. C. The new management tools: Problems and potential. NASPA Journal, 1975, 12, 171-178.
- Collins, C. C. Junior college student personnel programs- What they are what they should be. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.
- Connellan, T. K. MBO in Community Colleges. Paper presented in Michigan State University Conference, July 14-16, 1971, East Lansing, Michigan, 1971.
- Dannemiller, K. D. and Linta, E. Management by objectives (MBO) in student services. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1975.
- Deegan, A. X. and Fritz, R. J. MBO goes to college. Boulder, Colorado: Division of Continuing Education, Bureau of Independent Study, 1975.
- Drucker, P. F. Managing for results. New York, New York: Harper and Row, 1964.
- Drucker, P. F. The practice of management. New York, New York: Harper and Row, 1954.
- Easthope, T. A letter of testimonial regarding MBO at the University of Michigan. In K. D. Dannemiller and E. Linta (Eds.) Management by Objectives (MBO) in Student Services. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1975.
- Eurich, A. C. Plan or perish. College and University Journal, 1970, 9, 18-22.
- Feather, N. T. and Saville, M. R. Effects of amount of prior success and failure on expectation of success and subsequent task performance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 35, 226-232.
- French, E. G. Effects of the interaction of feedback and motivation on task performance. American Psychologist, 1956, 11, 395.
- French, J. P. and Coch, L. Overcoming resistance to change. Human Relations, 1948, 1, 512-532.
- Fryer, F. W. An evaluation of level of aspiration as a training procedure. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

- Gaither, G. Accountability. Teaching-Learning Issues, 1972, 18, 1-15.
- Glasner, D. M. Patterns of management by results. Business Horizons, 1969, 12, 37-40.
- Glick, G. W. Student Services. In W. E. Jellema (Ed.) Efficient college management. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 1972.
- Gross, E. and Grambsch, P. V. Changes in university organization: 1964-1971. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- Gross, E. and Grambsch, P. V. University goal and academic power. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1968.
- Gross, E. University organizations: A study of goals. In J. V. Baldridge (Ed.), Academic Governance. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1971.
- Hacker, T. Management by objectives for schools. Administrator's Handbook, 1971, 20, 1-4.
- Hagenmeyer, R. H. Junior College Student Personnel Services, Speech-American College Personnel Association, March 28, 1972, 9.
- Harlacher, E. L. Brookdale Community College in C. P. Heaton (Ed.). Management by objectives in higher education. Durham, North Carolina: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1975.
- Harnett, R. T. Accountability in higher education. Princeton, New Jersey: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971, ED 054 754. MF - 0.65.
- Harpel, R. L. Planning, budgeting, and evaluation in student affairs programs: A manual for administrators. NASPA Journal, 1976, 14, i-xx.
- Harvey, J. Administration by objectives in student personnel programs. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 12, 293-296.
- Harvey, J. L. Management by objectives in higher education: A guide to implementation. Washington, D. C.; McManis Associates, Inc., 1974.

- Harvey, J. Organization and Administration of Junior College Student Personnel Services. Student Personnel Workshop, William Rainey Harper College, October 14 - November 1, 1968. Chicago Heights: Group 10 for the Seventies, 1968, 124.
- Heaton, C. P. Eminence College. In C. P. Heaton (Ed.). Management by objectives in higher education. Durham, North Carolina: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1975.
- Hitt, W. D. Bringing management by objectives to schools. In R. W. Hostrop, J. A. Mecklenburge, and J. A. Wilson (Eds.), Accountability. Hamden, Connecticut: Linnet Books, 1973.
- Hodgkinson, H. L. How can we measure the value added to students by a college education? The Chronicle of Higher Education. (November 13, 1972), 10.
- Hostrop, R. W. Managing education for results. Homewood, Illinois: ETC Publications, 1973.
- Hostrop, R. W., Mecklenberger, J. A., and Wilson, J. A. Accountability. Hamden, Connecticut: Linnet Books, 1973.
- Humes, Charles W. Accountability: A boon to guidance. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1972, 1, 21.
- Humble, J. W. How to manage by objectives. New York, New York: AMACOM, American Management Association, 1973.
- Humble, J. W. Management by objectives in action. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Ivancevich, J. M. A longitudinal assessment of management by objectives. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1972, 17, 126-138.
- Ivancevich, J. M. and Donnelly, J. H. The present and future of MBO: Research and application. Paper presented at the Southwest Academy of Management Meeting, Dallas, March 29, 1971.
- Keane, G. F. Strengthening college administration. Management controls, 1970, 17, 56-61.
- Knezevich, S. J. MBO: Its meaning and application to educational administration. Education. 1972, 93, 18.

- Lahti, R. E. A President's View-Student Personnel in the Community College. Student Personnel Workshop, William Rainey Harper College, October 14 - November 1, 1968. Chicago Heights: Group 10 for the Seventies, 1968, 124.
- Lahti, R. E. Innovative college management. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973.
- Lahti, R. Management by Objectives. College and University Business, 1971, 13, 31-33.
- Lahti, R. E. The preface. In C. P. Heaton (Ed.). Management by objectives in higher education. Durham, North Carolina: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1975.
- Lawrence, L. C. and Smith, P. C. Group decision and employee participation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1955, 39, 334-337.
- Lessinger, L. M. Engineering accountability for results in public education. Phi Delta Kappan, 1970, 2, 217-225.
- Levinson, H. Management by whose objectives? Harvard Business Review, 1970, 48, 125-234.
- Levy, S. R. and Schreck, T. C. Management effectiveness: An introduction. NASPA Journal, 1975, 12, 142-143.
- Lewin, K., Dembo, T. T., Festinger, L., Sears, P. S. Level of aspiration. In J. M. Hunt (Ed.), Personality and the behavior disorders. New York: Ronald Press, 1944.
- Lieberman, M. An Overview of Accountability., Phi Delta Kappan, 1970, 2, 194-195.
- Likert, R. New patterns of management. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- Locke, E. A. Performance goals as determinants of level of performance and boredom. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51, 459-470.
- Locke, E. A. The relationship of goal level to performance level. Psychological Reports, 1967a, 20, 1068.

- Locke, E. A. The relationship of success and expectation to affect on goal-seeking tasks. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967b, 1, 123-134.
- Locke, E. A. The relationship of task success to task liking: A replication. Psychological Reports, 1966b, 18, 552-554.
- Locke, E. A. The relationship of task success to task liking and satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1965, 49, 379-385.
- Locke, E. A. Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1968, 3, 157-189.
- Lopez, F. M. Accountability in education. Phi Delta Kappan, 1970, 2, 231-235.
- Maher, J. R. and Pierson, D. T. Perceived clarity of individual job objectives and of group mission as correlates of organizational morale. Journal of Communication, 1970, 20.
- Maier, N. R. Problem solving discussions and conferences. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.
- Maier, N. R. The quality of group decision as influenced by the discussion leader. Human Relations, 1950, 3, 155-174.
- Maier, N. R. and Hoffman, L. R. Using trained developmental discussion leaders to improve further the quality of group discussion. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1960, 44, 247-251.
- Marland, Jr., S. P. Accountability in Education. In R. W. Hostrop, J. V. Mecklenberger, and J. A. Wilson (Eds.), Accountability, Hamden, Connecticut: Linnet Books, 1973.
- McAshan, H. H. The goals approach to performance objectives. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: W. B. Saunders Company, 1974.
- McDavis, R. J. The development and field testing of an instrument to evaluate student personnel programs. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1976, 17, 100-104.

- McIntyre, J. P. The management of student personnel programs. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1974, 15, 487-491.
- Michigan Efficiency Task Force, Inc. Summary Findings and Recommendations. Lansing, Michigan: Governor's Office, State of Michigan, 1976.
- Miller, T. K. and Prince, J. S. The future of student affairs. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1976.
- Millett, J. D. The management crisis in higher education. Keynote address - National Conference on Management by Objectives in Higher Education, November 9-10, 1972. Washington, D. C.: School of Education, The Catholic University of America, 1972.
- Miller, L. The use of knowledge of results in improving the performance of hourly operators. General Electric Company, Behavioral Research Service, 1965.
- Morrisey, G. L. Management by objectives and results. Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970.
- Mortimer, K. P. Accountability in higher education. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1972.
- Moulton, R. W. Effects of success and failure on level of aspiration as related to achievement motives, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 11, 399-406.
- Noble, C. E. and Taylor, A. Acquisition and extinction phenomena in human trial and error learning under different schedules of reinforcing feedback. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1962, 15, 31-44.
- Odiorne, G. S. Management by objectives. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1972.
- Odiorne, G. S. Management decisions by objectives. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Odiorne, G. S. Management by objectives: A system of managerial leadership. New York: Pitman Publishing Co., 1965.

- Painter, J. J. The University of Utah: Department of Marketing. In C. O. Heaton (Ed.), Management by objectives in higher education. Durham, North Carolina: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1975.
- Peterson, R. Goals for California higher education; A survey of 116 college communities. Berkeley, California: Educational Testing Service. 1973.
- Popham, W. J. The instructional objectives exchange: new support for criterion-reference instruction. Phi Delta Kappan, 1970, 2, 174-175.
- Price, J. L. The study of organizational effectiveness. The Sociological Quarterly, 1972, 3, 3-15.
- Pryer, M. W. and Bass, B. M. Some effects of feedback on behavior groups. Technical Report - 13, Contract N70NR 35609. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University, 1957.
- Raia, A. P. A second look at goals and controls. California Management Review, 1966, 8, 49-58.
- Raia, A. O. Goal-setting and self-control. Journal of Management Studies, 1965, 2, 34-53.
- Rawls, J. D. Western Medical University. In C. P. Heaton (Ed.), Management by objectives in higher education. Durham, North Carolina: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1975.
- Richman, B. M. and Farmer, R. N. Leadership, goals and power in higher education: A contingency and open systems approach to effective management. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974.
- Riles, W. C. Public Expectations. In R. W. Hostrop, J. A. Mecklenberger, and J. A. Wilson (Eds.), Accountability. Hamden, Connecticut: Linnet Books, 1973.
- Ringel, S. and Hammer, C. H. The effect of the amount of information provided and feedback of results on decision making efficiency. Human Factors, 1965, 7, 513-519.
- Robinson, D. W. Evaluation as a function of student personnel administration. In Fitzgerald, L. E.

- Johnson, W. F., and Norris, W. (Eds.), College Student Personnel: Readings and Bibliographies. Boston, Mass.: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1970.
- Satryb, R. P. A budget model for student personnel. NASPA Journal, 1974, 12, 51-56.
- Saurman, K. B. and Nash, R. J. MBO, student development and accountability: A critical look. NASPA Journal, 1975, 12, 179-187.
- Sax, G. Empirical Foundations of Educational Research. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.
- Schotzberger, M. L. Some reflections on higher education administration. A paper in Managing the University: A Systems Approach. (P. W. Hamelman, Ed.), New York: New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972.
- Sims, O. C. and Kozoll, C. E. A case for management by objectives for student development services. NASPA Journal, 1974, 12, 44-50.
- Smith, E. E. and Knight, S. E. Effects of feedback on insight and problem solving efficiency in training groups. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1959, 43, 209-211.
- Smith, V. B. More for less; Higher education;s new priority. Universal Higher Education: Costs and Benefits. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.
- Stedry, A. C. Aspiration levels, attitudes, and performance in a goal-oriented situation. Industrial Management Review, 1962, 3, 60-76.
- Stedry, A. C. and Kay, E. The effect of goal difficulty on performance: A field experiment. Behavioral Science, 1966, 11, 459-470.
- Steers, R. M. Organizational effectiveness: A behavioral view. Santa Monica, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc., 1977.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. The relevance of the CIPP evaluation model for educational accountability. In R. W. Hostrop, J. A. Mecklenberger, and J. A. Wilson (Eds.), Accountability. Hamden, Connecticut: Linnet Books, 1973.

- Svetlik, B. L., Prien, E., and Barrett, G. Relationship between job difficulty, employee's attitude toward his job, and supervisory ratings of employee effectiveness. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1964, 48, 320-324.
- Tosi, H. L. and Carroll, Jr., S. J. Management by objectives: Applications and research. New York: MacMillan Company, 1973.
- Tosi, H. L., Rizzo, J. R., and Carroll, S. J. Setting goals in management by objectives. California Management Review, 1970, 12, 70-78.
- Tosi, H. L. and Carroll, S. J. The practical limitation of management by objectives. Management Review, 1969.
- Trowbridge, M. H. An experimental study of Thorndike's theory of learning, Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1932, 7, 245-260.
- Tyler, R. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago, Illinois: Syllabus Division, The University of Chicago Press, 1950.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Definitions of Student Personnel Terms in Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1968.
- Vande Guchte, P. Management by objectives and perceived effectiveness in selected community junior colleges student personnel units. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1973.
- Vroon, V. Motivation in management. New York: American Foundation for Management Research, 1965.
- Weitz, J. A., Antoinetti, J., and Wallace, S. R. The effect of home office contact on sales performance. Personnel Psychology, 1954, 7, 381-384.
- Whyte, W. F. Money and motivation. New York, New York: Harper, 1955.
- Zajonc, R. B. The effects of feedback and group task difficulty on individual and group performance. Technical report 15, Contract NONR 1224 (34). Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, 1961.

Zander, A. and Medow, H. Individual and group levels of aspirations. Human Relations, 1963, 16, 89-105.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTIONS WHICH EXPLAIN HOW TO MAKE
USE OF THE INVENTORY AND SURVEY

1. Obtain permission of the chief student personnel administrator to conduct an evaluation or research study of your college or university's student personnel program.
2. Select objectives from the Inventory that are appropriate for your college or university's student personnel program at the beginning of the academic year. This selection should be made jointly by the evaluator/research and members of the student personnel staff.
3. Select the demographic items you wish to include in the analysis of the data and place those items at the top of the cover page. Then select the student personnel services that you wish to include in the evaluation/research and place them at the bottom of the cover page. Finally, select questions from the Survey that are representative of the Inventory objectives selected and include them in either Part I or Part II of the Survey. These selections should be made by the evaluator/researcher.
4. Select a sample of undergraduate students (at least 200 per class), a sample of faculty members (5%), and include all student personnel staff (other administrators may also be included). Undergraduate classes should be randomly selected to obtain the student sample. These selections should be made by the evaluator/researcher at the beginning of the spring quarter or second semester. I suggest spring quarter or second semester because the student personnel program will have had a year to achieve its objectives.
5. For data collection, first obtain permission from the appropriate faculty member to visit his/her class to administer the Survey. Then, visit the class and administer the Survey to the students. Finally, personally deliver the Survey to each faculty member and student personnel staff member at the outset of the evaluation/research, and personally collect them after 7 to 14 days.

6. To analyze the data use frequency and relative frequency distributions. Other statistics such as chi-square might also be used. A computer program can be written to analyze the data using the above mentioned statistics.
7. Report the results of the evaluation/research to the university community through the appropriate student personnel offices or student newspaper. Also, mail a copy of the results to me for inclusion in a data bank being established for the Survey.

APPENDIX B

AN INVENTORY OF STUDENT PERSONNEL OBJECTIVES

A. ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS

1. Assisting students to develop self-understanding and self-identities.
 - a. To provide opportunities for students to gain mature insights into their own self-identity and self-realization.
 - b. To assist students in their search for self-identity.
 - c. To assist students in their development of self-discipline and self-evaluation.
 - d. To help students understand what is taking place about and around them and what possible effects this will have on their future.
 - e. To assist students develop self-understanding through a variety of experiences in leadership, followership, and reality testing.
2. Assisting students to become self-directed.
 - a. To assist students in acquiring and developing skills in making self-directed, rational decisions.
 - b. To assist students to become responsible for their own development.
 - c. To assist students in gaining insights into their own behavior which would equip them to make more rational and mature decisions.
3. Assisting students to develop values.
 - a. To provide opportunities for students to develop a system of values.
 - b. To provide opportunities for students to examine and test their values.
 - c. To assist students in identifying alternate value positions and in evaluating the consequences of various actions or positions.

4. Assisting students to develop interpersonal relationships.
 - a. To provide opportunities for students to develop interpersonal relationships.
 - b. To assist students to develop social and human relations skills.
 - c. To help students respond to others as human beings.
 - d. To help students formulate principles for themselves as to how people should relate to one another.
5. Assisting students to develop educational and career objectives.
 - a. To provide opportunities for students to examine, fulfill or change their educational and career objectives.
 - b. College and community resources will be used maximally by students to achieve their educational purposes, in and after college.
6. Assisting students to develop leadership and citizenship competencies.
 - a. To provide opportunities for students to learn and apply leadership and organizational skills within the university.
 - b. To enable students to use campus resources for self-development by participation in student government, residence hall government, faculty policy-making committees and other decision-making processes within the university.
 - c. To encourage responsible participation by students in local, state, national, and world affairs.
7. Assisting students to participate in co-curricular activities.
 - a. To provide opportunities for students to participate in broad educational experiences through co-curricular activities.
 - b. To provide a balance of available social, cultural and recreational activities.

B. ASSISTANCE TO UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY**1. Assisting to develop a campus atmosphere.**

- a. To promote the development of a campus climate conducive to the intellectual, personal, psychological, social, and physical growth of the student.
- b. To help create a campus climate or tone which is one of respect and honesty.

2. Assisting to humanize the university community.

- a. To provide a humanization factor in an impersonal university community.

3. Assisting to individualize the university community.

- a. To provide input into the decision-making and policy formulation processes with the individual student in mind.
- b. To assure that the student's need for individual attention is met.
- c. To emphasize individualized methods in dealing with problems within the context of individual student values.
- d. To influence the university to keep foremost in mind the individuation of the learning process.

4. Assisting to interpret student life.

- a. To try to interpret accurately and effectively the values, goals, objectives, and actions of the students to the university community and its public.
- b. To contribute to the effective interpretation of the nature of a university, the substance of a university education, and the characteristics of a university educated person.

C. ASSISTANCE TO FACULTY**1. Assisting faculty to educate students.**

- a. To assist faculty to educate students for life in a changing society.
- b. To assist faculty to educate students for critical evaluation of information.

- c. To assist the faculty in seeing the relevancy of students' classroom work to the concerns of the wider world.
 - d. To supplement and increase the knowledge and skills of students in all those areas of intellectual development that are not included in the classroom experience.
2. Assisting faculty to interpret student life.
 - a. To assist the faculty to understand and work effectively with students.
 - b. To serve as resource persons in interpreting student life to faculty and conversely in interpreting faculty to students.
- D. ASSISTANCE TO ADMINISTRATORS
1. Assisting administrators to administer student services.
 - a. To administer the offices responsible for providing student services.
 - b. To acquaint students with and encourage them to use student services and other resources available to them.
 - c. To evaluate student experiences for the purpose of deleting and improving programs and practices.
 - d. To research the characteristics of the student body and convey the information to the appropriate offices.
 - e. To research the effect of the university on the attitudes and values of the students.
 - f. To interpret the philosophy of the university to students as reflected in the totality of its programs and procedures.
 - g. To provide for the health and safety of students.
 - h. To serve as a clearinghouse for problems that arise pertinent to student organizations, students, and student-faculty relationships.
 - i. To provide counseling for students with personal concerns.

- j. To assist in orienting new students to the campus in order to make them feel a vital part of the university.
2. Assisting administrators to interpret student life.
- a. To assist the president and other administrators to understand and work effectively with students.
 - b. To serve as resource person in interpreting student life to administrators and conversely in interpreting administrators to students.
 - c. To represent the interests, concerns, and values of students in policy councils.

APPENDIX C

A SURVEY OF STUDENT PERSONNEL OBJECTIVES

DIRECTIONS

Part I

The first part of this survey contains a list of questions which ask you if Student Personnel Services (SPS) are providing various services which help students. Please read the heading at the beginning of Part I and respond honestly to each question in the following manner:

1. Mark X under "YES" if you believe SPS are providing the service.
2. Mark X under "NO" if you believe SPS are not providing the service.
3. Mark X under "DON'T KNOW" if you lack enough information to respond "YES" or "NO".

DO STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES AT THIS UNIVERSITY

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
1. Provide services which help students to understand themselves as individuals?	___	___	___
2. Provide services which help students to develop skills in making their own decisions?	___	___	___
3. Provide services which help students to develop a system of values?	___	___	___
4. Provide services which help students to become aware of values held by other individuals?	___	___	___
5. Provide services which help students to learn how to relate to one another?	___	___	___
6. Provide services which help students to develop their educational and career objectives?	___	___	___
7. Provide opportunities for students to develop leadership and organizational skills?	___	___	___
8. Provide opportunities for students to apply leadership and organizational skills?	___	___	___
9. Provide opportunities for students to participate on decision-making committees?	___	___	___
10. Provide a balance of social, cultural and recreational activities for students?	___	___	___
11. Provide opportunities for students to receive individual help if they need it?	___	___	___
12. Provide input into the university decision-making processes with the interest of individual students in mind?	___	___	___
13. Provide counseling for students with personal concerns?	___	___	___

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
14. Provide advice for student organizations?	---	---	---

DIRECTIONS

Part II

The second part of this survey contains a list of questions which ask you if Student Personnel Services (SPS) are actually assisting students, faculty, or administrators in various ways. Please read the heading at the beginning of Part II and respond honestly to each question in the following manner:

1. Mark X under "YES" if you believe SPS are actually assisting students, faculty, or administrators.
2. Mark X under "NO" if you believe SPS are not actually assisting students, faculty, or administrators.
3. Mark X under "DON'T KNOW" if you lack enough information to respond "YES" or "NO".

DO STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES AT THIS UNIVERSITY:

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
15. Assist students to understand themselves as individuals?	---	---	---
16. Assist students to develop skills in making their own decisions?	---	---	---
17. Assist students to develop system of values?	---	---	---
18. Assist students to become aware of values held by other individuals?	---	---	---
19. Assist students to learn how to relate to one another?	---	---	---
20. Assist students to develop their educational and career objectives?	---	---	---
21. Assist students to develop leadership and organizational skills?	---	---	---

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
22. Assit in developing a campus climate which adds to the intellectual growth of students?	___	___	___
23. Assist in developing a campus climate which adds to the personal growth of students?	___	___	___
24. Assist the University community in becoming aware of the individual needs of students?	___	___	___
25. Assist in interpreting students' actions to the university campus?	___	___	___
26. Assist in interpreting student actions to the local community?	___	___	___
27. Assist the faculty to understand students?	___	___	___
28. Assist administrators to understand students?	___	___	___
29. Serve as resource persons in helping students to understand faculty?	___	___	___
30. Serve as resource persons in helping students to understand administrators?	___	___	___
31. Assist in orienting new students to the campus in order to make them feel a vital part of the university?	___	___	___
32. Orient students to the available student services?	___	___	___
33. Encourage students to use the available student services?	___	___	___
34. Interpret the philosophy of the university to students?	___	___	___
35. Evaluate the effectiveness of the SPS offered for students?	___	___	___
36. Report the results of research conducted on the student body to the university community?	___	___	___

Thank you for your cooperation!

APPENDIX D

Information Which Indicates that Each Survey Question is
Representative of an Inventory Objective

<u>Survey Question No.</u>	<u>Inventory Objective No.</u>
Part I	
1	A. 1a
2	A. 2a, 2b, 2c
3	A. 3a
4	A. 3b
5	A. 4a
6	A. 5a
7	A. 6a
8	A. 6a
9	A. 6b
10	A. 7b
11	B. 3b
12	B. 3a, D. 2c
13	D. 1i
14	D. 1h
Part II	
15	A. 1b
16	A. 2a, 2b, 2c
17	A. 3a
18	A. 3c
19	A. 4b, 4c, 4d
20	A. 5a
21	A. 6a
22	B. 1a
23	B. 1a
24	B. 3c, 3d
25	B. 4a, 4b
26	B. 4a, 4b
27	C. 2a
28	D. 2a
29	C. 2b
30	D. 2b
31	D. 1j
32	D. 1b
33	D. 1b
34	D. 1f
35	D. 1c, 1e
36	D. 1d

APPENDIX E

AN INVENTORY OF STUDENT PERSONNEL OBJECTIVES
(Thirty-six Objectives Used in this Study)

A. ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS

1. To provide opportunities for students to gain mature insights into their own self-identity and self-realization.
2. To assist students in their search for self-identity.
3. To assist students in acquiring and developing skills in making self-directed, rational decisions.
4. To assist students to become responsible for their own development.
5. To assist students in gaining insights into their own behavior which would equip them to make new rational and mature decisions.
6. To provide opportunities for students to develop a system of values.
7. To provide opportunities for students to examine and test their values.
8. To assist students in identifying alternate value positions and in evaluating the consequences of various actions or positions.
9. To provide opportunities for students to develop interpersonal relationships.
10. To assist students to develop social and human relations skills.
11. To help students respond to others as human beings.
12. To help students formulate principles for themselves as to how people should relate to one another.

13. To provide opportunities for students to examine, fulfill or change their educational and career objectives.
14. To provide opportunities for students to learn and apply leadership and organizational skills within the university.
15. To enable students to use campus resources for self-development by participation in student government, residence hall government, faculty policy-making committees and other decision-making processes within the university.
16. To provide a balance of available social, cultural, and recreational activities.

B. ASSISTANCE TO UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

17. To promote the development of a campus climate conducive to the intellectual, personal, psychological, social, and physical growth of the student.
18. To provide input into the decision-making and policy formulation processes with the individual student in mind.
19. To assure that the student's need for individual attention is met.
20. To emphasize individualized methods in dealing with problems within the context of individual student values.
21. To influence the university to keep foremost in mind the individuation of the learning process.
22. To try to interpret accurately and effectively the values, goals, objectives, and actions of the students to the university community and its public.
23. To contribute to the effective interpretation of the nature of a university, the substance of a university education, and the characteristics of a university educated person.

C. ASSISTANCE TO FACULTY

24. To assist the faculty to understand and work effectively with students.
25. To serve as resource persons in interpreting student life to faculty and conversely in interpreting faculty to students.

D. ASSISTANCE TO ADMINISTRATORS

26. To acquaint students with and encourage them to use student services and other resources available to them.
27. To evaluate student experiences for the purpose of deleting and improving programs and practices.
28. To research the characteristics of the student body and convey the information to the appropriate offices.
29. To research the effect of the university on the attitudes and values of the students.
30. To interpret the philosophy of the university to students as reflected in the totality of its programs and procedures.
31. To serve as a clearinghouse for problems that arise pertinent to student organizations, students, and student-faculty relationships.
32. To provide counseling for students with personal concerns.
33. To assist in orienting new students to the campus in order to make them feel a vital part of the university.
34. To assist the president and other administrators to understand and work effectively with students.
35. To serve as resource persons in interpreting student life to administrators and conversely in interpreting administrators to students.

APPENDIX F

A. ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS

1. Assisting students to develop self-understanding and self-identities.

- a. To provide opportunities for students to gain mature insights into their own self-identity and self-realization.

Question 1: Do SPS (student personnel services) at this university provide services which help students to understand themselves as individuals?

- b. To assist students in their search for self-identify.

Question 15: Do SPS at this university assist students to understand themselves as individuals?

2. Assisting students to become self-directed.

- a. To assist students in acquiring and developing skills in making self-directed, rational decisions.

Question 2: Do SPS at this university provide services which help students to develop skills in making their own decisions?

Question 16: Do SPS at this university assist students to develop skills in making their own decisions?

- b. To assist students to become responsible for their own development.

Question 2: Do SPS at this university provide services which help students to develop skills in making their own decisions?

Question 16: Do SPS at this university assist students to develop skills in making their own decisions?

- c. To assist students in gaining insights into their own behavior which would equip them to make new rational and mature decisions.

Question 2: Do SPS at this university provide services which help students to develop skills in making their own decisions?

Question 16: Do SPS at this university assist students in making their own decisions?

3. Assisting students to develop values

- a. To provide opportunities for students to develop a system of values.

Question 3: Do SPS at this university provide services which help students to develop a system of values?

Question 17: Do SPS at this university assist students to develop system of values?

- b. To provide opportunities for students to examine and test their values.

Question 4: Do SPS at this university provide services which help students to become aware of values held by other individuals?

- c. To assist students in identifying alternate value positions and in evaluating the consequences of various actions or positions.

Question 18: Do SPS at this university assist students to become aware of values held by other individuals?

4. Assisting students to develop interpersonal relationships.

- a. To provide opportunities for students to develop interpersonal relationships.

Question 5: Do SPS at this university provide services which help students to learn how to relate to one another?

- b. To assist students to develop social and human relations skills.

Question 19: Do SPS at this university assist students to learn how to relate to one another?

- c. To help students respond to others as human beings.

Question 19: Do SPS at this university assist students to learn how to relate to one another?

- d. To help students formulate principles for themselves as to how people should relate to one another.

Question 19: Do SPS at this university assist students to learn how to relate to one another?

- 5. Assisting students to develop educational and career objectives.
 - a. To provide opportunities for students to examine, fulfill or change their educational and career objectives.

Question 6: Do SPS at this university provide services which help students to develop their educational and career objectives?

Question 20: Do SPS at this university assist students to develop their educational and career objectives?

- 6. Assisting students to develop leadership and citizenship competencies.
 - a. To provide opportunities for students to learn and apply leadership and organizational skills within the university.

Question 7: Do SPS at this university provide opportunities for students to develop leadership and organizational skills?

Question 8: Do SPS at this university provide opportunities for students to apply leadership and organizational skills?

Question 21: Do SPS at this university assist students to develop leadership and organizational skills?

- b. To enable students to use campus resources for self-development by participation in student government, residence hall government, faculty policy-making committees and other decision-making processes within the university.

Question 9: Do SPS at this university provide opportunities for students to participate on decision-making committees?

7. Assisting students to participate in co-curricular activities.

- b. To provide a balance of available social, cultural and recreational activities.

Question 10: Do SPS at this university provide a balance of social, cultural, and recreational activities for students?

B. ASSISTANCE TO UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

1. To promote the development of a campus climate conducive to the intellectual, personal, psychological, social, and physical growth of the student.

Question 22: Do SPS at this university assist in developing a campus climate which adds to the intellectual growth of students?

Question 23: Do SPS at this university assist in developing a campus climate which adds to the personal growth of students?

3. Assisting to individualize the university community.

- a. To provide input into the decision-making and policy formulation processes with the individual student in mind.

Question 12: Do SPS at this university provide input into the university decision-making processes with the interest of individual students in mind?

- b. To assure that the student's need for individual attention is met.

Question 11: Do SPS at this university provide opportunities for students to receive individual help if they need it?

- c. To emphasize individualized methods in dealing with problems within the context of individual student values.

Question 18: Do SPS at this university assist students to become aware of values held by other individuals?

Question 24: Do SPS at this university assist the university community in becoming aware of the individual needs of students?

- d. To influence the university to keep foremost in mind the individuation of the learning process.

Question 24: Do SPS at this university assist the university community in becoming aware of the individual needs of students?

4. Assisting to interpret student life.

- a. To try to interpret accurately and effectively the values, goals, objectives, and actions of the students to the university community and its public.

Question 25: Do SPS at this university assist in interpreting student actions to the university community?

Question 26: Do SPS at this university assist in interpreting student actions to the local community?

- b. To contribute to the effective interpretation of the nature of a university, the substance of a university education, and the characteristics of a university educated person.

C. ASSISTANCE TO FACULTY

2. Assisting faculty to interpret student life.

- a. To assist the faculty to understand and work effectively with students.

Question 27: Do SPS at this university assist the faculty to understand students?

- b. To serve as resource persons in interpreting student life to faculty and conversely in interpreting faculty to students.

Question 29: Do SPS at this university serve as resource persons in helping students to understand faculty?

D. ASSISTANCE TO ADMINISTRATIONS

1. Assisting administrators to administer student services.

- b. To acquaint students with and encourage them to use student services and other resources available to them.

Question 32: Do SPS at this university orient students to the available student services?

Question 33: Do SPS at this university encourage students to use the available student services?

- c. To evaluate student experiences for the purpose of deleting and improving programs and practices.

Question 35: Do SPS at this university evaluate the effectiveness of the SPS offered for students?

- d. To research the characteristics of the student body and convey the information to the appropriate offices.

Question 36: Do SPS at this university report the results of research conducted on the student body to the university community?

- e. To research the effect of the university on the attitudes and values of the students.

Question 35: Do SPS at this university evaluate the effectiveness of the SPS offered for students?

- f. To interpret the philosophy of the university to students as reflected in the totality of its programs and procedures.

Question 34: Do SPS at this university interpret the philosophy of the university to students?

- h. To serve as a clearinghouse for problems that arise pertinent to student organizations, students, and student-faculty relationships.

Question 14: Do SPS at this university provide advice for student organizations?

- i. To provide counseling for students with personal concerns.

Question 13: Do SPS at this university provide counseling for students with person concerns?

- j. To assist in orienting new students to the campus in order to make them feel a vital part of the university.

Question 31: Do SPS at this university assist in orienting new students to the campus in order to make them feel a vital part of the university.

2. Assisting administrators to interpret student life.

- a. To assist the president and other administrators to understand and work effectively with students.

Question 28: Do SPS at this university assist administrators to understand students?

- b. To serve as resource persons in interpreting student life to administrators and conversely in interpreting administrators to students.

Question 30: Do SPS at this university serve as resource persons in helping students to understand administrators?

APPENDIX G

SURVEY QUESTIONS DELINEATED BY MAJOR
CATEGORIES AND SUB-CATEGORIES

A. ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS

1. Assisting students to develop self-understanding and self-identities

Questions: 1, 15

2. Assisting students to become self-directed

Questions: 2, 16

3. Assisting students to develop values

Questions: 3, 17, 4, 18

4. Assisting students to develop interpersonal relationships

Questions: 5, 19

5. Assisting students to develop educational and career objectives

Questions: 6, 20

6. Assisting students to develop leadership and citizenship competencies

Questions: 7, 8, 21, 9

7. Assisting students to participate in co-curricular activities

Question: 10

B. ASSISTANCE TO UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

1. Assisting to develop a campus atmosphere

Questions: 22, 23

3. Assisting to individualize the university community

Questions: 11, 12, 24

4. Assisting to interpret student life

Questions: 25, 26

C. ASSISTANCE TO FACULTY

2. Assisting faculty to interpret student life

Questions: 27, 29

D. ASSISTANCE TO ADMINISTRATORS

1. Assisting administrators to administer student services

Questions: 32, 33, 35, 36, 34, 14, 13, 31

2. Assisting administrators to interpret student life

Questions: 28, 30

APPENDIX H

OBJECTIVES ATTAINED

NON-MBO UNIVERSITY

Question 6: Do student personnel services at this university provide services which help students to develop their educational and career objectives?

Related Objective: To provide opportunities for students to examine, fulfill or change their educational and career objectives.

Question 20: Do student personnel services at this university assist students to develop their educational and career objectives?

Related Objective: To provide opportunities for students to examine, fulfill or change their educational and career objectives.

Question 9: Do student personnel services at this university provide opportunities for students to participate on decision-making committees?

Related Objective: To enable students to use campus resources for self-development by participation in student government, residence hall government, faculty policy-making committees and other decision-making processes within the university.

Question 11: Do student personnel services at this university provide opportunities for students to receive individual help if they need it?

Related Objective: To assure that the student's need for individual attention is met.

Question 13: Do student personnel services at this university provide counseling for students with personal concerns?

Related Objective: To provide counseling for students with personal concerns.

Number of questions reaching 60% standard: 5

Number of related objectives attained: 5

APPENDIX I

OBJECTIVES ATTAINED

NON-MBO COLLEGE

Question 6: Do student personnel services at this university provide services which help students to develop their educational and career objectives?

Related Objective: To provide opportunities for students to examine, fulfill or change their educational and career objectives.

Question 20: Do student personnel services at this university assist students to develop their educational and career objectives?

Related Objective: To provide opportunities for students to examine, fulfill or change their educational and career objectives.

Question 7: Do student personnel services at this university provide opportunities for students to develop leadership and organizational skills?

Related Objective: To provide opportunities for students to learn and apply leadership and organizational skill within the university.

Question 8: Do student personnel services at this university provide opportunities for students to apply leadership and organizational skills?

Related Objective: To provide opportunities for students to learn and apply leadership and organizational skills within the university.

Question 9: Do student personnel services at this university provide opportunities for students to participate on decision-making committees?

Related Objective: To enable students to use campus resources for self-development by participation in student government, residence hall government, faculty policy-making committees and other decision-making processes within the university.

Question 10: Do student personnel services at this university provide a balance of social, cultural and recreational activities for students?

Related Objective: To provide a balance of available social, cultural and recreational activities.

Question 11: Do student personnel services at this university provide opportunities for students to receive individual help if they need it?

Related Objective: To assure that the student's need for individual attention is met.

Question 13: Do student personnel services at this university provide counseling for students with personal concerns,

Related Objective: To provide counseling for students with personal concerns.

Question 22: Do student personnel services at this university assist in developing a campus climate which adds to the intellectual growth of students?

Related Objective: To promote the development of a campus climate conducive to the intellectual, personal, psychological, social and physical growth of students.

Number of questions reaching 60% standard: 9

Number of related objectives attained: 9

APPENDIX J

OBJECTIVE ATTAINED

MBO COLLEGE

Question 6: Do student personnel services at this university provide services which help students to develop their educational and career objectives?

Related Objective: To provide opportunities for students to examine, fulfill or change their educational and career objectives.

Question 20: Do student personnel services at this university assist students to develop their educational and career objectives?

Related Objective: To provide opportunities for students to examine, fulfill or change their educational and career objectives.

Question 7: Do student personnel services at this university provide opportunities for students to develop leadership and organizational skills?

Related Objective: To provide opportunities for students to learn and apply leadership and organizational skills within the university.

Question 8: Do student personnel services at this university provide opportunities for students to apply leadership and organizational skills?

Related Objective: To provide opportunities for students to learn and apply leadership and organizational skills within the university.

Question 10: Do student personnel services at this university provide a balance of social, cultural, and recreational activities for students?

Related Objective: To provide a balance of available social, cultural and recreational activities.

Question 11: Do student personnel services at this university provide opportunities for students to receive individual help if they need it?

Related Objective: To assure that the student's need for individual attention is met.

Question 13: Do student personnel services at this university provide counseling for students with personal concerns?

Related Objective: To provide counseling for students with personal concerns.

Question 31: Do student personnel services at this university assist in orienting new students to the campus in order to make them feel a vital part of the university?

Related Objective: To assist in orienting new students to the campus in order to make them feel a vital part of the university.

Question 32: Do student personnel services at this university orient students to the available student services?

Related Objective: To acquaint students with and encourage them to use student services and other resources available to them.

Question 33: Do student personnel services at this university encourage students to use the available student services?

Related Objective: To acquaint students with and encourage them to use student services and other resources available to them.

Number of questions reaching the 60% standard: 10

Number of objectives attained: 11

APPENDIX K

STUDENT RESPONSES TO SURVEY QUESTIONS

NON-MBO UNIVERSITY

QUESTION	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	TOTAL
1.	143	45	111	299
2.	116	59	124	299
3.	71	85	142	298
4.	103	76	118	297
5.	111	76	112	299
6.	209	36	54	299
7.	170	42	87	299
8.	174	42	83	299
9.	182	39	78	299
10.	177	47	75	299
11.	188	38	72	298
12.	87	83	127	298
13.	178	45	76	299
14.	112	46	140	298
15.	103	76	119	298
16.	107	66	125	298
17.	57	110	131	298
18.	93	75	130	298
19.	105	70	122	297
20.	188	49	60	298
21.	144	54	100	298
22.	149	53	96	298
23.	153	52	92	297
24.	97	75	126	298
25.	79	71	147	297
26.	58	82	157	298
27.	54	104	140	298
28.	55	86	157	298
29.	76	91	131	298
30.	64	92	139	297
31.	148	86	63	297
32.	141	93	64	298
33.	132	100	65	298
34.	63	118	116	297
35.	66	81	149	297
36.	72	88	136	298

APPENDIX L

STUDENT RESPONSES TO SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

MBO UNIVERSITY

QUESTION	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	TOTAL
1.	137	61	91	289
2.	99	77	112	289
3.	84	90	115	289
4.	103	80	106	289
5.	95	91	103	289
6.	150	55	83	289
7.	125	68	96	289
8.	124	78	87	289
9.	124	75	90	289
10.	139	66	84	289
11.	124	82	83	289
12.	90	88	110	289
13.	119	81	89	289
14.	87	74	127	289
15.	106	63	120	289
16.	76	82	131	289
17.	59	86	144	289
18.	77	96	116	289
19.	85	78	126	289
20.	133	61	95	289
21.	100	61	128	289
22.	109	72	108	289
23.	85	81	123	289
24.	86	75	128	289
25.	68	86	133	287
26.	65	80	144	289
27.	69	91	129	289
28.	63	86	140	289
29.	64	86	139	289
30.	81	82	126	289
31.	118	77	93	288
32.	117	89	82	288
33.	118	85	86	289
34.	62	104	123	289
35.	76	80	132	288
36.	76	73	139	288

APPENDIX M

STUDENT RESPONSES TO SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

NON-MBO COLLEGE

QUESTION	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	TOTAL
1.	127	76	73	278
2.	115	87	74	278
3.	89	174	83	278
4.	124	83	70	278
5.	155	75	47	278
6.	201	48	28	278
7.	174	58	44	278
8.	177	49	50	278
9.	183	45	49	278
10.	184	75	18	278
11.	210	40	27	278
12.	91	84	100	278
13.	221	25	29	278
14.	128	36	110	278
15.	97	98	83	278
16.	96	98	84	278
17.	58	124	96	278
18.	97	97	84	278
19.	143	76	59	278
20.	177	60	41	278
21.	143	71	63	278
22.	177	69	32	278
23.	148	83	47	278
24.	74	113	90	278
25.	72	89	116	278
26.	66	99	113	278
27.	53	101	124	278
28.	52	92	134	278
29.	65	102	110	278
30.	61	104	113	278
31.	156	72	47	278
32.	164	85	28	278
33.	165	80	32	278
34.	62	123	92	278
35.	51	79	147	278
36.	75	124	124	278

APPENDIX N

STUDENT RESPONSES TO SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

MBO COLLEGE

QUESTION	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	TOTAL
1.	99	67	107	273
2.	131	65	78	274
3.	102	76	96	274
4.	107	67	99	273
5.	143	61	69	273
6.	200	35	39	274
7.	169	46	59	274
8.	167	42	65	274
9.	162	45	67	274
10.	184	55	35	274
11.	212	25	35	272
12.	93	76	103	272
13.	162	39	71	272
14.	129	37	107	273
15.	90	71	112	274
16.	111	71	91	273
17.	88	74	111	273
18.	90	69	112	272
19.	118	73	81	272
20.	184	45	44	273
21.	150	53	71	274
22.	144	65	65	274
23.	146	64	64	274
24.	99	83	92	274
25.	88	74	112	274
26.	71	86	116	273
27.	80	93	101	274
28.	78	96	100	274
29.	80	107	87	274
30.	77	105	92	274
31.	182	56	33	272
32.	170	65	38	273
33.	177	51	46	274
34.	93	94	86	273
35.	90	63	119	273
36.	85	70	117	272