



8-1973

A Study of Relationships between the Use of Management-by-Objectives and Perceived Effectiveness in Selected Community Junior College Student Personnel Units

Peter Vande Guchte
Western Michigan University

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



Part of the Community College Leadership Commons

Recommended Citation

Vande Guchte, Peter, "A Study of Relationships between the Use of Management-by-Objectives and Perceived Effectiveness in Selected Community Junior College Student Personnel Units" (1973).

Dissertations. 2882.

<https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/2882>

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 STUDY OF RELATIONSHIPS
BETWEEN THE
USE OF MANAGEMENT-BY-OBJECTIVES AND PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS
IN
SELECTED COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL UNITS

by

Peter Vande Guchte

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 1973

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to a number of persons who have given me encouragement and assistance during the completion of this dissertation. I give my wholehearted thanks to these persons:

Dr. .. Dale Faunce, Chairman of my doctoral committee and major adviser, whose genuine regard for me as a person and whose enthusiasm for student personnel work in higher education inspired me...

Dr. W. Chester Fitch, Dr. Paul Griffeth and Dr. Uldis Smidchens, members of my doctoral committee, whose interest in this study and my personal progress was much in evidence...

Mr. Bruce Kocher, Dr. Ken Kuiper and Dr. Dennis Wilson, colleagues and friends, whose help at critical moments of need in the stages of this dissertation study was available...

Judy, my wife, and three children, Cynthia, Adrian, and Joy, without whose love and support this dissertation would not have been completed.

Peter Vande Guchte

INFORMATION TO USERS

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

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

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

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

73-30,303

GUCHTE, Peter Vande, 1934-
A STUDY OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE USE OF
MANAGEMENT-BY-OBJECTIVES AND PERCEIVED
EFFECTIVENESS IN SELECTED COMMUNITY JUNIOR
COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL UNITS.

Western Michigan University, Ed.D., 1973
Education, general

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES	v
I THE PROBLEM	1
Rationale for the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	6
Hypotheses	8
Scope and Limitations of the Study	9
Definition of Terms	11
II REVIEW OF LITERATURE	15
Purposes of Review	15
Review of Management Literature	16
Review of Student Personnel Literature	27
III RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES	40
Review of the Problem	40
Instrumentation	40
Population and Sample	57
Data Collection Procedures	59
Data Analysis Procedures	62
IV DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS	68
Introduction	68
Categorization of Colleges According to Use of MBO	68
Comparison of Perceived Total Effectiveness Scores for Three Categories of MBO-Use Colleges	71
Comparisons of Mean Scores of Each Characteristic of Effectiveness for Three Categories of MBO-Use Colleges	74

CHAPTER	PAGE
V SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY	90
Summary of Findings	90
Conclusions	95
Recommendations for Further Study	96
REFERENCES	98
APPENDICES	105
Appendix A, Illustrations of Expert Authors' Emphases of MBO Components with Assigned Numerical Rating by Researcher	106
Appendix B, Examples of Letters and Rating Sheets Sent to Experts	122
Appendix C, Student Personnel Staff Member Questionnaire and Student Questionnaire	128
Appendix D, Summary of Scheffe' Method Results and Resulting Decisions Concerning Null Hypotheses	135

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLES	PAGE	
1	Summary of Rating of Expert Author Books According to Author's Emphasis of MBO Components	22
2	Ratings by Four Experts of Identified Characteristics of Effective Student Personnel Units	44
3	Reliability Coefficients of Characteristic Item Scores in the Student Personnel Staff Member and Student Questionnaire	56
4	Characteristics of Students Who Participated in the Study	58
5	Number of Responses to Student Personnel Staff Member Questionnaire by College	60
6	Information Used to Categorize Colleges by Use of MBO	70
7	Categorization of Colleges by MBO-Use Category Showing Number of Respondents	72
8	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Total Effectiveness Score Means (as Perceived by Staff Members) among Three MBO-Use Categories of Colleges	73
9	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Clarity of College Goals, among Three MBO-Use Categories of Colleges	75
10	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Acceptance of College Goals by Student Personnel Staff, among Three MBO-Use Categories of Colleges	76
11	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Understanding of Student Personnel Goals and Their Relationship to College Goals, among Three MBO-Use Categories of Colleges	77

12	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Support of Top Administration, among Three MBO-Use Categories of Colleges	78
13	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Staff Role Clarity, among Three MBO-Use Categories of Colleges	79
14	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Program Implementing Ability, among Three MBO-Use Categories of Colleges	81
15	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Self-Evaluation Willingness, among Three MBO-Use Categories of Colleges	82
16	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Human Relations Skill Among Staff Members, among Three MBO-Use Categories of Colleges	83
17	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Leadership Quality, among Three MBO-Use Categories of Colleges	84
18	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Faculty Relatedness, among Three MBO-Use Categories of Colleges	85
19	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Concern for Students, as measured by the Student Questionnaire among Three MBO-Use Categories of Colleges	86
20	Presentation of Item Mean Scores for Character- istics of Effectiveness	87
21	Summary of Decisions Regarding Null Hypotheses Resulting from the Comparisons of Means for Three MBO-Use Categories of Colleges	91

FIGURE

1	Flow Chart of Activities for Instrument Development	42
---	--	----

Chapter I

THE PROBLEM

Rationale for the Study

Management-by-objectives is a system of managing organizations that is receiving wide-spread attention in education. The interest in management-by-objectives arose because of its prospect for increasing effectiveness and efficiency in education and industry. The purpose of this study was to investigate relationships between the use of management-by-objectives and the effectiveness of community junior college student personnel units.

The issue of "accountability" has received high priority in education in the early 1970s and has caused educators to seek new methods of managing education. Mortimer (1972) pointed out that the term "accountability" first appeared in the Education Index in June, 1970. Now, in 1973, the term has become a familiar part of the vocabulary that deals with administrative and management concerns in education. This growth of interest in accountability in educational circles has been evident not only by the increase of writings and speeches on that subject but also by an increase in practices which have met the accountability criterion. In 1971 twenty-nine states in the U.S. were in some stage of constructing an educational accountability approach to state educational management (Parks, 1971). Education at all levels has become cognizant of the need to be accountable to constituents for

the effective and efficient use of the resources committed to education.

Higher education has been facing increasing constituent concern about the management of higher education and has attempted to relate managerial efficiency to educational effectiveness (Mortimer, 1972). Millett (1972), in a keynote address at a national conference dealing with management in higher education, spoke about a crisis in higher education management. Two of the forces contributing to this crisis, according to Millett, 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) attempted to define the issue dealing with accountability when he said, "The question really is, are we willing to state what it is we think we do for and to students?"

The issues raised in current discussions of accountability in education are certainly not new issues in education, even though their currency on a wide scale in education is recent. As early as 1940 Tyler pointed out that fundamentally evaluation was a process for finding out how far the objectives were being realized. In his widely studied educational syllabus, Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction, Tyler (1950) listed four questions which he identified as 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? 4) How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained? These questions have current applicability to the discussion of accountability in education. Educators have for some time understood the concept that goals and purposes in education must be clarified if there is to be purposeful activity toward goals and if there is to be appropriate evidence that indicates progress toward or attainment of goals.

Educators who have searched for methods to administer education in an accountable manner have found that the system of management used in business and industry which is called "management-by-objectives" has potential for higher education. 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 by which to judge the quality of activity (behavior). Output statements are also used to govern the release of inputs (Odiorne, 1971). 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 interest in the use of MBO in higher education has become widespread. In November, 1972, The Catholic University of America called 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. Approximately two hundred persons from higher education attended the conference. Training conferences, like the one conducted by William Rainey Harper College in January, 1973, are scheduled with increasing frequency to teach higher education administrators how to implement the system of management-by-objectives. Sholtzberger (1972), reflecting on administration in higher education stated:

We need to learn more about managing by objectives. This means more than our important, but not 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 of management-by-objectives to student personnel administration in higher education was of particular interest in this study. Advocates of the MBO system who were thoroughly acquainted with student personnel work in higher education advised that MBO is both applicable and beneficial to student personnel administration in higher education (Harvey, 1968, 1972; Lahti, 1968; McAninch, 1971). The interest in MBO in student personnel administration in higher education has grown in the past few years. Some areas of student personnel work in higher education such as admissions, job placement, registration, and financial aid seem to be 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. Other student personnel functions, such as counseling, guidance, and student activities programs have dealt with outcomes which seem less measurable, if not intangible, and the professionals in these areas are presently wrestling with possible answers to the questions of

accountability. Although the accountability questions could be viewed with apprehension, if not alarm, by student personnel workers, they are being seen as a challenge and an opportunity. Humes (1972) saw accountability as a boon to guidance. Hagemeyer (1972) made this 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).

Student personnel workers in higher education are beginning to use the management-by-objectives system in an attempt to enhance the effectiveness of the student personnel work unit. A growing number of colleges, especially community junior colleges, are using the MBO system as the basic management system for administering the college in general and the student personnel unit in particular. A review of the literature of the 1970s showed that student personnel administrators in higher education were implementing MBO.

Tosi and Carroll (1968) studied the effects of MBO in industry and noted that MBO has been implemented on the basis of its apparent theoretical practicability rather than on its researched effectiveness. R.W. Collins (1972), after a critical review of the literature dealing with the use of MBO in community junior colleges, stated, "The amount of research concerned with the application and effectiveness of MBO is rather limited (p. 1)." Because of its recency in higher education, MBO had not been tested to determine its effects in student personnel

work. This study was planned at a time when many student personnel administrators were facing the question of whether or not to employ the system of management-by-objectives in the administration of the student personnel program.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of the present study was to investigate relationships which existed between the use of management-by-objectives and the presence of characteristics of effectiveness in the student personnel units of selected community junior colleges in Michigan. The investigation was designed to provide information about the relationships between the use of MBO and effective student personnel administration, information which was not available.

The problem led to a number of areas of concern to this study:

1. To develop an instrument that would be useful in measuring the presence of characteristics of effectiveness in student personnel units as perceived by student personnel staff members and students, and to develop a procedure for classifying the colleges according to their degree of use of MBO.
2. To determine the degree of difference in the perceived presence of characteristics of student personnel effectiveness among those units which fully use MBO, those units which partially use MBO, and those units which do not use MBO.
3. To determine if relationships exist between each of eleven characteristics of effective student personnel units and the degree of use of MBO.

An important feature of the study was the identification of the components of a MBO system and then the determination as to whether or not, or to what degree, each component was being used in the community junior colleges. Since every college used some sort of management or administrative system, it was possible that some colleges were using certain components of MBO without having given their system the MBO designation. Conversely, it was possible for a college to designate its system as an MBO system when, in fact, the system of MBO as defined in the literature was not in effect. The study attempted to identify the actual degree of use of MBO in the college. A review of management literature which described the MBO system was made and the component parts of the MBO system were identified. This review and analysis of management literature was necessary for the study to proceed.

In order to identify the characteristics of effectiveness in student personnel units, a review of recent student personnel literature was most helpful. Textbooks concerned with student personnel programs in higher education, current articles, and research studies were reviewed in an effort to identify the characteristics which distinguish effective student personnel units. Evaluation of the completeness and accuracy of the list was made by a panel of student personnel experts.

Two questions were asked in this study. A question about the relationship between the use of MBO and perceived effectiveness in the student personnel unit was asked. In order to answer this question, a mean score, referred to as "total effectiveness score" was computed for each category of MBO-use. The second question asked about the

relationship of MBO to each of the eleven specific characteristics of effectiveness. In order to answer this question, mean scores for each category of MBO-use were calculated for each characteristic. The relationship between the use of MBO and each characteristic of effectiveness was then studied.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses that were posed for study purposes were these:

1. The student personnel units of community junior colleges which fully use MBO rate higher on total-unit measures of the perceived extent of presence of characteristics of effective student personnel units than those that do not fully use MBO.

2. The student personnel units of community junior colleges which partially use MBO rate higher on total-unit measures of the perceived extent of presence of characteristics of effective student personnel units than those that do not use MBO.

3. The student personnel units of community junior colleges which fully use MBO rate higher on measures of the perceived extent of the presence of each of eleven characteristics of effective student personnel units than those that do not fully use MBO. The eleven characteristics were these:

- a. clarity of college goals.
- b. acceptance of college goals by student personnel staff members.
- c. understanding of student personnel goals and how they relate to college goals.

- d. support of top administration.
- e. staff role clarity.
- f. program implementing ability.
- g. self-evaluation willingness.
- h. human relations skill.
- i. leadership quality.
- j. concern for students.
- k. instructional faculty relatedness to student

personnel programs.

4. The student personnel units of community junior colleges which partially use MBO rate higher on measures of the perceived extent of presence of each characteristic of effectiveness than those that do not use MBO. The eleven characteristics are listed in the preceding Hypothesis 3.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

The study investigated the relationships between the use of MBO and effectiveness of student personnel units at eight selected community junior colleges. The study was limited to community junior colleges. This limitation in scope was necessary since an adequate number of four-year colleges or universities that were using MBO in the student personnel unit had not been identified. An adequate number of community junior colleges had been located that were using the MBO system. The study has applicability to community junior colleges. Since many aspects of student personnel work at four-year colleges are similar to those at community junior colleges the study may have relevance for four-year

colleges that are considering the adoption of MBO.

Because MBO is a system that has been recently developed, it was impossible to conduct the study at colleges that had been using the system for a long period of time. Colleges in this study had been using MBO from one to three years. Some colleges use a one to three year period to make the transition to MBO (Harvey, 1972). Although the full and final effects of MBO may not be apparent for a number of years, those who have been in the first year or two of implementation of MBO in community junior colleges (Lahti, 1970; Harvey, 1972; McAninch, 1971) extolled the system for the benefits it has yielded. In order to conduct the study at a time when MBO had a first foothold in higher education this limitation was accepted and the study continued.

The study was limited in its scope to the student personnel unit at the community junior colleges. The student personnel staff members included in the study were those professional staff members in the organizational division of the college headed by the chief student personnel administrator or officer. Personnel involved in these administrative and personnel functions were included:

1. Admissions, registration and records.
2. Financial aids and placement.
3. Student activities.
4. Counseling and guidance.
5. Central administrative function of student personnel.

Even though there was a large body of management theory that was worthy of study in relation to its applicability to higher education,

this study's consideration of management theory was limited to theory that was directly related to the management-by-objectives theme current in management literature. This small segment of management theory was considered important because of its current acceptance and use by management theorists and practitioners.

Definition of Terms

Terms used in this study which require definition were the following:

Student personnel - A basic or core definition of "student personnel services" in higher education as used by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare follows:

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 upon the student - his needs and aspirations, his intellectual, personal, psychological, social, and physical growth - so that he may achieve his own goals and the goals of society as reflected by the particular institution he attends. (Definitions of Student Personnel Terms in Higher Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, OE-50083, 1968).

The term "student personnel" used to describe an administrative group is freely interchanged with other terms such as "student affairs," "student services," "student activities," and "student development programs." O'Banion and Thurston (1972), describing the title of their recently published book (Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College), state, "While we have used the newer term student development programs to title the book, most authors still use the more

common term student personnel services; at least no one is using the old term guidance services."

For purposes of this study the major parts of the definition used in the research report to the Carnegie Corporation in 1965, Junior College Student Personnel Programs; Appraisal and Development was used since it is specific in its delineation of student personnel functions:

The student personnel program in the junior colleges consists of a series of related functions designed to support the instructional program, respond to student needs and foster institutional development... There are many ways to organize the basic functions but for our purpose five administrative units...seem to suffice:

- I. Admissions, Registration and Records
- II. Placement and Financial Aids
- III. Student Activities
- IV. Guidance and Counseling
- V. Central Administrative Unit

Unit - The term "unit" refers to that group of persons in the community junior college who were employed in professional, administrative, or management positions in the work of student personnel. For purposes of this study a distinction was drawn between such persons and those who were employed in secretarial or clerical functions for student personnel workers.

Since the organizational arrangements for conducting the functions of student personnel vary among colleges, the term "unit" refers to those student personnel workers who were engaged in at least one of the five areas defined above. This operational definition was necessary since the nature of the student personnel unit varied from college to college.

Community junior colleges - The Institutions In higher education In the United States which were established primarily to serve a local community of people with post-secondary educational opportunities which typically were no longer than two years In duration.

Management-by-objectives (MBO) - Peter Drucker (1954) coined the term "management-by-objectives." In his book, The Practice of Management, he entitled Chapter 11 as "Management by Objectives and Self-Control." This was generally considered as the first exposition of the concept. Drucker stated,

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 team work 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. 135-6).

Later Odiorne developed management-by-objectives into a system of management and wrote extensively about the subject. In his book Management by Objectives, A System of Managerial Leadership (Odiorne, 1965) he gave this brief definition:

In brief, the system of management by objectives can be described as 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 the results expected of him, and use these measures as guides for operating the unit and assessing the contribution of each of its members (p. 55-6).

This definition served well to capture the core meaning of MBO. Odiorne and other authors have described extensively the essential components of the MBO system. These components of the system, necessary

to a full and complete definition of MBO, are discussed in the later chapter of this study, "Review of Literature."

Perceived - The study measured the perceptions of student personnel workers and students concerning the presence (or absence) of certain characteristics in their particular student personnel unit. Perceiving is the act of knowing, becoming aware of, or identifying by means of the senses or the mind. The study described the student personnel unit as seen and understood by student personnel workers in the unit and by students attending the college.

Characteristics - A characteristic is a specific trait, condition or quality which is typical or distinctive of the essential nature of something (in this study, effective student personnel units).

Effective - An effective student personnel unit is one which accomplishes its purposes, achieves its goals, and meets its expectations. The term "effective" describes a favorable state of performance in relation to expectations.

Chapter 11

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Purposes of Review

The review of the literature required a study of management theory and research as well as an examination of higher education student personnel theory and research. The focus of the review of management literature was on the area related to the management-by-objectives system. There were two purposes for the review of management literature:

1. To identify the essential components of a management-by-objectives system as described by the major proponents of the system in management literature.
2. To describe research that relates management-by-objectives to organizational effectiveness and to illustrate the need for more research in this area.

There were three purposes for the review of higher education student personnel literature:

1. To verify that the major proponents of the management-by-objectives system in higher education were using the MBO system as described by management writers.
2. To identify the characteristics which distinguish effective student personnel units from those which were ineffective in community junior colleges.

3. To illustrate the scarcity of research that relates MBO to effectiveness in the student personnel unit.

Purpose #1 in the management literature review (to identify the essential components of a MBO system) and Purpose #2 in the review of student personnel literature (to identify the characteristics of effective student personnel units) formed the basis for development of instrumentation and procedures to carry out the study. Since the study required a categorization of the colleges by degree of use of MBO, it was necessary to identify the essential components of the MBO system. Similarly, basic to the development of an instrument to measure the characteristics of an effective student personnel unit was the accurate identification of such characteristics.

Review of Management Literature

Identification of the essential components of a management-by-objectives system as described by the major proponents of the system in management literature.

In order to isolate the essential components of the system, seven author-experts of the MBO system were selected. Kirchoff (1972) identified nine "experts" in his review of management-by-objectives literature. His criteria for selection were these: to qualify as an expert a person must have published at least one book dealing with MBO, and that book must have received recognition in numerous journals and books for its discussion of MBO. Kirchoff noted that many writers had written about MBO with varying degrees of influence and that no group of experts could be defined precisely.

For purposes of this study seven of the nine experts and their books used by Kirchoff were selected for determining the essential components of MBO:

Hughes, Charles L. Goal Setting--Key to Individual and Organizational Effectiveness. U.S.A.: American Management Association, Inc., 1965.

Humble, John W. Management by Objectives in Action. London, England: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, Limited, 1970.

McConkey, Dale D. How to Manage by Results. U.S.A.: American Management Association, Inc., 1967.

Odiorne, George S. Management by Objectives, A System of Managerial Leadership. New York: Pitman Publishing Co., 1965.

Olsson, David E. Management by Objectives. Palo Alto, California: Pacific Book Publishers, 1968.

Scanlan, Burt K. Results Management in Action. Cambridge, Mass.: Management Center of Cambridge, 1969.

Schleh, Edward C. Management by Results. U.S.A.: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961.

The books of two experts were eliminated from Kirchoff's list:

The Practice of Management (Drucker, 1954) and The Human Side of Enterprise (McGregor, 1960). While both books were written by leading management theorists and do include a discussion of management-by-objectives, they were excluded from this study's book list because the authors did not deal with MBO as a complete system of management. Drucker (1954), when he first coined the term "management-by-objectives," included this concept as one part of his larger description of the practice of management. He made no attempt to detail the components of a MBO system but rather discussed the philosophical implications of the concept.

Similarly, McGregor (1960) did not intend to describe a system of management using MBO but rather focused on the underlying theory and assumptions of management about human beings and on the dynamics of interpersonal relationships which are necessary for organizational effectiveness. He explicated his well-known Theory X and Theory Y which illustrates opposing assumptions which management persons can make about subordinates. McGregor attempted to integrate Theory Y with MBO rather than dealing with the system of MBO itself. The "integration principle" which he indicated as relating MBO and Theory Y is that members of an organization can achieve their own goals best by directing their efforts to enterprise success.

Scanlan (1969) was included even though his book focused to a great extent on the motivational purposes and benefits of a MBO system (which he refers to as "results management") rather than on an explanation of the system itself. However, Chapter 3 of his book was entitled "Establishing a System of Departmental and Job Objectives." This chapter described a step-by-step method for managing by objectives in a department. Because Scanlan described components of the system, his work was included among the experts' books.

A study of the experts' books provided evidence that there was substantial agreement among the authors concerning the essential components of a MBO system. As each expert's book was studied, an attempt was made to identify major components of MBO. Fourteen major components of MBO were identified in a first review of all of the books. Since some authors seemed to place greater emphasis on some components than did other authors, each author's

emphasis of each component was rated on the following five-point scale:

<u>Numerical rating</u>	<u>Author's Emphasis of MBO Component</u>
4	Very Important
3	Quite Important
2	Somewhat Important
1	Very Little Importance
0	No Importance

After rating each author's emphasis of each component it was possible to get a measure of author emphasis for each component. In order to be considered as an "essential" component, the total rating of the seven authors for a component had to meet a standard of at least 21, that is, at least a mean rating of 3, Quite Important, or higher.

As a result of the 21-point standard, two components originally selected were eliminated from the final list of essential components of MBO. The component "Job descriptions are written for each position" was eliminated with a total rating of 18. Although some of the authors (Hughes, Humble, and Olsson) clearly included job descriptions in their discussion of the system, most authors tended to down-grade the importance of the traditional means of describing responsibilities and duties in a job description as being an inexact method of focusing on the performance objectives of a job. Odiorne, for example, emphasized that MBO "enlarges the job description" because it centers on performance objectives and results rather than on a "charter to perform certain duties." Also failing to meet the criterion of a 21-point score was the component,

"Individuals at all levels must participate in organizational goal setting." Scanlan, Humble, and Hughes discussed the motivational effects of participative goal setting. Other authors, however, seemed to indicate that although communication of goals was necessary, goal setting was the task of top executives and the board.

As a result of the review of each expert author's description of MBO, twelve major components of MBO were identified:

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 his 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 them.

7. Goals of individuals and groups in the organization tie in with overall organizational goals.

8. Periodic review of progress toward objectives is made by boss and worker.

9. Boss and worker meet at end of time period to review the degree of accomplishment of objectives.

10. Appraisal of performance is judged on the basis of the worker'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 they can reach objectives.

Table 1 contains the results of the rating of each expert book according to the author's emphasis of the MBO component. Appendix A includes quotations or a synopsis of material from each expert book which served as an example of the author's identification of the component of MBO. Also included in Appendix A is the numerical rating given to each author's emphasis of the MBO component.

Description of research that relates management-by-objectives to organizational effectiveness and demonstration of the need for more research in this area

Since Peter Drucker (1954) coined the term "management by objectives" there has been continued interest in results-oriented systems of managing. Management-by-objectives can be described as a systematic method of answering three questions vital to management: 1) Where are we going? 2) How will we get there? 3) How will we determine when we have arrived? The MBO system is based on the premise that if objectives or results expected of persons or groups are carefully defined and stated, then the likelihood of attainment of such objectives is great. In addition, the system stresses the need for attention to the motivational forces present when people work effectively.

The systematic approach of MBO toward objective planning and attainment has been accepted widely throughout business and industry. Business management has shifted from an activity-orientation to a results-orientation.

TABLE 1

Summary of Rating of Expert Author Books
According to
Author's Emphasis of MBO Component

Rating scale: 4-Very Important; 3-Quite Important; 2-Somewhat Important;
1-Very Little Importance; 0-No Importance

Brief Description of MBO Component	Rating of Expert Authors								Essential ?
	Hughes	Humble	McConkey	Odiorne	Olsson	Scanlan	Schleh	Total Rating	
1. Organizational goals are stated.	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	28	Yes
2. Department-units have goals.	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	26	Yes
3. Each worker states objectives.	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	26	Yes
4. Worker and boss mutually agree on worker's objectives.	3	4	4	4	1	4	4	24	Yes
5. Worker and boss understand how progress will be measured.	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	28	Yes
6. Workers obligate themselves to completion of objectives.	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	26	Yes
7. Individual and group goals tie in with organizational goals.	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	27	Yes
8. Periodic review of progress toward objectives is made.	4	4	4	4	3	4	2	25	Yes
9. End-of-period review of objectives is made.	4	4	3	4	3	4	2	24	Yes
10. Performance appraisal is based on objectives accomplishment.	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	26	Yes
11. Top management is committed to manage by objectives.	3	4	4	4	4	4	2	25	Yes
12. Training and development of workers occurs.	3	4	3	3	2	4	3	22	Yes
13. Job descriptions for each position are written.	4	4	1	3	3	2	1	18	No
14. Participation in organizational goal setting takes place.	4	3	0	0	0	3	0	10	No

Objectives, outputs, results or ends that are clearly defined govern the release of input resources and finally, are the criteria to judge the quality of activity. Odiorne (1969) emphasized that objectives must be defined before energy or resources are released to achieve them.

The great use of MBO in business and industry (and its increasing use in education) came about despite the lack of research to support or refute its use. Ivancevich (1972) said this:

...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).

Raja (1965, 1966) conducted a research study and a follow-up study in a large business organization to "provide empirical evidence which attempts objectively to appraise the application of participative goal-setting and self-control in large organizations." The research method included: 1) analysis of production reports, control reports and written performance reviews; 2) a questionnaire survey to measure awareness, attitudes and opinions, and 3) open-ended interviews. The evidence compiled suggested "some degree of improvement in organization performance despite the problems uncovered." In his follow-up study fourteen months later, Raja (1966) supported his original study findings that benefits had accrued to the organization, but he also was

deliberate in his efforts to identify the problems inherent in the change to a goal and controls program (a program embodying all the characteristics of MBO except its name). He concluded: "However, neither the apparent success nor the problems can be attributed to any one aspect or element of the program, but rather to the extent to which the philosophy of individual growth has been embraced and practiced by individual managers (p. 58)."

Tosi and Carroll (1968) have reported on research that studied the managerial reactions to management-by-objectives. The study reported the results of in-depth interviews with forty-eight managers in a company that used MBO. The research showed evidence that managers saw both advantages and disadvantages in the use of MBO. Tosi and Carroll concluded that much more attention must be focused on the problems brought on with the transition to MBO: "Perhaps the most notable limitation in the management-by-objectives literature has been a consistent avoidance of a discussion of its problems.... Management-by-objectives is not the sovereign remedy that some seem to suggest (p. 423)."

Ivankevich's study (1972) of the effects of different MBO trainer groups on the participants was prefaced with an extensive review of the research studies that had attempted to examine MBO empirically. He concluded his review of the research literature with this judgment: "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 (p. 127)."

Ivankevich's study findings about the effect of different MBO trainer

groups suggested that an active participation role by management in the design and implementation of MBO can have a significant impact on improving the overall job satisfaction of managers.

Babcock (1970), in a doctoral research study, reported that the fundamental change in all successful MBO programs is the creation of managerial role stability. After analyzing three different enterprise environments he specified certain conditions that must exist in an MBO environment as he reported his findings:

1. MBO can have an almost immediate favorable effect on organization effectiveness and efficiency, provided its implications is preceded by careful planning.
2. MBO is a durable and continuing way to insure organization effectiveness and efficiency, assuming continued attention is paid to its implementation and administration and provided the environment remains favorable.
3. MBO has virtually untapped potential for improving the relationships, communication, and coordination among managers in the lateral sub-units of a firm. (Other findings are also listed).

Kirchoff (1972), in an unpublished doctoral dissertation study that focused on methods of measuring the extent of use of MBO, found strong evidence to suggest that participative management is positively related to the extent of use of MBO.

Although research on the use of MBO in education has not been reported, advocates of the MBO system have reported cases of implementation and use of MBO with many organizational benefits (Lahti, 1970, 1971; Harvey, 1972). Hacker (1971) scrutinized the problems rather than the successes of MBO. He emphasized that subordinates are unwilling to maximize their risk by accepting challenging goals since

the chance of failure is increased. Hacker also pointed out that the high premium on measurability of objectives often results in quantifiable goals which are insignificant. He concluded that "unanticipated and undesirable effects can be expected from introducing MBO into a school system..." and that "Means are needed of assessing how well it serves its intended purposes and at what cost to other components of the school system (p. 4)."

Collins (1971) reviewed the literature about MBO to determine its implications for community colleges. He emphasized that "the amount of research concerned with the applications and effectiveness of MBO is rather limited (p. 1)." Collins pointed out that the use of MBO was increasing at a much more rapid rate than subsequent knowledge about it. Although perturbed by the lack of research evidence, Collins concluded from a study of MBO systems that "MBO has sufficient advantages that should make it potentially more effective than traditional management systems..." He also made this statement: "Concepts of MBO are extremely applicable to community college administration (p.17)."

In summary, MBO was being used by many organizations because of its sound theoretical base and its prospect for increasing organizational effectiveness. However, there was a lack of empirical evidence that MBO increases organizational effectiveness. Although a beginning at such research had been made in business situations, there was a dearth of such research and evidence in education.

Review of Student Personnel Literature

Verification that the major proponents of the management-by-objectives system in higher education are using the MBO system as described by management writers

A number of persons had become known in higher education for their advocacy of management-by-objectives in the administration of higher education. Three, all associated with community junior colleges, are listed below with the references to their writings which indicate their description of the use of MBO:

Dr. L. James Harvey, President, Prince George's Community College, Largo, Maryland.

"Administration by Objectives in Student Personnel Programs," Journal of College Student Personnel, July, 1972, 293-296.

"Implementing MBO in Two-Year Colleges," Speech presented at National Conference on Management-by-Objectives in Higher Education, sponsored by School of Education, The Catholic University of America, November 9-10, 1972.

Dr. Robert E. Lahti, President, William Rainey Harper College, Palatine, Illinois.

"Harper College Organizational Development and the Implementation of a Management-by-Objectives System in an Educational Environment," William Rainey Harper College, Palatine, Illinois, April, 1970.

"Management by Objectives," College and University Business, July, 1971, 31-33.

"Dr. Harold D. McAninch, President, Joliet Junior College, Joliet, Illinois.

"Accountability through Management by Objectives," A background paper included in materials at the National Conference on Management-by-Objectives in Higher Education, sponsored by the School of Education, The Catholic University of America, November 9-10, 1972. (Paper co-authored by Thomas Connellan, The University of Michigan).

In addition to these three writers, Dr. George S. Odiorne, Dean of the College of Business, University of Utah, had also written and spoken widely about the use of MBO in higher education. Since he had been included as one of the MBO expert authors, he is excluded from this group of higher education proponents of MBO to avoid duplication.

Odiorne is, however, an articulate proponent of the use of MBO in higher education. He is more generally known for his application of the MBO system to business and industry.

The references by Harvey, Lahti, and McAninch all deal with the use of MBO in college settings. Each of the writers was a community junior college president. A review of the articles and papers of these writers provided evidence that the MBO system as used in business and industry was substantially the same as that being used in community junior colleges. This was not surprising since the authors readily acknowledged that the approach "has been borrowed from the business world." (Harvey, 1972). Nevertheless, it was important to the purposes of the study to note that no major changes had been made in the MBO system in its adaptation to higher education.

None of the three writers suggested that the components of a MBO system in education were different than those identified as being used in business and industry. McAninch, in his paper, concerned himself more with the steps needed for implementing the system rather than attempting to isolate or identify the component parts of the system, implying thereby that the system of MBO as defined in business and industry was the system being used in higher education. Harvey and Lahti were more precise in their identification of the component parts, but they too, by their references to management literature, suggested that they were applying the components of the system as practiced in business and industry. Harvey and Lahti focused on the dynamics of implementing such a system and on the benefits and problems that come with the use of MBO.

Identification of the characteristics which distinguish effective student personnel units in community junior colleges from those which are ineffective

Basic to the development of an instrument to measure the characteristics of an effective student personnel unit was the accurate identification of such characteristics. Student personnel literature was broadly reviewed to determine if there was widespread definition and acceptance of a group of characteristics that distinguished "effectiveness" in student personnel work in higher education.

Most authors of books on student personnel in higher education and those who have written papers and articles had touched on the matter of "effectiveness" in student personnel administration, but no one writer seemed intent on describing such a list of characteristics which could be considered as the bench-marks of an effective program. Most textbooks on higher education student personnel work are descriptive of the functions, services, or programs which should be offered or performed in successful student personnel programs. Wrenn (1951) did discuss in Chapter 2, "Organization and Administration of the Student Personnel Program" but focused the major part of his book on describing counseling services and group experiences. Later in his book he discussed general institutional administration but with no attempt to define the characteristics of effectiveness. Williamson (1961) described "The Art of Administration" in one chapter and "Administering the Program of Services" in another and proposed his philosophy about the operating conditions that are found in effective administration (unity of command, delegation of responsibility, span of control, coordination, etc.). His work provided a valuable beginning to the

discussion of effectiveness. In an addendum to his preface he acknowledged his work as a beginning effort. Shaffer and Martinson (1966) were descriptive of what student personnel services in higher education should be, and their book did not seem to intend to focus directly on the criteria of effectiveness in student personnel administration.

Four references were selected as being representatives of research and discussion of effectiveness current in the literature:

1. Two articles in Student Personnel Development Programs in the Community Junior College. T. O'Banion and A. Thurston (Editors), Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Fordyce, Joseph W. "Evaluation of Student Personnel in Community Colleges."

McDaniel, J.W. and Robert Lombardi. "Organization and Administration of Student Personnel Work in the Community College."

2. Harvey, L. James. "Organization and Administration of Junior College Student Personnel Services," Paper presented at Student Personnel Workshop, William Rainey Harper College, October 14-November 1, 1968, Chicago Heights: Group 10 for the Seventies, 1968.

3. Junior College Student Personnel Programs, Appraisal and Development, A Report to Carnegie Corporation, November, 1965. From the National Committee for Appraisal and Development of Junior College Student Personnel Programs, T.L. McConnell, Chairman. (Max R. Raines, Staff Director).

4. Policy Statement of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators: "Statement of Desirable Conditions and Standards for Maximum Effectiveness of the College Administrator," NASPA Journal, Vol. 9, No. 1, July, 1971, 2-7.

In an article, "Evaluation of Student Services in Community Colleges," which he wrote for the book Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College (Editors: O'Banion and Thurston, 1972), Fordyce discussed the problems of measuring effectiveness and efficiency in student personnel programs. Fordyce suggested that effectiveness be judged in terms of student outcomes. In the final section of his article he stressed

the importance of certain factors which, if well-managed, make it possible for the program to flourish. The factors included effective organization at both the college level and the student personnel level, adequate staffing, clear delineation of responsibilities, clear delineation of student personnel purposes for students, effective communication procedures, clear delineation of the faculty role in guidance, high morale, and collection of testing information from students.

In the same book an article by J.W. McDaniel and R. Lombardi, "Organization and Administration of Student Personnel Work," reviewed organizational structures and administrative principles for carrying out student personnel work in the community junior college. A healthy student personnel organization was described as having these characteristics:

- Group defined and accepted objectives
- More attention to goals than to structure
- Readiness to change forms as goals change
- Leader remains a part of the group
- Defined roles
- Reasonable calendars and schedules
- Mutual respect of professional competence
- Open communication of fact and feeling
- A machinery for problem solving
- A machinery for complaint resolution

The administrative principles needed for effective student personnel work, according to McDaniel and Lombardi, were these: provision of budget and policy support from college administration; involvement of faculty, students and administration in decision-making; efficient clerical and record-keeping services; emphasis on human-to-human relationships; clear communication through both formal and informal channels; and

other attributes emphasizing good human relationships.

Harvey (1968) listed certain principles and goals as basic to a sound student personnel program:

1. Student personnel units should clearly state objectives and these should directly relate to the purposes of the institution; broad policy statements regarding the student personnel program should be adopted;
2. Each student personnel officer should be close to the president and considered as one of the key officials of the college.
3. The chief student personnel officer must be an educational leader.
4. The staff must be adequate to serve students.
5. Continual research of strengths and weaknesses is needed.
6. A budget commitment for student personnel programs is essential.
7. There must be a concern for students: full and part-time, day and evening. Students must be involved in planning the student personnel program.

Harvey also defined objectives of a chief student personnel officer who is to lead a sound program. The objectives deal with leadership in the areas mentioned above and the need for giving adequate support for the program, strengthening ties between the program and other areas of the college, encouraging program and staff development and evaluation, and developing unity and cohesiveness among staff members.

Probably the most comprehensive investigation of community junior colleges was completed by the National Committee for Appraisal and Development of Junior College Student Personnel Programs (T.R. McConnell, Chairman). The research, directed by Max R. Raines, was conducted in

the mid-1960s. The report to the Carnegie Corporation, November, 1965, Junior College Student Personnel Programs, Appraisal and Development, presented the findings of the national study. The study analyzed the student personnel unit from a functional point of view. A model of a student personnel unit was developed in functional terms. Measurements of the scope and quality of the identified functions were made at seventy-four smaller and forty-nine larger junior colleges. The study, in general, showed that junior college student personnel programs were inadequate in terms of providing the breadth and quality of student personnel programs.

Most pertinent to the present study was Raines' identification of characteristics of effectiveness in the report, "Significance of Selected Variables in Differentiating Strong and Weak Programs." Raines reported on a part of the study which investigated the relationship to effectiveness of selected characteristics which were called "developmental characteristics" because they had impact upon the development of programs. Although causation was not established because it was a "correlational study," Raines reported that "the data strongly suggests that positive manipulation of developmental characteristics would result in improved programs (p. 10)." The characteristics which differentiated the strongest student personnel programs from the weakest are listed below, accompanied by a brief Raines' quotations which explains the characteristic:

1. Support from administration - "It is unlikely that any college program can thrive without the support of top leaders (p. 10)."

2. Clarity of staff roles - "...effectiveness is associated with unambiguous understandings of one's professional responsibilities (p. 11)."

3. Faculty concurrence with institutional goals and policies - "...the college which knows what it wants to do and employs a faculty which endorses these goals produces a climate favorable to the development of effective student personnel programs (p. 11)."

4. Identification of supporting data to stimulate development - "...collect relevant facts about students...(p. 11)."

5. Equipment - "...the presence of adequate equipment can be viewed as tangible evidence of a concern for adequate programming (p. 12)."

6. Workable ideas and concepts - "...the presence or absence of creative and practical efforts to implement functions and resolve problems." "...it seems likely that stronger programs demonstrate awareness of the educative potentialities of student participation and involvement (p. 12)."

7. In-service training - "...a well-developed in-service training is probably an out-growth of a felt need of staff members to improve their skills, to keep up with new developments...and to search for strengths and weaknesses in programming (p. 13)."

On April 3, 1970, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators adopted a policy statement, "Statement of Desirable Conditions and Standards for Maximum Effectiveness of the College Administrator." This statement specified the conditions and standards that should be present in pre-employment, employment, and termination

of a college administrator in order to enhance effectiveness. The statement intended to clarify the reciprocal relationship between the rights of the institution and the responsibilities of the administrator. In an attempt to indicate the specific details of the NASPA document that illustrate conditions and standards needed for maximum effectiveness without quoting extensively from the document, selected phrases are presented in condensed and re-worded form:

Pre-employment

1. Institution gives a clear statement of its objectives, beliefs, purposes and expectations.
2. Clear definition of responsibility, authority and nature of relationships for positions; definition of job description and criteria for evaluation.

During employment

1. Relationship of mutual trust and openness between administrator and his staff; consultation on all relevant policy matters.
2. Freedom to take exception, in a professional manner, with decisions of superiors.
3. Open communication channels between superiors and subordinates for discussing conflicts in decision-making, disagreements, doubts or questions about behavior.
4. Adequate clerical, budgetary and professional staff support.
5. Opportunities for learning and professional growth.
6. Participation in decisions which affect the area for which a person is responsible; reexamination of policies.
7. Support of top administration in the face of undue pressure and/or irresponsible criticism.

8. Periodic review of job performance on the basis of previously stated criteria.

After a review of these writings, research findings, and policy statements a number of characteristics of effectiveness of community junior college student personnel programs were identified. The list of characteristics was then subjected to evaluation by a panel of student personnel experts (see discussion of instrument development in Chapter 3) and eleven characteristics of effectiveness were identified. Following are these characteristics with a brief description of each:

1. Clarity of College Goals - College goals are stated clearly. They are defined in terms that are understandable and give specific direction to student personnel staff members.
2. Acceptance of College Goals by Student Personnel Staff - The student personnel staff members accept college goals as their own goals.
3. Understanding of Student Personnel Goals and Their Relationship to College Goals - Goals and objectives of the student personnel program are understood by student personnel staff members and give their work direction in terms of achieving the overall college goals.
4. Support of Top Administration - The board of trustees and the chief executive of the college promote the student personnel program, demonstrating that they consider the program and its staff as essential to the purpose of the college. They provide budgetary means for adequate facilities, equipment and staff resources.

5. Staff Role Clarity - A student personnel staff member has a clear definition of his responsibilities, his authority, the nature of his relationships with other colleagues and agencies, and the criteria for evaluation of his performance.

6. Program Implementing Ability - Student personnel staff members are able to provide the plans, efforts, and follow-through action to carry into effect the programs and projects which are necessary to achieve their ends.

7. Self-Evaluation Willingness - Efforts are made by student personnel staff members to assess the effects of individual and program efforts, and to appraise their adequacy, and to seek means and methods for improvement.

8. Human Relations Skill Among Staff Members - Student personnel staff members exhibit mutual respect and trust and participate in clear communication of fact and feeling with each other. They develop a unity and cohesiveness through friendly working relationships.

9. Leadership Quality - The chief student personnel administrator demonstrates the qualities, skills and actions necessary to help the student personnel staff member and the unit to move toward achievement of individual, unit, and college goals.

10. Faculty Relatedness - The student personnel staff is aware of and responsive to the needs and concerns of instructional faculty. The student personnel programs reflect this responsiveness.

11. Concern for Students - The student personnel program focuses its resources on meeting students' needs and upon individualizing the impact of the college for each student. The staff recognizes the

educative potentialities of student involvement and participation.

Illustration of the scarcity of research that relates MBO to effectiveness in the student personnel unit

There was a paucity of reported research about MBO and the student personnel unit. The writing that was done was descriptive of the use of MBO in student personnel administration and failed to provide research evidence that suggested that MBO was related to effectiveness in the student personnel unit.

Much of the reported research concerned with student personnel work in higher education and its effectiveness were attempts to identify the purposes of student personnel work or were efforts to identify the quality of the functions performed. In 1968 the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA, April 1968), in an article on research needs, stated that "The highest priority should be given to inquiries that clarify and delineate the professional responsibilities and necessary competencies of the student personnel administrator." This discussion of purpose and responsibilities continued in the professional literature (e.g. O'Banion in NASPA Journal, January, 1971). Although this area of concern was tangentially related to this study, it provided no direct evidence which relates management techniques to effectiveness.

In the UCLA Junior College Research Review (June, 1969) the statement was made that "Almost without exception, the Clearinghouse documents pertaining to junior college student personnel work are more descriptive than analytical; most are attempts to describe the functions of a

student personnel program--not the effects." The Carnegie Corporation report of 1965, previously discussed, probably was the most significant research that was done that illustrated factors which distinguish effective student personnel units. Even in that study, however, the major effort was aimed at determining the scope and quality of functions in the community junior colleges. The Carnegie study was completed well before MBO began to be used in the community junior colleges and, thus, had no reason to discuss the use of MBO in student personnel units.

This study attempted to make a beginning at investigating the relationships which existed between the use of management-by-objectives and the presence of characteristics of effectiveness in community junior college student personnel units.

Chapter III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Review of the Problem

The problem of this study was to investigate relationships which existed between the use of management-by-objectives and the presence of characteristics of effectiveness in the student personnel units of selected community junior colleges in Michigan. The purpose of the study was to provide information about the relationships between MBO and effective student personnel administration in higher education as perceived by student personnel staff members and students at the selected community junior colleges. This chapter will discuss the procedures used to carry out the study: the development of instruments, the selection of population and sample, and the data collection and analysis procedures.

Instrumentation

Development of the questionnaire

The Student Personnel Staff Member Questionnaire and the Student Questionnaire were developed to carry out the investigation of the use of MBO and characteristics of effectiveness in student personnel administration. Kirchoff (1972) developed an instrument to measure the extent of use of MBO in industrial organizations. His instrument, Managerial Style Questionnaire, was designed to measure the use of MBO in various managerial functions. The methods used in Kirchoff's instrument

to measure the use of MBO were useful in the development of the Student Personnel Staff Member Questionnaire.

The National Committee for Appraisal and Development of Junior College Student Personnel Programs developed an instrument, "Inventory of Selected College Functions," for their national study of community junior college student personnel programs. This instrument was designed to measure the scope and quality of student personnel functions. From that instrument, one section, entitled "Development Factors," was also useful in developing the Instruments used in this study.

Instrument development activities are illustrated in the Flow Chart of Activities For Instrument Development found in Figure 1 on the following page. The left side of the chart illustrates how the twelve major components of MBO were identified. A questionnaire item was developed to measure each of the twelve major components of MBO. The responses of student personnel staff members to these questions were used as part of the procedure for categorizing the colleges according to their use of MBO.

The right side of the chart illustrates the development of the portion of the instrument that measured the perceptions of the student personnel staff members and students regarding the characteristics of effectiveness of the student personnel unit. A group of experts included these persons:

- Dr. Jane E. Matson, Professor of Education, California State College of Los Angeles.
- Dr. Terry O'Banion, Associate Professor of Higher Education, University of Illinois at Urbana.
- Dr. Max Raines, Professor of Higher Education, Michigan State University.
- Dr. Kenneth Venderbush, Vice-President for Student Affairs, Grand Valley State College, Michigan.

Figure 1
Flow Chart of Activities for Instrument Development

Reviewed management literature.

Selected and reviewed seven "expert authors on MB0:
Hughes, Charles L. Goal Setting--Key to Individual and Organizational Effectiveness.

Humble, John W. Management by Objectives in Action.

McConkey, Dale D. How to Manage by Results.

Odiorne, George S. Management by Objectives,

A System of Managerial Leadership.

Olsson, David E. Management by Objectives.

Scanlan, Burt K. Results Management in Action.

Schleh, Edward C. Management by Results.

Selected twelve essential components of MB0 by rating each author's inclusion of the component in his book. Rejected components that were not given enough emphasis by all authors.

Instrument items developed.

Wording of items checked for clarity with a community college dean and eight doctoral students.

Instrument items revised and written in final form.

Drawing completed to assign question items to positions in the questionnaire without bias.

Instrument printed and ready for administration.

Reviewed higher education student personnel literature.

Selected and reviewed five references that are representative of discussion of "effectiveness" in student personnel:

Fordyce, Joseph W. "Evaluation of Student Services in Community Colleges" in Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College (Editors: O'Banion and Thurston, 1972).

Harvey, L. James. "Organization and Administration of Junior College Student Personnel Services."

McDaniel, J.W. and R. Lombardi. "Organization and Administration of Student Personnel Work in the Community College" in Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College" (Editors: O'Banion and Thurston, 1972).

Junior College Student Personnel Programs, Appraisal and Development, A Report to Carnegie Corporation, November, 1965.

Policy Statement of NASPA, "Statement of Desirable Conditions and Standards for Maximum Effectiveness of the College Administrator," NASPA Journal, July, 1971.

Identified characteristics of effectiveness in student personnel in higher education. Defined each.

Reviewed textbook authors to insure completeness of list of characteristics of effectiveness.

Instrument items developed.

Selected experts to judge accuracy and completeness of identified list of characteristics of effectiveness.

Experts' responses received; list of characteristics and instrument are modified.

Content validity of instrument checked with seventeen persons in four different meetings.

Instrument items revised and finalized.

Matson, O'Banion, and Raines were well-known in the community junior college student personnel professional community because of their numerous articles in professional journals and their leadership in community junior college student personnel associations. Venderbush was selected because he was on the executive committee of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators as Division Director of Professional Development and Standards during the period that the policy statement of NASPA, "Statement of Desirable Conditions and Standards for Maximum Effectiveness of the College Administrator" was issued.

A letter and questionnaire (See Appendix B) were mailed to each expert asking for a rating of each characteristic of effectiveness as either Very Important, Somewhat Important or Not Important. The expert was also asked to add characteristics which may have been omitted. Table 2 illustrates that there was major agreement among the experts that the identified characteristics were important. All four experts added a characteristic of effective student personnel units that had to do with faculty-relatedness to the student personnel program. Also, it became apparent in a telephone discussion with one of the experts that the first characteristic, "Clarity and Acceptance of College Goals," should be sub-divided into its two separate components, 1) Clarity and 2) Acceptance. This characteristic, then, was listed as two separate characteristics.

Validity

In order to insure content validity of the instrument and to insure that question items were worded in acceptable and understandable format, the questionnaire was discussed with seventeen persons

TABLE 2

Ratings by Four Experts
of
Identified Characteristics of Effective Student Personnel Units

Characteristic	Number of Expert Ratings by Category		
	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
1. Clarity and Acceptance of College Goals (later divided into two characteristics: 1) Clarity and 2) Acceptance	3	1	
2. Understanding of Student Personnel Goals and Their Relationship to College Goals	3	1	
3. Support of Top Administration	4		
4. Staff Role Clarity	3	1	
5. Program Implementing Ability	4		
6. Self-Evaluation Willingness	3	1	
7. Human Relations Skill Among Staff Members	3	1	
8. Leadership Quality	3	1	
9. Concern for Students	3	1	
10. Faculty-Relatedness (added by all four experts)	4		

in four different meetings. Individuals consulted included: 1) a vice-president for student affairs, dean of students, director of student activities, associate dean of students and a counselor of a university, 2) a dean of students and a registrar of a private four-year college, 3) eight doctoral students in educational leadership and counseling and personnel, 4) a dean of students of a community college and a former

dean of students of a community college who is currently a doctoral student in counseling and personnel.

The instrument items were arranged in groupings by characteristic of effectiveness to enhance discussion with the persons mentioned above. When possible, the instrument was given to these persons for study before the meeting for discussion purposes. A page of instructions preceded the instrument items. At the time of discussion of the document the following printed instruction was repeated from the page of instructions:

"For each item on the attached pages I would like your reaction to these questions: 1) Are the questionnaire items relevant to the characteristic being measured? 2) Are there dimensions to the characteristic that are not being measured by the items? 3) Are the items worded so that they are understandable and free from ambiguity?"

Feedback from these seventeen persons resulted in a number of revisions in the wording of questions, in the elimination of a few questions, and in the addition of several questions. The persons consulted evidenced general agreement that the questions measured what they intended to measure, measured the essential dimensions of the characteristics, and were phrased in clear and understandable words.

The questions as shown on the following pages, grouped by characteristic of effectiveness, represented the final revision made after discussion. This format was also used for discussion purposes as the questionnaires were developed. Each characteristic was briefly defined and the items pertaining to the measurement of the characteristic were listed immediately below it. The item that measured ten of the

characteristics of effectiveness and the items used to identify the use of MBQ were included in the Student Personnel Staff Member Questionnaire. The twelve items relating to the eleventh characteristic "Concern for Students" were included in the Student Questionnaire.

In order to assign the questions to positions in the Student Personnel Staff Member Questionnaire with as little bias as possible, chips numbered from 1-60 were mixed and drawn from a box. The first chip drawn was #44; therefore Item #1 on the final revision was assigned position #44 in the questionnaire. This procedure was continued until all questions were assigned to positions in the questionnaire. On the following pages the right-hand column indicates the assigned questionnaire position based on this drawing. The twelve questionnaire items for the Student Questionnaire were assigned positions based on the same procedure.

<u>Student Personnel Staff Member Questionnaire</u>	Assigned Position
<u>Clarity of College Goals</u> - College goals are stated clearly. They are defined in terms that are understandable and give specific direction to student personnel staff members.	
1. This colleges' goals are stated so that they give a well-defined sense of direction to student personnel staff members.	44
2. At the time of employment candidates for student personnel positions are provided a clear explanation of the purposes and goals of this college.	26
3. At this college top administration makes efforts to have college goals defined in terms of outcomes or behavioral changes that can be measured or observed.	45
4. Our college's goals and objectives are continually being clarified, reappraised, and revised if needed.	23

Acceptance of College Goals by Student Personnel Staff - Assigned
The student personnel staff members accept college goals as their own goals. Position

- | | |
|---|----|
| 5. This college's purposes and goals are important to me. | 34 |
| 6. Student personnel staff would be involved if this college was planning major shifts in college goals and purposes. | 1 |
| 7. I accept this college's goals as goals which I will work toward. | 11 |

Understanding of Student Personnel Goals and Their Relationship to College Goals - Goals and objectives of the student personnel program are understood by student personnel staff members and give their work direction in terms of achieving the overall college goals.

- | | |
|---|----|
| 8. The purposes of the student personnel program at this college are clearly defined. | 49 |
| 9. Close relationships exist between the goals of the student personnel program and the overall goals of this college. | 3 |
| 10. Student personnel staff members know what the top administration of this college expects of them. | 16 |
| 11. Our student personnel programs are the results of discussions and meetings with students, instructional faculty and student personnel staff. | 46 |
| 12. Systematic, formal efforts are made to integrate the student personnel program and the instructional program into one unified program for students. | 17 |

Support of Top Administration - The board of trustees and the chief executive of the college promote the student personnel program, demonstrating that they consider the program and its staff as essential to the purpose of the college. They provide budgetary means for adequate facilities, equipment and staff resources.

- | | |
|---|----|
| 13. The chief executive of this college gives moral support to the student personnel program. | 52 |
| 14. Student personnel staff are represented in top-level policy and decision-making groups. | 5 |

Assigned
Position

- | | |
|--|----|
| 15. Considering the total economic strength of this college, student personnel programs are provided adequate professional staff, secretarial and clerical assistance. | 31 |
| 16. Considering the total economic strength of this college, student personnel programs are provided adequate equipment and facilities. | 20 |
| 17. Student personnel staff members feel free to take exception, in a professional manner, with decisions made by their immediate supervisor or top administrators of the college. | 48 |

Staff Role Clarity - A student personnel staff member has a clear definition of his responsibilities, his authority, the nature of his relationships with other colleagues and agencies, and the criteria for evaluation of his performance.

- | | |
|--|----|
| 18. In my area, each student personnel staff member knows his/her responsibilities, authority and position in the organization. | 41 |
| 19. Each student personnel position has a written job description. | 13 |
| 20. The criteria for evaluating a student personnel staff member's performance are stated and understood by both the staff member and his immediate supervisor. | 33 |
| 21. Communication channels are open for clearing up organizational difficulties that may arise, such as overlapping responsibilities, ineffective relationships and unclear roles. | 29 |

Program Implementing Ability - Student personnel staff members are able to provide the plans, efforts and follow-through action to carry into effect the programs and projects which are necessary to achieve their ends.

- | | |
|--|----|
| 22. A favorable climate exists within our student personnel program so that new ideas and program are implemented. | 57 |
| 23. I view our student personnel unit as a group of people who can get a job done effectively and efficiently. | 4 |

	Assigned Position
24. Our student personnel staff has sufficient follow-through ability and perseverance so that newly introduced programs become well-developed programs.	28
25. The programs initiated by our student personnel unit are usually creative, yet practical, efforts to implement functions and resolve problems.	39
26. Planning programs for the future is considered important by the chief student personnel administrator.	55
<u>Self-Evaluation Willingness</u> - Efforts are made by student personnel staff members to assess the effects of individual and program efforts, and to appraise their adequacy, and to seek means and methods for improvement.	
27. Information concerning the nature of the student body is regularly collected and reported to student personnel staff members.	60
28. In my area, student personnel staff members exhibit willingness to discuss changing our student personnel programs.	38
29. Attempts are made to evaluate the effectiveness of new student personnel programs.	35
30. Student personnel staff members understand the fundamental principles of educational and behavioral research.	12
31. Staff meetings include time for critical evaluation of student personnel programs.	22
32. Most student personnel staff members engage in some kind of formal educational experience or course work related to their job.	50
33. Comments, suggestions, and evaluations of student personnel programs are systematically collected from students, instructional faculty and/or other "non-student personnel" individuals or groups.	15

<u>Human Relations Skill Among Staff Members -</u> Student personnel staff members exhibit mutual respect and trust and participate in clear communication of fact and feeling with each other. They develop a unity and cohesiveness through friendly working relationships.	Assigned Position
34. Student personnel staff members take time to meet with each other (formally or informally) and seem to enjoy each other's presence.	14
35. Student personnel staff members participate in decision-making which affects their area of work.	27
36. Among student personnel staff members there is a mutual respect of professional competence and a willingness to seek and to share such competence.	30
37. I feel an atmosphere of trust and openness exists between the chief student personnel administrator and his/her student personnel staff.	32
38. Both formal and informal channels provide me with opportunity to communicate concerns and problems.	54
<u>Leadership Quality -</u> The chief student personnel administrator demonstrates the qualities, skills and actions necessary to help the student personnel staff member and the unit to move toward achievement of individual, unit and college goals.	
39. The chief student personnel administrator demonstrates that he/she has the background and technical competence for the position.	40
40. The chief student personnel administrator is considerate of others and is sensitive in interpersonal relationships.	51
41. The chief student personnel administrator is able to delegate responsibility and to effectively communicate expectations.	18
42. The chief student personnel administrator makes constructive decisions without unnecessary delay.	10
43. The chief student personnel administrator coordinates the efforts of those responsible to him/her so that the student personnel program operates efficiently.	43

44. The chief student personnel administrator demonstrates the leadership skill necessary for the student personnel program to reach its goals. 53

45. The chief student personnel administrator is flexible, is willing to try new approaches or methods and encourages his/her staff to express opinions and new ideas. 9

Faculty Relatedness - The student personnel staff is aware of and responsive to the needs and concerns of instructional faculty. The student personnel programs reflect this responsiveness.

46. At this college the instructional faculty and the student personnel staff work closely together. 2

47. Student personnel staff members are used by the instructional faculty as viable resources in development of curricular and instructional programs. 37

48. Instructional faculty members are interested in the work of the student personnel unit. 8

Management-by-Objectives Essential Components - A review of management literature had identified the following components of MBO: 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 the future. 4) Each worker and his boss mutually agree on the worker's statement of his 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 them. 7) Goals of individual and groups in the organization tie in with the overall goals. 8) Periodic review of progress toward objectives is made by boss and worker. 9) Boss and worker meet at end of time period to review degree of accomplishment of objectives. 10) Appraisal of performance is judged on the basis of accomplishment of objectives. 11) Top administration is committed to management-by-objectives. 12) Efforts are made to train and develop worker capabilities so that he can reach objectives.

	Assigned Position
49. Student personnel staff members understand the central purposes of this college.	7
50. The purposes of our student personnel program are clear to student personnel staff members in my area.	59
51. Periodically, each student personnel staff member is required to write down the major objectives which he/she hopes to accomplish.	36
52. Each student personnel staff member in my area and his/her immediate supervisor mutually agree on the staff member's statement of the objectives which he/she hopes to accomplish.	25
53. Each student personnel staff member in my area and our immediate supervisor have a mutual understanding of the measures which will be used to determine if the staff member has made progress toward completion of objectives.	19
54. Each student personnel staff member obligates himself/herself to complete the objectives which he/she has stated will be completed.	6
55. At this college the goals and objectives of individual staff members and groups tie in with the overall goals of the college.	58
56. A review of a student personnel staff member's progress toward his stated objectives is made from time to time during a year by the staff member and his immediate supervisor.	24
57. Objectives are written for a specific time period by each staff member and then at the end of the period the immediate supervisor and the staff member meet to discuss the degree of accomplishment of the objectives of the staff member.	42
58. When a student personnel staff member's performance is reviewed at this college, the review is based primarily on the extent to which stated objectives are accomplished.	21

- | | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 59. | Top administration of this college is committed to a system of administration that involves goal-setting and working toward objectives. | 47 |
| 60. | At this college efforts are made to train and develop student personnel staff members so that they become more capable of reaching objectives. | 56 |

Student Questionnaire

Concern for Students - The student personnel program focuses its resources on meeting students' needs and upon individualizing the impact of the college for each student. The staff recognizes the educative potentialities of student involvement and participation.

- | | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 1. | Students are represented in important policy and decision-making groups at this college. | 8 |
| 2. | The deans and other administrative officials show that they are interested in students. | 10 |
| 3. | Students are given opportunity to express their ideas about important matters to officials of this college. | 4 |
| 4. | The registration and records staff show that they are concerned about students. | 12 |
| 5. | The financial aids staff shows that they are concerned about students. | 3 |
| 6. | The admissions staff shows that they are concerned about the needs of future students. | 11 |
| 7. | Those in charge of student activities at this college are concerned about what students desire and need. | 9 |
| 8. | The counselors of this college show their personal concern for students. | 5 |
| 9. | The job placement and graduate placement staff are concerned about helping students. | 6 |
| 10. | The top administrators (like deans, associate deans, directors and assistant deans) in charge of student affairs matters are interested in students. | 7 |

Assigned
Position

- | | |
|---|---|
| 11. College officials who are directly involved with student affairs make themselves available to meet with students. | 2 |
| 12. This college makes a real effort to meet the needs of students. | 1 |

Instructions for Completion of Questionnaires. Instructions for completion of both questionnaires were kept as short and simple as possible. The instructions for the Student Personnel Staff Member Questionnaire were these:

This questionnaire asks for your perceptions about situations and matters in your college's student personnel program. You are asked to answer each item honestly and frankly as you see it.

Please do not put your name on the questionnaire. All questionnaires will be kept in strict confidence. No persons at your college will have access to individual answers. Your college will receive summary information about the study.

Instructions: On the following pages please read each item and then check the column that best describes the situation at your college.

Following these instructions were two examples of completed item responses.

The instructions for the Student Questionnaire were as follows:

Dear Student: This questionnaire will take you less than five minutes to complete. Your answers, when combined with the answers of other students, will serve as important information to your college.

This study has been approved by the dean of students office of your college. All questionnaires will be kept in strict confidence. College officials will not have access to your individual answer. Each questionnaire has been coded so that a follow-up mailing is possible if some students do not respond to this questionnaire.

Will you please complete the questions on the back side of this sheet and return the sheet in the enclosed envelope? Thank you.

Following these instructions were two examples of completed item responses. Both student personnel staff members and students were assured of confidentiality. Staff questionnaires were coded so that only the college could be identified. This procedure did not allow for follow-up directly to an individual staff member if he did not respond; further coding was judged to be an infringement on the promise of confidentiality. In those colleges where a follow-up was needed to staff members, a letter was sent to the chief student personnel administrator requesting that he issue a general reminder to his staff to return the questionnaire. Student questionnaires were coded both with an alphabetic character identifying the college and a number which identified the student. The number assignment was needed so that a follow-up questionnaire could be sent to each student. Aside from the use for follow-up purposes, the confidentiality of the students' responses was respected. Appendix C shows the final drafts of the instruments.

Reliability

Reliability refers to the consistency of measurement of scores or results obtained with an instrument (Gronlund, 1965). The reliability of instrument scores can be estimated from a single administration of the instrument by using the split-half method. The reliability coefficient of the eleven characteristics were determined by correlating response scores for split-half items pertaining to each characteristic and by applying the Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula (Fox, 1969). Table 3 lists the reliability coefficient for each characteristic.

TABLE 3

Reliability Coefficients
of Characteristic Item Scores in the
Student Personnel Staff Member and Student Questionnaires

Characteristic	Coefficient
1. Clarity of College Goals	.81
2. Acceptance of College Goals by Student Personnel Staff	.79
3. Understanding of Student Personnel Goals and Their Relationship to College Goals	.89
4. Support of Top Administration	.78
5. Staff Role Clarity	.83
6. Program Implementing Ability	.81
7. Self-Evaluation Willingness	.80
8. Human Relations Skill Among Staff Members	.87
9. Leadership Quality	.94
10. Faculty-Relatedness	.67
11. Concern for Students	.79

The reliability correlation coefficients were based on responses of 75 staff members (characteristics numbered 1-10 in Table 3) and 246 student respondents (characteristic #11). Twenty-two student responses, each with seven or more answers of "don't know" were not included in the computation of the reliability coefficient. The reliability coefficients were converted to those for the entire group by means of the Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula. The Spearman-Brown

formula uses the actual reliability obtained by correlating scores on the two halves of the test to prophesy what the reliability would be of the total test.

Population and Sample

The population consisted of student personnel units at community junior colleges in Michigan with student enrollments ranging in size from approximately 1,000 to 3,000 full-time students.

Community junior college student personnel units were selected for inclusion in the study according to their similarities in these characteristics: 1) size of full-time student enrollment, 2) breadth of student personnel program, and 3) type of geographical area served by the college. Although it was not known in advance of the study to what degree the units were using MBO, an indication that a broad range of use of MBO was represented in the eight colleges selected was given when discussions were held with the president of the Michigan Association of Community College Student Personnel Administrators. Visits to each college revealed that colleges could be placed into three categories of use of MBO: full-use, partial-use, and no-use.

All eight colleges selected for the study agreed to cooperate in the study of their student personnel units. The sample of student personnel staff consisted of as close to full participation as could be obtained at the participating colleges. Ninety-eight student personnel staff members were available at the participating colleges. Seventy-five staff questionnaires were returned filled out completely

so that they could be used in the study. This represents a seventy-seven percent return. One questionnaire was judged invalid because the respondent failed to complete the last page of the questionnaire which included seventeen questions.

At each college a sample of fifty student was randomly selected for study of the characteristic Concern for Students. Students were selected from a numbered roster of registered students using a table of 10,000 random digits . Only students who were enrolled for six or more semester hours of academic work were included. After an initial mailing and a later follow-up, 268 of the 400 questionnaires were returned and included in the study. This response represented a reply percentage of 67%. Thirteen returns, not included in the 67%, were rejected for a number of reasons such as wrong addresses (8 returns), the student was no longer in school or felt unqualified to answer (3 returns), or the student did not wish to participate (2 returns). Characteristics of students who participated in the study are shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Characteristics of Students Who
Participated in the Study

<u>Class Level</u>	<u>Full-time students</u> (12 hrs or more)		<u>Part-time students</u> (6-11 hrs)		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	
Freshman	55	54	8	11	128
Sophomore	60	42	13	7	122
Unclassified	<u>4</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>18</u>
Total	119	105	23	21	268

Students who failed to return a questionnaire numbered 119 or 30% of the 400 who were initially sent questionnaires. It was not possible to classify the non-respondents by class level since this information was not readily available at the colleges and had to be provided on returned questionnaires. Information about sex and full or part-time status was available. Non-respondents were categorized as shown:

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
Full-time	63	27	90
Part-time	19	10	29
Total	<u>82</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>119</u>

Twenty-four percent of the non-respondents were part-time students. This compares to sixteen percent of the respondents. Such a difference was to be expected since part-time students are less apt to reply to a study of this nature than are full-time students. Also, females responded in greater percentages than did males. The respondents had a male:female ratio of 53:47 while the non-respondents' ratio was 69:31.

Data Collection Procedures

In order to gain cooperation for the study and to carry out the study successfully, a visit was made to each participating college after arrangements for the visit were made with the chief student personnel administrator. In a meeting with the chief student personnel administrator the purposes and details of the study were explained. All of the colleges selected for the study agreed to participate. When cooperation in the study was offered, these data collection plans were implemented.

1. A student Personnel Staff Member questionnaire was given

to each staff member. Attached to each questionnaire was a stamped-return envelope addressed to the researcher. The instructions clearly indicated that the responses were confidential. No person at the participating colleges had access to individual responses. The chief student personnel administrator did not complete a questionnaire since he had been informed of the purpose of the study to view effectiveness of colleges using different degrees of MBO. It was decided that the study's intent to view effectiveness through the perceptions of staff members and students would not include the viewpoint of the person in charge of the student personnel program.

All student personnel staff members that reported to the chief student personnel administrator were given questionnaires. Table 5 illustrates that ninety-eight staff members were given questionnaires. Seventy-five returned completed questionnaires.

TABLE 5
Number of Responses to
Student Personnel Staff Member Questionnaire
by College

College Number	No. of Questionnaires given to staff members	No. of Valid Responses	Percentage of Responses
1	22	13	59%
2	10	8	80%
3	8	8	100%
4	6	5	83%
5	16	11	69%
6	11	11	100%
7	17	15	88%
8	8	4	50%
Total	98	75	77%

Staff members in student personnel at the participating colleges represented a broad range of student personnel professional positions. Included in the group given questionnaires were the following: twelve in the area of admissions, eight in registration and records, twelve in financial aids and placement, thirteen in student activities and special student services, forty-five in the counseling area, and eight associate deans who were classified as being part of a central student personnel administrative unit.

Two weeks following the visit to the college a count was made of the returns from staff members. If returns were not complete, a letter was sent to the chief student personnel administrator asking him to remind his staff to return the questionnaires. Follow-up letters were sent to three colleges.

2. An interview with the chief student personnel administrator was designed to determine the extent of use of MBO in the student personnel unit and to gather other data pertinent to the study. The interview schedule used in situations where the chief administrator had not voluntarily given the information in previous discussion followed this format:

a. Which positions are included in the student personnel unit at your college? Have we included all of the student personnel staff in this study?

b. Do you use the management-by-objectives system in your student personnel unit? Please describe.

Would you briefly discuss the following components of MBO and rate each as to how it is carried out in your unit? (The twelve component items of MBO were given on a list to the administrator and he verbally reacted to each).

c. Are there any unusual conditions or situations at your college that I should be aware of in interpreting results, e.g., a great number of new people on your staff, a college situation that is creating a high amount of tension, etc.?

3. A random sample of fifty students was drawn at each college from a numbered alphabetic roster of registered students using a table of 10,000 random digits. Each student was mailed a Student Questionnaire with a stamped-returned envelope. About two weeks later a second questionnaire and stamped-returned envelope were sent to those who had not responded to the initial inquiry. Seventy replies came because of the follow-up letter. Of the 281 questionnaires returned, 273 were returned from students at the participating colleges (8 returns indicated wrong address information). Of these 273 questionnaires, 268 were acceptable for inclusion in the study. This represented 67% of the questionnaires initially mailed to students.

The data collected in the questionnaires required the respondents to check an appropriate answer for each item on this scale: Always, Often, Some, Rarely, Never, or Don't Know. The questionnaires were scored by assigning the numerical weight of 5 for an Always response, 4 for Often, 3 for Some, 2 for Rarely, and 1 for Never. "Don't Know" responses were assigned a code of zero but were not treated as part of the scale in data analysis.

Data Analysis Procedures

This study investigated the question whether or not differences in perceived effectiveness of student personnel units existed among community junior colleges which were categorized according to their use of MBO.

In order to approach this question a procedure was developed for placing each college student personnel unit into one of the categories of MBO use: full-use, partial-use, no-use. The procedure used for classifying the colleges follows:

1. An interview with the chief student personnel administrator was conducted as explained in the section, Data Collection Procedures. The researcher-judge tentatively placed the unit's use of MBO into one of the three categories on the basis of this interview.

2. The results of the staff members' responses to the twelve questionnaire items which measure the components of MBO were compiled and the college was placed into a category by this procedure:

Full-use - An average score of 4.0 (Often) or higher for each response.

Partial-use - An average score between 3.0 (Some) and 3.9.

No-use - An average score lower than 3.0 (Some).

3. In the event that the data collected by the interview information conflicted with the data collected by the instrument, the researcher-judge classified the college according to his knowledge of the college's situation based on his visit to the campus.

Null Hypotheses. In Chapter I (pages 8-9) a number of theoretical hypotheses were stated. Theoretical hypothesis #1 stated, in brief, that student personnel units which fully use MBO rate higher on total measures of effectiveness than those units which do not fully use MBO. ("Do not use MBO" includes both categories, partial-use and no-use). Theoretical hypothesis #2 stated that units which

partially use MBO rate higher on total measures of effectiveness than those units which do not use MBO. In operational form these two hypotheses were stated as follows:

$$H_1 : \mu_{\text{full-use total}} > \mu_{\text{partial-use total}} > \mu_{\text{no-use total}}$$

where " $\mu_{\text{full-use total}}$ " referred to the population mean of total effectiveness for full-use MBO units, " $\mu_{\text{partial-use total}}$ " referred to the population mean of total effectiveness for partial-use MBO units, and " $\mu_{\text{no-use total}}$ " referred to the population mean of total effectiveness for no-use MBO units.

Theoretical hypothesis #1 was stated in two null form hypotheses as follows:

$$H_{o1} : \mu_{\text{full-use total}} = \mu_{\text{partial-use total}}$$

$$H_{o2} : \mu_{\text{full-use total}} = \mu_{\text{no-use total}}$$

Theoretical hypothesis #2 was stated in one null form hypothesis as follows:

$$H_{o3} : \mu_{\text{partial-use total}} = \mu_{\text{no-use total}}$$

A summary null hypothesis as follows illustrated the null form for theoretical hypotheses #1 and #2:

$$H_{o} : \mu_{\text{full-use total}} = \mu_{\text{partial-use total}} = \mu_{\text{no-use total}}$$

Theoretical hypothesis #3 (pages 8-9) was stated so that it embodied two separate hypotheses for each of the eleven characteristics of effectiveness. Theoretical hypothesis #3 stated, in brief, that for each of the eleven characteristics of effectiveness, student personnel units which fully use MBO rate higher on measures of that characteristic than those units which do not fully use MBO. ("Do not fully use MBO" refers to both the partial-use and the no-use categories). Theoretical hypothesis #4 was stated so that it embodied a separate hypothesis for each of the eleven characteristics of effectiveness. Theoretical hypothesis #4 stated that for each of the eleven characteristics of effectiveness, student personnel units which partially use MBO rate higher on measures of that characteristic than those units that do not use MBO. In operational form these two hypotheses were:

$$H_2 : \mu_{\text{full-use char. \#}} > \mu_{\text{partial-use char. \#}} > \mu_{\text{no-use char. \#}}$$

where " $\mu_{\text{full-use char. \#}}$ " referred to the population mean of full-use units for a specific characteristic known by its number, " $\mu_{\text{partial-use char. \#}}$ " referred to the population mean of partial-use units for a specific characteristic known by its number, and " $\mu_{\text{no-use char. \#}}$ " referred to the population mean of no-use units for a specific characteristic known by its number.

Theoretical hypothesis #3 in null form, was stated as twenty-two separate hypotheses, one for each characteristic of effectiveness.

The null hypotheses were presented in summary form as follows:

$$H_{0\ 4-14} : \mu_{\text{full-use char. \#}} = \mu_{\text{partial-use char. \#}}$$

$$H_{0\ 15-25} : \mu_{\text{full-use char. \#}} = \mu_{\text{no-use char. \#}}$$

where "4-14" and "15-25" signified that each characteristic of effectiveness was tested separately. Other symbols are explained in the paragraph above.

Theoretical hypothesis #4 was stated in the following null form:

$$H_{0\ 26-36} : \mu_{\text{partial-use char. \#}} = \mu_{\text{no-use char. \#}}$$

where "26-36" signified that each characteristic was tested separately. A summary null hypothesis as follows illustrated the null form for theoretical hypotheses #3 and #4:

$$H_{0} : \mu_{\text{full-use char. \#}} = \mu_{\text{partial-use char. \#}} = \mu_{\text{no-use char. \#}}$$

Statistical Tests. The one way analysis of variance was used to compare the mean "effectiveness" scores of the respondents in the three MBO-use categories of colleges. This analysis was conducted as follows:

1. Comparison of mean "total effectiveness" scores of the three classes of MBO-use colleges using the data of the Staff Member Questionnaire that gave scores for the ten characteristics of effectiveness measured by this instrument.

2. Comparison of mean "effectiveness" scores for each characteristic of effectiveness of the three categories of MB0-use colleges.

If the analysis of variance resulted in a significant F-ratio then the Scheffe' method of post-hoc comparisons (Hays, 1963) was used to compare these MB0-use groups: 1 vs. 2, 1 vs. 3, 1 vs. 2+3, 2 vs. 3. and 3 vs. 1+2.

The level of significance used for rejection of the null hypotheses was .05. In this study the probability of observing differences by chance was reported as probability (p) levels. This method of reporting was mentioned by Kerlinger (1964) as a "newer trend of thinking that advocates reporting the significance level of all results (p. 154)."

CHAPTER IV

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

The data obtained from the procedures described in Chapter 3 were analyzed using the one-way analysis of variance model and the Scheffe' method for testing the significance of post-hoc comparisons. The results are presented as follows: first, discussion of the data and procedures used to categorize the colleges by MBO-use; second, a comparison and analysis of the three MBO-use categories of colleges using the scores of perceived total-unit effectiveness derived from the items in the Staff Member Questionnaire (this is a discussion of theoretical hypotheses #1 and #2 and of null hypotheses #1-3); third, a comparison and analysis of the three MBO-use categories of colleges using the scores for each of the eleven characteristics of effectiveness (this is a discussion of theoretical hypotheses #3 and #4 and of null hypotheses #4-36).

Categorization of Colleges According to Use of MBO

The procedures of the study were planned so that colleges could be grouped into one of three MBO-use categories: full-use, partial-use, or no-use. The possibility was recognized when the study was planned that a college might have the reputation of using MBO even though

the principles essential to MBO might not be in use at the college. Conversely, a college might be using the administrative principles associated with MBO but may not have given their administrative practice the label of MBO. In order to categorize accurately the colleges, twelve items in the Staff Member Questionnaire measured the staff member's perception of the use of MBO in his college's student personnel unit. The mean results of the scores of these twelve items for all respondents of a college were computed. Staff members' responses were weighted on the scale, 5=Always, 4=Often, 3=Some, 2=Rarely, and 1=Never. Colleges were categorized according to this breakdown: mean of 4.0 and up, full-use; mean of 3.0-3.9, partial-use; a mean of 2.9 or below, no-use. The categorization derived from the mean score of the staff members' responses on the twelve MBO items were compared with the categorization that resulted from an interview with the chief student personnel administrator. In the interview the chief student personnel administrator was asked to describe his unit's use of each of the twelve MBO components. Table 6 sets forth the findings of both the compilation of staff member data and the interview with the chief student personnel administrator. Also shown is the final categorization used for this study.

The findings of the Staff Member Questionnaires concerning MBO-use at colleges #7 and #8 differed from the findings of the interview with the chief student personnel administrator. At College 7 the chief student personnel administrator stated clearly that MBO was not in use in the student personnel unit. He felt that the issue was clear-cut: "No, we are not using MBO." Because of his outright naming of the unit

TABLE 6

Information Used To
Categorize Colleges By Use of MBO

College Number	Staff Member Categorization		Categorization from Interview with Chief Student Pers. Admnstr	Category Used in Study
	Mean of Questionnaire Items	Resulting Category ¹		
1	3.0	Partial	Partial	Partial
2	2.9	No-use	No-use	No-use
3	4.2	Full	Full	Full
4	2.4	No-use	No-use	No-use
5	3.8	Partial	Partial	Partial
6	4.0	Full	Full	Full
7	3.2	Partial	No-use	No-use
8	2.8	No-use	Partial	No-use

¹Categorization scale for mean staff member responses was: 4.0 and up=full-use of MBO; 3.0-3.9=partial-use of MBO; 2.9 and below=no-use of MBO.

as a unit that did not use MBO and because the staff member responses fell into a low partial-use range, College 7 was categorized as a no-use unit. At College 8 the chief student personnel administrator described his unit as if it were a partial-use unit. The staff members responses, however, showed little or no-use of MBO. The chief student personnel administrator had revealed in the interview that some attempts had been made to become knowledgeable about MBO. In addition, some initial attempts had been made at setting objectives but it was apparent

in the discussion that the MBO system was not in use, even though the chief student personnel administrator had hoped that the system would be in use. Therefore, the staff members' judgments about the unit as being a no-use unit were used for classifying College 8.

College 3 was categorized as full-use as a result of both the staff member responses and the interview with the chief student personnel administrator. The chief student personnel administrator, when discussing the administrative practices in his unit, recognized that his unit was using the principles of MBO but he did not think of them as "an entire MBO package." It was obvious that the unit was using the practices which have been identified as MBO components, that the members were knowledgeable about the MBO system, but, that the staff members and the chief student personnel administrator had not thought of their practices and procedure as a management-by-objectives system. Subsequent conversations with two staff members at College 3 reinforced the decision to categorize them as a full-use college.

Other colleges participating in the study were categorized as shown in the right hand column of Table 6. There was general agreement between the results of the staff member responses and the chief student personnel administrator's responses to questions about the use of MBO in the student personnel unit at the college.

Comparison of Perceived Total Effectiveness Scores for Three Categories of MBO-Use Colleges

In order to compare the three MBO-use categories of colleges the respondents' scores for each college were grouped into the categories

shown in Table 7. The number of respondents in each group is shown.

TABLE 7

Categorization of Colleges by MBO-Use Category
Showing Number of Respondents

Category of MBO-Use	Colleges	Number of Staff Responses		Number of Student Responses	
		#	%	#	%
1. Full-use	Colleges 3 and 6	19	25	70	26
2. Partial-use	Colleges 1 and 5	24	32	57	22
3. No-use	Colleges 2,4,7 and 8	<u>32</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>141</u>	<u>52</u>
	Total	75	100%	268	100%

The Staff Member Questionnaire had forty-eight questionnaire items which measured ten separate characteristics of effectiveness. The mean of all forty-eight items for each category was considered as a total effectiveness score as perceived by staff members in that category. When the means of the three categories were compared by use of the one-way analysis of variance they were found to have differences beyond the .001 level. Table 8 gives this analysis of variance and shows that the total effectiveness mean scores rise from a low score of the no-use MBO category to a high score mean for the full-use MBO category.

The Scheffe' method (also called the S-method) of post-hoc comparisons with $p=.05$ was made between categories 1 and 2, 1 and 3, 2 and 3, 1 + 2 and 3, and 1 and 2 + 3 for all results with significant F-ratios in this study in order to uncover the groups contributing to

the differences and in order to test the hypotheses of this study. The results of these post-hoc comparisons are found in Appendix D.

TABLE 8

One-Way Analysis of Variance
of Total Effectiveness Score Means (as Perceived by Staff Members)
among Three MBO-use Categories of Colleges

<u>Category</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SEM</u>
1. Full-use	19	183.60	21.19	4.86
2. Partial-use	24	167.78	30.00	6.12
3. No-use	32	151.86	28.31	5.00

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Between	2	6143.43	8.25	.001
Within	72	744.99		

Typically, only comparisons which support the theoretical hypotheses are discussed in this chapter. A difference large enough to reject the null hypothesis occurred when categories 1 and 3 were compared. Differences also occurred when comparisons were made between categories 1 and 2 + 3, 1 + 2 and 3. That is, the MBO full-use category was found to be different from the no-use category. The difference between the full-use category and the partial-use category was not large enough to reject the null hypothesis. Category 1 was also different from the

combined mean scores of the partial-use and no-use categories. When the full-use and partial-use categories were combined, they were found to be different from the no-use category.

Comparison of Mean Scores of Each Characteristic of Effectiveness for Three Categories of MBO-Use Colleges

Ten characteristics of effectiveness as perceived by staff members were measured separately in the Staff Member Questionnaire and one characteristic Concern for Students was measured by use of the Student Questionnaire. Chapter 3, pages 46-54, includes the name of each characteristic, a definition of each characteristic, and a listing of the questionnaire items used to measure the characteristic. The means of the three categories of MBO-use for each characteristic were compared by use of the one-way analysis of variance. If the F analysis resulted in rejection of the null hypothesis, post-hoc comparisons were made between categories using the Scheffe' method with $p=.05$.

Clarity of College Goals. A comparison of the means of the three categories of MBO-use colleges for the characteristic of effectiveness Clarity of College Goals with the one-way analysis of variance resulted in the rejection of the null hypothesis. Table 9 illustrates that the full-use category had the highest mean score and the no-use category had the lowest. Post-hoc comparisons using the S-method ($p=.05$) suggest differences between categories 1 and 3 large enough to reject the null hypothesis. Differences at the .05 level failed to occur when the partial-use category was compared to the no-use category and when the full-use category was compared to the partial-use category. When category 1 was compared with the average of groups 2 and 3 differences are also evidenced.

TABLE 9

One-Way Analysis of Variance
of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Clarity of College Goals,
among Three MBO-use Categories of Colleges

<u>Category</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SEM</u>
1. Full-use	19	14.47	3.04	.70
2. Partial-use	24	12.68	3.36	.69
3. No-use	32	11.72	3.22	.57

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Between	2	45.28	4.37	.016
Within	72	10.37		

Acceptance of College Goals by Student Personnel Staff. When the F analysis was used to compare the means of three categories of MBO-use for the characteristic of effectiveness Acceptance of College Goals by Student Personnel Staff there was no difference between the categories that were large enough to reject the null hypothesis (Table 10). The mean scores for this characteristic rose slightly from the no-use category to the partial-use and from the partial-use category to the full-use category. Respondents in the no-use category were about as accepting or committed to college goals at the colleges they serve as were staff members at colleges in other categories even though

the clarity of the college goals and purposes (Table 9) was not as evident.

TABLE 10

One-Way Analysis of Variance
Of Mean Scores for the Characteristic,
Acceptance of College Goals by Student Personnel Staff,
among Three MBO-use Categories of Colleges

<u>Category</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SEM</u>
1. Full-use	19	12.95	1.75	.40
2. Partial-use	24	12.46	1.41	.29
3. No-use	32	11.92	2.06	.36

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Between	2	6.46	2.00	.143
Within	72	3.23		

Understanding of Student Personnel Goals and Their Relationship to College Goals. A one-way analysis of variance comparing mean scores of the three categories on the characteristic Understanding of Student Personnel Goals and Their Relationship to College Goals resulted in an F-ratio of 5.14, signifying differences large enough to reject the null

TABLE 11

One-Way Analysis of Variance
of Mean Scores for the Characteristic,
Understanding of Student Personnel Goals
and Their Relationship to College Goals,
among Three MB0-use Categories of Colleges

<u>Category</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SEM</u>
1. Full-use	19	17.51	2.77	.64
2. Partial-use	24	16.64	4.47	.91
3. No-use	32	14.44	3.21	.57

Analysis of Variance				
<u>Source</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Between	2	65.48	5.14	.008
Within	72	12.74		

hypothesis. Table 11 illustrates that the mean score for the full-use category was greater than the other two categories. The partial-use category mean was greater than the no-use category. S-method comparisons with $p=.05$ suggested differences which resulted in rejection of the null hypothesis when categories 1 and 3 were compared. Differences large enough to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level did not occur when the category 1 was compared to category 2 and when category 2 was compared to category 3. A difference was obtained when the average

of categories 1 and 2 was compared to the mean of category 3.

Support of Top Administration. Differences large enough to reject the null hypothesis were found when the one-way analysis of variance was applied to the mean score of the three MBO-use categories of colleges for the characteristic Support of Top Administration. The F-ratio of 4.43 illustrated in Table 12 evidenced differences beyond the .015 level. Post-hoc comparisons ($p=.05$) revealed differences between categories 1 and 3 which resulted in rejection of the null

TABLE 12

One-Way Analysis of Variance
of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Support of Top Administration,
among Three MBO-use Categories of Colleges

<u>Category</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SEM</u>
1. Full-use	19	18.21	2.99	.69
2. Partial-use	24	15.79	3.53	.72
3. No-use	32	15.53	3.22	.57

Analysis of Variance				
<u>Source</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Between	2	47.23	4.43	.015
Within	72	10.67		

hypothesis. Differences were also noted between category 1 and the average of categories 2 and 3. Comparisons between categories 1 and 2 were not quite large enough to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level. No difference large enough to reject the null hypothesis were present between categories 2 and 3.

Staff Role Clarity. The one-way analysis of variance among mean scores of the three categories for the characteristic Staff Role Clarity resulted in a difference beyond the .018 level. This difference was large enough for rejection of the null hypothesis. Table 13 illustrates

TABLE 13

One-Way Analysis of Variance
of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Staff Role Clarity,
among Three MBO-use Categories of Colleges

<u>Category</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SEM</u>
1. Full-use	19	16.11	2.28	.52
2. Partial-use	24	13.93	3.61	.74
3. No-use	32	13.33	3.64	.64

<u>Source</u>	Analysis of Variance			<u>p</u>
	<u>DF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	
Between	2	47.35	4.23	.018
Within	72	11.18		

the F analysis and also shows that the mean of the full-use category was higher than the means of the other categories. The method due to Scheffe' of post-hoc comparisons with $p=.05$ resulted in a difference large enough between categories 1 and 3 so that the null hypothesis was rejected. Also, the comparison of category 1 with the average of categories 2 and 3 yielded differences. Although the mean score of the partial-use category was slightly higher than the no-use category, it was not different enough to warrant rejection of the null hypothesis at the .05 level.

Program Implementing Ability. The mean scores of the three categories of MB0-use colleges for the characteristic Program Implementing Ability rise from a low of 15.91 for the no-use category to 19.25 for the partial-use category, and to a high of 21.00 for the full-use category. The F analysis resulted in differences large enough to reject the null hypothesis. Both category 1 and category 2 had differences from category 3 that were large enough to reject the null hypotheses. When the averages of categories 2 and 3 were compared to category 1 differences in means were found. Also, the average of categories 1 and 2 differed from category 3.

TABLE 14

One-Way Analysis of Variance
of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Program Implementing Ability,
among Three MBO-use Categories of Colleges

<u>Category</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SEM</u>
1. Full-use	19	21.00	2.19	.50
2. Partial-use	24	19.25	2.91	.59
3. No-use	32	15.91	3.62	.64

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Between	2	171.72	17.99	.000
Within	72	9.55		

Self-Evaluation Willingness. Differences between the three categories large enough to warrant rejection of the null hypothesis were also found when the one way analysis of variance was applied to the means of the characteristic Self-Evaluation Willingness (Table 15). Mean scores were 26.11, 24.08, and 21.44 for the categories, full-use, partial-use, and no-use, respectively. Post-hoc comparisons resulted in a large enough difference beyond the .05 level between categories 1 and 3 to reject the null hypothesis. Differences were also noted between category 1 and the average of categories 2 and 3, and between the average of categories 1 and 2 and the mean of category 3. Differences large enough to reject the null hypotheses did not occur when categories 1 and 2 were compared and when categories 2 and 3 were compared.

TABLE 15

One-Way Analysis of Variance
of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Self-Evaluation Willingness,
among Three MBO-use Categories of Colleges

<u>Category</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SEM</u>
1. Full-use	19	26.11	3.09	.71
2. Partial-use	24	24.08	4.39	.90
3. No-use	32	21.44	4.48	.79

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Between	2	136.58	7.95	.001
Within	72	17.17		

Human Relations Skill Among Staff Members. A one-way analysis of variance comparing mean scores of the three categories on the characteristic Human Relations Skill Among Staff Members resulted in an F-ratio of 4.27, large enough for rejection of the null hypothesis. Table 16 illustrates that the mean scores contributing to this difference were 20.37, 18.58, and 17.52 for the categories full-use, partial-use and no-use, respectively. When post-hoc comparisons were conducted, differences beyond the .05 level were found when category 1 was compared to category 2 and to category 3. That is, differences between category 1 and category 2 and between category 1 and category

TABLE 16

One-Way Analysis of Variance
of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Human Relations Skill Among Staff
Members, among Three MBO-use Categories of Colleges

<u>Category</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SEM</u>
1. Full-use	19	20.37	2.95	.68
2. Partial-use	24	18.58	3.72	.76
3. No-use	32	17.52	3.31	.58

Analysis of Variance				
<u>Source</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Between	2	48.25	4.27	.018
Within	72	11.31		

3 were large enough to reject the null hypotheses. The differences between categories 2 and 3 were not large enough to reject the null hypothesis. When categories 1 and 2 were combined they were noted to be different than category 3.

Leadership Quality. Mean scores for the three categories for the characteristic Leadership Quality ranged from a high of 27.65 for the full-use category to 21.61 for the no-use category. The F analysis shown in Table 17 resulted in an F-ratio of 6.39, large enough for rejection of the null hypothesis. Differences with $p=.05$

TABLE 17

One-Way Analysis of Variance
of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Leadership Quality,
among Three MBO-use Categories of Colleges

<u>Category</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SEM</u>
1. Full-use	19	27.65	5.39	1.24
2. Partial-use	24	25.25	5.61	1.14
3. No-use	32	21.61	6.67	1.18

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Between	2	233.21	6.39	.003
Within	72	36.50		

between categories that resulted in the rejection of the null hypothesis were found between categories 1 and 3. Differences were also noted between category 1 and the average of categories 2 and 3, and between category 3 and the averages of categories 1 and 2. Differences resulting in rejection of the null hypothesis were not present when category 1 was compared to category 2 and when category 2 was compared to category 3.

Faculty Relatedness. Table 18 shows that the mean scores for the three categories differ very little. The mean scores drop slightly

TABLE 18

One-Way Analysis of Variance
of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Faculty Relatedness,
among Three MBO-use Categories of Colleges

<u>Category</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SEM</u>
1. Full-use	19	8.92	1.27	.29
2. Partial-use	24	8.88	2.38	.49
3. No-use	32	8.36	1.66	.29

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Between	2	2.65	0.78	.463
Within	72	3.40		

from the full-use category mean of 8.92 to the no-use category mean of 8.36. The one-way analysis of variance did not result in differences between the three groups at the .05 level. It should be noted that all three categories reported mean scores that reflected low faculty relatedness to the student personnel program. (For purposes of translating reported mean scores to the scale weights of the instrument, mean scores for a category can be reduced to average item scores by dividing by the number of items used to measure the particular characteristic. In this case, three questionnaire items measured this characteristic. The means reflected in the table were divided by three in order

to arrive at an average item response score).

Concern for Students. The Student Questionnaire had twelve items which measured one of the eleven characteristics of effectiveness Concern for Students. When the means of the three categories of MB0-use colleges were compared by use of the one-way analysis of variance the difference was not large enough to reject the null hypothesis (Table 19). There seems to be no pattern between the use of MB0 and the characteristic Concern for Students although it should be noted that category 3 had a slightly higher mean than other categories.

TABLE 19

One-Way Analysis of Variance
of Mean Scores for the Characteristic, Concern for Students,
as measured by the Student Questionnaire
among Three MB0-use Categories of Colleges

<u>Category</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SEM</u>
1. Full-use	70	44.11	8.50	1.02
2. Partial-use	57	41.62	8.54	1.13
3. No-use	141	44.47	7.56	.64

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Between	2	170.68	2.65	.073
Within	265	64.44		

Presentation and Discussion of Means of Characteristics. In an effort to permit visual comparison of the category means for each characteristic of effectiveness, Table 20 illustrates the placement of each category mean for each characteristic on the questionnaire item-scale used in this study. The average item score for a characteristic was found by dividing the reported means of a category's scores by the number of questionnaire items measuring that particular characteristic. Placing an X on the scale in the approximate position of the mean score permits a visual check of both the position on the scale and the relative position of each category to the other categories.

TABLE 20

Presentation of Item Mean Scores
for
Characteristics of Effectiveness

Characteristic and MBO category	Reported mean	Number of items	Item mean score	Presence of Characteristics				
				5 Always	4 Often	3 Some	2 Rarely	1 Never
Clarity of College Goals								
Full-use	14.47	4	3.62			X		
Partial-use	12.68	4	3.17			X		
No-use	11.72	4	2.93					
Acceptance of College Goals by Student Personnel Staff								
Full-use	12.95	3	4.32	X				
Partial-use	12.46	3	4.15	X				
No-use	11.92	3	3.97		X			
Understanding of Student Personnel Goals and their Relationship to College Goals								
Full-use	17.51	5	3.50			X		
Partial-use	16.64	5	3.33			X		
No-use	14.44	5	2.89				X	

(continued)

TABLE 20 (Continued)

Characteristic and MBO category	Reported mean	Number of items	Item mean score	Presence of Characteristic				
				5 Always	4 Often	3 Some	2 Rarely	1 Never
Support of Top Administration								
Full-use	18.21	5	3.64		X			
Partial-use	15.79	5	3.16			X		
No-use	15.53	5	3.11			X		
Staff Role Clarity								
Full-use	16.11	4	4.03		X			
Partial-use	13.93	4	3.48			X		
No-use	13.33	4	3.33			X		
Program Implementing Ability								
Full-use	21.00	5	4.20	X				
Partial-use	19.25	5	3.85		X			
No-use	15.91	5	3.18			X		
Self-Evaluation Willingness								
Full-use	26.11	7	3.73		X			
Partial-use	24.08	7	3.44			X		
No-use	21.44	7	3.06				X	
Human Relations Skill Among Staff Members								
Full-use	20.37	5	4.07	X				
Partial-use	18.58	5	3.72		X			
No-use	17.52	5	3.50			X		
Leadership Quality								
Full-use	27.65	7	3.95	X				
Partial-use	25.25	7	3.61		X			
No-use	21.61	7	3.09			X		
Faculty Relatedness								
Full-use	8.92	3	2.97				X	
Partial-use	8.88	3	2.96				X	
No-use	8.36	3	2.79				X	
Concern for Students								
Full-use	44.11	12	3.68		X			
Partial-use	41.62	12	3.47			X		
No-use	44.47	12	3.71		X			
Total Effectiveness-Staff Member Perceptions								
Full-use	183.60	48	3.83	X				
Partial-use	167.78	48	3.50		X			
No-use	151.86	48	3.16			X		

The full-use category mean was the highest mean in eleven of the twelve comparisons of means that were made. Similarly, the partial-use category mean was in second place eleven times. In the case of the characteristic Concern for Students, measured by the Student Questionnaire, the item mean scores did not fall into this order. The results of the Staff Member Questionnaire were such that the highest mean score for each characteristic was consistently that of the full-use category and the lowest score was that of the no-use category.

It should be noted that the lowest mean scores for all three categories were reflected in the characteristic Faculty Relatedness. The average item scores for this characteristic ranged between 2.79-2.97, that is, between Rarely and Some on the scale. The highest mean scores for all three categories appeared for the characteristic Acceptance of College Goals by Student Personnel Staff. The average item score ranged from 3.97 to 4.32, near or above the Often scale mark. The widest range of mean scores for items were reflected in the characteristic Program Implementing Ability. The full-use category average item score was 4.20 and the no-use category score was 3.18, a difference of 1.02.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study was to investigate relationships between the use of MBO and perceived effectiveness of community junior college student personnel units. The purpose was realized by administering a questionnaire to student personnel staff members and to students at selected community junior colleges in Michigan, some of which were using MBO and some of which were not using MBO.

The decisions regarding the null hypotheses resulting from the findings of differences between categories of MBO-use colleges are summarized in Table 21 on the following page. The table illustrates comparisons which resulted in differences large enough to warrant rejection of null hypotheses.

The last listing in the table, Total Effectiveness-Staff Member Perceptions, illustrates that theoretical hypothesis #1 was supported in part. This hypothesis was supported since there are differences between full-use and no-use mean scores with the full-use units rating higher than the no-use units. Also, when category 1 was tested against categories 2 + 3 the null hypothesis was rejected. The element in theoretical hypothesis #1 that stated that full-use units would rate higher than partial-use units was not confirmed. Theoretical hypothesis #2 that stated that partial-use units will rate higher than no-use units was not confirmed since the differences were not great enough to reject the null hypothesis.

TABLE 21

Summary of Decisions Regarding Null Hypotheses
Resulting from the
Comparison of Means for Three MBO-Use Categories of Colleges

Characteristic ¹	F Analysis Results		Listing of Rejected Null Hypotheses resulting from comparison of categories using Scheffe' method, p=.05				
	F	p	1 vs. 2	1 vs. 3	2 vs. 3	1 vs. 2 + 3	1 + 2 vs. 3
1. Clarity of College Goals (Ho _{char. 1} rejected)	4.37	.016		Null rej.		Null rej.	
2. Acceptance of College Goals by Student Per- sonnel Staff (Ho _{char. 2} not rejected)	2.00	.143					
3. Understanding of Student Personnel Goals and Their Relationship to College Goals (Ho _{char. 3} rejected)	5.14	.008		Null rej.			Null rej.
4. Support of Top Adminis- tration (Ho _{char. 4} rejected)	4.43	.015		Null rej.		Null rej.	
5. Staff Role Clarity (Ho _{char. 5} rejected)	4.23	.018		Null rej.		Null rej.	
6. Program Implementing Ability (Ho _{char. 6} rejected)	17.99	.000		Null rej.	Null rej.	Null rej.	Null rej.
7. Self-Evaluation Will- ingness (Ho _{char. 7} rejected)	7.95	.001		Null rej.		Null rej.	Null rej.
8. Human Relations Skills (Ho _{char. 8} rejected)	4.27	.018	Null rej.	Null rej.		Null rej.	Null rej.
9. Leadership Quality (Ho _{char. 9} rejected)	6.39	.003		Null rej.		Null rej.	Null rej.

(continued)

TABLE 21 (continued)

Listing of Rejected Null Hypotheses
resulting from comparison of categories
using Scheffe' method, $p=.05$

Characteristic	F Analysis Results		Listing of Rejected Null Hypotheses				
	F	p	1 vs. 2	1 vs. 3	2 vs. 3	1 vs. 2 + 3	1 + 2 vs. 3
10. Faculty Relatedness (Ho char. 10 not rejected)	.78	.463					
11. Concern for Students (Ho char. 11 not rejected)	2.65	.073					
Total. Total Effectiveness-Staff Member Perceptions (Ho total rejected)	8.25	.001		Null rej.		Null rej.	Null rej.

¹ Below each characteristic is the decision regarding Ho: $\mu_{full-use} = \mu_{partial-use} = \mu_{no-use}$.

Theoretical hypotheses #3 and #4 dealt with comparisons of mean scores between categories for each characteristic of effectiveness. Following is a brief statement of the findings for each characteristic:

1. Clarity of College Goals. The part of theoretical hypothesis #3 which stated that the full-use units will rate higher than the no-use units was supported since the full-use category mean was greater than the no-use category mean and the difference was large enough to warrant rejection of the null hypothesis. Neither the theoretical hypothesis that stated that the partial-use units will rate higher than the no-use units was supported nor the hypothesis that full-use units will rate higher than partial-use units.

2. Acceptance of College Goals by Student Personnel Staff.

Differences large enough to reject the null hypotheses were not found and thus, the theoretical hypotheses were not supported.

3. Understanding of Student Personnel Goals and Their Relationship to College Goals. The theoretical hypothesis that full-use units will rate higher than no-use units was supported by the findings. However, the theoretical hypothesis that full-use units will rate higher than partial-use units was not supported. Similarly, the hypothesis that partial-use units will rate higher than no-use units was not confirmed by the findings.

4. Support of Top Administration. Full-use MBO units scored higher than no-use units and the element of the theoretical hypothesis #1 that stated such was upheld. The theoretical hypothesis that partial-use units will rate higher than no-use units was not supported since differences between means were not large enough to warrant rejection of the null hypothesis. Similarly, support was not evidenced for full-use units rating higher than partial-use units.

5. Staff Role Clarity. The difference between the full-use units and the no-use units were large enough to reject the null hypothesis and thus, to support the theoretical hypothesis. Such was not the case, however, when the partial-use units were compared with either the no-use units or the full-use units.

6. Program Implementing Ability. All theoretical hypotheses were supported except the hypothesis that stated that full-use units will rate higher than partial-use units. Differences between categories were

large enough to reject the null hypotheses in each test except for the full-use, partial-use comparison.

7. Self-Evaluation Willingness. The theoretical hypothesis that full-use units will rate higher than no-use units was supported by the findings. However, differences large enough to reject the null hypothesis did not occur when categories 1 and 2, and 2 and 3 were compared.

8. Human Relations Skill Among Staff Members. Theoretical hypothesis #3 that stated that full-use units will rate higher than partial-use or no-use units was confirmed. Theoretical hypothesis #4 that stated that partial-use units will score higher than no-use units was not confirmed.

9. Leadership Quality. Differences large enough to warrant rejection of the null hypothesis were present when category 1 was compared to category 3, thus confirming the portion of the theoretical hypothesis that stated that full-use units will rate higher than no-use units. Both the theoretical hypothesis that full-use units will rate higher than partial-use units and that partial-use units will rate higher than no-use units were not supported with large enough differences.

10. Faculty Relatedness. Differences large enough to reject the null hypotheses were not present and thus, the theoretical hypotheses were not supported.

11. Concern for Students. The theoretical hypotheses were not supported since differences between categories were not large enough to warrant rejection of the null hypotheses at the .05 level.

Conclusions

When the principles of management-by-objectives are applied in the selected community junior college student personnel units, staff members in units which fully use MBO perceive their unit as more effective than staff members of units that do not use MBO. Such conclusions seem to indicate that student personnel units with MBO in full use are marked by a greater presence of the characteristic of effectiveness.

This study demonstrates that 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. 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.

Concluding statements can also be made about some of the findings regarding the individual characteristics of effectiveness. The measures of the characteristic Acceptance of College Goals by Student Personnel Staff were the highest group of scores in the study. The questionnaire items for this characteristic required responses to personal statements about the importance of and commitment toward a college's goals. The high scores can be interpreted as signifying a high degree of commitment and dedication on the part of the participating student personnel staff members to the goals of the community junior colleges at which they are employed.

Table 20 (pages 87-88) provided evidence that leads to the conclusion that effort must be directed toward increasing student personnel effectiveness in community junior colleges. The total effectiveness mean scores for all three categories fell between the Some (3) and Often (4) scale marks. When the individual mean scores for the characteristics are reviewed the characteristic Faculty Relatedness showed the lowest grouping of mean scores, below the scale mark of Some (3). Characteristics, in addition to Faculty-Relatedness, that showed the greatest need for improvement include Clarity of College Goals, Understanding of Student Personnel Goals and Their Relationship to College Goals, Support of Top Administration, and Self-Evaluation Willingness.

Recommendations for Further Study

Since MBO is being introduced at an increasing number of colleges, it should be possible to complete research which compares a unit's effectiveness prior to the introduction of MBO and subsequent to its use for a period of time. Such studies would permit control over variables such as leadership quality, support of top administration, and other environmental variables. The Student Personnel Staff Member Questionnaire and the Student Questionnaire developed for this study would provide a ready measuring device for such research.

The present study, in large part, measured effectiveness as perceived by student personnel staff members. While the present study asked students for perceptions on only one of the eleven characteristics

of effectiveness, future studies may well make a comprehensive review of student perceptions about effectiveness in a wide range of student personnel functions and activities. Also, studies of student personnel effectiveness as perceived by such groups as faculty, top administration, parents, and alumni would provide valuable insights into the impact of the student personnel program.

Finally, effort in the student personnel profession and in college student personnel units must be directed toward more precise descriptions of expected outcomes of student personnel work. Efforts must be directed toward developing a pattern and examples for stating student personnel program outcomes in terms which are clear and measurable, and in developing measuring instruments that are capable of being administered widely. Measurable statements of outcomes and appropriate measuring instruments are needed if the degree of effectiveness is to be determined in student personnel work in higher education.

REFERENCES

- Allendoerfer, Carl B. and Forbes, J.E., "The Utility of Behavioral Objectives." The Mathematics Teacher, (December 1971), 738-746.
- Babcock, Richard D., "An Analysis of MBO in Three Different Enterprise Environments." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1970.
- Bender, Louis W. and Richardson, R.C. Jr., Management Concepts and Higher Education Administration. Pamphlet of the Center for State and Regional Leadership, Florida State University and University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, 1972, Pp. 46.
- Bloom, Benjamin (Ed.), Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: Affective Domain. New York: David McKay Co., 1964.
- Brady, Rodney H., "MBO goes to work in the public sector." Harvard Business Review, (March-April 1973), 65-74.
- Burns, Gerald P., Administrators in Higher Education: Their Functions and Coordination. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.
- Collins, Charles C., Junior College Student Personnel Programs - What They Are and What They Should Be. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.
- Collins, Robert W., "MBO: Advantages, Problems, Implications for Community Colleges." Unpublished seminar paper, University of California - Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California, Pp. 17.
- Connellan, Thomas K., MBO in Community Colleges. Paper presented at Michigan State University Conference, July 14-16, 1971, East Lansing, Michigan, 1971.
- Crane, Robert M., "The Raison d'Etre of a Student Personnel Administrator." Improving College and University Teaching, (Winter 1965), 19-20.
- Crookston, Burns B., "An Organizational Model for Student Development." NASPA Journal, X (July 1972), 3-13.
- Drucker, Peter, The Practice of Management. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1954.
- Dutton, Thomas B., "Research Needs and Priorities in Student Personnel Work." NASPA Journal, VI (April 1968), 339-343.

- Fox, David J., The Research Process in Education. U.S.A.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.
- Glass, Gene V., "The Many Faces of 'Educational Accountability'." Phi Delta Kappan, (June 1972), 636-639.
- Greenleaf, Elizabeth, "Who Should Educate the Student Personnel Worker and to What End?" NASPA Journal, VI (July 1968), 29-32.
- Gronlund, Norman E., Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching. New York: Macmillan Company, 1965.
- Gutsch, Kenneth V., "A Survey of Student Personnel Services in Selected Florida Community Junior Colleges and the Attitudes of Presidents, Student Personnel Officers, Faculty Members and Students Toward these Services." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1961.
- Hacker, Thorne, "Management by Objectives for Schools." Administrator's Notebook, XX (November 1971), 1-4.
- Hagemeyer, Richard H., Junior College Student Personnel Services, Speech-American College Personnel Association, March 28, 1972, Pp. 9.
- Harvey, James, 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, Pp. 124.
- Harvey, James, "Administration by Objectives in Student Personnel Programs." Journal of College Student Personnel, (July 1972), 293-296.
- Harvey, James, Implementing MBO in Two-Year Colleges. Speech-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.
- Hodgkinson, Harold L., "How Can We Measure the Value Added to Students by a College Education?" The Chronicle of Higher Education, (November 13, 1972), 10.
- Hostrop, Richard W., Managing Education for Results. Homewood, Illinois: ETC Publications, 1973.
- Hughes, Charles L., Goal Setting-Key to Individual and Organizational Effectiveness. U.S.A.: American Management Association, Inc., 1965.

- Humble, John W., Management by Objectives in Action. London, England: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Limited, 1970.
- Humes, Charles W. III, "Accountability: a Boon to Guidance." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1, (September 1972), 21.
- Ivancevich, John M., "A Longitudinal Assessment of Management by Objectives." Administrative Science Quarterly, XVII (March 1972), 126-138.
- Kerlinger, Fred N., Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.
- Kirchoff, Bruce A., "A Foundation for the Measurement of the Extent of Use of Management by Objectives." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, June 1972.
- Lahti, Robert 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, Pp. 124.
- Lahti, Robert E., "Management by Objectives." College and University Business, (July 1971), 31-3.
- Lahti, Robert E., Harper College Organizational Development and the Implementation of a Management by Objectives System in an Educational Environment. Palatine, Illinois: William Rainey Harper College, 1970, Pp. 26.
- Lahti, Robert E., Planning Organizational Change. Paper presented at Michigan State University Conference, July 14-16, 1971, East Lansing, Michigan, 1971.
- Lahti, Robert E., "Implementing the System Means Learning to Manage Your Objectives." College and University Business, (February 1972), 43-6.
- Likert, Rensis, New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.
- MacLean, L.S. (Ed.), Community College Student Personnel Work. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri, 1968.
- Mager, Robert F., Preparing Instructional Objectives. Belmont, California: Fearon Publishers, 1962.
- Mahler, Walter R., "Management by Objectives: A Consultant's Viewpoint." Training and Development Journal, XXVI (April 1972), 16-19.

- Matson, Jane E., "Student Personnel Services in Junior Colleges - A Special Challenge." NASPA Journal, IV (April 1967), 161-164.
- McAninch, Harold D., Accountability Through Management by Objectives Background paper - 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.
- McConkey, Dale D., How to Manage by Results. (Revised Edition), U.S.A.: American Management Association, Inc., 1967.
- McConnel, T.R. (Chairman), Junior College Student Personnel Programs, Appraisal and Development, A Report to Carnegie Corporation, November, 1965. Washington, D.C.: National Conference for Appraisal and Development of Junior College Student Personnel Programs, 1965.
- McGregor, Douglas, The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- McManama, John, Systems Analysis for Effective School Administration. West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Co., 1971.
- Mealey, F.R., Report of the Annual Presidents' Institute: Administering Community College Student Personnel Services. Midwest Community College Leadership Program, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1965.
- (The) Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies, Inc., Dynamics of Management by Objectives for School Administrators. Special Monograph No. 3, 1971, Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University, 1971.
- Mueller, Kate H., Student Personnel Work in Higher Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961.
- Michigan Department of Education, The Common Goals of Michigan Education. Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Department of Education, 1971.
- Michigan Department of Education, Developing Performance Objectives. Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Department of Education, 1971.
- Millett, John 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.
- Mortimer, Kenneth P., Accountability in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, February, 1972.

- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, "Policy Statement of the NASPA: Statement of Desirable Conditions and Standards for Maximum Effectiveness of the College Administrator." NASPA Journal, IX (July 1971), 3-5.
- O'Banion, Terry, "Purposes of College and University Student Personnel Work." NASPA Journal, VIII (January 1971), 206-212.
- O'Banion, Terry and Thurston, A. (Ed.), Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Odiorne, George S., Management by Objectives: A System of Managerial Leadership. New York: Pitman Publishing Co., 1965.
- Odiorne, George S., Management Decisions by Objectives. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.
- Odiorne, George S., Personnel Administration by Objectives. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1971.
- Odiorne, George S., "Management by Objectives." College and University Journal, (March 1971), 13-15.
- O'Hare, Robert W. and Lasser, B., "Evaluating Pupil Personnel Programs." California Personnel and Guidance Association Monograph Number 2. Fullerton, California: California Personnel and Guidance Association, 1971.
- Olsson, David E., Management by Objectives. Palo Alto, California: Pacific Book Publishers, 1968.
- Parks, Darrel L., Management by Objectives. Paper presented at State-wide Conference on MBO, Tennessee State Board for Vocational Education, November 11, 1971, Nashville, Tennessee: Division of Vocational-Technical Education, 1971.
- Perry, Richard R., "Administrative Behavior and Vice-President for Student Affairs." NASPA Journal, IV (October 1966), 75-79.
- Raia, Anthony P., "Goal Setting and Self-Control." Journal of Management Studies, 11 (February 1965), 34-53.
- Raia, Anthony P., "A Second Look at Management Goals and Controls." California Management Review, VIII (Summer 1966), 49-58.
- Raines, Max R., "Student Personnel Development in Junior Colleges." NASPA Journal, IV (April 1967), 153-161.

- Rowland, Virgil K., Evaluating and Improving Managerial Performance. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1970.
- Russel, John D. (Ed.), Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1941.
- Scanlan, Burt K., Results Management in Action. Cambridge, Mass: Management Center of Cambridge, 1969.
- Schleh, Edward C., Management by Results. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961.
- Shaffer, Edward C., "Redefining Student Personnel Objectives." NASPA Journal, VIII (October 1970), 142-144.
- Shaffer, Robert H. and Martinson, W.D., Student Personnel Services in Higher Education. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.
- Schotzberger, Martin L., "Some Reflections on Higher Education Administration." A paper in Managing the University: A Systems Approach (P.W. Hamelman, Ed.), New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972.
- Sullivan, Howard J. and O'Hare, R.W., "Accountability in Pupil Personnel Services: A Process Guide for the Development of Objectives." California Personnel and Guidance Association Monograph Number 3. Fullerton, California: California Personnel and Guidance Association, 1971.
- Tosi, Henry L. and Carroll, S.J., "Managerial Reaction to Management by Objectives." Academy of Management, XI (December 1968), 415-426.
- Tyler, Ralph, Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: Syllabus Division, The University of Chicago Press, 1950.
- University of California - Los Angeles, "Student Personnel Services in Junior College." UCLA Junior College Research Review, III (June 1969), Published by American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C., 1969, Pp. 4.
- (The) University of Tennessee, Management by Objectives Bibliography, Volume XIII, No. 58. Knoxville: Office of Institutional Research, The University of Tennessee, 1972.
- 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.
- Williamson, E.G., Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1961.

Wrenn, C. Gilbert and Kamm, R.B., "A Procedure for Evaluating a Student Personnel Program." School and Society, LXVII (April 1948), 266-9.

Wrenn, C. Gilbert, Student Personnel Work in College. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1951.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Illustrations of Expert Authors' Emphasis of MBO Components
with Assigned Numerical Rating by Researcher

Appendix A

Illustrations of Expert Authors' Emphasis of MBO Components

with Assigned Numerical Rating by Researcher

Rating scale: 4-Very Important; 3-Quite Important; 2-Somewhat Important; 1-Very Little Importance; 0-No Importance.

<u>Author</u>	<u>Page Reference</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Illustrative material</u>
<u>Component 1:</u> Overall organizational goals and purposes are defined and stated.			
Hughes	107	4	"Organizational goal setting has the essential ingredients already described: A clear statement of basic company purposes followed by precisely determined goals...."
Humble	4	4	"...there is a continuous process of: 1. Reviewing critically, and restating, the company's strategic and tactical plans."
McConkey	42	4	"It is from the overall objectives of the company that the objectives established for individual managers are derived."
Odiorne	70	4	"Step one. Identify the common goals of the whole organizational unit for the coming period."
Olsson	47	4	"The organization description and the statement of operating objectives are the basic elements for prescribing organizational direction. They are the foundation for the development of objectives by the various segments...."
Scanlan	83	4	"Another factor of obvious importance is the existence of organizational goals which are known by all."
Schleh	36	4	"All are encouraged to work together toward an over-all company objective."
Total rating		28	

Appendix A (continued)

<u>Author</u>	<u>Page Reference</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Illustrative material</u>
<u>Component 2: Organizational</u> departmental units have stated goals and purposes.			
Hughes	108	4	"Business strategies are the goals of sub-units.... They define strategic areas, targets, key plans and long range check-points."
Humble	4	4	"2. Clarifying with each manager the key results and performance standards he must achieve, in line with unit and company objectives, and gaining his contribution and commitment to these."
McConkey	47	4	"The installation of a management-by-results program, then can proceed in definite steps...as follows: 1. Setting overall corporate objectives. 2. Setting line objectives."
Odiorne	70-1	3	"Step two. Clarify your working organization chart.... As a manager you are responsible for achieving organizational results.... Your objectives are your own goals plus the major goals of those reporting directly to you."
Olsson	47	4	"The operating departments first describe their functions and their interpretation of the goals which have been established for the organization...." "Each time the administrative staff has completed a review of the total organization's goals, the department goals must be reviewed...."
Scanlan	86	4	"The development of department objectives is a step-by-step process with each succeeding step being an elaboration and refinement...."
Schleh	8	3	"The results expected of a subordinate can never be determined soundly until the results of his superior have been clarified."
Total rating		<hr/> 26	

Appendix A (continued)

<u>Author</u>	<u>Page Reference</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Illustrative material</u>
<u>Component 3:</u> Each worker states his major objectives for a future time period.			
Hughes	114	4	"Research on personal goal setting has shown that there is no substitute for a definite statement, either written or spoken, in which the person makes a commitment not only to others...but to himself."
Humble	8	4	"Each manager must be clear about the results he is expected to secure in line with company objectives." "The key results analysis...A draft can be discussed with his immediate superior."
McConkey	49 39	4	"...and the members of this group will then go through basically the identical procedure, taking their superiors objectives, translating them into the required action, and finally coming back with objectives for themselves." "...both the objectives and the agreed-upon achievement dates should be put in writing."
Odiorne	71	4	"a. Ask the subordinate to make notes on what objectives he has in mind for next year and...."
Olsson	52	2	"The employee can identify trouble spots and establish some personal goals."
Scanlan	108	4	Paragraph headed: "6. Picking out key areas where the manager would like to see improvement made and writing specific objectives."
Schleh	30	4	"The copy (of objectives) in writing is merely a reflection of an understanding that has been arrived at personally."
Total rating		26	

Appendix A (continued)

<u>Author</u>	<u>Page Reference</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Illustrative material</u>
<u>Component 4:</u>			Each worker and his boss mutually agree on the worker's statement of his objectives.
Hughes	114	3	"Therefore, in establishing and documenting his goals and in communicating them to his supervisor, he must consider...."
Humble	4	4	"3. Agreeing with each manager a job improvement plan which makes a measurable and realistic contribution to the units' and company's plans for better performance."
McConkey	54	4	"Experience has proved that the best method of setting objectives is the one in which the objectives are drafted and recommended by the individual managers and then approved by their superiors."
Odiorne	71	4	"c. In your personal conference, review the man's own objectives in detail, then offer your own suggestions or changes. d. Have two copies of the final draft of his objectives typed; give him one and keep one yourself. e. Working from the final factors...."
Olsson	52-3	1	"more than likely the individual will indicate a need for some improvement.... The supervisor should note such areas or factors...."
Scanlan	136	4	"The key to integrating what the manager wants and what the subordinate wants is mutual agreement in the areas of:"
Schleh	30	4	"Objectives should always be discussed face to face between the supervisor and the man until they are mutually understood and accepted."
Total rating		24	

Appendix A (continued)

<u>Author</u>	<u>Page Reference</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Illustrative material</u>
<u>Component 5:</u> Boss and worker clearly understand how progress toward goals and objectives will be measured.			
Hughes	115	4	"Performance standards may be stated in company or in individual terms, however, the employee must understand them in his own terms and know exactly how he will be measured."
Humble	282	4	"Is each manager really clear about (a) the key results he must achieve? (b) the performance standards and criteria by which he will be judged?"
McConkey	55	4	"3. Is it clearly stated in terms of - a. The task? b. The measuring period c. The method of measuring to be used."
Odiorne	76	4	"The establishment of measures of organization performance before individual measures are set defines the boundaries within which subordinates can legitimately propose goals."
Olsson	76	4	"The test of the clarity of any goal is its measurability. If it cannot be measured, it is probably too vague...."
Scanlan	99	4	"For each major area of responsibility specific measures of successful performance should be established. Where possible these measures should be quantifiable..."
	136		"...mutual agreement in the areas of: ...3. How performance will be measured."
Schleh	20	4	"...state the objectives in terms of final, measurable results..."
	73		"You cannot have a 'results' accountability without measurement!"
Total rating		28	

Appendix A (continued)

<u>Authors</u>	<u>Page Reference</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Illustrative material</u>
<u>Component 6:</u> Workers set objectives and obligate themselves to the completion of them.			
Hughes	114	4	"...there is no substitute for a definite statement...in which the person makes a commitment...Through this commitment motivation as well as communication is achieved."
Humble	17	4	"...most managers will respond with vitality to really challenging objectives if they are involved in establishing them...."
McConkey	80	3	"Management by results...is an approach by which the manager is held responsible for certain results, which he may accomplish by freely calling upon the full-range of his experience, training and capabilities."
Odiorne	79	3	"The subordinate moves in a more results-oriented fashion because he knows what his goals are."
Olsson	100	4	"Involvement of the individual in his goals, the goals of the department, and in the objectives of the enterprise, ...is the heart of the system."
Scanlan	139	4	"The key point to remember is that there must be mutual agreement... because this agreement is what fosters commitment on the part of the man."
	125		"The success of the system depends on the degree to which people are committed to it."
Schleh	37	4	"The prime value of an objective is in the stimulation of a man...."
	63		"If an objective is delegated to a man, he must feel a sense of obligation for its accomplishment."
Total rating		26	

Appendix A (continued)

<u>Authors</u>	<u>Page Reference</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Illustrative material</u>
<u>Component 7:</u>	Goals of individuals and groups in the organization tie in with overall organizational goals.		
Hughes	109	4	"...it cannot be emphasized too strongly how important it is that... actions of managers, supervisors, and individual employees tie in absolutely with...long range... objectives."
Humble	285	4	"Define your departmental objectives... 1. What is the essential contribution your department is making to the company success?"
McConkey	66	4	"Objectives for each manager down the line must likewise be consistent with those of all other managers and with the overall objectives of the company."
Odiorne	76	4	"...individual goals and budgets should be solicited, and to the extent possible should be used to adapt to organization goals."
Olsson	43	4	"The goals for an individual's job must support the objectives of the enterprise."
Scanlan	87	3	"This situation cannot improve until each department of the unit begins to analyze its reason for being in terms of how it relates to the total organization and other closely allied departments."
Schleh	36	4	"...after all objectives have been set in a preliminary way, it is well to write them down and cross-check to see that all objectives blend with each other." "...objectives of any man tie into those of his superior and eventually into the objectives of the enterprise."
Total rating		27	

Appendix A (continued)

<u>Authors</u>	<u>Page Reference</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Illustrative material</u>
<u>Component B:</u> Periodic review of progress toward objectives is made by boss and worker.			
Hughes	111	4	"Obviously management cannot wait until time has run out before checking on the progress made. Review may be scheduled on a calendar basis (monthly, quarterly, or annually) or according to the timetable established...."
Humble	4	4	"Using systematic performance review to measure and discuss progress toward results...."
McConkey	41	4	"Subsequent steps will consist of the periodic review sessions which are held--usually at six-month intervals...."
Odiorne	71	4	"Step Four. During the year check each subordinate's goals as promised milestones are reached.
Olsson	85	3	"Review...is a continuous reporting on progress. The reports should tell the people in the group their rate of advancement toward their objectives and goals for a particular planning period."
Scanlan	123	4	"He (boss) works with the individual in his department several ways: 1. He reviews the progress which is being made toward accomplishing the desired results."
Schleh	42	2	"...the superior should require at least basic accomplishment on all objectives in each period."
Total rating		25	

Appendix A (continued)

<u>Authors</u>	<u>Page Reference</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Illustrative material</u>
<u>Component 9:</u>			Boss and worker meet at end of time period to review the degree of accomplishment of objectives.
Hughes	117	4	"Now it (cycle of individual goal setting) is completed by the application of the established performance standards to measure the degree to which both work and personal goals have been achieved."
Humble	12	4	" <u>Performance review</u> measures the extent to which a manager has succeeded in reaching the specific objectives set out in his key results analysis and improvement plans."
McConkey	40	3	"The session should conclude with the superior providing the subordinate with an overall evaluation of the latter's success during the period in question."
Odiorne	72	4	"Step One. Near the end of the budget year, ask each subordinate to prepare a brief 'statement of performance' against budget... Step Two. Set a date to go over the report in detail. Step Three. At this meeting...."
Olsson	52	3	"at the end of the employee's first year of employment the department head should again meet with him and review the job being done...."
	53		"Each year another review is made near the person's anniversary date...."
Scanlan	157	4	"One helpful approach is to provide a completely new form with which to conduct review sessions--a form which eliminates all reference to individual traits and instead uses a column for goals, a second for comments on the effectiveness of goal accomplishment...."
	171		"...the supervisor should set up a basis for holding the man accountable at the end of the period for the accomplishment of these objectives."

Appendix A (continued)

<u>Authors</u>	<u>Page Reference</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Illustrative material</u>
Component 9: (continued)			
Schleh	41	2	"A mid-period review may be advisable to consider whether the conditions are actually as anticipated."
Total rating		24	
<u>Component 10:</u> Appraisal of performance is judged on the basis of the worker's accomplishment of objectives.			
Hughes	111	4	"...the measurement of individual performance can be achieved at the same time.... Here the results-oriented philosophy of management by objectives achieves its fullest fruition ..."
Humble	27	4	"Performance review is used as a tool of business planning--a continuing approach to agreeing on results, reviewing performance, and resetting the next results." (Humble also emphasizes need for "potential review" when establishing an organizations' succession plan).
McConkey	40 30	4	"This evaluation should be based on job-centered performance, not on personal characteristics or traits." "No verbose appraisal form is required to measure the manager's performance when accountability is spelled out in this manner (results type of system)."
Odiorne	72	4	"Step Two. Set a date to go over this report (statement of performance against budget) in detail... Then get his agreement on how good his performance was and where he fell down."

Appendix A (continued)

<u>Authors</u>	<u>Page Reference</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Illustrative material</u>
Component 10: (continued)			
Olsson	53-4	2	"...the identification of the individual with the organization's goals, his problem areas, and roadblocks to better work are revealed to a much greater extent than is possible in a more traditional evaluation process."
Scanlan	156	4	"that improved performance is highly related to the establishment of realistic, measurable goals rather than general character improvement. Therefore, wisdom would seem to dictate a direct approach which avoids the pitfalls of personality discussion, and recognizes that the emphasis must always be on job performance."
Schleh	65	4	"Appraisals should be geared to the results expected of the man."
Total rating		26	
<u>Component 11: Top management (administration) is committed to management by objectives.</u>			
Hughes	109	3	"This is why planning must be done from the top down-otherwise it will be impossible for management and non-management people alike to know what they should be doing."
Humble	29	4	"...important keys for success: 1. Determined and committed leadership from the top."
McConkey		4	In chapter XVII, included in later printings only, authors say that two of the key points to success of MBR are these: Management must continually demonstrate its intention to MBR and management must regard the approach as a long-term and continuing way of corporate life.

Appendix A (continued)

<u>Authors</u>	<u>Page Reference</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Illustrative material</u>
<u>Component 11: (continued)</u>			
Odiorne	68	4	"The primary condition that must be met in installing a system of management by objectives is the support, endorsement, or permission of the principal manager in the organizational unit...."
Olsson	43	4	"Step one. Top Management Lays The Foundation. The purpose of the management by objectives system is to obtain cohesive group action...." Paragraph on the topic, "The Importance of Total Interest by Top Management."
	82		
Scanlan	127	4	"The key to implementing Results Management is the desire and dedication on the part of the manager. He is the one who must give leadership and direction as well as generate enthusiasm for the system...."
Schleh	9	2	"We should emphasize that the key in delegation is to delegate by the results that you expect of the man."
Total rating		25	
<u>Component 12: Efforts are made to train and develop worker capabilities so that they can reach objectives.</u>			
Hughes	131	3	"If we think of education as a structured learning process which has been directed toward general goals, then training can be thought of as a learning process which is more structured and is directed toward very specific goals."

Appendix A (continued)

<u>Author</u>	<u>Page Reference</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Illustrative material</u>
Component 12: (continued)			
Humble	4	4	"6. Developing management training plans to help each manager to overcome his weaknesses, to build on his strengths, and to accept a responsibility for self-development."
McConkey	30	3	"Management by results has proved to be a valuable means of promoting effective management training and development."
Odiorne	72	3	"d. Use the jointly-agreed-upon goals as a tool for coaching, developing, and improving each man's performance on a continuous basis."
Olsson	54	2	"From a fundamental understanding of the organization's purpose, in relation to the individual's job and ability, comes the material for effective coaching."
Scanlan	130	4	"The remainder of this chapter will be devoted to exploring the essential elements of a results-oriented coaching and development plan."
Schleh	83-4	3	Paragraph headings: "2. The supervisor must train his people." 3. The supervisor must develop men."
Total rating		22	

Component 13: Job descriptions are written for each position.

Hughes	103	4	"Plans for action describe the specific things that will be done in order to achieve the goals. For the company, this step defines the planned program; for the individual, specific responsibilities and the duties entailed."
--------	-----	---	---

Appendix A (continued)

<u>Author</u>	<u>Page Reference</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Illustrative material</u>
Component 13: (continued)			
Humble	33	4	"In each key area, a number of standards of performance were determined and these, together with the key areas, were recorded on the draft management job description."
McConkey	27	1	Author implies job description as an activity listing and describes its fallacy as an evaluation instrument.
Odiorne	103	3	"...the job description is a statement of the purpose and duties of the position, and is a charter to perform certain duties attached to it. The system of management by objectives enlarges the job description...."
Olsson	51	3	"At this point (end of new employee's probationary period), the employee and his supervisor examine the individual's job in connection with the purposes of the organization. Together they complete the "Our Job" form shown...."
Scanlan	136	2	"The problem with job descriptions is that too often they have been written without the man himself being involved."
Schleh	21	1	"Because job descriptions often attempt to describe all the duties of a job, each duty is used as a basis for an objective. This inevitably leads to objectives on many subparts of a job...."
Total rating		18	

Appendix A (continued)

<u>Author</u>	<u>Page Reference</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Illustrative material</u>
<u>Component 14:</u> Individuals at all levels must participate in organizational goal-setting.			
Hughes	135	4	"...prime requisite of effective individual goal setting is prior knowledge of and involvement in the establishment of organizational objectives."
Humble	282	3	"Did your subordinate managers contribute to these objectives?"
McConkey	44	0	"The overall objectives are set by top management--typically by the chief executive officer and his staff with the assistance and concurrence of the board of directors."
Odiorne	145	0	"...participation of itself has no claim to being the core of a new pattern of management that will guarantee high productivity if universally adopted by managers."
Olsson	5	0	"It is the board's responsibility to approve new goals and aims."
Scanlan	125 158	3	"When people participate in the objective setting process they become mentally and emotionally as well as physically involved in their jobs." "However, recent research evidence has indicated that the source of the objectives is less significant to the achievement of these objectives than is the opportunity for a mutual discussion of, and agreement upon the specific details."
Schleh	37	0	"Essentially, objective setting is the job of the superior."
Total rating		10	

APPENDIX B
Examples of Letters and Rating Sheets
Sent to Experts

Appendix B

A letter similar to this letter to Dr. Raines was sent to Dr. Terry O'Banion, Dr. Jane Matson, and Dr. Ken Venderbush. Each letter was written with personal references and included an introductory cover letter, as shown, by Dr. William Martinson of Western Michigan University.

February 13, 1973

Dr. Max R. Raines
Professor of Higher Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Dear Dr. Raines:

I am approaching you with a request because of your expertise in community junior college student personnel work. Your leadership in the study of community junior colleges in the 1965 Report for the Carnegie Corporation resulted in the most significant and major piece of research that I have read in an extensive review of community junior college student personnel literature.

I am involved in a doctoral research project which, simply stated, attempts to determine relationships, if any, between the "management by objectives system," currently in use in some community colleges and characteristics of effectiveness of community junior college student personnel units. Through a review of the literature I have identified those characteristics of effective units which student personnel writers consider important. Your identification of developmental characteristics in the 1965 study comes close to what I have in mind. If I can properly identify the characteristics of effectiveness I will then proceed to develop an instrument which will measure the perceptions of student personnel administrators about the presence or absence of such characteristics in various community college settings.

Your involvement as an expert in this intermediate step to instrument development will involve only a very brief period of time for you and is essential to my continued work on instrument development. I fully recognize that I assume all responsibilities for instrument development and only ask you to share your judgment as to the selection of characteristics of effectiveness.

Dr. Max Raines
Page Two
February 13, 1973

Would you please:

1. Judge the importance of each characteristic of effectiveness on the attached sheet?
2. Add characteristics of effectiveness of community junior college student personnel units that I may have missed in my review of the literature?

Again, your judgment is needed as an intermediate step in the development of an instrument. If it is possible for you to react within ten days I would be grateful. I can be reached either at my home telephone 616-534-5722 or through the Department of Counseling and Personnel at Western Michigan University 616-383-1600 if you would like to talk with me.

Sincerely,

Peter Vande Guchte
1660 Blanchard, S.W.
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49509

Enclosure: Rating sheet
Return envelope

- P. S. For your information I am also asking the following professionals to react to this list: Dr. Terry O'Banion (University of Illinois), Dr. Jane Matson (California State College of Los Angeles), and Dr. Kenneth R. Venderbush (Grand Valley State College).

Cover Letter of Dr. Martinson

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Department of Counseling and Personnel

KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN
49001

125

February 13, 1973

Dr. Max R. Raines
Professor of Higher Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Dear Max:

Mr. Peter Vande Guchte is a doctoral student in our department and needs your help in completing the attached instrument. I would appreciate it if you would cooperate with him and get this back as soon as possible.

I think Pete is on to something rather exciting and needs your help at this time.

Thanks so much.

Bill Martinson

EXPERT RATING SHEET

Instructions: You must answer this question for each of the nine characteristics shown: "How Important Is this characteristic to the effectiveness of a student personnel unit?" Mark the appropriate blank indicating your rating for each characteristic. Note that characteristics are not listed in order of importance and you are not asked to rank-order them.

- | <u>Description of Characteristics</u> | <u>Rating of Importance</u> |
|--|--|
| 1. <u>Clarity and acceptance of college goals.</u>
College goals are stated clearly. They are defined in terms that are understandable and give specific direction to student personnel workers. The staff accepts college goals as their own. | <input type="checkbox"/> Very Important
<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat Important
<input type="checkbox"/> Not Important |
| 2. <u>Understanding of student personnel goals and how they relate to college goals.</u>
Goals and objectives of the student personnel program are understood by student personnel workers and give their work direction in terms of achieving the overall college goals. | <input type="checkbox"/> Very Important
<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat Important
<input type="checkbox"/> Not Important |
| 3. <u>Support of Top Administration.</u>
The board of trustees and the president of the college promote the student personnel program demonstrating that they consider the program and its staff as essential to the purpose of the college. They provide budgetary means for adequate facilities, equipment and staff resources. | <input type="checkbox"/> Very Important
<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat Important
<input type="checkbox"/> Not Important |
| 4. <u>Staff role clarity.</u>
A student personnel worker has a clear definition of his responsibilities, his authority, the nature of his relationships with other colleagues and agencies, and the criteria for evaluation of his performance. | <input type="checkbox"/> Very Important
<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat Important
<input type="checkbox"/> Not Important |
| 5. <u>Program implementing ability.</u>
Student personnel workers are able to provide the plans, efforts, and follow-through to carry into effect the projects and programs which are necessary to achieve their ends. | <input type="checkbox"/> Very Important
<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat Important
<input type="checkbox"/> Not Important |

(continued on the next page)

6. Self-evaluation willingness.
Efforts are made by student personnel workers to assess the effects of individual and program efforts, to appraise their adequacy, and to seek means and methods for improvement.
- ___ Very Important
___ Somewhat Important
___ Not Important
7. Human relations skill.
Student personnel workers exhibit mutual respect and trust and participate in clear communication of fact and feeling with each other. They develop a unity and cohesiveness through friendly working relationships.
- ___ Very Important
___ Somewhat Important
___ Not Important
8. Leadership quality.
The chief student personnel administrator demonstrates the qualities, skills, and actions necessary to help the student personnel worker and the unit to move toward achievement of individual, unit and college goals.
- ___ Very Important
___ Somewhat Important
___ Not Important
9. Concern for students.
The student personnel program focuses its resources on meeting students' needs and upon individualizing the impact of the college for each individual student. The staff recognizes the educative potentialities of student involvement and participation.
- ___ Very Important
___ Somewhat Important
___ Not Important

Please identify and briefly describe other characteristics of effective student personnel units and rate their importance.

Your Signature: _____

A sincere thank-you for this generous contribution of your time. I hope that I may contribute a little bit to the body of research on student personnel units in community junior colleges.

APPENDIX C
STUDENT PERSONNEL STAFF MEMBER QUESTIONNAIRE
and
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

STUDENT PERSONNEL STAFF MEMBER QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire asks for your perceptions about situations and matters in your college's student personnel program. You are asked to answer each item honestly and frankly as you see it.

Please do **not** put your name on the questionnaire. All questionnaires will be kept in strict confidence. No persons at your college will have access to individual answers. Your college will receive summary information about the study.

INSTRUCTIONS: On the following pages please read each item and then check the column that best describes the situation at your college.

Examples:

1. Student personnel staff members in my area make efforts to meet with students in informal situations on campus.
2. The student government leaders of this college work closely with student personnel staff members.

	Always	Often	Some	Rarely	Never	Don't know
1. Student personnel staff members in my area make efforts to meet with students in informal situations on campus.		✓				
2. The student government leaders of this college work closely with student personnel staff members.				✓		

PLEASE ANSWER THE ITEMS ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES AND RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO ME.
THANK YOU!

College Code _____

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Student:

This questionnaire will take you less than five minutes to complete. Your answers, when combined with the answers of other students, will serve as important information to your college.

This study has been approved by the dean of students office of your college. All questionnaires will be kept in strict confidence. College officials will not have access to your individual answer. Each questionnaire has been coded so that a follow-up mailing is possible if some students do not respond to this questionnaire.

Will you please complete the questions on the back side of this sheet and return the sheet in the enclosed envelope? Thank you.

Peter VandeGuchte, Study Director

Please fill in these blanks:

Class Level

Freshman

Sophomore

Unclassified

Status

Full-time student

Part-time student

Sex

Male

Female

INSTRUCTIONS: On the back of this sheet please read each item and check the column that best describes how you view the situation at your college.

Examples:

- College officials enjoy working with students.
- The deans and counselors join students in lounges and coffee-shops just to talk and listen.

	Always	Often	Some	Rarely	Never	Don't know
1. College officials enjoy working with students.		✓				
2. The deans and counselors join students in lounges and coffee-shops just to talk and listen.				✓		

TURN SHEET OVER, ANSWER THE ITEMS AND RETURN IN ENVELOPE.
THANK YOU!

College Code _____

APPENDIX D

Summary of Scheffe' Method Results
and
Resulting Decisions Concerning Null Hypotheses

Appendix D

Summary of Scheffe' Method Results

<u>Characteristic and Compared Categories</u>	<u>Estimate of Contrast (difference of means)</u>	<u>Estimate of S.D.</u>	<u>Ratio Col.2: Col.3</u>	<u>Test 1 Statistic</u>	<u>Reject null hypothesis?</u>
Clarity of College Goals.					
1 vs. 2	1.79	.99	1.80	2.50	No
1 vs. 3	2.75	.93	2.96	2.50	Yes
2 vs. 3	.96	.87	1.10	2.50	No
1 vs. 2+3	2.27	.86	2.65	2.50	Yes
1+2 vs. 3	1.85	.75	2.47	2.50	No
Acceptance of College Goals by Student Personnel Staff. Comparisons not made since differences were not large enough to warrant examination.					
Understanding of Student Personnel Goals and Their Relationship to College Goals.					
1 vs. 2	.87	1.10	.79	2.50	No
1 vs. 3	3.07	1.03	2.98	2.50	Yes
2 vs. 3	2.20	.96	2.28	2.50	No
1 vs. 2+3	1.97	.95	2.07	2.50	No
1+2 vs. 3	2.64	.83	3.18	2.50	Yes
Support of Top Administration.					
1 vs. 2	2.42	1.00	2.42	2.50	No
1 vs. 3	2.68	.95	2.83	2.50	Yes
2 vs. 3	.26	.88	.29	2.50	No
1 vs. 2+3	2.55	.87	2.93	2.50	Yes
1+2 vs. 3	1.47	.76	1.94	2.50	No
Staff Role Clarity.					
1 vs. 2	2.18	1.03	2.12	2.50	No
1 vs. 3	2.78	.97	2.87	2.50	Yes
2 vs. 3	.60	.90	.66	2.50	No
1 vs. 2+3	2.48	.89	2.78	2.50	Yes
1+2 vs. 3	1.69	.78	2.18	2.50	No
Program Implementing Ability.					
1 vs. 2	1.75	.95	1.84	2.50	No
1 vs. 3	5.09	.90	5.68	2.50	Yes
2 vs. 3	3.34	.84	4.00	2.50	Yes
1 vs. 2+3	3.42	.82	4.16	2.50	Yes
1+2 vs. 3	4.21	.72	5.86	2.50	Yes

<u>Characteristic and Compared Categories</u>	<u>Estimate of Contrast (differences of means)</u>	<u>Estimate of S.D.</u>	<u>Ratio Col. 2: Col. 3</u>	<u>Test Statistics</u> ¹	<u>Reject null hypothesis?</u>
Self-Evaluation Willingness.					
1 vs. 2	2.03	1.28	1.59	2.50	No
1 vs. 3	4.67	1.20	3.89	2.50	Yes
2 vs. 3	2.64	1.12	2.36	2.50	No
1 vs. 2+3	3.35	1.10	3.05	2.50	Yes
1+2 vs. 3	3.65	.96	3.81	2.50	Yes
Human Relations Skill Among Staff Members.					
1 vs. 2	2.59	1.03	2.51	2.50	Yes
1 vs. 3	2.85	.97	2.94	2.50	Yes
2 vs. 3	1.06	.91	1.16	2.50	No
1 vs. 2+3	2.32	.89	2.61	2.50	Yes
1+2 vs. 3	1.96	.78	2.51	2.50	Yes
Leadership Quality.					
1 vs. 2	2.40	1.86	1.29	2.50	No
1 vs. 3	6.04	1.75	3.45	2.50	Yes
2 vs. 3	3.64	1.63	2.23	2.50	No
1 vs. 2+3	4.22	1.61	2.62	2.50	Yes
1+2 vs. 3	4.84	1.40	3.46	2.50	Yes
Faculty-Relatedness. Comparisons not made since differences were not large enough to warrant examination.					
Concern for Students. Comparisons not made since differences were not large enough to warrant examination.					
Total Effectiveness-Staff Member Perceptions.					
1 vs. 2	15.82	8.41	1.88	2.50	No
1 vs. 3	31.74	7.91	4.01	2.50	Yes
2 vs. 3	15.92	7.37	2.16	2.50	No
1 vs. 2+3	23.78	7.27	3.27	2.50	Yes
1+2 vs. 3	23.83	6.34	3.76	2.50	Yes

¹ The test statistic is computed by the formula:
$$\sqrt{\frac{(J-1) F}{.95 J-1, N-J}}$$