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The purpose of this study was to identify morale determinants and then to determine the extent of morale relationships and similarities among various categories of students and between students and faculty members in Southern Baptist institutions of higher education.

The study was conducted with randomly selected students and faculty members from four Southern Baptist institutions of higher education in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Two similar research instruments were used to collect data from 230 of 300 students and from 50 of 60 faculty members.

Selected morale studies of the 50's, 60's and 70's were studied in the review of related literature. These studies confirmed that the subject of morale (sometimes referred to as esprit, quality of work-life or attitudinal climate) is always a timely subject of concern . . . be it in the world of business, industry, military life or education.

After morale determinants were identified and comparisons made, seven hypotheses were tested.
Findings included:

1. Although some similarities in morale determinants were identified by students and faculty members, dissimilarities far outnumbered the similarities. Nevertheless, the similarities were important ones and should be addressed by trustees and administrators.

2. Morale self-perception for students did not necessarily increase with age, nor did it increase with the length of time one, either student or faculty member, had spent on campus.

3. Morale self-perception for students was not dependent upon a student's marital status, nor did one's class status dictate a particular morale rating.

4. Military veterans among students did show a higher morale self-perception than did their non-veteran colleagues.

To conclude the study, ten recommendations were offered to educational leaders. One recommendation concerned the necessity for open and continuous communication between all categories of persons within the institutional family. Another recommendation dealt with the necessity of handling student apathy, unconcern and misconduct in a fair, just and swift manner. And, a further recommendation emphasized the absolute must of placing academics first and foremost in the list of campus priorities.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to identify key morale determinants and then to determine the extent of morale relationships and similarities among categories of students, e.g., married or single, veteran or non-veteran, freshman or senior, and between students and faculty members in Southern Baptist institutions of higher education.

The leaders in every organization are concerned about the sense of well being of their members and about what factors help determine that overall climate of morale. This concern is partly evidenced whenever organizational leadership provides various kinds of morale building benefits, such as: Christmas bonuses, profit sharing programs, social events, company cars and family dental plans, to name just a few.

As goes the morale of the members of an organization, so goes the mission of that organization. This is particularly true in institutions of higher education where the campus morale of students and faculty members impacts on the health, quality of life, retention and attrition rates for both students and faculty and on the very existence of those institutions.

After having spent over twenty years on active duty with the United States military forces, seventeen of those
years as an Army chaplain, this author can attest that when the collective morale of a unit was up, that unit's promise of accomplishing its mission was considerably greater than for a similar type unit with low morale. Commanders knew how key the factor of morale was to the success of their units. "Chaplain, how is the morale of the troops?" was a familiar question indeed.

Morale has been defined as a "person's state of mind" (Army, 1973, 13-5). Further, morale can be measured by observing some specifics about a unit or organization, such as: appearance of the individuals of the unit, personal conduct, personal hygiene, job proficiency, excessive quarreling, harmful or irresponsible rumors, condition of the living and working areas, etc. How similar all of this is to a college campus environment and to its own state of morale.

In a Kent State University study of student satisfaction, Hallenbeck (1978) referred to morale as one's contentment or happiness with his total college experience. This second description or definition of morale better fits this present research.

In a recent study of Southern Baptist colleges and universities (McGrath, 1977), it was stated that high morale and commitment make institutions attractive to prospective students, faculty members and donors. This same study identified morale as being synonymous with
"institutional esprit," and that such esprit is the result of shared purposes between faculty, administrators, trustees, students, alumni and friends. The McGrath study in its chapter on "Institutional Esprit" (II 45-52) dealt primarily with the morale of faculty members and administrators. Two interesting observations in this particular study were:

1. The failure of administrators, especially in times of retrenchment, to involve other members of the faculty in the broad decisions which determines the character of the institution and the personal welfare of its members can cause disaffection (II 50).

2. A withering of the evangelical spirit which animated the pioneers in the establishment of a church related college could contribute to a low esprit (II 51).

This writer's research was an attempt to support such observations as these.

Statement of the Problem

Is there a relationship between student and faculty morale on the college campus? If there is a relationship, in what areas is it found? Do students and faculty members choose similar morale determinants? Do they have similar morale self-perceptions? Does being married or the number of years one has spent on campus affect morale? Does class status or being a veteran affect morale?
The purpose of this research was to attempt to identify specific morale determinants and relationships that existed among and between students and faculty members on the campuses of Southern Baptist institutions of higher education. Three such institutions were chosen for this research: 1) The University of Richmond, Richmond, Virginia; 2) Averett College, Danville, Virginia; and, 3) Bluefield College, Bluefield, Virginia.

These three institutions, all fully accredited, co-educational, four-year institutions in the Commonwealth of Virginia, were selected because of the author's long-time affiliation with this Christian denomination and because of his present employment with one of these institutions. Also, the close proximity of the three Virginia schools enabled the author to visit each campus to obtain the necessary research data. A fourth Southern Baptist institution, Virginia Intermont College in Bristol, Virginia, was chosen to pretest the survey questionnaires. This pretest was conducted in December 1979 through January 1980.

Significance of the Study

According to Madron (1976) and others, organizational difficulties in university departments can be diagnosed by studying morale levels of the individuals within those departments. Plato's saying, "The health of the nation
is but the health of the family writ large," could be reworded to say, "The morale of the institution is but the morale of the individual therein writ large." Individual morale is collectively reflected in the overall morale of the total organization. This, then, is the basic reason for continued research in the area of institutional morale and, specifically, the reason for this present study.

Madron's study encouraged this writer in his research and strengthened his determination to investigate and then present helpful information to educational administrators.

The information that was collected, sorted, analyzed, tested, interpreted and then presented on student and faculty morale determinants and relationships should be invaluable information to the leaders of all Southern Baptist institutions of higher education. Furthermore, such information should be applicable and helpful to all leaders in higher education ... to all who desire for their institutions to live, grow and function well within a climate of high institutional esprit.

Small, church-related colleges are noted for an on-campus environment of closeness and friendliness between students and faculty members ... similar to the relationships that exist between the members of a church congregation. Even an institution the size of the University of Richmond, with an enrollment of 4,404 in 1979-1980, reflected these interpersonal relationships.
Those who have attended such church-related institutions are witnesses to this atmosphere of mutual closeness and concern and recall being addressed on and off campus by their first names by the faculty. There was a close relationship in the past, and there is a close relationship now, between students and faculty members in Southern Baptist institutions of higher education.

This author knows of this close relationship through personal observation of students and faculty on Southern Baptist campuses, to include the campus of Virginia Inter­mont College. He knows it through personal experience, since he is a graduate of two Southern Baptist institutions of higher education, namely, Georgetown College in Georgetown, Kentucky and Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky. He knows of this close relationship through his experience in a cognate internship in 1978 on the campus of Belmont College in Nashville, Tennessee, another Southern Baptist institution of higher education. And, finally, he knows it exists because of his present experiences as dean of students and assistant professor of psychology at Bluefield College.

This research has identified on-campus morale determinants and has tested the relationships between students in one category with students in another category as well as tested the relationships between students and faculty members as the relationships pertained to on-campus morale.
Research Questions

The following questions were addressed and answered in this research:

1. Do students and faculty members identify similar on-campus morale determinants?

2. Does age play a part in student morale self-perception?

3. Is morale self-rating similar to how one rates the other, i.e., student rating self and then rating faculty members and faculty members rating themselves and then rating students?

4. Does the length of time on campus influence morale ratings?

5. Do military veterans have higher morale ratings than their non-veteran colleagues?

6. Do married students have higher morale than non-married or single students?

7. Does a student's class status predict his morale?

Summary and Organization

In summary, this research has explored morale determinants and relationships among students and faculty members on Southern Baptist college and university campuses. Morale determinants and relationships were identified through research procedures that included the collection of data by means of two similar survey instruments,
the analysis and interpretation of the data, the drawing of conclusions and the offering of recommendations.

Outline of the Report

Chapter II reviews the literature related to the subject of organizational or institutional morale. Chapter III explains how the research was conducted, explaining the methodology of the study, the sampling procedures used, the description of the samples, and the data analysis plan. Chapter IV presents the results of the study and the analysis of the collected data. Chapter V draws the conclusions, presents a summary and offers recommendations.
CHAPTER II

THE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Be assured, much has been written on the general subject of morale in higher education. As much, if not more, has been written on the subject of organizational morale in the world of business, industry and the military forces.

Other descriptors of the subject of morale would include such terms as: quality of work-life, attitudinal climate, esprit, satisfaction in life and environmental atmosphere. Articles, papers, essays, books and dissertations have all addressed these subjects...subjects which the author has elected to place under the umbrella of morale.

Significant Morale Studies from the 1950's

Twenty-seven years ago, Maslow (1954) developed his famous "Hierarchy of Needs" (Figure 1) to explain the inner motivation toward job satisfaction and the resultant higher morale of the individual. As one progressed from the basic needs upward to the highest needs, one's satisfaction level, or morale, increased proportionately. Surely this gentleman's contribution to morale studies remains a significant influence in all subsequent research.
self-actualization needs
(to become what one is capable of becoming)

status/esteem needs
(recognition and praise)

belongingness needs
(affiliation and acceptance, feeling loved)

safety, security needs
(from elements, enemies and uncertainty)

survival needs
(sleep, warmth, food, air, body elimination)

Figure 1. Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs
(Diagram source unknown.)
in the area of job satisfaction and morale. He was, we could say, a modern day pioneer in morale studies.

In an article by Getzels and Guba (1957), these two educators related morale to organizational theory and theorized that morale resulted from organizational needs in the achievement of its goals and the satisfaction of individual needs of the members of the organization.

Herzberg, and others, (1959) proposed a satisfaction and dissatisfaction theory that impacted on job satisfaction (morale) in the world of work. This, too, is applicable to the college setting as he identified the satisfiers, or builders of morale, as: 1) achievement, 2) recognition, 3) work itself, 4) responsibility, and 5) advancement. The dissatisfiers were identified as: 1) salary; 2) possibility of growth (of the company); 3) interpersonal relations with subordinates, superiors and peers; 4) supervision; 5) company policy and administration; 6) working conditions; 7) personal life; 8) status; and 9) job security. In other words, one's job satisfaction (morale) was more dependent on the former five factors than upon the latter nine.

Significant Morale Studies from the 1960's

Randall (1965), former chairman of Inland Steel Company, was on target when he wrote about the absolute
necessity of leaders knowing and understanding the various factors that influence morale:

Leadership, like everything else in life that is vital, finds its source in understanding. To be worthy of management responsibility today, a man must have insight into the human heart, for unless he has an awareness of human problems, a sensitivity toward the hopes and aspirations of those whom he supervises, and a capacity for analysis of the emotional forces that motivate their conduct, the projects entrusted to him will not get ahead—no matter how often wages are raised. (p. 2)

A significant study was made by Robinson and Seligman (1969) in which they developed a scale for measuring campus morale. The scale was tested with 100 institutions of higher education, and significant correlations were found between morale and 37 institutional variables, which lends support to the validity of their scale.

Robinson and Seligman (1969) began their research to develop "a tool for measuring institutional morale" with the assumption that there were then "no widely used tests measuring campus morale" (p. 109). They used material from the College and University Environment Scales (CUES), a standardized test devised to measure five dimensions of the college or university environment: 1) practicality, 2) community, 3) awareness, 4) propriety, and 5) scholarship. Some of the items, such as community, awareness and propriety, appeared to be relevant to institutional morale. Therefore, items
were selected, primarily on the basis of content, to make up an institutional morale scale. Although this is a good instrument for measuring morale, it does not allow one to make comparisons between students and faculty members.

Significant Morale Studies from the 1970's

Brooks (1970) wrote his doctoral dissertation on the morale of faculty members in community colleges in North Carolina. His work presented morale comparisons and relationships, all faculty directed, among such variables as: age, sex, total number of years teaching experience, faculty position, educational level and teaching load.

One of Brooks' main study objectives was to determine if there were differences in morale when faculty members were grouped according to these several categories. Although his research was similar in intent to this present research, and although he did find significant differences in morale among the variables, he dealt exclusively with faculty members without any kind of comparison with student morale in the surveyed colleges.

Smith (1971) developed a morale questionnaire that would discriminate significantly between schools where there was high staff morale and in schools where there was low staff morale. Smith was concerned only with
staff morale in selected elementary schools in Australia and in Florida. His measuring instruments were two
questionnaires, a 50-item and a 24-item instrument. He rejected his null hypothesis that there was no dif­ference in staff morale in several elementary schools, for he found significant morale differences in his analy­sis of the data. Smith, however, made no attempt to measure student morale nor to compare student morale with teacher morale in those selected elementary schools.

In a study by Price and Gardner (1972), the concern was with student teacher morale and how important this information was to the faculty members who were involved in student teacher preparation and supervision. Price and Gardner administered the Purdue Student Teacher Opinionaire (PSTO) to 361 student teachers at the con­clusion of their student teaching experience to deter­mine the present level of their morale. Copies of the results were then given to the student teacher super­visors, and then there followed a period of in-service training for each of the student teachers in the areas of: classroom relationships, student and teacher con­ferences . . . with the use of role playing techniques. Also, a better placement system was initiated for all 361 student teachers. Both the in-service training and better placement system were implemented to improve the
morale of student teachers. After these two efforts were made, the same PSTO was administered to 355 of those same subjects with the results of noticeable morale improvements. The median scores increased significantly. Personalized attention given by the teacher supervisors to the student teachers appears to have made the positive difference in their morale.

In 1974 and 1975, two extensive studies, i.e., Student Opinion Inventory and Teacher Opinion Inventory, were conducted at the elementary and secondary school levels to accomplish specific goals: 1) to assess teacher and student opinions and attitudes toward many facets of their schools, 2) to provide recommendations for improvements, and 3) to provide valuable information to administrators.

Both inventory instruments were developed by the National Study of School Evaluation (NSSE) under the auspices of the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and were administered to students and teachers in elementary and secondary schools throughout the nation. Questionnaires were used with 1,157 students from 43 high schools, and the high schools were selected from the entire continental United States membership of the regional accrediting associations. The Teacher Opinion Inventory was administered to 506 elementary and secondary school teachers from selected schools in seven states.
Since those two studies concerned students and teachers at the elementary and secondary school levels, and not at the college level, and since those research methods varied significantly from the methods used by this author, i.e., their total population and required participation as compared with this author's random and stratified random sampling and voluntary participation, this author was more interested in the composition of the survey instruments than he was with the results. Their composition was readable, clear and simple. This author's own questionnaires (see Appendices A and B) were made similar to the NSSE questionnaires, especially in regard to those three criteria.

Stewart (1976) conducted a study on life satisfaction stages with 48 undergraduate students at Laurentian University in Sudbury, Ontario, Canada. His focus was on levels of general happiness and the frequency of peak experiences.

Using an instrument adapted from Rollins and Feldman (1970) and used by Smart and Smart (1975), Stewart sought to measure past, present and projected satisfaction in various stages in the family life cycle. His instructions to the college were: "Different stages of life may be viewed as more satisfying (happier) than others. How satisfying do you think the following stages have been (or will be) for you?" (p. 106). Table 1 displays the results by percentages.
### Table 1

Ratings of Satisfaction in Stages of the Life Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>1 Very Satisfying %</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Satisfying %</th>
<th>3 So-So (Neutral) %</th>
<th>4 Somewhat Unsatisfying %</th>
<th>5 Very Unsatisfying %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early childhood</td>
<td>54*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle childhood</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later childhood</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescence</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early adulthood</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle adulthood</td>
<td>55*</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later adulthood</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old age</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean rating.
Stewart was surprised to find that his subjects, all predominantly young adults, believed that greater happiness lay up ahead in their middle and later adulthood years. They were at present "somewhat satisfying" in rating their satisfaction levels. As Stewart has shown in Table 2, the mean rating of his 48 college students on an elation-depression scale was at the level of "feeling pretty good, OK." Unfortunately, there was no attempt in Stewart's research to compare the morale of students with faculty members.

Table 2
Ratings on Elation-Depression Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Average Point for the Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Complete elation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Very elated and in very high spirits</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Elated and in high spirits</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Feeling very good and cheerful</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Feeling pretty good, &quot;OK&quot;</td>
<td>(46)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Feeling a little low, just &quot;so-so&quot;</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Spirits low and somewhat &quot;blue&quot;</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Depressed and feeling very low</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tremendously depressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Utter depression and gloom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean rating
In 1976, Swain reflected Herzberg's (1959) theory of satisfaction and dissatisfaction in his research among faculty members serving in a North Carolina community college system. New leadership within the system had recently implemented Herzberg's theory combined with Management by Objectives for Results (MBO), and this combination proved itself to be a positive influence toward higher faculty job satisfaction. Student morale was not part of Swain's research.

Another similar study based on Herzberg's (1959) theory of motivation was conducted by Seegmiller (1977) with the faculty and staff of the College of Eastern Utah. The focus was again on job satisfaction/dissatisfaction. Seegmiller concluded that major job dissatisfaction among faculty and staff centered around the three areas of policy, administration and salary. There was a high degree of dissatisfaction with opportunities for professional growth, i.e., workshops, seminars, conferences, etc. There was also high dissatisfaction with cooperation obtained from employees outside one's department. Seegmiller identified dissatisfaction with salaries as the main culprit responsible for job dissatisfaction at CEU. Finally, Seegmiller recommended the college administration address the highlighted areas of dissatisfaction with the overall goal of improvement of these areas and hence the resultant improvement in faculty/staff job satisfaction.
The conclusions of this research by Seegmiller were unmistakingly clear about one thing at least: Herzberg's work was and is a basic foundation for job satisfaction research, whether the research be in the industrial, military or academic world.

Eagle (1977) conducted morale research with a sampling of 1,100 students from Bronx Community College in New York City. This particular college had a high percentage of blacks (46.2%) and Hispanics (29.1%) among the students. His research results reflected the ethnic/racial concerns of the students in such matters as: adequate finances, safety on campus, and a lack of communication between the administration and the students. The clarity of Eagle's research findings influenced this author to strive for this same valuable trait in his own presentation of the data collected, sorted, analyzed and interpreted. Although Eagles's tables were extensive and far outnumbered his actual narrative sections, all of his work was unmistakably clear.

In her memorandum to four-year colleges and universities, Galambos (1979) reported on morale evaluations of public and private colleges. Her report was based, however, on responses from both college graduates and undergraduates as they reflected on their campus experiences. She reported: "According to the Carnegie Council of College Graduates 1975-76, 72 percent of the nation's
undergraduates reported that they were either satisfied or very satisfied with their colleges" (p. 12). Some comparisons in morale determinants between faculty and students were made in her report, notably, opportunities for personal growth was a key morale determinant for both students and faculty members. Her report summarized the comparisons for 55 public and 34 private institutions of higher education.

Personal Deductions

From personal experience, from the vast amount of research that has been conducted in the past and that is being conducted now in the areas of morale and job satisfaction, and from inferences drawn from this review of related literature, there are key morale determinants on campus that impact on the sense of well being of students and faculty members. Some, and possibly many, of these morale determinants are similar for both students and faculty members. Thus, this writer sought through his research to uncover and identify these similarities, to either substantiate his own research and experiencial conclusions or to show that such hypotheses of similarity cannot be supported.

Finally, this writer rejected other survey instruments for use in this present research for the following reasons:
1. The other instruments were not developed to measure the desired morale relationships between students and faculty members.

2. With the one exception of the McGrath study (1977), the other instruments were not directed toward church-related colleges. Although the McGrath study was a thorough and comprehensive research study, it did not make morale comparisons between students and faculty members. The morale measuring instrument used by McGrath, The Institutional Functioning Inventory (IFI), was designed jointly by the Educational Testing Service at Princeton, New Jersey and the Institute of Higher Education at Columbia University. This instrument measured, among other things, the general esprit among the members of Southern Baptist institutions of higher education. He reported his findings in Scale 7, page II-45 in the study. As was earlier stated by this writer, the McGrath study did not identify in rank order morale determinants on the surveyed campuses. It did not attempt to make morale comparisons between students and faculty members, nor did it address specifically the seven testable hypotheses of this present study; and, the study reported only the esprit ratings of administrators, faculty members and trustees.

3. The other instruments are now somewhat dated; whereas, this present research provided an update of the
"climate of the times" as pertains to campus morale for both students and faculty members.

Research question Number 1 (page 7), concerned with the identification of morale determinants, was researched first in this study and became the foundation for the testing of the seven hypotheses. The seven hypotheses were reasonable ones for they helped to measure, with a certain amount of preciseness, the morale relationships between students and faculty members on Southern Baptist college and university campuses.

Rationale for the Hypotheses

Based on the review of related literature and the personal experiences of this writer, a rationale for the identification of morale determinants and for the seven hypotheses was formulated. The two overall controlling principles that guided this research were: 1) that morale determinants of students and faculty members were similar, and 2) that morale relationships did exist between and among students and faculty members on Baptist campuses. These two principles prompted this research and the selection of the tests that were applied to the hypotheses.

Hypotheses of the Study

Hypothesis One: The older the student, the higher his/her morale self-perception, self-perception being
defined as "how one views himself."

Hypothesis Two: How students and faculty members rate themselves on the morale scale is reflected in how they rate one another. Example: The student who rates himself as having high morale will likewise rate the faculty members at his institution as having high morale.

Hypothesis Three: The longer a student has been on campus, the higher he/she will rate his/her morale.

Hypothesis Four: The longer a faculty member has been on campus, the higher he/she will rate his/her morale.

Hypothesis Five: As a distinct category on campus, military veterans will tend to have higher morale self-perceptions than will their non-veteran colleagues.

Hypothesis Six: Married students tend to have higher morale self-perceptions than do single students.

Hypothesis Seven: The higher the student's class status, i.e., freshman, sophomore, junior or senior, the higher he/she will rank his/her morale.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In this study the author used descriptive research methods and appropriate statistical measures to test the seven hypotheses mentioned in Chapter II. The concerns of this chapter are: 1) the population surveyed and the sampling methods employed, 2) the development of the survey instruments, 3) the procedures used in gathering data, and 4) the statistical analysis for each hypothesis.

Population and Samples

Data was collected from students and faculty members at the three institutions through two similar survey instruments (see Appendices A and B), color coded for easy sorting, i.e., red for students and blue for faculty, and mailed personally to some 300 students and 60 faculty members. For the sample size, the same number of subjects were surveyed, i.e., 100 students and 20 faculty members, from each institution.

Stratified random sampling procedures were chosen for the students to insure that there would be input from a cross-section of the studentry on each campus, that is, from each of the four classes, which were four basic stratification categories. Faculty members were selected by random sampling methods from faculty lists supplied by each
of the institutions. Tables of random digit numbers (Gay, 1976) were used to make both student and faculty selections. Mailing lists were obtained through personal visits to the University of Richmond, Averett College and Virginia Intermont College (the pretest). Being part of the Bluefield College community, the author obtained his mailing list of students from the registrar's office and the list of faculty members from the college directory.

The sampling was taken in this manner:

- **The University of Richmond**
  - Enrollment for '79-'80 = 4,404
  - 100 students, 25 from each class; and 20 faculty members

- **Averett College**
  - Enrollment for '79-'80 = 1,047
  - 100 students, 25 from each class; and 20 faculty members

- **Bluefield College**
  - Enrollment for '79-'80 = 391
  - 100 students, 25 from each class; and 20 faculty members

**Instrument Development**

The development of the two survey instruments was a lengthy process, beginning some eleven months before both instruments were pretested at Virginia Intermont College with seven students and five faculty members (selected at random) during December 1979 and January 1980. Existing instruments were discovered and perused in personal research; suggestions for building the instruments were
requested by the author and freely given by fellow colleagues in graduate school; other ideas were obtained through an educational research/resource center in Mount Clemens, Michigan; and, also helpful was a personal collection of survey instruments this author had collected during the past four years. Thus, the final survey instruments were the results of helpful ideas from many sources.

The survey instruments were developed to assess on-campus student and faculty morale determinants and student and faculty morale relationships as perceived and ranked by both students and faculty members, using morale as the dependent variable. Finally, the survey instruments were coded for follow-up purposes only.

Validity

Content validity was measured in this research. To fulfill their intended purposes, the instruments identified morale determinants, measured and compared morale among and between subjects. Random samples were drawn in sufficient quantities from the surveyed institutions to measure adequately the seven research hypotheses and to present those measurements to persons involved in higher education. Subjects selected at random included persons from different racial, social, economic and cultural backgrounds in addition to the differences identified on the survey instruments. The samples represented the total content area.
Were the instruments valid? Did they measure what they were intended to measure without bias? Did they provide the means for obtaining the necessary sampling of morale data so as to identify the morale determinants and test the hypotheses? In the author's judgment, both student and faculty instruments were valid, internally unbiased and fulfilled their intended purpose. They provided the basic information that was sorted, analyzed, interpreted and then presented.

Reliability

The survey instruments were consistent. The results of the main three-school survey were reflected in the results of the initial pretest. The similarity of responses from the students and faculty members of the four institutions support instrument reliability. In fact, after only a few student and faculty instruments were completed and returned, and the data began to accumulate with marked similarity, the answers became more and more predictable. Or, in other words, the main survey results were reproduced over and over again and reflected the pretest responses.

Survey Procedures

Survey procedures were carried out with the three primary institutions of higher education during February and March 1980, in the following manner:
1. On 20 February 1980, the first mailing took place, as some 300 student and 60 faculty questionnaires were mailed out individually. Each envelope contained a cover letter from the president of Bluefield College (see Appendix C), the survey questionnaire (red or blue) and a self-addressed, stamped envelope for the return of the completed questionnaire.

2. On 7 March 1980, the second mailing took place to all subjects who had not returned their completed questionnaires. This time there were 150 student and 35 faculty questionnaires mailed out. Each envelope contained a cover letter from the author (see Appendix D), another survey questionnaire (red or blue) and another self-addressed, stamped envelope for the return of the completed questionnaire.

3. On 21 March 1980, the third mailing took place to all who had still not replied. There were 130 postal cards mailed out to 110 students and to 20 faculty members (see Appendix E).

To insure greater confidentiality among the author's own colleagues at Bluefield College, he did not number their questionnaires and thus sent three complete mailings to each of the 20 faculty members.

On 25 April 1980, over two full months after the initial mailing of survey questionnaires to 300 students and 60 faculty members, the return percentages were:
Students = 77% (230 of 300)
Faculty = 83% (50 of 60)

Table 3 indicates the institutional return percentages.

Table 3
Institutional Return Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Averett</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluefield</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical Analysis

Seven hypotheses were tested in this research. Table 4 indicates which questionnaire items applied to which hypotheses. Questionnaire items 5, 6, 7 and 8 of both student and faculty questionnaires supplied information concerning the research question on morale determinants. The data on determinants are summarized in Tables 5 through 20.

Procedures for Testing the Hypotheses
Specific inferential procedures were used to test the seven research hypotheses. In each case the Alpha level used was .05, i.e., there was a 5% chance of rejecting a true null hypothesis when it should be accepted (Type I error).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis No.</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>1, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>1, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>1, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>1, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>1, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>1, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>1, 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis One, concerned with student age and morale, was tested by applying the Chi-Square Test ($X^2$) and by using a contingency table. The $X^2$ tested for differences between observed and expected frequencies relating to age (independent variable) and morale self-perception (dependent variable).
Hypothesis Two, concerned with students and faculty rating themselves and then rating one another, was tested by applying the Chi-Square Test ($X^2$) for differences between observed and expected frequencies relating to self-rating (independent variable) and the rating of members of the other group (dependent variable).

Hypothesis Three, concerned with student years on campus and morale, was tested by applying the Chi-Square Test ($X^2$) for differences between observed and expected frequencies relating to years on campus (independent variable) and morale (dependent variable). A contingency table was also used.

Hypothesis Four, concerned with faculty years on campus and morale, was tested by applying the Chi-Square Test ($X^2$) for differences between observed and expected frequencies relating to years on campus (independent variable) and morale (dependent variable). A contingency table was also used.

Hypothesis Five, concerned with veteran and non-veteran morale differences, was tested using the One-Tailed t-Test for differences between two independent means.

Hypothesis Six, concerned with one's marital status and morale, was tested using the One-Tailed t-Test for differences between two independent means.

Hypothesis Seven, concerned with one's class status and morale, was tested using the One-Way Analysis of
Variance (1-Way ANOVA) to determine if the mean differences for morale were significant between subjects in the four classes, i.e., freshman, sophomore, junior and senior.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the responses to the research question on morale determinants and to present the results of the testing of the seven hypotheses. The Alpha level used in testing the seven hypotheses was .05.

On-Campus Morale Determinants

The first consideration is a listing in rank order of the morale determinants, both negative and positive ones, as identified by the students and faculty at the three institutions. The percentages denote the percent of the actual number of students and faculty who identified the specific determinants. Tables 5 through 20 present this information along with the identification of the least and best liked qualities on the three campuses. Visual comparisons are quickly made as to the similarity, or dissimilarity, of choices by students and faculty members.

Data are presented on each of the three institutions to enable the administrators of the institutions to see clearly what their own constituents are reporting. Also, a collective assessment, or summary, of this same information is presented.
In Table 5, only two faculty determinants were similar to corresponding student determinants. Both student and faculty members not only recognized but disliked "student apathy/unconcern." Also, and as identified by both groups, present campus facilities were somewhat lacking. It is this author's understanding that a new campus for Averett College is now being planned.

Table 5
Averett College, Student and Faculty Negative Morale Determinants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant</th>
<th>Student %</th>
<th>Faculty %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. fellow student apathy/unconcern</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. lack of social/student activities</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. lack of adequate campus facilities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. unconcerned faculty toward students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. fellow student misconduct on campus</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. poor quality of teaching</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. low salary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. poor administration-faculty communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. inadequate departmental budgets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 6, there were four faculty determinants similar to corresponding student determinants. Students
and faculty members alike valued their social friendships and the academic program, to include academic freedom. Also, the faculty at Averett appreciated its administrative leadership.

Table 6
Averett College, Student and Faculty Positive Morale Determinants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. caring/concerned faculty</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. good friends/colleagues</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. challenging classes/academic freedom</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. good student activities/sports</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. positive administrative leadership</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. self-motivation/student interest</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Baptist Student Union</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. job fulfillment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. bright future for institution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 7, the lack of adequate campus facilities appeared again in both columns as the only similarity in "least liked qualities."

In Table 8, only three important determinants, or qualities, were held in common by both groups. The concept of "small school, friendly atmosphere" and "good
**Table 7**

**Averett College, Student and Faculty**
**Least Liked Qualities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualities</th>
<th>Student %</th>
<th>Faculty %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. rules/regulations are too strict</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. fellow student apathy/unconcern</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. lack of adequate campus facilities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. fellow student misconduct on campus</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. limited curriculum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. low salary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. poor campus location</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. all other least liked qualities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8**

**Averett College, Student and Faculty**
**Best Liked Qualities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualities</th>
<th>Student %</th>
<th>Faculty %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. small school, friendly atmosphere</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. good relationships with faculty/administration/colleagues</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. good classes/academic freedom</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. good location of campus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. good student/social activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
classes and academic freedom" appeared again and again on
the completed surveys from all three institutions.

In Table 9, only two determinants were similar be­tween the two groups. As first evidenced at Averett Col­lege, "student apathy/unconcern" was again identified by
both groups at the University of Richmond. Noteworthy
was the faculty determinant "poor administrative-faculty
communication" (83%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. rules/regulations are too strict</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. unconcern of administration/faculty toward students</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. fellow student apathy/unconcern</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. fellow student misconduct on campus</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. overemphasis on sports to the neglect of academics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. studies are too difficult</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. poor administration-faculty communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. low salary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. lack of faculty togetherness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. excessive teaching load</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 10, there were four similar determinants as both groups appeared pleased with their own colleagues, with those of the other group, with their campus facility, and with the academic program.

Table 10

University of Richmond, Student and Faculty Positive Morale Determinants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant</th>
<th>Student %</th>
<th>Faculty %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. caring/concerned faculty</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. good friends/colleagues</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. good student activities</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. challenging classes/academic freedom</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. nice campus facilities</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. variety of social organizations</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. good athletic program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. student interest/motivation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. financial security</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 11, there were no similarities identified between the two groups. Nevertheless, faculty members again identified the area of "poor administrative-faculty communication" as being tops on their list of least liked qualities.
Table 11

University of Richmond, Student and Faculty
Least Liked Qualities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualities</th>
<th>Student %</th>
<th>Faculty %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. rules/regulations are too strict</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. unconcern of administration toward students</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. fellow student apathy/unconcern</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. divided campus by sexes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. faculty attrition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. poor administration-faculty communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. university is operated like an industry rather than an educational institution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. lowering of academic standards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. all other least liked qualities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 12, the two similarities between the two groups were reflective of the climate of morale on the Averett College campus, in that, "a small school, friendly atmosphere" with an emphasis on academics can exist at a much larger institution like the University of Richmond.

In Table 13, the similarities in determinant identification were noticeably lacking between students and faculty members at Bluefield College. Dissatisfactions were many at the time of the survey in early 1980.
Table 12
University of Richmond, Student and Faculty
Best Liked Qualities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualities</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. small school, friendly atmosphere</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. good relationships with faculty</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. nice campus/facilities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. good classes/academic freedom</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. good location of campus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. motivated/inquiring students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. good relationships with colleagues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. all other best liked qualities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 14, there were five similarities, led in importance by a "caring relationship" between and among the groups on campus. Note particularly the positive morale determinant of a "Christian environment/Baptist Student Union" identified by both students and faculty members at Bluefield College. Also, the determinant "small college, friendly atmosphere" meant more to the faculty, a surprise indeed, than to the students.

In Table 15, the one quality similarity for both groups concerned the "lack of Christian emphasis on campus," and again the faculty members noticed this more than did the students.
Table 13
Bluefield College, Student and Faculty Negative Morale Determinants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant</th>
<th>Student %</th>
<th>Faculty %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. unconcern of faculty and administration toward students</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. unfriendly fellow students</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. fellow student misconduct on campus</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. fellow student apathy/unconcern</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. lack of adequate campus facilities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. lack of social/student activities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. rules/regulations are too strict</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. low salary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. lack of campus togetherness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. poor administration-faculty communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. excessive teaching load</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. little recognition for accomplishments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. inadequate college budget</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 16, the quality "small school, friendly atmosphere" led the list for both groups of the best liked qualities for Bluefield College as it did for Averett College and the University of Richmond. The quality "Christian environment" appeared as a strong fourth in ranking by students and faculty members.
Table 14
Bluefield College, Student and Faculty Positive Morale Determinants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant</th>
<th>Student %</th>
<th>Faculty %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. caring/concerned faculty/students</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. good friends/colleagues</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Christian environment/Baptist Student Union</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. small college, friendly atmosphere</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. good athletic/intramural programs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. good student activities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. good classes/academic freedom</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. administrative support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. self-fulfillment.in work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 17, the collective assessment of the three institutions was begun. In this table two determinants were similarly identified by both groups in the three institutions. It was evident that both groups were bothered by "student apathy/unconcern" and that the groups similarly recognized "inadequate facilities."

In Table 18, there were three similar positive determinants identified, namely, "mutual concern" between groups, the importance of "good friends/colleagues"; and "academics" was a close third.
Table 15
Bluefield College, Student and Faculty
Least Liked Qualities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualities</th>
<th>Student %</th>
<th>Faculty %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fellow student apathy/unconcern</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unconcern of administration toward</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rules/regulations are too strict</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of Christian emphasis on campus</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of adequate campus facilities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of togetherness among faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low salary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all other least liked qualities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16
Bluefield College, Student and Faculty
Best Liked Qualities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualities</th>
<th>Student %</th>
<th>Faculty %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>small school, friendly atmosphere</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good relationships with faculty/stu-</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good classes/academic freedom</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian environment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good location of campus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 17

Collective Assessment, Student and Faculty
Negative Morale Determinants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant</th>
<th>Student %</th>
<th>Faculty %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. unconcern of faculty/administration toward students</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. rules/regulations are too strict</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. fellow student apathy/unconcern</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. fellow student misconduct on campus</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. inadequate facilities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. poor faculty-administration communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. low salary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. lack of faculty togetherness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. excessive teaching load</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determinant</td>
<td>Student %</td>
<td>Faculty %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. caring/concerned faculty and administration</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. good friends/colleagues</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. student social activities/sports</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. good classes/academic freedom</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. nice campus/adequate facilities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. student interest/motivation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Christian environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 19, there were two least liked qualities identified by both groups. As with all of these negatives, these two least liked qualities, i.e., the "lack of Christian emphasis" and "inadequate facilities," appeared again and again in the returned surveys as if to be warning signals to the trustees and administrators of the surveyed institutions.

In Table 20, four similarities were identified by both groups. These best liked qualities were a repeat of what had been reported earlier, i.e., "small school, friendly atmosphere," "good student-faculty relationships," "good classes/academic freedom," and "Christian environment."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualities</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. rules/regulations are too strict</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. fellow student apathy/unconcern</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. unconcern of administration toward students</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. fellow student misconduct on campus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. lack of Christian emphasis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. inadequate facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. poor faculty-administration communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. underemphasis on academics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. low salary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. lack of faculty togetherness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following is a summary of findings concerning student and faculty morale determinants:

The identification of similar on-campus morale determinants by students and faculty members could not be supported by the collected data. Both students and faculty members did identify similar on-campus morale determinants, but the dissimilarities far outnumbered the similarities (see Tables 5 through 20). Taken collectively, the similar morale determinants averaged 2.4 per table, while the dissimilar morale determinants averaged 5.2 per table.

The identification of fewer than ten morale determinants by a majority of students and faculty members was supported by the collected data. The average number of morale determinants as selected by the majority of surveyed
students was 5.8, as compared to 5.1 for the faculty. Determinant percentages for both groups decreased substantially beyond the top five determinants.

The priority order for morale determinants could not be supported by the collected data. Although the ranking order for positive morale determinants between students and faculty was quite similar (see Tables 18 and 20), the negative morale determinants were quite dissimilar (see Tables 17 and 19).

Student Age and Morale Self-Perception

Hypothesis One, concerned with student age and morale, was tested by applying the Chi-Square Test ($X^2$) and by using a contingency table, Table 21. The test found no significant differences between observed and expected frequencies relating to age and morale self-perception. The null hypothesis was not rejected; consequently, the research hypothesis was not accepted.

Morale Rating of Self and Others

Hypothesis Two, concerned with students and faculty rating themselves and then rating those of the other group, was tested by applying the Chi-Square Test ($X^2$) and by using two contingency tables, Tables 22 and 23. The test as shown in Table 22 found a significant difference between observed and expected frequencies in the morale ratings.
### Table 21

**X² Test of Age and Morale Self-Perception**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morale Level</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>16-18</th>
<th>19-21</th>
<th>22-25</th>
<th>26 &amp; over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent/Very Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair/Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=17)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=139)</td>
<td>(n=55)</td>
<td>(n=18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 2.74 \]
\[ \text{df} = 6 \]
\[ p = .85 \]

### Table 22

**X² Test of Student Morale Rating of Self and Rating of Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morale Level</th>
<th>Student Rates Self</th>
<th>Student Rates Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent/Very Good</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair/Poor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=229)</td>
<td>(n=229)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 39.06 \]
\[ \text{df} = 2 \]
\[ p = 0 \]
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### Table 23

**X² Test of Faculty Morale Rating of Self and Rating of Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morale Level</th>
<th>Faculty Rates Self</th>
<th>Faculty Rates Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent/Very Good</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair/Poor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong> (n=50)</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong> (n=49)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**X² = 5.59**  
**df = 2**  
**p = .07**

Concerning student rating of self and faculty, the null hypothesis was rejected; therefore, the research hypothesis was accepted. The test as shown in Table 23 found no significant differences between observed and expected frequencies in the morale ratings. Concerning faculty rating of self and students, the null hypothesis was not rejected; consequently, the research hypothesis was not accepted.

**Length of Time on Campus and Morale**

Hypothesis Three, concerned with the relationship between years on campus (independent variable) with morale self-perception (dependent variable) for students, was tested using the Chi-Square Test (X²) and a contingency
The test found no significant differences between observed and expected frequencies. The null hypothesis was not rejected; therefore, the research hypothesis could not be supported and was not accepted.

Table 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morale Level</th>
<th>Years on Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent/Very Good</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair/Poor</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 4.57\] \[df = 8\] \[p = .80\]

Hypothesis Four, concerned with the relationship between years on campus (independent variable) with morale self-perception (dependent variable) for faculty members, was tested using the Chi-Square Test \((X^2)\) and a contingency table, Table 25. The test found no significant differences between observed and expected frequencies. The null hypothesis was not rejected; therefore, the research hypothesis was not accepted.
Table 25

$X^2$ Test of Years on Campus and Morale for Faculty Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morale Level</th>
<th>Years on Campus</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>13 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent/Very Good</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair/Poor</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n-6) (n=15) (n=4) (n=8) (n=13)

$X^2 = 2.57$  \hspace{1cm} df = 8  \hspace{1cm} p = .95$

Veteran or Non-Veteran and Morale

Hypothesis Five, concerned with veteran and non-veteran morale differences, was tested using the One-Tailed t-Test for differences between two independent means. For the veterans, the sample size was 17, the standard deviation, SD, was .58, and the mean was 4.0. For the non-veterans, the sample size was 217, the SD was .62, and the mean was 3.7. The significance level used was .05, t = 1.66 and p = .95. Military veterans had higher morale self-perceptions than did their non-veteran colleagues, due, it is believed, to factors such as age, experience and maturity. The null hypothesis was rejected; consequently, the research hypothesis was accepted.
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Marital Status and Morale

Hypothesis Six, concerned with one's marital status and morale, was tested using the One-Tailed t-Test for differences between two independent means. For the married, the standard deviation was .70, and the mean was 3.7. For the single student, the standard deviation was .65, and the mean was 3.7. Since the means did not differ, the null hypothesis was not rejected and the research hypothesis was not accepted.

Class Status and Morale

Hypothesis Seven, concerned with one's class status and morale, was tested using the One-Way Analysis of Variance (One-Way ANOVA). The critical F ratio at a significance level of .05 was 2.6. The following numerical values were given to morale ratings: Excellent = 5, Very Good = 4, Good = 3, Fair = 2, and Poor = 1. No significant differences were found between the means; thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected and the research hypothesis was not accepted. Table 26 displays the summary data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Source of Vari.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Sq.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>Column Means</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>Experimental Error</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26
One-Way ANOVA Summary Data
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CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the conclusions drawn from this research, to summarize the whole study and to offer recommendations to educational leaders.

Conclusions

The major conclusion drawn from this research is that the general thesis of this study, i.e., that there are similar morale determinants and morale relationships between students and faculty members on the campuses of Southern Baptist institutions of higher education regardless of the size of the institutions, can be supported by the collected data.

Although there were a greater number of dissimilar morale determinants between students and faculty, the similar positive determinants, e.g., "good friends/colleagues, challenging classes/academic freedom, small school, friendly atmosphere, Christian environment/Baptist Student Union," and the negative ones, e.g., "fellow student apathy/unconcern," and "lack of adequate campus facilities," were significant and should be kept in mind by college and university trustees and administrators who strive together to create and maintain a wholesome climate of morale on campus.
This writer felt that the overall response rate of 78 percent of the subjects surveyed was sufficient to represent the whole population considered.

It could be concluded further that the morale determinants, as they were identified by students and faculty members alike (see Tables 5 through 20), were fairly predictable due to the past research of such behavioral scientists as Abraham Maslow (1954) and Frederick Herzberg (1959). Both Maslow and Herzberg were concerned with determinants of morale, the former with general determinants and the latter with specific determinants.

In his "Hierarchy of Needs," Maslow (1954) was revisited in this present listing of morale determinants. Survival needs were equated with "good campus facilities"; safety/security needs were equated with "financial security" (a faculty positive morale determinant at the University of Richmond); belongingness needs were equated with "good friends," "good relationships with colleagues," and "good student-faculty relationships"; status/esteem needs were equated with "administrative support, recognition and concern"; and, self-actualization needs were equated with "self-fulfillment in work," and "good classes/academic freedom."

Herzberg, et al., (1959), in his morale studies identified similar determinants of morale as did this writer. A key dissatisfier in Herzberg's research was "low salary,"
and the faculty members of the three primary institutions surveyed in this study also identified "low salary" as one of the top five negative morale determinants or least liked qualities. One other dissatisfier identified by Herzberg, i.e., "interpersonal relations with subordinates, superiors and peers," was also placed high on the list of morale determinants by both students and faculty members in this present study.

To continue with conclusions, Seegmiller (1977) in his morale studies at the College of Eastern Utah determined that faculty and staff dissatisfaction related to the cooperation, or lack of it, obtained from employees outside one's department. In this present study, communication, or the lack of it, between various groups on campus, i.e., students, administrators, faculty and staff, had an impact, either negative or positive, on one's morale and upon the overall morale of the campus. This writer equated communication with cooperation.

Eagle (1977) also identified the importance of adequate and continuous communication between college administrators and students for the development and maintenance of high morale. This absolute necessity for open and continuous communication between administration and students and between administration and faculty was identified in this research. In fact, building and maintaining mutual trust, respect and concern for one another by means of an
open and continuous communication flow should be given first priority on campus.

The morale determinants as they were revealed in this research are vitally important to educational administrators in all institutions of higher education. The very health of their respective institutions depends on how well these morale determinants are addressed and attended to on a day-to-day basis.

This research also concluded that there was no direct relationship between a student's age and his/her morale self-perception. High and low morale self-perceptions were found among all students without any significant pattern emerging due to one's age.

This study further concluded that a higher percentage of both students and faculty members perceived their own morale as being higher than the morale of the members of the other group, that is, a majority of individual students rated their own morale higher than they rated faculty morale, and a majority of faculty members rated their morale higher than they rated student morale. Or, to put it yet another way, the majority of individuals of one group did not project their optimism upon the individuals of the other group.

To conclude further, whether a student's own morale self-perception tended to increase the longer he/she had been on campus could not be supported by the data. The same could be said about faculty members, for their morale was
not noticeably influenced by their years on campus, be the years few or many.

Based on the collected data, it was healthy to be a military veteran on a college campus, for a veteran's morale was rated higher than was the non-veteran's morale.

This research concluded that married students do not have higher morale than single students, nor is the reverse true. No pattern was found in one's marital status and one's morale rating.

Finally, this writer concluded that there was no significant relationship between one's class status and his/her morale self-perception. Upperclassmen had no corner on the market for high morale.

Summary of the Study

In summary, the research conducted, data collected, analyzed, interpreted and presented does emphasize the importance of on-campus morale for the accomplishment of the mission, and in this instance it is the mission of high quality, post-secondary education in an environment of mutual respect and trust.

The stated purpose of this research, namely, to identify key on-campus morale determinants, relationships and similarities between and among students and faculty members on Southern Baptist college and university campuses has been fulfilled. Additionally, it was this writer's belief
that such information could be presented in a clear and simplistic manner so as to be readily understood by all educators in institutions of higher learning. This also has been accomplished.

In accomplishing the objective of being understood by all persons involved in higher education, this writer endeavored to practice the essence of two quotations . . . the first being short and anonymous while the other is longer and came from the able pen of Benjamin Franklin, as he wrote long ago in The Pennsylvania Gazette, and as it is recorded in his autobiography (Labaree, 1964). They are:

To understand others and to be understood by all, know the big words but use the small.

and

Writing . . . should proceed regularly from the things unknown, distinctly and clearly without confusion. The words used should be the most expressive that the language affords, provided they are the most generally understood. Nothing should be expressed in two words that can be as well expressed in one; that is, synonyms should be as short as possible, consistent with clearness; the words should be so placed as to be agreeable to the ear in reading; summarily it should be smooth, clear and short, for the contrary qualities are displeasing (p. 8).
Recommendations

The following specific recommendations are now offered to educational leaders in all areas of higher education:

1. Show a personal interest in and a respect and concern for all members of the campus family, for respect begets respect.

2. Communicate openly and continuously with students and faculty alike, for they have a need to know new considerations, proposed changes and the state of the campus.

3. Give praise and recognition publicly, privately and liberally to students and faculty alike, for they, like all, have the need to be appreciated.

4. Deal with student apathy, unconcern and misconduct on campus firmly, fairly and swiftly.

5. Review and revise continuously campus rules and regulations so that they continue to serve the best interests of the students while upholding the overall purpose of the institution.

6. Upgrade and maintain with care all campus facilities and give special emphasis to residence halls, for inadequate living accommodations will lower morale quickly.

7. Maintain a genuine Christian emphasis on campus, for such an emphasis is expected and desired by many students and faculty members and it was the emphasis behind the founding of the institution.
8. Insure that faculty salaries are competitive with other similar sized, private institutions.

9. Emphasize academics first and foremost, for the institution exists primarily for academic purposes.

10. Provide wholesome and diversified student activities, to include intramural and intercollegiate sports, for these kinds of activities impact positively on student morale.

In closing, as goes the morale of the individual members of the college or university family, so goes the mission of that institution. Providing sound educational opportunities in a Christian environment is now and always has been the overall purpose of Christian institutions of higher education and of Southern Baptist institutions in particular. May this educational research dissertation prove helpful to all leaders in higher education . . . to all who desire for their institutions to live, grow, function well and accomplish their intended purpose.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF STUDENT AND FACULTY
MORALE DETERMINANTS AND RELATIONSHIPS IN
SOUTHERN BAPTIST INSTITUTIONS OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Please circle your answers unless otherwise noted.

1. How would you rate your own morale?
   (1) excellent
   (2) very good
   (3) good
   (4) fair
   (5) poor

2. What is your sex?
   (1) male
   (2) female

3. How would you describe/rate the overall climate of
   morale on your campus?
   (1) excellent
   (2) very good
   (3) good
   (4) fair
   (5) poor
4. How many years have you been on campus? ____________

5. In your opinion, and in priority order, what factors on campus have the greatest negative influence on your morale?
   (1) greatest influence: __________________________
   (2) 2nd greatest influence: ______________________
   (3) 3rd greatest influence: ______________________

6. In your opinion, and in priority order, what factors on campus have the greatest positive influence on your morale?
   (1) greatest influence: __________________________
   (2) 2nd greatest influence: ______________________
   (3) 3rd greatest influence: ______________________

7. What do you like least about your institution? (a short statement please) __________________________________

8. What do you like best about your institution? (a short statement please) _______________________________
9. How would you rate the overall faculty morale at your institution?
   (1) excellent
   (2) very good
   (3) good
   (4) fair
   (5) poor

10. What is the approximate student enrollment at your institution?
    (1) under 500
    (2) 500 to 1500
    (3) 1500 or over

11. What is your marital status?
    (1) single
    (2) married
    (3) other

12. Are you a military veteran?
    (1) no
    (2) yes

13. Which is your class status?
    (1) freshman  (4) senior
    (2) sophomore  (5) graduate student
    (3) junior
14. What is your age?
   (1) 16 to 18 years
   (2) 19 to 21 years
   (3) 22 to 25 years
   (4) 26 to 29 years
   (5) 30 years or over

15. What is your campus relationship?
   (1) resident
   (2) commuter

Note: Your participation in this important survey is sincerely appreciated, and your answers will be handled in the spirit of confidentiality and anonymity.
APPENDIX B

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF STUDENT AND FACULTY MORALE DETERMINANTS AND RELATIONSHIPS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

Please circle your answers unless otherwise noted.

1. How would you rate your own morale?
   (1) excellent
   (2) very good
   (3) good
   (4) fair
   (5) poor

2. What is your sex?
   (1) male
   (2) female

3. How would you describe/rate the overall climate of morale on your campus?
   (1) excellent
   (2) very good
   (3) good
   (4) fair
   (5) poor
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Faculty

4. How many years have you been on campus?_______

5. In your opinion, and in priority order, what factors on campus have the greatest negative influence on your morale?
   (1) greatest influence:__________________________
   (2) 2nd greatest influence:_______________________
   (3) 3rd greatest influence:_______________________

6. In your opinion, and in priority order, what factors on campus have the greatest positive influence on your morale?
   (1) greatest influence:__________________________
   (2) 2nd greatest influence:_______________________
   (3) 3rd greatest influence:_______________________

7. What do you like least about your institution? (a short statement please)______________________________________________________

8. What do you like best about your institution? (a short statement please)______________________________________________________
Faculty

9. How would you rate the overall student morale at your institution?
   (1) excellent
   (2) very good
   (3) good
   (4) fair
   (5) poor

10. What is the approximate student enrollment at your institution?
    (1) under 500
    (2) 500 to 1500
    (3) 1500 or over

11. What is your marital status?
    (1) single
    (2) married
    (3) other

12. Are you a military veteran?
    (1) no
    (2) yes

Note: Your participation in this important survey is sincerely appreciated, and your answers will be handled in the spirit of confidentiality and anonymity.
20 February 1980

Students and Faculty Colleagues
University of Richmond
Averett College
Bluefield College

Dear Student or Faculty Colleague;

This letter is to request your cooperation (for about five minutes) in filling in the enclosed questionnaire. This study on "Comparative Student and Faculty Morale Determinants and Relationships in Southern Baptist Institutions of Higher Education" is an integral part of a doctoral dissertation being prepared by our Dean of Students, Jack E. Brown, Jr. Jack is now completing his work for the Doctor of Education Degree in Educational Leadership from Western Michigan University.

It is hoped that the results of this study will serve useful purposes in the educational endeavors of all of our Baptist institutions of higher education.

Be assured that your answers will be treated in confidence, for the questionnaire numbering is strictly for follow-up purposes. A self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Thank you for helping. Your prompt reply and comments will be sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. TYER
President

Enclosure
7 March 1980

Students and Faculty Colleagues
University of Richmond
Averett College
Bluefield College

Dear Student or Faculty Colleague;

This is a follow-up letter (plus survey) to the one you should have received about two weeks ago from Dr. Charles L. Tyer, President of Bluefield College. A good number of completed questionnaires have been returned, but to date yours is still outstanding, that is, if it did reach you. If your completed questionnaire is in the mail to me, please disregard this reminder.

Let me reassure you of two things: 1) the results of this completed dissertation should be beneficial to present and future students, faculty members and administrators of all of our colleges and universities, and 2) your anonymity will be protected. The numbering is so I can follow-up on those colleagues who have not responded.

I again appeal for your cooperation and assistance. And, your frank and candid comments are sincerely appreciated. Thank you for helping.

Very sincerely yours,

JACK E. BROWN, JR.
Dean of Students

Enclosure
21 March 1980
Bluefield College
Bluefield, VA  24605

Dear Student or Faculty Colleague:

Your completed morale questionnaire is vitally important for my research dissertation. Won't you complete and return your questionnaire today?

Thank you.

Yours very sincerely,

JACK E. BROWN, JR.
Dean of Students
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Gay, L. R.  Student guide to educational research.  Columbus, OH:  Charles Merrill, 1976.

Gay, L. R.  Educational research: competencies for analysis and application.  Columbus, OH:  Merrill, 1976, pp. 325-328.


Holy Bible.


Rafferty, M. Punishment: part of life, education. The Macomb Daily, Macomb County, Michigan, November 14, 1977, p. 6-A.


Seegmiller, J. F. Job satisfaction of faculty and staff at the College of Eastern Utah. A research project in 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 139-389)


University of Richmond Catalog. Richmond, VA: 1979-80.